Summary of the 2015 COACHE survey of faculty satisfaction

This document was prepared by the Faculty Affairs group in the Provost’s office as a guide to reading the “Provost’s Report,” which is the detailed analysis of the survey results provided to us by COACHE. That Report, along with the survey instrument itself, is available to all PU faculty on the web site, accessible via PU username and password. We encourage all interested colleagues to participate in further analysis of the results, and in planning action based upon them.

This document has four parts:

- A “Super-summary,” which glosses the results in one page
- A one-page summary of our comparison group institutions and our survey response rates
- A one-page summary of the Results at a Glance portion of the COACHE Provost’s Report
- A more detailed summary of the results, section by section, that follows the order of the Provost’s Report (PR).

Note that some questions in some areas were specific to particular faculty ranks, so the skip logic of the survey did not present every participant with the same number of questions.
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Peter J Hollenbeck
Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Professor of Biological Sciences
(phollенb@purdue.edu)
COACHE SURVEY ANALYSIS SUPER-SUMMARY:

Areas of strength relative to our peers:

(1) Research and Interdisciplinary work – both show high comparative satisfaction, improvement since 2012, and some very high absolute scores

(2) Mentoring – shows high comparative satisfaction, improvement since 2012, and some very high absolute scores

(3) P&T Policies and Clarity – both show broad improvement in satisfaction since 2012 (we worked on these post-COACHE)

(4) Engagement with Department – shows high comparative satisfaction and broad improvement since 2012

Areas of concern relative to our peers:

(1) Personal policies and health benefits – both show comparative dissatisfaction, declines since 2012, and some very low absolute scores

(2) Leadership: Senior & Departmental – both showed comparative dissatisfaction, with both improvement and declines since 2012, and some very low absolute scores

(3) Departmental Collegiality – showed comparative dissatisfaction, despite improvement since 2012

(4) Appreciation & Recognition – showed broad dissatisfaction, as in 2012

Hot spots in the data:

(1) Demographic: There is broad, low-effect-size dissatisfaction across many areas for three demographic cadres: Associates, Women, and Faculty of Color

(2) The strongest demographic differences in the entire survey are the relative dissatisfaction of Associates about Promotion and Appreciation/Recognition

(3) The strongest cluster of overall dissatisfaction is in Leadership: Consistency and President

Best and worst absolute scores:

Highest satisfaction = Influence over focus of research
Discretion over course content
Mentoring is fulfilling
Mentoring is important

Lowest satisfaction = President: stated priorities
Priorities are stated/acted on consistently;
Changed priorities negatively affected my work
Dept effectiveness in addressing sub-standard performance
COACHE SURVEY COMPARISON GROUPS AND RESPONSE RATES (pp. 13, 59-60 of PR)

The COACHE Provost’s Report (PR) clusters related questions into 20 “benchmark” areas. For each benchmark, it uses the response data (1) to quantify satisfaction at PU relative to our comparison institutions; (2) to compare demographic subgroups at PU to subgroups at other institutions; (3) to identify differences among demographic subgroups within PU.

Selected peer institutions in 2015 survey (chosen from the larger cohort that took the survey):

Iowa State University
University of California, Davis
University of Kansas
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
University of Virginia

Larger cohort: >100 institutions (listed in Appendix of digital PR)

Components of the PR from COACHE:

(A) Response rates by basic demographic groups (we already have them by College)

(B) “Results at a Glance,” a comparison of aggregated university-wide responses for the 20 benchmarks for PU vs both our 5-insitution comparison group and the entire COACHE cohort. It includes the basic demographic breakdown and changes vs 2012.

(C) “Results in Context,” a comparison with all questions in each benchmark area broken out individually. It includes the basic demographic breakdown and changes vs 2012.

(A) RESPONSE RATES (p. 13 of PR)

Overall participation rate was 54%. Overall completion rate (modified by some filters) was 50%

Differences among demographic groups:

Women = 64%; Men = 44%
White = 53%; foc = 42% (URM 47%; Asian 38%)
Asst = 56%; Assoc = 50%; Full = 48%

Our participation rates were higher than all of our peers in every category, at top of the total cohort in all but one.
(B) RESULTS AT A GLANCE (pp 14-17 of PR):

The aggregate data shows how PU satisfaction ranked against our 5 peers plus the larger cohort. Notable areas are those where we are top two among our peers and in the top 30% of cohort ("strength"); or bottom two among our peers and in bottom 30% of cohort ("concern").

Dashboard data show this:

OVERALL STRENGTHS:
- Nature of Work: Research (improved since 2012; small demographic differences)
- Interdisciplinary Research (small demographic differences)
- Mentoring (improved since 2012; medium demographic differences)
- Departmental Engagement (improved since 2012; small demographic differences)

Other benchmark areas that are improved overall since 2012:
- Nature of Work: Teaching
- Tenure Policies
- Tenure Clarity
- Departmental Quality

OVERALL CONCERNS:
- Nature of Work: Service (small demographic differences)
- Health & Retirement Benefits (worse since 2012; small demographic differences)
- Leadership: Senior (improved since 2012; small demographic differences)
- Leadership: Departmental (small to medium demographic differences)
- Departmental Collegiality (small demographic differences)
- Appreciation & Recognition (small to medium demographic differences)

Other benchmark areas where overall satisfaction declined since 2012:
- None

Overall demographic concerns for the aggregated Dashboard data:

There is only ONE large demo difference = Associate Professors and Promotion
Diffuse small diffs across 15/20 areas (!) for Associate Professors
Diffuse small diffs across 7/20 areas for Women
Diffuse small diffs across 13/20 areas for foc

Two special questions here about working at PU:
(i) If I had to do it all over, I would again choose to work at this inst;
(ii) If candidate for a position asked about your dept as a place to work, would you recommend?
Both had similar responses to peers/cohort, >=50% positive
(C) RESULTS IN CONTEXT (pp. 18-42 of PR)

Note about comparison data: “strength” refers to an area or question for which PU satisfaction is in the top 2 of our peer group of 5 institutions, and in the top 30% of our larger cohort. “Concern” refers to an area or question for which PU satisfaction is in the bottom 2 of our peer group of 5 institutions, and in the bottom 30% of our larger cohort. Small, medium and large effect sizes of any differences are indicated and color-coded.

(1) Nature of work: Research, Teaching & Service

(1A) Research (an overall strength): 11 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = 5/11
Sub-area of concern = none

Areas with improved satisfaction since 2012:
Support for obtaining grants
Support for maintaining grants

Intramural demographic concerns:
*Diffuse diffs across sub-areas for tenured (4/11); women (3/11), assoc (7/11), foc (7/11);
*Med diff for Time spent on research for women, foc
*Med diff for Availability of course release for research for assoc

(1B) Service (an overall concern): 7 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = Number of student advisees
Sub-areas of concern: Attractiveness of committees
Discretion of choose committees
Equitability of committee assignments

Areas with changed satisfaction since 2012: none

Intramural demographic concerns:
*Diffuse small differences for tenured (4/7), assoc (7/7!), women (3/7), white (3/7)

(1C) Teaching: 8 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = Equitability of distribution of teaching load

Areas with improved satisfaction since 2012:
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Quality of students taught
Quality of grad students to support teaching

Intramural demographic concerns:
Diffuse small differences for pre-ten (5/8), assoc (8/8)
Small differences in 2 sub-areas for white
*Med differences in 4/8 sub-areas for foc
*Med differences for Time spent on administrative tasks for white
*Time spent on teaching = large diff pre-ten; med diff assoc; small diff women

Absolute score standouts: Influence over focus of research (4.35) and Discretion over course content (4.36) were two of the highest absolute satisfaction values of the entire survey.
(2) Facilities, Personal/Family Policies, Benefits, and Salary

(2A) Facilities and work resources: 8 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas changed since 2012: none

Intramural demographic concerns:
- *Diffuse small differences across sub-areas for tenure (5/8); assoc (3/8), foc (6/8)

(2B) Personal and family policies: 10 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = Family medical/parental leave

Areas with reduced satisfaction since 2012:
- Housing benefits
- Spousal/partner hiring program
- Family medical/parental leave

Intramural demographic concerns:
- *Diffuse small differences for pre-ten (4/10), assoc and women (6/10), foc (3/10)
- *Med differences for:
  - Spousal/partner hiring program (foc)
  - Childcare (pre-ten)
  - Eldercare (tenured)
  - Stop-the-clock policies (men)
  - Work/life compatibility & Balance between personal/professional (women)

Absolute score standouts: 4 sub-areas here were very low [<3.0; Housing benefits (2.48); Spousal/partner hiring program (2.88); Childcare (2.60); Eldercare (2.80)]

(2C) Health and retirement benefits (an overall concern): 4 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = Health benefits for self; Health benefits for family

Areas with reduced satisfaction since 2012:
- Health benefits for self (med diff)
- Health benefits for family (med diff)
Intramural demographic concerns:
*Diffuse differences for assoc (4/4); foc (4/4)
*Med differences for foc on Retirement benefits, & Phased retirement options

(2D) Salary: 1 question
Satisfaction reduced since 2012

Intramural demographic concerns:
*Small differences for ten, assoc; med difference for foc
(3) Interdisciplinary work, Collaboration and Mentoring

(3A) Interdisciplinary work (an overall strength): 6 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = five out of six sub-areas!
- Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas with improved satisfaction since 2012:
- *Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in tenure* (med diff)
- *Dept knows how to evaluate interdisciplinary work*

Intramural demographic concerns:
- *Diffuse differences for assoc (4/6), foc (3/6)
- *Med differences for assoc on *Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in promotion*

(3B) Collaboration: 3 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = *Opportunities to collab outside of dept*
  *Opportunities to collab outside of inst*
- Sub-areas of concern = *Opportunities for collab within dept*

Areas changed since 2012: none

Intramural demographic concerns:
- *Diffuse differences for pre-ten (3/3); assoc (3/3); women (2/3); foc (2/3)
- *Med differences for assoc on *Opportunities to collab within dept & outside inst*

(3C) Mentoring (an overall strength – but significant demo diffs): 10 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = most sub-areas
- Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas with improved satisfaction since 2012: *7 out of 10 sub-areas*

Intramural demographic concerns: *many*, differences for
- *Mentoring of pre-ten faculty* – assoc *(med)*, women & pre-ten (small)
- *Mentoring of assoc faculty* – assoc *(large)*, women *(med)*, foc (small)
- *Support for faculty to be good mentors* – assoc *(med)*, women (small)
- *Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept* – men *(med)*; foc (small)
- *Effectiveness of mentoring outside inst* – men *(med)*, foc (small)
- *Importance of mentoring (Q120) within dept* – tenured *(med)*, full & men (small)
- *Importance of mentoring outside dept* – tenured *(med)*, full/men/white (small)
Importance of mentoring outside inst – tenured & men (med), full (small)

[see graphic analysis on p. 27 of Report doc; no major diffs with peers/cohort, but interesting absolute numbers]

Absolute score standouts: “Being a mentor is fulfilling” (4.18) and “Importance of mentoring within dept” (4.24) had two of the highest absolute agreement ratings of the entire survey. But white and men demographics consider mentoring to be less important than average.
(4) Tenure and Promotion

(4A) Tenure policies (an area of Improvement): 7 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas improved since 2012 = 7 out of 7!
   incl Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure (med)

Intramural demographic concerns:
   Diffuse small differences (4/7) for white

(4B) Tenure clarity (an area of Improvement): 6 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = Clarity of expectations: Teacher
   Clarity of expectations: Colleague
   Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen

Areas improved since 2012:
   Clarity of expectations: Advisor
   Clarity of expectations: Colleague

Intramural demographic concerns: diffuse small differences for white (3/6)

(4C) Promotion: 8 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = none

Areas improved since 2012:
   Clarity of promotion process
   Clarity of promotion standards

Intramural demographic concerns:
   *diffuse small differences for foc (7/8), women (3/8)
   *large differences for assoc (7/7)

**Demographic standout:** the dissatisfaction of Assocs with promotion is one of the hottest spots in the entire survey.
Three special Qs on P&T:

Have you received formal feedback on your progress toward tenure?
Almost 90% said yes, higher than peers/cohorts

Have you received formal feedback on your progress toward promotion to full professor?
Over 50% said yes, higher than peers/cohorts

When do you plan to submit your dossier for promotion to full professor?
PU time line breakdown similar to peers/cohorts; foc had more optimistic timeline
(5) Leadership (an overall area of concern)

(5A) Leadership consistency (an area of concern): 3 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = Changed priorities negatively affect my work

Areas declined since 2012: 3 out of 3

Intramural demographic concerns:
- med differences for tenured (3/3)
- small-med differences for white (3/3)
- diffuse differences for women (2/3)

Absolute score standout: these 3 Qs had among the lowest absolute satisfaction values (2.56, 2.48, 2.40) of the entire survey (priorities stated / acted on consistently; changed priorities neg affected my work)

(5B) Leadership: Senior (an area of both improvement and concern!): 6 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = All three Presidential areas (also very low absolute values, <3.0)
- President: Pace of decision making (2.82)
- President: Stated priorities (2.44)
- President: Communication (2.79)

Areas improved since 2012: (5 out of 6; med upswing: CAO communication of priorities)
Area declined since 2012: President: stated priorities

Intramural demographic concerns:
- diffuse differences for tenured (3/6), assoc (4/6), women (3/6)
- med Pres differences for tenured (communic), women (pace of decision)

(5C) Leadership: Divisional: 4 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength or concern = none

Areas changed since 2012 = none

Intramural demographic concerns: med differences for tenured (4/4)
(5D) Leadership: Departmental (an area of concern): 5 questions

Comparison with peers:
Sub-areas of strength = none
Sub-areas of concern = all 5 out of 5!

Areas improved since 2012: Ensuring faculty input

Intramural demographic concerns:
*small-med diffs for tenured on all 5/5; diffuse diffs: men (2/5), foc (2/5)

[Nb: 2 graphic Qs at bottom of p.33 about impact on faculty work of changes in priorities]
(6) The Department (an overall area of concern)

(6A) Departmental collegiality (an area of concern): 8 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = 6 out of 8

Areas improved since 2012: Dept is collegial

Intramural demographic concerns:
- Diffuse small differences for assoc (7/8), women (4/8), foc (7/8)

(6B) Departmental engagement (an area of both strength and improvement): 7 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = Discussions of grad student learning
  Discussions of current research methods
- Sub-areas of concern = Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure
  Amount of professional interaction w/Tenure

Areas improved since 2012: 6 out of 7

Intramural demographic concerns:
- Diffuse small differences for pre-ten (6/7), assoc (6/7), foc (4/7)

(6C) Departmental quality (an area of both improvement and concern): 9 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = 5/9:
  Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty
  Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenured faculty
  Dept is successful at faculty recruitment
  Dept is successful at faculty retention
  Dept addresses sub-standard performance

Areas improved since 2012:
- Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty
- Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty

Intramural demographic concerns:
- Diffuse small differences for pre-ten (3/9), men (7/9), foc (6/9)
  Med differences for foc on 3/9:
    Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty
    Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty
    Dept is successful at faculty retention
Absolute score standout: *Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty* had a very high (4.01) absolute rating; note that none of the absolute numbers in this section is very low (<3.0)

**Absolute score standout:** “Dept addresses sub-standard performance” had the 2\(^{nd}\) lowest absolute satisfaction rating (2.47) of entire survey.
(7) Appreciation and Recognition (an overall area of concern)

**Appreciation & recognition:** 12 questions

Comparison with peers:
- Sub-areas of strength = none
- Sub-areas of concern = 5/12:
  - Recognition for teaching
  - Recognition from colleagues
  - Recognition from Head/chair
  - School/college is valued by Pres/Provost
  - Dept is valued by Pres/Provost

Areas changed since 2012 = none

**Intramural demographic concerns:**
- Diffuse diffs for tenured (4/12), assoc (10/12), foc (5/12)
- **Med** diffs for assoc on overall category and 4/12 sub-areas:
  - Recognition for advising; service; outreach
  - School/college is valued by Pres/Provost

**Demographic hotspot:** the dissatisfaction of Assoc on this cluster of questions was one of the strongest in the entire survey

Special Q: *The CAO seems to care about the quality of life for faculty of my rank*, broken down for PU by rank.
- Pre-tenure are >60% unsure; certainty grows with rank, and both “agree” and “disagree” categories rise.
Special Qs on Retention and negotiations:

(1) the % of PU faculty who have: actively sought an outside job offer; received a formal job offer; renegotiated the terms of their PU employment; are all very similar to peers and cohort.

(2) PU responses to whether “outside offers are necessary for negotiations” are very similar to peers and cohort.

(3) “If you could negotiate adjustments to your employment, which of the following items would you most like to adjust”

Overall, the top 3 are the same as our peers and cohort: base salary; lab/research support; teaching load

However, we place employment opps for spouse/partner higher (4th) than peers/cohoot

Intramural demographic differences:
Base salary is #1 for all demographics
All demographics have the overall top 3 in their top 4
Tenured and White place administrative responsibilities in top 4; displacing employment opps for spouse/partner

(4) “If you were to leave your institution, what would be your primary reason?”

PU overall shares 3 of our top 4 reasons with peers/cohoot:
Retire; Improve salary/benefits; work at inst with diff priorities

However, we differ in placing move to a preferred geographic location in our top 4 (3rd)

Intramural demographic differences:
Retire is #1 for Tenured, Men, White and almost #1 for Women; not in top 4 for Pre-tenured and foc
Improve your salary/benefits and move to a preferred geographic location are in top 4 for every demographic
Women place improve your quality of life in top 4 (4th)
Foc place pursue an admin position in higher ed in top 4 (4th)

(5) Three Qs about how long faculty plan to remain at Purdue, all break down similarly to peers/cohoot; only small demographic diffs
Two Best and Worst aspects of working here

(1) Choose the two (and only two) **best** aspects of working here.

**PU order:**
- Cost of living & quality of colleagues (near tie)
- Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues
- Support of colleagues; quality of grad students; academic freedom (tie)

We share our #1 (quality of colleagues) and our high ranking for support of colleagues and academic freedom with the entire peer/cohoot group

**Intramural demographic differences:** very small

(2) Choose the two (and only two) **worst** aspects of working here.

**PU order:**
- Compensation and Location (near tie)
- Quality of leadership:
- Other (we'll get a digest of written responses)

We share our #1 (compensation) and importance of quality of leadership with entire peer/cohoot group

**Intramural demographic differences:**
- First two aspects chosen are the same (Compensation and Location) for all demographics
- Pre-tenure cite unrelenting pressure to perform and lack of spousal/partner hiring program
- Foc cite lack of spousal/partner hiring program, lack of diversity and lack of support for research/creative work
Final special Q:
“What is the number 1 thing that your institution can do to improve the workplace for faculty?”

PU responses in order, from greatest to least (these are bins created by COACHE to categorize free responses, so they do not add to 100%):

- Leadership (>50%)
- Compensation/benefits/facilities (<50%)
- Research/teaching/service (<25%)
- The department (<25%)
- Appreciation & recognition (<15%)
- Promotion & tenure; Work-life balance; Collaboration & interdisciplinary work; Mentoring (all <5%)

Comparison of PU to comparable institutions:

- Swap #1 for #2; otherwise the order was similar
- PU % choosing #1, 2 and 4 was higher than peers