

2011 COACHE Survey

Nature of Work: Research, Service, Teaching

Tenure Track Faculty Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)

<i>Sub-theme</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>TT</i>
	<i>Benchmark: Nature of work: research</i>	3.23
Research	Time spent on research	3.63
	Expectations for finding external funding	3.24
	Influence over focus of research	4.34
	Quality of grad students to support research	3.31
	Support for research	2.72
	Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.07
	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.12
	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	3.03
	Support for securing grad student assistance	2.86
	Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.01
	Availability of course release for research	2.83
		<i>Benchmark: Nature of work: service</i>
Service	Time spent on service	3.54
	Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.87
	Number of committees	3.59
	Attractiveness of committees	3.42
	Discretion to choose committees	3.49
	Equitability of committee assignments	3.25
	Number of student advisees	3.71
	<i>Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching</i>	3.75
Teaching	Time spent on teaching	3.90
	Number of courses taught	3.88
	Level of courses taught	4.09
	Discretion over course content	4.40
	Number of students in classes taught	3.73
	Quality of students taught	3.36
	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.15
	Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.33
Other work activities	Time spent on outreach	3.73
	Time spent on administrative tasks	2.86
	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.41

**2011 COACHE Survey
Facilities, Personal/Family Policies, Benefits, and Salary
Tenure Track Faculty Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)**

<i>Sub-theme</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>TT</i>
	<i>Benchmark: Facilities and work resources</i>	3.58
Facilities and work resources	Support for improving teaching	3.30
	Office	3.95
	Laboratory, research, studio space	3.41
	Equipment	3.50
	Classrooms	3.71
	Library resources	4.17
	Computing and technical support	3.48
	Clerical/administrative support	2.98
	<i>Benchmark: Personal and family policies</i>	2.95
Personal and family policies	Housing benefits	2.20
	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.16
	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.76
	Childcare	2.33
	Eldercare	2.59
	Family medical/parental leave	3.33
	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.54
	Stop-the-clock policies ¹	3.66
Inst. does what it can for work/life compatibility	2.99	
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.36
	<i>Benchmark: Health and retirement benefits</i>	2.81
Health and retirement benefits	Health benefits for yourself	2.77
	Health benefits for family	2.25
	Retirement benefits	3.06
	Phased retirement options	3.27
Salary	Salary	2.78

¹ Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey
Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring
Tenure Track Faculty Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)

<i>Sub-theme</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>TT</i>
	<i>Benchmark: Interdisciplinary work</i>	2.67
Interdisciplinary work	Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.52
	Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	2.59
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.61
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion ¹	2.66
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure ²	2.86
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.87
	<i>Benchmark: Collaboration</i>	3.75
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. within dept.	3.77
	Opportunities for collab. outside dept.	3.61
	Opportunities for collab. outside inst.	3.86
	<i>Benchmark: Mentoring</i>	3.05
Mentoring	Effectiveness of mentoring from within dept.	3.49
	Effectiveness of mentoring from outside dept.	3.33
	Effectiveness of mentoring from outside inst.	3.70
	Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty	3.29
	Mentoring of associate faculty ¹	2.69
	Support for faculty to be good mentors ¹	2.37
	Being a mentor is fulfilling ¹	4.10
	Importance of mentoring within dept.	4.18
	Importance of mentoring outside dept.	3.31
Importance of mentoring outside inst.	3.57	

¹ Asked of tenured faculty only

² Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey

Tenure and Promotion

Tenure Track Faculty Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)

<i>Sub-theme</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>TT</i>
	<i>Benchmark: Tenure policies</i>	3.64
Tenure policies ¹	Clarity of tenure process	3.87
	Clarity of tenure criteria	3.73
	Clarity of tenure standards	3.49
	Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure	3.76
	Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure	3.70
	Consistency of messages about tenure	3.25
	Tenure decisions are performance-based	3.69
		<i>Benchmark: Tenure clarity</i>
Tenure clarity ¹	Clarity of expectations: Scholar	3.84
	Clarity of expectations: Teacher	3.65
	Clarity of expectations: Advisor	3.29
	Clarity of expectations: Colleague	3.24
	Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen	2.92
	Clarity of expectations: Broader community	2.90
		<i>Benchmark: Tenure reasonableness</i>
Tenure reasonableness ¹	Reasonable expectations: Scholar	4.01
	Reasonable expectations: Teacher	4.15
	Reasonable expectations: Advisor	3.84
	Reasonable expectations: Colleague	3.92
	Reasonable expectations: Campus citizen	3.68
	Reasonable expectations: Community member	3.63
		<i>Benchmark: Promotion</i>
Promotion ²	Reasonable expectations: Promotion	3.91
	Dept. culture encourages promotion	3.97
	Clarity of promotion process	4.05
	Clarity of promotion criteria	3.94
	Clarity of promotion standards	3.64
	Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	4.00
	Clarity of time frame for promotion	3.66
	Clarity of whether I will be promoted ³	3.28
	Decision to remain here based on promotion ³	3.32

¹ Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

² Asked of tenured faculty only

³ Asked of associate faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey

Leadership and Governance

Tenure Track Faculty Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)

Sub-theme	Question	TT
Institutional	Priorities are stated consistently	2.68
Governance and Leadership	Priorities are acted on consistently	2.50
	Changed priorities negatively affect my work	3.34
	<i>Benchmark: Leadership: senior</i>	3.23
Leadership: Senior	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.35
	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.30
	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.38
	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.18
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.11
	CAO: Communication of priorities	3.09
	<i>Benchmark: Leadership: divisional</i>	2.95
Leadership: Divisional	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.01
	Dean: Stated priorities	2.95
	Dean: Communication of priorities	2.97
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	2.90
	Dean: Support in adapting to change	2.56
	<i>Benchmark: Leadership: departmental</i>	3.68
Leadership: Departmental	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.67
	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.56
	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.60
	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.66
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.92
	Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change	3.39

**2011 COACHE Survey
 Departmental Collegiality, Engagement, and Quality
 Tenure Track Faculty Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)**

<i>Sub-theme</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>TT</i>
Departmental collegiality	<i>Benchmark: Departmental collegiality</i>	3.80
	Colleagues support work/life balance	3.63
	Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.13
	Amount of personal interaction w/ pre-tenure	3.64
	How well you fit	3.67
	Amount of personal interaction w/ tenured	3.62
	Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.73
	Dept. is collegial	3.97
	Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.96
Departmental engagement	<i>Benchmark: Departmental engagement</i>	3.49
	Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.28
	Discussions of grad student learning	3.59
	Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.29
	Discussions of effective use of technology	3.30
	Discussions of current research methods	3.40
	Amount of professional interaction w/ pre-tenure	3.82
	Amount of professional interaction w/ tenured	3.76
Departmental quality	<i>Benchmark: Departmental quality</i>	3.65
	Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.62
	Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.09
	Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.54
	Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	3.94
	Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.76
	Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.96
	Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment ¹	3.70
	Dept. is successful at faculty retention ¹	3.45
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.79	

¹ Asked of tenured faculty only

**2011 COACHE Survey
 Appreciation and Recognition
 Tenure Track Faculty Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)**

Question	TT
<i>Benchmark: Appreciation and recognition</i>	3.26
Recognition: For teaching	3.30
Recognition: For advising	3.13
Recognition: For scholarship	3.41
Recognition: For service	3.18
Recognition: For outreach	3.14
Recognition: From colleagues	3.63
Recognition: From CAO ¹	2.79
Recognition: From Dean ¹	3.00
Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.64
School/college is valued by Pres/Provost ¹	3.37
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost ¹	3.10
CAO cares about faculty of my rank	3.03

¹ Asked of tenured faculty only

**2011 COACHE Survey
Retention and Negotiations
Tenure Track Faculty Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)**

<i>Question</i>	<i>TT</i>
Outside offers are necessary in negotiations ¹	1.85

¹ Asked of NTT and tenured faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey**Global Satisfaction****Tenure Track Faculty Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)**

<i>Question</i>	<i>TT</i>
Visible leadership for support of diversity	3.96
I would again choose this institution	3.73
Department as a place to work	3.82
Institution as a place to work	3.60