Cultivating and Sustaining Research at BMCC

Report from the COACHE Taskforce, Subgroup on Research

15 April 2016

"Being an academic is to be passionate about seeking knowledge, therefore I can't not be a researcher. It's impossible to be a good professor if you don't spend the time to learn about the latest developments in your field and if you don't engage in leading those developments... The urgency of learning about the discipline is made clear to [my students] when I teach using research-related stories and experiences from my work outside of the classroom."

"I truly believe that my research has the potential to inform educational change on a larger scale, both at BMCC and in the world. The reason I started my current line of research was to be able to improve policies and practices not only for the students in my classes, but also across BMCC, and perhaps even across the nation. I truly believe that the research questions I am looking into have the potential to make a difference in the world. I feel that this is an integral part of my mission as a community college instructor."

Executive Summary

CUNY is the first university where research is an essential component of community college faculty work, and BMCC is uniquely positioned to be a leader in community college faculty-driven research. By hiring nationally-recognized researchers, providing contractual reassigned time for junior faculty, funding research infrastructure, and creating programs such as the Presidential Scholars and Faculty Publications programs, the foundation for this achievement has already been laid. Now is the time to build on that foundation by instituting critical new programs and structural changes that will take research to the next level and shine a national spotlight on BMCC's support of faculty scholarship.

BMCC and CUNY have made tremendous strides over the last 10-15 years to support research, and many researchers at BMCC likely would not have achieved success without supports such as contractual research reassigned time and internal funding opportunities. These endeavors have attracted a critical mass of highly-qualified researchers to BMCC who want to build sustainable long-term research programs. However, as an institution in transition, BMCC's structures and culture have not evolved as quickly as faculty have adapted to a research-focus. Cultural and structural obstacles to research resulted in BMCC faculty rating, in the COACHE survey, teaching load and lack of support for research as the worst aspects of working at BMCC. Roughly two-thirds more faculty at BMCC versus faculty at other CUNY community colleges rated "support for research" as one of the most negative aspects of their position.

The COACHE Taskforce Subgroup on Research was formed to investigate the changes needed to maximize BMCC faculty's ability to conduct high quality research, and to provide BMCC with the tools needed to capitalize on the significant investment that it has already made in faculty and in research. With this goal in mind, the Taskforce undertook an extensive process of data collection including interviews, surveys, and focus groups. The Taskforce received 156 survey responses from current faculty and conducted interviews or focus groups with 64 current and former faculty members. The Taskforce also conducted interviews with 12 current or recent BMCC administrators and interviewed 21 faculty and administrators at other CUNY colleges, to identify best practices.

By far the most positive research support identified by faculty was contractual reassigned time or reassigned time from internal funding programs; the most critical need was likewise identified as reassigned time for research, especially for veteran faculty no longer eligible for contractual reassigned time. Based on the information gleaned in the survey and in interviews about researcher needs at BMCC, the expertise and recommendations of administrators and faculty interviewed at BMCC and across CUNY, and on best practices gleaned from the research literature as well as relevant databases and reports (e.g. IPEDS, CUNY PMP Report), the Taskforce developed the enclosed recommendations for changes to the college's structures and culture.

These recommendations are a critical next step in advancing the research strides BMCC has already made. Without these changes, BMCC risks losing a critical and significant portion of their investment in faculty and research, as faculty who have built research programs here leave for positions elsewhere. Well over half of faculty who responded to the Taskforce survey reported that they plan to go on the job market during the next five years, and of those, about three-quarters cited time or workload as a primary reason for seeking a position elsewhere. Many of these faculty currently have thriving research programs at BMCC, some of which include extensive external funding. At the same time, faculty often indicated that they would prefer to stay at BMCC, if some concrete changes could be made.

This is a critical moment in BMCC's history. A strategic and prudent application of college resources and a thoughtful implementation of some straightforward structural changes, could position BMCC as the premier research community college within CUNY, the nation, and the world, with best practices others seek to emulate. BMCC has already laid the groundwork for this achievement; but in order to leverage and release the full potential of that investment in faculty and research, further steps need to be taken. These steps require fewer resources than the investment in research that has already been made at the college, and in fact most of the recommendations have no financial cost--and yet the potential returns on this investment are significant. BMCC students deserve to be taught by nationally-recognized scholars in their field, and to participate in cutting-edge research with faculty mentors. This can only be done if research structures and resources evolve at the same rate as the research does, so that faculty researchers can continue to cultivate rich and rigorous long-term research programs here at BMCC.

Summary of Recommendations

For details of each of these recommendations, see the corresponding page numbers in the report.

I. Reassigned time for veteran faculty past the first five years of appointment (p. 3):
- Establish a program for veteran faculty who meet pre-specified criteria to guarantee a minimum amount of reassigned time for research. Use a rubric developed by faculty-led team. (p. 3)

II. Change institutional culture to better support research (p. 10):

Department level (p. 10):
1. Appoint an experienced and successful researcher in each department at the deputy chair level or higher to serve as Research Coordinator. (p. 11)
2. Train chairs and departmental P&B committee members on how to support & evaluate faculty research. (p. 11)

Institutional level (p. 12):
1. Create a faculty research advisory committee, consisting of experienced faculty researchers (but membership should be open to interested faculty); this committee should be an integral part of institutional decisions regarding research (policies, procedures and structures, including budgetary allocations). (p. 12)
2. Create an Ombudsman position or similar entity for faculty to report workload concerns. (p. 13)
3. Implement 360 degree evaluation process for chairs, staff and administration and include faculty input on the criteria/metrics to be used. (p. 13)

III. Revise institutional structures to better support research (p. 14):
1. Streamline grant submission procedure (single sign-off; clear approval rubric; faculty retain control of content— e.g. allow necessary reassigned time). (p. 14)
2. Establish scheduling policies that reflect research responsibilities (eliminate three-day-rule). (p. 16)
3. Establish transparent, streamlined procedures for requesting research essentials (e.g. supplies, software, space, travel funds). (p. 17)
4. Establish IT policies that allow faculty to procure and install software and research tools. (p. 18)
5. Value and support BMCC faculty appointments at the CUNY Graduate Center. (p. 19)
6. Remove restrictions from current internal funding programs (e.g. allow funds to pay for RT). (p. 20)
7. Move up research leave (e.g. sabbatical) timeline so decisions are made by January of the leave year. (p. 20)
8. Create transparent and consistent process for all internal research-related opportunities (i.e. sabbatical, internal funding). (p. 21)

Secondary priorities (fund only <u>after</u> research reassigned time program for veteran faculty has been adequately funded) (p.22):
9. Increase the amount of travel funds available. (p. 22)
10. Increase available internal funding opportunities. (p. 22)

I. Veteran Faculty Research Reassigned Time (RT) Program

Time was by far the most significant obstacle to research identified by BMCC faculty. The recommendation to create a research reassigned time program is the most important change needed to support research at BMCC. Veteran faculty (faculty in professorial lines who are not eligible for contractual reassigned time for research) with an established record of significant research achievements at BMCC must have access to <u>regular</u>, <u>predictable</u> reassigned time for research; **without this change, other changes will have very limited impact**.

"Regardless of how many great initiatives are created, without release time, we can't really make them work to their full potential. … the problem is the reluctance to give release time for service-related administrative functions that eat up at least three times the release time we are given if we are lucky enough to get it."

"Reassigned time for non-tenured faculty has been a big success…However, the situation for senior faculty has gotten worse…Once faculty have tenure, they are pretty much left on their own to find research grants and a research program… practically impossible with a 27 hr teaching load. Something must be done to allow senior faculty to pursue research on a consistent basis. Programs like the faculty publication program are a start, but… totally insufficient."

"The one change that is crucial is to give reassigned time after the 5 years to those faculty that both have a track record of publications, and that plan on continuing to pursue research. This is the only way to make research sustainable."

"The high teaching load was my primary reason for leaving BMCC. If it had been reduced, I would have stayed."

Recommendation: Create a research reassigned time (RT) program for veteran faculty.

This program should have the following features:

- **Creation of a college-wide Research Rubric (the Rubric) by a team of faculty researchers that awards points for scholarly work**: publications, grants, student mentoring, etc. and would include discipline-specific items.

- **Under the Rubric, faculty accrue points annually based on their research activities; points are then exchanged for RT for research in the following years.** Point accrual and redemption should be <u>predictable</u> and <u>straightforward</u>: much like the form used by the college to redeem contractual RT.

The program would be flexible—the standards could be revised periodically, depending on the number of faculty that the college can support. A pilot program might award 3h of RT per semester to faculty who have received at least two external grants and who continue to apply for external grants each year that they do not have active external funding (comparable measures such as scholarly awards could be used for disciplines that are not grant-driven). Pilot outcomes (scholarly work produced, grant applications submitted[1]) could determine success and the need for future refinements.

The RT program should be streamlined, predictable, regular, and proportional to research productivity. Predictability and regularity are crucial for planning long-term research projects. Minimizing paperwork is essential—otherwise the RT intended for research will be consumed by paperwork requirements for the next year of the program.

We recommend that this RT be funded by using the indirect funds brought in by BMCC's external grants.

---

[1] We note that outcomes would not be immediate, since it takes time for researchers to write up results and for them to be reviewed, accepted and published. Outcomes would be best measured 1-2 years out for articles and grant applications, and 3-5 years out for larger projects such as books or successfully obtaining an external grant. For example, the average PI on an NSF grant had to submit a grant application roughly two and a half times before successfully obtaining funding (NSF, 2011-2014 data)--and this does not take into account the number of applications that are never funded.

Need

Time for research was overwhelmingly both the single biggest positive factor and the single biggest obstacle cited by faculty.   Reassigned time provided by the PSC CUNY contract or by internal funding had a larger positive impact than any other factor, and the current workload, especially for veteran faculty, was the biggest obstacle to research. Faculty researchers are compelled to work in the evening and on weekends (and the higher their research output scale value, the more hours they spend). Faculty who have abandoned a research agenda and/or have sought employment elsewhere, all cite time as the most important factor in these decisions. The lack of research reassigned time is seen as a big obstacle to keeping research going once contractual time is no longer available.

"[Evenings and weekends are] the only time in which [research] can be done. Absolutely, between grading, creating courses, work on pedagogy, participation in programs, meetings for service. I get up at 4:30am so that can squeeze in some writing time."

"As a Library faculty member on a 12-month schedule working 5 days a week in the Library including winter, spring, and summer breaks, it is exhausting and demoralizing trying to develop and maintain a research agenda. The only time for research is nights, weekends, and vacations. It is essential that reassigned time programs include Library faculty and recognize the realities of our work."

"We have lost a really valuable opportunity to reflect on our teaching. When we are teaching so much, then the rest of the time is eaten up by service and research expectations. Part of what is difficult about the current teaching load is that it doesn't give us the space to be the kind of teachers we want to be."

"Crushing P&B burden. Incredible teaching load. I was teaching a 5-4 and doing 4 searches per semester. I was not able to finish my book until I resigned from P&B."

Table 1. Impact of time on faculty research: Time was rated as the most critical positive factor and the most critical obstacle for research

	had impact	rated as most important factor
Most Critical Positive Factor: Reassigned time for research provided by the contract or internal funding	**75%**	**77%**
Contractual reassigned time	67%	67%
Reassigned time for research provided by internal grants	40%	34%
Biggest Obstacle: Time available to conduct research and apply for external funding	**89%**	**68%**
The number of classes they were required to teach (or library workload)	81%	71%
The amount of time they were required to spend on service	70%	34%

Table 2. Time as a factor in faculty decisions--Percentage of faculty who cited time as a reason for:

Never having submitted an external grant	69%
Considering stopping research and focusing solely on teaching	87%
Actually stopping research	75%
Looking for another job (in the past, or over the next 5 years)	76%

Internal funding opportunities don't supply enough RT and aren't predictable enough to sustain long-term research programs.

While there are some internal CUNY grants that can supply limited RT, internal grants alone are insufficient to support a long-term research program.

"The BMCC Faculty Publication Program Grant was a big help but I can't win it frequently enough to really affect my course load… Predictability and regularity are extremely important. With [reassigned time provided by internal funding] there is no predictability or regularity."

"Since my junior faculty RT ran out a few years ago, I have been successful at cobbling together at least a little research RT every year through internal and external grants. But that has been very stressful and uncertain, and has required both a certain amount of luck and crazy extra hours spent on grant applications. I don't know how long I can keep doing that. I spent a huge amount of my junior faculty RT on building up this research program, and I have to be able to keep it going by working on it regularly at least a little bit every semester; otherwise it will die off and I will have to start it all over again, but I don't have five years of junior faculty RT now to get it up and running a second time. I have been seriously considering looking for a job somewhere else, where I know that I will have at least a little time to work on my research every semester. I really don't want to leave BMCC, so I haven't gone on the job market yet--but if things don't change soon, I will go on the market before my current funding runs out. If there were just some way for me to know for sure that I could have at least one course release a semester as long as I continue to do research here, I would definitely stay here at BMCC."

The three main internal awards available to tenured faculty for which RT can be requested (PSC CUNY, Tenured Faculty Publication, CIRG/C3IRG) cannot be received every year; while tenured faculty can receive PSC CUNY grants two out of three years, they can only receive the other internal grants one out of every three years. And given the increasing competitiveness for these awards, their outcome is ever more unpredictable, as every year there are some strong proposals that are not funded. In addition, each of these internal awards limit faculty to 3h of RT, and some require that they not receive any other RT for research in the same semester.

Even in an ideal scenario (where applications are always successful) veteran faculty could at best win 3-4h of research RT per year. In contrast, untenured faculty receive roughly 5h per year contractually, and can win an additional 4h per year through PSC CUNY and CIRG/C3IRG awards, for a total of 9h of RT per year—more than double the maximum that a veteran faculty member could receive through internal awards. And untenured faculty receive base contractual RT automatically, without having to spend a substantial amount of time and effort (away from actually conducting research) on writing and submitting internal grant applications.

Applying for external funding requires significant additional time, beyond time needed to conduct research.
Sixty-nine percent of faculty who have never applied for an external grant cite a lack of time as the reason (see Table 2). And for faculty who have successfully received external funding, external research grant applications require a significant time investment long before funds are ever awarded: according to a recent study, the average principal investigator (PI) spends 116 hours per federal grant submission, and the average co-PI 55 hours (von Hippel & von Hippel, 2015). In addition, researchers who eventually do obtain funding typically have to submit a grant application several times before their proposal is funded (2.4 times on average at the NSF, according to 2011-2014 data).

Using these numbers, **the average successfully-funded federal grant proposal costs the PI the equivalent of over 6 hours of RT, and each co-PI the equivalent of about 3 hours of RT**. (This is just the amount of time invested in one single grant program from which the researcher eventually succeeds in obtaining funding—since most researchers submit simultaneously to several different programs, the amount of time invested before successfully obtaining outside funding for a particular research project is actually higher.) **Without some underlying research RT, faculty researchers don't have the time needed to write and submit successful external grant proposals.** The fact that some faculty at BMCC have managed to submit and successfully receive external grant applications is a testament to their willingness to work nights and weekends on grant proposal preparation.

Table 3. Average time investment required to obtain external funding from one single grant program, for those faculty who eventually do obtain funding from that program

	Avg. time to submit single federal proposal (von Hippel & von Hippel, 2015)	Avg. number of submissions before obtaining funding (NSF, 2011-2014 data)	Avg. total hrs. submitting proposals before successfully obtaining funding	Equivalent research RT (based on 3 hrs. work equivalent to 1h of RT)
Principal investigator (PI)	116 hrs	2.4	278 hrs	6.2 hrs
Co-PI	55 hrs	2.4	132 hrs	2.9 hrs

"I was told that I should use my contractual research to write an external grant, but I need that time to actually do research, not to write grants. External grants are very difficult to get, so it's a big risk... If I get an external grant then BMCC and I both benefit: I get the support for my research and BMCC gets prestige and indirect funds. If I don't get the grant, I lose my time, but BMCC doesn't risk anything. The rewards are distributed among both groups–it's only fair that the risks should be, too. Both of us should have skin in the game."

Best Practices at Other Institutions

Reassigned Time
There is widespread precedent at CUNY colleges to award faculty reassigned time for research, separate from contractual or grant-funded time. At Baruch, City, Staten Island, Hunter, John Jay, Lehman, and Queens, faculty are automatically awarded 3-6 hours yearly of reassigned time for research. The process is automatic and predictable, and requires minimal paperwork. Decisions are typically made at the department level, although in some cases they are managed by academic affairs or the provost. Brooklyn and John Jay also have competitive programs to provide reassigned time for work on ongoing research projects.

"At the senior colleges colleagues tell me they do not teach the contractual load as a matter of course, without filling out any paperwork. My former advisor teaches a 2-1. Until a similar arrangement happens here, at least for research-active faculty, not much will change."

The teaching workload of veteran faculty at BMCC is the highest in CUNY.

Thirty-five percent of veteran FT BMCC faculty would have to be allocated 3 hours of research RT per semester, to align the teaching load with the average at the other CUNY community colleges (CUNY PMP Report, 2013-2014)**:**

Table 4. Average annual hours taught by veteran full-time faculty (PMP Report, 2009-2013)	
BXCC	21.3
Hostos	21.7
KBCC	21.8
LaGCC	19.3
QBCC	22.9
Average of other CUNY CCs	**21.1**
BMCC	**23.2**

Use of Indirect Funds from External Grants
At many colleges, indirect funds brought in by grants are allocated to faculty research. At Hunter, indirect funds brought in by federal grants are given to the individual departments where the grants were earned and are earmarked for research expenses. At John Jay, these funds are also re-invested in research: a portion of indirect funds on every grant is given back to the PI, and another portion of these funds is used to fund a number of internal programs that supply faculty with funds or reassigned time; funding decisions are made by a Faculty Research Advisory Committee, consisting entirely of research-active faculty.

Impacts of This Recommendation

We note that the actual amount of reassigned time awarded through the proposed program would be based entirely upon what faculty achieve in a given year, so that all faculty who meet the required standards would achieve the set amount of reassigned time allocated to that standard. Because of this, there is no set number of faculty that would receive reassigned time under this program each year. However, for the ease of calculations, we use simple thresholds defined as the percentage of veteran faculty receiving 3h of research reassigned time per year.

We summarize below the impacts of three specific thresholds:

- **If 20% of all veteran faculty receive 3h of research reassigned time per semester:**
  This would bring the veteran faculty workload at BMCC closer to the average of the other CUNY community colleges, but would not be sufficient to close the gap. It would cost only $18.16 per FTE, which is roughly one-quarter of one-percent of total core expenditures at BMCC, less than one-third of one percent of all instructional expenditures, and only one-fifth of the amount BMCC annually spends on public service.

- **If 30% of all veteran faculty receive 3h of research reassigned time per semester:**
  This would bring the veteran faculty workload at BMCC even closer to the average of the other CUNY community colleges, but would still not be sufficient to close the gap. It would cost only $27.23 per FTE, which is less than two-fifths of one-percent of total core expenditures at BMCC, less than one-half of one percent of all instructional expenditures, and less than a third of the amount BMCC annually spends on public service.

- **If 40% of all veteran faculty receive 3h of research reassigned time per semester:**
  This would be sufficient to close the gap between current veteran faculty workload at BMCC and the average at the other CUNY community colleges. It would cost only $36.31 per FTE, which is roughly half of one-percent of total core expenditures at BMCC, roughly two-fifths of one percent of all instructional expenditures, and less than two-fifths of the amount BMCC annually spends on public service.

Table 5. Impacts of veteran faculty receiving 3h of reassigned time per semester, by percentage of veteran faculty receiving the RT (CUNY PMP Report, 2013-2014; IPEDS, 2013)

	20%	30%	40%
Would be sufficient to bring veteran faculty workload at BMCC down to average of other CUNY CCs?	no	no	yes
Cost per FTE	$18.16	$27.23	$36.31
Total cost	$333,564	$500,346	$667,128
Cost as % of total BMCC core expenditures	0.26%	0.38%	0.51%
Cost as % of instructional expenditures	0.31%	0.47%	0.62%
Cost as % of expenditures on public service	20%	30%	39%

It is important to note that whatever thresholds are chosen as the goal for the veteran faculty research reassigned time program, **the amount of RT awarded would vary across faculty based on productivity**. For example, in the table below the total amount of RT is the same as if 30% of all veteran faculty uniformly received 3h of RT per semester, but the RT is actually distributed among 56% of veteran faculty in amounts ranging from 1 to 6 hours annually.

Table 6. Sample Distribution of veteran faculty research RT	
percentage	RT hrs./yr.
12%	1
10%	2
10%	3
9%	4
8%	5
7%	6
56%	**TOTAL**

Cost

Indirect funds from existing grants could be used to fund the new research RT program, a procedure used elsewhere in CUNY. From 2010-2015, BMCC received roughly $4.4 million in grants from federal agencies. At a federal indirect cost rate of 71%, **the indirect funds brought in by these grants annually would be roughly equivalent to the amount needed to provide 18% of veteran faculty with 3h of research reassigned time per semester.**

The more research reassigned time that faculty have, the more grant funds they bring into the college. In a study of faculty workload and research productivity, <u>each</u> **reduction in teaching load by <u>one course per semester</u>, more**

than <u>doubled</u> the total number of external grant dollars received** (Porter & Umbach, 2001). Providing 3 hrs of RT per semester to faculty with prior external funding would thus generate increased grant revenues. Based on Porter & Umbach's model:

If all veteran faculty who received external funding over the last six years were to receive 3h of RT per semester, additional external funding totaling $3.2 million could be expected to be brought in by those faculty over the next six years[2]. This would be sufficient to fund an additional 13% of veteran faculty with 3h of reassigned time per semester, so that a total of 31% of all veteran faculty could be awarded 3h of RT per semester. In this way, as more faculty are supported by the veteran faculty research reassigned time program, more external grant funds would come into the college, and more funds would be available to support more veteran faculty with reassigned time, and then this cycle would repeat, so that the program could grow as the numbers of veteran faculty doing research grows.

Table 7. Impacts of veteran faculty research RT program on external grants received, based on Porter & Umbach's model (2001)	
External grant funds received by faculty PIs in 2010-2015	$4.7 million
Percentage of veteran faculty who could be awarded 3h of RT per semester based on the indirect funds from these grants	18%
Additional grant funds over the next 6 yrs that would result from giving 3h of RT per semester to all faculty who received grants during 2010-2015	$3.2 million
Additional percentage of veteran faculty who could be awarded 3h of RT per semester based on the indirect funds from these grants	13%
Total grant funds over the next 6 yrs, base amount reflective of prior years and additional funds resulting from veteran faculty research RT program	$7.9 million
Total percentage of veteran faculty who could be awarded 3h of RT per semester based on the indirect funds from these grants	31%

PMP Measures

Potential concerns that RT for research would negatively impact the ratio of FTEs taught by FT faculty at BMCC are unfounded. **For the percentage of FTEs taught by FT faculty at BMCC to change by even one percentage point, 20% of veteran faculty would have to be awarded three hours of research RT per semester--but the natural fluctuation in this number between 2009 and 2013 was four percentage points**, so veteran faculty research RT would have no significant impact on this ratio (PMP Report, 2013-2014).

In addition, increasing research RT for veteran FT faculty would improve several PMP measures including scholarship and grant funding, by which BMCC faculty trail other CUNY CC's in the PMP Report (see chart below for details):

● BMCC research grant funds per FTE is roughly half the CUNY community college average.
● At one-third the CUNY community college average, the amount of veteran faculty reassigned time for sponsored research is the lowest in CUNY.

---

[2] Based on Porter & Umbach's (2001) model, and the conservative assumption that veteran faculty receive annual award dollars for research proportional to their representation at BMCC.

Table 8. Summary of research and grant measures from the CUNY PMP report, for all CUNY community colleges			
	Total annual award $ for research, by FTE (2010-2014 avg.)*	Percentage of veteran FT faculty with RT for sponsored research (2009-2013 average)	Mean annual hours of veteran faculty RT for sponsored research (2009-2013 average)
BXCC	$3.43	26	1.5
Hostos	$39.09	17.1	1.2
KBCC	$29.19	13.5	0.5
LaGCC	$60.14	22.3	1.4
QBCC	$30.14	9.1	0.4
Avg. of other CCs	**$34.63**	**17.1**	**0.9**
BMCC	**$15.08**	**5**	**0.3**

*Since the initial analysis of this data, the PMP numbers for fiscal year 2015 have been released. Because in FY 2015 BMCC received roughly $1.6 million in two new NSF research grants, this number is much larger for FY 2015 ($56.53). However, the FY 2015 number is not indicative of trends over the last 10 years—the FY 2014, listed in this table, is the highest number over that period except for the FY 2015 number, and the FY 2015 number is 6.3 times larger than the average of this value on the PMP report over the last 10 years. Because the FY 2014 value seems to be more indicative of long-term trends, we have left that value here. We note, however, the significant difference that can be obtained in these PMP indicators even when only a few faculty successfully obtain large outside grants. This highlights the significance of the potential impacts of providing faculty with research reassigned time.

An important additional, but not inconsequential, benefit of instituting a program for research reassigned time for veteran faculty is the expected increase in faculty satisfaction, now also a CUNY community college PMP measure, and the underlying aim of CUNY's participation in the COACHE survey. Earlier we cited the very real risk that faculty without support for their research will leave BMCC, but there is an additional risk: that faculty will stay at BMCC but the inability to continue their research, or the burden of trying to do research and teach 27 hrs. per year, will lead to low morale. If this occurs, it is likely to have a negative impact on students. The only way that BMCC can recruit and retain the best faculty is to ensure that they experience BMCC as a positive environment where productivity is supported and rewarded.

II. Recommended Changes to Institutional Culture

After time, the factor that had the most positive or negative influence on faculty research was the college culture—specifically whether faculty felt that the college and their colleagues actually valued and respected their research, and whether faculty felt that they were a part of the decision-making process.

Finding like-minded collaborators was a critical positive factor for research. Experiences that made faculty feel that their research was not respected or valued was a critical obstacle, and increased the likelihood that faculty would stop doing research or look for a job elsewhere.

Changes at the Department Level

In the COACHE Report on shared governance and leadership, department leadership received particularly low marks on stated priorities, communication of priorities, ensuring faculty input, and fairness in evaluating faculty work: each of these measures was ranked near the 10th percentile in comparison to all other institutions. This rating was significantly lower than at other CUNY community or senior colleges.

Faculty experiences with chairs varied widely: Thirteen percent of faculty classified a current or former chair as a critical positive impact on their research, with 6% identifying chairs as the most critical positive factor; in contrast 18% of faculty classified a current or former chair as a critical obstacle to research, with 10% identifying chairs as the most critical obstacle. And 93% of faculty who classified their chair as an extremely critical obstacle sought or plan to seek a job elsewhere, significantly more than those who did not rate their chairs as an obstacle (see Table 9).

Table 9. Faculty experiences of chair support of research at BMCC	
Chairs (current or former) classified as having a positive impact on research	13%
Chairs (current or former) rated as most critical positive influence on research	6%
Chairs (current or former) classified as an obstacle to research	18%
Chairs (current or former) rated as most critical obstacle to research	10%

Percentage of faculty who sought or plan to seek jobs elsewhere, based on their experiences with their chairs (logistic regression to generate *p*-values)

Rated as:	not an obstacle at all	extremely critical obstacle	p-value	sig.
Department chairs, past or present	71%	93%	0.026	**

In addition, faculty often reported that requirements for tenure/promotion/research leave were not sufficiently clear. In the COACHE survey, BMCC faculty were significantly more likely to rate tenure and promotion policies lower than faculty at other CUNY community colleges, with associate professors, women, and faculty of color especially likely to do so. Since these requirements are often determined at the department level, this suggests that departments need more concrete structures in place to set these requirements and to communicate them to faculty.

"Mixed messages about how we should be prioritizing our time. They talk about teaching quality and service as if it is very important, but then give the impression that research is far more important at other times. I'd like a clear understanding of where my priorities should be."

"I wanted to apply to for external funding, but I couldn't get the chair's support. There was an instance where there was an application and it took me 45 days of back and forth to get it signed. With a different chair it took five minutes."

"[My chair] refuses to approve grants that include reassigned time even when it is a requirement for the grant. [The chair] also refuses to allow people to take reassigned time once they get it."

In one on one interviews, faculty members also mentioned the difficulty of utilizing resources (e.g. lists of grant opportunities, training opportunities, etc.) in part due to a lack of discipline specific emphasis. Administrators also mentioned poor faculty attendance at workshops. Time constraints are a contributing factor, but there is evidence that programs are more efficient when discipline specific, as evidenced by well attended department-level workshops.

A departmental level research coordinator could consolidate all of the department-level research responsibilities and serve as a liaison with research offices at the college, addressing many of these issues. In addition, chairs and department Personnel and Budget (P&B) committee members need some basic training to help them understand exactly what their role should be in supporting faculty research and setting clear research expectations.

Department-Level Recommendations

1. **Each department should select a research coordinator at the deputy chair level or higher**, consolidating all current research-related department responsibilities into a single position, for greater cohesion and accountability. This person should be an experienced and successful researcher who has obtained external funding (or comparable standards in disciplines where this is not relevant) and who can advise faculty in multiple research subfields in that department, either using their own expertise, or by drawing on the appropriate expertise of others.

   This research coordinator position would focus on supporting faculty in their research and grant-writing, and their journey through promotion, tenure, and leave applications. They should not be expected to hold office hours for student advisement. Specifically, they should be responsible for:
   ● Outlining clear standards for promotion, tenure, and research leave (in consultation with chair and dept).
   ● Communicating these standards clearly and regularly to department faculty.
   ● Holding annual department workshops on publication, grant-writing, and promotion/tenure/sabbatical.
   ● Gathering and distributing discipline-specific research-related information to faculty.
   ● Advising chair and department P&B committee on research evaluation for promotion/tenure/sabbatical.
   ● Signing research paperwork (e.g. grant forms, recommendations, etc.) & keeping chair informed of same.
   ● Advising faculty individually on publication, grant-writing, and promotion/tenure/leave applications.
   ● Instructing and reminding faculty about how to submit annual reports of publications, etc.
   ● Connecting researchers with one another for the purposes of research or grant collaboration.
   ● Meeting regularly with other research coordinators and relevant administrators, to discuss research.

   Chairs should <u>not</u> simply assign a current deputy chair these duties, but should instead select the person who seems best suited, either replacing a current deputy chair with the research coordinator, or creating a new position. The research coordinator should have the same reassigned time allocated to deputy chairs (usually 3h per semester, depending upon dept. size). In larger departments (e.g. English, Math), the research coordinator should only have additional administrative duties if they also have additional RT for them.

   The role of the research coordinator centralizes research-related responsibilities that departments should already be carrying out, so current administrative RT should be sufficient to support this role. However, there may be some cases where centralization of this role brings a shortage in adequate RT to light—in these cases additional RT will be needed, not because the new research coordinator position requires it, but rather because existing department RT was not sufficient to carry out longstanding department administrative responsibilities.

2. **Create specific training for chairs and department P&B members on how to support faculty research**, and how to communicate clear teaching/service/research expectations. Chairs and P&B members could complete this training annually. This training should include:
   ● A clear outline of why research is important to the college and the department.
   ● An overview of what researchers need in order to conduct research, and why (e.g. course sections to pilot educational interventions, grant funding for RT, student assistants to work in their offices, etc).
   ● Outline exactly what the duties of the department should be in terms of supporting research (e.g. signing off on grant applications, writing letters of recommendation, etc).
   ● Give concrete examples of how research, teaching and service expectations should be communicated to faculty, especially as related to tenure, promotion and leave applications (e.g. sabbatical).
   ● Give concrete information about where they can get advice about how to assess research (e.g. in tenure and promotion applications) when they don't have experience in that research area themselves.

Changes at the College Level

"I think that the college is often well-intentioned, but just doesn't understand what faculty researchers need. For example, I was offered travel money to visit a federal program officer and for a consultant to help with grant-writing. I didn't need either of those things—I had already gotten very positive reviews and clear feedback from the program officer—I revised the grant and got it the next time without any outside help. Instead what I really desperately needed was time to write the grant in the first place, and a removal of roadblocks to grant submission—It took me three months and endless negotiating just to get my intent-to-submit form signed. But I didn't feel that I could be frank about what I really needed because no one ever asked, and I didn't want to come across as ungrateful, or as a complainer."

"I was sad to leave BMCC because I loved the students and the faculty... However, I only received disrespect from the staff at every turn. I could even handle the low salary and sharing offices, if I knew that on the whole the college staff and administration respected me but they did not."

A former BMCC faculty member who got a number of job offers at other universities, and now has tenure at a Research I university: *"I loved BMCC… [but] senior colleagues in my department didn't really believe that BMCC could be a place where you could do research... I was advised to go to a research school because you can't do research at BMCC. There was the perception that people who come from certain institutions (e.g. research institutions) could never be happy at BMCC. I was really sad to leave. I just felt not valued at all, because we were told not to stay here."*

"As an untenured faculty member I was appointed by the chair to serve in a department administrative role. I got 3 hours of reassigned time each semester, but the job required 40 hours per week of work, not counting teaching or any other work responsibilities. I raised this with my chair several times and [he/she] was sympathetic but just said that this was the way BMCC was, and that there was nothing that [he/she] could do about it. I didn't feel that there was anyone at the college that I could go to—I just suffered through my two years and turned the job over to someone else who ended up with the same problem."

Faculty must be key collaborators in decisions related to research (and college life in general). In the COACHE Report on shared governance and leadership, measures related to faculty input were significantly lower in comparison to other institutions: Marks for "Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input" was at the 22nd percentile, and "ensuring faculty input" at the department level was at the 8th percentile. In the COACHE subgroup on research survey, 60% of faculty disagreed with the statement, "Researchers have been regularly included in the decision-making process surrounding research policies and procedures at BMCC," and 62% of faculty disagreed with the statement, "When I encounter issues related to my research at BMCC, I have felt comfortable raising my concerns with the administration." This suggests that faculty do not feel that they are a part of the decision-making process when it comes to research policies and procedures at BMCC, and that they often do not feel comfortable raising concerns with the college when they arise.

In addition, faculty often expressed the feeling that staff, administrators, chairs and even colleagues did not see the value in research and did not understand what it meant to conduct research. This often led to faculty feeling devalued and demoralized. In open-ended comments on the survey, a significant number of faculty cited a feeling that BMCC did not respect or value them (or their research) as a reason for stopping research or looking for a job elsewhere:

Table 10. Institutional culture as a factor in faculty decisions--Percentage of faculty who cited a feeling that BMCC did not respect or value them or their research as a reason for:	
Considering stopping research and focusing solely on teaching	31%
Actually stopping research	42%
Looking for another job (in the past, or over the next 5 years)	39%

College-Level Recommendations

1. **Create a faculty research advisory committee**. Decisions related to research must be made collaboratively between faculty, staff, and administrators, and a formal faculty research advisory committee is one effective way to implement this. This committee could consist of the research coordinators from each department, and other

interested and qualified faculty. **This committee should be an integral part of any institutional decisions regarding research policies, procedures and structures, including budgetary allocations related to research**.

John Jay is another CUNY college that could serve as a model for this: They already have a formal faculty Research Advisory Committee—it is this committee that allocates all of the internal research funding and is the official voting body for all research policies and procedures at the college.

2. **Create an ombudsman** position or similar entity for faculty to report workload and research concerns. This can be an existing person at the college, but must be someone who is not directly in charge of evaluating faculty, and should be someone whom faculty can feel comfortable approaching. They must also have research experience so that they can adequately understand issues related to research.

3. **Implement 360 degree evaluation process for chairs, staff and administration** and include faculty input on the criteria/metrics to be used for evaluation.

III. Revise Institutional Structures to Better Support Research

The recommendations in this section are largely structural, with no additional monetary costs attached. Some of the changes are important to a large majority of the faculty, whereas others are essential for faculty conducting specific types of research. Both types of changes should be made, especially when they don't require any financial investment.

1. Recommendation: Streamline grants submission procedure.

BMCC's current procedure for submitting an external grant needs to better reflect the realities of conducting research, and the practices at other CUNY campuses. In line with the most common practices across CUNY, it is recommended that the procedure have the following features:

- **Approval for research grant submission should require at most a proposal summary and a preliminary budget**, rather than a full proposal.
- **Layers of approval should be kept to a minimum**. At many other campuses, typically only <u>one signature</u> is needed. Chairs are informed of the submission by the grants office or the faculty member doing the submission, but the chair's permission is not typically needed unless significant department resources are involved.
- **Approval to submit grants should be automatic, once certain basic criteria typical of other colleges are met:**
    - A. The funder does not limit the number of proposals that can be submitted by the college. If the funder does limit proposals, the college has a clear, written policy for the selection of proposals.
    - B. The proposal follows all funder and CUNY budgetary requirements.
    - C. If any significant institutional resources are needed in order to conduct the research, the researchers have obtained the necessary support from the relevant departments.
- **Researchers should have full control of all aspects of the proposal necessary to conduct the research** (including the research plan, evaluation plan, consultants hired, and the budget), as long as these aspects satisfy the criteria A-C above. Researchers at other CUNY colleges, including community colleges, are typically given full control of proposals and there are typically little-to-no restrictions on reassigned time included in external grant proposals. For example, KBCC has allowed faculty with external funding to be on full research reassigned time. At QBCC faculty have regularly been permitted to use 15 hours of grant-funded research reassigned time per year. None of the faculty interviewed at CUNY senior colleges had ever been limited in the number of hours of reassigned time that they could include in an external grant application.
- **In any cases where a signature is required:**
    - o **The signatory should have experience in research**. For example, the departmental research coordinator or the college's faculty research advisory committee would be good candidates for signatories, especially if they have experience in the particular field of research.
    - o **The exact requirements of the signatory should be spelled out**, instead of just including a blank space for the signature. For example, the signatory might be asked to certify that the proposal satisfies criteria A-C above. This would clearly define the role of the signatory so that:
        - ▪ The signatory would clearly understand their role, and what criteria they should use, and;
        - ▪ If the signatory does not sign off, the researcher would know precisely why, and what to revise.

Need for Streamlined Grant Submission Procedure

Over one-third of faculty has decided not to submit a subsequent external grant application because of a negative prior experience with the process. Roughly one-quarter of faculty have had changes mandated to their grant proposals that interfered with their ability to do the research, even though those changes were not required by the funder or by CUNY legal requirements—in some cases those changes were directly opposed to funding agency recommendations. More than one-quarter of faculty identified the current procedure as an obstacle to research and grant submission.

"I once applied for an NSF collaborative grant with colleagues from XXXX University who have a record of NSF winning grant proposals.... The changes BMCC administration was asking for which were not needed for the grant almost made my collaborators withdraw ...and also delayed our submission.... We ended up not getting the grant and based on the

reviews it was clear that the additional constraints made by BMCC may have negatively affected us getting the grant. Since then, my collaborative relationship with my colleagues from XXXX University has not been the same."

"I applied for grants with several different federal funding agencies, and several of them told me that they would never fund a grant that included insufficient reassigned time because they would not believe I could complete the research without it. Yet despite this, I was repeatedly prohibited from including the necessary reassigned time in the grant budget, even though the funder would be paying the cost. When I was finally able to submit a grant with the necessary amount of reassigned time it was funded. But I'm very apprehensive about submitting more grant applications —it's a big investment of time to write a grant only to be unable to submit it in a form that allows you to complete the research."

"I have several times had issues with chairs signing off on the intent to submit form for grants: one chair was just unresponsive to all faculty requests to sign these types of forms, for whatever reason—I had to get upper-level administrators involved to get the chair to sign the form. Another chair just kept telling me that I couldn't ask for more than a minimal amount of RT, even though the grant couldn't be completed in that amount of time, and the department would have no trouble covering the classes."

"Our grant with a major federal agency was almost funded--we were strongly recommended to resubmit. We prepared the revised grant application and submitted to the grants office by the deadline; we spent a month repeatedly scheduling meetings with the then-current provost, only to have them repeatedly cancel because they were too busy. In the end we were told by that provost that we could not submit the grant because there 'wasn't enough time to approve it'. Completely devastating—we had already submitted the previous year, and done well in the review process—it was completely unclear to us why any further approval was needed, and it seemed particularly cruel that we couldn't submit after we had invested hundreds of hours in the grant and gotten signals from the funding agency that we had a strong chance of being funded. This experience has made me extremely anxious about submitting another grant application. If this procedure isn't changed, I will definitely leave BMCC for another job —I just can't go through this experience again."

Table 11. Faculty experiences with the internal approval process for external research grants at BMCC

Percentage of faculty who have decided not to submit a particular application for external funding because of negative past experiences with the external grant submission approval process at BMCC	36%
Percentage of faculty who have had changes mandated to an external research grant proposal that interfered with their ability to conduct the proposed research (and that were not required to meet legal or funder requirements)	24%
The current procedure for applying for grants classified as obstacle to research	27%
Of these, rated grants procedure as most critical obstacle to research	56%

Impact of Streamlined Grants Procedures: Externally-funded Research RT and PMP Measures

Allowing faculty to include all necessary research reassigned time on external research grant proposals does not significantly change the percentage of FTEs taught by FT faculty at BMCC. This percentage has varied by four percentage points over the last five years—in contrast, in order for externally funded research RT to lower this number by even one percentage point, the college would have to receive roughly an additional 235 hours of externally-funded RT each year, which would require at least 20 additional faculty to receive very large externally-funded research grants that each include 12 hours of research RT per year. In reality, the number of large externally-funded research grants, over and above what BMCC has already received, is likely to be a fraction of that amount, and will therefore not make any meaningful difference in the ratio of FTEs taught by FT faculty. Also, according to the PMP report, the proportion of BMCC veteran faculty receiving research RT and the amount of that time, is less than one-third that of their CUNY community college peers. **Thus, there is no evidence that limiting externally-funded RT benefits students yet there is significant evidence that RT limitations <u>do</u> significantly inhibit faculty ability to obtain external funding.**

2. Recommendation: Establish scheduling policies that reflect research responsibilities.

We recommend that the only restrictions on faculty scheduling should be the contractual workload (i.e. teaching plus reassigned time must total 27 hrs/yr) and practical considerations such as course availability. Similarly, for library faculty we recommend that they only be required to be physically present in the library on days when their work requires it and taking into consideration departmental scheduling needs.

We recommend that no distinction be made in scheduling face-to-face, hybrid or online courses. Just as these courses give students more flexibility, they also give more flexibility to faculty who are trying to balance research and teaching, especially when research requires the use of archives, labs or other research facilities that are only available during business hours, or when they must work on complex projects that require larger unbroken blocks of time. **BMCC does not distinguish between online and face-to-face courses with respect to students—all course types appear identical on student transcripts, and for good reason: research suggests that students learn just as much in these courses as they do face-to-face. Likewise, faculty do the same amount of work in these courses online as they do face-to-face, it is just that student interactions happen online instead of in person.** In addition, the PMP cites use of technology in instruction through offering online classes as one of the University goals, and BMCC has one of the lowest rates within CUNY on that measure (PMP, 2013-14); limiting the number of online classes that faculty can teach depresses this number.

If scheduling rules are in place because there is concern about faculty availability to students, we suggest that faculty availability be measured directly. For example, the current course evaluation form asks students if professors were available outside of class, and positive ratings on this question would reflect good faculty availability. In addition, **scheduling policies themselves don't guarantee that faculty are available to students:** they don't guarantee that faculty spend time with students while on campus, or that they answer student phone or email messages, etc.).

Need for more flexible scheduling policies

Roughly half (46%) of all faculty who responded to the Taskforce survey cited current scheduling policies as an obstacle to research, with roughly half of these faculty rating it as the most critical obstacle (54%).

Table 12. Faculty experiences of current scheduling policies at BMCC	
Current scheduling policies are an obstacle to research	46%
Among those who identified scheduling as an obstacle, % who rated it the most critical obstacle	54%

"My major concern in terms of research is this three days per week rule. It doesn't make sense. In fact, not every department enforces that rule. I spend more time commuting in on certain days than I am in class."

"I'd teach longer days to have three days on my own to write (because realistically those days are also taken up with grading papers, etc.). The issue isn't that we have a three day week, the issue is that people think that the other days we're NOT doing college work. If I'm in 3 days a week, I am teaching MOST of the day. When do I grade? The two days I'm home. When do I rest, well, I don't because the weekend is now for writing."

"Library faculty are required to be on campus 5 days a week. This severely limits our ability to visit archives, conduct interviews, or engage in other research activities. Much of a library faculty member's work is accomplished online and does not require being physically in the Library. Flexible scheduling options would go a small way toward accommodating research-active Library faculty."

"A lot of faculty in our department commute from pretty far away because they can't afford to live near the college, especially people with families. ...at least four people in our department...commute more than two hours each way. For these faculty, coming in to campus is a huge expenditure of time that they could be spending on other work."

"The archive where I have to go to do my research is only open during the day on weekdays, so it is hard for me to schedule time to go there. On non-teaching days I try not to grade papers so that I can go to the archive, but then I have to bring them home and grade them at night."

If we want to maximize the amount of faculty research, and therefore maximize the number of publications and external grants, we need to allow faculty to determine the most efficient way to use their own time.

- Many faculty members use research facilities such as archives or laboratories that are only available weekdays between 9 am and 5 pm or less. For these faculty, spending extra unnecessary days on campus inhibits their ability to work on their research, and faculty who can conduct their research on campus often have to schedule their classes across three separate days even when that doesn't make the most sense in terms of productivity of their research, because the time spent in labs on campus (often mentoring BMCC students) is not counted as a part of their schedule.
- Grouping related tasks together and spending larger chunks of time on single tasks is more efficient and supported by the psychological research literature on task-switching. When switching between tasks, particularly more complex ones like research, people can lose up to 60% of their time, and make over three times as many errors (Rubenstein, Meyer, & Evans, 2001). For many faculty, it is more productive to spend one day working on research (which often cannot be done on campus), and another day at BMCC focusing on teaching, advisement, mentoring, and meetings.
- Many faculty members have long commutes, a by-product of low CUNY salaries and the high cost of living in the metropolitan area. Commuting to work multiple additional times each week takes away from valuable time that could be spent working.

3. Recommendation: Establish transparent, streamlined procedures for requesting research essentials.

We recommend that the college establish one streamlined transparent procedure for all research resources, and that information about this process be shared with all faculty, preferably through a combination of yearly written memos and information on the college website. The procedure should have the following characteristics:

- It should be simple, easy to follow, and require little time.
- There should be clear written information on how resources will be allocated (e.g., first come, first served; competitive awards with a specific deadline; etc.).
- If there are rules that need to be followed (e.g. state travel regulations, rules on where supplies can be purchased), these should be spelled out in writing up front.
- The availability of these resources and rules/criteria should be shared with all faculty, preferably through a combination of yearly written memos and information on the college website.
- Requests should be processed in a timely manner, and it should be easy for researchers to track their requests.
- Staff processing these requests should understand their role in the process and should defer to disciplinary experts (e.g. faculty research coordinator in the department) when disciplinary-specific questions arise.
- Flexibility (perhaps a special fund) for emergency requests would address the vagaries of unpredictable research needs. This could take the form of allowing faculty to pay out of pocket for supplies and other expenses and then be reimbursed or allowing faculty to apply for fast-track approval of emergency research expenses.
- Faculty with external grant funds should be able to use purchasing cards, a standard practice at other CUNY colleges; none of the faculty that we talked to at other colleges had restrictions on their ability to apply for and use purchasing cards for Research Foundation administered grants. Without purchasing cards, faculty have to wait for reimbursement after paying out-of-pocket for most grant expenditures, and pay sales tax on all purchases paid out-of-pocket.

Need for Improving Transparency and Streamlining Procedures Related to Research Resources

No single transparent process for requesting research resources exists. Obtaining resources often depends on knowing whom to ask, having a good relationship with that person, or availability of resources at the time of request. The unpredictability of research resource availability completely undermines long-term planning.

"The way that monies for research supplies are parceled out (in proportion to the number of students you are mentoring) is positive; the programs for students to do research are positive. The problem is the distribution system. Research materials never come on time—it is 2-3 months from request to receipt, and in this time we lose students, we can't complete projects, we can't publish in a timely manner. Only very specific vendors are allowed to be used. This prevents us from buying something cheaper or that is not available with regular vendor, and it takes twice as long, even for inexpensive items (e.g. $40). And we can't pay for items out of pocket and then be reimbursed. I spent close to 3 months working on a research project only to find out on the day of data analysis that I needed a different form of the material for the experiment. I had to pay $350 out of pocket in order to finish the research, with no possibility of reimbursement. A new untenured faculty member in our department was told 'your order is in a black hole'. I called the representative at the company from whom they place orders, and the rep told me that the supplies were never ordered. I would like to be able to process orders myself and have direct contact with the vendor. All the orders used to be placed online—why can't we do that through CUNYfirst? Faculty sometimes then hoard materials from the lab because they are so concerned that they will not have supplies."

"Because I have been here long enough, I know who to ask, and to ask towards the end of the year whether money is left over. But who gets what is arbitrary and based on who you know. It is really unfairly distributed. Last year I heard that there was $2500 left over, if you have a small piece of equipment, hurry up and you can buy it. I was privy to that information, and not everyone else was. That is not a fair process. The priority should have been given to new untenured faculty members. Their needs should come first. There is no prioritizing on how the funds are spent. No one oversees it and there is no transparency."

Even though the survey didn't explicitly ask about the travel reimbursement process, a number of faculty mentioned this issue during interviews or in open-ended survey questions. Faculty seem not only to find the procedure for travel reimbursement burdensome and frustrating, but also seem to have unreliable results with getting reimbursed, to the extent that several faculty mentioned giving up on this process altogether.

"The amount of paperwork required ...to apply to travel funds is frustrating; to this frustration...add other travel restrictions (such as the allowed time to spend abroad when traveling to an international conference considering most of the costs is coming out of pocket)."

"Applying for the tiny amount of travel funds that were available to us was so excruciatingly awful, at first I just didn't do it, and had to pay out of pocket for my trips, if I took them. [A staff member] would try to humiliate and shame us about what we were applying for and why. The notion that if we wanted to stay an extra day to do research or collaborate was somehow a ploy to cheat the college out of precious funds was ludicrous."

"Just getting paid back $450 for travel takes a crazy amount of time and a never-ending cavalcade of strange, seemingly random obstacles."

4. Recommendation: Establish IT policies that enable faculty to install research software.

We recommend that there be a simple and straightforward procedure for faculty to request administrative access to their office computers so that they can install and update programs on their work computers as needed for research.

In the past, faculty were permitted to have administrative access to their office computers as long as they could supply a reason for needing the access, but currently there is a blanket policy that prohibits all faculty from having such access.

Need for More Flexible IT Policies

It is a standard policy at most other public universities for faculty to have access to install programs on their office computers for research or other work-related responsibilities. For faculty members in research areas where computing is central to conducting their research, having the ability to install and update programs on their own work computer is essential to their ability to do the work. At the current time, faculty who need to be able to install and regularly update programs as a part of their research have to purchase their own computers.

"The work that I do (teaching and research) involves programs that are not installed on my office computer: I use Dropbox to track and organize my files; I use design software for my online course; I use complex software packages for my research that need to be frequently updated. However, since I don't have administrative rights to install software, I can't use any of this on my work computer. Administrative rights disappeared with update to Windows 7, and I spent months trying to get them back. I was simply told that BMCC now has a blanket policy not to allow any faculty administrative rights on their own computers, regardless of need. So now I have to buy my own computer for work."

"I had software that came with an expensive piece of lab equipment, and came with updates included in the price; but I can't update it on my office computer even though it is already paid for."

5. Recommendation: Value and support BMCC faculty appointments at the CUNY GC.

BMCC faculty who are appointed to the CUNY Graduate Center should be valued, and this achievement should be seen as a benefit to BMCC's research programs and its students. Faculty with GC affiliation should be able to teach courses at the GC and have those courses count towards their BMCC teaching load (including credit for dissertation supervision); days spent at the GC (or on other CUNY campuses) should count as days spent on campus; work done at the GC should be valued for tenure and promotion.

At other CUNY colleges, including community colleges like LaGuardia, work done at the GC is seen as a positive thing that improves chances for promotion and tenure. Colleges also typically credit faculty for time spent supervising dissertations, usually 0.6 - 1 hrs per student per semester (e.g. CSI, CCNY, Queens, York).

Need for changes to the way the Graduate Center affiliation is handled at BMCC

All of the BMCC faculty who are affiliated with the CUNY Graduate Center see the Graduate Center as having a positive impact on their research because it gives them access to library resources, colleagues in their field, graduate students to work as research assistants, or seminars in their field, etc. However, the majority of these faculty faced obstacles at BMCC related to their CUNY Graduate Center affiliation.

Table 13. Faculty experiences with affiliation at the Graduate Center	
Percentage of faculty who feel that their affiliation with the GC has a positive impact on their research	100%
Percentage of faculty with GC affiliation who have encountered obstacles at BMCC that have interfered with their ability to benefit from your affiliation with the CUNY Graduate Center, or have experienced any negative consequences at BMCC as a result of their Graduate Center affiliation	52%

"I have been told that I should not ask to teach regularly at the GC... When I was granted release time hours for directing a doctoral dissertation I was made to wait weeks for BMCC to accept that decision and told that it would not happen again. I now am directing 4 dissertations and am quite concerned that the work will not be compensated."

"I was told that I should not expect to teach at the GC on a regular basis and not to ask."

"I have been told that only administrative work and service done at BMCC would count toward tenure and promotion, not [the work done] at the Graduate Center."

"Anything done at the GC seems to be seen as something I do for fun, or for myself, and not a part of my BMCC workload. There is no sense that what I learn at GC seminars, or using GC library resources, or teaching at the GC might benefit both my research (which is supposed to be a part of my work at BMCC) and my students at BMCC."

6. Recommendation: Remove budget restrictions from internal funding opportunities.

We recommend that internal funding programs use the same budget rules as the NSF or other large federal agencies, and allow researchers to include budget funds for any reasonable research-related expenditures, including reassigned time.

For the vast majority of faculty, time is the most critical factor; allowing the use of internal funds to pay for reassigned time is essential. For some faculty, networking with collaborators at conferences is the best way to move research forward; for other faculty, computer equipment is the most important factor to the success of their project. Internal grant funds can be most efficiently used when the faculty who are doing the research make the spending decisions. It is important that budget restrictions (such as the faculty development grant prohibition of reassigned time) be removed from BMCC internal awards, and that BMCC help to convince CUNY to remove similar restrictions from CUNY internal awards.

Need for Fewer Budget Restrictions on Internal Awards

Since almost 90% of all faculty identified time as a critical obstacle to research, BMCC should maximize researchers' ability to use already existing funds to buy the time that they need to do their research work. This strategic use of funds is likely to have the biggest relative impact on subsequent scholarly output.

"If given the choice, I would always choose reassigned time over money. I would rather pay for research supplies out of my own pocket if necessary, than go without reassigned time. Time is just so critical to my ability to do research— without it the research just can't be done."

"It is difficult enough to obtain internal funding, but the process is made more difficult by the fact that so many things that I need for my research can't be paid for with internal funds. Reassigned time is the most important example. But there are also other things that are critical to research that are often prohibited on internal budgets—travel to conferences, for example, or computers. My laptop is critical to my research, yet I had to pay for it out of my own pocket for my first five years at BMCC, until I started to get external grants. Travel to conferences is also critical to connecting with other researchers in the field, finding collaborators, getting feedback on your work. But it is often prohibited in internal grants."

7. Recommendation: Move up research leave (e.g. sabbatical) timeline.

Change the sabbatical timeline so that applications are due in the fall and decisions are made by January for September sabbaticals. This would allow faculty time to:

- Make travel arrangements if their research involves travel.
- Make arrangements with collaborators in advance.
- Reserve lab facilities, archive access, or other research resources that require advance planning.
- Apply for prestigious awards to support the sabbatical research, many of which have deadlines a year in advance.
- It would also allow dept. chairs to better plan for course coverage/scheduling.

Other CUNY colleges have an earlier timeline for sabbatical notifications. For example, both Hunter and Kingsborough Community College have research leave application deadlines in the fall, with decisions by early in the spring semester.

"This is SO important. I had the opportunity to move to [COUNTRY NAME] for several months and also [UNIVERSITY NAME] where I could write and conduct my analyses among colleagues who do similar work. Unfortunately, because the sabbatical notifications came out SO VERY LATE, I had to turn down those opportunities, as those scholars had to make

travel plans as well. It was very disappointing. I was rather shocked at how long it took to get sabbatical notifications. Moving up the notification process would be very useful."

"You don't know if you have a sabbatical until May or June so there is no way to plan. There are...things we can't apply for because of various restrictions and the timing of when we are notified—A lot of prestigious outside awards."

"My sabbatical research was in a lab in France, and I wanted the summer to start the work. I had to tell the lab when I would start and I had to make plans for my children's school. Because sabbatical notification is in late May or June, I had to get the visa at the last moment, which was very difficult. I only got my visa the morning that I was leaving. The embassy took all of our passports and had them for one week, and we only got them back on the day of travel. This was very stressful."

"My sabbatical project required foreign travel, which required commitments to be made in February and March for the following school year. I had to find places for my kids in a local school and commit to take those spots in March; I had to put down non-refundable payment on an apartment and buy a plane ticket—all before I got a decision on my sabbatical application. I had a collaborator with whom I was supposed to start working in June, and I also got research funding for the sabbatical project—but I had to keep both my collaborator and the funding agency in limbo until I heard back from BMCC. I ended up just committing to most of these arrangements and hoping for the best, and luckily it came out ok in the end, since I did successfully get the sabbatical. But it was incredibly stressful!"

8. Recommendation: Create transparent and consistent process for all internal research-related opportunities (i.e. leave applications, internal funding competitions).

Use rubrics, created by faculty researchers, for evaluating all faculty research leave applications and internal grant applications. Make that rubric widely available to faculty ahead of time (yearly memos and college website), and have a standard procedure for providing faculty with feedback.   Department research coordinators and the faculty research advisory committee could serve in an advisory role here.

Need for More Transparent Process for Internal Research-related Opportunities

While sabbatical leaves are not technically guaranteed to any faculty members at CUNY, the typical procedure at other colleges is for sabbatical decisions to be based solely on the quality and feasibility of the proposed project. At BMCC faculty felt the sabbatical process was not very transparent and even faculty who were awarded sabbaticals expressed concern about the lack of guidelines and uncertainty during the process. Basing leave applications and all internal grant opportunities on clear rubrics written by researchers (some internal funding programs already do this), would remove some of this uncertainty, and provide guidance to unsuccessful applicants, so that they can revise and resubmit.

"The last time I came up [for sabbatical] I was turned down in my department and no reasons were given... There are no developed guidelines for promotion, tenure, sabbatical, or leaves. There is nothing official that you can look to as a model. I was able to get it reversed. I went to the chair and was outraged and shocked. The chair was able to resubmit it ...and I didn't have trouble at any other level. There have to be some guidelines of what they will approve..."

"Taking (or earning, through external funding) RT seems to be held against you in the sabbatical application process."

"[Sabbatical] should be a right for researchers, not a privilege given under subjective criteria. ...colleagues who have been at BMCC 20 years get their request for a sabbatical denied. It is pretty demoralizing to junior faculty to hear that they will never get a sabbatical or that the criteria for obtaining one are vague and elusive. A clear policy for granting sabbaticals should be in place..."

"I know four different faculty members who had some issue with their sabbatical application that had nothing to do with the research quality. In most of these cases, there was some political issue in the department stemming from chair elections. This was incredibly disturbing to me—these decisions should be based on the quality of the research and nothing else—there should be some checks in place to prevent chairs from exercising this kind of power. While I have

never had a problem with my own sabbatical application, the very fact that this has gone on in other departments makes me very nervous—what happens if someday our department has a chair that does the same thing to me, just because I didn't vote for them? How can I build a research program in this environment?"

The following two recommendations are important, but they are significantly less important than providing research reassigned time to veteran faculty (Recommendation I). Funds should only be spent on the following two recommendations <u>after</u> the recommended veteran faculty research reassigned time program has been adequately funded.

9. Recommendation: Increase available travel funds.

Increase travel funds from $450 travel support to $1500 per academic year for faculty attending conferences as presenters or organizers (or fulfilling some other active role), and allow faculty to allocate this amount among as many conferences as necessary. For faculty attending without presenting, organizing, or participating in some other active role at the conference, the current travel allowance could remain at $450/yr (or be reduced, eliminated, or restricted—e.g. to new assist. professors only, to free up more funds for presenters).

The new Provost Travel fund has addressed this issue to some extent, but many faculty seemed not to be aware of this fund, or to have misconceptions about how it works (for example, believing that it could not be combined with the PSC CUNY funding for a single conference). To address this, we recommend that there be a single procedure for applying for all college travel funds (PSC CUNY, Provost, first-time presenter). If the information for the three funding sources were consolidated into a single form, this would streamline the process and also make it clearer to faculty exactly what funds are available and in what contexts they can be used together. This recommendation is in line with the procedure at many other CUNY colleges.

"Travel funding is a major issue for me. A significant part of my research involves attending conferences to present and then recruit other instructors across the country to participate. I have skipped going to conferences several times simply because I could not afford the expenses, and my research suffers."

"I regularly encounter graduate students with larger travel budgets. It's embarrassing for me and for BMCC."

10. Recommendation: Increase available internal funding opportunities.

We recommend that the total amount of funds available to internal funding programs be increased, and that restrictions on the frequency with which faculty can apply for these programs be relaxed or eliminated.

As the number of faculty doing serious research at BMCC has increased over the last 10-15 years, the number of internal funding opportunities has not increased at the same rate. This has made internal funding more competitive and more difficult to get on a regular basis. In addition, all internal funding programs restrict how often faculty can apply for them, usually allowing faculty to apply only once every three years.

"Internal awards have... become much more competitive, so it's become a fair amount of work [to apply for them] for much more uncertain outcome."

References

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, City University of New York *. Performance Management (PMP) Report.*
(2013). New York, NY, doi:https://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/ira/ir

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, City University of New York*. Performance Management (PMP) Report.*
(2014). New York, NY, doi:https://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/ira/ir

Porter, S. R., & Umbach, P. D. (2001). Analyzing Faculty Workload Data Using Multilevel Modeling. *Research in Higher*
Education, 42(2), 171-196. doi:10.2307/40196427

Rubenstein, J. S., Meyer, D. E., & Evans, J. E. (2001). Executive Control of Cognitive Processes in Task Switching. *Journal*
of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 27, 763-797.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2013).
Integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS). Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2014).
Integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS). Washington, DC.

von Hippel, T., & von Hippel, C. (2015). To Apply or Not to Apply: A Survey Analysis of Grant Writing Costs and Benefits.
PLoS ONE, 10(3), e0118494. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118494

Appendices

Appendix A: Trends over time and faculty identity

For the following analyses, we created a *research outcomes scale*. This scale counts the number of the following research activities that a faculty member has done:

- Published a paper in a peer-reviewed journal
- Submitted an internal grant application
- Submitted an external grant application

Values on this scale range from 0 to 3 and we used them as a *very* rough proxy of research outcomes.

This allowed us to see a few patterns:

Firstly, when controlling for faculty rank, **faculty who were hired during periods in which they were eligible for contractual reassigned time (RT) for research had higher values on the research outcomes scale, and the more reassigned time they were eligible for, the higher their values on the research outcomes scale.** As a matter of comparison, faculty who were eligible for the full amount of research RT provided for in the current contract (24 hours over the first five years) had research outcome scale values that were slightly higher than faculty one rank higher who received no contractual RT. For example, assistant professors who were eligible for the full contractual research RT, have research outcome scale values that were slightly higher on average than associate professors who were hired before the contract provided any research RT at all. Given the way that this scale is measured, all other things being equal, we would expect faculty who were hired earlier to have higher scores on this scale, since they have had a longer time horizon in which to publish papers or to apply for grants; **the fact that we see the reverse highlights how different the research activities of faculty seem to be, depending on when they were hired.**

Table A1. Relationship between initial date of hire and research outcomes scale, controlling for rank (regression)			
Positive coefficients indicate higher research outcomes scale values for that group compared to those who started prior to Sept 1, 2002*	Coeff.	St Error	p-value
started Sept 1, 2002 - Aug 31, 2006	0.308	0.231	0.185
started Sept 1, 2006 - Aug 31, 2011	0.642	0.229	0.006
rank	0.615	0.107	0.000

*Those hired after Aug 31, 2011 were excluded because they have had limited time to produce scholarship and are still using their contractual RT. Those hired prior to Sept 1, 2002 had no contractual research RT; those hired between Sept 1, 2002-Aug 31, 2006 received only 12h RT over their first five years.

These data highlight two important points:

1. **Relationship between research reassigned time and research outcomes:** Faculty who receive more reassigned time for research likely use that time to produce more research (therefore producing higher scores on the research outcomes scale).
2. **Generational differences may be leading to obstacles:** Prior to 2002, BMCC faculty received no contractual reassigned time for research and were not required to conduct research to obtain tenure. Since 2002, BMCC has required all professorial faculty to conduct research, and has been specifically hiring faculty with training, experience, and interest in research. This may explain some of the obstacles that faculty cite, since many chairs and administrators come from the pre-2002 group of faculty (who were hired to concentrate almost exclusively on teaching and service), and since many college policies and procedures were initially established prior to 2002.

Generational differences leading to obstacles (Faculty quotes):

i. *"The feeling that it is never enough for the administration, while any amount is too much and arouses the ire and jealousy of colleagues in my department. The feeling that killing myself to get great research done and provide opportunities to our students buys me nothing but a target on my back, and a 'what have you been doing since you haven't been teaching' attitude."*

ii. "[I stopped doing research because I have] no time to conduct research; I was told teaching is more important."

iii. One senior faculty member hired over ten years ago wrote in the survey under the general comments section: "We should be teaching. Not researching!"

iv. A former BMCC faculty member who got a number of job offers at other universities, and now has tenure at a Research I university: "I really wanted to work in NYC and have a job in NYC, and I loved BMCC. Even though there were two lines for tenure track jobs open in my department, neither my department chair nor senior administrators were willing to consider my husband as a spousal hire. Senior colleagues in my department didn't really believe that BMCC could be a place where you could do research. In some ways they may have thought that they were protecting us. I was advised to go to a research school because you can't do research at BMCC. There was the perception that people who come from certain institutions (e.g. research institutions) could never be happy at BMCC. I was really sad to leave. I just felt not valued at all, because we were told not to stay here."

v. "At BMCC I often feel as though research is viewed as something selfish that I do just for myself, and that therefore it should be done on my own time. Colleagues in my department, chairs, and administrators have all made comments that imply that I am "just trying to get out of teaching" when I spend time on research. All of this happens at the same time that I am practically killing myself trying to teach really well (and be innovative in my pedagogy), advise students, do administrative work that I see as important to the college (even though I am already a tenured full professor), and do research that is competitive enough to get published in top journals and to receive external funding. If I just taught a full teaching load and abandoned all my other work, no one would criticize me and I would have so much more free time to spend with my kids."

Doing research as a fundamental part of faculty identity

One major component of the identities of faculty who have been hired more recently is **that research is not just something that they do as a part of their jobs, but also something that is a fundamental part of their identity**. For this reason, it is likely especially critical to faculty that they feel that administrators and colleagues at BMCC respect and value their research.

Table A2. Research as an essential part of faculty identity--Percentage of faculty who cited these reasons for conducting research, or for deciding not to give up on their research, despite obstacles:	
I do research to keep myself current in my field	89%
I do research because I see research as a basic part of my role as an academic	88%
I keep doing research despite the obstacles because research is who I am, and/or because it is my passion	73%

Faculty quotes

"Being an academic is to be passionate about seeking knowledge, therefore I can't not be a researcher. Also, it's impossible to be a good professor if you don't spend the time to learn about the latest developments in your field and if you don't engage in leading those developments. My students benefit greatly from the examples I share with them from the field. The urgency of learning about the discipline is made clear to them when I teach using research related stories and experiences from my work outside of the classroom."

i. "Unfortunately, it's my passion, even though it's killing me."

ii. "I devoted a big part of my life studying this. I love my field and I come alive in my classes."

iii. "It's what I do, and who I am."

iv. "I love what I study even though BMCC inhibits being a serious scholar."

v. "I really care about my current book project. I think I have a contribution to make."

vi. *"I truly believe that my research has the potential to inform educational change on a larger scale, both at BMCC and in the world. The reason I started my current line of research was to be able to improve policies and practices not only for the students in my classes, but also across BMCC, and perhaps even across the nation. I truly believe that the research questions I am looking into have the potential to make a difference in the world. I feel that this is an integral part of my mission as a community college instructor."*

Appendix B: Positive Factors

Reassigned time (RT) provided to faculty, either by the contract, or through internal BMCC/CUNY funding opportunities had by far the biggest positive impact on faculty research productivity and grant-writing, according to the faculty survey. Three quarters of faculty identified this RT as having a positive impact, with two-thirds identifying the contractual RT specifically as having a positive impact; in contrast, about one half identified colleagues and research groups as having a positive impact, and only about one fourth identified offices (grants, research, CETLS, IR, academic affairs) at the college as having a positive impact.

Of those faculty who indicated that RT has a positive impact on their research, 96% identified it as the most influential positive factor, and 94% of those who identified the contractual RT as having a positive influence, identified it as the most influential positive factor. Research RT provided by BMCC/CUNY was identified far more than any other factor as the most positive influential factor, with 77% of all faculty identifying this RT as the most influential positive factor, and 67% identifying the contractual RT specifically as the most influential positive factor (more than for any other factor); in contrast, 26% identified colleagues/research groups as the most influential positive factor, and only 11% identified college offices as the most influential positive factor.

Table A3. Positive Impacts: Percentage of faculty who identified each factor as having a positive impact on their ability to conduct research

Factor	Had positive impact	Rated as most important factor
Reassigned time for research provided by the contract or internal funding	**75%**	**77%**
Contractual reassigned time	67%	67%
Reassigned time for research provided by internal grants	40%	34%
Collaborators, research groups, or colleagues at BMCC or CUNY	**53%**	**26%**
Offices at BMCC (grants, research, CETLS, IR, academic affairs)	**25%**	**11%**
The Grants Office	16%	6%
CETLS	11%	4%
The Research Office	10%	6%
The IR Office	7%	4%
Availability of resources and/or facilities necessary for your research	**18%**	**13%**
Scheduling policies	**12%**	**8%**

Appendix C: Obstacles to Research

Time available to conduct research, and the teaching load in particular, was by far the biggest obstacle to research. Almost all faculty (89%) identified this as an obstacle to research, with roughly two-thirds to three-quarters of all faculty identifying time for research and teaching load specifically as the most critical obstacles to research at BMCC.

Attitudes and misconceptions about research (its value to the college, and the conditions required to generate it) among peers and administrators was the second most commonly identified factor, with roughly half of all faculty indicating that

these attitudes were an obstacle to research and roughly one-quarter of all faculty rating this factor as the most critical obstacle at BMCC.

College policies related to time and scheduling was identified as the third most significant obstacle to research, a close second to attitudes and misconceptions. Again, almost half of all faculty identified these policies as an obstacle to research, with roughly one-quarter identifying them as the most critical obstacle to research productivity at BMCC.

Table A4. Research Obstacles: Percentage of faculty who identified each factor as being an obstacle to research

Factor	was an obstacle	rated as most critical obstacle
Time available to conduct research and apply for external funding	**89%**	**68%**
Number of classes, or library workload	81%	71%
The amount of time required to be spent on service	70%	34%
Attitudes or misconceptions among administrators, chairs and/or peers about the value of research to the college, or about what work/resources are necessary to publish or obtain external funding	**51%**	**24%**
College policies related to time and scheduling	**45%**	**24%**
Scheduling rules (e.g. 3-day teaching rule)	39%	22%
Limitations on reassigned time, even when externally funded	29%	16%
The unpredictability of time for research (i.e. not knowing when reassigned time or sabbatical will be approved, or when grant applications will be successful)	29%	9%
Resource availability	**37%**	**18%**
Policies/Procedures for Submission and Administration of external grant applications*	**27%**	**13%**
Exclusion of researchers from the decision-making processes surrounding research policies/procedures	**27%**	**10%**
Department chairs, past or present	**18%**	**10%**

*includes only those faculty who have submitted an external grant application

Obstacles that best predicted research outputs and faculty job-seeking

Faculty with higher values on the research outputs scale were significantly more likely to rate each of the following factors as obstacles to research:

Table A5. Obstacles that were significantly more critical for faculty with higher values on the research outcomes scale (linear regression)

	Coeff.	St Error	p-value	Sig.
Time available to conduct research and apply for external funding	0.708	0.260	0.007	***
Number of classes, or library workload	0.671	0.320	0.038	**
Policies/Procedures for Submission/Administration of external grant applications	0.576	0.289	0.048	**
College policies related to time and scheduling	0.738	0.376	0.051	*
Limitations on reassigned time, even when externally funded	1.112	0.342	0.001	***
Exclusion of researchers from the decision-making processes surrounding research policies/procedures	0.824	0.309	0.008	***

* $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$

Faculty who rated the following factors as obstacles to research were more likely to have applied for a job in the past or to be planning to go on the job market over the next five years. The more critical a faculty member rated these obstacles with respect to their research; the more likely they were to seek a job elsewhere.

Table A6. Obstacles that were most predictive of job-seeking while at BMCC (logistic regression to generate *p*-values)				
Percentage job-seeking while at BMCC if this factor was rated as:	not an obstacle at all	extremely critical obstacle	p-value	sig.
Time available to conduct research and apply for external funding	59%	79%	0.053	*
The number of classes they were required to teach, or library workload	52%	82%	0.001	***
Policies/Procedures for Submission and Administration of external grant applications	71%	92%	0.027	**
College policies related to time and scheduling	64%	88%	0.001	***
Limitations on reassigned time, even when externally funded	67%	92%	0.003	***
Scheduling rules (e.g. 3-day teaching rule)	68%	90%	0.010	**
Resource availability	71%	81%	0.109	
Department chairs, past or present	71%	93%	0.026	**
Attitudes or misconceptions among administrators, chairs and/or peers about the value of research to the college, or about what work/resources are necessary to publish or obtain external funding	66%	91%	0.003	***

Appendix D: Potential Impacts

Because of the obstacles faced by faculty when conducting research, some faculty have stopped conducting research, some have considered giving up their research to instead focus on teaching, and a number of faculty have either gone on the job market in the past or plan to go on the job market during the next five years.

Table A7. Consequences of faculty research burnout	
Faculty who have given up, or considered giving up their research at BMCC	39%
Faculty who have gone on the job market, or plan to go on the job market in the next 5 years	77%

The primary reasons faculty gave in the survey for giving up their research or going on the job market are: a lack of time for research, and an overall experience at BMCC that they and their research are neither respected nor valued.

Table A8. Reasons why faculty considered giving up their research	
Too little time for research at BMCC	87%
Felt that they or their research were disrespected and/or not valued at BMCC	31%
Lack of specific or general supports for research at BMCC	18%

Table A9. Reasons why faculty have stopped conducting research	
Too little time for research at BMCC	75%
Felt that they or their research were disrespected and/or not valued at BMCC	42%

Table A10. Reasons why faculty have gone or plan to go on the job market

Too little time for research at BMCC	76%
Proportion of these who cited teaching load specifically	74%
Felt that they or their research were disrespected and/or not valued at BMCC	39%
Lack of specific or general supports for research at BMCC	28%
Percentage of these who listed specific research supports	74%
Salary too low	19%
Unreasonable research expectations	6%
Issues with chair	6%

Faculty quotes

i. Reduce the teaching load. Recognize that professors are scholars as well as teachers, by providing support and time and funds for both. This survey seems to imply that there might be a way to find more of a balance -- if there were a mechanism in place to allow those of us who want to do serious research to apply for a mix of research and teaching assignments that would be a good start. More reassigned time during the times we have a project underway, or are incubating one would make BMCC a more attractive place to stay…. Just working to make the culture a more respectful one would go a long way toward making BMCC a place I would want to stay... these changes might make me re-consider going on the market again.

ii. [I have applied for jobs elsewhere because of] workload/lack of time to do by best work. Mind you, my colleagues are extraordinary, and I am generally happy at BMCC. A weakness of the institution is that it is tone-deaf to workload needs, but it is supportive in other ways.

Appendix E: Overall trends: Time for Research is Critical

Over and over again time came up as the most critical factor for faculty research in the data. Reassigned time (RT) for research that is available through the contract and internal grants was the single most positive factor influencing faculty research and a lack of time for research, specifically teaching load, was the most critical obstacle to faculty research. There was also significant evidence showing that faculty who are doing research have to do significant work during the evenings and weekends (and the higher their research output scale value, the more hours they spend); and that faculty who do not submit grants, who stop doing research, and who seek jobs elsewhere all cite time as the most important factor in these decisions. In particular, the lack of research reassigned time available to faculty once they are past the first five years of their appointment (and no longer eligible for contractual research RT) is seen as a big obstacle to keeping research going past the first five years.

Table A11. Impacts of time on faculty research: Time was rated as the most critical positive factor and the most critical obstacle for research

	Had impact	Rated as most important factor
Most Critical Positive Factor: Reassigned time for research provided by the contract or internal funding	**75%**	**77%**
Contractual reassigned time	67%	67%
Reassigned time for research provided by internal grants	40%	34%
Biggest Obstacle: Time available to conduct research and apply for external funding	**89%**	**68%**
The number of classes they were required to teach, or library workload	81%	71%
The amount of time they were required to spend on service	70%	34%

Table A12. Average number of hours that faculty report spending on research on evenings and weekends (over and above 40-hour workweek)

Hours per week	mean	median
All faculty	15.5	13.5
Faculty with one research category (i.e. has published peer-reviewed article, or submitted internal grant, or submitted external grant)	11.7	10.0
Faculty with two research categories	15.5	15.0
Faculty with all three research categories	17.0	15.0

Table A13. Impacts of available time on research--Percentage of faculty who expressed agreement with the following statements, and who strongly agreed with them:

	agreement	strongly agree
In order to conduct research/submit external grant applications at BMCC, it is necessary to put in substantial time working in the evenings and/or on weekends (or otherwise work much longer than the typical 35-40 hour workweek).	96%	84%
Keeping a long-term research program going at BMCC after the contractual research release time runs out (five years after initial appointment) is extremely difficult and requires an extraordinarily high commitment of personal time.	92%	78%
Writing external grant applications requires significant extra time, in addition to the time I spend conducting research.	93%	72%
Mentoring BMCC students (or using them as research assistants) requires significant extra time, in addition to the time I spend conducting research.	92%	63%
Administrative tasks associated with research and external funding (e.g. research approvals/permissions, grant application process, post-award administration) require significant extra time, in addition to the time I spend conducting research.	92%	55%
The quality and/or quantity of my research suffers significantly when research reassigned time is difficult to predict and/or varies from semester to semester.	83%	37%

Table A14. Time as a factor in faculty decisions--Percentage of faculty who cited time as a reason for:

Never having submitting an external grant	69%
Considering stopping research and focusing solely on teaching	87%
Actually stopping research	75%
Looking for another job (in the past, or over the next 5 years)	76%

Faculty quotes

i. Teaching the load we teach while trying to conduct research, getting it funded, and then publishing the results, necessitated making difficult sacrifices with regard to work/life balance. My husband says I work 900 hours a week. He is only half joking. If I only taught, without trying to cram in the time to do literature review, keep up with professional organizations, review calls for papers and conference calls, prepare conference papers and present them, follow up by writing research results into journal papers and then books, doing field work, staying abreast with developments in the field by attending conferences... there's a lot more, but you get the idea... if I didn't do all that, just teaching alone would fill a 45+ week, given our 4/5 teaching load.

ii.[I'm] overburdened with work, with teaching, with grading papers, with spending time with students outside my office hours, answering emails from students. All of the hours unaccounted for that are really required for me to be an effective teaching professional.

iii. There is a period of time in the semester (4th week to the end) when I am working consistently on nights and on weekends. I do think it is a disruption to our work/family balance. And I suppose if I didn't make changes every semester on my lectures and class prep and just did the same thing every semester I would not need to do that, but that's not the kind of teacher I want to be.

iv. I find the jump from 3 to 4 classes so much more critical than the jump from 4 to 5... Most of us want to be conducting research; but I find it frustrating too that we don't have the kind of opportunities to reflect on our teaching. That has to be squeezed in alongside our research and something gets less attention… Many of us do give ourselves a self-evaluation on our teaching about how we can do it better. But when we are teaching so much, then the rest of the time is eaten up by service and research expectations. We have lost a really valuable opportunity to reflect on our teaching. Part of what is difficult about the current teaching load is that it doesn't give us the space to be the kind of teachers we want to be.

v. Everyone is stretched out too thin, both because of heavy teaching and service responsibilities. I feel that the only way hard work is rewarded is by giving more work (I am good with committee work, so I am constantly asked to serve on different committees—I was asked to chair committees even in my first year).

vi. I am n no less than 6 committees and I chair several of them. I feel like this is work that I have to do to help my department, but it's not recognized as important. The mission and jobs that need to be completed for these committees can be extraordinarily time-consuming and cuts into the time needed to do scholarly work.

vii. The one issue I have with the way contractual RT is handled is that the school seems to find a way to fill your time with other activities. For instance, I found myself on various committees when I am taking contractual RT for research. I view that as a misappropriation of funds. Those are public monies to release me to do research not to release me to do administrative work… For instance, I am on APR this semester–I specifically told my chair that I don't want to be on APR, yet here I am on APR.

viii. The bottom line is, regardless of how many great initiatives are created, without release time, we can't really make them work to their full potential. For me this entirely a time issue and the problem is the reluctance to give release time for service-related administrative functions that eat up at least three times the release time we are given if we are lucky enough to get it.

ix. I'm now a full professor and I did it all on my own time and worked myself into illness to do it.

x. For reason that I do not understand but that I'm sure are historical, here at BMCC we are expected to teach in high volumes just like at a community college anywhere else in the country, but we are also expected to carry service and publications as if we are a four-year or university. Moreover, if a person is not tenured, then that person is expected to do EVEN MORE department, college, and university service on top of publishing and teaching. In other colleges and universities where my friends also have tenure-track positions, service is taken on by those who are tenured/associate professors because the assistant professors need time to publish. But here, so much of the service falls onto assistant professors who are striving for tenure that once associate professor is reached, people disappear from service positions.

xi. Just writing grants takes up all the RT–there is definitely no time to write publications after that is used up. With my grant coauthors we don't have time to write even one little paper–we have enough data we just don't have time to write

anything... You don't have time to do everything. If you spend time mentoring students, you don't have time to do your research. If you spend time writing a grant, you don't have time to do research. You just cannot do everything.

xii. I spent all of January just preparing two grants. All of January. The place where I have to go to do my research is only open during the day on weekdays, so I have to take other work home with me. On non-teaching days I try not to grade papers so that I can do research, but then I have to bring them home and grade them at night. When are you going to do research?

xiii. Mostly on days I do not have teaching, I am at BMCC doing research and mentoring research students. Thus my entire weekend is lost in preparing lesson plans for my class or grading their tests

xiv. [Evenings and weekends are] the only time in which [research] can be done. Absolutely, between grading, creating courses, work on pedagogy, participation in programs, meetings for service. I get up at 4:30am so that can squeeze in some writing time.

xv. The research expectations at BMCC are absurd. If you really want this to be part of a research university, you cannot expect 27 hours of teaching and incredible amounts of service. More grants of 3 hours at a time are not going to change that fundamental dynamic.

xiv. Crushing P&B burden. Incredible teaching load. I was teaching a 5-4 (i.e. no release time) and doing 4 searches per semester. I was not able to finish my book until I resigned from P&B. The policy of applying for release time is too onerous. It is too much work to get three hours. At the senior colleges colleagues tell me they do not teach the contractual load as a matter of course, without filling out any paperwork. My former advisor teaches a 2-1. Until a similar arrangement happens here, at least for research-active faculty, not much will change.

xv. Teaching 5 courses allows you to do NOTHING else during the semester and it burns you out in the process.

xvi. It is VERY difficulty to teach 27 credits a year and maintain any type of research agenda, let alone find the time to submit for publication and external grants.

xvii. BMCC is in a tough spot. They kind of want it all. They want to be connected to CUNY and have research requirements, so they hire people like me from Columbia University, folks from Harvard, and Oxford, and these people like doing research, but we quickly realize that in order to get the research done that we want--it would come at the expense of teaching because we have so many students and so many classes... When I met a colleague in my field he said that he never met another academic who worked as hard as me. The upside is that I have published a good deal, the downside is that I got completely burned out from constant, constant work. My personal relationships suffered and so did I. It's not sustainable. If you want to keep the serious scholars from prestigious universities who value research, they need the TIME to do that work.

xviii. Tenured faculty have to get grants to secure reassigned time but need reassigned time to secure grants. I have never actually had reassigned time.

xix. I feel that the reassigned time for non-tenured faculty has been a big success at CUNY. However, the situation for senior faculty at BMCC has got worse, if anything. Once faculty have tenure, they are pretty much left on their own to find research grants and a research program. This is practically impossible with a 27 hr teaching load. Something must be done to allow senior faculty to pursue research on a consistent basis. Programs like the faculty publication program are a start, but because of their sporadic nature, totally insufficient.

xx. The one change that is crucial is to give reassigned time after the 5 years runs out, to those faculty that both have a track record of publications, and that plan on continuing to pursue research. This is the only way to make research sustainable.

Appendix F: Overall trends (College Culture has a Critical Impact on Research)

Over time a theme that emerged most strongly were issues around the college culture—specifically whether faculty felt that the college and their colleagues actually valued and respected their research.

Finding like-minded collaborators was a critical positive factor for research, and having experiences that made faculty feel that their research was not respected or valued was a critical obstacle, and increased the likelihood that faculty would stop doing research or look for a job elsewhere.

Table A15. Impacts of institutional culture on faculty research:

	had impact	rated as most important factor
Second Most Critical Positive Factor:		
Collaborators, research groups, or colleagues at BMCC or CUNY	53%	26%
Second Biggest Obstacle:		
Attitudes or misconceptions among administrators, chairs and/or peers about the value of research to the college, or about what work/resources are necessary to publish or obtain external funding	51%	24%

Table A16. Faculty impression of BMCC's research culture--Percentage of faculty who expressed disagreement with the following statements, and who strongly disagreed with them:

	disagreement	strongly disagree
Researchers have been regularly included in the decision-making process surrounding research policies and procedures at BMCC.	60%	23%
When I encounter issues related to my research at BMCC, I have felt comfortable raising my concerns with the administration.	62%	22%
When I encounter issues related to my research at BMCC, I have typically been able to resolve them by discussing them with administrators at the college.	63%	23%

Table A17. Institutional culture as a factor in faculty decisions--Percentage of faculty who cited a feeling that BMCC did not respect or value them or their research as a reason for:

Considering stopping research and focusing solely on teaching	31%
Actually stopping research	42%
Looking for another job (in the past, or over the next 5 years)	39%

Faculty quotes

Respect for research and for faculty

i. I was sad to leave BMCC because I loved the students and the faculty... However, I only received disrespect from the staff at every turn. I could even handle the low salary and sharing offices, if I knew that on the whole the college staff and administration respected me but they did not.

ii. <u>A former BMCC faculty member</u>: *Receiving travel funds was a humiliating and demoralizing process. I had to meet repeatedly with [a staff member who] acted like [they were] my boss. The norm at any other college is that staff do everything possible to get faculty the funding they are entitled to so that we can present our research and make the college look good! I've been in other colleges, where the staff just take all my receipts and do their damnest to get me everything they can to fund my travels. I didn't even expect that level of support at BMCC. All I asked was to be treated with respect, not like an underlying.*

iii. <u>A former BMCC faculty member:</u> *I did not feel welcomed by the school or the department, and felt like a contractor or "cog in institutional machinery" rather than a respected full-time faculty member. I did not have an office for two weeks, was first assigned a wrong desk, and didn't have a computer or access to printer... I lacked a sense of community and did not feel well integrated in the department. I felt alienated, invisible, and replaceable. I also felt completely ignored by the department chair.*

iv. Perhaps the most important factor, however, is the often rude, ineffective, inconsistent, and unclear bureaucracy--the feeling that BMCC is in some way not only unsupportive but sabotaging. Why should it be so difficult to have HR accurately process a change of address? Why does [a staff member] have to give inconsistent instructions, and berate me like a child, so I can have my required conference trip partly subsidized?

v. I refer (with others) to the regular "hustle" I make for release time each year as the "CUNY Hustle." If I were writing and researching during all of this time I've spent hustling for time for writing and research, I would have accomplished much more. For this reason, I think a course reduction for faculty actively involved in research is essential for our continued scholarly activity.

Understanding what faculty jobs are, what research is, and what it takes to do it well

I. <u>A former BMCC faculty member:</u> *The head of HR made a comment at new faculty orientation that if faculty wanted to work full time, they could work 40 hours like him. This shows a complete lack of understanding of what faculty work life is like. We work 80 hours a week, and teaching is only 1/3 of our job.*

ii. [There is a] general perception that research is just a little thing you do on the side. No comprehension of how much time and effort it takes to maintain a real research program (or even what real research looks like--my STEM dept chair said that research was about reading in books).

iii. In a similar way that students sometimes don't appreciate all that's involved in a class beyond class time (prepping for class, homework); I think that the administration also has this lack of appreciation of what is involved in scholarship; all this time and mental energy even just to do a lit review.

iv. We are given directive to do research as though you can tack it on to everything else like being a member of committee. But establishing a research agenda, developing collaborators, doing the research, etc. is a full time job--but this is on top of teaching 150 students. I don't know if it's possible to juggle that.

v. There seems to be lip service to research standards, but on the day-to-day campaign, the primary message from administrators is service and teaching based. I raised my concern about how the high teaching load negatively affects my

ability to use the reassigned time to a close administrator, but was told I was spending too much time on teaching. There is institutional denial about the time, money, and resources required to produce quality scholarship. This is a teaching institution, of course. However, I can be more helpful to my students when I am modeling research and inviting them to share in it. I want to spend more time doing research. I want a balance between the teaching load, service load, and research. It is maddening to try to fit all three in. The few colleagues in my department who model effective research and who get grants and publish regularly are frank about how they put their research on top of their teaching. There seems to be a dichotomy between folks who prioritize research and take a lax approach to pedagogy, and those who prioritize pedagogy but trail in with their publishing. I am lucky to have met a few who are vibrant and dynamic enough to do both well, but it is not possible for all faculty to live up to that model.

vi. I'd LOVE a schedule that allowed me to get more work done during the week. I'd teach longer days to have three days on my own to write (because realistically those days are also taken up with grading papers, etc.). The issue isn't that we have a three day week, the issue is that people think that the other days we're NOT doing college work. If I'm in 3 days a week, I am teaching MOST of the day. When do I grade? The two days I'm home. When do I rest, well, I don't because the weekend is now for writing. Having a two day a week possibility might be very helpful.

vii. I feel there is an inherent culture at the administrative level that faculty released from teaching to do research are "getting away with something". I have had the grants office tell me that I was "padding my release time" in external grant proposals when they had absolutely no understanding of the amount of time and effort required for research. At the same time administrators seem to create barriers for research, every year we are asked for a list of publications... this is very unauthentic.

viii. I have heard someone say in the past, "Oh, this person just doesn't want to teach in front of the classroom". This is a misconception that people who are doing research (or teaching online) have to deal with. Some people may not see the value in it and you may not be able to change their perception. But as long as the school sees the value in it, that is more important than your peers in the department, as long as the chair see the value in it, and anyone else who decides schedules or gives approval.

Not feeling heard
i. <u>A former BMCC faculty member:</u> *I was on a committee that partly addressed faculty development. I worked with two administrators. One of the administrators was sympathetic but no attempt was made to implement any of my suggestions. No concerted effort was made to find out how we could change the institutional culture of disrespect toward faculty.*

ii. I do not feel that administration appreciates what it takes to conduct research. This is primarily expressed by not giving faculty enough time to do research, but also in general unappreciative attitudes among administrators.

Unrealistic expectations
i. A colleague of mine has come to call the CUNY community colleges an R1 community college. We are at a CC where the focus has traditionally been on our teaching, and all kinds of things have changed (it's not just coming from above, the faculty also want to do research) and there just seems to be a ridiculous mismatch.

ii. Obtaining external federal funding for personal research agendas at a community college requires competition with researchers at 4-year and graduate institutions.

iii. Personally, I really like my experience at BMCC, so I really don't want to actively look for another job. We are a two year school and they are asking us to do four year work, which is cool-I'm ok with that. But then we don't get the four-year pay or the time to do research.

iv. It is hard to believe that this is a serious effort because of the contractual teaching load. We have been asked to increase our research exponentially and we have done it with no additional resources.

v. I feel like the administration gives us totally mixed messages about how we should be prioritizing our time. They talk about teaching quality and service as if it is very important, but then give the impression that research is far more important at other times. I'd like a clear understanding of where my priorities should be.

vi. The college is trying to treat its faculty as if we are a research institution when evaluating tenure and promotion, but as if we are a community college in terms of teaching load and service.

Appendix G: Overall trends: Specific Structures have a Critical Impact on Research

There were also a number of specific structures—policies, procedures, and other more tangible mechanisms that faculty cited often as obstacles to research. The particular structures that are important to faculty vary somewhat by discipline or other factors, and so they manifest themselves in a number of ways, but often the biggest themes that emerge are not about resources per se, but about policies and procedures surrounding resources. For example, a number of faculty commented on the lack of specific procedures, or uniform procedures, for a number of different things (using reassigned time, scheduling rules, having one's office computer unlocked, requesting software or supplies, having certain types of conference travel reimbursed, having particular types of scholarship recognized as research, etc.). To highlight these more structural issues, we present a selection of illustrative examples. However, these are not exhaustive.

Policies and Procedures for Applying for External Grants

The current process for obtaining approval to submit external grants seems to be a significant obstacle at BMCC for many faculty. Over one-third of faculty have decided not to submit a subsequent external grant application because of a negative prior experience with this process, and roughly one-quarter of faculty have had changes mandated to their grant proposals that interfered with their ability to do the research, even though those changes were not required by the funder or by CUNY legal requirements; in some cases those changes were directly opposed to funding agency recommendations. And more than one-quarter of faculty identified the current procedure as an obstacle to research and grant submission.

Table A18. Faculty experiences of the internal approval process for external research grants at BMCC

Percentage of faculty who have decided not to submit a particular application for external funding because of negative past experiences with the external grant submission approval process at BMCC	36%
Percentage of faculty who have had changes mandated to an external research grant proposal that interfered with their ability to conduct the proposed research (and that were not required to meet legal or funder requirements)	24%
The current procedure for applying for grants classified as obstacle to research	27%
The current procedure for applying for grants rated as most critical obstacle to research	15%

Faculty quotes:

i. Where to start? It's always a horrible long slog. You write an outline, and a budget. You get a tentative ok. You write, you contact colleagues, you pull together collaborations--you spend hours--and then you have to get the ok again. And that's where the fun begins--no, too much RT. No, you can't have RT for working with students. No, you can't develop a new course to help our students. Never mind that these are basic, critical pieces of the proposal, never mind how many hours your collaborators at other institutions have put in. That a chair can make these demands, or even has say over this, is totally outrageous.

ii. Constant sniping from my chair and other members of my department that I am not teaching enough, that I think I'm so special, that I've raised the bar for everyone else, that I'm never here (never mind that I come in at 8am, and I start working on the subway at 7am, so yeah, I might leave early--and not that I'm not working when I'm not at BMCC). Administratively, the grants have gone reasonably smoothly, though every single semester I need to have my RT signed off AGAIN (even though it was signed off on when the proposal went in, and the grants came in and still each semester we have to do a little dance and beg and plead). It's infuriating.

iii. The 'intent to submit' form was a problem... When I applied for external funding last year, there was a clear lack of understanding how the funding would dovetail with CUNY's requirements of me as an employee, how it would be administered, and whether or not seeking this funding was legitimate or do-able.

iv. I was told not to submit above a certain amount of money for parts of the budget. The next time I submitted, I ignored that "advice" and got the grant. (It was hard to tell whether it was mandated, or advice.) I was also told not to submit for more than 4 of hours of RT per semester.

v. The grants office added someone I had never heard of to my grant and submitted it without informing me. The NSF later made us take this person off the grant before approving it.

vi. I once applied for an NSF collaborative grant with colleagues from XXXX University who have a record of NSF winning grant proposals in the field. The changes my college administration was asking for which were not needed for the grant almost made my collaborators withdraw from the submission process and also delayed our submission till the deadline date. We ended up not getting the grant and based on the reviews it was clear that the additional constraints made by my college may have negatively affected us getting the grant. Since then, my collaborative relationship with my colleagues from XXXX University has not been the same.

vii. I have applied for grants with several different federal funding agencies, and each time I got advice from the program director about the amount of reassigned time that I should include in the grant budget. Several of them told me that they would never fund a grant that included insufficient reassigned time because they would not believe that I could complete the research without it. Yet despite this, I was repeatedly prohibited from including the necessary reassigned time in the grant budget, even though the funder would be paying the cost. When I was finally able to submit a grant with the necessary amount of reassigned time it was funded. But because it was such a problem negotiating this in the past, I'm very apprehensive about submitting more grant applications in the future—it's a big investment of time to write the grant only to be unable to submit it in a form that allows you to complete the research.

viii. I have several times had issues with chairs signing off on the intent to submit form for grants: one chair was just unresponsive to all faculty requests to sign these types of forms, for whatever reason—I had to get upper-level administrators involved to get the chair to sign the form. Another chair just kept telling me that I couldn't ask for more than a minimal amount of RT, even though the grant couldn't be completed in that amount of time, and the department would have no trouble covering the classes.

ix. I had a grant with a major federal agency that was almost funded, and which we were strongly recommended to resubmit by the funder. We prepared the whole revised grant application and submitted everything to the grants office by the deadline; we also spent a month repeatedly scheduling meetings with the then-current provost to walk them through our application, only to have them repeatedly cancel the meetings because they were too busy with other tasks. In the end we were told by this previous provost that we could not submit the grant because there "wasn't enough time to approve it". This was completely devastating—we had already submitted the grant the previous year, and had done well in the review process—it was completely unclear to us why any further approval would even be needed, and it seemed particularly cruel that this happened only after we had invested hundreds of hours in the grant and already

gotten signals from the funding agency that we had a strong chance of being funded the next time around. This experience has made me extremely anxious about ever submitting another grant application again. If this procedure isn't changed, I will definitely leave BMCC for another job elsewhere—I just can't go through this kind of experience again.

Chairs, past or present

Faculty experiences with their chairs seems to vary wildly, with some faculty citing chairs that were critical supporters of their research, and other faculty citing chairs as a major obstacle to research and a primary reason for seeking other jobs while at BMCC. While some chairs seem to be very supportive of faculty research, other faculty seem to experience chairs who either don't value research or actively block research because it is seen as diametrically opposed to the college mission of teaching.

Table A19. Faculty experiences of chair support of research at BMCC	
Chairs (current or former) classified as having a positive impact on research	13%
Chairs (current or former) rated as most critical positive influence on research	6%
Chairs (current or former) classified as an obstacle to research	18%
Chairs (current or former) rated as most critical obstacle to research	10%

Table A20. Impact of chairs: Percentage of faculty who sought or plan to seek jobs elsewhere, based on their experiences with their chairs (logistic regression to generate *p*-values)				
Rated as:	not an obstacle at all	extremely critical obstacle	p-value	sig.
Department chairs, past or present	71%	93%	0.026	**

Faculty quotes:

i. [My chair] refuses to approve grants that include reassigned time even when it is a requirement for the grant. [The chair] also refuses to allow people to take reassigned time once they get it.

ii. [The previous chair] did not allot full junior faculty contractual reassigned time.

iii. Department chair loathe approving a grant requesting release time.

iv. My department chair once said to me: "I don't understand, why can't you just do your research in the summer?" The idea that I took a "writing day" each week was also something this chair did not understand or value.

v. If a Chair doesn't have personal experience with research or obtaining research funding, they simply don't understand what it means to apply, what the odds of success are, or what it means to win grants. Chairs need to be removed from the process since they function as a roadblock. I have deliberately not applied for several funding opportunities simply because I didn't have the energy to fight with my Chair. This shouldn't be an issue.

vi. There have been times in the past where other chairs were not supportive and there were things that I wanted to apply to for external funding, but I couldn't get the chair's support. There was an instance where there was an application and it took me 45 days of back and forth to get it signed. With a different chair it took five minutes. So the relationship that you have is really important.

vii. My Chair objects to release time. For the kind of work I do, I *must* ask for release time & in several grant proposal opportunities, I will be rejected if I *don't* ask for release time. Release time is the single most important facet of research at BMCC. Without it, good research cannot happen. Some chairs clearly do not understand this at all.

Affiliation with the CUNY Graduate Center

A number of faculty are affiliated with the CUNY Graduate Center (GC) and all of those faculty see the Graduate Center as having a positive impact on their research (for example because it gives them access to library resources, colleagues in their field, graduate students to work as research assistants, or seminars in their field); however, the majority of these faculty faced obstacles at BMCC related to their CUNY Graduate Center affiliation.

Table A21. Faculty experiences with affiliation at the Graduate Center	
Percentage of faculty who feel that their affiliation with the GC has a positive impact on their research	100%
Percentage of faculty with GC affiliation who have encountered obstacles at BMCC that have interfered with their ability to benefit from your affiliation with the CUNY Graduate Center, or have experienced any negative consequences at BMCC as a result of their Graduate Center affiliation	52%

Faculty quotes:

i. I have been told that I should not ask to teach regularly at the GC… When I was granted release time hours for directing a doctoral dissertation I was made to wait weeks for BMCC to accept that decision and told that it would not happen again. I now am directing 4 dissertations and am quite concerned that the work will not be compensated.

ii. I was told that I should not expect to teach at the GC on a regular basis and not to ask.

iii. I have been told that only administrative work and service done at BMCC would count toward tenure and promotion, not [the work done] at the Graduate Center.

iv. Anything done at the GC seems to be seen as something I do for fun, or for myself, and not a part of my BMCC workload. There is no sense that what I learn at GC seminars, or using GC library resources, or teaching at the GC might benefit both my research (which is supposed to be a part of my work at BMCC) and my students at BMCC.

Travel Reimbursement

Even though the survey didn't explicitly ask about the travel reimbursement process, a number of faculty mentioned this issue during interviews or wrote in information about this issue in the open comments section of the survey. **Faculty seem not only to find the procedure for travel reimbursement burdensome, but also seem to have unreliable results with getting reimbursed,** to the extent that several faculty mentioned giving up on this process because they either didn't have the time to follow through on it repeatedly, or because they felt too intimidated by the process to proceed with it.

Table A22. Faculty experiences with travel reimbursement	
Percentage of faculty who wrote in issues with the travel reimbursement process into their survey questionnaire in one of the "other" boxes	8%

Faculty quotes:

i. The amount of paperwork required to fill in order to apply to travel funds is frustrating; to this frustration we may add other travel restrictions (such as the allowed time to spend abroad when traveling to an international conference considering most of the costs is coming out of pocket).

ii. Applying for the tiny amount of travel funds that were available to us was so excruciatingly awful, at first I just didn't do it, and had to pay out of pocket for my trips, if I took them. [A staff member] would try to humiliate and shame us about what we were applying for and why. The notion that if we wanted to stay an extra day to do research or collaborate was somehow a ploy to cheat the college out of precious funds was ludicrous.

iii. The amount of obstacles to getting anything done at BMCC is very frustrating. Just getting paid back $450 for travel takes a crazy amount of time and a never-ending cavalcade of strange, seemingly random obstacles.

Appendix H: Members of COACHE Subgroup on Research

Claire Wladis, Professor, Mathematics (Chair)
Jean Amaral, Assistant Professor, Library
Sheldon Applewhite, Assistant Professor, Social Science, Human Services and Criminal Justice
Arto Artinian, Assistant Professor, Social Science, Human Services and Criminal Justice
Henry Bulley, Assistant Professor, Social Science, Human Services and Criminal Justice
Peter Consenstein, Professor, Modern Languages and Literature
Kay Conway, Professor, Business
Francesco Crocco, Associate Professor, English
Daniel DePaulo, Assistant Professor, Social Science, Human Services and Criminal Justice
K. E. Saavik Ford, Professor, Science
Daly Guilamo, Assistant Professor, Center for Ethnic Studies
Alyse Hachey, Professor, Teacher Education
Masha Komolova, Assistant Professor, Social Science, Human Services and Criminal Justice
Yolanda Martin, Assistant Professor, Social Science, Human Services and Criminal Justice
Patricia Mathews-Salazar, Professor, Social Science, Human Services and Criminal Justice
Yolanda Medina, Associate Professor, Teacher Education
Desmond Barry Mckernan, Professor, Science
Kathleen Offenholley, Associate Professor, Mathematics
Maria Pagan-Rivera, Assistant Professor, Social Science, Human Services and Criminal Justice
Diana Rickard, Assistant Professor, Social Science, Human Services and Criminal Justice
Sarah Salm, Professor, Science
Jason Samuels, Associate Professor, Mathematics

Appendix I: Summary information about surveys and interviews

The faculty members who submitted complete survey responses on the Taskforce Survey were very similar in composition to the overall BMCC faculty. Faculty from all departments at BMCC were also represented on the survey. The questions on the survey itself were developed after first talking informally with 37 different faculty members across different departments at BMCC about their experiences and their biggest concerns relating to research at BMCC. The survey instrument itself, as well as the interview and focus group protocols, and the recruitment process, were discussed and revised extensively by the subcommittee, which is made up of both junior and senior researchers from a variety of departments at BMCC.

Table A23. Taskforce Survey Respondents and BMCC Population (IPEDS, 2014; BMCC internal data)

	Survey	BMCC
total	156	456
tenured/CCE	52%	52%
female	74%	57%
faculty of color	38%	45%
rank		
instructor/lecturer	7%	12%
assist. prof.	51%	46%
assoc. prof.	26%	20%
professor	17%	22%
original date of hire*		
prior to Sept 1, 2002	14%	22%
Sept 1, 2002-Aug 31, 2006	20%	19%
Sept 1, 2006-Aug 31, 2011	28%	21%
Sept 1, 2011-present	39%	36%

*Data for original date of hire are not currently systematically available for BMCC faculty. Numbers presented here for original date of hire are estimates based on distribution in BMCC mathematics dept. Every single department at BMCC was represented in the survey.

All faculty who received external grants from 2010-2015 were invited to be interviewed, chairs from each department were asked to recommend the names of faculty who were research-active in their department and that represented a diversity of sub-disciplines and career stages, and those faculty recommended by the chairs were also invited to be interviewed. In addition, the general BMCC full time faculty was invited to participate in the survey, focus groups, and interviews via three separate college-wide email invitations and through announcements. Flyers were distributed at all department meetings in February. Faculty on the committee also approached other researchers in their own departments to be interviewed. The interviewees also included a number of current and former department chairs.

Former faculty who had left BMCC voluntarily (and not retired) over the last five years were also invited to be interviewed, via phone or email, by using contact information supplied by human resources or by using updated contact information found online. Members of the committee also identified faculty and administrators at other CUNY colleges with whom they had a collegial relationship and who had expertise in research, and they were invited to be interviewed by the committee. Faculty and administrators at the following colleges were interviewed:

- Baruch College
- The City College of New York

- College of Staten Island
- Hunter College
- John Jay College of Criminal Justice
- Lehman College
- New York City College of Technology
- Queens College
- York College
- Bronx Community College
- Guttman Community College
- Hostos Community College
- Kingsborough Community College
- LaGuardia Community College
- Queensborough Community College

The committee also identified administrators and staff at BMCC who have job responsibilities that relate to faculty research. The president and the staff member who oversees travel requests both declined to be interviewed, but the remaining administrators were interviewed and their suggestions were used for the basis of several of the recommendations in this report. The **BMCC administrators interviewed** are:

- Director of Grants Office
- Director of Research Office
- Director of Office of Faculty Appointments
- Dean of Faculty
- Provost
- Former Assistant Director of Grants Office
- Director of Institutional Research
- Dean of Institutional Effectiveness
- Vice President of Technology
- Chief Librarian
- Director of E-Learning Program
- Dean of Academic Programs and Instruction

BMCC Faculty Survey on Support for Research

The COACHE faculty satisfaction survey was administered to faculty across CUNY in 2015. At BMCC, this survey revealed that two of the most negative aspects of working at BMCC for faculty were workload and support for research. The aim of this survey is to collect more detailed information about exactly what kinds of modifications to research structures would best support research at BMCC. We will use the results of this survey (along with other data collected from faculty) to make recommendations directly to Vice President Karrin Wilks about how BMCC can best support research.

All results of this survey will be anonymized, any information that could identify individual respondents will not be shared.

There are 55 questions in this survey

intro questions

[]At the present time, do you consider yourself to be active in research? *

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes

◯ No

[]Are you currently a doctoral student?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes

◯ No

[]Are you affiliated with the CUNY Graduate Center?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes

◯ No

[]Are you a faculty member in the library department?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

◯ Yes

◯ No

Positive Impact

[]

Which of the following factors have had a positive impact on your ability to conduct research and obtain outside grants at BMCC?

Please choose **all** that apply:

- ☐ Contractual reassigned time provided in the first five years of your appointment
- ☐ Reassigned time for research provided by internal BMCC or CUNY grants
- ☐ Other internal grant funding and/or special programs (Please describe):
- ☐ The presence of research collaborators and/or research groups at BMCC
- ☐ The presence of research collaborators and/or research groups at CUNY
- ☐ Support, help, or advice from particular offices or people at BMCC or CUNY
- ☐ The Research Office
- ☐ The Grants Office
- ☐ The Institutional Research Office
- ☐ The Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (CETLS)
- ☐ Other administrators or offices at BMCC:
- ☐ Colleagues at BMCC
- ☐ Your department chairs, current or past
- ☐ The CUNY Research Foundation
- ☐ Other CUNY offices:
- ☐ Resources and/or colleagues at the CUNY Graduate Center
- ☐ Other CUNY colleagues outside BMCC
- ☐ Availability of resources and/or facilities necessary for your research
- ☐ Scheduling policies
- ☐ Other, please describe:: [_____]

[]Text inputs for the "positiveImpact" question.

Please write your answer(s) here:

Other internal grant funding and/or special programs (Please describe)	[_____]
Other administrators or offices at BMCC	[_____]
Other CUNY offices	[_____]

Positive 2

[]

You identified each of the following factors as having a positive impact on your research at BMCC. For each of these factors, please rate on a scale of 1-10 how critical it is to your ability to conduct research and obtain external funding at BMCC:

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
count(positiveImpact_a, positiveImpact_b, positiveImpact_c, positiveImpact_d, positiveImpact_e, positiveImpact_f, positiveImpact_f1, positiveImpact_f2, positiveImpact_f3, positiveImpact_f4, positiveImpact_f5, positiveImpact_f6, positiveImpact_f7, positiveImpact_f8, positiveImpact_f9, positiveImpact_f10, positiveImpact_f11, positiveImpact_g, positiveImpact_h, positiveImpact_other) > 0

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Only answer this question for the items you selected in question positiveImpact ('Which of the following factors have had a positive impact on your ability to conduct research and obtain outside grants at BMCC?')

Only answer this question for the items you did not select in question positiveImpact ('Which of the following factors have had a positive impact on your ability to conduct research and obtain outside grants at BMCC?')

	Not at all critical 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very critical 10
Contractual reassigned time provided in the first five years of your appointment	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Reassigned time for research provided by internal BMCC or CUNY grants	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Other internal grant funding and/or special programs (Please describe):	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The presence of research collaborators and/or research groups at BMCC	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The presence of research collaborators and/or research groups at CUNY	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Support, help, or advice from particular offices or people at BMCC or CUNY	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The Research Office	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The Grants Office	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The Institutional Research Office	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (CETLS)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Other administrators or offices at BMCC:	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Colleagues at BMCC	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Your department chairs, current or past	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
The CUNY Research Foundation	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Other CUNY offices:	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Resources and/or colleagues at the CUNY Graduate Center	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Other CUNY colleagues outside BMCC	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Availability of resources and/or facilities necessary for your research	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Scheduling policies	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Barriers 1

[]

Which of the following have been obstacles to your research and grant-writing at BMCC?

Please choose **all** that apply:

☐ Time available to conduct research and apply for external funding

☐ {if(library.NAOK == "Y", "Your library workload", "The number of classes you were required to teach")}

☐ The amount of time you were required to spend on service or administrative work

☐ The unpredictability of time for research (i.e. not knowing when reassigned time or sabbatical will be approved, or when grant applications will be successful)

☐ The inability to adequately plan due to timing of funding and/or leave notifications

☐ Other, please describe:

☐ Current Policies and Procedures for Submission and Administration of external grant applications

☐ The current procedure for applying for grants (e.g. too many layers of approvals required, too much paperwork, difficulties getting approvals for reasons unrelated to grant quality, etc.)

☐ Changes mandated to grant applications (by chair, grants office, other administrators) that were not required to meet legal or funder requirements, and that interfered with your ability to conduct the proposed research

☐ Discipline-specific aspects of the proposal critiqued by people with no qualifications in the discipline

☐ Lack of support from administration for grant proposal (e.g. no matching funds or RT when required by funder, research facilities evaluated as not strong enough by funder, etc.)

☐ Difficulties with post-award administration (e.g. lack of or inaccurate information from grants office or research foundation, difficulty obtaining reimbursement or purchasing equipment or other supplies, too much oversight required)

☐ Other, please describe:

☐ College policies related to time and scheduling

☐ Limitations on reassigned time, even when externally funded

☐ {if(library.NAOK == "Y", "Scheduling (e.g. 40 hr/wk on-campus rule)", "Scheduling (e.g. 3-day teaching rule)")}

☐ Unwritten or unevenly enforced policies

☐ Other, please describe:

☐ Resource availability

☐ Travel funds

☐ Equipment or lab facilities

☐ Supplies, software, etc

☐ Administrative access to office computer (to install/update own programs)

☐ Office space

☐ Other, please describe:

☐ Your department chairs, <u>past or present</u>

☐ Difficulties obtaining necessary permissions from chair to submit external funding proposals and/or to conduct research

☐ Department scheduling policies that interfere with ability to spend time on research/grant-writing, or inequitable methods for determining department schedules

☐ Criticism for time spent on research versus {if(library.NAOK == "Y", "library duties", "teaching")}, or told to spend less

time on research

☐ Research inaccurately or inappropriately evaluated during reappointment/tenure/promotion/sabbatical request

☐ Inequitable distribution or lack of willingness to provide department resources for research (e.g. office/lab space, ability to use course sections for pilot educational interventions, writing letters of support, etc)

☐ Other, please describe:

☐ Attitudes or misconceptions among administrators, chairs and/or peers about the value of research to the college, or about what work/resources are necessary to publish or obtain external funding

☐ Exclusion of researchers from the decision-making processes surrounding research policies and procedures

☐ Hidden checkbox to control the display of "Other" in the array

☐ Other, please describe:: [   ]

[]Text inputs for the "barriers" question.

Please write your answer(s) here:

If there are any particular details about these factors that you would like to share, please feel free to do so here:	
If there are any particular details about these factors that you would like to share, please feel free to do so here:	
If there are any particular details about these factors that you would like to share, please feel free to do so here:	
If there are any particular details about these factors that you would like to share, please feel free to do so here:	
If there are any particular details about these factors that you would like to share, please feel free to do so here:	
If there are any particular details about this factor that you would like to share, please feel free to do so here:	
If there are any particular details about this factor that you would like to share, please feel free to do so here:	

[]Text inputs for the "Other" options in the "barriers" question.

Please write your answer(s) here:

Other, please describe: [_____]

Other, please describe: [_____]

Other, please describe: [_____]

Other, please describe: [_____]

Other, please describe: [_____]

Barriers 2

[]

You identified each of the following factors as obstacles to your research at BMCC. For each of these factors, please rate on a scale of 1-10 how critical it is to your ability to conduct research and obtain external funding at BMCC:

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
count(barriers_a, barriers_a1, barriers_a2, barriers_a3, barriers_a4, barriers_a5, barriers_b, barriers_b1, barriers_b2, barriers_b3, barriers_b4, barriers_b5, barriers_b6, barriers_c, barriers_c1, barriers_c2, barriers_c3, barriers_c4, barriers_d, barriers_d1, barriers_d2, barriers_d3, barriers_d4, barriers_d5, barriers_d6, barriers_e, barriers_e1, barriers_e2, barriers_e3, barriers_e4, barriers_e5, barriers_e6, barriers_f, barriers_g, barriers_97, barriers_other) > 0

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Only answer this question for the items you selected in question barriers ('Which of the following have been obstacles to your research and grant-writing at BMCC?')

Only answer this question for the items you did not select in question barriers ('Which of the following have been obstacles to your research and grant-writing at BMCC?')

	Not at all critical 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very critical 10
Time available to conduct research and apply for external funding	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
{if(library.NAOK == "Y", "Your library workload", "The number of classes you were required to teach")}	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The amount of time you were required to spend on service or administrative work	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The unpredictability of time for research (i.e. not knowing when reassigned time or sabbatical will be approved, or when grant applications will be successful)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The inability to adequately plan due to timing of funding and/or leave notifications	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
{barriersOtherInputs_a5}	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Current Policies and Procedures for Submission and Administration of external grant applications	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The current procedure for applying for grants (e.g. too many layers of approvals required, too much paperwork, difficulties getting approvals for reasons unrelated to grant quality, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Changes mandated to grant applications (by chair, grants office, other administrators) that were not required to meet legal or funder requirements, and that interfered with your ability to conduct the proposed research	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Discipline-specific aspects of the proposal critiqued by people with no qualifications in the discipline	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Lack of support from administration for grant proposal (e.g. no matching funds or RT when required by funder, research facilities evaluated as not strong enough by funder, etc.)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Difficulties with post-award administration (e.g. lack of or inaccurate information from grants office or research foundation, difficulty obtaining reimbursement or purchasing equipment or other supplies, too much oversight required)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
{barriersOtherInputs_b6}	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

College policies related to time and scheduling:	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Limitations on reassigned time, even when externally funded	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
{if(library.NAOK == "Y", "Scheduling (e.g. 40 hr/wk on-campus rule)", "Scheduling (e.g. 3-day teaching rule)")}	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Unwritten or unevenly enforced policies	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
{barriersOtherInputs_c4}	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Resource availability	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Travel funds	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Equipment or lab facilities	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Supplies, software, etc	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Administrative access to office computer (to install/update own programs)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Office space	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
{barriersOtherInputs_d6}	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Your department chairs, past or present	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Difficulties obtaining necessary permissions from chair to submit external funding proposals and/or to conduct research	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Department scheduling policies that interfere with ability to spend time on research/grant-writing, or inequitable methods for determining department schedules	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Criticism for time spent on research versus {if(library.NAOK == "Y", "library duties", "teaching")}, or told to spend less time on research	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Research inaccurately or inappropriately evaluated during reappointment/tenure/promotion/sabbatical request	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Inequitable distribution or lack of willingness to provide department resources for research (e.g. office/lab space, ability to use course sections for pilot educational interventions, writing letters of support, etc)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
{barriersOtherInputs_e6}	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Attitudes or misconceptions among administrators, chairs and/or peers about the value of research to the college, or about what work/resources are necessary to publish or obtain external funding	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Exclusion of researchers from the decision-making processes surrounding research policies and procedures	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
{barriers_other}	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Potential Changes

[]

Please rate how critical each of the following potential changes are to your ability to conduct research and apply for external funding:

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

	Not at all critical 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very critical 10	N/A
{if(library.NAOK == "Y", "A reduction in the hours that you work on library duties commensurate with the time that you spend on research", "A reduction in the number of courses that you teach commensurate with the time that you spend on research")}	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
A reduction in service/administrative work, or an increase in the reassigned time allocated to such work so as to better reflect the associated workload	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Elimination of restrictions, subjective approvals, and mandated changes on external grant applications whenever basic criteria are met (e.g. legal/funder requirements)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
More researcher control and less "red tape" for post-award administration	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Less restrictive scheduling policies	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Better equipment, lab facilities, or more research supplies	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
More travel funds	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Administrative access to office computer (to install/update own software)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Removal of department chairs from decisions related to research (unless department resources are necessary for the research)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
More official recognition of research achievements	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
More internal funding opportunities with reassigned time	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Systematic inclusion of faculty researchers in the decision-making process at BMCC related to research and grant policies/procedures	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Simple procedure for faculty researchers to give anonymous feedback on issues related to research and grants	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Move up timing of sabbatical submissions and notifications earlier in the academic year, to allow more time for planning	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Other:	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

[]The text input for the "changesCritical" "Other" sub-question.

Please write your answer here:

time needs

[]

What is the maximum teaching load that you could teach at BMCC and still consistently publish research papers and submit proposals for external funding?

Please type only whole numbers.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'No' at question '4 [library]' (Are you a faculty member in the library department?)

Please write your answer(s) here:

maximum number of **classes per semester**

maximum number of class contact **hours per**

semester

[]What is the maximum library workload (in number of hours per week spent on library duties) that you could work at BMCC and still consistently publish research papers and submit proposals for external funding?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '4 [library]' (Are you a faculty member in the library department?)

Only numbers may be entered in this field.
Your answer must be between 0 and 40

Please write your answer here:

hrs/wk

[]Consider research reassigned time. Which of the following factors are particularly critical to your ability to conduct research and apply for external funding?

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

	Not at all critical 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very critical 10
predictability—knowing in advance (e.g. at least 1-2 semesters) exactly when and how much of it you will have	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
flexibility in deciding exactly when to take it	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
regularity—having at least a little bit every semester	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

[]

In which of the following activities have you engaged?

Please check ALL that apply.

Please choose **all** that apply:

☐ I have published a research paper in a peer reviewed journal.

☐ I have submitted an **internal** research grant application.

☐ I have submitted an **external** research grant application.

[]How many hours do you spend on a typical research paper, from the beginning stages of planning the research, to final publication?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was at question '17 [pubgrantchecks]' (In which of the following activities have you engaged? Please check ALL that apply.)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ 1-50 hours

○ 51-100 hours

○ 101-150 hours

○ 151-200 hours

○ more than 200 hours

[]How many hours do you typically spend on each internal grant proposal, from the beginning planning stages, to final submission?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was at question '17 [pubgrantchecks]' (In which of the following activities have you engaged? Please check ALL that apply.)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ 1-25 hours

○ 26-50 hours

○ 51-75 hours

○ 76-100 hours

○ more than 100 hours

[]How many hours do you typically spend on each external grant proposal, from the beginning planning stages, to final submission?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was at question '17 [pubgrantchecks]' (In which of the following activities have you engaged? Please check ALL that apply.)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ 1-50 hours

○ 51-100 hours

○ 101-150 hours

○ 151-200 hours

○ more than 200 hours

[]

On average, how many hours do you spend each week on research and grant-writing during evening/weekends?

(Or, if your teaching and administrative duties occur evenings/weekends, how many hours do you spend each week on research and grant-writing over and above the 35-40 hours of work per week required to fulfill your job duties at BMCC?)

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '1 [researchactive]' (At the present time, do you consider yourself to be active in research?)

Your answer must be between 0 and 999
Only an integer value may be entered in this field.

Please write your answer here:

☐

hrs/wk

grants

[]Have you ever submitted an application for external funding?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[]Why not? What factors impacted your decision not to apply for external funding?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'No' at question '22 [submittedexternal]' (Have you ever submitted an application for external funding?)

Please write your answer here:

[]Have you ever had changes mandated to an external grant proposal (by your chair, the grants office, or other administrators) that interfered with your ability to conduct the proposed research (and that were not required to meet legal or funder requirements)?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '22 [submittedexternal]' (Have you ever submitted an application for external funding?)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[](Optional) If you would like, feel free to provide more details about changes that have been mandated to your grant application(s) and the impact it has had on your research/grant-writing.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '24 [mandatedchanges]' (Have you ever had changes mandated to an external grant proposal (by your chair, the grants office, or other administrators) that interfered with your ability to conduct the proposed research (and that were not required to meet legal or funder requirements)?)

Please write your answer here:

[]Have you ever decided not to submit a particular application for external funding because of negative past experiences with the external grant submission approval process at BMCC?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '22 [submittedexternal]' (Have you ever submitted an application for external funding?)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[]Please explain how prior experiences with the external grant proposal submissions process at BMCC impacted your decision not to submit particular subsequent external grant applications.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '26 [notsubmittedgrant]' (Have you ever decided not to submit a particular application for external funding because of negative past experiences with the external grant submission approval process at BMCC?)

Please write your answer here:

[]

What was your role on the external grant applications that you have submitted?

Please select ALL that apply:

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '22 [submittedexternal]' (Have you ever submitted an application for external funding?)

Please choose **all** that apply:

☐ Principal investigator

☐ Co-principal investigator

☐ Other: _____

[]When you have served as a principal investigator on external grant applications, how many hours did you individually spend on writing the grant application, from the beginning planning stages to final submission?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Principal investigator' at question '28 [grantroles]' (What was your role on the external grant applications that you have submitted?   Please select ALL that apply:)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ 1-50 hours

○ 51-100 hours

○ 101-150 hours

○ 151-200 hours

○ more than 200 hours

[]When you have served as co-principal investigator on external grant applications, how many hours did you individually spend writing the grant application, from the beginning planning stages to final submission?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was at question '28 [grantroles]' (What was your role on the external grant applications that you have submitted?   Please select ALL that apply:)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ 1-25 hours

○ 26-50 hours

○ 51-75 hours

○ 76-100 hours

○ more than 100 hours

consequences, etc

[]

What are your reasons for conducting research?

Please check ALL that apply.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '1 [researchactive]' (At the present time, do you consider yourself to be active in research?)

Please choose **all** that apply:

☐ To obtain my graduate degree

☐ To obtain promotion or tenure

☐ To provide research-based evidence for educational changes within BMCC/CUNY

☐ To produce educational change on a larger scale (outside BMCC/CUNY)

☐ {if(library.NAOK == "Y", "To contribute to library and information science theory and practice", "To provide myself with information to improve my teaching")}

☐ To keep myself current in my field

☐ To serve as a role model for students

☐ To provide research opportunities for students

☐ Because I see research as a basic part of my role as an academic

☐ Other: [_____]

[]

What are the benefits of your affiliation with the CUNY Graduate Center to your research?

Please select ALL that apply.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '3 [gradcenter]' (Are you affiliated with the CUNY Graduate Center?)

Please choose **all** that apply:

☐ Library resources not available at BMCC

☐ Access to research seminars

☐ Access to a larger number of research colleagues in my discipline

☐ Access to graduate student assistants

☐ My affiliation with a research department at the Graduate Center has made it easier for me to obtain funding at BMCC

☐ Other: [_____]

[]

Have you encountered any obstacles at BMCC that have interfered with your ability to benefit from your affiliation with the CUNY Graduate Center, or have you experienced any negative consequences at BMCC as a result of your Graduate Center affiliation?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '3 [gradcenter]' (Are you affiliated with the CUNY Graduate Center?)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[]Please describe the problems/obstacles you have encountered related to your affiliation with the CUNY Graduate Center, and what impact they have had.

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '33 [GCproblems]' (Have you encountered any obstacles at BMCC that have interfered with your ability to benefit from your affiliation with the CUNY Graduate Center, or have you experienced any negative consequences at BMCC as a result of your Graduate Center affiliation?)

Please write your answer here:

```
```

[]Have you ever considered discontinuing your research agenda and focusing solely on {if(library.NAOK == "Y", "librarianship", "teaching")}?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '1 [researchactive]' (At the present time, do you consider yourself to be active in research?)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[]What were the major factors that led you to consider giving up your research?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '35 [abandonresearch]' (Have you ever considered discontinuing your research agenda and focusing solely on {if(library.NAOK == "Y", "librarianship", "teaching")}?)

Please write your answer here:

[]What made you decide to keep doing research despite the obstacles?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '35 [abandonresearch]' (Have you ever considered discontinuing your research agenda and focusing solely on {if(library.NAOK == "Y", "librarianship", "teaching")}?)

Please write your answer here:

[]Have you previously conducted research?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'No' at question '1 [researchactive]' (At the present time, do you consider yourself to be active in research?)

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[]What were your reasons for stopping (or taking a break from) your research?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '38 [previousresearch]' (Have you previously conducted research?)

Please write your answer here:

[]Have you ever applied for, or considered applying for a job elsewhere, since coming to BMCC?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[]What were the major factors that led to your decision to consider leaving BMCC?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '40 [jobappliedpast]' (Have you ever applied for, or considered applying for a job elsewhere, since coming to BMCC?)

Please write your answer here:

[ ]Do you plan to go on the job market, or have you been considering going on the job market, sometime during the next five years?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[ ]What would have to change at BMCC in order for you to consider staying at BMCC?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '42 [jobapplyfuture]' (Do you plan to go on the job market, or have you been considering going on the job market, sometime during the next five years?)

Please write your answer here:

agree disagree

[]To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

	strongly disagree	disagree	somewhat disagree	neither agree nor disagree	somewhat agree	agree	strongly agree	N/A
The current reassigned time available for research (i.e. provided by the contract and internal funding) is sufficient to produce the publications/scholarship required for tenure and/or promotion.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
In order to conduct research/submit external grant applications at BMCC, it is necessary to put in substantial time working in the evenings and/or on weekends (or otherwise work much longer than the typical 35-40 hour workweek).	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
If a faculty researcher is diligent enough, they will be able to obtain enough internal and external funding to keep their research program going long-term at BMCC, even without other support from the college.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Keeping a long-term research program going at BMCC after the contractual research release time runs out (five years after initial appointment) is extremely difficult and requires an extraordinarily high commitment of personal time.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Researchers have been regularly included in the decision-making process surrounding research policies and procedures at BMCC.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The quality and/or quantity of my research suffers significantly when research reassigned time is difficult to predict and/or varies from semester to semester.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

When I encounter issues related to my research at BMCC, I have felt comfortable raising my concerns with the administration.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
When I encounter issues related to my research at BMCC, I have typically been able to resolve them by discussing them with administrators at the college.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Writing external grant applications requires significant extra time, in addition to the time I spend conducting research.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mentoring BMCC students (or using them as research assistants) requires significant extra time, in addition to the time I spend conducting research.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Administrative tasks associated with research and external funding (e.g. research approvals/permissions, grant application process, post-award administration) require significant extra time, in addition to the time I spend conducting research.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

demographics

The following questions have been included in order to assess the representativeness of this survey sample. They will not be used to identify any individual faculty members. Answers to these questions will only be shared in the aggregate (e.g. 10% of survey respondents were from the English department).

[]What is your title?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Instructor

○ Lecturer

○ Assistant Professor

○ Associate Professor

○ Professor

○ Other [_____]

[]Are you tenured?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[]When did you first start working at BMCC?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Before September 1, 2002

○ September 1, 2002 - August 31, 2006

○ September 1, 2006 - August 31, 2011

○ September 1, 2011 or later

[]Are you currently eligible for contractual reassigned time for research (e.g. in the first five years of your initial appointment to a professorial line)?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[]What is your academic department?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

- ◯ Academic Literacy and Linguistics
- ◯ Accounting
- ◯ Allied Health Sciences
- ◯ Business Management
- ◯ Center for Ethnic Studies
- ◯ Computer Information Systems
- ◯ English
- ◯ Health Education
- ◯ Library
- ◯ Mathematics
- ◯ Media Arts and Technology
- ◯ Modern Languages
- ◯ Music and Art
- ◯ Nursing
- ◯ Science
- ◯ Social Sciences, Human Services & Criminal Justice
- ◯ Speech, Communications, and Theatre Arts
- ◯ Teacher Education
- ◯ Other [_____]

[]

In which of the following general disciplinary areas have you conducted research?

Please select ALL that apply.

Please choose **all** that apply:

- ☐ education or the scholarship of teaching and learning
- ☐ social science (excluding education)
- ☐ the arts and humanities
- ☐ STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics)
- ☐ Other: [_____]

[]What is your gender?

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Female

○ Male

○ Other [   ]

[]

What is your race/ethnicity?

Please select ALL that apply.

Please choose **all** that apply:

☐ Non-Hispanic White or European American

☐ Latina/o, Hispanic or Spanish origin

☐ Black, African, Afro-Caribbean, or African American

☐ East Asian or Asian American

☐ South Asian or Indian American

☐ Middle Eastern or Arab American

☐ Native American or Alaskan Native

☐ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

☐ Other: [   ]

follow up and final thoughts

[]

May we contact you with follow-up questions?

Your responses to any follow-up questions will also be kept completely anonymous.

Please choose **only one** of the following:

○ Yes

○ No

[]Could you please enter your full name and provide your email and/or phone number?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:
Answer was 'Yes' at question '53 [followup]' (May we contact you with follow-up questions?   Your responses to any follow-up questions will also be kept completely anonymous.)

Please write your answer(s) here:

first name: _____

last name: _____

email: _____

phone number: _____

[](*Optional*)   Is there anything else you would like to share about your positive or negative experiences as a researcher at BMCC or about changes you feel that need to be made at BMCC in order to better support research and grant-writing?

Please write your answer here:

Thanks for participating in this survey! Hearing about your experiences conducting research at BMCC is essential for us to make the best possible recommendations for change here at BMCC. If there is anything further that you would like to share, feel free to contact the chair of the COACHE Research Subcommittee, Claire Wladis, at cwladis@bmcc.cuny.edu.

Submit your survey.
Thank you for completing this survey.