

UNLV

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) Faculty Satisfaction Survey

2016 Results

Table of Contents

Introduction	
Preface	3
Guide to report	5
 RESULTS	
Benchmarks at a glance	14
COACHE comparison	16
 Benchmark dashboards	18
Nature of work in research, teaching, service	19
Facilities, personal/family policies, benefits and salary	23
Interdisciplinary work, collaboration, and mentoring	26
Tenure and promotion	29
Leadership and governance	32
Departmental collegiality, engagement, and quality	33
Appreciation and recognition	39
Retention and negotiations	41
Best and worst aspects	43
How to improve the workplace for faculty	47
Detailed results by individual questions	48
 Appendices	
What's a dean to do?	56
Background and definitions	59
Participating institutions	63

Preface

The core strength of an institution of higher education is its faculty. A preponderance of evidence supports the notion that college faculty are affected by their perception of the values and rewards in their workplace, and that supportive environments promote faculty satisfaction, which can lead to a greater commitment to and relationship with their home institution. With this understanding, the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at the Harvard Graduate School of Education developed the Tenure-track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey.

Since 2003, COACHE institutions have used data from this survey to leverage improvements in the workplace for pre-tenure faculty. Meanwhile, COACHE and its research partners have analyzed the data more broadly to understand the themes associated with faculty satisfaction and to contribute to the existing literature on faculty. Perhaps one of the most critical lessons learned in the first few years of COACHE's development is the role that tenured faculty play as catalysts for the success of pre-tenure faculty. Tenured faculty serve as leaders for campus governance and policy decisions, as mentors to pre-tenure faculty, and as the arbiters of campus culture and climate. Simply put, tenured faculty shape nearly every facet of campus life. To understand them better, COACHE expanded its focus in 2010 to include the design and launch of the Tenured Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey.

After a successful pilot study with seven large research universities, the COACHE team merged the two surveys to create a unified instrument (with appropriate branches) attending to the full spectrum of tenure-stream faculty. In 2012-13, COACHE added an optional survey module to assess the work satisfaction of full-time, non-tenure-track faculty.

COACHE surveys faculty about their experiences and views as regards several important areas of their work lives:

- Research, teaching, service
- Resources in support of faculty work
- Benefits, compensation, and work/life
- Interdisciplinary work and collaboration
- Mentoring
- Tenure and promotion practices
- Leadership and governance
- Departmental collegiality, quality, engagement
- Appreciation and recognition

We are pleased to provide this diagnostic and comparative management tool for college and university leaders. Tailored to each participating institution, this COACHE report and supplementary materials pinpoint problem areas, whether within a particular policy, practice, or demographic. This benchmarking report identifies the overall performance of your campus compared to your selected comparison institutions, compares subgroups at your campus to subgroups at other campuses, and

describes differences between groups on your campus. Thorough, yet accessible, this report is designed to assist faculty and administrators to confront concerns and showcase achievements.

Membership in the Collaborative, however, does not conclude with delivery of this report. Academic leaders use COACHE results to focus attention, spot successes and weaknesses, and then to take concrete steps to make policies and practices more effective and more prevalent. Our mission to make the academy a more attractive place to work is advanced only when supported by institutional action. To that end, COACHE is your partner and a resource for maximizing the ability of your data to initiate dialogue, recruit talented scholars, and further the work satisfaction of all faculty at your institution. For our advice on making the most of your participation, please review the supplementary material provided with this report. Then, contact us with any questions or new ideas that have emerged.

Guide to Report

Introduction | The Chief Academic Officer's Report

Introduction

The quality of an academic institution depends heavily on its faculty. As teachers, scholars, participants in shared governance and the purveyors of institutional culture and history, faculty are at the heart of the best work being done in higher education today. Not surprisingly, supporting faculty in all the work they do is a central focus for successful academic leaders.

By enrolling as a member of the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, you have already shown a commitment to improving the faculty workplace. In fact, just the act of asking your faculty to participate in the Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey helps communicate concern for and support of your faculty. Today, with the delivery of your institutional report, you take the next step towards improving the academic workplace on your campus.

This report contains the data necessary for you to understand where your institution thrives and where it struggles in the key components of faculty life. Considering faculty satisfaction within your campus as well as comparatively will provide you with a robust sense of where your campus supports faculty well and where there is work to be done.

Given hundreds of survey items disaggregated by race, gender, tenure status and rank for your institution and all others in COACHE, we have used the best of our abilities to synthesize, organize, and prioritize millions of data points in a thorough yet accessible format.

We encourage you to share this report with other senior administrators, faculty leadership, institutional researchers, and other constituents. In fact, your report portfolio includes communication models and milestones to consider in your dissemination strategy. We also recommend that you participate in one of COACHE's regularly-scheduled "Guided Tour to Your Report" and other webcasts.

Keeping your audiences in mind, we designed your report with components that can be distributed together or individually around campus. Your COACHE portfolio contains:

- the CAO's Report, summarizing your results overall and according to key subgroups at your institution relative to the five selected comparison institutions and to the faculty labor market writ large;
- supplementary materials to assist you in engaging your campus community in making the most of your investment in this research.

This guide introduces you to each of these portfolio pieces and provides you with recommendations for maximizing the utility of your report. Just as your work with the data has just begun, so has your work with COACHE. Your three-year membership

means that we will continue to support your exploration of the data. We sincerely hope that you will take advantage of COACHE-sponsored opportunities to learn from the most promising practices of your colleagues and to share your plans for using COACHE data to improve faculty workplace satisfaction.

The Chief Academic Officer's Report

Your Chief Academic Officer's Report is designed to provide the reader with an "at-a-glance" understanding of the views of your faculty with respect to faculty at your comparison institutions and across the sector. It will also help you to see where subgroups of faculty on your campus differ with respect to each other. Understanding the balancing act that senior administrators perform on a daily basis, COACHE designed this report with the goal of providing your campus with top-level analysis and some indicators of where to dig deeper. In other words, it is the best place to start; just keep in mind that much more is available.

Response rates and selected comparison institutions

In this section, you will find the response rates for your campus, your selected comparison institutions, and the faculty labor market. Disaggregation by tenure status, rank, gender, and race will help you to consider non-response generally and within subgroups of your faculty.

Your results at a glance

This single chart summarizes the benchmark results for your institution relative to your selected comparison institutions and the entire cohort of participating institutions. Each column represents the range of institutional means (not the distribution of individual respondents) along that dimension. Within each chart, you can see your institution's mean score on the benchmark (X), the mean scores of your five selected comparison institutions (°), and the distribution of the responses of the entire cohort as signified by the red, grey, and green boxes.

You should be most concerned with the placement of your marker (X). A score in the red section of the column indicates that your institution ranked in the bottom 30 percent of all institutions. A mark in the green section indicates your faculty rated a benchmark in the top 30 percent of all institutions. A mark in the grey area indicates a middle-of-the-road result.

This combination of your cohort comparison and rank relative to your selected comparison institutions establishes the threshold COACHE uses to identify areas of strength and areas of concern. An area of strength is identified as any benchmark or survey item where your score is in the top two among your selected comparison institutions and in the top 30 percent across all institutions. An area of concern is any benchmark or item where your campus falls in the bottom two among the selected comparison institutions and in the bottom 30 percent compared to the entire survey cohort. This two-step criterion allows you to differentiate between results that are typical of your institutional type and those that are out of isaggregation by tenure status, rank, gender, and race will help you to consider non-response generally and within subgroups of your faculty.

The COACHE Dashboard

This data display offers a view of your faculty from 10,000 feet. Each benchmark represents the mean score of several items that share a common theme. Thus, the benchmark scores provide a general sense of how faculty feel about a particular aspect of their work/life. The benchmarks include:

- Nature of work in research, teaching, service
- Resources in support of faculty work
- Benefits, compensation, and work/life
- Interdisciplinary work and collaboration
- Mentoring
- Tenure and promotion practices
- Leadership and governance
- Departmental collegiality, quality, engagement
- Appreciation and recognition

For each result, your report will use two adjacent triangles (◄►) to compare your faculty's rating to those of your selected comparison institutions (the left ◄) and the cohort (the right ►). Red triangles (◄◄) indicate an area of concern relative to the comparison group; green triangles (◄►) are areas of strength; grey triangles (◄►) suggest unexceptional performance; and empty triangles (◄►) signify insufficient data for reporting comparisons.

With this iconography, your dashboard page shows your results relative to your selected comparison institutions and the cohort overall, by tenure status, rank, gender, and race/ethnicity. For example, a finding for females might read ◄► meaning that, compared to women elsewhere, your female faculty's ratings placed your campus in the top two among your selected comparison institutions and in the bottom 30 percent among all COACHE institutions. Thus, although you are generally doing well against your selected comparators, you and your comparators have room for improvement in women's attitudes along this dimension.

On the right side of the page are your intra-institutional comparisons, which highlight the meaningful differences between subgroups on your own campus. Here, effect sizes are indicated as small (text appears in cell), moderate (text appears in cell with yellow highlight), and large (text appears in the cell with orange highlight). Trivial differences remain blank. The name of the group with the lower rating appears in the cell to indicate the direction of the difference. Ideally, this section of your report would be blank, suggesting parity across subgroups. (We did not design a typical red/yellow/green signal here because a large difference is not necessarily a poor outcome, but depends, instead, on the context of the result.)

Even if your campus performs well compared to other institutions, large differences between subgroups can suggest a problem. For example, it is quite possible for a campus to perform very well overall on a particular benchmark (or individual item) while still having great disparity based on rank, race, or gender. This is especially true when the number of faculty in a particular

subgroup is small. The underrepresented group may be less satisfied, but because their numbers are so small, their concerns may get lost in the overall result.

Benchmark dashboards

After reviewing the COACHE Dashboard, you will have a sense of where, generally, your faculty are most satisfied, moderately satisfied, and least satisfied. To understand these benchmarks fully, you must explore the individual items within them. The next pages of your report apply the same organization of data in the COACHE Dashboard to each survey dimension. Using the framework described above, these tables display results for the individual items nested in each benchmark.

For those institutions with prior COACHE data, the tables include comparisons of your new data to your most recent past results. A plus sign (+) indicates improvement since your last survey administration. A minus sign (-) indicates a decline in your score. Change over time is only reported for survey items that have not changed since your prior survey administration. Given the update that occurred to the instrument in 2011-12, many questions do not track perfectly to prior versions of the survey. If the question changed even slightly since the last time it was administered, the data are not reported here. However, please feel free to contact COACHE for help comparing more items in this year's report to prior years' reports.

Other displays of data

Some questions in the COACHE Survey do not fit into a benchmark. This happens when an item does not use a five-point Likert scale or when the nature of the question does not lend itself to analysis by a central tendency (i.e., a mean). In most of these exceptions, a separate display highlights those results.

The Retention and Negotiation items are such an example: the COACHE Survey asks faculty about their intent to remain at the institution and details about what, if anything, they would renegotiate in their employment contracts. The Chief Academic Officer's Report includes views dedicated to these items.

The Best and Worst Aspects pages are another example of important survey items that do not fit a benchmark factor scale. The survey asks faculty to identify, from a list of common characteristics of the academic workplace, the two best and two worst aspects of working at your institution. The most frequently mentioned "best" and "worst" aspects are highlighted.

Your Chief Academic Officer's Report also includes COACHE's Thematic Analysis of Open-ended Questions. The final open-ended question in the survey asks respondents to identify the one thing they feel their institutions could do to improve the workplace for faculty. COACHE reviews all comments, redacts any identifying information, and codes them thematically. This table summarizes those themes by rank and provides comparative data. Note that responses often touch upon multiple themes, so the total number of comments reported in this thematic summary is likely to exceed the actual number of faculty who responded to this question. The complete responses are available in the Excel version of your COACHE Digital Report Portfolio.

Finally, the Demographic Characteristics section includes self-reported background information about respondents' careers, family status, and other personal qualities. Though most of this information is not used explicitly in our analysis of your results, your online reporting tool (see below) and COACHE staff are available for deeper analysis that deploys these and other survey or institutional variables.

Appendix

The Chief Academic Officer's Report concludes with suggestions in your appendix for taking the next steps in your COACHE campus strategy. The appendix also includes information about COACHE's methods and definitions, including a list of the colleges and universities that comprise the "All Comparable Institutions" cohort used in your report. That list also includes, separately, the names of institutions that have participated in past rounds of COACHE surveys, for which comparison data (de-identified) are available for subsequent, follow-up analysis.

Supplementary materials

Your digital repository also includes supporting material to help you contextualize your results and to consider policies and practices in response.

- The COACHE Survey Instrument 2015-16
- A review of potential Communication Models and Milestones may help you design a dissemination and engagement strategy around COACHE at your institution.

A folder of Suggested Readings includes an array of COACHE's prior reports, research, and other materials to support your efforts to make the most of your investment in this project.

Your Results Are in Your Hands... Now What?

By Kiernan Mathews, Director

YOUR FIRST STEPS

This COACHE Chief Academic Officer's Report is the culmination of our work since 2003 with faculty focus groups, two pilot studies, and ongoing dialog with institutional researchers and chief academic officers at our member institutions.

With so many perspectives on report design, we aim to provide the information you and your campus stakeholders need to translate these COACHE results into substantive, constructive actions.

At first glance, the report can be daunting. How does one begin to turn so much data into ideas to improve your institution? To paraphrase Carl Sandburg, this report is like an onion: you peel it off one layer at a time, and sometimes you weep.

The Chief Academic Officer's Report, like the skin of the onion, gives you a glimpse of what lies within, but is the beginning, not the end. It is colored - literally, red and green - by your comparisons to other institutions and to differences between subgroups within your institution. The Results at a Glance and COACHE Dashboard will show you, within 10 minutes or so, the broad themes of your survey results and the areas deserving of immediate scrutiny.

Take note of our criteria for determining "areas of strength" and "areas of concern." COACHE analysts have identified comparative "strengths" as those survey dimensions where your campus ranks first or second among your six peers. A comparative "concern," on the other hand, means your campus ranked fifth or sixth among your peers. Differences by gender, race, rank, and tenure status are highlighted when mean results differ by a moderate or large effect.

The digital files accompanying this report contain faculty responses to open-ended questions, including their opinions on the one thing your college can do to improve the workplace for faculty. Our members find this qualitative, personal component of the report helpful in illustrating the faculty story in ways that quantitative data cannot.

Soon, you will discover that many faculty concerns can be dealt with immediately and inexpensively, while others present themselves as opportunities for broad involvement in designing collaborative solutions.

Build a communication plan.

If you have not yet developed a "COACHE communication plan," do so now. Use the COACHE Communication Models and Milestones charts in your supplementary materials to help you consider where your campus (or your leadership style) fits now

on the range of transparency and shared governance, and perhaps where it should be in the future. Of course, this framework is not designed to suggest that one approach is always better than another, but instead, to assist in your determination of which approach is best given your institution's culture - and given also what your faculty want from you, their leaders, as expressed through the COACHE survey.

To inform your communication strategy, review the campus calendar for the most effective venues to discuss COACHE participation, such as faculty senate meetings, collective bargaining group meetings, opening convocations and/or retreats (for deans, chairs, and/or faculty), and new faculty orientations. Consider print and electronic media outlets (e.g., campus newspapers, HR and provostial newsletters, faculty job postings) for communicating your COACHE enrollment and results. When you have decided on a course of action, prepare and distribute a letter for communicating your plan.

Disseminate broadly.

Whatever model you feel fits best, do not delay sharing your institutional report, in part or in full, with key constituents on your campus. Consider forming a task force or ad hoc committee. If you choose to do so, you should designate its members as the conduit for all information about COACHE and mention this group in all communication with faculty. Put your data into play with pre-tenure and tenured faculty, the faculty senate, collective bargaining groups, campus committees (e.g., Promotion & Tenure, Status of Women, Diversity), deans, department chairs, the executive council and/or senior administrators, including the Chief Diversity Officer, and the board of trustees (see more on this below).

It is particularly important to disseminate your results to the faculty who each spent about 20 minutes completing the survey. Failure to demonstrate action in response to their contribution of time may result in reduced response rates in future surveys. Many COACHE members have posted some or all of their results on their web sites to highlight institutional strengths and demonstrate their commitment to transparency in improving the areas of concern.

Many colleges and universities hold workshops and forums with constituents, together or separately, to discuss interpretations of and policy responses to their COACHE findings. When meeting with these groups, ask questions to organize and catalyze the conversations around COACHE. For example: What confirmed (or defied) conventional wisdom? What are the surprises? Disparities? Lessons? Implications?

Take ownership.

You must take ownership of the results, or insist that people in a position to make change are held accountable for doing so. Our colleagues, Cathy Trower and Jim Honan, cited a provost in *The Questions of Tenure* (ed. R. Chait, 2002) who said: "Data don't just get up and walk around by themselves... they only become potent when somebody in charge wants something to happen." Without the catalyst of responsibility, good intentions may not produce desired results.

Consider forming, for example, a mid-career faculty task force that would identify the COACHE findings particularly germane to local concerns of associate professors, then would present a range of policy recommendations emerging from their analysis. As an alternative, ask administrators in academic affairs, faculty development, diversity, and human resources to read the report and identify the top three things they would recommend as a result. The responses might be broad (e.g., “Demystify the promotion process”) or specific (e.g., “Increase availability of eldercare options”). Naturally, expectations ought to be set so that recommendations are realistic and align with your strategic plan and priorities.

Through COACHE, we have seen this accountability exemplified by a provost who memorably signaled a “buck stops here” attitude (not to mention a sense of humor) to improving faculty work/life by donning a shirt imprinted with “C-A-O” in big, bold letters. He understood that the actions suggested by his COACHE report - whether highlighting strengths or addressing concerns - align with the will of policymakers and faculty, and that it must be someone’s responsibility to see the recommendations through to outcomes. Just giving constituents - and in particular, the faculty - some part in the COACHE conversation gives them a stake in advancing better recruiting, retention, and development.

Engage with peer institutions.

We named this project the Collaborative because only by gathering together the agents for change in faculty work/life will we understand what works well, where, and why. Several times each year, COACHE sends invitations to key contacts at each member institution to participate in conference-based special events and workshops. There, participants share innovative strategies for using COACHE data and tackling the challenges we all have in common.

Out of these discussions have emerged more comprehensive data-sharing agreements among peers, site visits to exemplary institutions, and lasting contacts for free advice and consultation. (“We’re thinking about implementing this new program. Has anyone else ever tried it?”)

In addition to bringing COACHE members together for these special events, we continually seek out other ways to support our collaborative spirit: hosting our annual Leaders’ Workshop; highlighting member institutions in our newsletter; trying out new policy and program ideas on the COACHE ListServ (sign up at www.coache.org); and offering to conduct site visits to member campuses. Thanks to these collaborations, we all gain actionable insight into making colleges campuses great places to work.

Call us.

Think of COACHE as your hotline for suggestions in faculty recruitment, development and success. For the duration of your three-year COACHE membership, please call us (617-495-5285) if you have any questions about how you can make the most of your investment in this project. Also, recommend to anyone working with or presenting COACHE data (such as institutional research staff) to call us for advice and tools to simplify the work.

If your COACHE report is collecting dust on the shelf, then we have failed. Let us help you cultivate your data - and your faculty - as a renewable resource.

*Although COACHE does not survey new hires, these faculty are likely to communicate with their colleagues. Additionally, even though they did not participate in the survey, they will benefit from your responses to the findings.

Acknowledgements

Many people and organizations are responsible for making the COACHE project possible. We would especially like to thank the following:

The Ford Foundation
The Atlantic Philanthropies
Harvard Graduate School of Education
All of our member institutions

Reproduction: No part of this report or its appendices may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), such as that given in a participation agreement signed by representatives of participating institutions and COACHE. Any reproduction of the report material must include a credit line.

Contact information:

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE)
Harvard Graduate School of Education
8 Story Street, 5th Floor
Cambridge, MA 02138

Email: coache@gse.harvard.edu

URL: <http://www.coache.org>


Voice: 617-495-5285

Fax: 617-496-9350

Copyright © 2015 by The President and Fellows of Harvard College. All Rights Reserved.

Benchmarks at a Glance


Reading Your Results



The display on the next page summarizes over a half million data points in benchmark results for your institution relative to peers and the full cohort of COACHE's participating institutions. Each column has a chart like the model at left, which represents the range of institutional means (not the distribution of individual respondents) along that dimension. Within each chart, you can see your institution's mean score on the benchmark (X), the mean scores of your five peers (O), and the distribution of the responses of the entire cohort of institutions as signified by the red, grey, and green boxes.

You should be most concerned with the placement of your marker (X). A score in the red section of the column indicates that your institution ranked in the bottom 30 percent of all institutions. A mark in the green section indicates your faculty rated a benchmark in the top 30 percent of all institutions. A mark in the grey area indicates a "middle-of-the-road" result.

Your Results



COACHE Comparisons

A unique feature of COACHE is the ability to compare our results with those of peer institutions that also completed the survey. These institutions were chosen based on several factors including similarities in student enrollment, faculty size, faculty to student ratio, degrees granted, and length of membership with COACHE. Additionally, institutions were chosen as peers if they included non-tenure-track faculty in their survey as UNLV chose to do. The pool from which to choose our peer institutions was extremely limited and the schools chosen may not be appropriate peers for other comparisons (e.g, Top Tier). These peer institutions are not identified in our results which prevent individual peer comparison.

The peer institutions for the purposes of this particular project include:

- Oklahoma State University
- Old Dominion University
- University of Central Florida
- University of Missouri-Columbia
- University of Houston-Clear Lake*

*It is recognized that the University of Houston-Clear Lake is not similar to UNLV. The inclusion of this institution was in error as the University of Houston was the intended peer. The University of Houston did not participate in COACHE within the last three years and was, therefore ineligible for comparison. The University of Houston-Clear Lake was mistakenly entered in their place. If COACHE is used in the future, it is recommended that new peers be established.

Benchmarks Dashboard

Reading Your Results

COACHE Dashboard Guide

This is the overall score (between 1 and 5) for all faculty respondents at your institution.

These columns describe how your faculty's responses compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions: tenured vs. tenured, men vs. men, faculty of color vs. faculty of color, etc.

These columns compare groups on your campus: pre-tenure/tenured, associate/full, women/men, white/faculty of color.

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	tenure	rank	gender	race	2008
Health and retirement benefits	3.43										pre-ten	full	women		
Interdisciplinary work	3.00										pre-ten	assoc	women	white	
Collaboration	3.46										tenured		women	white	
Mentoring	3.18										tenured	assoc		foc	
Tenure policies	3.64		N/A		N/A	N/A				N<5	N/A	N/A			+
Tenure clarity	3.33		N/A		N/A	N/A				N<5	N/A	N/A	men		



What do these triangles mean?

These symbols represent results that fit COACHE's criteria (adjustable in Excel) for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

Your ranking among peers:

- 1st or 2nd
- 3rd or 4th
- 5th or 6th

Your percentile among all members:

- Top 30%
- Middle 40%
- Bottom 30%

insufficient data for reporting



This result, for example, shows that your female faculty are **less satisfied** than are women at your peers (red triangle), but **more satisfied** than are women at 70% of other institutions (green triangle). Although the women at your institution are "less satisfied" than women at peers, they still fare better than most.



And these results?

Here, the faculty subgroup with the *lower* rating appears. Shading conveys the *magnitude* of subgroup differences: **small** effects appear as text only, **moderate** effects are shaded yellow, and **large** effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as +/-.

Regardless of your results compared to peers and others (on the left), you should direct your concern to subgroups who consistently appear here in yellow or orange shaded cells.

Your Results

Your results compared to PEERS ◀
Your results compared to COHORT ▶

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) **med. (.3)** **lrg. (.5)**

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	change over time
Nature of Work: Research	3.19	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Nature of Work: Service	3.24	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Nature of Work: Teaching	3.69	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Facilities and Work Resources	3.46	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian		N/A
Personal and Family Policies	3.03	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Health and Retirement Benefits	2.83	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured		men	foc	asian		N/A
Interdisciplinary Work	2.38	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Collaboration	3.40	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Mentoring	2.86	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian		N/A
Tenure Policies	3.17	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Tenure Expectations: Clarity	3.24	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Promotion to Full	3.33	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Leadership: Senior	3.09	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Leadership: Divisional	2.95	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Leadership: Departmental	3.52	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Leadership: Faculty	2.95	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	full		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Governance: Trust	2.82	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Governance: Shared sense of purpose	2.85	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Governance: Understanding the issue at hand	2.76	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Governance: Adaptability	2.64	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Governance: Productivity	2.87	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Departmental Collegiality	3.61	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Departmental Engagement	3.37	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶			assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Departmental Quality	3.40	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Appreciation and Recognition	3.13	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A

Your Results

Your results compared to PEERS ◀
Your results compared to COHORT ▶

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) med. (.3) lrg. (.5)

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	change over time
Nature of Work: Research	3.19														tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Time spent on research	3.46															assoc				urm	N/A
Expectations for finding external funding	3.22														ntt			foc	asian		N/A
Influence over focus of research	4.24														ntt	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Quality of grad students to support research	2.94													pre-ten	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Support for research	2.89													tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Support for engaging undergrads in research	2.88													tenured			women	foc	asian		N/A
Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	2.87														tenured		women		asian		N/A
Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	2.76													tenured	tenured		women				N/A
Support for securing grad student assistance	2.78														tenured		women		asian		N/A
Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.48													tenured				foc	asian		N/A
Availability of course release for research	2.89														ntt	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Nature of Work: Service	3.24														tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Time spent on service	3.40														tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.78														tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Number of committees	3.41														tenured	assoc	women	foc		urm	N/A
Attractiveness of committees	3.40													pre-ten	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Discretion to choose committees	3.38													pre-ten		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Equitability of committee assignments	2.87														tenured	assoc	women				N/A
Number of student advisees	3.69													pre-ten	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Support for being a good advisor	2.72														tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	2.79													tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Nature of Work: Teaching	3.69														tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Time spent on teaching	3.97														tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Number of courses taught	3.82													tenured		assoc			asian		N/A
Level of courses taught	4.08													tenured		assoc		foc	asian		N/A
Discretion over course content	4.44													pre-ten	ntt			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Number of students in classes taught	3.69															assoc					N/A
Quality of students taught	3.22														tenured		men	foc	asian		N/A
Equitability of distribution of teaching load	2.97													tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian		N/A
Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.09													pre-ten	tenured		women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Teaching schedule	4.04													pre-ten	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Support for teaching diverse learning styles	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Support for assessing student learning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Support for developing online/hybrid courses	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Support for teaching online/hybrid courses	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Related Survey Items	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Time spent on outreach	3.58														tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Time spent on administrative tasks	2.95														tenured	assoc			white		N/A
Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.39														tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A

Nature of Work: Research, Service, Teaching

About This Theme

Nature of Work: Research

Guiding Principles

Faculty satisfaction with research is a function not just of the time faculty members have to commit to research, but importantly, of the clarity and consistency of institutional expectations for research productivity and the resources colleges and universities provide faculty to meet them. When faculty are criticized for falling short of others' expectations for research, consider the demands, obstacles, mixed signals, and lack of meaningful support that may be undermining their ability to do their best work.

The COACHE instrument invites faculty to assess the environmental qualities conducive to research productivity. The questions are designed to be agnostic on institutional type (e.g., research university, liberal arts college) and research area (in the disciplines, creative work, the scholarship of teaching and learning). It is in the analysis where participating colleges and universities can determine whether faculty feel they are being supported in fulfilling the expectations of them.

Hallmarks of Successful Models

If your institution is serious about supporting faculty research and creativity, then be prepared to commit to the essential elements of success:

Leadership on research support comes from the top. C-level leadership in stressing the importance of excellence in research is critical substantively and symbolically. This means that resources directed at supporting faculty work--across the creative lifecycle--are crucial, as is the messaging that goes along with the financial support.

Formal offices and programs energetically support faculty research. Visibly dedicating resources to support faculty work clearly demonstrates how important faculty members are to institutional success. Our studies identified the following areas of focus for full-time college staff:

Grant support. Many universities offer pre-award support to faculty preparing proposals for outside funding. What is less common, but equally important, is post-award support.

Internal grants. Faculty are grateful for internal funding, even in small amounts. Well-designed programs can foster common refrain emerged: faculty are eager to participate not

interdivisional collaboration, extramural mentoring, and other innovations.

Research institutes. Such institutes may be a source of internal grant support, but even more, they are places where faculty find collaborators and inspiration.

Colloquia, workshops, and seminars. All faculty, and especially pre-tenure faculty, appreciate opportunities to present their research at colloquia on campus, receive feedback, and fine-tune their work prior to presenting at a national conference. Workshops and seminars for writing grants, running a lab, getting published, mentoring undergraduates and graduates, getting tenure and "getting to full" are all programs that support fulfilling collaboration and engagement.

Nature of Work: Teaching

Guiding Principles

Among the core areas of faculty work explored by the COACHE survey, teaching--and the supports institutions provide faculty to teach well--is bound by significant constraints, but also by great opportunities. The challenge for every faculty member is to strike a balance between institutional expectations for teaching and the time and ability available to invest in it.

Dissatisfaction can occur when expectations for teaching are unreasonable or contrary to what faculty were promised at the point of hire, when institutional support is lacking, or when the distribution of work is inequitable. Time is the common denominator: if expectations for teaching outstrips the time available to meet them, morale and productivity can suffer.

When considering COACHE results on this benchmark, keep in mind that our instrument measures not teaching load, but faculty satisfaction with teaching load. While reducing teaching load is often "off the table" as a short-term fix, increasing faculty satisfaction with teaching load can be accomplished through workshops and seminars about improving teaching, mentoring students, using instructional technologies, and experimenting with new pedagogical techniques. These opportunities may be housed in centers of teaching and learning (or of "faculty success" or "faculty excellence"), where other resources and advice are mission; comprehensive colleges with strong ties with the

dispensed by seasoned experts. The implementation of and communication about these supports can increase faculty satisfaction with the nature of teaching.

Hallmarks of Successful Models

Most COACHE institutions with exemplary results on this benchmark had a number of qualities in common. They make expectations for teaching clear from the point of hire. They recruit faculty with a demonstrated devotion to teaching. They ensure that faculty members have a say in which courses they teach and in their content. They offer grants for pedagogical development and innovation, usually through a center for teaching. They also recognize excellence in the classroom through prestigious and substantive awards (e.g., for exemplary teaching informed by creative scholarship, or for outstanding teaching in the humanities) given in public (e.g., at mid-court during a basketball game).

Nature of Work: Service

Guiding Principles

Among the top three responsibilities of the tenure--stream faculty--but almost always the third--service is infused in the ethos of shared governance and the DNA of faculty life. In COACHE focus groups, faculty included in their definition of their most "vital" colleagues an engagement in service to the discipline and university. Yet, tenured faculty expressed their dissatisfaction with their service work: too many committees doing unfulfilling work, too many reports sitting unread on administrators' shelves, and too many good soldiers picking up the slack of faculty colleagues who, whether by influence or incompetence, seem always to evade service commitments. Meanwhile, college and universities are often encouraged as a best practice to "protect" pre-tenure faculty from too many time commitments outside of the teaching and research that will make their tenure case. The aggregate result is a gulf between institutional expectations for service and the recognition it receives in evaluations of faculty.

The COACHE survey instrument invites faculty to explore these tensions with questions about the quantity, quality, and equitable distribution of their service work broadly defined, as well as their institutions' efforts to help faculty be service leaders and sustain their other commitments as faculty. In follow-up interviews with faculty and institutional leaders, a orientations, and reviews. It is also common practice to

common refrain emerged: faculty are eager to participate not in more service, but in more meaningful service, and we must do better to engage and to reward those contributions.

Hallmarks of Successful Models

Colleges and universities with faculty satisfied with service consistently cited institutional mission and culture in explaining their results. Among these exemplars were land-grant universities committed to fostering a service-oriented culture; religiously-affiliated colleges with an explicit service

mission; comprehensive colleges with strong ties with the local community; and former normal schools whose minority-serving mission is inextricable from its faculty's ethic of care. So, institutions struggling with service might do well to explore, engage, and elaborate their mission and historical circumstances--above and beyond the usual website boilerplate--as the foundation of an ethos of service.

College leaders cited other commitments as the basis for ensuring faculty satisfaction with service. Most communicate expectations regarding service through a number of avenues including handbooks, guidelines for mentoring, workshops,

orientations, and reviews. It is also common practice to provide course release time for taking on leadership roles and to keep the service commitments of tenure-track faculty few (but not zero), particularly at the college and university level, and to make certain what commitments are required are meaningful.

*For practical-minded inspiration from COACHE members with high ratings in the Nature of Work, read our **Benchmark Best Practices** white papers.*

Reading Your Results

COACHE Dashboard Guide

This is the overall score (between 1 and 5) for all faculty respondents at your institution.

These columns describe how your faculty's responses compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions: tenured vs. tenured, men vs. men, faculty of color vs. faculty of color, etc.

These columns compare groups on your campus: pre-tenure/tenured, associate/full, women/men, white/faculty of color.

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	tenure	rank	gender	race	2008
Health and retirement benefits	3.43														
Interdisciplinary work	3.00														
Collaboration	3.46														
Mentoring	3.18														
Tenure policies	3.64		N/A		N/A	N/A				N<5	N/A	N/A			
Tenure clarity	3.33		N/A		N/A	N/A				N<5	N/A	N/A	men		+



What do these triangles mean?

These symbols represent results that fit COACHE's criteria (adjustable in Excel) for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

Your ranking among peers:

1st or 2nd

3rd or 4th

5th or 6th

insufficient data for reporting

Your percentile among all members:

Top 30%

Middle 40%

Bottom 30%

assoc

And these results?

Here, the faculty subgroup with the lower rating appears. Shading conveys the magnitude of subgroup differences: small effects appear as text only, moderate effects are shaded yellow, and large effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as +/-.



This result, for example, shows that your female faculty are **less satisfied** than are women at your peers (red triangle), but **more satisfied** than are women at 70% of other institutions (green triangle). Although the women at your institution are "less satisfied" than women at peers, they still fare better than most.

Regardless of your results compared to peers and others (on the left), you should direct your concern to subgroups who consistently appear here in yellow or orange shaded cells.

Your Results

Your results compared to PEERS ◀
Your results compared to COHORT ▶

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) **med. (.3)** **lrg. (.5)**

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	change over time
Facilities and Work Resources	3.46	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian		N/A
Support for improving teaching	3.06	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Office	3.82	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured		men	foc	asian		N/A
Laboratory, research, studio space	3.14	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Equipment	3.37	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured		men	foc	asian		N/A
Classrooms	3.40	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶			assoc	women	white		white	N/A
Library resources	3.99	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Computing and technical support	3.51	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian		N/A
Clerical/administrative support	3.26	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Personal and Family Policies	3.03	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Right balance between professional/personal	3.28	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Inst. supports family/career compatibility	2.90	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Housing benefits	2.08	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women				N/A
Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	3.37	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured		men		asian	white	N/A
Spousal/partner hiring program	2.57	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Childcare	2.58	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Eldercare	2.46	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc	women	white		white	N/A
Family medical/parental leave	3.01	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	tenured		women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Flexible workload/modified duties	3.25	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian		N/A
Stop-the-clock policies	2.75	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N<5	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	men	foc	white	urm	N/A
Commuter benefits	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Parking benefits	2.74	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶			assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Health and Retirement Benefits	2.83	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured		men	foc	asian		N/A
Health benefits for yourself	2.48	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured		men		asian		N/A
Health benefits for family	2.35	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured		men	foc	asian		N/A
Retirement benefits	3.49	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Phased retirement options	2.96	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Related Survey Items	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Salary	2.80	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	ntt	assoc		foc	asian		N/A

Resources and Support

About This Theme

Guiding Principles

Facilities and support. COACHE found a number of facets of the physical workplace for faculty to be especially important to faculty satisfaction, including office, lab, research or studio space, equipment, and classrooms. In addition, many faculty need support for technology, administrative work, and improvements to teaching.

Personal and family policies. The COACHE survey measures faculty beliefs about the effectiveness of various policies--many of them related to work-family balance and support for families. This is especially important because more than two-thirds of COACHE respondents are married; three-fifths, half, and one-third of assistant, associate, and full professors, respectively, have children under the age of 18. In addition, more than one in 10 professors are providing care for an elderly, disabled, or ill family member.

Health and retirement benefits. Health benefits, once a given, have been steadily eroding as the costs of insurance skyrocket, and many faculty put their retirements on hold in the wake of the recent economic recession. To encourage timely retirements, phased programs have become more prevalent. Some allow individuals to enjoy institutional affiliation, intellectual engagement, and contact with students

and colleagues, while the institutions realize salary savings and more reliable staffing projections.

Hallmarks of Successful Models

Analysis of our survey identified partner institutions whose faculty rated these themes exceptionally well. Here's what we learned from them:

When it comes to facilities, *new is nice but equity is best.* Faculty understand that not everyone can have a brand new office or lab because campuses must invest in different areas over time, but everyone should enjoy equity in the distribution of resources and space within a department.

Hire personnel to staff work-life services. This is important not only to get the job done but also for symbolic reasons. Putting physical resources behind your words signifies meaning beyond the rhetoric. It is unlikely that universities will need fewer personnel in the future to attend to these matters.

Have written policies. Platitudes that "This is a family-friendly place" or "There's plenty of work-life balance here" are no longer enough. In addition to assuring pre-tenure faculty that the institution is doing more than just paying lip-service to work-life balance, written policies provide clarity, consistency, and transparency which leads to greater fairness and equity.

Written policies concerning dual-career hiring; early promotion and tenure; parental leave; modified duties; part-time tenure options; and stop-the-tenure-clock provision are also indicators of how family-friendly a campus actually is.

Ensure that written policies are communicated to everyone-- pre-tenure and tenured faculty members, chairs, heads, and deans. COACHE research indicates that written policies are particularly important to women and under-represented minorities. Make certain the policies are easily accessible online, and provide personnel to assist faculty in choosing the right healthcare option.

Provide additional accommodations: Childcare, eldercare, lactation rooms, flexibility, and opportunities for social occasions in which kids can be included are all relevant practices that help ensure a viable workplace for the future. Communicating their availability is critical.

Offer phased retirement for faculty to ease into retirement gradually. At the same time, institutions have the flexibility to fill the void left by retiring faculty more easily. Retiring faculty can continue their contributions to the institution by developing the teachers, scholars, and leaders who follow them.

Reading Your Results

COACHE Dashboard Guide

This is the overall score (between 1 and 5) for all faculty respondents at your institution.

These columns describe how your faculty's responses compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions: tenured vs. tenured, men vs. men, faculty of color vs. faculty of color, etc.

These columns compare groups on your campus: pre-tenure/tenured, associate/full, women/men, white/faculty of color.

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	tenure	rank	gender	race	2008
Health and retirement benefits	3.43	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	full	women		
Interdisciplinary work	3.00	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	assoc	women	white	
Collaboration	3.46	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured		women	white	
Mentoring	3.18	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	assoc		foc	
Tenure policies	3.84	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A			+
Tenure clarity	3.33	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A	men		



What do these triangles mean?

These symbols represent results that fit COACHE's criteria (adjustable in Excel) for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

Your ranking among peers:

1st or 2nd ▶

3rd or 4th ▶

5th or 6th ▶

insufficient data for reporting ◀

Your percentile among all members:

Top 30% ▶

Middle 40% ▶

Bottom 30% ▶



This result, for example, shows that your female faculty are **less satisfied** than are women at your peers (◀), but **more satisfied** than are women at 70% of other institutions (▶). Although the women at your institution are "less satisfied" than women at peers, they still fare better than most.



And these results?

Here, the faculty subgroup with the **lower** rating appears. Shading conveys the **magnitude** of subgroup differences: **small** effects appear as text only, **moderate** effects are shaded yellow, and **large** effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as +/-.

Regardless of your results compared to peers and others (on the left), you should direct your concern to subgroups who consistently appear here in yellow or orange shaded cells.

Your Results

Your results compared to PEERS ◀
Your results compared to COHORT ▶

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) med. (.3) lrg. (.5)

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	change over time
Interdisciplinary Work	2.38	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.27	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	2.40	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured					urm	N/A
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.12	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion	2.39	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure	2.13	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.47	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Collaboration	3.40	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Opportunities for collab. within dept	3.44	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	tenured		women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Opportunities for collab. outside inst	3.55	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Opportunities for collab. outside dept	3.18	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Mentoring	2.86	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian		N/A
Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	3.47	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured			white	white		N/A
Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept.	3.45	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	tenured	full			white		N/A
Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept	2.87	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Mentoring of tenured associate profs in dept	2.33	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Support for faculty to be good mentors	2.19	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Related Survey Items	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in reappointment	2.57	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N<5	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N<5	N<5	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	N<5	N<5	N<5	N/A
Being a mentor is fulfilling	4.04	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	tenured		women	white	white	white	N/A
Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst.	3.98	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶			assoc	men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Mentoring of NTT faculty in dept	2.49	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A		white	N<5	white	N/A

Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring

About This Theme

Interdisciplinary Work and Collaboration

Guiding Principles

Interdisciplinary Work. First, universities (and also many liberal arts colleges) have seen widespread growth in research collaboration within and between institutions and with off-campus partners. Although not exclusively the province of the sciences, interdisciplinary research has become the predominant model there. Second, public and private funding for interdisciplinary research has increased. Third, there is a great deal of interest and intrinsic motivation for researchers to cross-fertilize; this type of work attracts many graduate students and early-career faculty. However, because the academy has not yet fully embraced interdisciplinary work, unchanged policies, structures and cultures are institutional disincentives, as they are still best-suited to narrower work within disciplines. This includes publication vehicles, multiple authors, peer review, and reward structures (for promotion and tenure; merit pay; incentives), to name a few.

Collaboration. Despite a popular perception of faculty as soloists, most faculty work requires collaboration whether with students, peers, administrators, or other colleagues inside and outside of the institution, in the classroom or the lab, and with the broader community through service or outreach programs. Although many faculty members value the work they do independently, they also enjoy collaborative projects within and across their disciplines. In addition, many early career faculty members report an expectation for collaboration, having come to enjoy and expect such intellectual commerce during graduate school.

Hallmarks of Successful Models

Leading institutions on these benchmarks openly consider among faculty and administrative leaders the salience and importance of interdisciplinarity to their campuses, including the variety of forms such work can take. These may include:

- cross-fertilization, when individuals make cognitive connections among disciplines;
- team-collaboration, when several individuals spanning different fields work together;
- field creation, when existing research domains are bridged to form new disciplines or sub-disciplines at their intersection; and
- problem orientation, when researchers from multiple disciplines work together to solve a 'real world' problem.

If interdisciplinary work is important on your campus, discuss and potentially remove the barriers to its practice. The common obstacles to interdisciplinary work extend beyond the disciplinary criteria for promotion and tenure to include also discipline-based budgets and environmental limitations such as space and facilities.

Likewise, discuss the importance of teaching and research collaborations on your campus and the factors that enhance or inhibit it; then determine ways to remove the barriers.

Mentoring

Guiding Principles

Mentoring has always been important in the academic workplace. Only in recent years, however, has the practice evolved more widely from incidental to intentional as academic leaders have come to appreciate that mentorship is too valuable to be left to chance.

Many pre-tenure faculty members feel mentoring is essential to their success, but such support is also instrumental for associate professors on their path to promotion in rank. While some institutions rely on the mentor-protégé approach (a senior faculty member formally paired with a junior faculty member), new models encourage mutual mentoring (where faculty members of all ages and career stages reap benefits), team mentoring (a small group approach), and strategic

collaborations (in which faculty members build networks beyond their departments and colleges).

Hallmarks of Successful Models

COACHE partners who are high performers on the mentoring benchmark follow some or all of the following guidelines:

Ensure mentoring for assistant and associate professors.

Promote the mutual benefits for mentee and mentor alike: mentees learn the ropes, collect champions and confidants, and enjoy a greater sense of "fit" within their departments. Mentors feel a greater sense of purpose, even vitality, through these relationships.

Mentoring should meet individuals' needs, so make no "silver bullet" assumptions about what type of mentoring faculty will want (or even if they will want it at all). Instead, provide multiple paths to mentors on faculty's own terms.

Transparency is important, especially to women and faculty of color. Therefore, written, department-sensitive guidelines help both mentors and mentees.

For underrepresented faculty groups, finding a mentor with a similar background can be vital to success, yet difficult to find in some disciplines. Support mentoring networks beyond the department and division by reaching out to other institutions (e.g., through a consortium or system).

If possible, reward mentors through stipends, course releases, or other avenues of recognition (examples are available in *Benchmark Best Practices: Appreciation & Recognition*).

Evaluate the quality of mentoring. Both mentors and mentees should be part of the evaluative process. COACHE results can be used to frame the conversation.

For practical-minded inspiration from COACHE members with high ratings in Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring, read our **Benchmark Best Practices** white papers.

Reading Your Results

COACHE Dashboard Guide

This is the overall score (between 1 and 5) for all faculty respondents at your institution.

These columns describe how your faculty's responses compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions: tenured vs. tenured, men vs. men, faculty of color vs. faculty of color, etc.

These columns compare groups on your campus: pre-tenure/tenured, associate/full, women/men, white/faculty of color.

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	tenure	rank	gender	race	2008
Health and retirement benefits	3.43										pre-ten	full	women		
Interdisciplinary work	3.00										pre-ten	assoc	women	white	
Collaboration	3.46										tenured		women	white	
Mentoring	3.18										tenured	assoc		foc	
Tenure policies	3.84		N/A		N/A	N/A				N<5	N/A	N/A			+
Tenure clarity	3.33		N/A		N/A	N/A				N<5	N/A	N/A	men		



What do these triangles mean?

These symbols represent results that fit COACHE's criteria (adjustable in Excel) for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

Your ranking among peers:

1st or 2nd



3rd or 4th



5th or 6th



insufficient data for reporting



Your percentile among all members:

Top 30%



Middle 40%



Bottom 30%



And these results?

Here, the faculty subgroup with the lower rating appears. Shading conveys the magnitude of subgroup differences: **small** effects appear as text only, **moderate** effects are shaded yellow, and **large** effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as +/-.



This result, for example, shows that your female faculty are **less satisfied** than are women at your peers (◀), but **more satisfied** than are women at 70% of other institutions (▶). Although the women at your institution are "less satisfied" than women at peers, they still fare better than most.

Regardless of your results compared to peers and others (on the left), you should direct your concern to subgroups who consistently appear here in yellow or orange shaded cells.

Your Results

Your results compared to PEERS ◀
Your results compared to COHORT ▶

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) **med. (.3)** **lrg. (.5)**

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	change over time
Tenure Policies	3.17	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of tenure process	3.24	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of tenure criteria	3.32	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of tenure standards	2.93	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure	3.08	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure	3.30	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of tenure process in department	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Consistency of messages about tenure	3.05	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Tenure decisions are performance-based	3.26	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Tenure Expectations: Clarity	3.24	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of expectations: Scholar	3.59	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of expectations: Teacher	3.48	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of expectations: Advisor	3.12	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of expectations: Colleague	3.29	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen	2.95	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of expectations: Broader community	2.86	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Promotion to Full	3.33	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Dept. culture encourages promotion	3.19	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Reasonable expectations: Promotion	3.45	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of promotion process	3.43	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of promotion criteria	3.33	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of promotion standards	3.18	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	3.38	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Clarity of time frame for promotion	3.37	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women		white	urm	N/A
Clarity of whether I will be promoted	3.09	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A

Tenure and Promotion

About This Theme

Guiding Principles

Tenure. Administrators and faculty alike acknowledge that, at most institutions, the bar to achieve tenure has risen over time. While it is impossible to eliminate anxiety from the minds of all pre-tenure faculty members, or the pressures exerted on their lives en route to tenure, academic leaders can improve the clarity of tenure policies and expectations, and the satisfaction of their faculty, without sacrificing rigor. After so much has been invested to recruit and to hire them, pre-tenure faculty are owed consistent messages about what is required for tenure and credible assurances of fairness and equity, that is, that tenure decisions are based on performance, not influenced by demographics, relationships, or departmental politics.

Promotion. While the academy has recently improved many policies for assistant professors, it has done far less for associate professors. Fortunately, new practices--some truly novel, others novel only to this rank--have emerged from COACHE's research on tenured faculty. These include modified duties such as reduced teaching load; sabbatical planning and other workshops; workload shifts (i.e., more teaching or more research); improved communication about timing for promotion and a nudge to stand for full; small grants to support mid-career faculty (e.g., matching funds, travel support); a trigger mechanism, such as a ninth year review; and broader, more inclusive criteria.

Hallmarks of Successful Models

We have learned from leading institutions on these benchmarks what practices promote faculty satisfaction. Some findings:

Be direct with faculty during the interview stage about tenure and promotion expectations, then reinforce relative weights and priorities in a memorandum of understanding, then discuss them again in orientation sessions. These are formative opportunities.

If collegiality, outreach, and service count in the tenure process, provide definitions, say how they count, and state how they will be measured.

Provide written information about where to find everything they need to feel comfortable with the tenure process and with their campus. Use intuitively-organized websites with links to relevant policies and people.

Conduct year-long faculty orientations and workshops to support effective teaching and research throughout their years as assistant and associate professors.

Host Q&A sessions or provide other venues where pre-tenure faculty can safely ask difficult questions.

Teach departments chairs to deliver plenty of feedback along the way--annually, and then more thoroughly in a third- or fourth-year review. Written summaries of such conversations are particularly important to women and underrepresented minorities.

Provide sample dossiers to pre-tenure faculty and sample feedback letters to those responsible for writing them.

Ensure open doors for early-career faculty to chairs and senior faculty members in the department. The most clear and satisfied pre-tenure faculty have such access for questions about tenure, for feedback, for opportunities to collaborate, and for collegueship.

Be cognizant of the workload placed on associate professors. They often find themselves buried suddenly with more service, mentoring, and student advising, as well as more leadership and administrative duties that may get in the way of their trajectory to promotion.

Provide mentors. COACHE data confirm that just because a faculty member earns tenure does not mean that s/he no longer needs or wants a mentor.

For practical-minded inspiration from COACHE members with high ratings in Tenure and Promotion, read our **Benchmark Best Practices** white papers.

Reading Your Results

COACHE Dashboard Guide

This is the overall score (between 1 and 5) for all faculty respondents at your institution.

These columns describe how your faculty's responses compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions: tenured vs. tenured, men vs. men, faculty of color vs. faculty of color, etc.

These columns compare groups on your campus: pre-tenure/tenured, associate/full, women/men, white/faculty of color.

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	tenure	rank	gender	race	2008
Health and retirement benefits	3.43	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	full	women		
Interdisciplinary work	3.00	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	assoc	women	white	
Collaboration	3.46	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured		women	white	
Mentoring	3.18	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	assoc		foc	
Tenure policies	3.84	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A			+
Tenure clarity	3.33	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A	men		



What do these triangles mean?

These symbols represent results that fit COACHE's criteria (adjustable in Excel) for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

Your ranking among peers:

1st or 2nd ▶

3rd or 4th ▶

5th or 6th ▶

insufficient data for reporting ◀

Your percentile among all members:

Top 30% ▶

Middle 40% ▶

Bottom 30% ▶



This result, for example, shows that your female faculty are **less satisfied** than are women at your peers (◀), but **more satisfied** than are women at 70% of other institutions (▶). Although the women at your institution are "less satisfied" than women at peers, they still fare better than most.



And these results?

Here, the faculty subgroup with the **lower** rating appears. Shading conveys the **magnitude** of subgroup differences: **small** effects appear as text only, **moderate** effects are shaded yellow, and **large** effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as +/-.

Regardless of your results compared to peers and others (on the left), you should direct your concern to subgroups who consistently appear here in yellow or orange shaded cells.

Your Results

Your results compared to PEERS ◀
Your results compared to COHORT ▶

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) med. (.3) lrg. (.5)

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	change over time
Leadership: Senior	3.09														tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.15														tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.27													pre-ten	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.19														tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
CAO: Pace of decision making	2.93														tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
CAO: Stated priorities	3.01													tenured	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
CAO: Communication of priorities	2.94														tenured	full		foc	asian	urm	N/A
CAO: Ensuring faculty input	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Leadership: Divisional	2.95													tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Dean: Pace of decision making	2.97														tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Dean: Stated priorities	3.00													tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Dean: Communication of priorities	2.94													tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Dean: Ensuring faculty input	2.90														tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Leadership: Departmental	3.52													tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.48													tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.38													tenured	tenured		women	foc		urm	N/A
Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.40													tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.52													tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.83														tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Leadership: Faculty	2.95													tenured	tenured	full		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making	2.88													tenured	tenured	full		foc		urm	N/A
Faculty leaders: Stated priorities	2.97													tenured	tenured	full				urm	N/A
Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities	2.93													tenured	tenured	full		foc		urm	N/A
Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input	3.03													tenured	tenured	full		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Related Survey Items	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Priorities are stated consistently	2.78														tenured			foc		urm	N/A
Priorities are acted on consistently	2.44													tenured	tenured	assoc				urm	N/A
Changed priorities negatively affect my work	2.77													tenured	tenured	assoc					N/A
CAO: Support in adapting to change	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Visible leadership for support of diversity	3.47													pre-ten	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A

Your Results

	Your results compared to PEERS ◀ Your results compared to COHORT ▶													Areas of strength in GREEN Areas of concern in RED													Within campus differences sm (.1) med. (.3) lrg. (.5)								change over time
	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm															
Governance: Trust	2.82	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
I understand how to voice opinions about policies	2.86	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	2.77	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women				N/A														
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement	2.94	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Faculty and admin have an open system of communication	2.82	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	2.85	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Governance: Shared sense of purpose	2.85	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.56	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input	2.83	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	2.87	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured		women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.04	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured		women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Governance: Understanding the issue at hand	2.76	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	2.79	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	2.73	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions	2.60	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc		foc	asian		N/A														
Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	2.81	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured		women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Governance: Adaptability	2.64	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	2.63	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women			urm	N/A														
Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.45	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc	women				N/A														
Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	2.77	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Governance: Productivity	2.87	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A														
Overall effectiveness of shared governance	2.75	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A														
My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.16	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	tenured		women	foc	asian		N/A														
Public recognition of progress	2.65	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A														

Institutional Leadership

About This Theme

Guiding Principles

Academic leaders--especially the provost, dean, and department chair--play critical roles in shaping the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of faculty members. COACHE research has found that tenured faculty desire from the administration a clearly-articulated institutional mission and vision that do not change in ways that adversely affect faculty work (e.g., increased focus on research over teaching or vice versa; raised expectations for generating funding from outside grants). Faculty also wish for clear and consistent expectations for the mix of research, teaching, and service or outreach; support for research (pre- and post-award) and teaching; and a sense that their work is valued.

Deans and department chairs (or heads) can improve faculty morale through honest communication, and particularly by involving faculty in meaningful decisions that affect them. Deans and chairs are also responsible for ensuring opportunities for faculty input and supporting faculty in adapting to any changes to mission and institutional priorities. Equity and fairness in faculty evaluation are also important factors when assessing department head or chair leadership.

Hallmarks of Successful Models

COACHE researchers interviewed leaders from member institutions whose faculty rated items in this theme exceptionally well compared to faculty at other participating

campuses. We learned that high-performing institutions do some or all of the following:

Even if the Leadership: Senior marks are low, share them with faculty. Embrace reality, promise change, and be grateful that you have brought to light your faculty's concerns before a vote of no confidence was called.

Ensure that resources are allocated effectively to support changes in faculty work.

Be careful not to let faculty get caught unaware, unsuspecting, or unprepared for shifts in priorities. For example, guidelines for tenure and promotion should not be changed midstream; commitments (e.g., in a memorandum of understanding) should be honored.

Allow senior faculty members grace periods to adjust to new expectations.

Be transparent: it is almost impossible to over-communicate with faculty about changes to mission, institutional priorities, and resource allocation.

Consistent messaging is pivotal to strong leadership: work diligently to ensure that senior, divisional, and departmental leaders are hearing and communicating the same message about institutional priorities.

Priorities must be communicated via multiple channels, media, and venues. A blanket email or a website update does not adequately ensure broad communication of institutional priorities. Develop a communication plan that considers how the faculty everywhere--even the hard-to-reach--get information.

Provide consistent, well-designed management training and educational sessions for your institutional and departmental leaders. Offer department chairs more than just a one-day tutorial on the job--develop their leadership competencies. When their term as chair concludes, they will return to the faculty as leaders, not merely managers.

Provide chairs with a "Chair Handbook" and a web portal with "one stop shopping" on mentoring strategy, career mapping tools, and access to advice from peers.

Create opportunities for chairs to convene--perhaps without a dean or provost present--to discuss best practices, innovations, and shared struggles. Then, invite them to share their take-aways with the deans' council or other senior administrators.

For practical-minded inspiration from COACHE members with high ratings in leadership, read our **Benchmark Best Practices** white papers.

Reading Your Results

COACHE Dashboard Guide

This is the overall score (between 1 and 5) for all faculty respondents at your institution.

These columns describe how your faculty's responses compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions: tenured vs. tenured, men vs. men, faculty of color vs. faculty of color, etc.

These columns compare groups on your campus: pre-tenure/tenured, associate/full, women/men, white/faculty of color.

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	tenure	rank	gender	race	2008
Health and retirement benefits	3.43	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	full	women		
Interdisciplinary work	3.00	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	assoc	women	white	
Collaboration	3.46	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured		women	white	
Mentoring	3.18	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	assoc		foc	
Tenure policies	3.84	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A			+
Tenure clarity	3.33	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A	men		



What do these triangles mean?

These symbols represent results that fit COACHE's criteria (adjustable in Excel) for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

Your ranking among peers:

1st or 2nd ▶

3rd or 4th ▶

5th or 6th ▶

insufficient data for reporting ◀

Your percentile among all members:

Top 30% ▶

Middle 40% ▶

Bottom 30% ▶



This result, for example, shows that your female faculty are **less satisfied** than are women at your peers (◀), but **more satisfied** than are women at 70% of other institutions (▶). Although the women at your institution are "less satisfied" than women at peers, they still fare better than most.



And these results?

Here, the faculty subgroup with the **lower** rating appears. Shading conveys the **magnitude** of subgroup differences: **small** effects appear as text only, **moderate** effects are shaded yellow, and **large** effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as +/-.

Regardless of your results compared to peers and others (on the left), you should direct your concern to subgroups who consistently appear here in yellow or orange shaded cells.

Your Results

Your results compared to PEERS ◀
Your results compared to COHORT ▶

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) **med. (.3)** **lrg. (.5)**

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	change over time
Departmental Collegiality	3.61														tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Colleagues support work/life balance	3.51														tenured		women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.07													tenured	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.69													tenured			men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
How well you fit	3.49													tenured				foc	asian	urm	N/A
Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.52														ntt	assoc	men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.39													pre-ten	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Department is collegial	3.62														tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.67													pre-ten	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Departmental Engagement	3.37															assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.56													tenured	tenured	full	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Discussions of grad student learning	3.50													pre-ten	ntt	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.23													tenured	tenured			foc	asian	urm	N/A
Discussions of effective use of technology	3.01													pre-ten	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Discussions of current research methods	3.06													pre-ten	ntt	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.74													tenured				foc	asian		N/A
Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured	3.54														ntt	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Departmental Quality	3.40														tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.29													pre-ten	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	3.94													tenured	tenured			foc	asian		N/A
Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.22													pre-ten	tenured	assoc	men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	3.89													tenured	tenured	full	men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.41													pre-ten		assoc		foc	asian		N/A
Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.81													tenured	ntt			foc	asian		N/A
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment	3.43			N/A										N/A	tenured	assoc	men	foc	asian		N/A
Dept. is successful at faculty retention	3.18			N/A										N/A	tenured	assoc	men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.30													pre-ten		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Related Survey Items	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Intellectual vitality of NTT faculty	3.50														tenured		men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Scholarly productivity of NTT faculty	3.36														tenured		men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Teaching effectiveness of NTT faculty	3.67														tenured		men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Amount of professional interaction w/NTT	3.55													tenured	tenured		men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Amount of personal interaction w/NTT	3.49													tenured	tenured		men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recruiting part-time faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Managing part-time faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Departmental Engagement, Quality, and Collegiality

About This Theme

Guiding Principles

Faculty are employed by institutions, but they spend most of their time in departments, where culture has perhaps the greatest influence on faculty satisfaction and morale. We have highlighted three broad areas in which faculty judge the departments in which they work: engagement, quality, and collegiality.

Engagement. It is increasingly common to talk about student engagement, but less so faculty engagement. Yet, it is difficult to imagine an engaged student population without an engaged faculty. COACHE and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) complement one another in that FSSE considers the faculty--student connection, while COACHE measures faculty engagement with one another--by their professional interactions and their departmental discussions about undergraduate and graduate learning, pedagogy, the use of technology, and research methodologies.

Quality. Departmental quality is a function of the intellectual vitality of faculty, the scholarship that is produced, the effectiveness of teaching, how well the department recruits and retains excellent faculty, and whether and how poor faculty performance is handled.

Collegiality. While many factors comprise faculty members' opinions about departmental collegiality, COACHE has

discovered that faculty are especially cognizant of their sense of "fit" among their colleagues, their personal interactions with colleagues, whether their colleagues "pitch in" when needed, and colleague support for work/life balance. There is no substitute for a collegial department when it comes to faculty satisfaction, and campus leaders--both faculty and administrators--can create opportunities for more and better informal engagement.

Hallmarks of Successful Models

As arbiters of departmental culture, chairs especially are well-served to pay attention to departmental collegiality. They should keep their doors open so faculty can stop in and chat about departmental issues. Likewise, chairs should drop in to offer help, perhaps to intervene.

Be especially conscious that those who are in the minority--whether by gender, race/ethnicity, age, subfield, political views or another factor--are not marginalized in the department; what you might think of as respecting autonomy might be perceived by another as isolation. Create forums for faculty to play together: schedule some social activities and ensure everyone knows about important milestones in each other's lives. Celebrate! All institutions in our related Benchmark Best Practices report foster departmental engagement, quality, and collegiality by hosting social gatherings once or twice a month.

Create forums for faculty to work together: convene to discuss research, methodology, interdisciplinary ideas, pedagogy, and technology.

Provide chair training for handling performance feedback for tenure-track faculty members (e.g., annual reviews, mid-probationary period reviews), tenured faculty members (e.g., post-tenure review, annual or merit review, informal feedback); and non-tenure-track faculty members.

Discuss the vitality of the department by using COACHE and other analytical data to keep these matters from becoming overly-personalized.

Be an advocate for faculty participation in activities in the campuses' center for teaching and learning.

Use department meeting agendas not as a list of chores, but as opportunities for generative thinking. Enlist colleagues to discuss new teaching and research methods or to present case studies to problem-solve. Using this structured time to initiate departmental engagement may encourage continued engagement beyond the meetings. As often as possible, ask department colleagues to take ownership of the meeting by co-presenting.

For practical-minded inspiration from COACHE members with high ratings in department-focused themes, read our **Benchmark Best Practices** white papers.

Reading Your Results

COACHE Dashboard Guide

This is the overall score (between 1 and 5) for all faculty respondents at your institution.

These columns describe how your faculty's responses compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions: tenured vs. tenured, men vs. men, faculty of color vs. faculty of color, etc.

These columns compare groups on your campus: pre-tenure/tenured, associate/full, women/men, white/faculty of color.

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	tenure	rank	gender	race	2008
Health and retirement benefits	3.43	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	full	women		
Interdisciplinary work	3.00	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	assoc	women	white	
Collaboration	3.46	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured		women	white	
Mentoring	3.18	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	assoc		foc	
Tenure policies	3.64	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A			+
Tenure clarity	3.33	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A	men		



What do these triangles mean?

These symbols represent results that fit COACHE's criteria (adjustable in Excel) for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

Your ranking among peers:

1st or 2nd ▶

3rd or 4th ▶

5th or 6th ▶

insufficient data for reporting ◀

Your percentile among all members:

Top 30% ▶

Middle 40% ▶

Bottom 30% ▶



And these results?

Here, the faculty subgroup with the lower rating appears. Shading conveys the magnitude of subgroup differences: small effects appear as text only, moderate effects are shaded yellow, and large effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as +/-.



This result, for example, shows that your female faculty are **less satisfied** than are women at your peers (◀), but **more satisfied** than are women at 70% of other institutions (▶). Although the women at your institution are "less satisfied" than women at peers, they still fare better than most.

Regardless of your results compared to peers and others (on the left), you should direct your concern to subgroups who consistently appear here in yellow or orange shaded cells.

Your Results

Your results compared to PEERS ◀
Your results compared to COHORT ▶

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) **med. (.3)** **lrg. (.5)**

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	change over time
Appreciation and Recognition	3.13	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recognition: For teaching	3.17	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recognition: For advising	2.94	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured		assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recognition: For scholarship	3.21	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶			assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recognition: For service	2.97	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recognition: For outreach	2.95	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recognition: From colleagues	3.47	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶		tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recognition: From CAO	2.79	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc		foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recognition: From Dean	2.98	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.56	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured	tenured	assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A
School/college is valued by Pres/Provost	3.09	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc	men	white		white	N/A
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost	2.81	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N/A	N/A	assoc			asian	white	N/A
CAO cares about faculty of my rank	2.85	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	N/A

Appreciation and Recognition

About This Theme

Guiding Principles

Faculty, at all ranks, are just like other employees when it comes to wanting to be appreciated by colleagues and recognized for doing good work. Focus group research conducted by COACHE showed that while many tenured faculty members feel valued by undergraduate and graduate students, with whom research relationships were especially gratifying, they do not receive much recognition from other faculty and upper-level administrators. The degree to which appreciation and recognition themes appeared in our 2010 study of tenured faculty far surpassed their appearance in our pre-tenure faculty research.

In our recent study, tenured faculty (especially at smaller institutions) felt that extramural service that increases the reputation of their colleges, while expected of them, is not recognized and goes unrewarded. Being engaged in the local community or on the board of a nationally-recognized association yields little recognition from senior colleagues or others at their home institutions. This gap between expectations and appreciation discouraged many faculty from external service that increased the reputation of the institution.

Hallmarks of Successful Models

Institutions with high marks for appreciating faculty typically understand the following:

The greatest obstacle is simply not knowing what faculty have done that warrants recognition. What mechanisms are in place to ensure that faculty contributions are being shared with deans, provosts, and with their colleagues? Cultivate a culture of recognition by creating ways for students, faculty, and campus leaders to aggregate and to highlight the accomplishments of your faculty. For example, a physical and a virtual drop box allow others to comment on their good work.

The chief academic officer should get to know the faculty in a variety of forums, including brownbag lunches, speakers' series, workshops, and seminars that engage faculty members in appealing topics and current issues.

Likewise, deans and chairs should make opportunities to showcase faculty work, share kind words, and offer a "pat on the back" from time to time.

Take note of what faculty are doing and celebrate that work in each school or college at some point every year; such occasions do not have to be costly to be meaningful. We know of two universities where the Provost surprises faculty with a "prize patrol" offering an award or other recognition in what would have been a run-of-the-mill department meeting or class.

Provide department chairs with guidelines to form a nominating committee of two faculty (rotating out annually) responsible for putting forward their colleagues' names for internal and external awards and honors. These might include recognition from a disciplinary association, institutional teaching awards, or prizes from higher ed associations. Such activities foster awareness of and appreciation for all department colleagues' work.

For practical-minded inspiration from COACHE members with high ratings in Appreciation and Recognition, read our **Benchmark Best Practices** white papers.

Retention and Negotiation

Re-negotiations

If you could negotiate adjustments to your employment, which one of the following items would you most like to adjust?

	Overall			Pre-Tenure			Non-Tenure Track			Women			Asian			URM		
	you	peers	all	you	peers	all	you	peers	all	you	peers	all	you	peers	all	you	peers	all
Base salary	54%	48%	43%	41%	39%	37%	64%	51%	50%	54%	47%	42%	63%	43%	44%	50%	56%	45%
Supplemental salary	5%	6%	4%	9%	5%	4%	4%	7%	5%	3%	6%	4%	5%	7%	5%	3%	6%	4%
Tenure clock	1%	2%	2%	6%	7%	6%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	2%	0%	4%	2%	3%	3%	2%
Teaching load	7%	10%	13%	11%	13%	15%	4%	8%	9%	9%	12%	15%	8%	11%	11%	11%	13%	14%
Administrative responsibilities	3%	4%	4%	0%	2%	3%	4%	5%	4%	2%	4%	5%	5%	2%	2%	6%	3%	4%
Equipment	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	2%	3%	0%	1%
Lab/research support	5%	8%	9%	7%	13%	13%	2%	4%	5%	5%	7%	8%	5%	8%	12%	6%	5%	7%
Employment for spouse/partner	3%	3%	4%	6%	6%	8%	4%	1%	2%	5%	3%	4%	0%	6%	6%	6%	3%	4%
Sabbatical or other leave time	3%	4%	6%	6%	2%	4%	0%	3%	4%	5%	4%	7%	0%	4%	4%	8%	2%	6%
There is nothing about my employment that I wish to adjust	6%	5%	6%	4%	3%	4%	6%	8%	7%	4%	4%	5%	3%	6%	5%	6%	2%	4%

Reasons to consider leaving

If you were to choose to leave your institution, what would be your primary reason?

	Overall			Pre-Tenure			Non-Tenure Track			Women			Asian			URM		
	you	peers	all	you	peers	all	you	peers	all	you	peers	all	you	peers	all	you	peers	all
To improve your salary/benefits	18%	20%	17%	15%	15%	15%	23%	22%	22%	18%	17%	16%	22%	18%	19%	11%	26%	19%
To find a more collegial work environment	10%	5%	4%	10%	7%	5%	3%	4%	4%	11%	6%	5%	20%	6%	5%	11%	6%	6%
To find an employer who provides more resources in support of your work	10%	8%	10%	15%	13%	13%	9%	5%	5%	8%	8%	10%	17%	15%	14%	18%	9%	10%
To work at an institution whose priorities match your own	10%	10%	9%	10%	13%	11%	6%	7%	6%	5%	10%	8%	10%	12%	10%	5%	11%	10%
To pursue an administrative position in higher education	4%	4%	4%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	4%	4%	2%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%
To pursue a nonacademic job	2%	2%	2%	0%	1%	2%	5%	5%	4%	1%	3%	2%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	2%
To improve the employment opportunities for your spouse/partner	3%	3%	4%	3%	7%	8%	5%	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	2%	4%	5%	2%	2%	4%
For other family or personal needs	6%	5%	6%	15%	9%	9%	8%	6%	7%	7%	6%	6%	5%	7%	8%	5%	4%	6%
To improve your quality of life	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%	10%	9%	9%	9%	8%	8%	9%	5%	7%	6%	9%	7%	9%
To retire	18%	20%	21%	2%	3%	3%	17%	24%	21%	21%	20%	18%	2%	8%	9%	18%	13%	14%
To move to a preferred geographic location	4%	7%	7%	7%	14%	12%	3%	5%	5%	3%	6%	7%	2%	5%	6%	7%	7%	6%
There is no reason why I would choose to leave this institution	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	1%	2%	3%	5%	5%	4%	0%	2%	3%

Best Aspects

Your Results

Faculty were asked to identify the two (and only two) **best aspects** of working at your institution. The top four responses for your institution are shown in red and disaggregated by tenure status, rank, gender, and race. The columns labeled Peer show the total number of times an item appeared as a top four item amongst any of your five peer institutions. The All column reflects the number of times an item appeared in the top four at any of the institutions in your comparable cohort. When a **best aspect** at your institution is also shown as a best aspect for your peers and/or the cohort, the issue may be seen as common in the faculty labor market. Best aspects that are unique to your campus are market differentiators, which can be highlighted in your institution's recruitment and retention efforts.

	Overall			Pre-Tenure			Women			Asian			URM		
	you	peers	all (89)	you	peers	all (89)	you	peers	all (89)	you	peers	all (89)	you	peers	all (89)
Quality of colleagues	21%	5	82	17%	4	79	24%	5	85	2%	2	64	11%	4	76
Support of colleagues	15%	4	51	15%	5	67	15%	5	69	7%	4	52	7%	4	48
Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	8%	1	8	8%	1	12	8%	0	6	10%	1	20	7%	0	8
Quality of graduate students	4%	0	5	0%	0	2	6%	0	3	0%	0	6	5%	0	12
Quality of undergraduate students	4%	0	19	3%	0	13	4%	0	17	2%	0	16	7%	0	22
Quality of facilities	2%	0	1	0%	0	1	1%	0	1	0%	0	7	5%	1	9
Support for research/creative work	6%	0	2	7%	0	1	9%	0	2	2%	0	9	7%	0	5
Support for teaching	3%	0	2	2%	0	4	3%	0	4	2%	0	11	2%	0	7
Support for professional development	2%	0	0	3%	0	0	1%	0	0	0%	0	7	2%	0	3
Assistance for grant proposals	1%	0	0	2%	0	0	1%	0	0	0%	0	5	2%	0	1
Childcare policies/practices	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	2%	0	2	0%	0	0
Availability/quality of childcare facilities	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	1%	0	0	0%	0	2	0%	0	0
Spousal/partner hiring program	1%	0	0	2%	0	0	1%	0	0	0%	0	2	2%	0	0
Compensation	6%	0	0	5%	0	3	5%	0	0	5%	0	3	7%	0	5
Geographic location	28%	3	63	22%	3	58	22%	4	63	37%	3	54	36%	3	66
Diversity	7%	0	12	14%	0	13	11%	0	13	7%	0	14	5%	0	14
Presence of others like me	2%	0	0	3%	0	0	1%	0	0	2%	0	4	5%	0	0
My sense of "fit" here	13%	2	45	8%	2	47	16%	3	45	10%	2	34	5%	2	34
Protections from service/assignments	1%	0	0	2%	0	0	1%	0	0	0%	0	4	2%	0	1
Commute	4%	0	2	3%	0	1	3%	0	4	7%	1	13	11%	2	13
Cost of living	21%	2	27	31%	3	29	17%	2	22	34%	5	44	34%	3	38

Teaching load	7%	0	0	7%	0	5	7%	0	2	2%	0	12	9%	0	10
Manageable pressure to perform	11%	0	2	17%	1	17	11%	0	3	17%	0	18	5%	0	10
Academic freedom	16%	3	44	14%	2	36	13%	2	32	15%	2	60	11%	3	52
Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	6	0%	0	0
Quality of leadership	1%	0	0	0%	0	0	1%	0	0	0%	0	5	0%	0	2
There are no positive aspects	3%	0	0	0%	0	0	3%	0	0	7%	0	4	5%	0	3
Decline to answer	1%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	5%	0	7	0%	0	4

Worst Aspects

Your Results

Faculty were asked to identify the two (and only two) **worst aspects** of working at your institution. The top four responses for your institution are shown in red and disaggregated by tenure status, rank, gender, and race. The columns labeled Peer show the total number of times an item appeared as a top four item amongst any of your five peer institutions. The All column reflects the number of times an item appeared in the top four at any of the institutions in your comparable cohort. When a **worst aspect** at your institution is also shown as a worst aspect for your peers and/or the cohort, the issue may be seen as common in the faculty labor market. More attention should be paid to the worst aspects that are unique to your institution. These distinctions cast the institution in a negative light.


	Overall			Pre-Tenure			Women			Asian			URM		
	you	peers	all (89)	you	peers	all (89)	you	peers	all (89)	you	peers	all (89)	you	peers	all (89)
Quality of colleagues	11%	0	1	15%	0	5	9%	0	1	20%	0	13	11%	0	6
Support of colleagues	6%	0	0	10%	0	1	7%	0	1	10%	0	6	5%	0	9
Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	1%	0	0	3%	0	1	1%	0	0	5%	0	3	2%	0	0
Quality of graduate students	9%	0	4	17%	5	27	7%	0	2	29%	5	34	11%	0	4
Quality of undergraduate students	9%	1	4	7%	0	12	7%	0	0	5%	1	15	9%	1	8
Quality of facilities	12%	1	20	8%	0	26	9%	0	22	7%	1	23	9%	0	20
Support for research/creative work	15%	4	70	19%	3	67	15%	4	73	22%	3	67	14%	4	54
Support for teaching	5%	0	0	3%	0	1	7%	0	0	0%	0	3	5%	0	2
Support for professional development	4%	0	1	0%	0	3	5%	1	4	10%	0	11	2%	1	6
Assistance for grant proposals	4%	0	0	2%	0	5	4%	0	1	0%	0	5	5%	0	5
Childcare policies/practices	1%	0	0	2%	0	2	2%	0	1	0%	0	3	0%	0	2
Availability/quality of childcare facilities	1%	0	0	0%	0	2	1%	0	1	2%	0	3	0%	0	1
Spousal/partner hiring program	4%	0	2	2%	1	18	2%	0	2	5%	1	17	7%	1	8
Compensation	28%	5	82	22%	5	71	27%	5	79	24%	4	74	23%	5	77
Geographic location	4%	1	16	8%	2	29	4%	1	14	2%	1	23	5%	1	20
Diversity	6%	1	9	12%	0	17	6%	1	13	0%	0	14	27%	3	52
Presence of others like me	4%	0	0	5%	0	3	3%	0	1	5%	0	7	7%	0	12
My sense of "fit" here	5%	0	1	3%	0	1	4%	0	2	2%	0	5	5%	0	9
Protections from service/assignments	9%	2	45	7%	0	27	11%	4	63	5%	0	18	9%	1	23
Commute	1%	0	3	0%	0	6	1%	0	6	0%	0	9	0%	0	4
Cost of living	1%	0	13	0%	0	15	1%	0	8	0%	0	17	0%	0	13

Teaching load	7%	1	29	5%	2	25	7%	2	29	7%	1	31	5%	1	24
Manageable pressure to perform	4%	0	5	5%	0	17	5%	0	13	2%	0	7	2%	0	8
Academic freedom	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0	2%	0	2	0%	0	2
Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	5%	0	3	10%	1	10	7%	1	4	5%	0	12	2%	1	12
Quality of leadership	12%	4	55	7%	2	15	11%	2	36	5%	2	36	14%	2	34
There are no positive aspects	3%	0	0	2%	0	1	3%	0	0	7%	0	14	7%	0	4
Decline to answer	3%	0	0	0%	0	2	2%	0	1	0%	1	21	0%	0	7

How to improve the workplace for faculty

Your Results

The final question in the COACHE survey asks faculty to describe the one thing your institution can do to improve the workplace for faculty. COACHE analysts assigned all responses to one or more common themes.



Detailed Results by Individual Questions

The following tables provide detailed results by individual questions within the benchmark categories. These tables were constructed at UNLV using data provided by COACHE. In order to help protect the confidentiality of respondents, values are not reported for those items with 5 or less cases.

Nature of Work: Research, Service, and Teaching

Detailed Results by Question

	UNLV Overall		Tenured Faculty		Pre-Tenured Faculty		Non-Tenure-Track Faculty		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Men Faculty		Women Faculty		White Faculty		Faculty of Color	
	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)
Nature of Work: Research	3.19	352(80)	3.16	228(81)	3.17	68(73)	3.33	56(82)	3.26	126(88)	3.05	106(70)	3.14	64(72)	3.23	199(77)	3.12	153(82)	3.25	260(77)	2.99	92(83)
Time spent on research	3.46	332(1.18)	3.45	224(1.17)	3.51	68(1.22)	3.40	40(1.15)	3.65	124(1.20)	3.22	105(1.10)	3.51	63(1.23)	3.49	190(1.15)	3.42	142(1.21)	3.49	241(1.18)	3.38	91(1.18)
Expectations for finding external funding	3.22	275(1.01)	3.22	193(99)	3.27	59(98)	3.09	23(1.20)	3.29	105(1.02)	3.16	90(99)	3.25	57(93)	3.25	165(1.02)	3.17	110(99)	3.29	194(1.00)	3.04	81(1.00)
Influence over focus of research	4.24	328(0.93)	4.28	221(93)	4.25	67(94)	4.00	40(84)	4.37	123(90)	4.16	102(1.00)	4.29	63(86)	4.28	192(88)	4.18	136(99)	4.39	238(79)	3.84	90(1.13)
Quality of grad students to support research	2.94	277(1.13)	2.99	197(1.11)	2.70	61(1.18)	3.11	18(1.10)	3.18	110(1.11)	2.73	92(1.04)	2.73	56(1.21)	2.96	164(1.08)	2.90	113(1.20)	3.06	200(1.10)	2.61	77(1.14)
Support for research	2.89	320(1.22)	2.83	217(1.22)	3.02	66(1.22)	3.00	37(1.22)	2.97	121(1.26)	2.74	99(1.19)	2.92	63(1.19)	2.98	189(1.15)	2.76	131(1.30)	2.96	231(1.20)	2.72	89(1.26)
Support for engaging undergrads in research	2.88	284(1.08)	2.86	191(1.10)	3.00	61(1.03)	2.81	32(1.03)	2.83	103(1.10)	2.91	89(1.10)	2.97	60(1.04)	3.03	172(1.02)	2.66	112(1.11)	2.93	205(1.06)	2.76	79(1.10)
Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	2.87	262(1.22)	2.80	181(1.19)	2.82	56(1.23)	3.48	25(1.19)	2.84	98(1.24)	2.76	86(1.16)	2.83	53(1.20)	2.93	152(1.25)	2.78	110(1.16)	2.89	183(1.20)	2.82	79(1.24)
Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	2.76	222(1.15)	2.68	163(1.14)	2.93	40(1.09)	3.11	19(1.19)	2.70	91(1.19)	2.72	74(1.12)	2.82	38(1.03)	2.87	131(1.14)	2.60	91(1.13)	2.75	151(1.11)	2.77	71(1.22)
Support for securing grad student assistance	2.78	283(1.19)	2.77	199(1.19)	2.77	61(1.10)	2.91	23(1.34)	2.85	108(1.27)	2.69	96(1.08)	2.75	56(1.11)	2.85	169(1.08)	2.68	114(1.31)	2.81	203(1.18)	2.70	80(1.19)
Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.48	327(1.23)	3.44	218(1.29)	3.60	65(1.18)	3.55	44(92)	3.41	121(1.33)	3.49	101(1.24)	3.57	61(1.17)	3.44	187(1.21)	3.54	140(1.24)	3.56	238(1.20)	3.28	89(1.25)
Availability of course release for research	2.89	292(1.32)	2.93	212(1.30)	2.83	60(1.39)	2.60	20(1.27)	3.18	119(1.29)	2.69	98(1.28)	2.71	55(1.37)	2.93	180(1.25)	2.81	112(1.41)	2.96	212(1.30)	2.69	80(1.32)
Nature of Work: Service	3.23	363(87)	3.16	229(83)	3.18	68(93)	3.54	66(88)	3.28	126(80)	3.03	107(80)	3.19	64(94)	3.31	202(85)	3.15	161(89)	3.28	272(82)	3.09	91(98)
Time spent on service	3.40	362(1.08)	3.29	229(1.10)	3.37	68(1.07)	3.80	65(92)	3.47	126(1.03)	3.13	107(1.14)	3.30	64(1.10)	3.47	201(1.08)	3.31	161(1.07)	3.43	271(1.03)	3.30	91(1.20)
Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.78	320(1.34)	2.73	212(1.35)	2.86	59(1.29)	2.90	49(1.32)	2.93	116(1.36)	2.49	100(1.33)	2.89	55(1.24)	2.85	182(1.33)	2.70	138(1.33)	2.86	237(1.32)	2.57	83(1.36)
Number of committees	3.41	342(1.02)	3.32	225(1.00)	3.42	67(1.03)	3.80	50(99)	3.48	124(92)	3.15	105(1.07)	3.40	63(1.04)	3.47	196(98)	3.33	146(1.06)	3.46	254(98)	3.28	88(1.11)
Attractiveness of committees	3.40	335(0.99)	3.39	222(99)	3.21	66(1.03)	3.70	47(88)	3.43	122(1.00)	3.32	104(98)	3.26	62(1.02)	3.42	194(93)	3.38	141(1.06)	3.47	247(91)	3.19	88(1.15)
Discretion to choose committees	3.38	334(1.12)	3.40	223(1.08)	3.29	66(1.23)	3.40	45(1.11)	3.47	122(1.06)	3.32	105(1.09)	3.29	62(1.26)	3.46	192(1.01)	3.27	142(1.23)	3.45	249(1.09)	3.19	85(1.18)
Equitability of committee assignments	2.87	334(1.26)	2.81	220(1.28)	2.85	66(1.21)	3.17	48(1.19)	2.89	119(1.23)	2.69	105(1.31)	2.90	62(1.26)	2.99	189(1.21)	2.70	145(1.30)	2.86	247(1.23)	2.90	87(1.35)
Number of student advisees	3.69	337(0.93)	3.68	220(96)	3.57	67(87)	3.92	50(80)	3.74	121(99)	3.60	103(93)	3.56	63(85)	3.75	190(87)	3.62	147(99)	3.74	247(88)	3.54	90(1.02)
Support for being a good advisor	2.72	329(1.17)	2.69	214(1.16)	2.73	66(1.14)	2.86	49(1.25)	2.87	118(1.12)	2.48	100(1.21)	2.71	62(1.09)	2.87	188(1.13)	2.52	141(1.19)	2.81	242(1.16)	2.48	87(1.17)
Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	2.79	319(1.15)	2.68	208(1.15)	2.97	67(1.20)	3.02	44(97)	2.91	113(1.11)	2.41	99(1.14)	2.98	63(1.21)	2.96	182(1.07)	2.55	137(1.20)	2.84	232(1.12)	2.66	87(1.21)
Nature of Work: Teaching	3.69	369(80)	3.65	230(69)	3.67	68(66)	3.80	71(62)	3.73	127(75)	3.60	107(60)	3.64	64(65)	3.69	202(69)	3.68	167(65)	3.73	277(64)	3.55	92(75)
Time spent on teaching	3.97	367(0.96)	3.94	229(96)	3.96	68(95)	4.09	70(95)	4.03	126(94)	3.85	107(96)	3.94	64(97)	3.99	200(90)	3.95	167(1.01)	4.01	276(91)	3.87	91(1.06)
Number of courses taught	3.82	357(1.06)	3.78	223(1.09)	4.04	67(92)	3.75	67(1.06)	3.85	122(1.06)	3.73	105(1.12)	4.00	63(93)	3.83	197(1.06)	3.82	160(1.05)	3.84	268(1.04)	3.76	89(1.11)
Level of courses taught	4.08	357(0.87)	4.07	223(89)	4.19	67(83)	4.01	67(80)	4.16	122(85)	4.01	105(91)	4.13	63(88)	4.06	197(86)	4.11	160(87)	4.11	268(85)	4.00	89(91)
Discretion over course content	4.44	358(73)	4.52	223(64)	4.30	67(93)	4.34	68(76)	4.49	122(68)	4.56	105(58)	4.25	63(95)	4.45	198(73)	4.43	160(73)	4.49	268(71)	4.29	90(78)
Number of students in classes taught	3.69	358(1.17)	3.70	223(1.15)	3.61	67(1.15)	3.74	68(1.25)	3.83	122(1.11)	3.56	105(1.18)	3.60	63(1.15)	3.72	198(1.17)	3.66	160(1.17)	3.70	268(1.19)	3.68	90(1.10)
Quality of students taught	3.22	356(1.09)	3.20	222(1.08)	3.17	66(1.09)	3.34	68(1.14)	3.27	121(1.08)	3.15	105(1.06)	3.11	62(1.10)	3.14	196(1.06)	3.33	160(1.11)	3.25	266(1.06)	3.13	90(1.17)
Equitability of distribution of teaching load	2.97	349(1.28)	2.84	222(1.27)	3.21	66(1.27)	3.21	61(1.24)	2.94	121(1.29)	2.76	105(1.26)	3.16	62(1.28)	3.06	192(1.28)	2.87	157(1.26)	3.02	262(1.26)	2.84	87(1.31)
Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.09	277(1.15)	3.14	189(1.12)	2.65	55(1.15)	3.58	33(1.09)	3.17	103(1.12)	3.09	87(1.11)	2.65	54(1.16)	3.18	167(1.09)	2.96	110(1.21)	3.15	201(1.13)	2.95	76(1.19)
Teaching schedule	4.04	357(0.91)	4.07	223(85)	3.81	67(1.06)	4.18	67(88)	4.06	122(89)	4.10	105(80)	3.75	63(1.06)	4.04	197(88)	4.04	160(93)	4.10	268(87)	3.85	89(99)
Related:																						
Time spent on outreach	3.58	304(0.89)	3.56	199(88)	3.50	60(94)	3.78	45(82)	3.65	113(92)	3.42	91(85)	3.53	55(90)	3.62	173(89)	3.53	131(88)	3.63	222(81)	3.45	82(1.05)
Time spent on administrative tasks	2.95	343(1.15)	2.81	216(1.15)	2.82	65(1.08)	3.60	62(98)	2.98	118(1.16)	2.63	102(1.10)	2.79	61(1.09)	2.97	189(1.15)	2.94	154(1.14)	2.93	258(1.13)	3.02	85(1.21)
Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.39	360(1.29)	3.34	228(1.30)	3.27	67(1.25)	3.71	65(1.23)	3.64	125(1.26)	2.97	107(1.25)	3.29	63(1.26)	3.53	202(1.23)	3.21	158(1.34)	3.43	269(1.27)	3.27	91(1.32)

Facilities, Personal & Family Policies

Detailed Results by Individual Questions

	Overall		Tenured	n(s.d.)	Pre-Tenure	n(s.d.)	NTT	n(s.d.)	Full	n(s.d.)	Assoc	n(s.d.)	Assistant	n(s.d.)	Men	n(s.d.)	Women	n(s.d.)	White	n(s.d.)	FOC	n(s.d.)
	Mean	n(s.d.)																				
Facilities and Work Resources	3.46	361(.77)	3.35	224(.81)	3.47	67(.72)	3.81	70(.56)	3.44	123(.85)	3.26	105(.77)	3.45	63(.71)	3.43	200(.76)	3.49	161(.79)	3.51	270(.75)	3.29	91(.83)
Support for improving teaching	3.06	347(1.11)	2.99	216(1.09)	3.08	65(1.09)	3.27	66(1.14)	3.04	117(1.05)	2.95	103(1.12)	3.03	61(1.12)	3.07	196(1.06)	3.05	151(1.15)	3.11	260(1.03)	2.90	87(1.28)
Office	3.82	359(1.11)	3.73	222(1.16)	3.88	67(1.03)	4.03	70(.96)	3.80	122(1.16)	3.64	104(1.16)	3.89	63(1.03)	3.76	199(1.07)	3.88	160(1.15)	3.88	269(1.07)	3.63	90(1.19)
Laboratory, research, studio space	3.14	246(1.29)	3.08	163(1.28)	3.18	50(1.33)	3.39	33(1.22)	3.04	90(1.40)	3.12	76(1.15)	3.19	47(1.31)	3.18	147(1.26)	3.08	99(1.33)	3.20	174(1.27)	3.01	72(1.31)
Equipment	3.37	345(1.19)	3.20	213(1.21)	3.55	64(1.14)	3.75	68(1.02)	3.20	118(1.27)	3.19	99(1.18)	3.57	60(1.07)	3.29	191(1.19)	3.47	154(1.17)	3.42	257(1.19)	3.23	88(1.15)
Classrooms	3.40	355(1.08)	3.41	221(1.11)	3.34	67(1.00)	3.43	67(1.00)	3.51	122(1.15)	3.32	103(1.05)	3.29	63(1.00)	3.47	197(1.02)	3.31	158(1.12)	3.36	269(1.08)	3.53	86(1.03)
Library resources	3.99	354(0.95)	3.92	221(.99)	3.85	65(1.06)	4.34	68(.58)	4.05	121(.90)	3.79	104(1.06)	3.82	61(1.07)	3.85	195(1.00)	4.16	159(.86)	4.07	265(.90)	3.75	89(1.06)
Computing and technical support	3.51	354(1.18)	3.36	220(1.22)	3.50	66(1.16)	4.00	68(.89)	3.51	121(1.23)	3.23	103(1.20)	3.42	62(1.16)	3.49	198(1.12)	3.53	156(1.25)	3.57	265(1.18)	3.33	89(1.17)
Clerical/administrative support	3.26	351(1.29)	2.98	218(1.27)	3.38	65(1.30)	4.03	68(.94)	3.12	119(1.27)	2.86	103(1.30)	3.34	61(1.26)	3.28	194(1.19)	3.24	157(1.39)	3.34	264(1.26)	3.02	87(1.34)

Personal and Family Policies	3.02	323(.98)	2.94	203(.94)	2.92	60(1.08)	3.40	60(.94)	3.04	110(.91)	2.81	96(.95)	2.94	57(1.10)	3.14	183(.91)	2.87	140(1.04)	3.24	239(1.00)	2.82	84(.91)
Right balance between professional/personal	3.28	337(1.35)	3.19	215(1.33)	3.19	58(1.44)	3.67	64(1.27)	3.38	116(1.36)	2.98	103(1.28)	3.19	54(1.45)	3.39	188(1.30)	3.15	149(1.40)	3.37	255(1.34)	3.00	82(1.35)
Inst. supports family/career compatibility	2.90	268(1.29)	2.79	179(1.25)	2.67	42(1.28)	3.51	47(1.30)	2.94	96(1.23)	2.62	86(1.25)	2.67	39(1.30)	3.03	151(1.27)	2.72	117(1.30)	2.97	196(1.29)	2.69	72(1.28)
Housing benefits	2.08	86(0.98)	2.02	53(.95)	2.04	23(.97)	2.50	10(1.17)	2.18	28(.90)	1.85	27(.98)	2.05	21(.97)	2.20	46(.98)	1.95	40(.98)	2.09	53(1.00)	2.06	33(.96)
Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	3.37	209(1.09)	3.29	131(1.13)	3.27	37(1.07)	3.73	41(.92)	3.30	74(1.16)	3.29	59(1.08)	3.26	35(1.09)	3.32	124(1.12)	3.45	85(1.05)	3.36	151(1.14)	3.40	58(.95)
Spousal/partner hiring program	2.57	115(1.22)	2.42	77(1.09)	2.83	24(1.43)	2.93	14(1.43)	2.51	43(1.09)	2.39	36(1.12)	2.73	22(1.45)	2.55	71(1.14)	2.59	44(1.35)	2.66	80(1.27)	2.34	35(1.08)
Childcare	2.58	106(1.14)	2.70	61(1.13)	2.19	26(1.02)	2.68	19(1.25)	3.13	30(.97)	2.36	33(1.14)	2.08	24(.97)	2.65	60(1.13)	2.48	46(1.15)	2.80	71(1.16)	2.11	35(.93)
Eldercare	2.46	71(0.98)	2.31	48(.94)	2.62	13(.87)	3.00	10(1.15)	2.48	27(.89)	2.14	22(.99)	2.58	12(.90)	2.69	39(.95)	2.19	32(.96)	2.35	48(1.00)	2.70	23(.92)
Family medical/parental leave	3.01	186(1.12)	2.96	123(1.06)	2.84	32(1.29)	3.35	31(1.08)	2.97	71(1.02)	2.96	54(1.14)	2.80	30(1.27)	3.17	103(1.05)	2.81	83(1.16)	3.04	133(1.06)	2.92	53(1.23)
Flexible workload/modified duties	3.25	175(1.11)	3.22	113(1.11)	2.82	28(1.09)	3.71	34(.93)	3.40	57(1.05)	3.02	58(1.14)	2.85	26(1.12)	3.38	102(1.01)	3.07	73(1.20)	3.37	120(1.11)	3.00	55(1.05)
Stop-the-clock policies	2.75	28(1.21)			2.75	28(1.20)					3.33	n<5	2.68	25(1.21)	2.33	9(1.11)	2.95	19(1.22)	2.83	18(1.24)	2.60	10(1.17)
Parking benefits	2.74	353(1.24)	2.71	219(1.23)	2.82	65(1.28)	2.75	69(1.24)	2.87	119(1.21)	2.59	104(1.27)	2.72	61(1.22)	2.81	194(1.20)	2.65	159(1.28)	2.80	265(1.18)	2.56	88(1.38)

Health and Retirement Benefits	2.83	358(.96)	2.66	222(.91)	2.85	67(.95)	3.32	69(.97)	2.70	122(.92)	2.63	104(.89)	2.84	63(.97)	2.77	199(.91)	2.90	153(1.01)	2.88	268(.96)	2.67	90(.93)
Health benefits for yourself	2.48	355(1.23)	2.25	219(1.15)	2.54	67(1.21)	3.14	69(1.24)	2.31	120(1.15)	2.21	103(1.16)	2.49	63(1.21)	2.41	197(1.22)	2.56	158(1.23)	2.51	265(1.23)	2.39	90(1.23)
Health benefits for family	2.35	289(1.20)	2.20	182(1.11)	2.41	56(1.23)	2.80	51(1.32)	2.29	103(1.11)	2.13	84(1.11)	2.37	51(1.24)	2.28	173(1.16)	2.46	116(1.23)	2.41	211(1.19)	2.19	78(1.18)
Retirement benefits	3.49	334(1.08)	3.34	207(1.10)	3.58	62(.99)	3.89	62(.97)	3.31	112(1.13)	3.38	99(1.06)	3.57	61(1.02)	3.49	189(1.07)	3.48	145(1.10)	3.56	249(1.09)	3.28	85(1.01)
Phased retirement options	2.96	156(1.01)	2.83	113(1.02)	3.13	23(.81)	3.45	20(.94)	2.85	68(1.04)	2.83	46(1.01)	3.09	22(.81)	2.93	94(.98)	3.00	62(1.04)	3.03	113(.95)	2.77	43(1.10)
Related:																						
Salary	2.80	106(1.13)	2.70	61(1.13)	2.19	26(1.02)	2.68	19(1.25)	3.07	121(1.25)	2.53	104(1.23)	2.97	63(1.20)	2.81	198(1.22)	2.78	160(1.31)	2.86	268(1.26)	2.61	90(1.25)

Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring

Detailed Results by Question																						
	UNLV Overall		Tenured Faculty		Pre-Tenured Faculty		Non-Tenure-Track Faculty		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Men Faculty		Women Faculty		White Faculty		Faculty of Color	
	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)
Interdisciplinary Work	2.38	325(0.98)	2.32	210(98)	2.29	64(88)	2.72	51(1.05)	2.47	115(1.04)	2.11	99(88)	2.33	60(84)	2.45	187(1.01)	2.26	138(92)	2.48	241(98)	2.08	84(91)
Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.27	279(1.12)	2.18	188(1.08)	2.27	52(1.08)	2.67	29(1.22)	2.25	103(1.07)	2.07	89(1.09)	2.33	48(1.09)	2.29	163(1.12)	2.22	116(1.10)	2.34	205(1.11)	2.05	74(1.10)
Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	2.40	302(1.10)	2.32	201(1.08)	2.34	59(1.09)	2.88	42(1.06)	2.41	109(1.14)	2.21	96(1.03)	2.35	55(1.05)	2.45	174(1.17)	2.34	128(99)	2.41	223(1.06)	2.37	79(1.20)
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.12	251(1.17)	2.13	182(1.17)	2.02	42(1.13)	2.26	27(1.19)	2.25	95(1.24)	1.99	91(1.09)	2.03	38(1.12)	2.27	152(1.21)	1.90	99(1.06)	2.28	178(1.18)	1.75	73(1.05)
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion	2.39	206(1.21)	2.35	181(1.18)	n/a	n/a	2.64	25(1.38)	2.46	97(1.25)	2.23	84(1.07)	n/a	n/a	2.55	129(1.19)	2.12	77(1.18)	2.55	155(1.21)	1.90	51(1.06)
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure	2.13	38(1.12)	n/a	n/a	2.13	38(1.18)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.13	38(1.11)	n/a	n/a	2.33	21(1.06)	1.88	17(1.16)	2.45	20(1.19)	1.78	18(94)
Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.47	278(1.33)	2.43	194(1.34)	2.38	55(1.19)	2.86	29(1.48)	2.68	106(1.40)	2.10	91(1.23)	2.46	52(1.14)	2.62	166(1.31)	2.24	112(1.34)	2.61	202(1.37)	2.08	76(1.12)
Related:																						
Interdiscip. Work is rewarded in reappointment	2.57	21(1.25)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.57	21(1.25)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.70	10(1.41)	2.45	11(1.12)	2.82	17(1.18)	1.50	n<5
Collaboration	3.39	353(93)	3.35	222(93)	3.36	65(92)	3.57	66(90)	3.45	122(96)	3.20	104(92)	3.42	61(88)	3.46	198(93)	3.31	155(92)	3.51	266(87)	3.04	87(1.01)
Opportunities for collab. within dept	3.44	350(1.25)	3.40	220(1.25)	3.26	65(1.21)	3.75	65(1.21)	3.44	121(1.27)	3.32	103(1.23)	3.31	61(1.21)	3.50	197(1.19)	3.36	153(1.31)	3.63	263(1.17)	2.86	87(1.29)
Opportunities for collab. outside inst	3.55	334(1.12)	3.51	218(1.14)	3.69	64(1.05)	3.52	52(1.09)	3.67	120(1.19)	3.31	102(1.09)	3.73	60(1.00)	3.61	189(1.12)	3.46	145(1.11)	3.62	247(1.07)	3.34	87(1.22)
Opportunities for collab. outside dept	3.18	345(1.12)	3.14	220(1.11)	3.16	64(1.14)	3.36	61(1.14)	3.24	120(1.10)	2.97	104(1.13)	3.23	60(1.09)	3.25	193(1.11)	3.09	152(1.13)	3.26	258(1.06)	2.94	87(1.24)
Mentoring	2.85	343(1.08)	2.73	221(1.00)	3.16	66(1.05)	2.98	56(1.31)	2.87	121(1.03)	2.61	104(96)	3.13	62(1.07)	2.93	193(1.01)	2.75	150(1.16)	2.90	255(1.09)	2.73	88(1.05)
Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	3.47	284(1.31)	3.36	183(1.30)	3.48	61(1.33)	4.00	40(1.19)	3.32	99(1.34)	3.44	88(1.25)	3.40	57(1.34)	3.43	164(1.26)	3.53	120(1.37)	3.43	211(1.29)	3.59	73(1.36)
Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept.	3.45	231(1.16)	3.43	145(1.11)	3.31	59(1.24)	3.85	27(1.13)	3.38	81(1.16)	3.47	68(1.07)	3.31	55(1.24)	3.49	135(1.05)	3.39	96(1.29)	3.42	161(1.12)	3.50	70(1.23)
Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept	2.87	278(1.43)	2.89	212(1.42)	2.82	66(1.46)	n/a	n/a	3.12	113(1.39)	2.65	103(1.44)	2.77	62(1.44)	3.04	166(1.40)	2.63	112(1.45)	3.02	201(1.41)	2.47	77(1.40)
Mentoring of tenured associate profs in dept	2.33	205(1.27)	2.33	205(1.26)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.61	109(1.31)	2.00	96(1.13)	n/a	n/a	2.46	132(1.21)	2.08	73(1.33)	2.48	155(1.30)	1.86	50(1.03)
Support for faculty to be good mentors	2.19	256(1.11)	2.21	209(1.10)	n/a	n/a	2.11	47(1.14)	2.43	115(1.21)	1.94	94(89)	n/a	n/a	2.38	153(1.09)	1.90	103(1.08)	2.27	196(1.14)	1.93	60(95)
Related:																						
Being a mentor is fulfilling	4.04	183(0.93)	4.01	163(94)	n/a	n/a	4.25	20(85)	4.05	95(97)	3.96	68(90)	n/a	n/a	4.14	102(82)	3.91	81(1.05)	3.97	146(93)	4.30	37(87)
Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst.	3.98	264(1.04)	3.98	164(1.00)	3.94	62(1.19)	4.05	38(95)	4.03	91(90)	3.92	77(1.12)	3.91	58(1.20)	3.92	149(1.04)	4.05	115(1.04)	4.03	192(95)	3.83	72(1.24)
Mentoring of NTT faculty in dept	2.49	61(1.47)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.49	61(1.46)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.45	22(1.29)	2.51	39(1.57)	2.42	53(1.43)	3.00	8(1.69)

Tenure & Promotion

Detailed Results by Question																						
	UNLV Overall		Tenured Faculty		Pre-Tenured Faculty		Non-Tenure-Track Faculty		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Men Faculty		Women Faculty		White Faculty		Faculty of Color	
	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)
Tenure Policies	3.17	60(1.23)	n/a	n/a	3.17	60(1.23)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.17	60(1.23)	3.37	30(1.21)	2.97	30(1.23)	3.41	36(1.04)	2.80	24(1.41)
Clarity of tenure process	3.24	59(1.45)	n/a	n/a	3.24	59(1.45)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.24	59(1.45)	3.47	30(1.43)	3.00	29(1.46)	3.56	36(1.27)	2.74	23(1.60)
Clarity of tenure criteria	3.32	60(1.5)	n/a	n/a	3.32	60(1.50)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.32	60(1.50)	3.57	30(1.50)	3.07	30(1.48)	3.58	36(1.40)	2.92	24(1.58)
Clarity of tenure standards	2.93	60(1.35)	n/a	n/a	2.93	60(1.35)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.93	60(1.35)	3.20	30(1.32)	2.67	30(1.34)	3.14	36(1.24)	2.63	24(1.46)
Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure	3.08	60(1.33)	n/a	n/a	3.08	60(1.33)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.08	60(1.33)	3.33	30(1.37)	2.83	30(1.26)	3.28	36(1.21)	2.79	24(1.47)
Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure	3.30	60(1.36)	n/a	n/a	3.30	60(1.35)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.30	60(1.35)	3.43	30(1.43)	3.17	30(1.28)	3.56	36(1.20)	2.92	24(1.50)
Consistency of messages about tenure	3.05	59(1.48)	n/a	n/a	3.05	59(1.47)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.05	59(1.47)	3.30	30(1.41)	2.79	29(1.52)	3.14	35(1.35)	2.92	24(1.66)
Tenure decisions are performance-based	3.26	58(1.46)	n/a	n/a	3.26	58(1.45)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.26	58(1.45)	3.33	30(1.44)	3.18	28(1.49)	3.68	34(1.31)	2.67	24(1.46)
Tenure Clarity	3.24	59(1.20)	n/a	n/a	3.24	59(1.20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.24	59(1.20)	3.43	30(0.93)	3.04	29(1.41)	3.40	35(0.99)	3.00	24(1.43)
Clarity of expectations: Scholar	3.59	59(1.42)	n/a	n/a	3.59	59(1.41)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.59	59(1.41)	3.93	30(1.28)	3.24	29(1.48)	3.66	35(1.28)	3.50	24(1.61)
Clarity of expectations: Teacher	3.48	58(1.37)	n/a	n/a	3.48	58(1.36)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.48	58(1.36)	3.73	30(1.17)	3.21	28(1.52)	3.83	35(1.01)	2.96	23(1.66)
Clarity of expectations: Advisor	3.12	58(1.36)	n/a	n/a	3.12	58(1.33)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.12	58(1.33)	3.27	30(1.11)	2.96	28(1.59)	3.37	35(1.30)	2.74	23(1.38)
Clarity of expectations: Colleague	3.29	58(1.34)	n/a	n/a	3.29	58(1.33)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.29	58(1.33)	3.53	30(1.19)	3.04	28(1.45)	3.57	35(1.17)	2.87	23(1.48)
Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen	2.95	58(1.25)	n/a	n/a	2.95	58(1.24)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.95	58(1.24)	3.13	30(0.97)	2.75	28(1.48)	3.09	35(1.14)	2.74	23(1.38)
Clarity of expectations: Broader community	2.86	58(1.26)	n/a	n/a	2.86	58(1.26)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.86	58(1.26)	3.03	30(1.03)	2.68	28(1.46)	2.94	35(1.13)	2.74	23(1.45)
Promotion to Full	3.33	220(1.19)	3.33	220(1.19)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.66	122(1.15)	2.92	98(1.10)	n/a	n/a	3.44	141(1.14)	3.13	79(1.24)	3.42	166(1.17)	3.04	54(1.20)
Dept culture encourages promotion	3.19	216(1.43)	3.19	216(1.42)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.61	119(1.36)	2.66	97(1.33)	n/a	n/a	3.41	139(1.32)	2.78	77(1.52)	3.35	164(1.40)	2.67	52(1.39)
Reasonable expectations: Promotion	3.45	209(1.34)	3.45	209(1.34)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.79	119(1.24)	3.01	90(1.34)	n/a	n/a	3.50	133(1.35)	3.38	76(1.32)	3.61	158(1.28)	2.98	51(1.42)
Clarity of promotion process	3.43	220(1.44)	3.43	220(1.44)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.72	122(1.37)	3.07	98(1.44)	n/a	n/a	3.53	141(1.33)	3.25	79(1.59)	3.51	166(1.40)	3.19	54(1.53)
Clarity of promotion criteria	3.33	220(1.43)	3.33	220(1.43)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.62	122(1.35)	2.96	98(1.45)	n/a	n/a	3.45	141(1.36)	3.10	76(1.52)	3.43	166(1.40)	3.02	54(1.48)
Clarity of promotion standards	3.18	220(1.44)	3.18	220(1.44)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.51	122(1.36)	2.77	98(1.43)	n/a	n/a	3.34	141(1.38)	2.89	79(1.51)	3.24	166(1.41)	2.98	54(1.51)
Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	3.38	220(1.36)	3.38	220(1.36)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.68	122(1.28)	3.01	98(1.36)	n/a	n/a	3.47	141(1.29)	3.23	79(1.47)	3.51	166(1.30)	3.00	54(1.46)
Clarity of time frame for promotion	3.37	220(1.40)	3.37	220(1.39)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.73	122(1.29)	2.93	98(1.40)	n/a	n/a	3.47	141(1.33)	3.20	79(1.49)	3.39	166(1.39)	3.33	54(1.41)
Clarity of whether I will be promoted	3.09	96(1.35)	3.09	96(1.34)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.00	n<5	3.05	94(1.33)	n/a	n/a	3.27	55(1.29)	2.85	41(1.38)	3.19	69(1.30)	2.85	27(1.43)

Leadership

Detailed Results by Question

	UNLV Overall		Tenured Faculty		Pre-Tenured Faculty		Non-Tenure-Track Faculty		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Men Faculty		Women Faculty		White Faculty		Faculty of Color	
	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)
Senior Leadership	3.08	344(98)	3.01	217(99)	3.02	63(104)	3.38	64(82)	3.03	122(102)	2.97	99(97)	3.07	59(104)	3.11	195(101)	3.05	149(94)	3.18	258(93)	2.80	86(106)
Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.15	319(106)	3.10	201(106)	3.12	60(112)	3.33	58(96)	3.09	114(106)	3.10	91(108)	3.16	56(109)	3.19	181(105)	3.09	138(105)	3.25	238(98)	2.84	61(118)
Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.27	331(110)	3.22	209(111)	3.10	61(119)	3.59	61(86)	3.29	117(106)	3.11	96(117)	3.14	57(118)	3.25	189(110)	3.29	142(108)	3.40	248(106)	2.89	83(106)
Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.19	336(116)	3.09	213(118)	3.10	62(116)	3.62	61(95)	3.09	120(119)	3.06	97(118)	3.14	58(117)	3.22	193(117)	3.15	143(114)	3.29	252(112)	2.88	84(122)
CAO: Pace of decision making	2.93	320(116)	2.86	204(119)	2.91	58(109)	3.22	58(109)	2.87	114(119)	2.84	94(119)	2.93	54(109)	2.98	179(119)	2.88	141(113)	3.00	238(114)	2.76	82(121)
CAO: Stated priorities	3.01	325(119)	2.92	207(122)	3.05	58(117)	3.25	60(103)	2.94	115(123)	2.88	96(122)	3.11	54(116)	3.05	183(120)	2.95	142(116)	3.12	242(116)	2.66	83(120)
CAO: Communication of priorities	2.94	324(121)	2.83	206(122)	2.92	59(119)	3.34	59(112)	2.79	114(123)	2.88	96(121)	2.95	55(120)	2.95	182(121)	2.93	142(121)	3.04	240(119)	2.67	84(123)
Related:																						
Priorities are stated consistently	2.78	338(130)	2.64	213(128)	2.72	60(127)	3.29	65(127)	2.72	116(124)	2.57	101(132)	2.70	56(129)	2.81	191(126)	2.75	147(134)	2.82	253(131)	2.66	85(126)
Priorities are acted on consistently	2.44	330(124)	2.29	214(118)	2.50	56(122)	2.92	60(135)	2.47	116(120)	2.08	102(113)	2.52	52(122)	2.47	188(121)	2.39	142(128)	2.45	245(125)	2.39	85(121)
Changed priorities negatively affect my work	2.77	324(134)	2.60	215(132)	3.05	55(131)	3.15	54(136)	2.85	117(134)	2.37	102(125)	3.00	51(132)	2.72	190(133)	2.84	134(135)	2.76	242(134)	2.79	82(134)
Visible leadership for support of diversity	3.47	335(141)	3.49	215(142)	3.02	58(144)	3.84	62(123)	3.62	117(141)	3.26	102(145)	3.13	54(141)	3.68	188(132)	3.21	147(148)	3.73	249(130)	2.74	86(145)
Division Leadership	2.95	347(131)	2.76	218(132)	2.99	64(119)	3.54	65(123)	2.90	119(135)	2.60	103(126)	3.00	60(119)	2.99	198(130)	2.88	149(132)	3.04	260(130)	2.67	87(130)
Dean: Pace of decision making	2.97	343(137)	2.82	217(140)	2.95	63(125)	3.54	63(122)	2.95	119(143)	2.65	102(136)	2.98	59(122)	3.00	197(139)	2.94	146(134)	3.06	257(134)	2.72	86(142)
Dean: Stated priorities	3.00	345(139)	2.79	217(141)	3.16	64(125)	3.56	64(128)	2.95	119(143)	2.65	102(136)	3.12	60(126)	3.02	198(139)	2.99	147(138)	3.10	258(137)	2.70	87(140)
Dean: Communication of priorities	2.94	346(140)	2.71	218(140)	3.03	64(128)	3.61	64(130)	2.86	119(144)	2.57	103(136)	3.00	60(126)	2.99	197(140)	2.86	149(140)	3.03	260(140)	2.66	86(138)
Dean: Ensuring faculty input	2.90	346(145)	2.73	218(142)	2.84	64(141)	3.56	64(137)	2.87	119(142)	2.54	103(142)	2.88	60(139)	2.98	198(143)	2.80	148(146)	3.00	259(144)	2.62	87(142)
Departmental Leadership	3.51	303(135)	3.38	183(137)	3.64	60(136)	3.80	60(123)	3.47	96(130)	3.27	89(146)	3.70	58(132)	3.58	173(131)	3.42	130(139)	3.57	223(130)	3.33	80(147)
Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.48	299(140)	3.35	179(142)	3.62	60(137)	3.77	60(129)	3.43	94(134)	3.25	87(152)	3.64	58(134)	3.59	171(134)	3.34	128(146)	3.54	220(136)	3.37	79(148)
Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.38	300(141)	3.19	180(142)	3.57	60(139)	3.73	60(128)	3.25	93(135)	3.13	89(151)	3.59	58(136)	3.45	172(135)	3.27	128(147)	3.42	220(139)	3.26	80(145)
Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.40	301(145)	3.23	181(146)	3.58	60(141)	3.72	60(139)	3.31	94(135)	3.13	89(159)	3.60	58(138)	3.46	173(140)	3.30	128(151)	3.45	221(141)	3.24	80(156)
Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.52	301(151)	3.39	181(153)	3.67	60(145)	3.77	60(144)	3.50	94(146)	3.26	89(162)	3.69	58(142)	3.57	173(148)	3.45	128(153)	3.60	221(147)	3.30	80(159)
Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.83	298(141)	3.77	180(142)	3.77	60(142)	4.07	58(150)	3.89	95(133)	3.60	87(155)	3.81	58(144)	3.88	169(140)	3.75	129(140)	3.93	220(133)	3.54	78(156)
Faculty Leadership	2.95	327(99)	2.82	214(103)	3.12	58(88)	3.28	55(88)	2.67	116(102)	3.01	102(100)	3.11	54(90)	2.95	191(100)	2.95	136(99)	2.99	242(98)	2.83	85(104)
Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making	2.88	321(104)	2.74	209(108)	3.14	57(85)	3.18	55(96)	2.59	114(108)	2.93	99(105)	3.13	53(85)	2.89	188(106)	2.87	133(101)	2.92	238(104)	2.80	83(105)
Faculty leaders: Stated priorities	2.97	317(108)	2.82	206(112)	3.13	56(101)	3.38	55(89)	2.68	112(113)	3.00	98(108)	3.10	52(101)	2.96	186(110)	2.98	131(105)	3.00	234(108)	2.89	83(109)
Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities	2.93	324(111)	2.81	212(112)	3.03	58(104)	3.30	54(105)	2.65	115(112)	3.03	101(110)	2.98	54(103)	2.93	190(109)	2.93	134(114)	2.96	239(109)	2.85	85(116)
Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input	3.03	323(111)	2.90	211(115)	3.26	58(94)	3.28	54(105)	2.79	115(115)	3.02	100(112)	3.30	54(94)	3.06	190(110)	2.98	133(112)	3.09	238(108)	2.85	85(118)

Governance

Detailed Results by Question																						
	UNLV Overall		Tenured Faculty		Pre-Tenured Faculty		Non-Tenure-Track Faculty		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Men Faculty		Women Faculty		White Faculty		Faculty of Color	
	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)
Governance Trust	2.82	330(94)	2.78	215(91)	2.64	56(100)	3.10	59(95)	2.84	119(92)	2.68	100(90)	2.72	52(100)	2.91	189(93)	2.69	141(95)	2.89	248(91)	2.60	82(100)
I understand how to voice opinions about policies	2.87	326(1.25)	2.91	213(1.25)	2.54	54(1.23)	3.00	59(1.20)	3.01	117(1.27)	2.75	100(1.25)	2.60	50(1.21)	2.99	188(1.24)	2.70	138(1.24)	2.95	244(1.23)	2.62	82(1.27)
Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	2.77	325(1.16)	2.68	213(1.15)	2.72	54(1.10)	3.16	58(1.15)	2.79	117(1.19)	2.53	100(1.09)	2.76	50(1.09)	2.88	187(1.12)	2.62	138(1.19)	2.77	243(1.16)	2.76	82(1.13)
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement	2.94	219(1.12)	2.83	155(1.07)	2.79	34(1.25)	3.67	30(1.25)	2.94	88(1.06)	2.64	69(1.09)	2.91	32(1.20)	3.05	131(1.12)	2.77	88(1.09)	3.13	160(1.00)	2.42	59(1.24)
Faculty and admin have an open system of communication	2.82	256(1.13)	2.71	176(1.10)	2.76	38(1.19)	3.31	42(1.11)	2.71	96(1.09)	2.64	83(1.12)	2.94	35(1.16)	2.86	152(1.16)	2.76	104(1.09)	2.91	191(1.07)	2.55	65(1.27)
Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	2.85	259(1.06)	2.77	182(1.05)	2.81	36(1.11)	2.82	41(1.06)	2.83	102(1.07)	2.71	82(1.02)	2.76	34(1.13)	2.88	154(1.04)	2.79	105(1.07)	2.97	194(1.00)	2.48	65(1.14)
Governance Shared Sense of Purpose	2.84	304(97)	2.76	207(91)	2.80	47(108)	3.23	50(103)	2.82	113(94)	2.66	98(86)	2.88	43(110)	2.89	179(98)	2.78	125(96)	2.94	228(92)	2.55	76(107)
Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.56	249(1.08)	2.52	177(1.02)	2.47	36(1.15)	2.86	36(1.19)	2.60	101(1.06)	2.38	81(1.08)	2.55	31(1.15)	2.61	150(1.06)	2.49	99(1.10)	2.62	192(1.06)	2.37	57(1.11)
Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input	2.83	276(1.10)	2.75	193(1.05)	2.87	46(1.22)	3.24	37(1.11)	2.81	106(1.11)	2.64	91(1.09)	2.95	42(1.20)	2.87	166(1.15)	2.77	110(1.02)	2.91	206(1.02)	2.61	70(1.27)
Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	2.87	239(1.05)	2.75	168(1.01)	2.89	35(1.15)	3.39	36(1.06)	2.81	91(1.08)	2.68	81(1.03)	2.90	31(1.19)	2.92	146(1.04)	2.78	93(1.05)	2.94	177(1.08)	2.65	62(1.18)
Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.04	263(1.17)	2.71	176(1.10)	2.76	38(1.19)	3.31	42(1.11)	3.00	101(1.14)	2.92	84(1.16)	3.03	36(1.20)	3.09	162(1.18)	2.96	101(1.13)	3.21	199(1.08)	2.52	64(1.26)
Governance Understanding the issue at hand	2.76	328(95)	2.68	214(92)	2.73	57(104)	3.07	57(93)	2.73	117(93)	2.60	101(91)	2.78	53(103)	2.79	187(95)	2.71	141(95)	2.82	246(91)	2.55	82(103)
Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	2.79	320(1.23)	2.73	210(1.25)	2.72	54(1.15)	3.07	56(1.17)	2.83	114(1.22)	2.60	100(1.29)	2.74	50(1.12)	2.86	185(1.22)	2.68	135(1.23)	2.84	238(1.21)	2.65	82(1.27)
Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	2.73	285(1.13)	2.65	197(1.05)	2.68	44(1.30)	3.09	44(1.19)	2.66	108(1.07)	2.66	93(1.06)	2.68	40(1.26)	2.76	168(1.09)	2.68	117(1.17)	2.79	217(1.08)	2.51	68(1.24)
Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions	2.60	239(1.04)	2.75	168(1.01)	2.89	35(1.15)	3.39	36(1.06)	2.81	91(1.08)	2.68	81(1.03)	2.90	31(1.19)	2.92	146(1.04)	2.78	93(1.05)	2.94	177(1.08)	2.65	62(1.18)
Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	2.81	263(1.16)	2.97	181(1.15)	2.98	40(1.18)	3.38	42(1.14)	3.00	101(1.14)	2.92	84(1.16)	3.03	36(1.20)	3.09	162(1.18)	2.96	101(1.13)	3.21	199(1.08)	2.52	64(1.26)
Governance Adaptability	2.63	326(95)	2.56	214(94)	2.66	57(99)	2.89	55(95)	2.63	117(96)	2.47	101(91)	2.71	53(101)	2.69	187(92)	2.55	139(100)	2.67	244(96)	2.52	82(95)
Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	2.63	307(1.13)	2.60	201(1.18)	2.54	54(1.04)	2.85	52(1.12)	2.71	113(1.17)	2.45	92(1.15)	2.56	50(1.07)	2.69	176(1.13)	2.55	131(1.13)	2.65	233(1.15)	2.55	74(1.08)
Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.45	308(1.08)	2.35	205(1.08)	2.46	50(1.01)	2.85	53(1.08)	2.50	112(1.09)	2.15	97(1.03)	2.52	46(1.02)	2.57	180(1.05)	2.29	128(1.10)	2.46	229(1.09)	2.44	79(1.05)
Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	2.77	277(1.09)	2.71	192(1.05)	2.82	44(1.18)	2.98	41(1.15)	2.71	104(1.07)	2.70	92(1.02)	2.85	40(1.21)	2.78	162(1.05)	2.74	115(1.14)	2.89	215(1.03)	2.34	62(1.18)
Governance Productivity	2.86	310(99)	2.78	212(95)	2.83	49(108)	3.23	49(103)	2.89	118(91)	2.60	98(99)	2.95	45(104)	2.93	183(95)	2.75	127(104)	2.91	233(95)	2.71	77(111)
Overall effectiveness of shared governance	2.75	294(1.27)	2.62	202(1.26)	2.84	45(1.29)	3.21	47(1.16)	2.72	113(1.25)	2.49	93(1.28)	2.90	41(1.26)	2.79	174(1.28)	2.69	120(1.24)	2.79	219(1.24)	2.63	75(1.32)
My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.16	224(1.03)	3.13	173(98)	3.00	28(1.15)	3.61	23(1.15)	3.18	97(99)	3.00	77(1.02)	3.19	27(1.03)	3.25	138(94)	3.01	86(1.15)	3.24	176(1.00)	2.88	48(1.08)
Public recognition of progress	2.65	251(1.09)	2.57	176(1.02)	2.53	38(1.22)	3.14	37(1.13)	2.68	98(1.04)	2.37	82(1.01)	2.68	34(1.19)	2.68	151(1.04)	2.59	100(1.15)	2.73	195(1.06)	2.36	56(1.13)

Department Collegiality, Engagement, and Quality

Detailed Results by Question																						
	UNLV Overall		Tenured Faculty		Pre-Tenured Faculty		Non-Tenure-Track Faculty		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Men Faculty		Women Faculty		White Faculty		Faculty of Color	
	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)
Departmental Collegiality	3.60	343(91)	3.55	219(93)	3.59	59(84)	3.80	65(87)	3.64	119(93)	3.45	104(90)	3.60	55(87)	3.64	192(86)	3.56	151(96)	3.73	257(85)	3.22	86(97)
Colleagues support work/life balance	3.51	288(126)	3.42	189(124)	3.34	50(133)	4.00	49(117)	3.47	102(117)	3.38	91(131)	3.30	46(134)	3.64	165(119)	3.33	123(133)	3.67	216(120)	3.01	72(131)
Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.07	329(113)	3.97	213(118)	4.16	57(97)	4.34	59(104)	4.05	115(116)	3.87	102(119)	4.19	53(100)	4.09	186(114)	4.05	143(112)	4.17	247(105)	3.76	82(130)
Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.69	312(0.96)	3.63	208(94)	4.03	59(89)	3.56	45(103)	3.61	114(93)	3.60	98(98)	4.13	55(79)	3.65	185(96)	3.76	127(95)	3.77	232(92)	3.48	80(103)
How well you fit	3.49	339(131)	3.44	218(131)	3.61	59(121)	3.56	62(138)	3.45	119(138)	3.42	103(124)	3.62	55(122)	3.52	191(128)	3.45	148(135)	3.58	254(129)	3.21	85(133)
Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.52	324(110)	3.56	213(105)	3.56	59(111)	3.33	52(123)	3.67	117(104)	3.42	100(107)	3.58	55(110)	3.47	186(111)	3.59	138(107)	3.65	241(102)	3.14	83(122)
Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.39	335(131)	3.36	213(129)	3.20	59(129)	3.70	63(134)	3.50	117(127)	3.22	100(129)	3.15	55(132)	3.42	189(125)	3.36	146(137)	3.50	252(127)	3.08	83(136)
Department is collegial	3.62	336(143)	3.57	215(144)	3.45	58(134)	3.94	63(140)	3.70	119(141)	3.41	100(147)	3.46	54(134)	3.64	190(137)	3.59	146(149)	3.76	253(139)	3.19	83(145)
Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.67	335(136)	3.65	212(139)	3.36	59(141)	4.03	64(114)	3.82	114(133)	3.42	102(144)	3.40	55(140)	3.83	186(126)	3.47	149(145)	3.88	251(125)	3.04	84(149)
Department Engagement	3.37	344(88)	2.82	219(89)	3.12	60(88)	3.41	65(85)	3.39	119(89)	3.26	104(89)	3.48	56(88)	3.42	192(80)	3.30	152(97)	3.47	258(84)	3.07	86(93)
Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.56	339(119)	3.41	214(118)	3.80	60(113)	3.85	65(117)	3.33	115(116)	3.46	103(121)	3.91	56(108)	3.63	188(112)	3.48	151(126)	3.67	255(114)	3.24	84(125)
Discussions of grad student learning	3.50	331(127)	3.62	212(122)	3.43	60(124)	3.10	59(138)	3.71	117(117)	3.49	99(128)	3.46	56(123)	3.62	184(115)	3.34	147(138)	3.57	247(124)	3.26	84(131)
Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.23	342(122)	3.08	217(116)	3.30	60(118)	3.66	65(133)	3.08	118(116)	3.07	103(116)	3.34	56(118)	3.24	191(112)	3.22	151(133)	3.32	257(118)	2.95	85(128)
Discussions of effective use of technology	3.01	341(113)	2.98	216(111)	2.85	60(114)	3.26	65(117)	3.09	117(111)	2.80	103(109)	2.96	56(115)	3.03	190(105)	2.99	151(123)	3.11	257(111)	2.73	84(115)
Discussions of current research methods	3.06	339(121)	3.17	214(121)	2.92	60(129)	2.82	65(108)	3.27	117(122)	3.05	101(118)	2.89	56(130)	3.16	188(112)	2.93	151(130)	3.16	255(118)	2.75	84(125)
Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.74	316(0.99)	3.66	210(98)	4.08	59(98)	3.70	47(95)	3.66	115(103)	3.64	99(95)	4.15	55(93)	3.73	188(98)	3.76	128(100)	3.82	235(96)	3.53	81(103)
Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured	3.54	328(113)	3.59	217(107)	3.51	59(123)	3.37	52(122)	3.71	118(107)	3.38	103(110)	3.62	55(116)	3.58	190(109)	3.47	138(117)	3.70	244(106)	3.06	84(119)
Department Quality	3.39	341(90)	3.35	217(90)	3.35	60(85)	3.59	64(93)	3.40	118(95)	3.29	103(84)	3.37	56(85)	3.37	191(89)	3.43	150(91)	3.51	257(89)	3.05	84(84)
Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.29	322(124)	3.29	215(123)	3.08	60(123)	3.51	47(126)	3.42	118(123)	3.14	101(123)	3.09	56(122)	3.29	187(116)	3.30	135(134)	3.47	241(120)	2.74	81(120)
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	3.94	312(102)	3.84	208(103)	4.22	60(90)	4.00	44(105)	3.84	114(108)	3.86	98(98)	4.21	56(86)	3.90	185(101)	3.98	127(102)	4.03	232(99)	3.66	80(105)
Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.22	316(126)	3.25	212(123)	2.85	60(127)	3.57	44(122)	3.30	115(126)	3.18	101(122)	2.86	56(127)	3.13	186(120)	3.34	130(132)	3.42	236(118)	2.61	80(128)
Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	3.89	303(101)	3.82	203(101)	4.02	60(96)	4.05	40(101)	3.69	110(109)	3.97	97(89)	4.04	56(95)	3.82	182(103)	3.99	121(95)	3.98	226(98)	3.62	77(103)
Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.41	303(114)	3.49	206(110)	3.12	52(127)	3.40	45(107)	3.55	110(108)	3.42	99(113)	3.08	49(127)	3.40	172(114)	3.43	131(112)	3.52	228(111)	3.08	75(113)
Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.81	288(0.94)	3.78	195(95)	4.00	54(84)	3.67	39(98)	3.79	106(99)	3.80	93(90)	3.98	50(84)	3.79	170(95)	3.84	118(91)	3.88	216(94)	3.60	72(89)
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment	3.43	272(131)	3.35	212(135)	n/a	n/a	3.68	60(115)	3.44	117(136)	3.24	95(133)	n/a	n/a	3.34	157(135)	3.54	115(125)	3.54	214(131)	3.00	58(124)
Dept. is successful at faculty retention	3.18	271(128)	3.09	210(129)	n/a	n/a	3.51	61(119)	3.31	115(131)	2.81	95(122)	n/a	n/a	3.10	154(129)	3.28	117(125)	3.27	213(126)	2.84	58(129)
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.30	277(128)	2.37	195(133)	2.00	46(107)	2.25	36(225)	2.50	107(135)	2.18	92(127)	2.07	42(113)	2.42	163(131)	2.12	114(122)	2.39	207(132)	2.03	70(114)
Related:																						
Intellectual vitality of NTT faculty	3.50	290(110)	3.34	183(111)	3.40	48(112)	4.08	59(79)	3.38	97(112)	3.30	89(115)	3.38	45(105)	3.35	164(111)	3.69	126(104)	3.61	221(106)	3.16	69(114)
Scholarly productivity of NTT faculty	3.36	247(111)	3.28	159(111)	3.24	41(104)	3.74	47(107)	3.28	88(109)	3.29	75(117)	3.22	37(97)	3.24	145(112)	3.54	102(106)	3.47	182(109)	3.06	65(110)
Teaching effectiveness of NTT faculty	3.67	288(111)	3.52	184(115)	3.60	47(101)	4.21	57(86)	3.53	94(114)	3.52	92(116)	3.56	45(101)	3.57	158(114)	3.78	130(105)	3.77	217(112)	3.34	71(99)
Amount of professional interaction w/NTT	3.55	314(0.98)	3.44	200(97)	3.62	53(98)	3.87	61(97)	3.46	106(100)	3.39	98(93)	3.69	49(96)	3.45	177(96)	3.69	137(99)	3.68	236(91)	3.17	78(108)
Amount of personal interaction w/NTT	3.49	311(0.94)	3.39	196(92)	3.51	53(91)	3.79	62(97)	3.41	103(96)	3.34	97(88)	3.57	49(89)	3.41	175(90)	3.60	136(98)	3.60	234(89)	3.14	77(99)

Appreciation and Recognition

Detailed Results by Question																						
	UNLV Overall		Tenured Faculty		Pre-Tenured Faculty		Non-Tenure-Track Faculty		Full Professors		Associate Professors		Assistant Professors		Men Faculty		Women Faculty		White Faculty		Faculty of Color	
	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)	Mean	n(s.d.)
Appreciation and Recognition	3.12	342(96)	3.04	219(92)	3.17	59(98)	3.37	64(105)	3.18	119(99)	2.88	104(82)	3.21	55(99)	3.14	192(96)	3.10	150(98)	3.22	256(96)	2.82	86(92)
Recognition: For teaching	3.17	338(1.27)	3.11	217(1.23)	3.07	59(1.35)	3.48	62(1.27)	3.26	117(1.28)	2.94	104(1.18)	3.05	55(1.33)	3.20	189(1.20)	3.14	149(1.35)	3.29	254(1.25)	2.81	84(1.25)
Recognition: For advising	2.94	301(1.18)	2.90	200(1.15)	3.02	57(1.18)	3.00	44(1.27)	3.05	109(1.22)	2.71	95(1.05)	3.08	53(1.17)	2.94	170(1.14)	2.93	131(1.22)	3.02	220(1.16)	2.70	81(1.17)
Recognition: For scholarship	3.21	318(1.26)	3.20	216(1.28)	3.24	59(1.30)	3.19	43(1.09)	3.32	118(1.37)	3.06	102(1.16)	3.25	55(1.28)	3.28	184(1.26)	3.11	134(1.25)	3.38	234(1.21)	2.74	84(1.26)
Recognition: For service	2.97	329(1.25)	2.88	215(1.27)	3.02	59(1.13)	3.27	55(1.23)	3.13	118(1.28)	2.61	101(1.22)	2.98	55(1.09)	2.99	186(1.25)	2.94	143(1.25)	3.05	247(1.24)	2.72	82(1.24)
Recognition: For outreach	2.95	263(1.23)	2.88	177(1.20)	2.89	47(1.18)	3.31	39(1.36)	3.12	98(1.27)	2.60	84(1.07)	2.90	42(1.14)	3.01	153(1.21)	2.86	110(1.25)	3.06	186(1.22)	2.68	77(1.19)
Recognition: From colleagues	3.47	335(1.18)	3.40	214(1.19)	3.47	59(1.19)	3.69	62(1.09)	3.50	115(1.22)	3.34	103(1.16)	3.40	55(1.19)	3.44	189(1.15)	3.50	146(1.22)	3.59	253(1.13)	3.10	83(1.25)
Recognition: From CAO	2.79	201(1.30)	2.79	201(1.30)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.90	111(1.40)	2.66	90(1.15)	n/a	n/a	2.81	128(1.27)	2.75	73(1.35)	2.89	153(1.27)	2.48	48(1.35)
Recognition: From Dean	2.98	207(1.41)	2.98	207(1.41)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.15	113(1.45)	2.78	94(1.33)	n/a	n/a	3.05	133(1.36)	2.85	74(1.49)	3.09	158(1.41)	2.61	49(1.35)
Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.56	302(1.32)	3.48	183(1.35)	3.69	58(1.23)	3.70	61(1.28)	3.63	94(1.35)	3.32	93(1.32)	3.70	54(1.26)	3.66	168(1.30)	3.44	134(1.32)	3.68	222(1.28)	3.25	80(1.37)
School/college is valued by Pres/Provost	3.09	215(1.26)	3.09	215(1.25)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.18	117(1.29)	2.98	98(1.21)	n/a	n/a	3.01	137(1.24)	3.22	78(1.28)	3.06	163(1.22)	3.19	52(1.37)
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost	2.81	206(1.38)	2.81	206(1.37)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.93	113(1.42)	2.67	93(1.30)	n/a	n/a	2.77	131(1.40)	2.88	75(1.32)	2.78	157(1.34)	2.90	49(1.48)
CAO cares about faculty of my rank	2.85	257(1.33)	2.87	176(1.36)	2.58	36(1.18)	2.98	45(1.30)	2.97	102(1.43)	2.70	79(1.25)	2.65	31(1.19)	2.97	149(1.32)	2.69	108(1.33)	2.99	188(1.28)	2.46	69(1.39)

What's A Dean To Do

by Cathy Trower, COACHE Co-founder

Not long ago, after addressing a group of academic deans about the barriers to interdisciplinary scholarship and changes needed to overcome them, a dean asked, “But what’s a dean to do? We are seen as ‘middle meddlers!’” He elaborated by saying that it is difficult to manage or effect change from the decanal vantage point because of the organizational hierarchy and power structure; there’s a provost and president above him and senior, department chairs and tenured faculty in various departments around him.

Since that question was posed to me, I have met with several academic administrators and here is what I’ve learned about what deans can do to bring about improvements on any issue, whether it is promoting interdisciplinary scholarship and supporting such scholars for success, increasing the numbers, status, and success of women in STEM disciplines and of faculty of color, or creating a great place to work for faculty. I hope these suggestions will prove helpful for COACHE member institutions as they focus on the issues related to faculty recruitment, retention and development on their campuses as uncovered by our survey.

Focus attention.

Most issues have low salience for most people most of the time. In addition, there are always multiple concerns on college campuses and all too often the ‘crisis de jour’ can distract us from persistent, systemic problems. Deans can help focus the attention of faculty and other administrators by spending time, over time, on the issue upon which s/he wishes to influence.

Be accountable.

Gather data. Deans are in a prime position to call attention to issues or problems by bringing data to bear on them. Research shows that what gets measured gets done. In some cases, the data are quantitative and in others help will come in the form of stories and anecdotes. In any case, marshal the evidence to make the case.

Engage colleagues up, down, and across campus.

Build alliances with other deans by discussing areas of mutual concern, defining the problems, and thinking of possible solutions. Involve the faculty in those conversations. One administrator with whom I spoke recently said that he plans to form an Advisory Task Force of key senior faculty to figure out how to make progress recruiting and retaining scholars of color. Take

COACHE and Governance

by Richard Chait, COACHE Co-founder

Academic administrators regularly and rightly remind boards of trustees that the quality of a college or university and the vitality of the faculty are very tightly linked. In turn, most trustees recognize that the vitality of the faculty requires that institutions create an attractive and supportive work environment. In particular, colleges must be able to recruit and retain a talented and diverse stream of “new blood” for the faculty. Despite the importance administrators and trustees assign to this objective, boards rarely discuss the topic.

COACHE reports offer presidents, provosts, and deans the opportunity to engage trustees at an appropriate policy level in conversations about the quality of work life for the faculty that represent the institution’s academic future and its current reality. There are two potentially productive lines of inquiry. In the first mode, management educates the board about major themes that emerged from COACHE data and from benchmark comparisons with the institution’s peer group.

The Chief Academic Officer’s Report can be further distilled to highlight for trustees the overall or global levels of satisfaction; specific aspects of work/life that faculty consider most agreeable and most problematic; significant disparities by race, gender, or rank; and critical “policy gaps,” areas respondents rated important in principle and unsatisfactory in practice. In short order, trustees will have keener insight into the organizational environment and personal experiences of faculty, as well as a deeper appreciation for management’s commitment and game plan to make the college a great place to work.

The second mode, which may be even more profitable, turns the tables. Here, trustees educate the administration. As academic leaders contemplate appropriate responses to the challenges and concerns that faculty confront, board members can be a valuable resource. Whether as corporate executives or senior partners in firms (e.g., law, medicine, consulting, and engineering), many trustees also have to create, if only for competitive reasons, attractive work environments responsive to the preferences and lifestyles of new generations of professionals. While the circumstances are not identical, the fundamental challenges are not terribly different: clarity of performance expectations; professional fulfillment; work-family balance; collegial culture; and diversity, to name a few.

With COACHE data as context, trustees can share successful (and unsuccessful) strategies, policies, and practices intended to improve work satisfaction and vitality, whether for relatively young newcomers or seasoned veterans at the company or firm. What did you try, and to what effect? What did you learn? This line of inquiry could well yield some innovative and effective initiatives that can be adapted to academe, and the discussion will reinforce the board’s role as a source of intellectual capital and as active participants in consequential conversations.

the ideas to the provost; in other words, make your best case and make it known that you have support on multiple fronts. Offer solutions, not more problems.

Don't accept the status quo.

In other words, persist. Some decisions in academic institutions are made by accretion and just because one's proposal is rejected today doesn't mean that it won't be accepted later. Deans can persist until progress, even incremental, is made. An effective strategy is not only to anticipate the costs of policy implementation (e.g., modified duties, flextime, stop-the-clock, dual career hires), but also to discuss the cost of maintaining the status quo.

Ask questions.

Instead of feeling the need to have all the answers all of the time, pose questions in a variety of forums where you already have people's attention. As one dean said to me, "I lead by asking relevant questions at a variety of tables with various constituencies. Most often, those questions have no easy answers, but I am able to put the issue effectively into play. Raising issues as questions puts academics in a mindset of problem solving. This is, after all, how we all approach our own scholarship - with questions, not with answers."

Background and Definitions

Background

The principal purposes of the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey are two-fold: (1) to enlighten academic leaders about the experiences and concerns of full-time, faculty; and (2) to provide data that lead to informed discussions and appropriate actions to improve the quality of work/life for those faculty. Over time, we hope these steps will make the academy an even more attractive and equitable place for talented scholars and teachers to work.

The core element of COACHE is a web-based survey designed on the basis of extensive literature reviews; of themes emerging from multiple focus groups; of feedback from senior administrators in academic affairs; and of extensive pilot studies and cognitive tests in multiple institutional contexts. While there are many faculty surveys, the COACHE instrument is unique in that it was designed expressly to take account of the concerns and experiences of faculty on issues with direct policy implications for academic leaders.

This *COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey* provides academic leaders with a lever to enhance the quality of work-life for faculty. The report portfolio provides not only interesting data, but also actionable diagnoses - a springboard to workplace improvements, more responsive policies and practices, and an earned reputation as a great place for faculty to work.

Survey Design

The chief aim in developing the COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey was to assess, in a comprehensive and quantitative way, faculty's work-related quality of life. The survey addresses multiple facets of job satisfaction and includes specific questions that would yield unambiguous, actionable data on key policy-relevant issues.

The COACHE instrument was developed and validated in stages over a period of several years. Focus groups were conducted with faculty to learn how they view certain work-related issues, including specific institutional policies and practices, work climate, the ability to balance professional and personal lives, issues surrounding tenure, and overall job satisfaction.

Drawing from the focus groups, prior surveys on job satisfaction among academics and other professionals, and consultation with subject matter and advisory board experts on survey development, COACHE researchers developed web-based survey prototypes that were then tested in pilot studies across multiple institutions.

COACHE solicited feedback about the survey by conducting follow-up interviews with a sub-sample of the respondents of the pilot study. Cognitive interviews were conducted with faculty from a broad range of institutional types to test the generalizability of questions across various institutional types. The survey was revised in light of this feedback. The current version of the

survey was revised further, taking into account feedback provided by respondents in survey administrations annually since 2005.

Survey administration

All eligible subjects at participating institutions were invited to complete the survey. Eligibility was determined according to the following criteria:

- Full-time
- Not hired in the same year as survey administration
- Not in terminal year after being denied tenure

Subjects first received a letter about the survey from a senior administrator (e.g., president, provost, or dean) at their institution. Next, subjects received an email from COACHE inviting them to complete the survey. Over the course of the survey administration period, three automated reminders were sent via email to all subjects who had not completed the survey.

Participants accessed a secure web server through their own unique link provided by COACHE and, agreeing to an informed consent statement, responded to a series of multiple-choice and open-ended questions (see Supplemental Materials). Generally, respondents completed the survey in less than twenty-five minutes; the mode (most frequent) completion time was approximately 21 minutes.

Data conditioning

For a participant's responses to be included in the data set, s/he had to provide at least one meaningful response beyond the initial demographic section of the instrument. The responses of faculty who either terminated the survey before completing the demographic section or chose only N/A or Decline to Respond for all questions were removed from the data set. The impact of such deletions, however, is relatively small: on average, greater than 90 percent of respondents who enter the COACHE survey go on to complete it in its entirety.

When respondents completed the survey in an inordinately short time or when the same response was used for at least 95% of items, the respondents were removed from the population file.

For demographic characteristics which impact a respondent's path through the survey (tenure status and rank) or the COACHE Report (gender and race) institutionally provided data is confirmed by the survey respondent in the demographics section of the survey. When respondent answers differ from institutional data, COACHE always recodes the data to match the respondent's selection.

In responses to open-ended questions, individually-identifying words or phrases that would compromise the respondent's anonymity were either excised or emended by COACHE analysts. Where this occurred, the analyst substituted that portion of the original response with brackets containing an ellipsis or alternate word or phrase (e.g., [...] or [under-represented minority]). In the case of custom open-ended questions, comments were not altered in any way.

Definitions

All comparable institutions, "All comparables," or "All"

Within the report, comparisons between your institution and the cohort group provide context for your results in the broader faculty labor market. While the experiences, demands, and expectations for faculty vary by institutional type - reflected in your peers selections - this comparison to the entire COACHE cohort can add an important dimension to your understanding of your faculty. The institutions included in this year's "all comparables" group are listed in the appendix of your Provost's Report.

Data weighting or "weight scale"

In prior reports, a weighting scale was developed for each institution to adjust for the under- or over-representation in the data set of subgroups defined by race and gender (e.g., White males, Asian females, etc.). Applying these weights to the data thus allowed the relative proportions of subgroups in the data set for each institution to more accurately reflect the proportions in that institution's actual population of pre-tenure faculty.

However, the use of weights poses some methodological challenges. First, and foremost, the actual application of weights in the COACHE report only produced very small changes in results. Because COACHE does not use samples the respondent group typically is representative of the full population. Also, weights applied to an overall mean are less useful when comparing subgroups of the respondent population. When weighted data is disaggregated, the utility of the weights is compromised. For these reasons and other, the use of weights for this type of large scale analysis is becoming less common.

Effect size

Put simply, an effect size describes the magnitude of difference between two groups, regardless of statistical significance. In this report, effect sizes measure the differences between paired subgroups within a campus (i.e., men and women, tenured and pre-tenure faculty, associate and full professors, white faculty and faculty of color).

We do not use tests of statistical significance in part because COACHE is a census, not a sample; differences in means are representative of the population, not of some broader sample. We rely on effect sizes, instead, because they consider both the central tendency and the variance, countering concerns about differences in group sizes. Also, unlike other measures of differences between groups, effect sizes show both the direction and magnitude of differences.

Effect sizes in this report are calculated using the formula below where:

$$(x_1 - x_2) / sd_1$$

In the social science research domain in which COACHE operates, the following thresholds are generally accepted ranges of effect size magnitude.

0 < Trivial < .1

.1 < Small < .3

.3 < Moderate < .5

.5 < Large < 1.0+

This report ignores trivial differences, but subgroups appear in the Within Campus Differences tables when their ratings are lower than their comparison group by a small (unshaded), moderate (yellow), or large (orange) effect.

Faculty of color or "foc"

Any respondent identified by his or her institution or self-identifying in the survey as non-White.

Underrepresented minority faculty or "urm"

Any respondent identified by his or her institution or self-identifying in the survey as non-White and non-Asian/Asian-American.

n < 5

To protect the identity of respondents and in accordance with procedures approved by Harvard University's Committee on the Use of Human Subjects, cells with fewer than five data points (i.e., mean scores for questions that were answered by fewer than five faculty from a subgroup within an institution) are not reported. Instead, "n < 5" will appear as the result.

Response rate

The percent of all eligible respondents, by tenure status, rank, gender and by race, whose responses, following the data conditioning process, were deemed eligible to be included in this analysis. Thus, your response rate counts as nonrespondents those faculty who were "screened out" by the survey application or by later processes.

Please feel free to contact COACHE with any additional questions about our research design, methodology, or definitions; about survey administration; or about any aspects of our reports and available data.

Participating Institutions

Faculty from the following institutions comprise the COACHE database of Universities for this 2016 Chief Academic Officer's Report.

Appalachian State University
 Auburn University
 Bowling Green State University
 Brown University
 Central Washington University
 Clemson University
 CUNY - Bernard M Baruch College
 CUNY - Brooklyn College
 CUNY - City College
 CUNY - College of Staten Island
 CUNY - Hunter College
 CUNY - John Jay College Criminal Justice
 CUNY - Lehman College
 CUNY - Medgar Evers College
 CUNY - New York City College of Technology
 CUNY - Queens College
 CUNY - York College
 Dartmouth College
 Duke University
 East Carolina University
 Fayetteville State University
 Florida International University
 Florida State University
 Georgetown University
 Gonzaga University
 Indiana State University
 Indiana University - Bloomington
 Iowa State University
 James Madison University
 Kent State University

Faculty from the following institutions comprise the COACHE database of Liberal Arts Colleges and Small Masters Universities for this 2016 Chief Academic Officer's Report.

Albright College
 Amherst College
 College of the Holy Cross
 Connecticut College
 Emerson College
 Franklin and Marshall College
 Hamilton College
 Hendrix College
 Kenyon College
 Merrimack College
 Middlebury College
 Mount Holyoke College
 Pitzer College
 Pomona College
 Scripps College
 Skidmore College
 The University of the South
 Wabash College
 Wellesley College
 Wheaton College

Lehigh University
Loyola University Maryland
Missouri University of Science and Technology
Montclair State University
New Jersey City University
New School University
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
North Carolina Central University
North Carolina State University
Northern Arizona University
Oklahoma State University
Old Dominion University
Otterbein University
Providence College
Purdue University
Radford University
Richard Stockton College of NJ
Rochester Institute of Technology
Syracuse University
Tufts University
Tulane University of Louisiana
University of Alabama
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of Baltimore
University of California, Davis
University of Central Florida
University of Connecticut
University of Houston
University of Houston - Clear Lake
University of Massachusetts - Lowell
University of Minnesota - Twin Cities
University of Missouri - Columbia
University of Missouri - Kansas City
University of Missouri - St. Louis

University of Nevada - Las Vegas
University of North Carolina - Asheville
University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina - Charlotte
University of North Carolina - Greensboro
University of North Carolina - Pembroke
University of North Carolina - Wilmington
University of Pittsburgh
University of Richmond
University of Rochester
University of Tennessee
University of the Pacific
University of Toronto
University of Tulsa
University of Washington Tacoma
University of Wisconsin - Platteville
Vanderbilt University
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Washington State University
West Virginia University
Western Carolina University
Winston-Salem State University
Worcester Polytechnic Institute