

President's Council for Women

Task Force on Auxiliary Faculty

Group Formation and Composition:

The President's Council for Women Task Force on Auxiliary Faculty (PCWTFAF) was formed by the PCW in Autumn, 2007. The initial group consisted of the following PCW members: Matt Platz (OAA), Lynn Ready (Legal Affairs), Patrick Hall (Multicultural Center), Mimi Dane (Community member from Squires, Sanders, & Dempsey), Kay Bea Jones (Architecture), Bettina Bair (Computer Science), and Paula Renker (Nursing who served as convener and subsequent Chair). Ad hoc members were added after the initial task force meeting to represent College Administration: Jan Weisenberger (then Associate Dean for SBS) and Tom Rosol (Dean College of Veterinary Medicine); Auxiliary Faculty: Ruthmarie Mitsch (African American Studies) and Patricia Reid (Nursing); and resource members: Marjie Hamlett (Human Resources) and Julie Carpenter-Hubin (Research and Institutional Planning). The committee composition changed over the 3 academic years with Carol Anderson replacing Matt Platz as she assumed the position of Interim Asst. Dean for the Office of Academic Affairs and Patrick Hall assumed other responsibilities as he transitioned off of the PCW.

Meeting Schedule: The PCWTFAF met for the first time in November of 06 and met 7 additional times. The final meeting was held in Dec of 08.

Purpose Discernment:

The initial meetings were held to identify the purpose, mission, and composition of the task force.

Purpose: It was identified that the purpose of the task force was to identify issues and make recommendations relevant to non-tenured faculty (including clinical faculty, instructors, and lecturers) to the President's Council for Women.

Mission Statement: The overarching goal of this task force is to legitimize and validate lecturer, instructor, and clinical faculty positions as a career choice for women. The task force conceptualizes that the faculty as a whole will be the most productive when divisions between faculty strata are minimized and all faculty feel an ownership, pride, and responsibility for their individual and collective work.

Methodology:

Initial Meetings:

Initial discussion identified the following issues related to common perceptions held by, or about, auxiliary faculty:

1. Avoid a migrant worker mentality

2. Address governance issues
3. Improve faculty collegiality
4. Address pay equity concerns (intra-college, gender and market related).
5. Treat other issues related to sick pay, tuition assistance, library privileges, and other faculty perks.
6. Consider financial resources.

It was determined that background data were needed to formulate specific areas or sub-populations of need. This was accomplished through a literature review of national data and established research in this area and specific information about the structure and characteristics and structure of auxiliary faculty that were obtained through OSU Human Resources.

The initial plan conceptualized by the task force was to develop a list of survey items from the literature search and conduct a survey of auxiliary faculty to provide a basis for recommendations.

In January of 2007, the task force met to discuss the results of our literature review. We reviewed information from a variety of sources, including the AAUP analysis and recommendations for contingent faculty. We discussed an article, "Consequences: An Increasingly Contingent Faculty" by John Curtis and Monica Jacobe, that was published by AAUP and the US Department of Education to determine local relevance. After review of the literature the task force identified specific concerns for contingent faculty at OSU:

- a. Benefits
- b. Work-schedule
- c. Evaluation process
- d. Involvement in local decision making
- e. Governance issues (other than d)
- f. Work load
- g. Contracts

The task force decided that it was important to validate the issues identified from our data gathering with focus groups of auxiliary faculty members from OSU before surveying all faculty members. Subsequently, a two academic year time line was developed to complete data collection from focus groups and the survey, data analysis, and formation of recommendations. Our goal was to present our findings Spring of 2008 to PCW.

Focus Groups:

Five focus groups were held in April and May of 2007. The focus groups were held at noon and 4PM to best accommodate teaching schedules. Two groups were held for clinical faculty (Group 1= 8 members, Group 2 = 1 member), two groups were held for lecturers (Group 3 = 12 members and Group 4 = 10 members). One focus group was also held for contingent/auxiliary research faculty with only one faculty member. Paula Renker conducted all of the focus groups – in addition PCWTF members also attended the larger groups: Mimi Dane (Group 1), Patrick Hall (Group 2) and Matt Platz (Group 4). Focus Group leaders discussed their meeting summaries to establish inter-rater reliability.

In October of 2007, the focus group survey summaries were distributed and discussed to identify relevant themes for inclusion in the campus wide survey. While we acknowledged that some auxiliary faculty participants' concerns did not reflect actual practice at the University level, we acknowledged that these were the perceptions of these group members. The task force determined that the data reflected that auxiliary faculty were seeking information about their roles, benefits, and membership within the University community and that the following issues were consistent throughout the focus groups.

- A. Expectations
 - 1. Work load, raises, etc.
- B. Communication of concerns
 - 1. Much misinformation appears to be present about the positions between faculty and administration at the department/college levels.
 - 2. Group members want to have letters/contracts that outline all of the tasks that they are expected to do to keep their positions
 - a. Thesis committees
 - b. Developing Programs
 - c. Mentoring Honors Students
 - d. Attendance at Meetings
- C. Evaluation Concerns
 - 1. Process and Feedback
 - 2. From administration
 - 3. Want access to student evaluations
- D. Teaching awards
 - 1. Eligibility concerns
 - 2. Separate or combined awards
- E. Consistency between and within colleges and departments in terms of
 - 1. Expectations
 - 2. Evaluations
 - 3. Workload
 - 4. Contracts

5. Focus group members discussed their intense frustration of not having a contract before the quarter begins and the difficulty this places on economic stability and family concerns related to child care, etc.

F. Governance Issues

1. Voting rights for issues related to their courses and students.
2. Central governance (not supported – but a topic for survey).

It was determined that these issues would serve as the basis for the campus wide survey.

Survey Process:

A subcommittee was formed to develop and implement the survey that included Lynn Readey, Kay Bea Jones, Patti Reid, and Ruthmarie Mitsch. The subcommittee met with Julie Carpenter-Hubin from the Provost's Office in the area of Institutional Research and Planning at the suggestion of Deb Ballam. The subcommittee reviewed the proposed faculty/staff culture survey that was being conducted by the Provost's office and decided that it would be the best approach to reach auxiliary faculty to identify their concerns. The survey was conducted in March and April of 2008 and the data for Auxiliary Faculty were given to the task force in August of 2008. Paula Renker conducted analysis in Autumn Quarter and released her analysis via email to the task force. Available members of the task force met in November 2008 to discuss the analysis and implications of the findings. Five recommendations to be presented to the President's Council on Women were made that addressed the findings of both the focus groups and the survey results. These recommendations were circulated to all of the task force members with the opportunity to comment and/or make suggested revisions. There were no suggestion revisions.

Survey Analysis:

The Provost's office of Institutional Research and Planning analysis of the culture survey data is available at <http://hr.osu.edu/culturesurvey.aspx>. Their findings were reported by collapsing five Likert categories into two categories. The analyses conducted by the PCW Task Force did not include collapsed categories and utilized statistical analyses (Kruskall Wallis) that addressed ranked differences.

Several caveats to the analysis of the culture survey for auxiliary faculty are important to consider.

- 1) Methodological concerns including survey length, item placement for auxiliary faculty concerns, and missing data:
Only 694 auxiliary faculty (including regular clinical faculty) initiated the HR survey. The survey was very long and, as a result, we had extensive missing data (n=200 missing) by the end of the survey when the most pertinent questions (i.e. those developed by the task force) r/t auxiliary faculty were posted. The findings analyzed by the task force focused on valid percentages, eliminating the missing respondents. In addition, the overall response rate for the survey was very limited. However, or perhaps because of these issues, auxiliary faculty responses strongly supported concerns identified in the focus groups in 2007. The survey responses analyzed by the task force focused on

overall frequencies as well as differences related to gender and specific faculty group. No attempt was made to examine findings by colleges or departments.

- 2) Please know that the survey was conducted before the current economic situation became a “crisis”. Such events may change overall perspectives about work place climate when there are fears about being unemployed.
- 3) Methodological issues related to the meaning or interpretation of the findings: There are no hard and fast rules concerning parameters (in terms of response rates) that would be deemed as “unacceptable, troublesome, worrisome,” etc. For example, is it considered acceptable and expected for 36% of auxiliary faculty to identify that it is likely that they will be leaving OSU within the next three years? Or should we look at the glass as half-full and celebrate that 64% are planning on remaining for more than 3 years? Does the fact that the auxiliary faculty’s 36% rate is consistent with faculty and staff throughout the university mitigate their response or it a business standard for OSU? Are these findings no longer valid because the survey was conducted before the economic collapse beginning in the last quarter of 2008?

Auxiliary Sample Demographics.

The sample was comprised of 44.5% (n=309) lecturers; 20.6% (n=143) non-regular clinical; 16.3% (n=113) others; 18.6% (n=129) regular clinical faculty. There were 355 males and 339 women (51-49%). Unfortunately, there were insufficient numbers of disadvantaged minorities to undertake valid analyses as only 5.2% of auxiliary faculty self-identified in that category.

The construction of the survey makes it difficult to provide information about the number of children for each individual auxiliary faculty member; however, the data revealed that 34% had children between the age of 0-2; 32% indicated that they had children between the age of 3-4; 38.9% had children between the age of 5-12; 32% indicated that they had children between the age of 13-17; 38.5% had children between the age of 18-23; and 43% had children over the age of 24.

Other descriptive findings related to auxiliary faculty:

- 30.2% of auxiliary faculty identified that they held positions outside of OSU. (28% female, 31% male), [29% missing!] and 6.2% indicated that they had teaching positions at other colleges (29% missing!) [equal percentages of male/female]. Lecturers were the dominant class in these last two categories.
- 34.3% of the auxiliary faculty (n=238) taught graduate level courses.
- 39.2% developed a new course in the last two years.
- 33.3% participated in workshops about teaching in the classroom.
- 34.4% had reimbursement for professional travel.
- 6.5% (n=45) participated in tuition reimbursement.
- 11.1% were offered another position outside of OSU in the last year.

- 36% (n=178) indicated that they were somewhat or very likely to leave OSU within the next 3 years, with only 5.9% indicating that they were planning on retiring in the next 3 years.
- 18.3% (n=90) are currently providing care for elderly relatives; 33.1% expect to be caring for an elderly relative within the next 3 years. (Women reported significantly higher levels of responsibilities for current care. No significant differences between genders (for future care) or faculty groups with either of the last two variables.)

The following themes were consistent throughout the focus groups and were used to base items formulated for the HR Survey. Survey results and indicated analyses are included in the section after the theme.

Overall satisfaction

Twenty-three percent of the faculty reported that they were somewhat or very dissatisfied with their *overall experience* at OSU. Men were significantly more likely to be satisfied with their overall experience than women. ($H, 1, p=.045$) In addition, evaluation of responses (Kruskall-Wallis) by different faculty types found a significant difference ($H 8.565, df=3, p=.036$) with regular clinical faculty being the least satisfied.

Focus Group Finding 1: *Contingent faculty members appear to be seeking information or are concerned about their roles, benefits, and membership within the University community. These concerns include, among others, expectations, work load, and raises.*

Survey findings related to Focus Group Findings include:

Salary: 40% of women and 30% of men were somewhat or very dissatisfied with their salary – there were no significant gender or faculty type differences.

Benefits: In terms of medical, retirement and vacation benefits, 26% of auxiliary faculty were either very or somewhat dissatisfied with their benefits; there were no significant differences between gender, but lecturers were significantly lower than other faculty members in terms of satisfaction of benefits. This finding supports the information from the focus groups.

Teaching Responsibilities: Although satisfaction with teaching responsibilities was relatively high (somewhat or highly satisfied = 83% female and 91% male), women were significantly less satisfied with teaching responsibilities than men ($H, 3.876, df 1, p=.049$). Faculty type also differed significantly with a bimodal distribution – both non-regular and regular clinical faculty rated the lowest and others and lectures rated the highest. ($H, 79.937, df=3, p=.000$)

Time for Scholarly Work: Women were significantly less satisfied with time for scholarly work than men ($H, 37.598, df=1, p=.000$). Faculty type also significantly differed with regular clinical reporting the least satisfaction ($H 21.317, df=3, p=.000$).

Workload: 32% of faculty indicated that their workload was too or much too heavy. Women rated workload as significantly heavier ($H 10.773$, $df=1$, $p=.001$) than men. Faculty groups differed significantly as well with regular clinical faculty rating the heaviest workloads ($H 45.577$, $df=3$, $p=.000$). 10% of auxiliary faculty identified that they had 1 or more graduate advisees, dissertation, or fellows to supervise; 11% identified that they were advisors for undergraduate students (1-477). 11% of the sample served on 1-13 theses committees. 42% of the faculty served on 1-13 departmental committees and 30% served on University, School, or Divisional committees.

Focus Group Findings: Communication of concerns, Evaluation Issues, and Teaching Awards

These areas were addressed under departmental and university climate questions. Gender differences were most striking in this area of the survey, while there was only one significant difference between groups of auxiliary faculty.

Governance and Climate Issues:

Non-significant findings:

There were no significant findings in terms of gender and the following items relating to governance issues; however, the descriptive statistics highlight the importance of the issues to auxiliary faculty.

- 1) Being considered a voting member of the faculty (Strongly/somewhat agree -34.4% women and 36.7% of men).
- 2) Faculty meetings being a productive use of time (Strongly/Somewhat agree – 46.9% women, 36.6% men)
- 3) Importance of attending faculty or committee meetings (Strongly/Somewhat agree -57.5% women and 64.9% of men).
- 4) 41.2% (n=168) of auxiliary faculty reported increased information about role relationships between faculty and administration would be of great value. (268 missing)
- 5) 49.5% (n=201) reported that an improved orientation would be of great value.
- 6) 24% (n=120) of auxiliary faculty did not feel that faculty were treated fairly in their dept.

Significant differences

- 1) Women were significantly less likely to rate their departmental climate as cohesive. Departmental climate (cohesive-fragmented) Range 1 (cohesive) -7 (fragmented), mean 3.41, SD 1.866. ($H 7.691$, $df 1$, $p=.006$) Faculty groups did not differ significantly.
- 2) Women were less likely to agree with the statement that “I have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department/ unit” (8.4% of women strongly agreed, 16.8% of men)[$H 8.613$, $df 1$, $p=.003$]

- 3) Women were significantly less likely to feel that they can navigate the unwritten rules concerning how one is to conduct oneself as a faculty member (Strongly/Somewhat disagree – 19.6% of women, 7.4% of men) [H 8.815, df 1, p = .003]
- 4) Women were significantly less likely to agree with the statement that their department/ unit is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/ or family responsibilities when scheduling departmental/ unit obligations (Strongly/Somewhat disagree – women 26.6%, men 13.9%)[H 9.757, df 1, p =.002]
- 5) Women were significantly more likely to agree with the statement that they feel ignored in their departments (Strongly/Somewhat agree – women 29.9%, men 21.7%)[H 6.795, df 1, p =.016]
- 6) Women were significantly more likely to agree with the statement that they feel that they have to work harder than some of their colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. (Strongly/Somewhat agree – 43.7% women, 32.7% men) [H 8.763, df 1, p =.003]
- 7) Women were significantly less likely to agree with the statement that senior colleagues create a collegial and supportive environment. (Strongly/Somewhat disagree – women 25.4%, men 14.9%) [H 6.148, df 1, p =.013]
- 8) Women were significantly less likely to feel comfortable sharing their views in faculty meetings (Strongly/somewhat disagree: women=41.6% and men=24.3 of men)[H 8.510, df 1, p =.004].
- 9) Women were significantly more likely to feel that they were very or somewhat dissatisfied with relationships with faculty [H 4.134, df =1, p =.042) Faculty groups differed significantly (H 25.115, df 1, p =.000) with regular clinical faculty scoring significantly lower in satisfaction than the other groups.
- 10) Women were significantly less likely to feel that faculty in their department generally treat each other in a civil and respectful manner. (Strongly/Somewhat disagree – women 14.5%, men 8.4%) [H 6.733, df 1, p =.009]
- 11) Women were significantly more likely to feel excluded from an informal network in their departments. (Strongly/Somewhat agree – women 47.3%, men 30.7%) [H 5.935, df 1, p =.015]
- 12) Women were significantly less likely to agree that their unit head encouraged and empowered them. (Strongly/Somewhat disagree - Women 23.7%, Men 16.3%) [H 5.642, df 1, p =.018]
- 14) Women were significantly less likely to feel that women are treated fairly here. (University Climate (Strongly/Somewhat disagree – women, 16.3%, men 2.5%)[H 14.274, df 1, p =.000]

Descriptive Analysis of Contracts and Evaluation Concerns

- 1) Survey results indicated that 59.7% were provided a contract for their employment: 4.8% were provided the contract 10 weeks or more before initiation of teaching and 3% were given their contracts 30 weeks or less before teaching.
- 2) 65% received formal evaluations with 48.9% evaluated by their dean or dept chair. 32% participated in peer evaluation. 30% indicated that they did not feel that the evaluation criteria applied to their job positions
- 3) 85% (n=399) auxiliary faculty agreed that auxiliary faculty should be eligible for university teaching awards.
- 4) 73.9% (n=342) supported having a representative on faculty senate.
- 5) 65.1% (n=302) supported having a separate organization for auxiliary faculty.

Recommendations:

After reviewing the final survey results, the following recommendations are set forth:

- 1) Auxiliary faculty should be eligible for teaching awards. (Need for awards separate from regular faculty was not discussed.)
- 2) Human Resources should establish standards so that all auxiliary faculty have their contracts in hand in a timely manner before the start of classes. Improved orientation for new faculty is needed, however, so is a process to identify new faculty.
- 3) Auxiliary faculty should have access to all of their student evaluations.
- 4) Departments and colleges are encouraged to include auxiliary faculty in social and group meetings.
- 5) President's Council for Women should consider a pathway for giving a voice in university government to auxiliary faculty.
- 6) Venues for disseminating information about the roles and other points of interest related to auxiliary faculty should be used widely (i.e. On Campus, etc.).

Please note: The gender differences in terms of University and Departmental climate are both shocking and striking. It is also important to note that there were minimal differences in the perspective of climate between the four auxiliary faculty groups (Lecturers, Regular Clinical, Non-regular Clinical, and Others). Women's significantly lower satisfaction with their treatment, involvement, and respect as well as their diminished sense of empowerment is consistent university-wide. While no specific recommendations were made by the current task force to address these issues, these concerns speak volumes for the need for the President's Council for Women to continue its important work.