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What is COACHE?

• Web-based, anonymous survey, started in 2003
  – Limited participation (pre-tenure only) for ASE in 2009
• Comprehensive questionnaire about faculty life: 20 “benchmark” domains
• Comparative data based on national sample and peer group
Comparison Institutions

Our selected peer institutions for 2012-2013:

- Johns Hopkins University
- SUNY - University at Buffalo
- University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
- University of Toronto
- University of Virginia

The full cohort included 77 institutions with a total of 20,946 respondents.
Who Participated in 2012-2013 Survey?

- Five of the six UR schools participated. School of Medicine and Dentistry completed a parallel survey- *Faculty Forward*.

- Of our 481 UR faculty eligible, 259 faculty responded to the survey. This is a **54% response rate** (average for peers=44%; national average= 50).

- Of our respondents, 191 were tenured faculty and 68 were pre-tenure faculty.
# Participants by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajim</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman Music</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>259</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Research faculty only*
UR Demographics

All Eligible Faculty
- 347 (72.1%) men
- 134 (27.9%) women
- 407 (84.6%) white
- 74 (15.4%) faculty of color
- 23 (4.8%) underrepresented minorities

Respondents
- 178 (68.7%) men
- 81 (31.3%) women
- 223 (86.1%) white
- 35 (13.9%) faculty of color
- 15 (6%) underrepresented minorities

Note: Data derived from our HRMS system
Note: Data self-reported in the survey

Faculty of Color as defined by COACHE includes: Asian, Black, Hispanic, and Native American
Underrepresented minority is defined as Black, Hispanic, and Native American
Question: “All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the University of Rochester as a place to work?”

- Very Satisfied or Satisfied:
  - University of Rochester: 167
  - Our 5 Peer Group: 2551
  - All COACHE cohort institutions: 10924

- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied:
  - University of Rochester: 52
  - Our 5 Peer Group: 416
  - All COACHE cohort institutions: 3043

- Very Dissatisfied or Dissatisfied:
  - University of Rochester: 26
  - Our 5 Peer Group: 512
  - All COACHE cohort institutions: 2809
Satisfaction with the Institution by School

Question: “All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the University of Rochester as a place to work?”

[Bar chart showing satisfaction levels for different schools at the University of Rochester]
COACHE benchmark areas

- Nature of work: Teaching, Research, Service
- Interdisciplinary work/Collaboration/Mentoring
- Departments: Collegiality, Quality, Engagement
- Facilities/ work resources
- Tenure: Policies, Clarity, Reasonableness
- Promotion
- Leadership: Sr, Division (Deans), Department
- Appreciation & recognition
- Benefits & personal/family polices
Benchmarks for UR vs. ALL

• Top 30% for 12/20 domains
  – Tops among peers for tenure policies, clarity & reasonableness and departmental leadership

• Middle 40% for 8/20 domains

• NO benchmark areas where UR ranked in bottom 30% nationally
Examples of bragging rights (*top 1 or 2*)

- Interdisciplinary work
- Tenure policies
- Clarity of tenure policies
- Departmental leadership
Examples of Strengths
UR vs. ALL

Nature of work: Service and Teaching
– Support for faculty leadership roles, fairness of committee assignments
– Time spent on teaching, Number of courses taught, students

Interdisciplinary work
– Budgets, facilities and for interdisciplinary work

Tenure policies and clarity
– Clarity of tenure process, criteria, standards, consistency in messaging.

Departmental leadership
– Head/Chair’s pace of decision-making, communication of priorities, faculty input.

Departmental collegiality
– Meeting times compatible with personal needs
ASE 2009- Areas of strength
Pre-tenure faculty

• Tenure practices
• Tenure expectations- clarity of scholarly criteria
• Tenure reasonableness
• Nature of work overall
• Nature of work: research
• Nature of work: teaching
• Work and home
• Climate, culture and collegiality
• Compensation and benefits (housing assistance only)
• Global satisfaction
ASE-2009 Areas of concern
Pre-tenure faculty

Bottom quartile for entire cohort and 5th/6th compared to peers

• Tenure expectations: Clarity of expectations as an advisor, campus citizen, and member of community*
• Tenure expectations: reasonableness of expectations as a campus citizen and member of community*
• Nature of work: teaching (professional assistance for improving teaching)*
• Work and home: paid and unpaid personal leave
• Climate, culture, collegiality: Peer reviews of teaching or research

* Bottom quartile, nationally
Examples of concerns (*rank 5\textsuperscript{th} or 6\textsuperscript{th})*

- Classroom facilities (nationally lowest 30%)
- Departmental engagement
- Health and retirement benefits
- Promotion (excludes pre-tenure)
- Mentoring
- Support to improve teaching (overall, though not for pre-tenure faculty)
Facilities and work resources
- Classroom spaces

Benefits
- Retirement Benefits and Phased Retirement options
- Eldercare
- Health benefits for faculty & their families

Mentoring
- 50% have not met with their mentor in the past year (26% met seldom or occasionally)
- Many faculty noted that mentoring was not fulfilling.

Promotion
- Lack of clarity around process, criteria, standards, and time frame.

Departmental Engagement
- Discussions of student learning, effective practices, uses of technology
- Colleagues support work/life balance
Areas of difference based on:
Tenure, Gender, Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenured faculty</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Faculty of Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Differences:</td>
<td>Large Difference: Promotion</td>
<td>Large Differences:</td>
<td>Large Difference:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nature of work: Service</td>
<td>• Tenure Policies</td>
<td>• Departmental Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health and Retirement Benefits</td>
<td>• Tenure Clarity</td>
<td>Medium Differences:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring</td>
<td>• Tenure Reasonableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership: Senior</td>
<td>Medium Differences:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership: Divisional</td>
<td>• Tenure Reasonableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership: Departmental</td>
<td>• Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: In the social science research domain in which COACHE operates, the following thresholds are generally accepted ranges of effect size magnitude.

All “Difference” is in a negative direction
Less than .1 = Trivial Difference
Between .1 and .3 = Small Difference
Between .3 and .5 = Medium Difference
Greater than .5 = Large Difference
When our faculty were asked to **identify the two (and only two) best and worst aspects** of working at University of Rochester, the top four responses were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Aspects</th>
<th>Worst Aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Quality of Colleagues*</td>
<td>Compensation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Quality of Undergrad Students</td>
<td>Geographic Location*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Cost of Living*</td>
<td>Lack of Support for Research/Creative Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Academic Freedom</td>
<td>Quality of Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(There was a tie in Worst Aspects)</td>
<td>Quality of Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Diversity*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*also cited in 2009*
COACHE 2013

SUMMARY

• Overall- high levels of faculty satisfaction with work life, interdisciplinary opportunities colleagues

• Striking improvements since 2008-09 in support for teaching, clarity of tenure policies

• Some areas of concern can be addressed without additional expense: mentoring, faculty engagement and promotion

• Additional resources will be required to consider benefits and facilities
Recommended Actionable Items

• Mentoring
  – Review departmental mentoring plans
  – Engage chairs & faculty in focus groups to determine needs

• Promotion
  – Work on communication plan

• Faculty Engagement
  – Engage faculty, chairs in focus groups/interviews to determine needs
What’s next?

• Thank faculty and communicate findings
  – Faculty Senate
  – Faculty Diversity Officer (FDO) Committee
  – Department chairs
  – Discussed school-specific data with Deans and FDOs in annual fall meetings
• Choose areas of focus for improvement
• Action plans
  – Continue work with FDOs and FDO subcommittee on COACHE Recommended Actionable Items
  – Spring Mentoring Workshop
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