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$n < 5$
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.

**Percentage difference (% diff)**
In reporting comparisons of means, many studies express the result as a percentage difference based on one of the subgroup means. For example, if females (group1) rated clarity of the tenure criteria at 2.40 on a five-point scale, and males (group2) rated the same dimension at 2.00, one might report that “women find tenure criteria 20 percent clearer than do men.”

\[
\frac{\text{group1} - \text{group2}}{\text{group2}}
\]

By this method, however, the same difference in rating (0.40) at the higher end of the five-point scale would seem narrower if expressed as a percentage. If we compare a female (group1) mean of 4.40 against a male (group2) mean of 4.00, we find just 10 percent difference—half the difference of our earlier example—even though the absolute difference between the results is the same. Thus, using a variable divisor (group2) exaggerates differences at the low end of a scale, or conversely, mutes differences at the high end of a scale.

Another problem caused by this method is that the percentage value of the difference changes depending on how you express the comparison: “Women find tenure clarity 20 percent clearer than do men,” but “Men find tenure clarity 16.7 percent less clear than do women.”

Still, expressing comparative results as a percentage is a universal method of deciding whether or not a difference is “important,” “practical,” or “meaningful.” Therefore, your COACHE report expresses differences as a percentage of the range on our five point scale.

\[
\frac{\text{group1} - \text{group2}}{\text{scale high} - \text{scale low}}
\]

To cite the examples above, the 0.40 that separates female and male results—whether at the low or high end of the scale—will always be 10 percent of the range of possible clarity responses, or \(5 - 1 = 4\). Likewise, a 10 percent difference always translates into a 0.40 difference in means.

Arguably, the fixed divisor could be the number (5), not the range (4) of responses. We provide your data in a format allowing you to substitute your own assumptions. (Be aware that such a change will make smaller the relative differences between groups.) However, we believe that these assumptions strengthen the consistency of the analysis from item to item across the dimensions of the survey.

**Response rate**
The percent of all eligible pre-tenure faculty, by gender and by race, whose responses, following the data conditioning process, were deemed eligible to be included in this analysis. These response rates determine the weight scale used to balance the sample.
Please contact COACHE with any additional questions about methodology and definitions, about survey administration, or about any aspects of this institutional report.

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE)
Harvard Graduate School of Education
8 Story Street, 5th Floor
Cambridge, MA 02138
Email: coache@gse.harvard.edu
URL: http://www.coache.org
Voice: 617-496-9348
Fax: 617-496-9350
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Executive Summary
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Areas of strength
Your faculty’s ratings of the following survey dimensions placed your institution first or second (out of six) compared to peers and in the top quartile compared to all comparable COACHE participants. We recommend sharing these findings (e.g., in job postings, with search committees and prospective faculty) as compelling aspects of your institution as a workplace.

Tenure practices
- clarity of tenure process
- clarity of tenure criteria
- clarity of tenure standards
- clarity of tenure body of evidence
- clarity of sense of achieving tenure
- consistent messages about tenure from tenured colleagues
- periodic, formal performance reviews
- written summary of performance reviews

Tenure expectations: Clarity
- clarity of expectations: scholar
- clarity of expectations: teacher
- clarity of expectations: colleague in department

Tenure expectations: Reasonableness
- reasonableness of expectations: scholar
- reasonableness of expectations: colleague in department

Nature of the work: Research
- influence over focus of research

Work and home
- spousal/partner hiring program
- paid/unpaid personal leave
- institution makes having children and tenure-track compatible
- institution makes raising children and tenure-track compatible
- colleagues make having children and tenure-track compatible
- colleagues make raising children and tenure-track compatible

Climate, culture, collegiality
- formal mentoring
- peer reviews of teaching or research
- informal mentoring
- opportunities to collaborate with tenured faculty
- amount of professional interaction with tenured colleagues
- intellectual vitality of tenured colleagues

Compensation and benefits
- financial assistance with housing

Global satisfaction
department as a place to work
CAO cares about quality of life for pre-tenure faculty
overall rating of institution

**Areas of concern**

Your faculty’s ratings of the following survey dimensions placed your institution *fifth or sixth (out of six)* compared to peers and *in the bottom quartile* compared to all comparable COACHE participants. We recommend targeting these areas for intervention.

**Nature of the work: Overall**
- amount of access to TA’s, RA’s, etc.
- computing services

**Nature of the work: Research**
- professional assistance in obtaining grants

**Nature of the work: Teaching**
- discretion over course content
- teaching services

**Climate, culture, collegiality**
- how well you fit

**Improving trends**

Compared to your prior survey results, the following dimensions appear to have improved to an extent you might consider meaningful (i.e., *by five percent or more*).

**Tenure practices**
- consistent messages about tenure from tenured colleagues

**Tenure expectations: Clarity**
- clarity of expectations: colleague in department

**Nature of the work: Overall**
- quality of facilities
- computing services

**Nature of the work: Research**
- amount of time to conduct research
- travel funds

**Nature of the work: Teaching**
- degree of influence over which courses you teach
- number of students you teach

**Work and home**
- childcare
- institution makes having children and tenure-track compatible
- institution makes raising children and tenure-track compatible
- colleagues make having children and tenure-track compatible
- colleagues make raising children and tenure-track compatible
- ability to balance between professional and personal time

**Climate, culture, collegiality**
- formal mentoring
Areas of strength / Areas of concern

**Compensation and benefits**
- financial assistance with housing
- compensation

**Global satisfaction**
- department as a place to work

---

**Worsening trends**
Compared to your prior survey results, the following dimensions appear to have worsened to an extent you might consider meaningful (i.e., by five percent or more).

**Tenure practices**
- clarity of sense of achieving tenure
- upper limit on committee assignments

**Tenure expectations: Clarity**
- clarity of expectations: advisor
- clarity of expectations: campus citizen
- clarity of expectations: member of community

**Tenure expectations: Reasonableness**
- reasonableness of expectations: scholar
- reasonableness of expectations: teacher
- reasonableness of expectations: advisor
- reasonableness of expectations: campus citizen
- reasonableness of expectations: member of community

**Nature of the work: Overall**
- way you spend your time as a faculty member

**Nature of the work: Research**
- professional assistance in obtaining grants
- paid/unpaid research leave

**Nature of the work: Teaching**
- teaching services
- upper limit on teaching obligations

**Work and home**
- stop-the-clock

**Climate, culture, collegiality**
- peer reviews of teaching or research
- fairness of immediate supervisor’s evaluations
- amount of personal interaction with tenured colleagues
- amount of professional interaction with pre-tenure colleagues
- amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure colleagues
- how well you fit
- intellectual vitality of tenured colleagues

**Global satisfaction**
- would again choose to work at this institution
This table summarizes your mean results for each survey dimension. The overall mean is shown. In the "vs others" column, a green arrow signifies that your institution places first or second amongst peers and in the top quartile overall; a red arrow indicates that you ranked fifth or sixth amongst peers and the bottom quartile overall. In all other columns, the arrows demonstrate that the mean is better (green) or worse (red) than the comparable group's mean by 10 percent or more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OVERALL RESULTS</th>
<th>SUBGROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>vs others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>clarity of tenure process</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>clarity of tenure criteria</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>clarity of tenure standards</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>clarity of tenure body of evidence</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>clarity of sense of achieving tenure</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24A</td>
<td>clarity of expectations: scholar</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24B</td>
<td>clarity of expectations: teacher</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24C</td>
<td>clarity of expectations: advisor</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24D</td>
<td>clarity of expectations: colleague in department</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24E</td>
<td>clarity of expectations: campus citizen</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24F</td>
<td>clarity of expectations: member of community</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25A</td>
<td>reasonableness of expectations: scholar</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25B</td>
<td>reasonableness of expectations: teacher</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25C</td>
<td>reasonableness of expectations: advisor</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25D</td>
<td>reasonableness of expectations: colleague in department</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25E</td>
<td>reasonableness of expectations: campus citizen</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25F</td>
<td>reasonableness of expectations: member of community</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>consistent messages about tenure from tenured colleagues</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27A</td>
<td>tenure decisions based on performance</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>way you spend your time as a faculty member</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28B</td>
<td>number of hours you work as a faculty member</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29A</td>
<td>level of courses you teach</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29B</td>
<td>number of courses you teach</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29C</td>
<td>degree of influence over which courses you teach</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29D</td>
<td>discretion over course content</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29E</td>
<td>number of students you teach</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29F</td>
<td>quality of undergraduate students</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29G</td>
<td>quality of graduate students</td>
<td>N&lt;5</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30B</td>
<td>amount of time to conduct research</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30C</td>
<td>expectations for finding external funding</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30D</td>
<td>influence over focus of research</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>quality of facilities</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>amount of access to TA's, RA's, etc.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33A</td>
<td>clerical/administrative services</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33B</td>
<td>research services</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33C</td>
<td>teaching services</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33D</td>
<td>computing services</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table summarizes your mean results for each survey dimension. The overall mean is shown. In the "vs others" column, a green arrow signifies that your institution places first or second amongst peers and in the top quartile overall; a red arrow indicates that you ranked fifth or sixth amongst peers and the bottom quartile overall. In all other columns, the arrows demonstrate that the mean is better (green) or worse (red) than the comparable group's mean by 10 percent or more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OVERALL RESULTS</th>
<th>SUBGROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>vs others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B1</td>
<td>formal mentoring</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B2</td>
<td>informal mentoring</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B3</td>
<td>periodic, formal performance reviews</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B4</td>
<td>written summary of performance reviews</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B5</td>
<td>professional assistance in obtaining grants</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B6</td>
<td>professional assistance for improving teaching</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B7</td>
<td>travel funds</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B8</td>
<td>paid/unpaid research leave</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B9</td>
<td>paid/unpaid personal leave</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B10</td>
<td>upper limit on committee assignments</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B11</td>
<td>upper limit on teaching obligations</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B12</td>
<td>peer reviews of teaching or research</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B13</td>
<td>childcare</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B14</td>
<td>financial assistance with housing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B15</td>
<td>stop-the-clock</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B16</td>
<td>spousal/partner hiring program</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B17</td>
<td>elder care</td>
<td>N&lt;5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B18</td>
<td>tuition waivers</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B19</td>
<td>modified duties for parental or other family reasons</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34B20</td>
<td>part-time tenure-track position</td>
<td>N&lt;5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35A</td>
<td>institution makes having children and tenure-track compatible</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35B</td>
<td>institution makes raising children and tenure-track compatible</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35C</td>
<td>colleagues make having children and tenure-track compatible</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35D</td>
<td>colleagues make raising children and tenure-track compatible</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35E</td>
<td>colleagues are respectful of efforts to balance work/home</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>compensation</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>ability to balance between professional and personal time</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38A</td>
<td>fairness of immediate supervisor's evaluations</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38B</td>
<td>interest tenured faculty take in your professional development</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38C</td>
<td>opportunities to collaborate with tenured faculty</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38D</td>
<td>value faculty in your department place on your work</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39A</td>
<td>amount of professional interaction with tenured colleagues</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39B</td>
<td>amount of personal interaction with tenured colleagues</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39C</td>
<td>amount of professional interaction with pre-tenure colleagues</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39D</td>
<td>amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure colleagues</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>how well you fit</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>intellectual vitality of tenured colleagues</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41A</td>
<td>intellectual vitality of pre-tenure colleagues</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41B</td>
<td>participation in governance of institution</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41C</td>
<td>participation in governance of department</td>
<td>N&lt;5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>on the whole, institution is collegial</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45A</td>
<td>department as a place to work</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45B</td>
<td>institution as a place to work</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46B</td>
<td>CAO cares about quality of life for pre-tenure faculty</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>would again choose to work at this institution</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>overall rating of institution</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tenure Expectations: Clarity

clarity of expectations: scholar
clarity of expectations: teacher
clarity of expectations: advisor
clarity of expectations: colleague in department
clarity of expectations: campus citizen
clarity of expectations: member of community
Tenure Expectations: Reasonableness

- Scholar
- Teacher
- Advisor
- Colleague in department
- Campus citizen
- Member of community
Nature of Work: Research

amount of time to conduct research
expectations for finding external funding
influence over focus of research
research services
professional assistance in obtaining grants
travel funds
paid/unpaid research leave

- amount of time to conduct research
- expectations for finding external funding
- influence over focus of research
- research services
- professional assistance in obtaining grants
- travel funds
- paid/unpaid research leave
Nature of Work: Teaching

Level of courses you teach

Number of courses you teach

Degree of influence over which courses you teach

Discretion over course content

Number of students you teach

Quality of undergraduate students

Teaching services

Upper limit on teaching obligations

Professional assistance for improving teaching

Number of students you teach

Quality of undergraduate students

Teaching services

Upper limit on teaching obligations

Professional assistance for improving teaching
Work and Home

- childcare
- stop-the-clock
- spousal/partner hiring program
- elder care
- modified duties for parental or other family reasons
- part-time tenure-track position
- paid/unpaid personal leave
- institution makes having children and tenure-track compatible
- institution makes raising children and tenure-track compatible
- colleagues make having children and tenure-track compatible
- colleagues make raising children and tenure-track compatible
- colleagues are respectful of efforts to balance work/home
- ability to balance between professional and personal time

Insufficient data for reporting
Compensation and Benefits

- Financial assistance with housing
- Tuition waivers
- Compensation

- Insufficient data for reporting
Global Satisfaction

1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5 3.0 3.5 4.0 4.5 5.0

department as a place to work
institution as a place to work
CAO cares about quality of life for pre-tenure faculty
would again choose to work at this institution
overall rating of institution

CAO cares about quality of life for pre-tenure faculty
would again choose to work at this institution
overall rating of institution

Overall rating: 4.0

Department as a place to work: 3.5
Institution as a place to work: 4.0
CAO cares about quality of life for pre-tenure faculty: 3.0
Would again choose to work at this institution: 3.5
PREFACE

One of the great strengths of an institution of higher education is its faculty. A consensus has emerged that college faculty are affected by their perception of the values and rewards in their workplace, and that supportive environments promote faculty satisfaction, which can lead to increased productivity and retention. With this understanding, the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at the Harvard Graduate School of Education developed the Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey.

This core instrument of COACHE was developed, tested, validated, and is continually improved with assistance from participating institutions. Our survey assesses early-career faculty experiences in several areas deemed critical to their success:

- Clarity and reasonableness of tenure processes and review
- Workload and support for teaching and research
- Integration and balance of work and home responsibilities
- Climate, culture and collegiality on campus
- Compensation and benefits
- Global satisfaction

The result is this diagnostic and comparative management tool for college and university leaders. The COACHE Institutional Report pinpoints problem areas, whether within a particular policy or practice, academic area, or demographic. Each of the over 120 colleges and universities in the Collaborative receives a custom version of this benchmarking report and analysis of our job satisfaction database with responses of over 10,000 pre-tenure faculty nationwide.

Membership in the Collaborative, however, does not conclude with delivery of this report. Academic leaders use COACHE results to focus attention, spot successes and weaknesses, and then take concrete steps to make policies and practices more effective and more prevalent.

Our mission to make the academy a more attractive place to work is advanced only when supported by institutional action. To that end, COACHE is your partner and a resource for maximizing the ability of your data to initiate dialogue, recruit talented new scholars, and further the work satisfaction of all faculty at your institution. For our advice on making the most of your participation, please review the supplementary material provided with this report. Then, contact us with any questions or new ideas that have emerged.
GUIDE TO YOUR REPORT

The data, summary tables, and visual displays provided here tell the story of your pre-tenure faculty’s satisfaction and experiences working at your institution. Your report is comprised of three sections:

I. Executive summary

The executive summary gives an overview of what your pre-tenure, tenure-track faculty members think about working at your institution. It shows, in a condensed fashion, your institution’s strengths and weaknesses, in relation to the five peer institutions you chose for comparison, as well as in relation to all COACHE colleges or universities.

Areas of strength and areas of concern
Translating the visual displays into text produced these lists of survey dimensions for which your faculty’s responses overall ranked your institution particularly well or poorly relative to your peers and to comparable COACHE sites. If you read nothing else in this report, you will learn the general thrust of your results from this synopsis.

Improving trends and worsening trends
For institutions that have administered the survey more than once, we have compared your current survey results to your prior data by highlighting the dimensions that, overall, have improved or worsened by five percent or more.

Dashboards
The benchmark dashboard identifies your institution’s results across the ten COACHE benchmarks of tenure-track faculty success. Each benchmark is the average score—along five-point scales—of several survey dimensions that share a common theme. Additional dashboards present the individual components making up the benchmark scores. All dashboards are simplified views of your absolute and comparative results overall; to grasp the nuances of your results by gender and over time (where applicable), we encourage further exploration of the means and frequency data.

The dashboard’s visual display represents your mean rating as a black diamond (♦), your selected peer ratings as circles (○), and the mean of all comparable institutions (i.e., “universities” or “colleges”) as a line (—) on a five-point scale. The green box signifies the performance of the top quartile of campuses in your comparable institutional group; the grey box, the middle 50 percent;
and the red box, the bottom quartile.’ As you read across the data display, train your eye on the black diamond to discover a) your highest and lowest scores, and b) whether those scores place your faculty among the top, middle, or bottom of your peers and all others. (Note, however, that comparisons are not available for some questions new to the survey in 2008-09 due to insufficient data.)

Index of results

With this list of overall results for nearly all survey dimensions, we have paired comparisons beyond your walls to comparisons within. Alongside the overall mean results, green (▲) and red (▼) arrows suggest where your results are most positive, most negative, or mixed. This table serves best as an index to the fine-grained data tables of your report.

Policies and practices: effectiveness gaps

For the faculty who rated various policies as important to their success, we report the percentage (and rank order) who rated the policy as effective or ineffective (or not offered) at your institution. Higher percentages in the first chart indicate relatively successful policies, but in the second chart indicate policies currently absent or not working well.

Best and worst aspects about working at your institution

From a list of common characteristics of the academic workplace, your faculty chose two “best” and two “worst” aspects about working at your institution. We report the four aspects most frequently cited in each case and how many other peers and comparable COACHE sites share your best or worst qualities. In addition, all responses are grouped into response categories (e.g., tenure, nature of the work, external factors) and presented overall and by sub-groups in a chart format.

II. Data tables and other results

Descriptive data

We provide the survey response rates for your institution, your peers, and for all comparable sites. You will also find here the range of weights used in calculating your results, as well as the names of the five institutions you selected as your peers. (Peer data, however, is kept anonymous throughout this report.)

Demographic data

This is the report of the initial questions of the survey, which ask respondents to provide background information about their careers, family status, and other personal characteristics. Though much of this information is not used later in the report, COACHE analysts are available for follow-up analysis that takes into account any of these demographics variables.

Mean comparisons

The mean comparisons are based on results from all survey respondents at your institution, at the five peer institutions you selected, and at all other comparable institutions participating in this study (i.e., all colleges or all universities). For each survey dimension, the mean is the weighted arithmetic average of faculty responses on a particular item. Means are provided for your institution overall, for your peer institutions individually

* If you have selected a peer institution outside of your institutional type’s “comparables” (e.g., you are a university and selected a college as a peer in the faculty labor market), some peer symbols (O) may fall outside the shaded percentile boxes. This is because the range of “comparables” includes only institutions of your same type.
and overall, for all comparable institutions overall, and—where population size allows—for groups by gender, by race (white faculty or faculty of color), by academic area, and against prior survey results (if your institution is administering the survey for a second time). In separate columns, the relative position of your results is provided by a rank against your five peers and by a percentile among all comparable institutions. For further context (i.e., of the distribution of results), the means of the institutions at the 75th and 25th percentiles are provided.

Frequency distributions
As with the mean comparisons, these frequency distribution tables are based on results from all survey respondents at your institution and at all other institutions participating in this study. Provided here are the weighted number and percentage of faculty responses on each survey dimension. We provide comparisons overall and between the same sub-groups identified in the mean comparisons (i.e., by gender, race/ethnicity, academic area, and current/prior survey administrations).

A note on interpreting means and frequencies
Relative frequencies of responses for each item can provide crucial information not given by the mean score alone. While a group’s mean score on an item gives valuable information about the group’s central tendency, the frequency can tell you the extent to which the group is polarized in their responses. For example, consider the following two hypothetical cases:

1) In one case, half of a group of pre-tenure faculty chose “Very dissatisfied” (1) on a 5-point scale, and half chose “Very satisfied” (5);
2) In the second case, every respondent in the group chose “Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” (3).

In both cases, the mean score is 3.0; however, whereas in the second case the mean reflects individuals’ attitudes very accurately, in the first case, the mean (Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied) does not actually reflect the attitude of anyone in the group. Rather, this group seems to be made up of two sub-groups with very different attitudes. It is important to take into account the polarization of scores when considering policy changes in order to gain a greater understanding of how faculty members will be affected.
Policies and practices: detail
These tables provide a deeper glimpse at your faculty’s ratings of the importance and effectiveness of twenty policies and practices at your institution.

Responses to open-ended questions
This section shows the comments written by your pre-tenure faculty in response to follow-up questions to five survey items and to one open-ended question:

Q27b. On what are tenure decisions in your department primarily based? Subjects were asked this follow-up question if they responded “Somewhat disagree” or “Strongly disagree” to Question 27a (“From what I can gather, tenure decisions here are based primarily on performance rather than on politics, relationships, or demographics.”).

Q44a. Please check the two (and only two) best aspects about working at your institution. Subjects responding "Other" were asked to specify.

Q44b. Please check the two (and only two) worst aspects about working at your institution. Subjects responding "Other" were asked to specify.

Q46a. Who serves as the chief academic officer at your institution? Subjects responding “other” were asked to specify.

Q47b. Assuming you achieve tenure, how long do you plan to remain at your institution? Subjects responding “For no more than 5 years after earning tenure” to Q47 were prompted in Q47b to specify their reasons.

Q51. Please use the space below to tell us the number one thing that you, personally, think your institution should do in order to be a great place to work.

III. Appendices

A. Participating institutions
A list of institutions, by type, control, and cohort, whose data comprise the COACHE database. If your institutional type is “college,” then your comparables in this report are all colleges; if your type is university, your “comparables” are all universities.

B. Survey instrument
A static, coded version of the web-based instrument is provided in the first appendix. Please note that this medium does not accurately indicate survey “adaptive branching” behavior, where some items are skipped because of responses to previous questions.

C. Suggestions for action
Selections from COACHE’s extensive policy response database (a resource for COACHE members), included here to provide a range of possible next steps as you involve your campus in discussions around your COACHE results.
D. Results of custom questions (if applicable)

For institutions that appended additional, custom questions to the COACHE survey, the results are displayed here in cross-tabulations and/or open-ended narrative.

METHOD

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, tenure-track 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 and tested in focus groups and a rigorous pilot study with twelve sites (see Survey Design below). The survey asked full-time tenure-track faculty to rate the attractiveness of various terms and conditions of employment and to assess their own level of work satisfaction. 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 full-time, pre-tenure, tenure-track faculty, especially with regard to the promotion and tenure process, work-family balance, and organizational climate and culture.

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

Survey design

The chief aim in developing the COACHE Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey was to assess, in a comprehensive and quantitative way, pre-tenure 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.

First, six focus groups were conducted with a total of 57 tenure-track 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 Harvard University and advisory board experts on survey development, COACHE researchers developed a web-based survey prototype that was then tested in a pilot study of 1,188 pre-tenure faculty members at 12 institutions.

COACHE solicited feedback about the survey by conducting follow-up interviews with a sub-sample of the respondents of the pilot study. 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 since the pilot study.
Survey administration
All eligible subjects at participating institutions were invited to complete the survey. Eligibility was determined according to the following criteria:

- Full-time
- Tenure-track/ladder rank
- Pre-tenure
- Hired prior to 2008 (new hires are unable to respond meaningfully to many questions)
- Not clinical faculty in such areas as Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine
- Not in terminal year after being denied tenure

See “Descriptive data” in your report for response rates at your institution by gender and by race.

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 (coache@gse.harvard.edu) 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 responded to a series of multiple-choice and open-ended questions (see Appendix B). The average survey completion time was approximately 20 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 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.

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]).

DEFINITIONS

Data weighting or “weight scale”
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. (See “Descriptive Data” in your report for your institution’s weight scale.)

Faculty of color
Any respondent identified by his or her institution or self-identifying in the survey as non-White.
## Most frequently cited best aspects about working at your institution (Q44a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>category</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>Selected peers</th>
<th>All comparables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>quality of undergraduate students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>support of colleagues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>my sense of “fit” here</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>academic freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>external factors</td>
<td>cost of living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>category</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>Selected peers</th>
<th>All comparables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>support of colleagues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>my sense of “fit” here</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>quality of undergraduate students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>external factors</td>
<td>cost of living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>manageable pressure to perform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>category</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>Selected peers</th>
<th>All comparables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>quality of undergraduate students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>support of colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>academic freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>policies and practices</td>
<td>spousal/partner hiring program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>my sense of “fit” here</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>quality of colleagues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>external factors</td>
<td>cost of living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Most frequently cited worst aspects about working at your institution (Q44b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>category</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selected peers</td>
<td>All comparables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>external factors</td>
<td>geographic location</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>absence of others like me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>unrelenting pressure to perform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>tenure requirements in general</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>external factors</td>
<td>geographic location</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>absence of others like me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>lack of support for research/creative work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>lack of assistance for grant proposals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>policies and practices</td>
<td>spousal/partner hiring program (or lack thereof)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>external factors</td>
<td>commute</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>teaching load</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>external factors</td>
<td>geographic location</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>nature of the work</td>
<td>unrelenting pressure to perform</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>climate, culture and collegiality</td>
<td>lack of diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>tenure requirements in general</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>