Improving faculty careers

University of Washington Tacoma
Today

- Introduce COACHE and UWT’s COACHE team
- COACHE at UWT
- What do we know so far?
- When will we get more results?
- How should we disseminate and make use of results?
COACHE

Collaborative On Academic Careers in Higher Education
UWT’s current COACHE team

- **Katie Baird** (Chair, Faculty Assembly; IAS)
- **Zoe Barsness** (Chair, SBC; MSB)
- **Donald Chinn** (Chair, Faculty Affairs; IoT)
- **Michael Crosby** (Research Analyst, Academic Affairs)
- **Linda Dawson** (FA EC; IAS)
- **JW Harrington** (Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs)
- **Alison Navarrete** (Director, Academic HR)
- **Thuch Mam** (Admin Ass’t, Academic Affairs)
- **Sharon Parker** (Ass’t Chancellor, Equity & Diversity)
- **Jill Purdy** (Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly; MSB)
More than a survey...

- Process of institutional discovery and change.
- Multi year project
- Preparation; survey; data reporting; data querying; programmatic development
- Consulting with others in the network
Participating institutions

http://isites.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=coache&pageid=icb.page307145
Survey of faculty experiences

- Non-tenure-stream, full-time
- Tenured
- Pre-tenure

Eligible faculty had been at UWT as a faculty member at least one year prior to the survey in Autumn 2012.
Our team’s session on 4/22

“What you should expect today”
- A process for reading your report
- Pitfalls to avoid when working with COACHE data
- Strategies for engaging your campus in the next phase of COACHE membership

“What you should not expect today”
- A personalized walk-thru of your campus report (yet)
- An introduction to statistical analysis
- A silver bullet
Excellent response rates

- 63% overall (73) versus 50% among all participating institutions.
- 67.6% of eligible FTLs responded.
- 58% of eligible pre-tenure faculty responded.
- 70% of eligible associate professors (vs. 45% in the comparator group).
- 66% of eligible tenured faculty
Cohort & Comparator institutions

Albright College
Amherst College
Appalachian State University
Bowling Green State University
Clemson University
Connecticut College
East Carolina University
Elizabeth City State University
Emerson College
Fayetteville State University
Franklin and Marshall College
Indiana University - Bloomington
Johns Hopkins University
Kansas State University
Kenyon College
Lincoln University (MO)
Loyola University Maryland
Merrimack College
Middlebury College
New School University
North Carolina Ag and Tech State University
North Carolina Central University
North Carolina State University
North Dakota State University
Otterbein University
Pomona College
Purdue University
Radford University
Rochester Institute of Technology
Saint Mary's College of Maryland
Scripps College
St. Olaf College
Stonehill College
SUNY - Alfred State College
SUNY - Binghamton University
SUNY - Brockport
SUNY - Buffalo State College
SUNY - Canton
SUNY - Cobleskill
SUNY - Cortland
SUNY - Delhi
SUNY - Environmental Science and Forestry
SUNY - Farmingdale State College
SUNY - Fredonia
SUNY - Geneseo
SUNY - IT
SUNY - Maritime
SUNY - Morrisville State College
SUNY - New Paltz
SUNY - Old Westbury
SUNY - Oneonta
SUNY - Oswego
SUNY - Plattsburgh
SUNY - Potsdam
SUNY - Purchase
SUNY - Stony Brook University
SUNY - University at Albany
SUNY - University at Buffalo
University of California Davis
University of Houston
University of Kansas
University of Massachusetts - Lowell
University of Missouri - Columbia
University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina - Charlotte
University of North Carolina - Greensboro
University of North Carolina - Pembroke
University of Richmond
University of Rochester
University of Saint Thomas (MN)
University of Tennessee
University of Toronto
University of Tulsa
University of Virginia
University of Washington Tacoma
University of Wisconsin - Parkside
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Wabash College
Wellesley College
Western Carolina University
Winston-Salem State University
Themes (a.k.a. benchmarks)

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
Leadership – Senior
Leadership – Divisional
Leadership – Departmental
Departmental collegiality
Departmental engagement
Departmental quality
Appreciation and recognition
From a 30-minute briefing...

...this Tuesday, without data in front of us, we learned:

While respondents from all institutions were generally satisfied with the geographic location of their institutions and the quality of their colleagues, UWT respondents were unusually satisfied with these factors.
Uniformly shared concerns:

UWT respondents were dissatisfied with teaching load and with salary in similar ratios as all institutions.
Non-tenure-stream faculty

- Mean responses from non-tenure-track faculty at UWT were higher than NTT faculty at all institutions combined, for 10 of the 16 themes.
- For 14 of the 16 themes, mean responses from non-tenure-track faculty at UWT were higher than for tenured faculty or for pre-tenure faculty.
- Pre-tenure faculty had higher mean responses than the other two groups in the themes of “Leadership: Divisional” and “Departmental quality.”
UWT mean responses noticeably above institutions as a whole:

**Health and retirement**, for which our theme mean was 3.747 (on a 1-5 scale, 5 indicating great satisfaction), just below the 70th percentile mark (3.787). Component survey items:

- Health benefits for yourself
- Health benefits for family
- Retirement benefits
- Phased retirement options
UWT mean responses noticeably above institutions as a whole:

Facilities and work resources, for which our theme mean was 3.562, just above the 70th percentile mark (3.540).

Component survey items:

- Support for improving teaching
- Office
- Laboratory, research, studio space
- Equipment
- Classrooms
- Library resources
- Computing and technical support
- Clerical/administrative support
UWT mean responses noticeably below institutions as a whole:

Nature of work: Research, for which our theme mean was 2.801, below the 30th percentile mark (2.992). Component survey items (in all cases, “Rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with...”):

- Time spent on research
- Expectations for finding external funding
- Influence over focus of research
- Quality of grad students to support research
- Support for research
- Support for engaging undergrads in research
- Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)
- Support for maintaining grants (post-award)
- Support for securing gradf student assistance
- Support for travel to present/conduct research
- Availability of course release for research
UWT mean responses noticeably below institutions as a whole:

**Nature of work: Teaching**, for which our theme mean was 3.276, the minimum of all institutions. Component survey items (in all cases, “Rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with…”):

- Time spent on teaching
- Number of courses taught
- Level of courses taught
- Discretion over course content
- Number of students in classes taught
- Quality of students taught
- Equitability of distribution of teaching load
- Quality of grad students to support teaching
UWT mean responses noticeably below institutions as a whole:

**Interdisciplinary work**, for which our theme mean was 2.429, below the 30th percentile mark for all institutions (2.575).

Component survey items (in all cases, “Rate your agreement or disagreement with...”):

- Budgets encourage interdisp. work
- Facilities conducive to interdisc. work
- Interdisc. work is rewarded in merit
- Interdisc. work is rewarded in promotion
- Interdisc. work is rewarded in tenure
- Dept. knows how to evaluate interdisc. work
When we do get our report:
When we do get our report:

Comparator inst’ns

Overall mean

Our inst’l mean

Top 30%

Low 30%
When we do get our report:

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education  
Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey 2011-12  

**Story Street University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COACHE DASHBOARD</th>
<th>YOUR RESULTS COMPARED TO PEERS</th>
<th>AREAS OF STRENGTH IN GREEN</th>
<th>AREAS OF CONCERN IN RED</th>
<th>INTERNAL COMPARE DIFFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>overall</td>
<td>tenured</td>
<td>pre-ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work: Research</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work: Service</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work: Teaching</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and work resources</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and family policies</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and retirement benefits</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary work</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure policies</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure clarity</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure reasonableness</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: Senior</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: Divisional</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: Departmental</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental collegiality</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental engagement</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental quality</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation and recognition</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If I had to do it all over,* I would again choose to work at this institution.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly recommend your department as a place to work</th>
<th>recommend your department with reservations</th>
<th>not recommend your department as a place to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>peers</td>
<td>all comparables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UWT COACHE overview, 3 May 2013
Visual reporting of open-ended responses:

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education
Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey 2011-12

Story Street University

Please use the space below to tell us the number one thing that you, personally, feel your institution could do to improve your workplace.

- full
- associate
- assistant
- all comparable institutions

UWT COACHE overview, 3 May 2013
Next steps:

- Get the report!
- Two summer meetings to begin to ask Qs of the report
- Campus roll-out
- Formation of interest and action groups
Involvement options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFORM</td>
<td>“We’ll keep you informed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULT</td>
<td>“We’ll keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge your concerns, and provide feedback on how your input influenced the final decisions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATE</td>
<td>“We’ll work with you to ensure that concerns and issues are directly reflected in the alternatives developed...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-CREATE</td>
<td>“We’ll look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEGATE</td>
<td>“We’ll place final decision-making in your hands...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>