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INTRODUCTION

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) is an ongoing study of faculty job satisfaction coordinated and administered by Harvard University. COACHE strives to place actionable information in the hands of participating colleges and universities to improve work life for faculty. COACHE administers an annual survey and provides each participating institution with a formal Provost’s report containing both internal and external comparative analyses highlighting each institution’s strengths and opportunities for improvement. The MU Office of Institutional Research and Quality Improvement has used COACHE data from 2013, 2016, and 2019 to create this report specific to your school/college.

The 2019 COACHE survey of faculty satisfaction was last administered in spring 2019. The data is aggregated into 25 benchmarks of faculty job satisfaction, separated into the 7 categories listed below. For more information regarding the construction of these benchmarks see Appendix B.

- Nature of Work
- Professional Support
- Professional Development
- Tenure and Promotion
- Leadership
- Shared Governance
- Departmental Climate

Average scores on each benchmark can range between 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Scores are not normed. Benchmark scores are intended to be starting points for further examination of the survey data or the jumping off point for gathering more information about the dimension in your school or college (perhaps through interviews or focus groups with faculty, or through examination of existing processes and policies).

COACHE provides comparisons between the faculty at MU with selected peer institutions and a larger cohort. The selected peers for MU are Indiana University - Bloomington, Iowa State University, Purdue University, University of Arizona, and University of Virginia. The comparison cohort includes 103 COACHE partner institutions whose faculty size and organizational characteristics are similar to MU.

This report contains the following sections:

- Response Rates .......................................................................................................................... 2
- External Comparisons ................................................................................................................. 3
- General Satisfaction ..................................................................................................................... 6
- Internal Rankings ......................................................................................................................... 8
- Benchmark Comparisons by Year .............................................................................................. 9
- Benchmark Comparisons by Category .................................................................................... 10
- Appendices ................................................................................................................................. 17

Limitations: To preserve the anonymity of respondents, department level data cannot be provided. Due to a lack of access to our peer institutions’ data, we cannot provide external comparisons at the school/college level.
The following information will give you an overall view of the response rates for the 2019 COACHE survey. Each chart/figure provides a different magnification - starting with the broadest view comparing MU to our peers and cohort then narrowing to your school/college counts. For more information regarding the sample selection, survey design, and definitions (e.g. FOC, URM, etc.) refer to Appendix A.

Overall, the 2019 MU campus response rate was 41% - a 13% decrease from 2016 and slightly lower than our selected peer and cohort. The College of Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources (CAFNR) response rate was 45.51% - a 10% decrease from 2016.
The next two pages of this report provide an overview of the faculty satisfaction at MU compared to our selected peers and cohort. Please refer to the guides included on this page when interpreting these results.

Overall, MU faculty are more satisfied than 70% of faculty in our cohort of 103 institutions in two benchmarks areas: Personal/Family Policy and Collaboration.

Overall, MU faculty were the least satisfied among our peer institutions and less satisfied than 70% of faculty in our cohort in 6 benchmarks: Faculty Leadership, Appreciation and Recognition, and Governance (Adaptability, Productivity, Purpose, and Understanding).

Each governance benchmark has improved since 2016, but all remain an area of concern in 2019.
2019 COACHE Benchmark Comparison - MU with Selected Peers & Cohort

Nature of Work: Research
Nature of Work: Service
Nature of Work: Teaching
Facilities and Work Resources
Personal and Family Policies
Health and Retirement Benefits
Interdisciplinary Work
Collaboration
Mentoring
Tenure Policies
Tenure Expectations: Clarity
Promotion to Full
Leadership: Senior
Leadership: Divisional
Leadership: Departmental
Leadership: Faculty
Governance: Trust
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose
Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand
Governance: Adaptability
Governance: Productivity
Departmental Collegiality
Departmental Engagement
Departmental Quality
Appreciation and Recognition

Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL SATISFACTION

The remainder of this report will focus specifically on the College of Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources. The figures below depict the views of only CAFNR faculty.

If a candidate for a faculty position asked you about your department as a place to work, you would...

- NTT
- Pre-Tenure
- Tenured

All things considered, what is your level of satisfaction...

- Working in CAFNR
- Working at MU

If I had to do it all over, I would choose MU again...

- Women
- Men
- Faculty of Color
- Underrepresented Faculty

Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI
**General Satisfaction**

**Worst Aspects of Working at MU**
- Compensation
- Unrelenting pressure to perform
- Quality of leadership
- Quality of facilities
- Too much service/too many assignments

**Best Aspects of Working at MU**
- Academic freedom
- Collaborating with colleagues
- Quality of colleagues
- Support of colleagues
- Cost of living

**How long do you plan to remain at MU? (Excludes Tenured Faculty)**

- Women
- Men
- Faculty of Color
- Pre-Tenure
- NTT

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

- To improve your salary/benefits
- To retire
- To find more resources in support of your work
- To pursue an administrative position
- To improve your quality of life

Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI
INTERNAL RANKINGS

- Lowest School/College Score to Median Score
- Median Score to Highest School/College Score
- CAFNR

1. Nature of Work: Service
2. Nature of Work: Teaching
3. Nature of Work: Research
4. Facilities & Work Resources
5. Personal & Family Benefits
6. Health & Retirement Benefits
7. Appreciation & Recognition
8. Interdisciplinary Work
9. Collaboration
10. Mentoring
11. Tenure Policies
12. Tenure Clarity
13. Promotion
14. Leadership: Senior
15. Leadership: Division
16. Leadership: Departmental
17. Leadership: Faculty
18. Governance: Trust
19. Governance: Purpose
20. Governance: Understanding
21. Governance: Adaptability
22. Governance: Productivity
23. Departmental: Engagement
24. Departmental: Quality
25. Departmental: Collegiality

Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI
2019 COACHE Benchmark Comparison from 2013, 2016 & 2019

Overall
Nature of Work: Service
Nature of Work: Teaching
Nature of Work: Research
Facilities & Work Resources
Personal & Family Benefits
Health & Retirement Benefits
Appreciation & Recognition
Interdisciplinary Work
Collaboration
Mentoring
Tenure Policies
Tenure Clarity
Promotion
Leadership: Senior
Leadership: Division
Leadership: Departmental
Leadership: Faculty
Governance: Trust
Governance: Purpose
Governance: Understanding
Governance: Adaptability
Governance: Productivity
Departmental: Engagement
Departmental: Quality
Departmental: Collegiality
The boxes above show the percent-change in benchmark score from 2016 to 2019 in CAFNR. The bar graphs below compare CAFNR faculty with the rest of faculty at MU (excludes CAFNR faculty).

Each pair of bars is comparing a faculty demographic with their counterparts across MU. Pay particular attention to large differences between bar-pairs. This indicates that the faculty in your school/college are considerably different than the rest of the faculty at MU.
### Professional Support Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MU Campus</th>
<th>CAFNR Women</th>
<th>CAFNR Men</th>
<th>CAFNR Faculty of Color</th>
<th>CAFNR Underrepresented Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities &amp; Work Resources</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal &amp; Family Benefits</strong></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Retirement Benefits</strong></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appreciation &amp; Recognition</strong></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

- Facilities & Work Resources: -0.3%
- Personal & Family Benefits: 4.1%
- Health & Retirement Benefits: 7.0%
- Appreciation & Recognition: 3.1%

*Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI*
**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BENCHMARKS**

**INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK**
- MU Campus: 1.8%

**COLLABORATION**
- MU Campus: 4.6%

**MENTORING**
- MU Campus: -0.2%

---

*Interdisciplinary Work Collaboration Mentoring*

MU Campus  CAFNR Women  CAFNR Men  CAFNR Faculty of Color  CAFNR Underrepresented Faculty

Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI
### TENURE & PROMOTION BENCHMARKS

#### TENURE POLICIES

- **MU Campus**: 12.6%
- **CAFNR Professor**: 12.0%
- **CAFNR Assistant**: -2.3%

#### TENURE CLARITY

- **MU Campus**: 12.6%
- **CAFNR Women**: 12.0%
- **CAFNR Men**: -2.3%
- **CAFNR Faculty of Color**: Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI
- **CAFNR Underrepresented Faculty**: Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI

#### PROMOTION

- **MU Campus**: 12.6%
- **CAFNR Professor**: 12.0%
- **CAFNR Assistant**: -2.3%

*Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI*
### SHARED GOVERNANCE BENCHMARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRUST</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>UNDERSTANDING</th>
<th>ADAPTABILITY</th>
<th>PRODUCTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bar Charts

- **MU Campus**
- **CAFNR Women**
- **CAFNR Men**
- **CAFNR Faculty of Color**
- **CAFNR Underrepresented Faculty**

### Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI
DEPARTMENTAL BENCHMARKS

ENGAGEMENT
-0.8%

QUALITY
-2.2%

COLLEGIALITY
1.9%

MU Campus
CAFNR Women
CAFNR Men
CAFNR Faculty of Color
CAFNR Underrepresented Faculty

Engagement
Quality
Collegiality

MU Campus
CAFNR Professor
CAFNR Associate
CAFNR Assistant
CAFNR NTT

Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI
APPENDIX A

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.

Survey Design
The chief aim in developing the COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey was to assess, in a comprehensive and quantitative way, faculty's work-related quality of life. The survey addresses multiple facets of job satisfaction and includes specific questions that would yield unambiguous, actionable data on key policy-relevant issues. The COACHE instrument was developed and validated in stages over a period of several years. Focus groups were conducted with faculty to learn how they view certain work-related issues, including specific institutional policies and practices, work climate, the ability to balance professional and personal lives, issues surrounding tenure, and overall job satisfaction.

Drawing from the focus groups, prior surveys on job satisfaction among academics and other professionals, and consultation with subject matter and advisory board experts on survey development, COACHE researchers developed web-based survey prototypes that were then tested in pilot studies across multiple institutions. COACHE solicited feedback about the survey by conducting follow-up interviews with a sub-sample of the respondents of the pilot study. Cognitive interviews were conducted with faculty from a broad range of institutional types to test the generalizability of questions across various institutional types. The survey was revised in light of this feedback. The current version of the survey was revised further, taking into account feedback provided by respondents in survey administrations annually since 2005.

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

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

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

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

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.

Faculty of color or "FOC"
Any respondent identified by his or her institution or self-identifying in the survey as non-White.

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

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

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.
### Instrumentation Summary

These tables list the **abbreviated** names for nearly every item included in the 2018-19 edition of the COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey. Some items are rated on an agreement scale, others on a satisfaction scale, still others on a frequency scale, and so on. The complete instrument is available upon request.

The question identifiers (e.g., “Q45B”) skip in sequence and do not indicate the quantity of variables in this survey, only their relative order; although a “Q460” exists, there are not 460 questions. Also, due to adaptive survey branching (depending on respondents’ institutional types, rank, tenure status, etc.), no participant is administered every item in the instrument.

Completion rates and response times positively reflect this tailoring of the survey experience. During the developmental phases of our research, COACHE analysts conducted a series of principal component analyses (PCA) to derive twenty summary themes, or benchmarks, which describe faculty attitudes about their workplaces. Each benchmark is comprised of a few or several survey items, as follows. Some items remain in the survey, though they are not included in a benchmark score; these are marked here with an asterisk. Where applicable, Cronbach’s alpha values are reported in parentheses.

**Nature of work: Research** \((\alpha = .852)\)

- Q45B Satisfaction with the portion of your time spent on research.
- Q50B* Indicate whether you feel you spend too much or too little time on research.
- Q80A The amount of external funding you are expected to find
- Q80B The influence you have over the focus of your research/scholarly/creative work
- Q80C The quality of graduate students to support your research/scholarly/creative work
- Q80D Institutional support (e.g., internal grants/seed money) for your research/scholarly/creative work
- Q80E The support your institution provides you for engaging undergraduates in your research/scholarly/creative work
- Q85A Obtaining externally funded grants (pre-award)
- Q85B Managing externally funded grants (post-award)
- Q85C Securing graduate student assistance
- Q85D Traveling to present papers or conduct research/creative work
- Q85E The availability of course release time to focus on your research

**Nature of work: Service** \((\alpha = .83)\)

- Q45C Satisfaction with the portion of your time spent on service.
- Q50C* Indicate whether you feel you spend too much or too little time on service.
- Q55B My institution helps faculty who take on additional leadership roles to sustain other aspects of their work.
- Q60A The number of committees on which you serve
- Q60B The attractiveness (e.g., value, visibility, importance, personal preference) of the committees on which you serve
- Q60C The discretion you have to choose the committees on which you serve
- Q60D How equitably committee assignments are distributed across faculty in your department
- Q60E* The number of students you advise/mentor

**Nature of work: Teaching** \((\alpha = .82)\)

- Q45A Satisfaction with the portion of your time spent on teaching.
- Q50A* Indicate whether you feel you spend too much or too little time on teaching.
- Q70A The number of courses you teach
- Q70B The level of courses you teach
- Q70C The discretion you have over the content of the courses you teach
- Q70D The number of students in the classes you teach, on average
- Q70E The quality of students you teach, on average
- Q70H How equitably the teaching workload is distributed across faculty in your department
- Q70I The quality of graduate students to support your teaching

**Facilities and work resources** \((\alpha = .81)\)

- Q70F The support your institution has offered you for improving your teaching
- Q90A Office
- Q90B Laboratory, research, or studio space
- Q90C Equipment
- Q90D Classrooms
- Q90E Library resources
- Q90F Computing and technical support
- Q90H Clerical/administrative support
- Q90G* Salary

Updated 2/20/20, J Beasley, IRQI
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Personal and Family Policies ($\alpha=.85$)
- Q95D Housing benefits (e.g. real estate services, subsidized housing, low-interest mortgage)
- Q95E Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange
- Q95F Spousal/partner hiring program
- Q95G Childcare
- Q95H Eldercare
- Q95J Family medical/parental leave
- Q95K Flexible workload/modified duties for parental or other family reasons
- Q95L Stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons

Q200B My institution does what it can to make personal/family obligations and an academic career compatible.
Q200A I have been able to find the right balance, for me, between my professional life and my personal/family life.

Health and retirement benefits ($\alpha=.83$)
- Q95A Health benefits for yourself
- Q95B Health benefits for your family (i.e. spouse, partner, and dependents)
- Q95C Retirement benefits
- Q95I Phased retirement options

Appreciation and recognition ($\alpha=.92$)
- Q215A Recognition you receive for your teaching efforts
- Q215B Recognition you receive for your student advising?
- Q215C Recognition you receive for your scholarly/creative work?
- Q215D Recognition you receive for your service contributions?
- Q215E Recognition you receive for your outreach?
- Q215J For all of your work, recognition you receive from your chief academic officer (provost, VPAA, dean of faculty)?
- Q215K For all of your work, recognition you receive from your dean or division head?
- Q215L For all of your work, recognition you receive from your department head or chair?
- Q215I For all of your work, recognition you receive from your colleagues/peers?
- Q220A My school/college is valued by this institution’s President/Chancellor and Provost. [large institutions]
- Q220B My department is valued by this institution’s President/Chancellor and Provost.
- Q245A The chief academic officer at my institution seems to care about the quality of life for faculty of my rank.

Interdisciplinary work (Pre-tenure $\alpha=.83$, Tenured $\alpha=.87$)
- Q99* Interest in interdisciplinary work
- Q98A* Engagement in collaborative interdisciplinary teaching
- Q98B* Engagement in collaborative interdisciplinary research
- Q98C* Engagement in solo interdisciplinary teaching or research
- Q100A Budget allocations encourage interdisciplinary work.
- Q100B Campus facilities (e.g. spaces, buildings, centers, labs) are conducive to interdisciplinary work.
- Q100C Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the merit process.
- Q100D Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the promotion process.
- Q100E Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the tenure process.
- Q100G My department understands how to evaluate interdisciplinary work.

Collaboration ($\alpha=.73$)
- Q105A Opportunities for collaboration with other members of your department
- Q105D Opportunities for collaboration with faculty outside your institution

Mentoring ($\alpha=.70$)
- Q110* I have served as either a formal or informal mentor to... (Pre-tenure, Tenured faculty | In my, Outside my department)
- Q115* Being a mentor is/has been fulfilling to you in your role as a faculty member
- Q120A* Importance of having a mentor(s) in your department to your success as a faculty member
- Q120B* Importance of having a mentor(s) outside your department at your institution to your success as a faculty member
- Q120C* Importance of having a mentor(s) outside your institution to your success as a faculty member
- Q125A Effectiveness of mentoring for you from someone in your department
- Q125B Effectiveness of mentoring for you from someone outside your department at your institution
- Q125C* Effectiveness of mentoring for you from someone outside your institution
- Q130A There is effective mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in my department.
- Q130B There is effective mentoring of tenured associate professors in my department.
- Q130C My institution provides adequate support for faculty to be good mentors.
Tenure policies (Pre-tenure α=.92)
Q136A The clarity of the tenure process in your department.
Q136B The clarity of the tenure criteria (what things are evaluated) in my department
Q136C The clarity of the tenure standards (the performance threshold) in my department
Q136D The clarity of the body of evidence (the dossier’s contents) considered in making tenure decisions in my department
Q136E The clarity of whether or not you will achieve tenure.
Q139A I have received consistent messages from tenured faculty about the requirements for tenure.
Q139B Tenure decisions here are made primarily on performance-based rather than on non-performance-based criteria.
Q145B* Have you received formal feedback on your progress toward tenure?

Tenure clarity (Pre-tenure α=.88)
Q137A Clarity of expectations regarding your performance as a scholar
Q137B Clarity of expectations regarding your performance as a teacher
Q137C Clarity of expectations regarding your performance as an advisor to students
Q137D Clarity of expectations regarding your performance as a colleague in your department
Q137E Clarity of expectations regarding your performance as a campus citizen
Q137F Clarity of expectations regarding your performance as a member of the broader community (e.g., outreach)

Promotion (Tenured α=.92)
Q135C Generally, the expectations for promotion from associate to full professor are reasonable to me.
Q135B My department has a culture where associate professors are encouraged to work towards promotion to full professor.
Q140A Clarity of the process for promotion from associate to full professor in my department
Q140B Clarity of the criteria (what things are evaluated) for promotion from associate to full professor in my department
Q140C Clarity of the standards (the performance thresholds) for promotion from associate to full professor in my department
Q140D Clarity of the body of evidence (the dossier’s contents) for promotion from associate to full professor in my department
Q140E Clarity of the timeframe within which associate professors should apply for promotion in rank to full professor
Q140F My sense [of clarity] of whether or not I will be promoted from associate to full professor
Q145A* Have you received formal feedback on your progress toward promotion to full professor?
Q150* When do you plan to submit your dossier for promotion to full professor?
Q155* What are your primary reasons?

Leadership: Senior (α=.91)
Q180A My institution’s president’s/chancellor’s: Pace of decision making
Q180B My institution’s president’s/chancellor’s: Stated priorities
Q180C My institution’s president’s/chancellor’s: Communication of priorities to faculty
Q180L My institution’s CAO’s: Pace of decision making
Q180M My institution’s CAO’s: Stated priorities
Q180N My institution’s CAO’s: Communication of priorities to faculty
Q180O My institution’s CAO’s: Ensuring opportunities for faculty to have input into the institution’s priorities [small colleges]

Leadership: Divisional (α=.94)
Q185D My dean’s or division head’s: Pace of decision making
Q185E My dean’s or division head’s: Stated priorities
Q185F My dean’s or division head’s: Communication of priorities to faculty
Q185G My dean’s or division head’s: Ensuring opportunities for faculty to have input into school/college priorities

Leadership: Departmental (α=.95)
Q185H My department head’s or chair’s: Pace of decision making
Q185I My department head’s or chair’s: Stated priorities
Q185J My department head’s or chair’s: Communication of priorities to faculty
Q185K My department head’s or chair’s: Ensuring opportunities for faculty to have input into departmental policy decisions
Q185L My department head’s or chair’s: Fairness in evaluating my work

Leadership: Faculty
Q186A My institution-wide faculty governing body’s: Pace of decision making
Q186B My institution-wide faculty governing body’s: Stated priorities
Q186C My institution-wide faculty governing body’s: Communication of priorities to faculty
Q186D My institution-wide faculty governing body’s: Steps taken to ensure faculty are included in that body’s decision making
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Shared Governance: Trust
Q188B I understand the process by which I can express my opinions about institutional policies.
Q188C My institution has clear rules about the various roles and authority of the faculty and administration.
Q189BD Faculty leaders and senior administrators: Follow agreed-upon rules of engagement when there are disagreements.
Q189BE Faculty leaders and senior administrators: Have an open system of communication for making decisions.
Q189BG Faculty leaders and senior administrators: Discuss difficult issues in good faith.

Shared Governance: Purpose
Q189AB Important institutional decisions not made until consensus among faculty leaders, senior administrators is achieved.
Q189AC Senior administrators ensure that there is sufficient time for faculty to provide input on important decisions.
Q189BC Faculty leaders and senior administrators: Respectfully consider one another’s views before important decisions.
Q189BF Faculty leaders and senior administrators: Share a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the institution.

Shared Governance: Understanding
Q188A Existing faculty governance structures offer sufficient oppys for me to provide input on institution-wide policies.
Q189AD Once an important decision is made, senior administrators communicate their rationale.
Q189BA Faculty leaders and senior administrators: Have equal say in governance matters.
Q189BB Faculty leaders and senior administrators: Engage each other in defining decision criteria used to evaluate options.

Shared Governance: Adaptability
Q188D My institution’s shared governance model holds up under unusual situations.
Q188E My institution systematically reviews the effectiveness of its decision making processes.
Q189AA My institution cultivates new leaders among faculty.

Shared Governance: Productivity
Q187B On the whole, the effectiveness of the shared governance system at your institution.
Q189F The governance committees on which I currently serve make observable progress toward goals.
Q189G The progress achieved through governance efforts is publicly recognized.

Departmental collegiality (α=.84)
Q200C My department colleagues do what they can to make personal/family obligations and an academic career compatible.
Q200D Department meetings occur at times that are compatible with my personal/family needs.
Q205B The amount of personal interaction you have with pre-tenure faculty in your department
Q205C How well you fit in your department (e.g. your sense of belonging in your department)
Q205E The amount of personal interaction you have with tenured faculty in your department
Q210A My department colleagues “pitch in” when needed.
Q210C On the whole, my department is collegial.
Q212A On the whole, my department colleagues are committed to supporting, promoting diversity and inclusion in the dept.

Departmental engagement (α=.80)
Q190A Engagement with faculty in your department in conversations about: Undergraduate student learning
Q190B Engagement with faculty in your department in conversations about: Graduate student learning [large institutions]
Q190C Engagement with faculty in your department in conversations about: Effective teaching practices
Q190D Engagement with faculty in your department in conversations about: Effective uses of technology
Q190E Engagement with faculty in your department in conversations about: Uses of current research methodologies
Q205A The amount of professional interaction you have with pre-tenure faculty in your department
Q205D The amount of professional interaction you have with tenured faculty in your department

Departmental quality (α=.88)
Q195A The intellectual vitality of tenured faculty in your department
Q195B The intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty in your department
Q195C The research/scholarly/creative productivity of tenured faculty in your department
Q195D The research/scholarly/creative productivity of pre-tenure faculty in your department
Q195G The teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty in your department
Q195H The teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty in your department
Q195I The teaching effectiveness of non-tenure track faculty in your department
Q240B My department is successful at recruiting high-quality faculty members.
Q240C My department is successful at retaining high-quality faculty members.
Q240D My department is successful at addressing sub-standard tenured faculty performance.
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