

COACHE

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education

The initiative to improve
faculty recruitment, retention,
and work/life quality

Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey
Highlights Report
August 1, 2007



HARVARD
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

8 Story Street, 5th Floor • Cambridge, Mass. 02138 • 617.496.9348 • coache@gse.harvard.edu • www.coache.org

Copyright © 2007 by the
President and Fellows of Harvard College
All Rights Reserved

Reproduction: No part of this report or its appendices may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), such as that given in a participation agreement signed by representatives of participating institutions and COACHE. Any reproduction of the report material must include a credit line.

Contact information:

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE)
Harvard Graduate School of Education
8 Story Street, 5th Floor
Cambridge, MA 02138

Email: coache@gse.harvard.edu
URL: <http://www.coache.org>
Voice: 617-496-9348
Fax: 617-496-9350

Recommended citation:

Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education [COACHE]. (2007). *COACHE highlights report 2007*. Cambridge, MA: Author.

COACHE

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education

Contents		Overview
Population statistics	2	The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) provides academic leaders with in-depth peer data to monitor and improve work satisfaction among full-time, tenure-track faculty.
Tenure	3	More than 80 four-year colleges and universities have joined COACHE to enhance the quality of life for pre-tenure faculty and to enhance their institutions' ability to recruit, retain, and develop the cohort most critical to their long-term future.
Nature of the Work	7	The core element of COACHE is the Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, a validated survey instrument developed, tested, and continually improved with assistance from the Ford Foundation, the Atlantic Philanthropies, and participating institutions. We now have job satisfaction data on several thousand junior faculty nationwide.
Policies and Practices	10	The COACHE Survey assesses faculty experiences in several areas deemed critical to junior faculty success:
Climate, Culture and Collegiality	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Clarity and reasonableness of tenure processes and review- Workload and support for teaching and research- Importance and effectiveness of common policies and practices
Global Satisfaction	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Climate, culture and collegiality on campus- Global satisfaction
Appendix A: Participating institutions	24	Academic leaders use COACHE to focus attention, to spot successes and weaknesses, to compare results with a self-selected set of peer institutions, and then to take concrete steps to make policies and practices more effective and more prevalent. The COACHE Institutional Report pinpoints problem areas, whether within a particular policy or practice, academic area, or demographic. Ultimately, COACHE provides a powerful lever to achieve a competitive advantage in the recruitment, retention, and success of new faculty. This COACHE Highlights Report, available to the public, complements the Institutional Report with an overview of results across all COACHE sites in the 2005-06 and 2006-07 cohorts. If your institution would like more information about enrolling in the Collaborative, please call 617-496-9348. You may also e-mail us at coache@gse.harvard.edu or visit our web site at http://www.coache.org .

COACHE

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education

Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey

Highlights Report

June 2007

	Total Faculty N	Male Faculty N	% Males	Female Faculty N	% Females	White Faculty N	% White Faculty	Faculty of Color N	% Faculty of Color	Missing Race Data
University Population	10469	6193	59%	4261	41%	7561	72%	2787	27%	121
University Respondents	6159	3434	56%	2725	44%	4594	75%	1556	25%	9
University Response Rate	59%	55%	--	64%	--	61%	--	56%	--	--
College Population	809	411	51%	398	49%	574	71%	234	29%	1
College Respondents	614	321	52%	293	48%	466	76%	147	24%	1
College Response Rate	76%	78%	--	64%	--	81%	--	63%	--	--
Total Population	11278	6604	59%	4659	41%	8135	72%	3021	27%	122
Total Respondents	6773	3755	55%	3018	45%	5060	75%	1703	25%	10
Total Response Rate	60%	57%	--	65%	--	62%	--	57%	--	--

NOTE: We are missing gender data for 15 faculty members included in the university population file; thus, the total number of males (6193) and females (4261) at universities does not equal the total faculty university population (10469) in the above table.

A total of 11,278 full-time, pre-tenure faculty at 77 colleges and universities have received the COACHE survey and 6,773 responded (overall response rate = 60%).

The COACHE survey is organized around five themes: (a) Tenure; (b) Nature of the Work; (c) Policies and Practices; (d) Climate, Culture and Collegiality; and (e) Global Satisfaction.

TENURE

The survey asked junior faculty to rate their level of clarity¹ regarding four aspects of tenure: process, criteria, standards, and the body of evidence. According to the survey:

- Junior faculty were most clear about the tenure process and least clear about tenure standards (Table 1).
- Female faculty reported less clarity than their male peers on all dimensions, and significantly² less clarity on the tenure process, body of evidence, and standards (Table 1).
- Faculty of color and white faculty reported similar levels of clarity across process, criteria and the body of evidence. However, white faculty reported significantly less clarity with regard to tenure standards (Table 1).
- Faculty at private institutions reported less clarity on the process and criteria and significantly less clarity on tenure standards than faculty at public institutions (Table 2).
- University faculty reported significantly less clarity on the tenure process and body of evidence (Table 2).
- Female faculty at universities reported significantly less clarity than their male peers on the tenure process and body of evidence (Table 2).
- Female faculty at colleges reported significantly less clarity than their male peers on the tenure process, standards, and body of evidence (Table 2).

Table 1: Mean Tenure Clarity, by Respondent Characteristics

Clarity of tenure...	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
process	3.67	3.63**	3.71	3.67	3.67
criteria	3.57	3.55	3.59	3.57	3.57
standards	3.23	3.20*	3.26	3.33	3.20***
body of evidence	3.49	3.44***	3.53	3.49	3.49

Table 2: Mean Tenure Clarity, by Institutional Characteristics

Clarity of tenure...	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
process	3.64	3.68	3.83	3.66***	3.62*	3.69	3.70**	3.94
criteria	3.53	3.58	3.64	3.57	3.55	3.58	3.57	3.71
standards	3.12***	3.27	3.17	3.24	3.21	3.26	3.04**	3.30
body of evidence	3.49	3.49	3.63	3.48***	3.43**	3.51	3.46***	3.78

¹ Scale: 5 = Very clear, 4 = Fairly clear, 3 = Neither clear nor unclear, 2 = Fairly unclear, 1 = Very unclear

² Throughout this report, significance level annotations, ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05, appear with the lesser of means.

The survey asked junior faculty to rate their level of clarity regarding, and the reasonableness of expectations for, earning tenure. With regard to clarity of expectations, the survey found:

- Junior faculty reported the greatest clarity about the expectations for their performance as scholars and as teachers; they reported the least clarity about what is expected of them as a member of the broader community (Table 3).
- Female faculty reported significantly less clarity than male faculty about the expectations for their performance as scholars (Table 3).
- White faculty reported significantly less clarity than faculty of color about the expectations for their performance as a scholar, teacher, advisor, colleague, campus citizen and member of the broader community (Table 3).
- Faculty at private institutions reported significantly less clarity about expectations for their performance as a scholar, a campus citizen and a member of the broader community (Table 4).
- College faculty reported significantly less clarity about expectations for their performance as a scholar and as a member of the broader community (Table 4).
- University faculty reported significantly less clarity about expectations for their performance as a teacher, advisor, colleague, and campus citizen (Table 4).
- At universities and colleges, female faculty reported significantly less clarity than their male peers about the expectations for their performance as a scholar (Table 4).

Table 3: Mean Clarity of Expectations, by Respondent Characteristics

Clarity of expectations as...	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
a scholar	3.75	3.67***	3.81	3.88	3.70***
a teacher	3.74	3.77	3.72	3.82	3.72***
an advisor to students	3.24	3.24	3.24	3.38	3.20***
a colleague in your department	3.26	3.25	3.27	3.33	3.24**
a campus citizen	3.16	3.17	3.15	3.23	3.14**
a member of the broader community	2.93	2.94	2.92	3.08	2.88***

Table 4: Mean Clarity of Expectations, by Institutional Characteristics

Clarity of expectations as...	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
a scholar	3.65***	3.77	3.46***	3.77	3.71***	3.83	3.33**	3.59
a teacher	3.70	3.76	3.97	3.72***	3.75	3.70	3.94	3.99
an advisor to students	3.20	3.26	3.33	3.23*	3.23	3.24	3.40	3.27
a colleague in your department	3.27	3.26	3.45	3.24***	3.23	3.26	3.49	3.41
a campus citizen	3.09**	3.18	3.40	3.14***	3.15	3.13	3.36	3.43
a member of the broader community	2.78***	2.97	2.83*	2.94	2.95	2.93	2.81	2.85

After asking about the clarity of expectations for performance, the survey asked faculty about the reasonableness³ of those expectations. Below, we highlight the responses of those who indicated that expectations were fairly clear (4) or very clear (5).

- Faculty felt expectations for performance as a colleague and teacher were the most reasonable, while expectations as a scholar were the least reasonable (Table 5).
- Female faculty felt that expectations for performance as a scholar, teacher, advisor, colleague, campus citizen, and member of the community were significantly less reasonable than their male peers (Table 5).
- Faculty of color reported that expectations for performance as a teacher were significantly less reasonable than their white peers (Table 5).
- Faculty at private institutions faculty felt that expectations for performance as a scholar, teacher, advisor, colleague and campus citizen were significantly less reasonable then their peers at public institutions (Table 6).
- College faculty reported that the expectations for campus citizenship were significantly less reasonable than their university peers (Table 6).
- University female faculty rated the reasonableness of expectations for their performance as scholars, teachers, advisors, colleagues, campus citizens, and members of the broader community as significantly less reasonable than did their male peers (Table 6).
- College female faculty rated that the expectations for performance as a scholar were significantly less reasonable than their male peers (Table 6).

Table 5: Mean Reasonableness of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Respondent Characteristics

Reasonableness of expectations as...	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
a scholar	4.16	4.01***	4.27	4.19	4.14
a teacher	4.31	4.26***	4.35	4.26**	4.33
an advisor to students	4.29	4.21***	4.35	4.28	4.29
a colleague in your department	4.34	4.31*	4.37	4.29*	4.36
a campus citizen	4.24	4.20*	4.27	4.22	4.24
a member of the broader community	4.29	4.24**	4.34	4.25	4.31

³ Scale: 5 = Very reasonable, 4 = Fairly reasonable, 3 = Neither reasonable nor unreasonable, 2 = Fairly unreasonable, 1 = Very unreasonable

Table 6: Mean Reasonableness of Performance Expectations for Tenure, by Institutional Characteristics

Reasonableness of expectations as...	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
a scholar	4.06***	4.18	4.20	4.15	4.00***	4.27	4.10*	4.28
a teacher	4.21***	4.34	4.24	4.32	4.27***	4.36	4.21	4.27
an advisor to students	4.22**	4.31	4.21	4.30	4.22***	4.36	4.14	4.27
a colleague in your department	4.25***	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.32*	4.38	4.23	4.32
a campus citizen	4.15**	4.26	4.04***	4.26	4.23*	4.28	3.94	4.12
a member of the broader community	4.25	4.31	4.22	4.30	4.25**	4.34	4.11	4.33

NATURE OF THE WORK

The COACHE survey asked junior faculty to rate their level of satisfaction⁴ with a number of aspects of the work, the workplace, and support services including their satisfaction with how faculty spend their time, teaching and research. Instead of reporting each individual question in the section, three composites were created.

- The Teaching Composite represents the mean satisfaction scores of the following:
 - Level of courses taught
 - Number of courses taught
 - Degree of influence over which courses are taught
 - Discretion over content of courses taught
 - Number of students taught
 - Quality of undergraduates taught/interacted with
 - Quality of graduates taught/interacted with
- The Research Composite represents the mean satisfaction scores of the following:
 - Expectations of you as a researcher
 - Amount of time to conduct research
 - Amount of external funding required
 - Influence over research focus
- The Support Services Composite represents the mean satisfaction scores of the following:
 - Clerical/administrative support services
 - Research support services
 - Teaching support services
 - Computing support services

Overall, junior faculty reported the greatest satisfaction with the teaching composite and the least satisfaction with the research composite (Table 7). Differences among groups included:

- Female faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than did their male peers with how they spend their time, the research composite, and the support services composite (Table 7).
- White faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than did faculty of color with how they spend their time and the support services composite (Table 7).
- Faculty of color reported significantly less satisfaction than did white faculty with several aspects of teaching (Table 7).
- Faculty at public institutions reported significantly less satisfaction than did faculty at private institutions with all three composites for teaching, research, and support services (Table 8).
- University faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than did college faculty with the teaching composite and the support services composite (Table 8).
- Female faculty at both colleges and universities reported significantly less satisfaction than did their male peers with how they spend their time and the research composite (Table 8). University female faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than did university male faculty with the support services composite.

⁴ Scale: 5 = Very satisfied, 4 = Fairly satisfied, 3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = Fairly dissatisfied, 1 = Very dissatisfied

Table 7: Mean Satisfaction with Nature of Work by Respondent Characteristics (Means in *italics* are for variables included in the composite scores)

Satisfaction with...	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
The way you spend your time as a faculty member	3.76	3.67***	3.84	3.81	3.75*
Teaching composite	4.01	4.01	4.01	3.94***	4.03
<i>Level of courses you teach</i>	<i>4.19</i>	<i>4.21</i>	<i>4.18</i>	<i>4.10***</i>	<i>4.22</i>
<i>Number of courses you teach</i>	<i>3.87</i>	<i>3.84</i>	<i>3.90</i>	<i>3.82*</i>	<i>3.89</i>
<i>Degree of influence over which courses you teach</i>	<i>4.20</i>	<i>4.16*</i>	<i>4.22</i>	<i>4.12**</i>	<i>4.22</i>
<i>Discretion over course content</i>	<i>4.64</i>	<i>4.64</i>	<i>4.65</i>	<i>4.54***</i>	<i>4.68</i>
<i>Number of students you teach</i>	<i>3.90</i>	<i>3.87</i>	<i>3.92</i>	<i>3.91</i>	<i>3.90</i>
<i>Quality of undergraduate students</i>	<i>3.49</i>	<i>3.56</i>	<i>3.43***</i>	<i>3.39***</i>	<i>3.52</i>
<i>Quality of graduate students</i>	<i>3.63</i>	<i>3.67</i>	<i>3.60*</i>	<i>3.55**</i>	<i>3.66</i>
Research composite	3.46	3.31***	3.58	3.45	3.46
<i>Expectations of you as a researcher</i>	<i>3.73</i>	<i>3.55***</i>	<i>3.87</i>	<i>3.80</i>	<i>3.71*</i>
<i>Amount of time for research</i>	<i>2.75</i>	<i>2.51***</i>	<i>2.95</i>	<i>2.92</i>	<i>2.70***</i>
<i>Amount of external funding you are expected to find</i>	<i>2.96</i>	<i>2.81***</i>	<i>3.08</i>	<i>2.92</i>	<i>2.98</i>
<i>Influence you have over research</i>	<i>4.45</i>	<i>4.43</i>	<i>4.46</i>	<i>4.28***</i>	<i>4.50</i>
Support services composite	3.50	3.45***	3.55	3.56	3.49**
<i>Clerical/administrative services</i>	<i>3.57</i>	<i>3.48***</i>	<i>3.64</i>	<i>3.61</i>	<i>3.56</i>
<i>Research services</i>	<i>3.19</i>	<i>3.08***</i>	<i>3.27</i>	<i>3.27</i>	<i>3.16**</i>
<i>Teaching services</i>	<i>3.61</i>	<i>3.60</i>	<i>3.62</i>	<i>3.64</i>	<i>3.60</i>
<i>Computing services</i>	<i>3.60</i>	<i>3.58</i>	<i>3.62</i>	<i>3.66</i>	<i>3.58*</i>

Table 8: Mean Satisfaction with Nature of Work by Institutional Characteristics (Means in *italics* are for variables included in the composite scores)

Satisfaction with...	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
The way you spend your time as a faculty member	3.76	3.76	3.78	3.76	3.67***	3.84	3.68*	3.87
Teaching composite	4.22	3.95***	4.22	3.99***	3.99	3.99	4.27	4.18
<i>Level of courses you teach</i>	4.25	4.17**	4.28	4.18*	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.25
<i>Number of courses you teach</i>	3.98	3.84***	3.75*	3.89	3.86	3.91	3.70	3.79
<i>Degree of influence over which courses you teach</i>	4.34	4.15***	4.44	4.17***	4.12**	4.21	4.52	4.37*
<i>Discretion over course content</i>	4.71	4.62***	4.76	4.63***	4.62	4.64	4.79	4.74
<i>Number of students you teach</i>	4.09	3.84***	4.05	3.89*	3.85*	3.91	4.09	4.01
<i>Quality of undergraduate students</i>	4.12	3.30***	4.08	3.42***	3.47	3.38**	4.24	3.93***
<i>Quality of graduate students</i>	3.82	3.59***	3.75	3.63	3.67	3.60*	3.81	3.67
Research composite	3.57	3.43***	3.45	3.46	3.31***	3.58	3.35**	3.54
<i>Expectations of you as a researcher</i>	3.75	3.72	3.62	3.74	3.55***	3.88	3.49*	3.75
<i>Amount of time for research</i>	2.79	2.74	2.34***	2.79	2.55***	2.99	2.20**	2.47
<i>Amount of external funding you are expected to find</i>	3.17	2.90***	3.23	2.94***	2.78***	3.06	3.11*	3.33
<i>Influence you have over research</i>	4.59	4.40***	4.64	4.43***	4.40	4.45	4.63	4.65
Support services composite	3.59	3.48***	3.63	3.49***	3.43***	3.54	3.58	3.67
<i>Clerical/administrative services</i>	3.73	3.52***	3.91	3.54***	3.44***	3.61	3.81	3.99
<i>Research services</i>	3.30	3.16***	3.16	3.19	3.08***	3.28	3.08	3.22
<i>Teaching services</i>	3.74	3.58***	3.72	3.60*	3.59	3.62	3.73	3.70
<i>Computing services</i>	3.54*	3.62	3.58	3.60	3.58	3.62	3.56	3.61

POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The COACHE survey asked junior faculty to rate the importance⁵ to their success and the effectiveness⁶ of various institutional policies and practices. Below, the mean importance scores by faculty and institutional characteristics are reported in tables 9 and 10.

- Overall, junior faculty reported that the most important policies for their success were an upper limit on teaching and travel funds to present papers or conduct research.
- Female faculty rated every policy significantly more important for their success than their male peers.
- Faculty of color found nine of the policies significantly more important than white faculty.
- Faculty at private institutions reported that paid or unpaid research or personal leave, stop-the-clock policies, childcare and financial assistance with housing were significantly more important to their success, while faculty at public institutions reported that travel funds, periodic formal and written reviews, professional assistance with grants and for teaching, and formal mentoring were more important for their success.
- College faculty rated travel funds and paid or unpaid research leave as the most important for their success and these policies were significantly more important to them than to university faculty.
- University female faculty rated every policy significantly more important than their male peers at universities.
- College female faculty rated paid or unpaid research leave as most important to their success; the policy was significantly more important to them than to their male colleagues.

⁵ Scale: 5 = Very important, 4 = Fairly important, 3 = Neither important nor unimportant, 2 = Fairly unimportant, 1 = Very unimportant

⁶ Scale: 5 = Very effective, 4 = Fairly effective, 3 = Neither effective nor ineffective, 2 = Fairly ineffective, 1 = Very ineffective

Table 9: Mean Importance of Policies, by Respondent Characteristics

Importance to your success	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
Upper limit on teaching obligations	4.65	4.73	4.58***	4.65	4.64
Travel funds	4.62	4.74	4.52***	4.64	4.61
Informal mentoring	4.49	4.62	4.39***	4.47	4.50
Upper limit on committee assignments	4.41	4.56	4.29***	4.44	4.40
Paid or unpaid research leave	4.37	4.57	4.20***	4.43	4.35***
Periodic, formal performance reviews	4.34	4.45	4.24***	4.34	4.33
Written summaries of periodic performance reviews	4.27	4.40	4.17***	4.28	4.27
Professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants	4.25	4.36	4.15***	4.36	4.21***
Peer reviews of teaching or research	4.13	4.22	4.07***	4.22	4.10***
Formal mentoring	4.04	4.21	3.89***	4.18	3.99***
Stop-the-clock policies	4.01	4.30	3.78***	4.11	3.98***
Professional assistance for improving teaching	3.77	3.89	3.67***	3.99	3.69***
Paid or unpaid personal leave	3.75	4.05	3.51***	3.97	3.68***
Childcare	3.62	3.80	3.47***	3.83	3.55***
Spousal/partner hiring program	3.61	3.67	3.56***	3.94	3.50***
Financial assistance with housing	3.25	3.27	3.24	3.65	3.12***

Table 10: Mean Importance of Policies, by Institutional Characteristics

Importance to your success	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
Upper limit on teaching obligations	4.66	4.64	4.64	4.65	4.73	4.58***	4.75	4.55***
Travel funds	4.58**	4.63	4.75	4.61***	4.74	4.50***	4.78	4.73
Informal mentoring	4.51	4.48	4.52	4.49	4.61	4.39***	4.66	4.40***
Upper limit on committee assignments	4.40	4.41	4.34*	4.42	4.57	4.29***	4.46	4.23***
Paid or unpaid research leave	4.58	4.31***	4.74	4.33***	4.55	4.16***	4.80	4.69*
Periodic, formal performance reviews	4.27***	4.35	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.24***	4.38	4.24*
Written summaries of periodic performance reviews	4.16***	4.31	4.25	4.27	4.40	4.17***	4.38	4.13***
Professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants	4.08***	4.29	4.09***	4.26	4.38	4.17***	4.17	4.02*
Peer reviews of teaching or research	4.10	4.14	4.17	4.13	4.21	4.06***	4.26	4.09*
Formal mentoring	3.92***	4.07	3.89***	4.05	4.23	3.90***	4.03	3.77**
Stop-the-clock policies	4.17	3.97***	4.06	4.01	4.29	3.78***	4.34	3.81***
Professional assistance for improving teaching	3.67***	3.80	3.88	3.76**	3.89	3.65***	3.95	3.81
Paid or unpaid personal leave	3.89	3.72***	3.95	3.73***	4.03	3.50***	4.27	3.66***
Childcare	3.94	3.52***	3.84	3.59***	3.78	3.44***	3.99	3.71*
Spousal/partner hiring program	3.60	3.61	3.45**	3.63	3.69	3.57***	3.48	3.42
Financial assistance with housing	3.68	3.12***	3.52	3.22***	3.24	3.21	3.51	3.53

The COACHE survey asked junior faculty to rate the effectiveness of each of the sixteen policies discussed above. Below, mean effectiveness scores are reported for those faculty members who rated a policy as fairly important (4) or very important (5) in tables 11 and 12.

- Overall, the least effective policy was professional assistance for obtaining externally funded grants.
- Male and female faculty agreed that professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants was the least effective. Male faculty rated seven policies significantly less effective than their female peers: financial assistance with housing, formal mentoring, paid or unpaid personal leave, professional assistance for improving teaching, stop-the-clock provisions, and paid or unpaid research leave.
- White faculty found five policies significantly less effective than faculty of color: professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants, formal mentoring, peer reviews, periodic formal reviews and written summaries of reviews.
- Childcare was the least effective policy for faculty at public institutions. Overall, faculty at public institutions rated eleven policies as significantly less effective than did faculty at private institutions.
- University faculty rated childcare and professional assistance in obtaining grants as the least effective policies; they found fourteen of the policies significantly less effective than did college faculty.
- Male faculty at universities found ten policies significantly less effective than did their female peers: financial assistance with housing, formal mentoring, paid or unpaid personal leave, peer reviews, professional assistance for improving teaching, stop-the-clock provisions, paid or unpaid research leave, and travel funds.
- Male faculty at colleges found professional assistance in obtaining grants significantly less effective than did female faculty at colleges.

Table 11: Mean Effectiveness of Policies, by Respondent Characteristics

Effectiveness at your institution	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
Professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants	2.74	2.73	2.75	2.85	2.70**
Childcare	2.86	2.89	2.84	2.93	2.83
Spousal/partner hiring program	2.89	2.95	2.85	2.93	2.88
Financial assistance with housing	3.19	3.46	2.99*	3.10	3.23
Formal mentoring	3.25	3.32	3.19*	3.34	3.22*
Paid or unpaid personal leave	3.28	3.36	3.18**	3.25	3.29
Upper limit on committee assignments	3.37	3.39	3.36	3.40	3.36
Peer reviews of teaching or research	3.39	3.44	3.35*	3.50	3.35**
Professional assistance for improving teaching	3.51	3.56	3.47*	3.55	3.50
Stop-the-clock policies	3.52	3.66	3.37***	3.38*	3.57
Written summaries of periodic performance reviews	3.56	3.60	3.53	3.63	3.54*
Upper limit on teaching obligations	3.61	3.58	3.63	3.62	3.61
Periodic, formal performance reviews	3.61	3.64	3.59	3.69	3.59**
Travel funds	3.63	3.67	3.59	3.62	3.63
Paid or unpaid research leave	3.64	3.77	3.51***	3.53*	3.68
Informal mentoring	3.69	3.71	3.67	3.67	3.70

Table 12: Mean Effectiveness of Policies, by Institutional Characteristics

Effectiveness at your institution	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
Professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants	2.83	2.72*	3.00	2.72***	2.69	2.74	3.18	2.84*
Childcare	3.33	2.66***	3.98	2.72***	2.70	2.74	4.31	3.66
Spousal/partner hiring program	2.96	2.88	3.40	2.85**	2.90	2.81	3.49	3.31
Financial assistance with housing	3.74	2.87***	4.21	3.04***	3.32	2.84***	4.39	4.07
Formal mentoring	3.44	3.20***	3.64	3.22***	3.29	3.15**	3.34	3.22
Paid or unpaid personal leave	3.66	3.17***	3.73	3.23***	3.32	3.13**	3.71	3.76
Upper limit on committee assignments	3.59	3.31***	3.66	3.35**	3.37	3.33	3.81	3.81
Peer reviews of teaching or research	3.48	3.37	3.65	3.36***	3.41	3.32*	3.68	3.63
Professional assistance for improving teaching	3.71	3.46***	3.78	3.48***	3.54	3.44*	3.76	3.79
Stop-the-clock policies	3.84	3.42***	4.05	3.47***	3.59	3.35***	4.23	3.76
Written summaries of periodic performance reviews	3.55	3.56	3.56	3.56	3.61	3.52*	3.48	3.64
Upper limit on teaching obligations	3.81	3.55***	3.74	3.60*	3.57	3.62	3.71	3.77
Periodic, formal performance reviews	3.51*	3.64	3.67	3.61	3.65	3.57*	3.56	3.77
Travel funds	3.93	3.54***	4.03	3.58***	3.63	3.55*	4.04	4.02
Paid or unpaid research leave	4.16	3.45***	4.14	3.57***	3.71	3.43***	4.20	4.09
Informal mentoring	3.70	3.69	3.89	3.67***	3.69	3.65	3.87	3.90

The COACHE survey asked faculty five questions related to professional and personal/family life. Faculty rated their level of agreement⁷ with the following four statements: “My institution does what it can to make **having** children and the tenure-track compatible,” and “My departmental colleagues do what they can to make **having** children and the tenure-track compatible;” “My institution does what it can to make **raising** children and the tenure-track compatible” and “My departmental colleagues do what they can to make **raising** children and the tenure-track compatible.” Faculty were also asked to rate their satisfaction with the balance between professional time and personal or family time.

- Overall, faculty reported less agreement with the statements regarding their institution’s support for having and raising children than with those statements about their departmental colleagues (Table 13).
- Faculty reported they were somewhat unsatisfied with their ability to balance work life and home life activities.
- Female faculty reported significantly less agreement with all the statements than did their male peers, and reported significantly lower satisfaction with the balance between home and work (Table 13).
- Faculty of color reported significantly less agreement with the statements regarding their department’s support for having and raising children (Table 13).
- Faculty at public institutions reported significantly less agreement with the statement regarding their institution’s support for having children, while faculty at private institutions reported significantly lower satisfaction with the balance between home and work (Table 14).
- University faculty reported significantly less agreement with all four statements regarding their department’s and institution’s support for having and raising children (Table 14).
- Female faculty at universities reported significantly less agreement with all four statements regarding their department’s and institution’s support for having and raising children and lower satisfaction with the balance between home and work (Table 14).
- Female faculty at colleges reported significantly lower satisfaction with the balance between home and work (Table 14).

Table 13: Mean Agreement/Satisfaction with Family Support and Professional/Personal Balance, by Respondent Characteristics

Agreement/Satisfaction	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
Agree that institution supports having children	2.84	2.72***	2.94	2.84	2.84
Agree that institution supports raising children	2.68	2.51***	2.83	2.72	2.67
Agree that departmental colleagues support having children	3.44	3.40*	3.49	3.32***	3.48
Agree that departmental colleagues support raising children	3.40	3.32***	3.47	3.29***	3.44
Satisfaction ⁸ with balance between professional time and personal or family time	2.78	2.57***	2.96	2.79	2.78

⁷ Scale: 5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

⁸ Scale: 5 = Very satisfied, 4 = Fairly satisfied, 3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = Fairly dissatisfied, 1 = Very dissatisfied

Table 14: Mean Agreement/Satisfaction with Family Support and Professional/Personal Balance, by Institutional Characteristics

Agreement/ Satisfaction	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
Agree that institution supports having children	2.91	2.81*	3.17	2.80***	2.66***	2.92	3.17	3.16
Agree that institution supports raising children	2.65	2.69	2.88	2.66***	2.47***	2.82	2.78	2.97
Agree that departmental colleagues support having children	3.43	3.45	3.81	3.40***	3.35**	3.45	3.79	3.84
Agree that departmental colleagues support raising children	3.38	3.41	3.76	3.36***	3.27***	3.44	3.71	3.80
Satisfaction with balance between professional time and personal or family time	2.72*	2.80	2.70	2.79	2.58***	2.96	2.45***	2.93

The COACHE survey asked faculty to rate their satisfaction⁹ with compensation. Overall, faculty were moderately satisfied with their compensation (Table 15 and 16).

- Faculty of color reported significantly less satisfaction with their compensation than did white faculty.
- Faculty at public institutions reported significantly less satisfaction with their compensation than did faculty at private institutions.
- University faculty reported significantly less satisfaction with their compensation than did faculty at colleges.

Table 15: Mean Satisfaction with Compensation, by Respondent Characteristics

Satisfaction	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
Compensation	3.15	3.14	3.16	3.05***	3.18

Table 16: Mean Satisfaction with Compensation, by Institutional Characteristics

Satisfaction	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
Compensation	3.48	3.05***	3.44	3.12***	3.10	3.14	3.50	3.37

⁹ Scale: 5 = Very satisfied, 4 = Fairly satisfied, 3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = Fairly dissatisfied, 1 = Very dissatisfied

CLIMATE, CULTURE AND COLLEGIALITY

The COACHE survey asked junior faculty to rate their satisfaction¹⁰ with various aspects of the climate, culture and collegiality of their workplaces.

- Overall, faculty reported the greatest satisfaction with the fairness with which their immediate supervisor evaluates their work and the amount of personal interaction with junior colleagues (Table 17).
- Female faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than did their male peers with the fairness with which their immediate supervisor evaluates their work, the interest senior faculty take in their professional development, the opportunities to collaborate with senior faculty, and their sense of fit (Table 17). Male faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than female faculty with their personal interaction with junior colleagues (Table 17).
- Faculty of color reported significantly less satisfaction than their white colleagues with regard to the fairness with which their immediate supervisor evaluates their work, the amount of personal interaction with senior colleagues, the amount of professional and personal interaction with junior colleagues, their sense of fit, and the intellectual vitality of senior faculty (Table 17).
- Both female faculty and faculty of color reported significantly less agreement with the statement, “On the whole, my department treats junior faculty fairly compared to one another” (Table 17).
- Faculty at public institutions reported significantly less satisfaction than did their peers at private institutions with the intellectual vitality of senior faculty (Table 18). Faculty at private institutions reported significantly less satisfaction than their counterparts at public institutions with the amount of personal interaction they have with other junior colleagues.
- University junior faculty members were generally less satisfied than were their counterparts at colleges with various aspects of culture, climate and collegiality (Table 18). Notably, they reported significantly less satisfaction with the interest senior faculty take in their professional development, the amount of professional and personal interaction with senior colleagues, and their sense of fit.
- Female faculty at universities reported significantly less satisfaction than did male faculty at universities with the fairness with which their immediate supervisor evaluates their work, the interest senior faculty take in their professional development, opportunities to collaborate with senior faculty, the amount of professional interaction with senior faculty, and their sense of fit (Table 18). In addition, female faculty at universities reported significantly less agreement with the statement, “On the whole, my department treats junior faculty fairly compared to one another.”
- Male faculty at colleges reported significantly less satisfaction than did female faculty at colleges with the amount of professional and personal interaction with junior colleagues (Table 18).

¹⁰ Scale: 5 = Very satisfied, 4 = Fairly satisfied, 3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = Fairly dissatisfied, 1 = Very dissatisfied

Table 17: Mean Satisfaction with Climate, Culture and Collegiality, by Respondent Characteristics

Satisfaction	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
Fairness with which your supervisor evaluates your work	4.02	3.97**	4.06	3.96*	4.05
Interest sr. faculty take in your professional development	3.52	3.48*	3.55	3.49	3.53
Opportunities to collaborate w/ sr. faculty	3.35	3.22***	3.45	3.30	3.36
Professional interaction w/ sr. colleagues	3.48	3.42***	3.53	3.44	3.50
Personal interaction w/ sr. colleagues	3.70	3.69	3.71	3.60***	3.73
Professional interaction w/ jr. colleagues	3.88	3.90	3.86	3.78***	3.91
Personal interaction w/ jr. colleagues	4.01	4.07	3.96***	3.89***	4.05
How well you "fit"	3.81	3.76**	3.85	3.73**	3.83
Intellectual vitality of sr. faculty in your dept.	3.42	3.41	3.42	3.36*	3.44
"My department treats junior faculty fairly." ¹¹	3.78	3.65***	3.89	3.73*	3.80

¹¹ Scale: 5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

Table 18: Mean Satisfaction with Climate, Culture and Collegiality, by Institutional Characteristics

Satisfaction	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
Fairness with which your supervisor evaluates your work	3.99	4.03	4.18	4.01**	3.96**	4.05	4.13	4.22
Interest sr. faculty take in your professional development	3.56	3.51	3.75	3.49***	3.45*	3.53	3.71	3.79
Opportunities to collaborate w/ sr. faculty	3.32	3.36	3.46	3.34*	3.20***	3.45	3.48	3.45
Professional interaction w/ sr. colleagues	3.46	3.49	3.59	3.47*	3.40***	3.53	3.65	3.54
Personal interaction w/ sr. colleagues	3.73	3.69	3.86	3.68***	3.66	3.69	3.88	3.84
Professional interaction w/ jr. colleagues	3.82*	3.90	3.81	3.89	3.90	3.88	3.91	3.72*
Personal interaction w/ jr. colleagues	4.01	4.01	4.07	4.00	4.05	3.96***	4.18	3.97**
How well you "fit"	3.80	3.81	3.98	3.79***	3.73**	3.84	3.97	4.00
Intellectual vitality of sr. faculty in your dept.	3.60	3.36***	3.58	3.40**	3.39	3.42	3.66	3.51
"My department treats junior faculty fairly." ¹²	3.82	3.77	3.92	3.77**	3.64***	3.88	3.83	4.00

¹² Scale: 5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

GLOBAL SATISFACTION

The COACHE survey asked junior faculty about their overall satisfaction in a series of questions. Below are results from four questions.

University faculty were asked to rate their satisfaction with their *department* as a place to work.

- Overall, faculty reported being “somewhat satisfied” with their department (Table 19).
- Female faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than male faculty with their department as a place to work (Table 19).
- Faculty of color reported significantly less satisfaction than white faculty with their department as a place to work (Table 19).

All faculty were asked to rate their satisfaction with their *institution* as a place to work.

- Overall, faculty reported being “somewhat satisfied” with their institution as a place to work (Table 19).
- Faculty at public institutions reported significantly less satisfaction than faculty at private institutions with their institution as a place to work (Table 20).
- University faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than college faculty with their institution as a place to work (Table 20).

*Agreement*¹³ with “If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.”

- Overall, junior faculty reported that they would accept their current positions again (Table 19).
- White faculty agreed with the statement to a greater extent than did faculty of color (Table 19).
- Faculty at private institutions agreed with the statement to a greater extent than did faculty at public institutions (Table 20).
- Faculty at colleges agreed with the statement to a greater extent than did faculty at universities (Table 20).

*Rate*¹⁴ your institution as a place for junior faculty to work.

- Overall, respondents rated their institutions as “good” places for junior faculty to work (Table 19).
- Female faculty rated their institutions significantly lower than did their male peers (Table 19).
- Faculty at public institutions rated their institutions significantly lower than did faculty at private institutions (Table 20).
- University faculty rated their institutions significantly lower than did college faculty (Table 20).
- Female faculty at universities rated their institutions significantly lower than did male faculty at universities (Table 20).

¹³ Scale: 5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

¹⁴ Scale: 5 = Great, 4 = Good, 3 = So-so, 2 = Bad, 1 = Awful

Table 19: Mean Ratings of Global Satisfaction, by Respondent Characteristics

	All Faculty	Gender		Race	
		Female Faculty	Male Faculty	Faculty of Color	White Faculty
Satisfaction w/ department ¹⁵	3.88	3.83**	3.91	3.82*	3.90
Satisfaction w/ institution	3.65	3.63	3.66	3.64	3.65
I'd accept my current position again	4.08	4.08	4.08	3.95***	4.12
Rating of institution as a place for junior faculty to work	3.75	3.70***	3.79	3.72	3.76

Table 20: Mean Ratings of Global Satisfaction, by Institutional Characteristics

	Control		Type		University Faculty		College Faculty	
	Private	Public	College	University	Female	Male	Female	Male
Satisfaction w/ department ¹⁶	3.89	3.88	--	3.88	3.83**	3.91	--	--
Satisfaction with institution	3.79	3.60***	4.06	3.60***	3.58	3.62	4.01	4.11
I'd accept my current position again	4.17	4.05***	4.35	4.05***	4.05	4.05	4.33	4.37
Rating of institution as a place for junior faculty to work	3.81	3.73***	3.96	3.72***	3.67***	3.77	3.90	4.02

¹⁵ Only university faculty were asked to respond to this question.

¹⁶ Only university faculty were asked to respond to this question.

COACHE

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education

Appendix A

COACHE site data included in this report

Institution	TYPE College (C) / University (U)	CONTROL Private (PR) / Public (PU)	Cohort
Amherst College	C	PR	2006-07
Appalachian State University	U	PU	2005-06
Arizona State University	U	PU	2005-06
Auburn University	U	PU	2005-06
Barnard College	C	PR	2005-06
Boston University	U	PR	2006-07
Bowdoin College	C	PR	2006-07
Brown University	U	PR	2005-06
California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo	U	PU	2006-07
California State Polytechnic University-Pomona	U	PU	2006-07
California State University-Fullerton	U	PU	2006-07
California State University-Long Beach	U	PU	2006-07
California State University-San Bernardino	U	PU	2006-07
California State University-San Marcos	U	PU	2006-07
Carleton College	C	PR	2006-07
Case Western Reserve University	U	PR	2005-06
Clemson University	U	PU	2005-06
College of the Holy Cross	C	PR	2006-07
College of Wooster	C	PR	2006-07
Connecticut College	C	PR	2006-07
Dartmouth College	U	PR	2005-06
Davidson College	C	PR	2005-06
Denison University	C	PR	2005-06
Drexel University	U	PR	2006-07
East Carolina University	U	PU	2005-06
Elizabeth City State University	C	PU	2005-06
Fayetteville State University	U	PU	2005-06
Goucher College	C	PR	2005-06
Hamilton College	C	PR	2005-06
Hampshire College	C	PR	2005-06
Harvard University	U	PR	2005-06
Hobart & William Smith Colleges	C	PR	2006-07
Indiana University, Bloomington	U	PU	2005-06
Iowa State University	U	PU	2005-06
Kansas State University	U	PU	2005-06
Kenyon College	C	PR	2005-06
Macalester College	C	PR	2005-06
Michigan State University	U	PU	2005-06
North Carolina A & T State University	U	PU	2005-06
North Carolina Central University	U	PU	2005-06

Institution	TYPE College (C) / University (U)	CONTROL Private (PR) / Public (PU)	Cohort
North Carolina State University	U	PU	2005-06
North Dakota State University	U	PU	2006-07
Northeastern University	U	PR	2005-06
Ohio State University	U	PU	2005-06
Ohio University	U	PU	2006-07
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey	C	PU	2005-06
Skidmore College	C	PR	2006-07
Sonoma State University	U	PU	2006-07
Stanford University	U	PR	2005-06
SUNY at Albany	U	PU	2005-06
SUNY at Buffalo	U	PU	2005-06
Syracuse University	U	PR	2005-06
Texas Tech University	U	PU	2005-06
Trinity College	C	PR	2006-07
Tufts University	U	PR	2005-06
University of Arizona	U	PU	2005-06
University of Connecticut	U	PU	2006-07
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	U	PU	2005-06
University of Kansas	U	PU	2005-06
University of Memphis	U	PU	2005-06
University of Minnesota	U	PU	2005-06
University of North Carolina at Asheville	C	PU	2005-06
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	U	PU	2005-06
University of North Carolina at Charlotte	U	PU	2005-06
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	U	PU	2005-06
University of North Carolina at Pembroke	U	PU	2005-06
University of North Carolina at Wilmington	U	PU	2005-06
University of Notre Dame	U	PR	2006-07
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	U	PU	2006-07
University of Virginia	U	PU	2005-06
Virginia Commonwealth University	U	PU	2006-07
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	U	PU	2006-07
Wabash College	C	PR	2005-06
Washington State University	U	PU	2006-07
Western Carolina University	U	PU	2005-06
Wheaton College	C	PR	2005-06
Winston-Salem State University	C	PU	2005-06