

Highlights Report 2008

Selected Results
from the
COACHE Tenure-Track Faculty
Job Satisfaction Survey



The COLLABORATIVE ON ACADEMIC CAREERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

at the HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

8 STORY STREET, 5TH FLOOR, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138 | 617 496 9348 | COACHE@GSE.HARVARD.EDU | WWW.COACHE.ORG

COPYRIGHT © DECEMBER 2008

The President & Fellows of Harvard College

All rights reserved. No part of this report, including any part of the Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, 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.

To request copies of this report, contact:

The Collaborative on Academic Careers
in Higher Education
Harvard Graduate School of Education
8 Story Street, Fifth Floor
Cambridge, MA 02138
Email: coache@gse.harvard.edu
URL: <http://www.coache.org>
Voice: 617-384-7873
Fax: 617-496-9350

Recommended citation:

Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education [COACHE]. (2008). *COACHE highlights report 2008*. Cambridge, MA: Author.

Table of contents

3 OVERVIEW

4 SURVEY THEMES

6 HIGHLIGHTS

- 6 Overall
- 7 By Gender
- 10 By Race/Ethnicity
- 14 By Institutional Type and Control

17 DEFINITIONS AND TABLES

- 17 Population Statistics
- 18 Tenure
- 20 Nature of the Work
- 22 Policies & Practices
- 26 Work/Home and Compensation
- 28 Climate, Culture, Collegiality
- 30 Global Satisfaction
- 31 List of Participating Institutions

Overview

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.

More than 130 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.

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 over eight thousand pre-tenure faculty nationwide.

The COACHE Survey assesses faculty experiences in several areas deemed critical to junior faculty success:

- Clarity and reasonableness of tenure processes and review
- Workload and support for teaching and research
- Importance and effectiveness of common policies and practices
- Climate, culture and collegiality on campus
- Global satisfaction

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, 2006-07, and 2007-08 cohorts. This year's Report provides, for the first time, results disaggregated by race/ethnicity; by university control; and by gender within both colleges and universities.

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>.

Survey Themes

The COACHE survey is organized around five themes:

Tenure

The survey asked pre-tenure faculty to rate their level of clarity¹ regarding four aspects of tenure: process, criteria, standards, and the body of evidence required. Along the same scale, the survey asked pre-tenure faculty to rate their level of clarity regarding their sense of whether or not they will achieve tenure. Faculty then rated their level of agreement² with the following two statements: “I have received consistent messages from tenured colleagues about the requirements for tenure,” and, “In my opinion, tenure decisions here are made primarily on performance-based criteria rather than on non-performance criteria.”

Next, the survey asked pre-tenure faculty to rate their level of clarity regarding the expectations for earning tenure in six areas where faculty work is judged: scholarship, teaching, advising, collegue-ship in the department, campus citizenship, and membership in the broader community. For each item, the survey also asked faculty about the reasonableness³ of those expectations; we include in the analysis of reasonableness only the responses of those who previously rated expectations as “fairly clear” or “very clear.”

Nature of the work

The COACHE survey asked pre-tenure faculty to rate their level of satisfaction⁴ with a number of aspects of the work, workplace, and support services. Three composites were created to reflect teaching, research, and support services.

- 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:
 - » 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

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

2 Agreement scale: 5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree

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

4 Satisfaction scale: 5 = Very satisfied, 4 = Satisfied, 3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, 1 = Very dissatisfied

In addition, faculty reported their level of satisfaction with the quality of the facilities and with the amount of access they have to Teaching Fellows, Graduate Assistants, et al.

Policies and practices

COACHE asks pre-tenure faculty to rate the importance⁵ to their success and the effectiveness⁶ at their institution of 16 faculty policies and practices common to academic careers. The survey follows this list with several statements related to the interaction of professional and personal/family life. Faculty rated their level of agreement with these five items:

- My institution does what it 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.
- My departmental colleagues do what they can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible.
- My departmental colleagues do what they can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible.
- My colleagues are respectful of my efforts to balance my home and work responsibilities.

Faculty were also asked to rate their satisfaction with the balance they are able to strike between professional time and personal or family time. Finally, the COACHE survey asked faculty to rate their satisfaction with their compensation (i.e., salary and benefits).

Climate, culture and collegiality

The COACHE survey asked pre-tenure faculty to rate their satisfaction with various aspects of the climate, culture and collegiality of their workplaces. These items include the fairness with which their immediate supervisors evaluate their work, the interest tenured faculty take in their professional development, and the opportunities available to collaborate with tenured faculty. In four separate questions, COACHE also asks faculty to consider the amount of personal and professional interactions they have with pre-tenure and tenured colleagues. Faculty then rate their satisfaction with how well they fit (e.g., their sense of belonging, their comfort level) in their departments and the intellectual vitality of the tenured colleagues in their departments. This section of the survey concludes by asking faculty to rate their agreement with the statement, “On the whole, my department treats pre-tenure faculty fairly compared to one another.”

Global satisfaction

The COACHE survey asks pre-tenure faculty about their overall satisfaction in a series of questions. This report includes results from four of these items: satisfaction with their departments and with their institutions as places to work, “all things considered”; agreement with the statement, “If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position”; and an overall rating⁷ of their institutions as places for pre-tenure faculty to work.

5 Importance scale: 5 = Very important, 4 = Important, 3 = Neither important nor unimportant, 2 = Unimportant, 1 = Very unimportant

6 Effectiveness scale: 5 = Very effective, 4 = Effective, 3 = Neither effective nor ineffective, 2 = Ineffective, 1 = Very ineffective

7 Global satisfaction scale: 5 = Great, 4 = Good, 3 = So-so, 2 = Bad, 1 = Awful

Overall

TENURE

- Faculty were most clear about the tenure process and least clear about tenure standards.
- Faculty reported the greatest clarity around the expectations for their performance as scholars and as teachers; they reported the least clarity around what is expected of them as members of the broader community.
- Faculty felt expectations for their performance as teachers and scholars were the most reasonable, while expectations as members of the broader community and as campus citizens were the least reasonable.

NATURE OF THE WORK

- Faculty reported the greatest satisfaction with the COACHE teaching composite and the least satisfaction with the COACHE research composite.

POLICIES & PRACTICES

- The policies rated as most important for faculty success were upper limits on teaching and travel funds to present papers or conduct research.
- The most effective practice was informal mentoring, also rated as important to faculty success.
- The least effective policy was financial assistance with housing, but faculty also rated it as least important to their success.
- Faculty were less inclined to agree with statements about their institutions' support for having and raising children than with those statements about their departmental colleagues' support.
- Faculty reported they were fairly dissatisfied with their ability to balance work and home life.

CLIMATE, CULTURE, COLLEGIALITY

- Faculty reported the greatest satisfaction with the fairness with which their immediate supervisors evaluate their work and the amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure colleagues, and the least satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of tenured faculty in their departments.

GLOBAL SATISFACTION

- On average, faculty were "somewhat satisfied" with their institutions.
- Faculty generally agreed that, if they could do it over again, they would accept their current positions.
- Overall, respondents rated their institutions as "good" places for pre-tenure faculty to work.

By Gender

These highlights illustrate the statistical differences and similarities between male and female faculty in the COACHE survey data set. This analysis further delineates between the sexes within universities and within colleges.

TENURE

Clarity

- Females generally reported less clarity than males on all tenure dimensions, and significantly less clarity on the tenure process, body of evidence, and standards.
- Females at universities reported significantly less clarity than males on the tenure process and body of evidence.
- Females at colleges reported significantly less clarity than males on the tenure process, standards, and body of evidence.
- Females at universities and at colleges reported significantly less clarity than males about their sense of whether or not they will achieve tenure.
- Females at universities and at colleges reported significantly less clarity than males about the expectations for their performance as scholars.
- Females at universities and at colleges agreed to a significantly lesser extent than did males that they receive consistent messages from tenured colleagues about the requirements for tenure and that tenure decisions are made primarily on performance-based criteria.

Reasonableness

- Female faculty generally rated the expectations for their performance as scholars, teachers, advisors, colleagues, and members of the community as significantly less reasonable than did their male peers.
- At universities, female faculty rated the reasonableness of expectations for their performance as scholars, teachers, advisors, and colleagues significantly lower than did their male peers.
- At colleges, female faculty rated the reasonableness of expectations for their performance as campus citizens and members of the broader community significantly lower than did their male peers.

NATURE OF THE WORK

- Females reported significantly less satisfaction than did males with how they spend their time, the number of hours they work as faculty members in an average week, the quality of facilities, the amount of access to Teaching Fellows and Graduate Assistants, the COACHE research composite, and the COACHE support services composite.
- Females at both colleges and universities reported significantly less satisfaction than did males with how they spend their time, the average number of hours they work each week as faculty members, and the COACHE research composite.

- At universities, females also reported significantly less satisfaction than did males with the quality of facilities, the amount of access to Teaching Fellows and Graduate Assistants, and the COACHE support services composite.

POLICIES & PRACTICES

Importance

- Females generally, and at universities, rated every policy—with the exception of financial assistance with housing—significantly more important to their success than did males.
- At colleges, females rated all but two policies—financial assistance with housing and spousal/partner hiring—as significantly more important to their success than did males.

Effectiveness

- Males generally, and at universities, rated seven policies as significantly less effective than did females: paid or unpaid research leave, paid or unpaid personal leave, stop-the-clock provisions, professional assistance for improving teaching, periodic performance reviews, written summaries of performance reviews, and travel funds.
- At colleges, males rated only stop-the-clock provisions as less effective than did females.
- Females generally rated three policies significantly less effective than did males: childcare, upper limits on committee assignments, and upper limits on teaching assignments.
- At universities, females found four policies to be significantly less effective than did males: childcare, professional assistance in obtaining grants, upper limits on committee assignments, and upper limits on teaching assignments.

Work/Home

- Females at universities reported significantly less agreement than did males on all five statements related to professional and personal/family life, and significantly less satisfaction than males with the balance they are able to strike between home and work.
- At colleges, females reported significantly less agreement than males with two of the work/home statements—that their institution does what it can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible, and that their colleagues are respectful of their efforts to balance work and home responsibilities—and significantly less satisfaction with the balance between home and work.

Compensation

- There was no statistically significant difference in satisfaction between males and females on compensation.

CLIMATE, CULTURE, COLLEGIALITY

- At universities, males reported significantly less satisfaction than did females with the amount of personal interaction with other pre-tenure faculty.

- Females generally, and at universities, reported significantly less satisfaction than did males with regard to five climate, culture, and collegiality dimensions:
 - » The fairness with which their immediate supervisors evaluate their work
 - » The interest tenured faculty take in their professional development
 - » Their opportunities to collaborate with tenured faculty
 - » Their professional interactions with tenured faculty
 - » Their sense of ‘fit’ in their departments
- Females generally, at universities, and at colleges reported significantly less agreement than their male counterparts with the statement, “On the whole, my department treats pre-tenure faculty fairly compared to one another.” This was the only statistically significant difference between male and female faculty at colleges on these climate, culture, and collegiality items.

GLOBAL SATISFACTION

- Female faculty generally, and at universities, rated their institutions as places for pre-tenure faculty to work significantly lower than did males.
- Female faculty at universities reported significantly less satisfaction than their male counterparts with their departments as places to work.

By Race/Ethnicity

In the demographic portion of the survey, COACHE asked respondents to self-identify into one or more of the following racial/ethnic categories:

- **White, non-Hispanic:** A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.
- **American Indian or Native Alaskan:** A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America).
- **Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander:** A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Pacific Islands, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, Guam, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa.
- **Black or African American:** A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.
- **Hispanic or Latino/a:** A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin.
- **Other:** Respondents were required to type in their “other” description.
- **Multiracial**

The following highlights describe COACHE’s comparisons of survey results between white faculty and faculty of color. For the purposes of this analysis, “American Indian” refers to American Indian or Native Alaskan; “Asian” refers to Asian, Asian-American, and Pacific Islander; “African American” refers to Black or African-American; “Hispanic” refers to Hispanic or Latino/a; and “White” refers to White, non-Hispanic. This report does not include the results of any statistical tests between white faculty and those self-identifying as “Other” or “Multiracial.”

TENURE

Clarity

- White faculty and all faculty of color reported similar clarity about their own sense of whether or not they will achieve tenure. Asian, African American, Hispanic and white faculty also reported similar levels of clarity about process, criteria, standards, and the body of evidence.
- American Indian faculty reported significantly less clarity than white faculty about the tenure process, criteria, and body of evidence, and significantly less agreement that they have received consistent messages from tenured colleagues about the requirements for tenure.
- American Indian faculty reported similar levels of clarity as white faculty about the expectations for their performance in all categories – as scholars, teachers, advisors, colleagues, campus citizens, and members of the broader community.
- Asian faculty reported significantly more clarity than white faculty about the tenure standards (the performance threshold), and significantly more agreement that they have received consistent messages from tenured colleagues about the requirements for tenure.

- Asian faculty reported significantly more clarity than white faculty about the expectations for their performance in all categories – as scholars, teachers, advisors, colleagues, campus citizens, and members of the broader community.
- African American faculty reported significantly less agreement than white faculty that tenure decisions are made primarily on performance-based criteria, but significantly more clarity about the expectations for their performance in three categories: as teachers, campus citizens, and members of the broader community.
- Hispanic faculty reported significantly less agreement than white faculty that tenure decisions are made primarily on performance-based criteria, but significantly more clarity about the expectations for their performance in two categories: as teachers and as members of the broader community.

Reasonableness

- American Indian faculty felt that expectations for performance as colleagues and as campus citizens were significantly less reasonable than white faculty.
- Asian faculty responded that expectations for performance as scholars were significantly more reasonable than did white faculty; however, they felt that expectations for performance as campus citizens were significantly less reasonable than did white faculty.
- African American faculty reported that expectations for performance as colleagues were significantly less reasonable than white faculty.
- Hispanic faculty reported that expectations for performance as campus citizens were significantly less reasonable than white faculty.

NATURE OF THE WORK

- American Indian faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than white faculty with the degree of influence they have over which courses they teach.
- Asian faculty reported significantly more satisfaction than did white faculty with how they spend their time, the number of hours they work as a faculty member in an average week, the amount of time they have to conduct research, the quality of the facilities, the amount of access they have to Teaching Fellows and Graduate Assistants, and the COACHE support services composite. However, they reported significantly less satisfaction than did white faculty with all but one item in the teaching composite (number of students they teach).
- African American faculty reported significantly more satisfaction than did white faculty with the number of courses they teach, the number of students they teach, and the COACHE support service composite, but significantly less satisfaction with the COACHE research composite.
- Hispanic faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than did white faculty with the COACHE research composite.

POLICIES & PRACTICES

Importance

- There were no significant differences between American Indian faculty and white faculty in their ratings of the importance to their success of 16 common policies and practices.
- Asian faculty rated the following policies as significantly more important for their success than did white faculty: professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants, professional assistance for improving teaching, peer reviews of teaching or research, formal mentoring, paid or unpaid personal leave, childcare, spousal/partner hiring programs, and financial assistance with housing.
- Asian faculty rated informal mentoring and upper limits on committee assignments as significantly less important for their success than did white faculty.
- African American rated every policy as significantly more important for their success than did white faculty.
- Hispanic faculty rated the following policies as significantly more important for their success than did white faculty: upper limits on committee assignments, paid or unpaid research leave, paid or unpaid personal leave, professional assistance for improving teaching, peer reviews of teaching or research, stop-the-clock provisions, formal mentoring, childcare, spousal/partner hiring programs, and financial assistance with housing.

Effectiveness

- American Indian faculty rated stop-the-clock provisions and informal mentoring as significantly less effective at their institutions than did white faculty.
- Asian faculty rated five policies significantly more effective than white faculty: childcare, professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants, formal mentoring, upper limits on committee assignments, and peer reviews of teaching or research.
- African American faculty rated seven policies significantly more effective than did white faculty: spousal/partner hiring programs, professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants, formal mentoring, peer reviews of teaching or research, periodic performance reviews, written summaries of reviews, and travel funds.
- Hispanic faculty rated formal mentoring significantly more effective than did white faculty, but rated stop-the-clock provisions to be significantly less effective.

Work/Home

- American Indian faculty reported significantly less agreement than white faculty that their institutions do what they can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible.
- Asian faculty reported significantly less agreement than white faculty that their institutions do what they can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible and significantly more agreement than white faculty that their departmental colleagues do what they can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible.

- African American and Hispanic faculty reported similar levels of agreement as white faculty with all five statements related to professional and personal/family life.

Compensation

- American Indian, Hispanic, and white faculty reported similar levels of satisfaction with their compensation.
- Asian and African American faculty reported significantly less satisfaction with their compensation than did white faculty.

CLIMATE, CULTURE, COLLEGIALITY

- American Indian faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than their white colleagues with regard to: the interest tenured faculty take in their professional development, their opportunities to collaborate with tenured faculty, the amount of personal interaction with tenured colleagues, their sense of 'fit' in their departments, and the intellectual vitality of tenured faculty. They also reported significantly less agreement than their white colleagues did with the statement, "My department treats pre-tenure faculty fairly compared to one another."
- Asian faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than their white colleagues with regard to: the fairness with which their immediate supervisors evaluate their work, the amount of both personal and professional interaction with tenured colleagues, the amount of both personal and professional interaction with other pre-tenure colleagues, and their sense of 'fit' in their departments.
- African American faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than their white colleagues with regard to: their opportunities to collaborate with tenured faculty, the amount of personal interaction with both tenured and with other pre-tenure colleagues, and their sense of 'fit' in their departments. They also reported significantly less agreement than their white colleagues did with the statement, "My department treats pre-tenure faculty fairly compared to one another."

GLOBAL SATISFACTION

- American Indian faculty rated lower than did white faculty their institutions as places for pre-tenure faculty to work.
- White faculty agreed with the statement, "If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position," to a greater extent than did Asian and African American faculty.
- Hispanic faculty reported no significant differences with white colleagues on the global satisfaction dimensions.

By Institutional Type and Control

These highlights describe COACHE's comparisons of survey results between participating "colleges" (baccalaureate and some small Master's institutions) and "universities" (research and all other Master's institutions). Within the larger university population, COACHE has disaggregated results by institutional control, that is, faculty at public universities have been compared to faculty at private universities.

TENURE

Clarity

- College faculty reported significantly less clarity than university faculty on tenure standards and on expectations for their performance as scholars and members of the broader community.
- University faculty reported significantly less clarity than college faculty about the tenure process and the body of evidence required for tenure, and about expectations for their performance as teachers, colleagues, and campus citizens.
- Faculty at private universities reported significantly less clarity than faculty at public universities about tenure process, criteria, standards, and body of evidence. They also reported significantly less clarity about their own sense of whether or not they will achieve tenure and about expectations for their performance as teachers, campus citizens, and members of the broader community.
- Faculty at private universities agreed to a significantly lesser extent than faculty at public universities that tenure decisions are made primarily on performance-based criteria.

Reasonableness

- College faculty reported that the expectations for performance as teachers, student advisors, and members of the broader community were significantly less reasonable than their university peers.
- Private university faculty regarded expectations for their performance as scholars, teachers, and colleagues as significantly less reasonable than did their peers at public universities.

NATURE OF THE WORK

- College faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than did university faculty with the number of hours they work as faculty members in an average week and the amount of access they have to Teaching Fellows and Graduate Assistants.
- University faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than did college faculty with the quality of facilities, the COACHE teaching composite and the COACHE support services composite.
- Faculty at public universities reported significantly less satisfaction than did faculty at private universities with the quality of facilities, the amount of access they have to Teaching Fellows and Graduate Assistants, and all three COACHE composites for teaching, research, and support services.

POLICIES & PRACTICES

Importance

- Travel funds, paid or unpaid research leave, paid or unpaid personal leave, professional assistance for improving teaching, childcare, and financial assistance with housing were rated as significantly more important by college faculty than by university faculty.
- Faculty at universities attributed significantly greater importance to professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants and formal mentoring than did college faculty.
- Faculty at private universities reported the following policies and practices as significantly more important to their success than did public university faculty: upper limits on teaching assignments, informal mentoring, paid or unpaid research leave, paid or unpaid personal leave, stop-the-clock policies, childcare, and financial assistance with housing.
- Faculty at public universities reported that travel funds, periodic performance reviews, written summaries of reviews, professional assistance with grants, professional assistance for improving teaching, peer reviews of teaching and research, and formal mentoring were more important for their success than did faculty at private universities.

Effectiveness

- College faculty rated upper limits on teaching assignments and spousal/partner hiring programs as significantly less effective than did university faculty.
- University faculty rated seven policies significantly less effective than did college faculty: informal mentoring, professional assistance in obtaining grants, travel funds, paid or unpaid research leave, paid or unpaid personal leave, financial assistance with housing, and stop-the-clock provisions.
- Faculty at public universities rated eight policies as significantly less effective than did faculty at private universities: travel funds, paid or unpaid research leave, paid or unpaid personal leave, upper limits on committee assignments, upper limits on teaching assignments, professional assistance for improving teaching, financial assistance with housing, and stop-the-clock provisions.
- Faculty at private universities rated five policies as significantly less effective than did faculty at public universities: formal mentoring, periodic performance reviews, written summaries of periodic performance reviews, peer reviews of teaching or research, and spousal/partner hiring programs.

Work/Home

- University faculty reported significantly less agreement than did college faculty with all four statements regarding their institutions' and their departmental colleagues' support for having and raising children.
- Faculty at private universities reported significantly less agreement with three statements: their institutions' support for raising children and their departmental colleagues' support for having and raising children. They also reported significantly lower satisfaction with the balance between home and work.

Compensation

- University faculty reported significantly less satisfaction with their compensation than did faculty at colleges.
- Among university faculty, those at public institutions reported significantly less satisfaction with their compensation than did faculty at private institutions.

CLIMATE, CULTURE, COLLEGIALITY

- University faculty members were generally less satisfied than were their counterparts at colleges with various aspects of culture, climate and collegiality. Notably, they reported significantly less satisfaction with the fairness with which their immediate supervisors evaluate their work, the interest tenured faculty take in their professional development, the amount of professional and personal interaction with tenured colleagues, and their sense of ‘fit’ in their departments.
- Faculty at universities also expressed significantly less agreement than their counterparts at colleges with the statement, “On the whole, my department treats pre-tenure faculty fairly compared with one another”.
- Faculty at public universities reported significantly less satisfaction than did their peers at private universities with the intellectual vitality of tenured faculty.
- Faculty at private universities reported significantly less satisfaction than their counterparts at public universities with four factors: the fairness with which their immediate supervisors evaluate their work, their opportunities to collaborate with tenured colleagues, the interest tenured faculty take in their professional development, and their sense of fit.

GLOBAL SATISFACTION

- Faculty at colleges agreed with the statement, “If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position,” to a greater extent than did faculty at universities.
- University faculty reported significantly less satisfaction than college faculty with their institutions.
- University faculty rated their institutions as places for pre-tenure faculty to work significantly lower than did college faculty.
- Faculty at public universities reported significantly less satisfaction than faculty at private universities with their institutions.
- Faculty at private universities agreed with the statement, “If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position,” to a greater extent than did faculty at public universities .
- Faculty at public universities rated their institutions as places for pre-tenure faculty to work significantly lower than did faculty at private universities .

Definitions and Tables

A total of 12,807 full-time, pre-tenure faculty at 80 colleges and universities have received the COACHE Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey and 8,513 responded, for an overall response rate of 61 percent.

Unless further described (e.g., “tenured”), “faculty” in this report are defined as respondents to the COACHE Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey: full-time, pre-tenure (tenure-track), non-clinical professors at four-year, postsecondary institutions.

Every use of the word “significant” and its variants (e.g., “significantly lower”) refers to the results of t-tests, which are based on two-sided tests assuming equal variances with significance level of $p < 0.05$. Tests have been adjusted for all pairwise comparisons using the Bonferroni correction.

In the tables that follow, for each significant pair, the mean of the larger category is identified with a single asterisk (“*”). In tables of results by race/ethnicity, t-tests pair American Indian, Asian, African American, and Hispanic categories with the “White, non-Hispanic” category of respondents. Here, an asterisk still identifies the mean that is larger by a statistically significant margin, but a dagger (“†”) appears when the mean is significantly smaller.

For a list of participating institutions, their types (i.e., “university” or “college”) and control as defined in this report, see Table 20.

Table 1. Population and Respondent Characteristics

	Total Faculty N	Male Faculty N	Male %	Female Faculty N	Female %	White Faculty N	White %	Faculty of Color N	Faculty of Color %	Missing Race N
University Population	12807	7552	59%	5240	41%	9287	73%	3399	27%	121
University Respondents	7582	4226	56%	3356	44%	5656	75%	1917	25%	9
University Response Rate	59%	56%		64%		61%		56%		
College Population	1226	615	50%	611	50%	906	74%	319	26%	1
College Respondents	931	471	51%	460	49%	719	77%	211	23%	1
College Response Rate	76%	77%		75%		79%		66%		
Total Population	14033	8167	58%	5851	42%	10193	73%	3718	26%	122
Total Respondents	8513	4697	55%	3816	45%	6375	75%	2128	25%	10
Total Response Rate	61%	58%		65%		63%		57%		

NOTE

Our database is missing gender data for 15 faculty members included in the university population file; thus, the total number of males (7,552) and females (5,240) at universities does not equal the total faculty university population (12,807) in the above table.

Table 2. Mean ratings of tenure dimensions, overall, by gender, and by race/ethnicity

	All faculty	Male	Female	White, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Native Alaskan	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Other or multi-racial
clarity > process	3.71	3.75*	3.67	3.71	3.42†	3.76	3.64	3.69	3.49
clarity > criteria	3.61	3.63	3.59	3.61	3.32†	3.64	3.59	3.58	3.51
clarity > standards	3.26	3.29*	3.23	3.24	3.08	3.41*	3.29	3.33	3.25
clarity > body of evidence	3.52	3.56*	3.48	3.52	3.15†	3.56	3.49	3.49	3.55
clarity > sense of whether or not I will achieve tenure	3.65	3.74*	3.54	3.65	3.45	3.68	3.58	3.66	3.81
clarity > expectations as a scholar	3.73	3.79*	3.66	3.69	3.61	3.95*	3.78	3.72	3.79
clarity > expectations as a teacher	3.73	3.71	3.75	3.70	3.60	3.80*	3.80	3.81*	3.85
clarity > expectations as an advisor to students	3.21	3.21	3.21	3.17	3.15	3.41*	3.30*	3.23	3.33
clarity > expectations as a department colleague	3.24	3.25	3.23	3.22	3.00	3.35*	3.33	3.25	3.31
clarity > expectations as a campus citizen	3.11	3.10	3.13	3.09	2.95	3.21*	3.24*	3.13	3.24
clarity > expectations as a member of broader community	2.89	2.89	2.89	2.84	2.76	3.06*	3.09*	2.96*	3.00
reasonableness > expectations as a scholar	4.14	4.24*	4.00	4.13	4.03	4.25*	3.99†	4.09	4.25
reasonableness > expectations as a teacher	4.28	4.31*	4.23	4.30	4.10	4.22†	4.24	4.21	4.40
reasonableness > expectations as an advisor to students	4.26	4.33*	4.18	4.26	4.19	4.30	4.16	4.20	4.50
reasonableness > expectations as a department colleague	4.31	4.34*	4.28	4.33	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.22†	4.45
reasonableness > expectations as a campus citizen	4.23	4.26*	4.20	4.24	4.18	4.20	4.19	4.13	4.63
reasonableness > expectations as a member of broader community	4.27	4.32*	4.22	4.29	4.24	4.28	4.06†	4.17	4.58
agreement > I have received consistent messages from tenured colleagues about tenure requirements	2.96	3.05*	2.85	2.94	2.30†	3.19*	2.87	2.92	2.69
agreement > tenure decisions here are made primarily on performance-based criteria rather than on non-performance-based criteria	3.59	3.67*	3.50	3.62	3.33	3.68	3.23†	3.47†	3.33

Table 3. Mean ratings of tenure dimensions, overall, by institutional type and gender, and by control

	All faculty	University	College	Public University	Private University	University Male	University Female	College Male	College Female
clarity > process	3.71	3.70	3.84*	3.72*	3.55	3.73*	3.66	3.94*	3.75
clarity > criteria	3.61	3.60	3.67	3.63*	3.47	3.61	3.59	3.74	3.61
clarity > standards	3.26	3.28*	3.18	3.31*	3.10	3.30	3.25	3.27*	3.09
clarity > body of evidence	3.52	3.51	3.62*	3.53*	3.42	3.54*	3.47	3.74*	3.50
clarity > sense of whether or not I will achieve tenure	3.65	3.66	3.61	3.72*	3.33	3.73*	3.56	3.80*	3.42
clarity > expectations as a scholar	3.73	3.77*	3.40	3.78	3.73	3.82*	3.71	3.50*	3.30
clarity > expectations as a teacher	3.73	3.71	3.87*	3.73*	3.59	3.69	3.74	3.90	3.84
clarity > expectations as an advisor to students	3.21	3.22	3.15	3.22	3.18	3.22	3.21	3.10	3.20
clarity > expectations as a department colleague	3.24	3.23	3.35*	3.24	3.18	3.24	3.21	3.33	3.38
clarity > expectations as a campus citizen	3.11	3.09	3.28*	3.12*	2.94	3.08	3.11	3.31	3.25
clarity > expectations as a member of broader community	2.89	2.91*	2.73	2.93*	2.80	2.91	2.91	2.78	2.69
reasonableness > expectations as a scholar	4.14	4.13	4.15	4.16*	3.99	4.24*	4.00	4.24*	4.06
reasonableness > expectations as a teacher	4.28	4.29*	4.16	4.31*	4.19	4.33*	4.25	4.20	4.13
reasonableness > expectations as an advisor to students	4.26	4.27*	4.17	4.28	4.24	4.34*	4.19	4.22	4.13
reasonableness > expectations as a department colleague	4.31	4.32	4.27	4.33*	4.24	4.34	4.29	4.32	4.22
reasonableness > expectations as a campus citizen	4.23	4.26*	4.04	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.23	4.12*	3.96
reasonableness > expectations as a member of broader community	4.27	4.28	4.20	4.29	4.22	4.31*	4.23	4.32*	4.07
agreement > I have received consistent messages from tenured colleagues about tenure requirements	2.96	2.95	3.02	2.96	2.90	3.04*	2.84	3.13*	2.92
agreement > tenure decisions here are made primarily on performance-based criteria rather than on non-performance-based criteria	3.59	3.60	3.58	3.61*	3.51	3.67*	3.50	3.65	3.52

Table 4. Mean ratings of satisfaction with “nature of the work” dimensions, overall, by gender, and by race/ethnicity

satisfaction with...	All faculty	Male	Female	White, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Native Alaskan	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Other or multi-racial
way you spend your time as a faculty member	3.75	3.83*	3.66	3.74	3.71	3.82*	3.79	3.77	3.79
number of hours you work as a faculty member in an average week	3.38	3.54*	3.20	3.34	3.50	3.56*	3.59	3.45	3.33
quality of facilities (i.e., office, labs, classrooms)	3.37	3.44*	3.29	3.36	3.28	3.49*	3.39	3.38	3.19
amount of access to Teaching Fellows, Graduate Assts., et al.	2.96	3.05*	2.84	2.95	2.63	3.08*	2.83	2.92	2.64
Nature of Work: Teaching Composite	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.02	3.94	3.87†	4.06	4.01	3.97
level of the courses you teach	4.16	4.16	4.18	4.19	4.00	4.02†	4.17	4.17	4.12
number of courses you teach	3.84	3.88*	3.80	3.86	3.88	3.73†	3.99*	3.79	3.85
degree of influence you have over which courses you teach	4.21	4.24*	4.17	4.23	3.93†	4.08†	4.20	4.21	4.33
discretion you have over the content of courses you teach	4.62	4.63	4.61	4.65	4.49	4.41†	4.67	4.64	4.58
number of students you teach	3.90	3.93*	3.86	3.90	3.93	3.85	4.02*	3.91	4.06
quality of undergraduate students	3.51	3.45	3.58*	3.53	3.49	3.35†	3.50	3.54	3.32
quality of graduate students	3.63	3.59	3.68*	3.65	3.79	3.51†	3.66	3.67	3.27
Nature of Work: Research Composite	3.42	3.53*	3.28	3.43	3.21	3.46	3.31†	3.34†	3.28
amount of time to conduct research/produce creative work	2.78	2.98*	2.53	2.73	2.48	3.14*	2.72	2.72	2.61
amount of external funding you are expected to find	3.00	3.11*	2.85	3.01	2.78	3.05	2.79†	2.86†	2.67
influence over the focus of your research/creative work	4.43	4.46*	4.40	4.49	4.33	4.14†	4.33†	4.42	4.43
Nature of Work: Support Services Composite	3.50	3.54*	3.45	3.48	3.42	3.56*	3.61*	3.54	3.41
clerical/administrative services	3.58	3.64*	3.50	3.57	3.23	3.66*	3.64	3.62	3.32
research services	3.20	3.28*	3.10	3.17	3.04	3.34*	3.24	3.21	3.18
teaching services	3.61	3.62	3.61	3.61	3.49	3.62	3.70	3.65	3.58
computing services	3.57	3.60*	3.54	3.55	3.81	3.59	3.82*	3.63	3.54

Table 5. Mean ratings of satisfaction with “nature of the work” dimensions, overall, by institutional type and gender, and by control

satisfaction with...	All faculty	University	College	Public University	Private University	University Male	University Female	College Male	College Female
way you spend your time as a faculty member	3.75	3.76	3.73	3.76	3.77	3.83*	3.66	3.83*	3.63
number of hours you work as a faculty member in an average week	3.38	3.45*	3.06	3.46	3.24	3.59*	3.27	3.25*	2.89
quality of facilities (i.e., office, labs, classrooms)	3.37	3.34	3.62*	3.27	3.72*	3.42*	3.24	3.64	3.60
amount of access to Teaching Fellows, Graduate Assts., et al.	2.96	2.97*	2.78	2.90	3.32*	3.06*	2.85	2.84	2.72
Nature of Work: Teaching Composite	4.00	3.98	4.16*	3.94	4.20*	3.99	3.98	4.13	4.19
level of the courses you teach	4.16	4.16	4.23*	4.14	4.24*	4.15	4.16	4.18	4.29
number of courses you teach	3.84	3.88*	3.58	3.84	4.09*	3.91*	3.84	3.62	3.53
degree of influence you have over which courses you teach	4.21	4.18	4.38*	4.17	4.26*	4.22*	4.14	4.36	4.41
discretion you have over the content of courses you teach	4.62	4.61	4.71*	4.60	4.66*	4.62	4.59	4.71	4.71
number of students you teach	3.90	3.89	4.00*	3.85	4.11*	3.93*	3.84	3.98	4.03
quality of undergraduate students	3.51	3.43	4.06*	3.31	4.12*	3.39	3.48*	3.94	4.19*
quality of graduate students	3.63	3.63	3.75	3.59	3.84*	3.59	3.68*	3.67	3.81
Nature of Work: Research Composite	3.42	3.42	3.38	3.39	3.59*	3.54*	3.28	3.48*	3.28
amount of time to conduct research/produce creative work	2.78	2.83*	2.33	2.80	3.03*	3.03*	2.58	2.48*	2.17
amount of external funding you are expected to find	3.00	2.97	3.27*	2.94	3.10*	3.09*	2.81	3.37*	3.16
influence over the focus of your research/creative work	4.43	4.41	4.56*	4.39	4.55*	4.44*	4.38	4.61*	4.51
Nature of Work: Support Services Composite	3.50	3.49	3.60*	3.47	3.57*	3.53*	3.43	3.63	3.58
clerical/administrative services	3.58	3.54	3.90*	3.53	3.60	3.61*	3.45	3.94	3.85
research services	3.20	3.20	3.14	3.17	3.37*	3.29*	3.10	3.21	3.07
teaching services	3.61	3.60	3.69*	3.58	3.75*	3.62	3.59	3.65	3.74
computing services	3.57	3.57	3.55	3.58	3.55	3.60	3.54	3.59	3.52

Table 6. Mean ratings of importance (“to your success”) of policies and practices, overall, by gender, and by race/ethnicity

importance of...	All faculty	Male	Female	White, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Native Alaskan	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Other or multi-racial
formal mentoring program	3.97	3.82	4.16*	3.91	4.12	4.13*	4.31*	4.12*	3.99
informal mentoring	4.44	4.33	4.57*	4.44	4.28	4.36†	4.60*	4.42	4.42
periodic, formal performance reviews	4.30	4.21	4.41*	4.29	4.31	4.26	4.52*	4.33	4.17
written summary of performance reviews	4.23	4.13	4.35*	4.22	4.26	4.18	4.47*	4.27	4.08
professional assistance in obtaining external grants	4.19	4.10	4.29*	4.14	4.22	4.29*	4.47*	4.24	4.17
professional assistance for improving teaching	3.73	3.63	3.87*	3.66	3.78	3.93*	4.18*	3.94*	3.78
travel funds to present papers or conduct research	4.59	4.49	4.71*	4.58	4.62	4.56	4.75*	4.65*	4.64
paid or unpaid research leave	4.33	4.16	4.54*	4.30	4.53	4.30	4.58*	4.47*	4.45
paid or unpaid personal leave during the pre-tenure period	3.72	3.48	4.01*	3.65	3.83	3.84*	4.18*	3.99*	3.93
upper limits on committee assignments	4.36	4.24	4.51*	4.35	4.43	4.28†	4.56*	4.48*	4.40
upper limits on teaching obligations	4.61	4.54	4.69*	4.61	4.57	4.58	4.68*	4.66	4.70
peer reviews of teaching or research/creative work	4.10	4.02	4.20*	4.07	4.14	4.14*	4.31*	4.25*	4.08
childcare	3.59	3.45	3.76*	3.52	3.29	3.80*	3.73*	3.95*	3.78
financial assistance with housing	3.22	3.20	3.24	3.09	3.41	3.60*	3.73*	3.66*	3.45
stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons	3.98	3.75	4.26*	3.94	3.91	3.99	4.19*	4.24*	4.21
spousal/partner hiring program	3.60	3.55	3.66*	3.49	3.36	3.95*	3.86*	3.96*	4.18

Table 7. Mean ratings of importance (“to your success”) of policies and practices, overall, by institutional type and gender, and by control

importance of...	All faculty	University	College	Public University	Private University	University Male	University Female	College Male	College Female
formal mentoring program	3.97	4.00*	3.78	4.01*	3.91	3.85	4.19*	3.59	3.97*
informal mentoring	4.44	4.44	4.43	4.43	4.50*	4.33	4.58*	4.29	4.56*
periodic, formal performance reviews	4.30	4.30	4.27	4.31*	4.24	4.21	4.42*	4.18	4.36*
written summary of performance reviews	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.26*	4.10	4.13	4.36*	4.08	4.34*
professional assistance in obtaining external grants	4.19	4.22*	3.93	4.24*	4.08	4.12	4.33*	3.87	4.00*
professional assistance for improving teaching	3.73	3.72	3.81*	3.75*	3.56	3.62	3.86*	3.71	3.91*
travel funds to present papers or conduct research	4.59	4.57	4.70*	4.59*	4.49	4.47	4.70*	4.66	4.75*
paid or unpaid research leave	4.33	4.29	4.62*	4.26	4.46*	4.12	4.51*	4.54	4.71*
paid or unpaid personal leave during the pre-tenure period	3.72	3.71	3.83*	3.69	3.82*	3.48	3.99*	3.55	4.13*
upper limits on committee assignments	4.36	4.37*	4.25	4.37	4.41	4.25	4.53*	4.14	4.36*
upper limits on teaching obligations	4.61	4.61	4.59	4.60	4.66*	4.55	4.70*	4.50	4.68*
peer reviews of teaching or research/creative work	4.10	4.10	4.12	4.11*	4.05	4.02	4.19*	4.02	4.22*
childcare	3.59	3.57	3.71*	3.52	3.89*	3.43	3.75*	3.60	3.81*
financial assistance with housing	3.22	3.19	3.45*	3.11	3.63*	3.18	3.22	3.44	3.46
stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons	3.98	3.98	3.96	3.95	4.15*	3.75	4.26*	3.70	4.22*
spousal/partner hiring program	3.60	3.62*	3.46	3.61	3.65	3.56	3.69*	3.46	3.46

Table 8. Mean ratings of effectiveness (“at your institution”) of policies and practices, overall, by gender, and by race/ethnicity

effectiveness of...	All faculty	Male	Female	White, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Native Alaskan	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Other or multi-racial
formal mentoring program	2.90	2.88	2.91	2.82	2.57	3.23*	2.98*	3.04*	2.90
informal mentoring	3.56	3.54	3.59	3.56	3.23†	3.56	3.57	3.59	3.44
periodic, formal performance reviews	3.50	3.47	3.55*	3.47	3.40	3.59*	3.69*	3.54	3.45
written summary of performance reviews	3.41	3.37	3.46*	3.38	3.35	3.50*	3.65*	3.43	3.47
professional assistance in obtaining external grants	2.71	2.73	2.68	2.66	2.34	2.90*	2.83*	2.74	2.79
professional assistance for improving teaching	3.32	3.28	3.38*	3.31	3.19	3.36	3.42	3.38	3.18
travel funds to present papers or conduct research	3.50	3.47	3.54*	3.50	3.40	3.42	3.71*	3.54	3.51
paid or unpaid research leave	3.23	3.17	3.31*	3.22	3.37	3.22	3.32	3.22	3.13
paid or unpaid personal leave during the pre-tenure period	3.07	3.01	3.16*	3.07	2.66	3.09	3.01	3.12	3.12
upper limits on committee assignments	3.11	3.18*	3.02	3.07	3.00	3.38*	3.07	3.06	2.92
upper limits on teaching obligations	3.49	3.54*	3.42	3.48	3.25	3.55	3.53	3.56	3.45
peer reviews of teaching or research/creative work	3.17	3.17	3.17	3.13	3.28	3.33*	3.36*	3.22	3.10
childcare	2.49	2.54*	2.43	2.45	2.26	2.64*	2.61	2.58	2.49
financial assistance with housing	2.38	2.41	2.35	2.39	2.39	2.46	2.29	2.20	2.32
stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons	3.31	3.16	3.47*	3.34	2.72†	3.23	3.33	3.13	3.39
spousal/partner hiring program	2.67	2.67	2.65	2.66	2.96	2.61	2.87*	2.72†	2.44

Table 9. Mean ratings of effectiveness (“at your institution”) of policies and practices, overall, by institutional type and gender, and by control

effectiveness of...	All faculty	University	College	Public University	Private University	University Male	University Female	College Male	College Female
formal mentoring program	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.92*	2.74	2.88	2.92	2.91	2.89
informal mentoring	3.56	3.55	3.67*	3.55	3.50	3.52	3.58	3.68	3.67
periodic, formal performance reviews	3.50	3.50	3.53	3.54*	3.27	3.46	3.55*	3.54	3.51
written summary of performance reviews	3.41	3.41	3.40	3.45*	3.16	3.37	3.47*	3.36	3.44
professional assistance in obtaining external grants	2.71	2.69	2.89*	2.70	2.62	2.72*	2.65	2.81	2.98
professional assistance for improving teaching	3.32	3.33	3.26	3.32	3.40*	3.28	3.39*	3.22	3.30
travel funds to present papers or conduct research	3.50	3.45	3.91*	3.41	3.66*	3.42	3.48*	3.88	3.94
paid or unpaid research leave	3.23	3.11	3.97*	3.00	3.66*	3.05	3.17*	3.91	4.03
paid or unpaid personal leave during the pre-tenure period	3.07	3.02	3.49*	2.99	3.23*	2.97	3.09*	3.38	3.60
upper limits on committee assignments	3.11	3.12	3.03	3.09	3.29*	3.19*	3.02	3.08	2.99
upper limits on teaching obligations	3.49	3.50*	3.37	3.46	3.77*	3.55*	3.44	3.44	3.30
peer reviews of teaching or research/creative work	3.17	3.17	3.21	3.19*	3.00	3.16	3.17	3.21	3.20
childcare	2.49	2.49	2.55	2.48	2.49	2.54*	2.41	2.46	2.65
financial assistance with housing	2.38	2.30	3.02*	2.19	2.73*	2.34	2.25	3.03	3.01
stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons	3.31	3.28	3.64*	3.24	3.47*	3.14	3.43*	3.41	3.81*
spousal/partner hiring program	2.67	2.70*	2.36	2.72*	2.54	2.70	2.70	2.43	2.28

Table 10. Mean ratings of agreement with statements relating to work-home balance, overall, by gender, and by race/ethnicity

agreement that...	All faculty	Male	Female	White, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Native Alaskan	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Other or multi-racial
institution does what it can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible	2.93	3.03*	2.81	2.92	2.30†	3.03	2.97	2.87	2.72
institution does what it can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible	2.76	2.91*	2.57	2.74	2.31	2.90*	2.80	2.71	2.51
departmental colleagues do what they can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible	3.51	3.56*	3.44	3.54	3.40	3.38†	3.39	3.43	3.17
departmental colleagues do what they can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible	3.47	3.54*	3.37	3.50	3.14	3.36†	3.36	3.40	3.03
colleagues are respectful of my efforts to balance work and home responsibilities	3.81	3.96*	3.64	3.83	3.33	3.79	3.93	3.72	3.14

Table 11. Mean ratings of satisfaction with work-home balance and compensation, overall, by gender, and by race/ethnicity

satisfaction with...	All faculty	Male	Female	White, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Native Alaskan	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Other or multi-racial
compensation (i.e., salary and benefits)	3.18	3.19	3.16	3.21	2.93	3.09†	2.99†	3.12	3.01
balance between professional time and personal or family time	2.81	2.97*	2.60	2.80	2.67	2.83	2.83	2.78	2.67

Table 12. Mean ratings of agreement with statements relating to work-home balance, overall, by institutional type and gender, and by control

agreement that...	All faculty	University	College	Public University	Private University	University Male	University Female	College Male	College Female
institution does what it can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible	2.93	2.90	3.16*	2.89	2.91	3.01*	2.76	3.18	3.14
institution does what it can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible	2.76	2.74	2.90*	2.75*	2.66	2.89*	2.54	3.00*	2.80
departmental colleagues do what they can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible	3.51	3.46	3.81*	3.50*	3.28	3.52*	3.39	3.86	3.77
departmental colleagues do what they can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible	3.47	3.42	3.78*	3.46*	3.23	3.50*	3.33	3.85	3.70
colleagues are respectful of my efforts to balance work and home responsibilities	3.81	3.80	3.87	3.81	3.57	3.94*	3.63	4.07*	3.68

Table 13. Mean ratings of satisfaction with work-home balance and compensation, overall, by institutional type and gender, and by control

satisfaction with...	All faculty	University	College	Public University	Private University	University Male	University Female	College Male	College Female
compensation (i.e., salary and benefits)	3.18	3.15	3.41*	3.09	3.46	3.17	3.12	3.34	3.47
balance between professional time and personal or family time	2.81	2.82*	2.68	2.84*	2.74	2.98*	2.62	2.90*	2.46

Table 14. Mean ratings of satisfaction with dimensions related to workplace climate, culture, and collegiality, overall, by gender, and by race/ethnicity

satisfaction with...	All faculty	Male	Female	White, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Native Alaskan	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Other or multi-racial
fairness with which your immediate supervisor evaluates your work	4.02	4.06*	3.97	4.04	3.94	3.92†	3.96	4.05	4.08
interest tenured faculty take in your professional development	3.53	3.56*	3.50	3.54	3.14†	3.56	3.45	3.49	3.33
opportunities to collaborate with tenured faculty	3.35	3.45*	3.22	3.36	2.85†	3.38	3.17†	3.30	3.14
amount of professional interaction with tenured colleagues	3.49	3.54*	3.43	3.51	3.22	3.42†	3.42	3.55	3.33
amount of personal interaction with tenured colleagues	3.70	3.72	3.68	3.74	3.38†	3.61†	3.58†	3.65	3.56
amount of professional interaction with pre-tenure colleagues	3.87	3.87	3.88	3.90	3.87	3.70†	3.83	3.88	3.65
amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure colleagues	4.00	3.97	4.04*	4.04	4.11	3.82†	3.92†	4.00	3.70
how well you fit (e.g., your sense of belonging, your comfort level) in your department	3.81	3.84*	3.76	3.84	3.47†	3.73†	3.55†	3.83	3.72
intellectual vitality of the tenured colleagues in your department	3.43	3.44	3.41	3.45	3.07†	3.39	3.49	3.34	3.07

Table 15. Mean ratings of agreement that pre-tenure faculty are treated fairly, overall, by gender, and by race/ethnicity

agreement that...	All faculty	Male	Female	White, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Native Alaskan	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Other or multi-racial
on the whole, my department treats pre-tenure faculty fairly compared to one another	3.79	3.90*	3.66	3.81	3.33†	3.83	3.60†	3.75	3.65

Table 16. Mean ratings of satisfaction with dimensions related to workplace climate, culture, and collegiality, by institutional type and gender, and by control

satisfaction with...	All faculty	University	College	Public University	Private University	University Male	University Female	College Male	College Female
fairness with which your immediate supervisor evaluates your work	4.02	4.01	4.13*	4.02*	3.90	4.05*	3.95	4.18	4.07
interest tenured faculty take in your professional development	3.53	3.51	3.72*	3.52	3.45	3.54*	3.47	3.75	3.70
opportunities to collaborate with tenured faculty	3.35	3.34	3.44	3.36*	3.25	3.45*	3.20	3.47	3.40
amount of professional interaction with tenured colleagues	3.49	3.48	3.59*	3.50*	3.39	3.54*	3.41	3.58	3.59
amount of personal interaction with tenured colleagues	3.70	3.69	3.84*	3.69	3.66	3.71	3.66	3.85	3.83
amount of professional interaction with pre-tenure colleagues	3.87	3.88*	3.78	3.89	3.83	3.88	3.88	3.73	3.83
amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure colleagues	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.00	3.98	3.97	4.03*	3.96	4.07
how well you fit (e.g., your sense of belonging, your comfort level) in your department	3.81	3.79	3.93*	3.81*	3.70	3.83*	3.74	3.96	3.90
intellectual vitality of the tenured colleagues in your department	3.43	3.42	3.50	3.38	3.62*	3.44	3.40	3.48	3.53

Table 17. Mean ratings of agreement that pre-tenure faculty are treated fairly, by institutional type and gender, and by control

agreement that...	All faculty	University	College	Public University	Private University	University Male	University Female	College Male	College Female
on the whole, my department treats pre-tenure faculty fairly compared to one another	3.79	3.78	3.92*	3.79	3.75	3.89*	3.64	4.02*	3.80

Table 18. Mean ratings of survey dimensions related to global satisfaction, overall, by gender, and by race/ethnicity

	All faculty	Male	Female	White, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Native Alaskan	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Other or multi-racial
satisfaction > department as a place to work	3.89	3.92*	3.84	3.91	3.69	3.85	3.76†	3.89	3.79
satisfaction > institution as a place to work	3.67	3.68	3.65	3.67	3.47	3.65	3.70	3.69	3.41
agreement > "if I could do it over, I would again choose to to work at this institution."	4.06	4.07	4.05	4.10	3.97	3.87†	3.98†	4.05	3.86
rating of institution as a place for pre-tenure faculty to work	3.77	3.81*	3.72	3.78	3.45†	3.78	3.73	3.74	3.66

Table 19. Mean ratings of survey dimensions related to global satisfaction, by institutional type and gender, and by control

	All faculty	University	College	Public University	Private University	University Male	University Female	College Male	College Female
satisfaction > department as a place to work	3.89	3.89	n/a‡	3.89	3.91	3.92*	3.84	n/a‡	n/a‡
satisfaction > institution as a place to work	3.67	3.63	4.00*	3.62	3.68	3.64	3.61	4.05	3.94
agreement > "if I could do it over, I would again choose to to work at this institution."	4.06	4.04	4.24*	4.04	4.06	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20
rating of institution as a place for pre-tenure faculty to work	3.77	3.75	3.90*	3.75	3.76	3.79*	3.70	3.95	3.85

‡ Faculty at colleges were not asked to rate their satisfaction with their departments as places to work.

Table 20. List of participating institutions, their types (college or university), control (public or private), and academic year of COACHE survey administration

INSTITUTION	TYPE	CONTROL	COHORT	INSTITUTION	TYPE	CONTROL	COHORT
Amherst College	C	PR	2006-07	Kenyon College	C	PR	2005-06
Appalachian State University	U	PU	2005-06	Lehigh University	U	PR	2007-08
Arizona State University	U	PU	2005-06	Macalester College	C	PR	2005-06
Auburn University	U	PU	2005-06	Michigan State University	U	PU	2005-06
Ball State University	U	PU	2007-08	Montclair State University	U	PU	2007-08
Barnard College	C	PR	2005-06	NC A & T State University	U	PU	2005-06
Boston University	U	PR	2006-07	North Carolina Central University	U	PU	2005-06
Bowdoin College	C	PR	2006-07	North Carolina State University	U	PU	2005-06
Brown University	U	PR	2005-06	North Dakota State University	U	PU	2006-07
CSU-San Luis Obispo	U	PU	2006-07	Northeastern University	U	PR	2005-06
CSU-Pomona	U	PU	2006-07	Oberlin College	C	PR	2007-08
CSU-Fullerton	U	PU	2006-07	Ohio State University	U	PU	2005-06
CSU-Long Beach	U	PU	2006-07	Ohio University	U	PU	2006-07
CSU-San Bernardino	U	PU	2006-07	Pacific Lutheran University	C	PR	2007-08
CSU-San Marcos	U	PU	2006-07	CUNY Queens College	U	PU	2007-08
CSU-Sonoma State University	U	PU	2006-07	Richard Stockton College of NJ	C	PU	2005-06
Carleton College	C	PR	2006-07	Saint Olaf College	C	PR	2007-08
Case Western Reserve University	U	PR	2005-06	Skidmore College	C	PR	2006-07
Clemson University	U	PU	2007-08	Stanford University	U	PR	2005-06
Colgate University	C	PR	2007-08	Susquehanna University	C	PR	2007-08
College of the Holy Cross	C	PR	2006-07	Syracuse University	U	PR	2005-06
College of Wooster	C	PR	2006-07	Texas Tech University	U	PU	2005-06
Connecticut College	C	PR	2006-07	Trinity College (CT)	C	PR	2006-07
Dartmouth College	U	PR	2005-06	Tufts University	U	PR	2005-06
Davidson College	C	PR	2005-06	University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa	U	PU	2007-08
Denison University	C	PR	2005-06	University at Albany - SUNY	U	PU	2005-06
Drexel University	U	PR	2006-07	University of Arizona	U	PU	2005-06
East Carolina University	U	PU	2005-06	University at Buffalo - SUNY	U	PU	2005-06
Elizabeth City State University	C	PU	2005-06	University of Connecticut	U	PU	2006-07
Fayetteville State University	U	PU	2005-06	University of Il. Urbana-Champaign	U	PU	2005-06
Goucher College	C	PR	2005-06	University of Iowa	U	PU	2007-08
Hamilton College	C	PR	2005-06	University of Kansas	U	PU	2005-06
Hampshire College	C	PR	2005-06	University of Mass. Amherst	U	PU	2007-08
Harvard University	U	PR	2005-06	University of Memphis	U	PU	2005-06
Hendrix College	C	PR	2007-08	University of Minnesota	U	PU	2005-06
Hobart & William Smith Colleges	C	PR	2006-07	UNC at Asheville	C	PU	2005-06
Indiana University, Bloomington	U	PU	2005-06	UNC at Chapel Hill	U	PU	2005-06
Iowa State University	U	PU	2005-06	UNC at Charlotte	U	PU	2005-06
Ithaca College	C	PR	2007-08	UNC at Greensboro	U	PU	2005-06
Kansas State University	U	PU	2005-06	UNC at Pembroke	U	PU	2005-06

Table 19. (continued)

INSTITUTION	TYPE	CONTROL	COHORT
UNC at Wilmington	U	PU	2005-06
University of Notre Dame	U	PR	2006-07
University of South Carolina	U	PU	2007-08
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	U	PU	2006-07
University of Toronto	U	PU	2007-08
University of Virginia	U	PU	2005-06
University of Wyoming	U	PU	2007-08
Virginia Commonwealth University	U	PU	2006-07
Virginia Tech	U	PU	2006-07
Wabash College	C	PR	2005-06
Washington State University	U	PU	2006-07
Wellesley College	C	PR	2007-08
Western Carolina University	U	PU	2005-06
Wheaton College (MA)	C	PR	2005-06
Whitman College	C	PR	2007-08
Winston-Salem State University	C	PU	2005-06

