

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education
at the Harvard Graduate School of Education



COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey
PROVOST'S REPORT
Borough of Manhattan Community College
2015

Acknowledgements: Support for COACHE reports on faculty leadership and shared governance is provided by our partner institutions in the Collaborative. We are grateful to their academic leaders for having the courage to participate.

Reproduction: No part of this report may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), such as that included 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, Suite 5-03
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.



CONTENTS OF YOUR REPORT

Introduction	3
Results	
Response rates	6
Benchmarks	7
Nature of work in research, teaching, service	9
Facilities, personal/family policies, benefits and salary	13
Interdisciplinary work, collaboration, and mentoring	15
Tenure and promotion	19
Leadership and governance	21
Departmental collegiality, engagement, and quality	23
Appreciation and recognition	25
Best and worst aspects	27
Appendices	
Your COACHE results are in your hands... now what?	31
Background and definitions	37

Introduction

The COACHE Dashboard

This data display offers a broad view of your faculty. 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 perceive a certain 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 balance
- Interdisciplinary work and collaboration
- Mentoring
- Tenure and promotion practices
- Leadership (Senior, Divisional, and Departmental)
- Departmental collegiality, quality, engagement
- Appreciation and recognition

For each benchmark, your report displays a series of three inter-campus comparisons: the mean for all CUNY community colleges compared to the mean for the entire CUNY system; the mean for your institution compared to the mean for the entire CUNY system; and the mean for your institution compared to all CUNY community colleges. Within each difference, effect sizes *and* direction of effect are indicated by circles in shades of green (strength) and red (concern).

A green circle indicates the mean for the first reference category—either all CUNY community colleges or your campus—is higher than the mean for the second reference category—either the CUNY system or all CUNY community colleges. A red circle indicates that the mean for the first reference category is lower than the mean for the second reference category. Effect size is indicated as small (● or ●), moderate (● or ●), or large (● or ●). Trivial differences remain blank. A light gray “N/A” indicates that the adaptive branching in the survey did not allow for direct comparisons between groups.

For some benchmarks, such as Nature of work: Teaching, your report displays results for two versions of the benchmark. The first version is based on a core set of items related to the theme asked of all faculty, regardless of institutional type. The second version of the benchmark, designated “CC,” has been tailored to address the same theme in meaningful ways for faculty at community colleges. This second set of results adjusts the questions to more accurately reflect the experiences of community college faculty. For example, the Nature of work: Teaching (CC) benchmark for community college faculty includes additional question related to addressing diverse learning styles in the classroom, such as returning adult students and English Language Learners.

The right side of the page contains intra-campus comparisons, which highlight meaningful differences between subgroups on your own campus. 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 may suggest concerns. For example, it is quite possible for a campus to perform very well overall on a 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.

The **Best and Worst Aspects** pages demonstrate 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.

Appendix

The Provost’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.

The RESULTS

Borough of Manhattan Community College

		overall	tenured	pre-tenure	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	faculty of color
Borough of Manhattan Community College	<i>responders</i>	218	124	91	3	48	44	71	147	132	86
	<i>population</i>	456	283	170	3	110	99	200	256	255	201
	<i>response rate</i>	48%	44%	54%	100%	44%	44%	36%	57%	52%	43%
All CUNY Community Colleges	<i>responders</i>	866	520	329	17	190	230	341	525	538	328
	<i>population</i>	1817	1144	655	18	443	432	839	978	1109	708
	<i>response rate</i>	48%	44%	54%	100%	44%	44%	36%	57%	52%	43%

BENCHMARKS

	Inter-campus Differences			Effect Size for Intra-campus Group Comparisons*				
	strength		concern		small (>.1)	mod (>.3)	large (>.5)	
	All CUNY Community Colleges vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. CUNY system	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. all CUNY Community Colleges	Tenured vs. Pre-tenure	Tenure stream vs. Non-tenure-track N<5	Associate vs. Full Associate	Men vs. Women Women	White faculty vs. Faculty of color
Nature of work: Research								
Nature of work: Service				Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Women	White
Nature of Work: Service (CC)	N/A	N/A		Pre-tenure	N<5		Women	White
Nature of work: Teaching				Pre-tenure	N<5		Women	
Nature of work: Teaching (CC)	N/A	N/A		Pre-tenure	N<5		Women	
Facilities and work resources				Pre-tenure	N<5			
Personal and family policies					N<5		Women	
Personal and family policies (CC)	N/A	N/A		Tenured	N<5		Women	
Health and retirement benefits				Tenured	N<5		Men	
Interdisciplinary work					N<5		Women	
Collaboration				Tenured	N<5	Associate	Women	
Mentoring				Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate		White
Tenure policies				N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Tenure policies (CC)	N/A	N/A		N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Tenure clarity				N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Promotion				N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Leadership: Senior					N<5	Associate		
Leadership: Divisional	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Leadership: Departmental				Tenured	N<5		Women	
Departmental collegiality				Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Departmental engagement					N<5			FOC
Departmental quality				Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Departmental quality (CC)	N/A	N/A		Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Appreciation and recognition				Tenured	N<5		Women	

*For intra-campus differences, the name of the group with lower benchmark ratings appears in the cell. Blank cells indicate statistical parity between groups.



Your Findings in Context

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 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 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 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.

	Inter-campus Differences			Effect Size for Intra-campus Group Comparisons*				
	strength	●●●●● ●●●●● ●●●●● ●●●●● ●●●●●	concern		small (>.1)	mod (>.3)	large (>.5)	
	All CUNY Community Colleges vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. all CUNY Community Colleges	Tenured vs. Pre-tenure	Tenure stream vs. Non-tenure-track	Associate vs. Full	Men vs. Women	White faculty vs. Faculty of color
Benchmark: Nature of work: Research								
Q45B	Time spent on research				N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q80A	Expectations for finding external funding				N<5	Full		
Q80B	Influence over focus of research				N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q80D	Support for research				Tenured	Associate		FOC
Q85A	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)				N<5	Associate	Women	
Q85B	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)				Pre-tenure	Associate	Women	
Q85D	Support for travel to present/conduct research				Pre-tenure			
Q85E	Availability of course release for research				Tenured			
Benchmark: Nature of work: Service								
Benchmark: Nature of Work: Service (CC)								
Q45C	Time spent on service				Pre-tenure	Associate	Women	White
Q55B	Support for faculty in leadership roles				Pre-tenure	Associate	Women	White
Q60A	Number of committees				Pre-tenure	Associate		FOC
Q60B	Attractiveness of committees					Full	Women	White
Q60C	Discretion to choose committees				Pre-tenure	Associate		
Q60D	Equitability of committee assignments				Pre-tenure			White
Q60E	Number of student advisees				Pre-tenure		Women	White
Q60F	Equity of compensation for service					Associate		
Q60G	Relevance of committee assignments				Pre-tenure		Men	White
Q60H	Support for Advising				Pre-tenure	Associate	Women	
Q60I	Equity of distribution of advising duties						Women	

*For intra-campus differences, the name of the group with lower benchmark ratings appears in the cell. Blank cells indicate statistical parity between groups.

		Inter-campus Differences			Effect Size for Intra-campus Group Comparisons*				
		strength	●●●●●●●●●●	●●●●●●●●●●	concern		small (>.1)	mod (>.3)	large (>.5)
		All CUNY Community Colleges vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. all CUNY Community Colleges	Tenured vs. Pre-tenure	Tenure stream vs. Non-tenure-track	Associate vs. Full	Men vs. Women	White faculty vs. Faculty of color
Benchmark: Nature of work: Teaching			●	●	Pre-tenure	N<5		Women	
Benchmark: Nature of work: Teaching (CC)		N/A	N/A	●	Pre-tenure	N<5		Women	
Q45A	Time spent on teaching			●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Women	
Q70A	Number of courses taught		●	●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate		
Q70B	Level of courses taught	●	●	●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Men	
Q70C	Discretion over course content	●	●		Pre-tenure	N<5	Full		
Q70D	Number of students in classes taught	●	●	●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Full	Women	
Q70E	Quality of students taught	●				N<5		Men	FOC
Q70H	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	●				N<5	Full	Women	White
Q70I	Quality of grad students to support teaching	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q70J	Teaching schedule	N/A	N/A			N<5	Full		White
Q70K	Support for teaching diverse learners	N/A	N/A			N<5	Associate		FOC
Q70L	Support for assessing student learning	N/A	N/A			N<5	Associate	Women	
Q70M	Support for developing online courses	N/A	N/A		Pre-tenure	N<5	Full		
Q70N	Support for teaching online courses	N/A	N/A			N<5	Full	Men	White
Q45D	Time spent on outreach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q45E	Time spent on administrative tasks	●				N<5	Associate	Women	
Q55A	Ability to balance teaching/research/service		●	●		N<5	Associate	Women	

*For intra-campus differences, the name of the group with lower benchmark ratings appears in the cell. Blank cells indicate statistical parity between groups.



Your Findings in Context

Facilities & Work Resources, Personal & Family Policies, and Health & Retirement Benefits

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.

	Inter-campus Differences			Effect Size for Intra-campus Group Comparisons*					
	strength	●●●● ●●●● ●●●● ●●●● ●●●●	●●●● ●●●● ●●●● ●●●● ●●●●	concern	Tenured vs. Pre-tenure	small (>.1)	mod (>.3)	large (>.5)	White faculty vs. Faculty of color
	All CUNY Community Colleges vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. all CUNY Community Colleges						
Benchmark: Facilities and work resources	●	●			Pre-tenure	N<5			
Q70F Support for improving teaching	●		●			N<5		Women	White
Q90A Office		●	●		Pre-tenure	N<5			White
Q90B Laboratory, research, studio space					Pre-tenure	N<5		Women	
Q90C Equipment	●	●			Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Women	
Q90D Classrooms	●	●●	●		Tenured	N<5			
Q90E Library resources				●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Full		
Q90F Computing and technical support	●			●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Men	
Q90H Clerical/administrative support	●	●				N<5			
Benchmark: Personal and family policies						N<5		Women	
Benchmark: Personal and family policies (CC)	N/A	N/A			Tenured	N<5		Women	
Q95D Housing benefits	●			●	Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	
Q95E Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	●			●	Tenured	N<5	Full	Men	
Q95F Spousal/partner hiring program				●		N<5	Associate	Women	White
Q95G Childcare				●		N<5		Women	FOC
Q95H Eldercare		●		●	Tenured	N<5	Full		
Q95J Family medical/parental leave					Tenured	N<5			
Q95K Flexible workload/modified duties		●		●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Full	Women	White
Q95L Stop-the-clock policies					N/A	N<5	N/A	Men	
Q200B Inst. does what it can for work/life compatibility				●		N<5		Women	FOC
Q200A I have found personal and professional balance				●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Women	
Q90G Salary	●					N<5	Associate	Men	
Q95M Commuter benefits	N/A	N/A		●	Tenured	N<5			FOC
Q95N Parking	N/A	N/A		●●	Tenured	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Benchmark: Health and retirement benefits					Tenured	N<5		Men	
Q95A Health benefits for yourself					Tenured	N<5	Associate	Men	White
Q95B Health benefits for family					Tenured	N<5	Associate	Men	White
Q95C Retirement benefits					Tenured	N<5	Associate	Men	FOC
Q95I Phased retirement options	●				Tenured	N<5	Full	Men	FOC

*For intra-campus differences, the name of the group with lower benchmark ratings appears in the cell. Blank cells indicate statistical parity between groups.



Your Findings in Context

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.**

	Inter-campus Differences			Effect Size for Intra-campus Group Comparisons*				
	strength	●●●●● ●●●●● ●●●●● ●●●●● ●●●●●	concern		small (>.1)	mod (>.3)	large (>.5)	
	All CUNY Community Colleges vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan College vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. all CUNY Community Colleges	Tenured vs. Pre-tenure	Tenure stream vs. Non-tenure-track	Associate vs. Full	Men vs. Women	White faculty vs. Faculty of color
Benchmark: Interdisciplinary work	●		●		N<5		Women	
Q100A Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	●		●		N<5	Full	Women	White
Q100B Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	●	●			N<5	Full	Women	
Q100C Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	●		●	Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	
Q100D Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion	●		●	N/A	N<5		Women	
Q100E Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure	●		●	N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q100G Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work		●	●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Full	Women	
Benchmark: Collaboration		●	●	Tenured	N<5	Associate	Women	
Q105A Opportunities for collab. within dept.	●		●	Tenured	N<5		Women	FOC
Q105E Opportunities for collab. outside dept.	●		●		N<5	Associate	Women	
Q105D Opportunities for collab. outside inst.		●	●	Tenured	N<5	Associate	Women	
Benchmark: Mentoring	●		●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate		White
Q125A Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	●		●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate		White
Q125B Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept.		●		Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Men	White
Q130A Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty		●	●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Women	
Q130B Mentoring of associate faculty	●		●	N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	
Q130C Support for faculty to be good mentors	●		●	N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	White
Q115 Being a mentor is fulfilling		●		N/A	N<5	Associate		White
Q120A Importance of mentoring within dept.	●				N<5	Associate	Men	
Q120B Importance of mentoring outside dept.	●	●			N<5	Associate	Men	White
Q120C Importance of mentoring outside inst.		●	●	Tenured	N<5		Men	
Q125C Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst.	●		●	Pre-tenure	N<5		Men	

*For intra-campus differences, the name of the group with lower benchmark ratings appears in the cell. Blank cells indicate statistical parity between groups.



Your Findings in Context

Tenure & Promotion

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 collegiality.

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.

	Inter-campus Differences			Effect Size for Intra-campus Group Comparisons*				
	strength	●●●●● ●●●●● ●●●●● ●●●●● ●●●●●	concern		small (>.1)	mod (>.3)	large (>.5)	
	All CUNY Community Colleges vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. all CUNY Community Colleges	Tenured vs. Pre-tenure	Tenure stream vs. Non-tenure-track	Associate vs. Full	Men vs. Women	White faculty vs. Faculty of color
Benchmark: Tenure policies		●	●	N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Benchmark: Tenure policies (CC)	N/A	N/A	●	N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q136A Clarity of tenure process		●	●	N/A	N<5	N/A	Men	FOC
Q136B Clarity of tenure criteria		●	●	N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q136C Clarity of tenure standards		●	●	N/A	N<5	N/A	Men	FOC
Q136D Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure		●	●	N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q136E Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure		●	●	N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q136F Clarity of grievance process	N/A	N/A	●	N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q139A Consistency of messages about tenure				N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q139B Tenure decisions are performance-based		●	●	N/A	N<5	N/A	Women	
Benchmark: Tenure clarity	●	●		N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q137A Clarity of expectations: Scholar				N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q137B Clarity of expectations: Teacher	●	●	●	N/A	N<5	N/A	Men	FOC
Q137C Clarity of expectations: Advisor				N/A	N<5	N/A		FOC
Q137D Clarity of expectations: Colleague				N/A	N<5	N/A	Men	FOC
Q137E Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen	●			N/A	N<5	N/A	Men	FOC
Q137F Clarity of expectations: Broader community	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Benchmark: Promotion		●	●	N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q135C Reasonable expectations: Promotion	●	●		N/A	N<5	Associate		
Q135B Dept. culture encourages promotion		●	●	N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q140A Clarity of promotion process				N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q140B Clarity of promotion criteria				N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q140C Clarity of promotion standards				N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q140D Clarity of body of evidence for promotion		●		N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q140E Clarity of time frame for promotion	●	●	●	N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	
Q140F Clarity of whether I will be promoted	●	●	●	N/A	N<5	N/A	Women	FOC

*For intra-campus differences, the name of the group with lower benchmark ratings appears in the cell. Blank cells indicate statistical parity between groups.



Your Findings in Context

Leadership: Senior, Divisional, Departmental

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.

	Inter-campus Differences			Effect Size for Intra-campus Group Comparisons*					
	strength	●●●●●	●●●●●	concern		small (>.1)	mod (>.3)	large (>.5)	
	All CUNY Community Colleges vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan College vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. all CUNY Community Colleges		Tenured vs. Pre-tenure	Tenure stream vs. Non-tenure-track	Associate vs. Full Associate	Men vs. Women	White faculty vs. Faculty of color
Q170A	Priorities are stated consistently	●	●			N<5			White
Q170C	Priorities are acted on consistently	●	●			N<5			White
Q170D	Changed priorities negatively affect my work**	●	●			N<5	Associate		
Benchmark: Leadership: Senior									
Q180A	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making				Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q180B	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities		●	●	Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate		
Q180C	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities		●	●		N<5	Associate		White
Q180L	CAO: Pace of decision making	●	●	●		N<5		Men	FOC
Q180M	CAO: Stated priorities	●	●			N<5		Men	FOC
Q180N	CAO: Communication of priorities	●	●		Tenured	N<5		Men	FOC
Q180O	CAO: Ensuring faculty input	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q175C	CAO: Support in adapting to change	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional									
Q185D	Dean: Pace of decision making	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q185E	Dean: Stated priorities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q185F	Dean: Communication of priorities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q185G	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q175A	Dean: Support in adapting to change				Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Men	FOC
Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental									
Q185H	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making		●	●	Tenured	N<5		Women	
Q185I	Head/Chair: Stated priorities		●	●		N<5	Full	Women	
Q185J	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities		●	●	Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	White
Q185K	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input		●	●	Tenured	N<5			
Q185L	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work		●	●	Tenured	N<5			
Q175B	Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change				Tenured	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC

*For intra-campus differences, the name of the group with lower benchmark ratings appears in the cell. Blank cells indicate statistical parity between groups.
 **The scale for this item is reversed in the data cleaning process.



Your Findings in Context

Department Engagement, Quality, and Collegiality

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.

	Inter-campus Differences			Effect Size for Intra-campus Group Comparisons*					
	strength			concern		small (>.1)	mod (>.3)	large (>.5)	
	All CUNY Community Colleges vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. all CUNY Community Colleges		Tenured vs. Pre-tenure	Tenure stream vs. Non-tenure-track	Associate vs. Full	Men vs. Women	White faculty vs. Faculty of color
Benchmark: Departmental collegiality					Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q200C Colleagues support work/life balance					Pre-tenure	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q200D Meeting times compatible with personal needs					Tenured	N<5	Full		FOC
Q205B Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure					Tenured	N<5			FOC
Q205C How well you fit					Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q205E Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured						N<5	Full		FOC
Q210A Colleagues pitch in when needed					Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	
Q210C Dept. is collegial					Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q212A Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion						N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Benchmark: Departmental engagement						N<5			FOC
Q190A Discussions of undergrad student learning						N<5		Men	FOC
Q190B Discussions of grad student learning	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q190C Discussions of effective teaching practices						N<5	Associate		FOC
Q190D Discussions of effective use of technology					Pre-tenure	N<5			FOC
Q190E Discussions of current research methods						N<5	Associate		FOC
Q205A Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure					Tenured	N<5	Full		FOC
Q205D Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured						N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Benchmark: Departmental quality					Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Benchmark: Departmental quality (CC)	N/A	N/A			Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q195A Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty					Pre-tenure	N<5	Full	Women	
Q195B Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty					Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q195C Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty					Pre-tenure	N<5		Women	FOC
Q195D Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty					Tenured	N<5		Women	FOC
Q195G Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty						N<5	Full	Women	
Q195H Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty					Tenured	N<5	Full		FOC
Q240B Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment					N/A	N<5	Full		FOC
Q240C Dept. is successful at faculty retention					N/A	N<5	Full		FOC
Q240D Dept. addresses sub-standard performance						N<5	Full	Women	
Q206A Recruiting part-time faculty	N/A	N/A				N<5	Associate		FOC
Q206B Managing part-time faculty	N/A	N/A				N<5	Associate	Women	FOC

*For intra-campus differences, the name of the group with lower benchmark ratings appears in the cell. Blank cells indicate statistical parity between groups.

**The scale for this item is reversed in the data cleaning process.



Your Findings in Context

Appreciation & Recognition

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](#).

	Inter-campus Differences			Effect Size for Intra-campus Group Comparisons*				
	strength		concern		small (>.1)	mod (>.3)	large (>.5)	
	All CUNY Community Colleges vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. CUNY System	Borough of Manhattan Community College vs. all CUNY Community Colleges	Tenured vs. Pre-tenure	Tenure stream vs. Non-tenure-track	Associate vs. Full	Men vs. Women	White faculty vs. Faculty of color
Benchmark: Appreciation and recognition				Tenured	N<5		Women	
Q215A Recognition: For teaching				Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	
Q215B Recognition: For advising				Pre-tenure	N<5		Women	
Q215C Recognition: For scholarship				Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q215D Recognition: For service					N<5	Full	Women	
Q215E Recognition: For outreach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q215I Recognition: From colleagues					N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q215J Recognition: From CAO				N/A	N<5	Full		
Q215K Recognition: From Dean				N/A	N<5		Women	White
Q215L Recognition: From Head/Chair					N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q220A School/college is valued by Pres/Provost	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Q220B Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost				N/A	N<5	Associate	Men	White
Q245A CAO cares about faculty of my rank				Tenured	N<5	Associate		
Q240A Outside offers are necessary in negotiations				N/A	N<5	Associate	Women	FOC
Q212B Visible leadership for support of diversity				Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	FOC
Q245D I would again choose this institution				Tenured	N<5	Associate		FOC
Q245F I would again choose to work at a community college	N/A	N/A		Pre-tenure	N<5	Associate	Men	
Q250A Department as a place to work				Tenured	N<5	Full	Women	
Q250B Institution as a place to work					N<5	Associate		

*For intra-campus differences, the name of the group with lower benchmark ratings appears in the cell. Blank cells indicate statistical parity between groups.
 **The scale for this item is reversed in the data cleaning process.

Borough of Manhattan Community College

Best Aspects

Faculty were asked to identify the two (and only two) **best aspects** of working at your institution. The top four responses for your institution, all community colleges and the CUNY four year institutions are shown in red and disaggregated by tenure status, gender, and race.

	Overall			Tenured			Pre-tenure			Men			Women			White			Faculty of Color		
	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY
quality of colleagues	28%	27%	28%	25%	28%	29%	29%	27%	24%	29%	28%	29%	27%	27%	27%	30%	29%	30%	25%	25%	23%
support of colleagues	15%	19%	16%	14%	20%	15%	17%	17%	18%	18%	19%	14%	14%	19%	18%	20%	21%	16%	6%	16%	16%
opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	5%	9%	6%	7%	9%	5%	2%	9%	6%	2%	7%	5%	7%	10%	6%	4%	9%	6%	6%	8%	5%
quality of graduate students	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%	4%
quality of undergraduate students	12%	10%	12%	14%	9%	12%	9%	11%	12%	13%	8%	12%	11%	11%	12%	17%	11%	12%	4%	8%	11%
quality of the facilities	3%	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	0%	2%	2%	4%	3%	1%	2%	3%	2%	4%	2%	1%
support for research/creative work	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	4%	4%	0%	3%	4%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	3%
support for teaching	3%	8%	4%	4%	7%	3%	2%	8%	6%	2%	8%	3%	4%	8%	5%	3%	7%	4%	4%	8%	5%
support for professional development	3%	6%	3%	2%	4%	2%	5%	7%	4%	0%	7%	3%	5%	5%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%	7%	5%
assistance for grant proposals	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%
childcare policies/practices	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
availability/quality of childcare facilities	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
spousal/partner hiring program	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
compensation	8%	5%	3%	10%	7%	3%	5%	3%	3%	10%	6%	3%	7%	5%	3%	6%	5%	3%	10%	5%	3%
geographic location	32%	21%	31%	28%	21%	32%	38%	22%	30%	37%	24%	34%	29%	19%	28%	31%	22%	31%	34%	20%	30%
diversity	33%	21%	18%	34%	20%	18%	33%	22%	19%	34%	18%	15%	33%	23%	21%	28%	18%	16%	42%	25%	23%
presence of others like me	1%	2%	2%	0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	4%	2%
my sense of "fit" here	12%	13%	14%	11%	13%	14%	12%	13%	14%	8%	16%	15%	14%	12%	14%	13%	14%	15%	10%	13%	12%
protections from service/assignments	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
commute	10%	10%	6%	7%	10%	6%	13%	10%	6%	10%	8%	5%	10%	10%	7%	9%	8%	6%	10%	12%	8%
cost of living	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
teaching load	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	4%	3%
manageable pressure to perform	2%	5%	6%	1%	5%	6%	4%	7%	8%	2%	4%	6%	2%	6%	6%	3%	6%	7%	1%	4%	5%
academic freedom	10%	10%	14%	11%	11%	14%	9%	8%	14%	11%	9%	15%	9%	10%	13%	8%	10%	14%	13%	9%	14%
t&p clarity or requirements	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	5%	3%	2%	0%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	0%	2%	2%
quality of leadership	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
other (please specify)	6%	8%	7%	8%	9%	7%	2%	8%	6%	6%	6%	5%	5%	9%	8%	8%	9%	7%	3%	7%	6%
decline to answer	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	0%	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%	1%	3%	3%	5%	4%	4%
there are no positive aspects	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	2%

Borough of Manhattan Community College

Worst Aspects

Faculty were asked to identify the two (and only two) **worst aspects** of working at your institution. The top four responses for your institution, all community colleges and the CUNY four year institutions are shown in red and disaggregated by tenure status, gender, and race.

	Overall			Tenured			Pre-tenure			Men			Women			White			Faculty of Color		
	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY	you	All CC	All CUNY
quality of colleagues	7%	4%	4%	5%	3%	4%	9%	5%	5%	5%	3%	5%	8%	4%	3%	8%	3%	4%	5%	4%	5%
support of colleagues	3%	3%	3%	1%	3%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	5%	4%
opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%
quality of graduate students	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%
quality of undergraduate students	8%	8%	6%	8%	9%	7%	9%	7%	5%	13%	10%	8%	6%	7%	5%	8%	9%	6%	8%	8%	6%
quality of facilities	3%	13%	16%	5%	13%	16%	1%	11%	14%	3%	12%	16%	3%	13%	16%	4%	13%	17%	1%	12%	15%
lack of support for research/creative work	25%	15%	15%	25%	14%	14%	26%	16%	18%	21%	12%	12%	27%	16%	17%	25%	14%	14%	26%	15%	16%
lack of support for teaching	4%	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	5%	3%	3%	0%	2%	5%	5%	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	5%	3%	4%
lack of support for professional development	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	0%	4%	5%
lack of assistance for grant proposals	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	1%	2%	0%	0%	1%	4%	1%	2%	1%	0%	1%	5%	2%	2%
childcare policies/practices (or lack thereof)	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	1%	1%
availability/quality of childcare facilities	2%	2%	1%	0%	1%	1%	5%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
spousal/partner hiring prog. (or lack thereof)	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	5%	2%	1%
compensation	21%	25%	29%	22%	25%	31%	20%	24%	25%	21%	27%	32%	21%	24%	27%	20%	25%	30%	22%	25%	29%
geographic location	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	0%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	2%	0%	2%	2%	4%	1%	1%
lack of diversity	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	3%	4%	4%
absence of others like me	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	0%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	0%	1%	2%	0%	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%
my lack of fit here	3%	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
too much service/too many assignments	12%	12%	11%	11%	10%	10%	15%	17%	14%	11%	11%	8%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	11%	12%	12%	10%
commute	8%	10%	8%	11%	10%	7%	5%	10%	9%	8%	11%	8%	8%	9%	8%	7%	10%	8%	10%	8%	7%
cost of living	9%	11%	15%	10%	9%	13%	9%	13%	18%	13%	13%	18%	8%	9%	12%	13%	12%	15%	4%	8%	14%
teaching load	45%	35%	29%	40%	37%	29%	52%	34%	29%	42%	35%	28%	47%	36%	29%	49%	38%	29%	39%	31%	27%
unrelenting pressure to perform	3%	4%	2%	5%	5%	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	5%	3%	3%	4%	2%	4%	5%	3%
academic freedom	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
t&p clarity or requirements	2%	5%	4%	2%	4%	3%	2%	5%	5%	2%	5%	4%	2%	4%	4%	2%	4%	4%	3%	6%	5%
quality of leadership	8%	9%	10%	7%	11%	12%	9%	6%	5%	10%	10%	10%	7%	8%	9%	8%	9%	10%	6%	9%	8%
other (please specify)	8%	8%	9%	11%	9%	9%	4%	8%	8%	10%	8%	7%	7%	8%	10%	8%	9%	10%	6%	7%	6%
decline to answer	4%	4%	3%	2%	4%	4%	6%	4%	3%	0%	5%	4%	5%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	5%	3%	4%
there are no negative aspects	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%	0%	3%	2%	5%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	4%	2%



The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education
at the Harvard Graduate School of Education

The Provost's Report
APPENDIX



YOUR RESULTS ARE IN YOUR HANDS... NOW WHAT?

YOUR FIRST STEPS

By Kiernan Mathews, Director

This COACHE Provost'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 **Provost'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.

Your rich dataset tells many stories, and review of the **means comparisons and frequency distributions** will yield some important nuances that defy easy summary. Institutional researchers find these tables particularly useful in organizing data for special constituents' needs (e.g., for a committee on the status of women or the chief diversity officer), but these crosstabs can be useful to anyone looking for more detail.

For example, you can sort the **Excel version** of these data tables to identify quickly *the degree to which* your faculty are more or less satisfied than faculty at your six peers. You can also use the **Criteria tab** in your Excel report to raise or lower the threshold for areas of strength and weakness. If your report is overrun with highlighted differences between men's and women's levels of satisfaction, you can easily raise the threshold for highlighting, and the report will adjust itself accordingly. Changing the criteria for “top-level” results, then, allows you to reorganize your report around your biggest successes and most pressing problems.

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

* 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.

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.

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 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."

COACHE & 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 Provost'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.



BACKGROUND & 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 clinical faculty in such areas as Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine
- 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:

$$\frac{x_1 - x_2}{\sqrt{(sd_1^2 + (sd_2^2)/2)}}$$

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.

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.



The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE)

at the Harvard Graduate School of Education

8 Story Street, Fifth Floor

Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Telephone: (617) 495-5285

E-mail: coache@gse.harvard.edu

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