Overview: Findings from the 2019 COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey
The COACHE Survey

- Survey developed and managed by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), Harvard University at https://coache.gse.harvard.edu. The COACHE team gathers data directly from IUB faculty.
  - Tenure-track faculty and librarians, lecturers, research scientists, clinical faculty, professors of practice
- 2019 Response rate: overall 43.
- All responses are anonymous and strictly confidential.
Advantages of the COACHE Survey

- Comparable data for IUB over time (since 2005; especially 2013-2019)
- Comparisons to peer schools
- Comparisons among groups within IU (rank, gender, race/ethnicity, discipline)
- Validity and reliability of items tested by experts in higher education/survey methods
- We have the option to add a few items
What is COACHE used for at IU?

Strategic plan (2013 survey)

- Prioritized support for faculty -> investment in programs that support faculty work such as:
  - faculty writing groups
  - faculty success program
- Prioritized building and retaining diverse faculty
  - Increased investment in strategic hiring, dual career funding
EXAMPLES: IN 2016 COACHE, YOU SAID...

1. We need more institutional leadership in diversity and inclusion
   - Increased D&I leadership at school, campus, university level

2. We need more support for associate professors
   - IAS and VPFAA revamped and expanded programs to support associate professors

3. We need more clarity in promotion and tenure standards
   - Expand workshops on P&T for faculty at all ranks
   - VPFAA and BFC revised campus criteria

4. Not all faculty equally recognized for their work
   - Reduce barriers to award nomination (example: Provost Professor – tripled nominations, increased diversity of nominees)
COACHE 2019

Peer comparison
- Purdue University (2018)
- SUNY - Binghamton University (2017)
- University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill (2018)
- University of Tennessee (2018)
- University of Virginia (2016)

OVERALL COHORT: 149 institutions in the cohort database; 104 are research universities

IUB RESPONSE: N= 968 responses; 43% overall response rate
COACHE Benchmarks + Global Satisfaction

Nature of Work
- Research
- Service
- Teaching

Appreciation & Recognition

Department
- Engagement
- Quality
- Collegiality

Tenure & Promotion
- Tenure Policies
- Tenure Expectations: Clarity
- Promotion to Full

Leadership
- Senior
- Divisional
- Departmental
- Faculty

Shared Governance
- Trust
- Shared Sense of Purpose
- Understanding the Issue at Hand
- Adaptability
- Productivity

Collaboration & Mentoring
- Interdisciplinary Work
- Collaboration
- Mentoring

Resources & Support
- Facilities & Work Resources
- Personal & Family Policies
- Health & Retirement Benefits

Global Satisfaction
- Department
- Institution
- Recommend Department to Candidate
Global Satisfaction: IUB Results 2013-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would again choose to work at IUB (strongly agree/agree)</td>
<td>Department as a place to work (very satisfied/satisfied)</td>
<td>IUB as a place to work (very satisfied/satisfied)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Global Satisfaction: Compare with Peers 2019

- I would again choose to work at IUB (strongly agree/agree)
- Department as a place to work (very satisfied/satisfied)
- IUB as a place to work (very satisfied/satisfied)
- Recommend dept to a candidate (strongly recommend/recommend)
## Benchmarks: Compare with Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths compared with peers</th>
<th>About the same as peer average</th>
<th>Weaknesses compared with peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal &amp; Family Policies</strong> (#1 among peers, top 30% of all institutions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Retirement Benefits</strong> (#1 among peers, top 30% of all institutions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Work Resources</td>
<td>Governance: Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: Senior</td>
<td>Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose</td>
<td>Tenure Expectations: Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: Faculty</td>
<td>Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand</td>
<td>Leadership: Divisional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance: Productivity</td>
<td>Governance: Adaptability</td>
<td>Departmental Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of Work: Research</td>
<td>Departmental Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of Work: Teaching</td>
<td>Nature of Work: Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Work</td>
<td>Appreciation &amp; Recognition (#5 among peers, bottom 30% of all institutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion to Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership: Departmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strength: Facilities & Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>IUB</th>
<th>Peer Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for improving teaching</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library resources</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing and technical support</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/administrative support</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of very satisfied/satisfied
### Strength: Personal, Family & Health Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>IUB (%)</th>
<th>Peer Average (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My institution supports family/career</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compatibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(strongly agree/agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible workload/modified duties for</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parental or other family reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family medical/parental leave</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits for yourself</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits for family</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement benefits</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(very satisfied/satisfied)
Weakness: Appreciation & Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IUB 2013</th>
<th>IUB 2016</th>
<th>IUB 2019</th>
<th>Peer 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nor dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appreciation & Recognition Benchmark by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IUB*
Appreciation & Recognition Specific Items

- Recognition: For teaching
  - IUB: 52%
  - Peer average: 54%

- Recognition: For advising
  - IUB: 37%
  - Peer average: 40%

- Recognition: For scholarship
  - IUB: 52%
  - Peer average: 56%

- Recognition: For service
  - IUB: 40%
  - Peer average: 44%

- Recognition: For outreach
  - IUB: 34%
  - Peer average: 38%
Satisfaction with Service Assignments by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent on service</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Pre-tenure</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of very satisfied/satisfied</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitability of committee assignments</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IUB
Appreciation & Recognition Items (Cont)

Recognition: From colleagues
(very satisfied/satisfied)
- IUB: 61%
- Peer average: 63%

Recognition: From Head/Chair
(very satisfied/satisfied)
- IUB: 62%
- Peer average: 62%

CAO cares about faculty of my rank
(strongly agree/somewhat agree)
- IUB: 50%
- Peer average: 47%
What does this tell us about appreciation and recognition?

• Attention to appreciation and recognition is important at all levels – from colleague interactions to senior leadership.

• Our colleagues feel least recognized and appreciated for advising, outreach, and service work.

• Associate and full professors are the ranks least satisfied with appreciation and recognition.

• Given centrality of service to shared governance, need broad thought about how we acknowledge that work.
Continuing work…

• Closer assessment of faculty climate and faculty retention (VPDI and VPFAA)

• Highlighting importance of appreciation and recognition to chairs and deans

• **Tackling the intersection of service and recognition** (Kimberly Geeslin, Initiative for the Advancement of Women Faculty)
Intersection of Recognition & Service: Initiative for the Advancement of Women Faculty

Our current context:

• Faculty sometimes feel that their work goes unrecognized and this is more pronounced for women and underrepresented faculty
• There may be barriers to nomination for some groups
• Service burdens may be inequitable (and/or invisible)
• Service requests for many have increased in the pandemic and/or been matched with increased challenges in other areas (access to research support, travel, caregiving)

Response: Campus-wide award audit:

• Do all required documents contribute meaningfully to decision-making?
• Can demands on nominators/recommenders be reduced?
• Is there a bottleneck in the nomination path (e.g., nominations from chairs only)?
• Is the pool of nominees as representative as it should be?
You can find more information on COACHE at https://vpfaaa.indiana.edu/index.html
Additional Slides
Global Satisfaction by Rank: 2013-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>Pre-tenure</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I would again choose to work at IUB (strongly agree/agree)
- Department as a place to work (very satisfied/satisfied)
- IUB as a place to work (very satisfied/satisfied)
- Recommend dept to a candidate (strongly recommend/recommend)
Satisfaction with Facilities & Resources

Support IUB has offered for improving teaching:
- NTT: 67%
- Pre-tenure: 63%
- Associate: 57%
- Full: 54%

Library resources:
- NTT: 89%
- Pre-tenure: 86%
- Associate: 88%
- Full: 87%

Computing and technical support:
- NTT: 78%
- Pre-tenure: 69%
- Associate: 66%
- Full: 74%

Clerical/administrative support:
- NTT: 74%
- Pre-tenure: 62%
- Associate: 58%
- Full: 62%
Satisfaction with Personal, Family & Health Benefits

My institution does what it can to make personal/family obligations (e.g. childcare or eldercare) and an academic career compatible.

- 64% satisfied
- 45% satisfied
- 43% satisfied
- 46% satisfied

Family medical/parental leave
- 72% satisfied
- 71% satisfied
- 67% satisfied
- 62% satisfied

Flexible workload/modified duties for parental or other family reasons
- 73% satisfied
- 60% satisfied
- 65% satisfied
- 56% satisfied

Health benefits
- 85% satisfied
- 83% satisfied
- 78% satisfied
- 77% satisfied

NTT | Pre-tenure | Associate | Full
Appreciation & Recognition Items by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition:</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Pre-tenure</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For teaching</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For advising</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For scholarship</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For service</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For outreach</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recognition: From colleagues (very satisfied/satisfied) - 60% NTT, 71% Pre-tenure, 58% Associate, 59% Full
Recognition: From Head/Chair (very satisfied/satisfied) - 62% NTT, 71% Pre-tenure, 62% Associate, 53% Full
CAO cares about faculty of my rank (strongly agree/somewhat agree) - 47% NTT, 57% Pre-tenure, 50% Associate, 48% Full
Satisfaction with Shared Governance

The communication of priorities by my institution-wide faculty governing body. (very satisfied/satisfied)

The steps taken by my institution-wide faculty governing body to ensure faculty are included in that body's decision making. (very satisfied/satisfied)

Overall effectiveness of the shared governance system at IUB (very effective/somewhat effective)
### Campus Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Pre-tenure</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My department (or school if not in a department) is a place where all faculty are treated with respect.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued as an individual at IUB.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department Collegiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleagues pitch in when needed</th>
<th>Department is collegial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 70% 72%</td>
<td>All 78% 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT 74% 75%</td>
<td>NTT 78% 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-ten 73% 73%</td>
<td>Pre-tenure 80% 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten 67% 71%</td>
<td>Tenured 77% 76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of strongly agree/agree

- IUB
- Peer average