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I. INTRODUCTION

Vanderbilt University recognizes that the core strength of an institution of higher education is its faculty. To learn more about faculty satisfaction, Vanderbilt partnered with the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) to survey Vanderbilt faculty on their perceptions of the workplace and the support provided by the University. The results will allow the University to evaluate our practices and implement improvements informed by these data.

Vanderbilt’s participation in the COACHE survey has three stages. In year 1 (2016), the survey was designed and administered and COACHE tabulated the results. Year 2 (2017) was devoted to examining, compiling, and disseminating the results in the community. In year 3 (2018), the results can be used to inform goals and plans.

This final report to the Vanderbilt University faculty community begins with an explanation of the COACHE survey including its origin, design, and methodology. It next explains the appointment of the COACHE faculty committee and its work during the 2016-2017 academic year. The report then offers a summary and analysis of important findings for each category of questions. The final section provides more detailed information about the results including frequencies for each questions, relative frequencies based on different categories of respondents, and comparisons across peers.

II. THE COACHE SURVEY

A. Background on COACHE

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, or “COACHE”, was founded in 2002 at Harvard University Graduate School of Education with support from the Ford Foundation and Atlantic Philanthropies. Its original purpose was to develop and implement surveys to learn about the experiences and attitudes of tenure-track faculty to inform workplace improvements for pre-tenure faculty. While still based at Harvard, COACHE has evolved into a membership organization that includes more than 200 institutions and has expanded its surveys to include tenured faculty and full-time non-tenure track faculty.

The COACHE survey is administered annually to a subset of member universities. Most members opt to participate every three years. COACHE designed the survey instrument and implementation plan. COACHE administers the survey and retains the responses, sharing only the results, but not the raw data, with a participating school. By retaining the data, COACHE protects confidentiality. By releasing only results that would not risk revealing a
respondent's identity, COACHE ensures anonymity of respondents.¹ The end result is a reliable and informative survey that is more likely to secure faculty participation and candor and to produce results that are credible and trustworthy.

**B. Vanderbilt Participation in COACHE**

In fall 2015, Vanderbilt partnered with COACHE to identify the drivers of faculty success in order to implement informed changes.² Vanderbilt joined COACHE with the intent of administering the COACHE survey at regular intervals, allowing comparison of faculty satisfaction over time. The Office of the Provost solicited input from all full-time faculty reporting to the Provost in the new university organization. COACHE launched their survey at Vanderbilt in February 2016 and closed the survey in mid-April. (The full survey is available on Vanderbilt’s COACHE Survey website: [http://vanderbilt.edu/faculty-development-diversity/faculty-development/COACHE.php](http://vanderbilt.edu/faculty-development-diversity/faculty-development/COACHE.php).)

Vanderbilt has previously surveyed its faculty. In 2012, the Vanderbilt Institutional Research Group ("VIRG") administered a survey that covered similar issues but was much broader than the COACHE survey. The VIRG Faculty Survey was sent to tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty in university-central. VIRG issued a detailed report.³ The VIRG report is informative, but the underlying survey has shortcomings. Those shortcomings include concerns about the confidentiality and anonymity of responses since the survey was internal to Vanderbilt, the subset of faculty who were included in the survey, and the lack of external benchmarks and validation.

In fall 2016, COACHE provided preliminary results from the COACHE survey to Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Susan R. Wente and Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion George C. Hill.⁴ COACHE provided additional results, including statistics used as the basis for this report, during the 2016-2017 academic year.

---

¹ COACHE will not release results where fewer than five respondents answered a question.

² The Provost Office contracted with COACHE and manages the relationship between Vanderbilt and COACHE.


⁴ Vanderbilt does not have access to the raw survey data. No one at Vanderbilt University has access to the individual responses to the surveys.
Vanderbilt’s current plan is to participate in the COACHE Survey again in 2019. By repeating the survey, the University will be able to measure the effects of initiatives informed by the 2016 results and to continue to gauge the satisfaction of faculty over time.

C. Survey Design

The COACHE survey includes a standard set of questions for all participating institutions. The survey begins with a set of simple biographical questions related to the respondent’s job (including tenure status, rank, scope of work, and length of employment) and demographic characteristics (such as race and/or ethnicity, sex, age, citizenship, LGBT identification, and family circumstances). All results are based on self-reported biographical information. A respondent could decline to answer any question. (Results include only respondents who provided a substantive answer to a question.)

The majority of COACHE questions are substantive, focusing on respondent’s evaluation of specific issues related to work and workplace. The substantive questions are grouped into eight broad subject areas:

1. Nature of Work,
2. Resources and Support,
3. Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, & Mentoring,
4. Tenure & Promotion,\(^6\)
5. Leadership,
6. Governance,
7. Department, and
8. Appreciation.

The COACHE survey is designed to measure faculty satisfaction. Thus, unsurprisingly, many of the questions ask respondent’s level of satisfaction with a specific feature of work (e.g., “Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the portion of your time spent on research”) or the workplace (e.g., “Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with computing and technical support”). The next most common question format asks the level of agreement with a normatively positive statement about the institution (e.g., “My

\(^5\)The exact number of preliminary questions depends on the respondent’s answers to certain questions.

\(^6\)The Tenure and Promotion subject area includes questions related to contract renewal and promotion of non-tenure track faculty. Thus, we refer to this area as “Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal” in our discussion of the Vanderbilt survey results.
department is successful at retaining high-quality faculty members”). Aside from the COACHE biographical questions (and some of the Vanderbilt-specific questions discussed below), COACHE questions offer a Likert scale response format where two responses are normatively positive about the institution, one is neutral, and two are negative. In addition, a respondent could choose not to answer any question.

In addition to the standard COACHE questions, COACHE included a set of Vanderbilt-specific questions in the survey completed by Vanderbilt faculty. The VU-specific questions were created by COACHE in collaboration with the offices of the Provost and Vice Chancellor Hill. The VU-specific questions focus on issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion. The questions included Likert scale questions about levels of satisfaction, similar to those asked in the general COACHE survey, but focused specifically on equity, diversity, and inclusion. The VU-specific questions also asked about the frequency with which a respondent had experienced discriminatory behavior.

While most questions were posed to all respondents, some questions were posed to only a subset of respondents. Such questions focused on issues common to faculty with shared characteristics. Only tenure-track faculty (pre-tenure), for example, were asked questions about the tenure process. Only non-tenured track faculty were asked questions about the length and renewability of their current contracts. Since respondents are not asked all questions, the number of potential respondents is lower for certain questions.

The questions, including both the COACHE questions and the VU-specific equity, diversity, and inclusion questions, is available at the end of this report. The number of respondents choosing each answer is noted for each question. The survey question results indicate if the question was posed to only a subset of faculty.

**D. Vanderbilt Respondents**

The COACHE results are based on responses from fifty-six percent (56%) of faculty who were surveyed. The COACHE survey was distributed to all tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty who report to the Provost with two exceptions: senior administrators with faculty appointments and clinical faculty employed by VUMC. The spring 2016 administration of the COACHE survey excluded VUMC clinical faculty because VUMC had recently requested their participation in a different survey covering some of the same issues. Rather than impose on VUMC clinical faculty again in such a short-time frame, VUMC and the

---

7 The initial survey invitation was sent by email in February 2016 and the survey closed in April 2016.
Provost’s office agreed not to include them in the 2016 administration but to include them in future administrations.

Vanderbilt’s response rate of 56% is markedly higher than other institutions in general and in every category of respondent. The five selected institutions in the 2016 survey cohort had an average response rate of 43%. Vanderbilt’s response rate varies by tenure-status, gender, and race: pre-tenure, women, and white faculty were more likely to respond than the other group(s) in their category. However, with one exception, at least half of those surveyed in each category responded. Non-tenure track faculty had the lowest response rate as a group, but the response rate was still as high or higher than the response rate at peer institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TENURE-STATUS</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>RACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Pre-Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response rate for the COACHE Survey is roughly the same as that for the 2012 Vanderbilt University Faculty Survey that was administered by the Vanderbilt Institutional Research Group. That 2012 Survey was designed, administered, and analyzed inside the University.

The identity of individual respondents remains anonymous. COACHE keeps all individual level data. COACHE releases frequency data to universities. However, it will not include frequencies if the cell value is less than five in order to ensure protection of the identity of respondents.

---

8 Tenure-status, gender, and race are based on self-identification by respondents. White includes any faculty member who chose White (non-Hispanic). Faculty of Color includes any respondent who chose one of the following answers: American Indian or Native Alaskan; Asian, Asian-American, or Pacific Islander; Black or African-American; Hispanic or Latino; Other; or Multiracial. Respondents who declined to answer are excluded from the breakdowns based on race. Elsewhere in the report, we refer to results based on URM faculty. URM – or Under-Represented Minority – is categorized by COACHE to include any Faculty of Color who are not Asian, Asian-American, or Pacific Islander.
E. Benchmark Institutions and Respondents

The COACHE Survey has been administered to faculty at more than 230 universities over the past decade. COACHE provides basic statistics on the responses to survey questions based on all respondents from the same year. In addition, participating universities may request institution-level responses for a group of five “peer” universities, chosen from institutions whose faculty took the survey in the same year.

In 2016, twenty-three institutions in addition to Vanderbilt participated in the COACHE survey. From those, Vanderbilt selected the following five as our comparison institutions:

- Brown University,
- Dartmouth College,
- University of Missouri-Columbia,
- University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and
- University of Virginia.

Vanderbilt chose these five universities based on an assessment of an array of considerations including: AAU and Research 1 status; presence of comparable departments, schools and programs; location; athletic conference; and others. During discussions with faculty about this report, a number of colleagues inquired about the choice of the University of Missouri-Columbia over Georgetown University. The decision appears to be based on, among other things, the conclusion that University of Missouri was a better match to Vanderbilt in terms of its schools and departments and the desire to include an institution from the Southeastern Conference, of which Vanderbilt is a member.

For every substantive question, COACHE provides two ways to compare our survey responses to results at other institutions. First, COACHE provides detailed results for our selected five peer institutions, broken out by peer. Peers are not identified by name. Instead, they are identified by a neutral number (“Peer 1,” “Peer 2,” and so on). Second, COACHE also reports a summary of all faculty respondents from all institutions that participated in the 2016 COACHE Survey (listed in footnote 9). COACHE does not have peer comparison data for the equity, diversity, and inclusion questions created by Vanderbilt for inclusion at the end of the 2016 survey since those questions are unique to Vanderbilt.

---

9 The following institutions participated in the COACHE survey in 2016 and could have been chosen as one of the five: Brown University, Colby College, Dartmouth College, Georgetown University, Indiana University, James Madison University, Merrimack College, Middlebury College, Missouri University of Science & Technology, Oklahoma State University, Old Dominion University, Radford University, Rochester Institute of Technology, Tufts University, University of Baltimore, University of Houston-Clear Lake, University of Missouri-Columbia, University of Missouri-St. Louis, University of Nevada-Las Vegas, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, University of Pittsburgh, University of Richmond, and University of Virginia.
The COACHE Survey also allows us to compare survey responses across demographic groups within Vanderbilt. The results are broken out by the following categories as self-identified by respondents:

- Tenure Status (pre-tenure, tenured, non-tenure track),
- Rank (full professor, associate, assistant),
- Gender (men, women), and
- Race/Ethnicity (white, faculty of color (anyone who responded they are not white), Asian/Asian American, Under-Represented Minorities (anyone who responded they are African-American or Hispanic/Latino).

IV. THE COACHE FACULTY WORKING GROUP

In order to provide context for the analysis that follows, the report reviews the composition and work of the committee that authored it. This section explains the charge and composition of the committee, the timeline of its workflow, the release of the preliminary report, the outreach to the faculty community, and the final work.

A. Charge and Composition

In September 2016, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Susan Wente charged the Faculty Working Group ("FWG") to develop a faculty-driven report to the community. The FWG has a diverse membership. The members come from eight schools, include faculty of different ranks and tenure status, and reflect the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the University faculty. The Provost charged the FWG to guide the overall assessment and dissemination of the results with the key deliverable being this Final Report to the Community. The Faculty Working Group worked to create a culture of transparency and critical discussion throughout the analysis and assessment process.

B. Timeline

From September 2016 through April 2017, the FWG met regularly to fulfill its charge. In October 2016, the FWG received the first release of survey results from COACHE. The group requested supplemental information from COACHE and received additional reports in December 2016 and January 2017. The FWG reviewed and analyzed all of the results. The members decided to release a preliminary report in order to solicit input and guidance from all faculty about the appropriate form of the final report. The committee acted independently of faculty administrators and leaders.
C. Preliminary Report

In February 2017, the FWG released a preliminary report based on results released by COACHE. The FWG simultaneously released charts displaying the frequency distribution of responses to all questions in the COACHE survey. The information in that report is included in the current Final Report. The goal of the report was to engender discussion, reveal any sources of confusion or uncertainty from our compilation of the results, and to engage in dialogue with colleagues.

D. Community Outreach

Having invested significant time and thought to the review of the COACHE data, the FWG was eager to hear from colleagues. During the spring 2017 semester, the FWG actively sought input on findings through multiple avenues:

- The report and concurrent statistical analysis was made available online to all faculty.
- Results were formally presented to campus leaders at a meeting of academic deans and to the COACHE Deans’ Working Group.
- Two town halls were open to all members of the faculty community. The town halls are being held on different parts of campus and different days of the week to maximize opportunities for participation.
- Four roundtables focused on issues of special interest to groups of faculty.
- All FWG members invited faculty to call, email, or visit our offices. As a result, we had numerous one-on-one meetings and other exchanges with colleagues from across campus.
- An anonymous online comment box allowing faculty to submit feedback was created.

E. Final Work

This final report incorporates and responds to the feedback we received. The most common request was to offer greater detail about the responses to each question, which prompted us to create the question by question breakdown that immediately follows this report.
III. The 2016 COACHE Survey Results

The COACHE Survey results offer a great deal of information worthy of consideration. We do not attempt to provide an exhaustive review of those results in this report. Instead, we provide a summary of the results along with an observation about discernable patterns in the results. The goal of this preliminary report is to provide sufficient information to allow productive discussion and feedback as we move to the creation of a final report.

We review the COACHE survey results by offering a small number of high-level findings and then focusing on the subject areas into which COACHE organizes the survey. Each section begins with an explanation of the questions asked in each subject area. We then offer a consideration of the key findings and consider any noteworthy variations. You can find a full review of the answers to each question in the statistical appendix. The appendix includes graphics showing the percentage of respondents selecting each answer option for each question (i.e., the distribution of responses). To allow a comparison of Vanderbilt respondents, we provide a second set of graphics that reports the percentage of faculty subgroups (based on tenure-status, race/ethnicity, and gender) who responded favorably to a question. This set of graphics includes the same figures for five peer institutions.

A. High-Level Findings

The Vanderbilt faculty reports high levels of satisfaction across a wide range of areas, but the faculty also expresses dissatisfaction and even strong dissatisfaction on certain issues. We identified the following areas of strength when our faculty responses are compared to those of five other institutions (“peers”):

- Satisfaction with support for obtaining and maintaining grants,
- Satisfaction with facilities and work resources,
- Satisfaction with opportunities for and support of interdisciplinary work,
- Satisfaction with personal and family policies,
- Satisfaction with the quality of departments and students, and
- Satisfaction with health and retirement benefits.

We also note areas of concern, including:

- Lack of clarity of tenure expectations reported by pre-tenure Vanderbilt faculty as compared to peers’ pre-tenure faculty,
- Lack of clarity of expectations and timeline for promotion to full reported by tenured associate professors as compared to tenured full professors,
- Dissatisfaction with recognition of interdisciplinary work in the tenure process,
- Dissatisfaction with the opportunities to engage undergraduates in research relative to peers’ levels of satisfaction,
• Dissatisfaction with support for and availability of mentoring across respondents,
  and
• Dissatisfaction with the nature of faculty governance (lowest of all survey questions
  and lower than peers).

The survey also reveals that the level of satisfaction varies depending on tenure-status, rank,
gender, and race and ethnicity. Tenured faculty are generally more satisfied than pre-tenure
faculty and non-tenure track faculty, full professors are generally more satisfied than
associate professors, and white (non-Hispanic) faculty are generally more satisfied than
faculty of color. These differences are more pronounced in certain areas than others.

B. Nature of Work: Research, Service and Teaching

The Nature of Work questions explore levels of satisfaction with the central work of a faculty
member: research (11 questions), service (9), and teaching (9). The survey also included
three additional questions regarding time spent on outreach, time spent on administrative
tasks, and ability to balance the areas of teaching, research, and service. For each of the three
main areas, respondents were queried about their satisfaction levels with the amount of time
they spent on that activity, the expectations of their work in the area, and perceived
university support for their efforts. There were also more specific questions pertaining to
each domain. We review the survey questions and responses by area. We then offer our
analysis.

Vanderbilt faculty are generally satisfied with the nature of their work. On a five-point scale
where 5 is the high score and 1 is the low score, the mean response is at or above 3 for all
questions but one and also at or above peers in all categories. For example, Vanderbilt
faculty are satisfied with time spent on research (more than 60% are satisfied), on service
(nearly 60%), and on teaching (nearly 80%).

The research questions ask about various aspects of research including time devoted to
research, academic freedom, and support for research. Faculty are generally satisfied with
the nature of their research work. They are more satisfied than peers with respect to not
only time spent on research but also support for research. Faculty report less satisfaction
with expectations for securing external funding (43% are satisfied), the support for engaging
undergraduates in research (less than half are satisfied), and the availability of course
release time to focus on research (just over 40%). Table 2 shows the percentage of all faculty
respondents who report being satisfied or very satisfied with regard to each item.
Table 2. Nature of Work-Research: Relative Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Satisfied or Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portion of your time spent on research</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of external funding you are expected to find</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The influence you have over the focus of your research/scholarly/creative work</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of graduate students to support your research/scholarly/creative work</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support for your research/scholarly/creative work</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support your institution provides you for engaging undergraduates in your research/scholarly/creative work</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support your institution has offered you for obtaining externally funded grants (pre-award)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support your institution has offered you for managing externally funded grants (post-award)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support your institution has offered you for securing graduate student assistance</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support your institution has offered you for traveling to present papers or conduct research/creative work</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The availability of course release time to focus on your research</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The service questions centered on: time devoted to service; support for those taking on leadership positions; the number and attractiveness of committee assignments; the amount of discretion to choose committees and the equitability of assignments; the number of student advisees; the equitability of advising responsibilities; and level of support for faculty doing advising. While faculty are relatively satisfied with their service obligations including committee work, fewer faculty report satisfaction with the distribution of committee work across their department (only 38% are satisfied), discretion over choice of committee assignments (44%), and institutional support for taking on additional leadership roles including chairing committees (41%).

Table 3 shows the relative frequency with which respondents reported being satisfied or very satisfied on key service questions.
Table 3. Nature of Work-Service: Relative Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Satisfied or Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portion of your time spent on service</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of committees on which you serve</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attractiveness of the committees on which you serve</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The discretion you have to choose the committees on which you serve</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How equitably committee assignments are distributed across faculty in your department</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching questions asked about: time devoted to teaching; the number and level of courses taught; discretion regarding course content; the number and quality of students taught; equitability of teaching load; the quality of graduate student teaching assistance; and teaching schedule. Faculty report remarkably high levels of satisfaction with most aspects of teaching with satisfaction rates ranging from 70% to nearly 90%. Thus, the 49% satisfaction rate for the distribution of teaching workload stands out as a particularly low score in this area. However, faculty concern about the equitable distribution of teaching workload is consistent with the response to the equitable distribution of committee work.

Our top-line assessment of faculty satisfaction with the teaching, service, and research environment is that the teaching and research environment is both positively perceived by most faculty and also a clear strength of Vanderbilt when judged either in absolute terms or relative to the performance of the peer institutions. There are hints of slightly higher levels of dissatisfaction in the distribution of teaching and committee assignments, especially among female and under-represented minority faculty. Further investigation may be warranted as to the gender and race-based differences, which are not present across all
“nature of work” questions. While our peer institutions report similar subgroup differences, the issue still merits additional exploration.

That said, it is again important to emphasize that when we compare our scores to those of our peers, we do not find a systematic or consistent gap. However, we do fare better on some questions and worse on others when compared to peers. Our average was higher than our peers for 13 of the 35 items, the same for 8 items, and lower for 14 items. The relative rankings do not tell us much about satisfaction in these areas. First, the differences between peers within an area of work can be slight. For example, Vanderbilt’s average score for the summary measure of Nature of Work: Research is no different from our peers, but Vanderbilt appears to be slightly better on questions related to time spent on research (we are better than 2 peers, worse than 1 peer, and the same as 2 peers) and support for research (we are better than 3 peers, worse than 1 peer, and the same as 1 peer) and slightly worse on support for engaging undergrads in research (worse than 2 peers, better than 1 peer and the same as 2 peers). Second, even when Vanderbilt faculty express lower satisfaction, the comparison may not show that Vanderbilt is normatively worse than its peers. For example, Vanderbilt faculty express lower satisfaction with expectations for securing external funding. But if this reflects that Vanderbilt has relatively high expectations with respect to grants, it could be considered a good thing. And, Vanderbilt faculty report higher levels of satisfaction with support for obtaining and maintaining grants.

A meaningful number of faculty are either neutral or dissatisfied with some of the core work that they do and the differences often track individual characteristics. Tenure-track, associate professors, women, and under-represented minorities (“URM”) are less satisfied with certain aspects of workload. Tenure-track faculty and URM faculty, for example, report relatively lower levels of satisfaction with time spent on teaching (the level of satisfaction is 15 percentage points lower than for all faculty). Women and URM faculty report relatively lower levels of satisfaction with time spent on service. Finally, non-tenure track faculty, women, and URM faculty express lower levels of satisfaction with expectations for the amount of external funding they should secure and with institutional support, such as internal grants, for their work.

C. Resources and Support

The survey included 25 questions in the category of “Resources and Support,” ranging from the material conditions of work (offices and laboratory space) to university policies (support for managing family and career) to financial benefits (tuition, childcare, and parking). In all, nine questions related to facilities and work resources; 12 to personal and family policies; and four to health and retirement benefits.
• **Facilities and Work Resources** questions covered: support for improving teaching; office, lab, research and studio spaces; classrooms and equipment; library resources as well as computing and technical support; clerical and administrative support; and salary.

• **Personal and Family Policies** items included: professional-personal balance and institutional support for family and career compatibility; housing and tuition benefits; spousal/partner hiring; childcare and eldercare; family medical and parental leave; flexible workload; stop-the-clock policies; and commuter and parking benefits.

• **Health and Retirement Benefits** questions included: health benefits for the employee and the employee’s family; retirement benefits; and phased retirement options.

Our top-line assessment is that the resources and support that are given to faculty is a clear strength of Vanderbilt – a strength that should be praised, continued, and even strengthened given that the benefits are both a source of great satisfaction among the faculty and also seemingly a point of comparative advantage. Moreover satisfaction is not only generally high across the various items that were asked about, but there are also no real systematic differences between different faculty groups at Vanderbilt; regardless of tenure status, rank, gender, race, or ethnicity there was common agreement and satisfaction with the resources and support that they received from Vanderbilt.

In general, most faculty report satisfaction with resources, family policies, and benefits. In terms of Resources and Support, the average responses of our faculty compare very favorably to those of our peers. Our average responses were statistically greater than all five peers for questions involving: Institutional supports for family/career compatibility, housing benefits, spousal/partner hiring program, childcare, eldercare, family medical/parental leave, and flexible workload/modified duties. We performed worse than our peers in only two areas: satisfaction with computing and technical support (three of our peers had higher scores and two were indistinguishable) and satisfaction with office space (two had a higher average, two had the same average, and one peer had a worse average). The Resources and Support responses do not reveal any consistent pattern of less satisfaction for a demographic or tenure-status group.
D. Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, And Mentoring

The COACHE survey includes questions that explore support for and opportunities to work with others on interdisciplinary work (5), collaboration (3), and mentoring (8).

- **Interdisciplinary Work** questions asked about level of agreement with the following statements: budget allocations encourage interdisciplinary work; campus facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work; interdisciplinary work is rewarded; and department’s ability to evaluate interdisciplinary work.

- **Collaboration** questions covered opportunities for collaboration within a department, within the institution but outside the department, and outside the institution.

- **Mentoring** questions centered on the role and effectiveness of mentoring within the department, outside the department but within the institution, and outside the institution.

Faculty are generally satisfied with opportunities to collaborate and with mentoring. Faculty at Vanderbilt, as at most of our peers, express the view that there is insufficient support for being a good mentor and insufficient mentoring of tenured associate professors and non-tenure track faculty. Of note, though, faculty overwhelmingly report that mentoring has been fulfilling to them (more than 80%) and is important (87%).

Less than half of respondents are satisfied with support for and recognition of interdisciplinary work, but our faculty’s reported level of satisfaction with interdisciplinary work is as high or higher than the rates of satisfaction at peer institutions. The one exception to our relative strength on interdisciplinary work is among tenure-track faculty who report a very low level of satisfaction with the treatment of interdisciplinary work in the tenure process (18%) which ties for the lowest among our peers.

E. Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal

The COACHE Survey posed different tenure, promotion, and renewal questions to faculty based on their tenure-status and rank. Vanderbilt scores generally were lower than our peers on tenure, promotion, and renewal questions.

- **Promotion to Full** questions were posed to tenured associate and full professors and focused on: support within the department for achieving promotion to full;
reasonability of promotion expectations; and clarity of numerous aspects of the promotion process (such as criteria, standards, evidence, and timing).

- **Tenure** questions were posed to tenure-track faculty and inquired about: clarity of numerous aspects of the tenure process (such as criteria, standards, evidence, and time frame); clarity of tenure expectations; consistency of communications about tenure; and the basis for tenure decisions (performance-based or not).

- **Renewal and Promotion (Non-Tenured)** questions were posed to non-tenure track faculty and centered on: the clarity of the contract renewal process (criteria, standards, and evidence) and the promotion process.

The majority of Vanderbilt tenure-track respondents rated the tenure process, criteria, standards, and evidence as clear. (Women and URM faculty responded comparably to men and non-URM faculty.) They also agreed that the decision was based on performance. (URM faculty agreed with this statement more often than non-URM faculty.) But, they expressed uncertainty about whether they would earn tenure.

Tenured full professors report much higher rates of satisfaction with the promotion-to-full process than do tenured associate professors. Most full professors rate the promotion process, criteria, standards, and body of evidence as clear and the expectations as reasonable. But roughly half or slightly less than half of associate professors agree. Less than one-quarter of associate professors describe the time-frame for promotion as clear. And, many associate professors are unsure as to whether they will be promoted.

Non-tenured track faculty view all aspects of the renewal and promotion process as less clear than tenure-track faculty and tenured associate professors rate their respective advancement processes. The differences are meaningful. For example, the mean score for clarity of the renewal/tenure process is 3.2 for non-tenure track faculty versus 3.7 for tenure-track faculty. The difference between the mean score for clarity of the promotion process is 1.3 (2.6 for non-tenure track faculty versus 3.8 for tenured associate professors).

**F. Institutional Leadership and Shared Governance**

The Institutional Leadership questions explore levels of satisfaction with all levels of leadership: Senior (Chancellor and Provost) (7 questions), Divisional (College/School Dean) (4), Departmental (Chair) (5), and Faculty (Senate) (4). The survey also included four additional questions regarding consistency of statements and actions on priorities across levels of leadership, the effect of changing priorities, and leaders' support for diversity. For each level of leadership, respondents were queried about their satisfaction levels with the
pace of decision making, stated priorities, communication of priorities, and support for faculty input.

The Shared Governance questions explore attitudes about collaboration between faculty and administration in making institutional decisions. The questions explore the institution's model of shared governance, the effectiveness of the model, and the opportunities and support for faculty participation in governance.

Vanderbilt's mean scores for satisfaction with senior, divisional, and departmental leadership are as high or higher than all but one peer. The percentage of Vanderbilt faculty who report they are satisfied with senior, divisional, and departmental leaders is the same or greater than the percentage of peers' faculties who are satisfied. Vanderbilt's mean scores for faculty leaders are roughly in the middle of our peers. Vanderbilt responses to senior, divisional, and faculty leadership questions include many neutral responses. Vanderbilt faculty report higher levels of satisfaction with departmental leadership than with senior and divisional leadership.

Vanderbilt's mean scores for shared governance are slightly higher than our peers but among the lowest scores on the survey. Tenured faculty and URM faculty give the lowest scores on the shared governance questions.

**G. Department Engagement, Quality, And Collegiality**

The COACHE survey includes questions about departmental engagement (5), quality (9), and collegiality (7).

- **Departmental Engagement** questions inquired into: the frequency of faculty conversations about undergraduate student learning; graduate student learning; teaching; technology; and research.

- **Departmental Quality** items focused on satisfaction with: intellectual vitality; scholarly productivity; and teaching effectiveness of tenured, pre-tenure, and non-tenured faculty.

- **Collegiality** asked about: personal and professional interaction with colleagues; ability to find a balance between professional and personal life; and support for finding the right balance.
Vanderbilt faculty report high levels of satisfaction with the quality of their departments and with collegiality within their departments. (Both are comparable to peers.) Vanderbilt faculty report that graduate student learning and research are more frequently discussed than undergraduate learning, teaching, and technology. Vanderbilt’s mean scores for the latter three place us in the middle of our peers.

**H. Appreciation and Recognition**

The COACHE survey asks faculty whether they are satisfied with the recognition they receive for different types of work (teaching, advising, scholarship, service, and outreach) and from their department chair and colleagues. The survey also asks tenured faculty whether they agree that their college and department are valued by the chancellor and provost and whether they personally feel valued by the provost and dean.

Vanderbilt faculty are generally satisfied with the recognition for their scholarship and teaching, but neutral or dissatisfied with the recognition for their advising, service, and outreach. These numbers are consistent across groups although slightly lower for women and URM faculty. Vanderbilt’s mean responses are comparable to those of peers.

Most faculty are satisfied with the level of recognition from their colleagues, although non-tenure-track, women, and URM faculty are less satisfied. More than sixty percent of tenured faculty feel that their college is valued by senior leadership, but slightly less than fifty percent feel that their department is valued. Tenured faculty are neutral or dissatisfied with the recognition which they receive from the provost and dean. But, those scores place us above most of our peers.
I. **Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion**

The Vanderbilt version of the COACHE survey included a set of questions focused on issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion. Faculty were asked whether the environment is inclusive and equitable for community members regardless of background and whether they were satisfied with efforts to recruit and retain a diverse faculty.

Vanderbilt faculty respond unevenly to the questions of whether our environment is inclusive and equitable. Tenured faculty, full professors, men, and White (non-Hispanic) faculty agree in large numbers that the university is an inclusive environment (more than 60% across categories) and an equitable environment (more than 60% across categories). Women respondents were less likely than men to rate the environment as inclusive (57% versus 71%) or equitable (54% versus 69%). URM respondents were much less likely than White (non-Hispanic) respondents to rate the environment as inclusive (35% versus 68%) or equitable (35% versus 66%).

Vanderbilt faculty are somewhat divided on the university’s efforts to recruit a diverse faculty. URM faculty are roughly half as likely as other faculty to be satisfied with recruitment of diverse faculty (26% compared to 54%).

The survey also asked how frequently over the prior year a respondent had personally experienced discriminatory behavior based on personal characteristics. For each of the following characteristics, the number reflects the rounded percentage of faculty who answered that they had experienced the type of discrimination very often, often, or sometimes:

- **Age**: 1%
- **Disability**: 1.5%
- **English language proficiency**: 3%
- **Ethnicity/national origin**: 6%
- **Gender identity**: 13%
- **Physical characteristics**: 5%
- **Political views/affiliation**: 8%
- **Pregnancy**: 3%
- **Race**: 6%
- **Religious views**: 6%
- **Sexual orientation**: 3%
- **Socioeconomic Status**: 4%
IV. CONCLUSION

The COACHE Faculty Satisfaction Survey is a useful tool that provides helpful information about faculty attitudes. However, the data has inherent limitations. The results are not a precise measure of faculty satisfaction. The responses reflect the time when the survey was administered and the faculty who chose to respond. Because the survey is constructed to be used by faculty from a range of disciplines and work settings, some questions likely were interpreted differently by different faculty. The peer comparisons often turn on small differences in means and/or large variance. Yet, the survey remains useful and information. We recommend that the University use it to inform and build on what we already know and to question some of our assumptions about the faculty’s attitudes.

The survey supports the conclusion that the University has numerous successes that merit continued support. Benefits, work-life balance, departmental satisfaction, teaching satisfaction, and research satisfaction are all signs of a positive work environment that we should continue to foster. Vanderbilt’s support for our faculty and their families is a strength and should be a point of both pride and distinction.

The survey also reveals some mixed attitudes. For example, pre-tenure faculty as a whole agree that the tenure process is generally clear. But, they are less positive about the tenure process than pre-tenure faculty at our peer institutions. And, while they report that the expectations for their performance as a scholar or teacher is clear, the majority report that expectations for other roles is not clear and that the messages from tenured colleagues about tenure requirements are not consistent. The pre-tenure faculty’s responses are not associated with race or gender. Another example of mixed results are associated with interdisciplinary work: faculty are satisfied with support for such work but do not believe their departments know how to value the work in renewal, tenure, and promotion decisions.

Finally, the survey reveals what appear to be pressing concerns meriting special attention. For example, it shows large race and gender differences on the distribution of teaching and service obligations. Tenured associate professors and tenured full professors report sharply different views on the clarity of the standards and process for promotion to full.

We end by drawing attention to the responses to the final questions on the survey. On the penultimate question, 73% of faculty agrees “If I had to do it all over, I would again choose to work at this institution” (and only 15% disagreed with the remainder unsure). And, on the ultimate question, 71% report they are satisfied with Vanderbilt as a place to work (and only 13% are dissatisfied and 16% are neither).
COACHE Survey Questions with Response Frequencies

In the spring of 2016, Vanderbilt University faculty were asked to complete the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey that is administered by COACHE, which is based at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Fifty-six percent of Vanderbilt faculty participated in the survey. The substantive questions and possible answers are reprinted below. The number of respondents choosing each answer is listed after the answer. (COACHE does not report the number of respondents who declined to answer a question.)

SECTION 2. NATURE OF WORK – OVERALL

Q45. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the portion of your time spent on the following:

A. Teaching

Very satisfied.................................................................207
Satisfied.................................................................356
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.................................101
Dissatisfied.................................................................55
Very dissatisfied..........................................................6

B. Research

Very satisfied.................................................................178
Satisfied.................................................................262
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.................................101
Dissatisfied.................................................................133
Very dissatisfied..........................................................26

C. Service (e.g., department/program administration, faculty governance, committee work, advising/mentoring students, speaking to alumni or prospective students/parents)

Very satisfied.................................................................90
Satisfied.................................................................329
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.................................179
Dissatisfied.................................................................108
Very dissatisfied..........................................................23

D. Outreach (e.g., extension, community engagement, technology transfer, economic development, K-12 education)
Very satisfied.................................................................95
Satisfied...........................................................................213
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.................................186
Dissatisfied......................................................................43
Very dissatisfied.............................................................9

E. Administrative tasks (e.g., creating and submitting reports, routine paperwork)

Very satisfied.................................................................63
Satisfied...........................................................................205
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.................................210
Dissatisfied......................................................................173
Very dissatisfied.............................................................51

Q55. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

A. I am able to balance the teaching, research, and service (and clinical, if applicable) activities expected of me.

   Strongly agree ..........................................................179
   Somewhat agree .........................................................275
   Neither agree nor disagree ...........................................63
   Somewhat disagree .....................................................158
   Strongly disagree .......................................................52

B. My institution does what it can to help faculty who take on additional leadership roles (e.g., major committee assignments, department chairmanship), to sustain other aspects of their faculty work.

   Strongly agree ..........................................................179
   Somewhat agree .........................................................275
   Neither agree nor disagree ...........................................63
   Somewhat disagree .....................................................158
   Strongly disagree .......................................................52
SECTION 3. NATURE OF WORK – SERVICE

Q60. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following:

A. The number of committees on which you serve

Very satisfied ................................................................. 81
Satisfied ................................................................. 295
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ......................... 193
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 89
Very dissatisfied ............................................................. 13

B. The attractiveness (e.g., value, visibility, importance, personal preference) of the committees on which you serve

Very satisfied ................................................................. 64
Satisfied ................................................................. 258
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ......................... 233
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 84
Very dissatisfied ............................................................. 12

C. The discretion you have to choose the committees on which you serve

Very satisfied ................................................................. 63
Satisfied ................................................................. 224
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ......................... 207
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 123
Very dissatisfied ............................................................. 34

D. How equitably committee assignments are distributed across faculty in your department

Very satisfied ................................................................. 58
Satisfied ................................................................. 193
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ......................... 181
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 144
Very dissatisfied ............................................................. 82
SECTION 4. NATURE OF WORK – TEACHING

Q70. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following:

A. The number of courses you teach

Very satisfied ................................................................. 237
Satisfied ................................................................. 317
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 73
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 65
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 8

B. The level of courses you teach

Very satisfied ................................................................. 263
Satisfied ................................................................. 314
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 64
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 50
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 12

C. The discretion you have over the content of the courses you teach

Very satisfied ................................................................. 396
Satisfied ................................................................. 213
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 52
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 30
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 8

D. The number of students in the classes you teach, on average

Very satisfied ................................................................. 258
Satisfied ................................................................. 299
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 73
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 57
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 12

E. The quality of students you teach, on average

Very satisfied ................................................................. 258
Satisfied ................................................................. 299
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 73
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 42
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 11
I. The quality of graduate students to support your teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. The support your institution has offered you for improving your teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. How equitably the teaching workload is distributed across faculty in your department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 5. NATURE OF WORK – RESEARCH

Q80. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following:

A. The amount of external funding you are expected to find

- Very satisfied: 66
- Satisfied: 184
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 196
- Dissatisfied: 93
- Very dissatisfied: 37

B. The influence you have over the focus of your research/scholarly/creative work

- Very satisfied: 374
- Satisfied: 221
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 54
- Dissatisfied: 31
- Very dissatisfied: 12

C. The quality of graduate students to support your research/scholarly/creative work

- Very satisfied: 94
- Satisfied: 194
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 117
- Dissatisfied: 80
- Very dissatisfied: 40

D. Institutional support (e.g., internal grants/seed money) for your research/scholarly/creative work

- Very satisfied: 115
- Satisfied: 233
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 134
- Dissatisfied: 126
- Very dissatisfied: 74

E. The support your institution provides you for engaging undergraduates in your research/scholarly/creative work

- Very satisfied: 66
- Satisfied: 189
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 174
- Dissatisfied: 92
- Very dissatisfied: 35
Q85. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the support your institution has offered you for:

A. Obtaining externally funded grants (pre-award)

Very satisfied ................................................................. 84
Satisfied ............................................................................. 194
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 137
Dissatisfied ......................................................................... 100
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 35

B. Managing externally funded grants (post-award)

Very satisfied ................................................................. 66
Satisfied ............................................................................. 174
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 115
Dissatisfied ......................................................................... 81
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 36

C. Securing graduate student assistance

Very satisfied ................................................................. 51
Satisfied ............................................................................. 143
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 140
Dissatisfied ......................................................................... 104
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 49

D. Traveling to present papers or conduct research/creative work

Very satisfied ................................................................. 157
Satisfied ............................................................................. 223
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 116
Dissatisfied ......................................................................... 120
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 69

E. The availability of course release time to focus on your research

Very satisfied ................................................................. 69
Satisfied ............................................................................. 168
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ...................................... 151
Dissatisfied ......................................................................... 121
Very dissatisfied ............................................................... 69
SECTION 6. RESOURCES & SUPPORT

Q90. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following aspects of your employment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Office</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Laboratory, research, or studio space</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Equipment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Classrooms</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Library resources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Computing and technical support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Clerical/administrative support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q95. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following aspects of your employment:

A. Health benefits for yourself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Health benefits for your family (i.e. spouse, partner, and dependents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Retirement benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Housing benefits (e.g. real estate services, subsidized housing, low-interest mortgage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Spousal/partner hiring program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Childcare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. Eldercare

Very satisfied ................................................................. 5
Satisfied .......................................................... 23
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ........................................ 69
Dissatisfied .......................................................... 8
Very dissatisfied ..................................................... 9

I. Phased retirement options

Very satisfied ................................................................. 32
Satisfied .......................................................... 125
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ........................................ 132
Dissatisfied .......................................................... 36
Very dissatisfied ..................................................... 24

J. Family medical/parental leave

Very satisfied ................................................................. 95
Satisfied .......................................................... 192
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ........................................ 100
Dissatisfied .......................................................... 30
Very dissatisfied ..................................................... 19

K. Flexible workload/modified duties for parental or other family reasons

Very satisfied ................................................................. 106
Satisfied .......................................................... 164
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ........................................ 87
Dissatisfied .......................................................... 26
Very dissatisfied ..................................................... 24

L. [Pre-tenure Faculty] Stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons

Very satisfied ................................................................. 14
Satisfied .......................................................... 21
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ........................................ 13
Dissatisfied .......................................................... 5
Very dissatisfied ..................................................... 3
SECTION 7. INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK

Q100. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

A. Budget allocations encourage interdisciplinary work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Campus facilities (e.g. spaces, buildings, centers, labs) are conducive to interdisciplinary work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the merit process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. [NTT or Tenured Associate or Tenured Full] Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the promotion process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. [Pre-tenure Faculty] Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the tenure process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. My department understands how to evaluate interdisciplinary work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 8. COLLABORATION

Q105. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with your opportunities for collaboration with:

A. Other members of your department

Very satisfied ................................................................. 201
Satisfied ................................................................. 292
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ........................................ 108
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 88
Very dissatisfied .......................................................... 38

F. Within your institution, faculty outside your department

Very satisfied ................................................................. 145
Satisfied ................................................................. 282
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ........................................ 156
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 87
Very dissatisfied .......................................................... 33

D. Faculty outside your institution

Very satisfied ................................................................. 168
Satisfied ................................................................. 311
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ........................................ 138
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 66
Very dissatisfied .......................................................... 23
SECTION 9. MENTORING

Q110 for NTT or Tenured Associate or Tenured Full

Q115. Would you agree or disagree that being a mentor is(has been) fulfilling to you in your role as a faculty member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q120. Whether or not you have received formal or informal mentoring at your current institution, please indicate how important or unimportant each of the following is to your success as a faculty member:

A. Having a mentor or mentors in your department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Having a mentor or mentors outside your department at your institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Having a mentor or mentors outside your institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>................................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>..........................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q125. Please rate the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the following for you:

### A. Mentoring from someone in your department

- **Very effective**: 170
- **Somewhat effective**: 220
- **Neither effective nor ineffective**: 60
- **Somewhat ineffective**: 59
- **Very ineffective**: 57

### B. Mentoring from someone outside your department at your institution

- **Very effective**: 80
- **Somewhat effective**: 183
- **Neither effective nor ineffective**: 101
- **Somewhat ineffective**: 36
- **Very ineffective**: 44

### C. Mentoring from someone outside your institution

- **Very effective**: 157
- **Somewhat effective**: 207
- **Neither effective nor ineffective**: 96
- **Somewhat ineffective**: 16
- **Very ineffective**: 15

Q130. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

### A. [Pre-tenure or Tenured Faculty] There is effective mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in my department.

- **Strongly agree**: 100
- **Somewhat agree**: 180
- **Neither agree nor disagree**: 49
- **Somewhat disagree**: 65
- **Strongly disagree**: 50
B. [Tenured Associate or Tenured Full Faculty] There is effective mentoring of tenured associate professors in my department.

Strongly agree ................................................................. 23
Somewhat agree ............................................................. 73
Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 68
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 80
Strongly disagree .......................................................... 88

C. [NTT or Tenured Associate or Tenured Full Faculty] My institution provides adequate support for faculty to be good mentors.

Strongly agree ................................................................. 32
Somewhat agree ............................................................. 94
Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 131
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 165
Strongly disagree .......................................................... 123
SECTION 10. TENURE AND PROMOTION

Q135B-Q135E for Tenured Faculty

Q135. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

B. [Associate and Full Faculty] My department has a culture where associate professors are encouraged to work towards promotion to full professorship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. [Associate and Full Faculty] Generally, the expectations for promotion from associate to full professor are reasonable to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q136, Q133, Q136A-Q136F Q137A-Q137G and Q139A-Q139B for Pre-tenure Faculty

Q136. Please rate the clarity of the following aspects of earning tenure in your department:

A. The tenure process in my department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity Level</th>
<th>Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The tenure criteria (what things are evaluated) in my department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity Level</th>
<th>Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. The tenure standards (the performance thresholds) in my department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. The body of evidence (the dossier’s contents) that will be considered in making my tenure decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. My sense of whether or not I will achieve tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q137. Is what's expected in order to earn tenure clear to you regarding your performance as:

A. A scholar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. A teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. An advisor to students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. A colleague in your department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. A campus citizen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. [College and University Faculty] A member of the broader community (e.g., outreach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat clear</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither clear nor unclear</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unclear</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q139. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

#### A. I have received consistent messages from tenured faculty about the requirements for tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. In my opinion, tenure decisions here are made primarily on performance-based criteria (e.g., research/creative work, teaching, and/or service) rather than on non-performance-based criteria (e.g., politics, relationships, and/or demographics).

Strongly agree ................................................................. 27
Somewhat agree ............................................................... 41
Neither agree nor disagree ............................................... 16
Somewhat disagree .......................................................... 7
Strongly disagree ............................................................. 10

Q140A-Q140F for Tenured Associate or Tenured Full Faculty

Q140. Please rate the clarity of the following aspects of promotion in rank from associate professor to full professor:

A. The promotion process in my department

Very clear........................................................................ 144
Somewhat clear............................................................... 115
Neither clear nor unclear ................................................. 35
Somewhat unclear .......................................................... 43
Very unclear .................................................................... 27

B. The promotion criteria (what things are evaluated) in my department

Very clear........................................................................ 134
Somewhat clear............................................................... 125
Neither clear nor unclear ................................................. 31
Somewhat unclear .......................................................... 43
Very unclear .................................................................... 31

C. The promotion standards (the performance thresholds) in my department

Very clear........................................................................ 102
Somewhat clear............................................................... 131
Neither clear nor unclear ................................................. 39
Somewhat unclear .......................................................... 53
Very unclear .................................................................... 40

D. The body of evidence (the dossier's contents) considered in making promotion decisions

Very clear........................................................................ 140
Somewhat clear............................................................... 125
Neither clear nor unclear ................................................. 27
Somewhat unclear .......................................................38
Very unclear ....................................................................34

E. The time frame within which associate professors should apply for promotion

Very clear ....................................................................78
Somewhat clear .......................................................... 104
Neither clear nor unclear ..............................................62
Somewhat unclear .........................................................60
Very unclear ....................................................................59

F. [Tenured Associate Faculty] My sense of whether I will be promoted from associate to full professor

Very clear ....................................................................16
Somewhat clear .......................................................... 31
Neither clear nor unclear ..............................................12
Somewhat unclear .........................................................28
Very unclear ....................................................................33
SECTION 11. INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE & LEADERSHIP

Q170. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

A. My institution's priorities are stated consistently across all levels of leadership (i.e. president, provost, deans/division heads, and department chairs/heads).

- Strongly agree................................................................. 79
- Somewhat agree ............................................................. 214
- Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 135
- Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 167
- Strongly disagree .......................................................... 71

C. My institution's priorities are acted upon consistently across all levels of leadership (i.e. president, provost, deans/division heads, and department chairs/heads).

- Strongly agree................................................................. 62
- Somewhat agree ............................................................. 179
- Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 139
- Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 174
- Strongly disagree .......................................................... 95

D. In the past five years, my institution's priorities have changed in ways that negatively affect my work in my department.

- Strongly agree................................................................. 89
- Somewhat agree ............................................................. 99
- Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 143
- Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 195
- Strongly disagree .......................................................... 145

Q175. In adapting to the changing mission, I have received sufficient support from:

A. My dean or division head

- Strongly agree................................................................. 36
- Somewhat agree ............................................................. 70
- Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 60
- Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 73
- Strongly disagree .......................................................... 69
B. My department head or chair

Strongly agree................................................................. 65
Somewhat agree............................................................... 78
Neither agree nor disagree ............................................... 43
Somewhat disagree............................................................ 46
Strongly disagree.............................................................. 46

Q180. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following: My institution’s president’s/chancellor’s:

A. Pace of decision making

Very satisfied................................................................. 56
Satisfied.............................................................................. 208
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ..................................... 271
Dissatisfied................................................................. 84
Very dissatisfied.............................................................. 47

B. Stated priorities

Very satisfied................................................................. 62
Satisfied.............................................................................. 205
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ..................................... 217
Dissatisfied................................................................. 135
Very dissatisfied.............................................................. 62

C. Communication of priorities to faculty

Very satisfied................................................................. 64
Satisfied.............................................................................. 225
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ..................................... 195
Dissatisfied................................................................. 122
Very dissatisfied.............................................................. 81

My institution’s chief academic officer’s (provost, VPAA, dean of faculty):

L. Pace of decision making

Very satisfied................................................................. 69
Satisfied.............................................................................. 207
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ..................................... 269
Dissatisfied................................................................. 73
Very dissatisfied.............................................................. 45
M. Stated priorities

Very satisfied.................................................................72
Satisfied...............................................................................212
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.......................................225
Dissatisfied...........................................................................108
Very dissatisfied.................................................................55

N. Communication of priorities to faculty

Very satisfied.........................................................................81
Satisfied...............................................................................230
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.......................................222
Dissatisfied...........................................................................89
Very dissatisfied.................................................................55
Q185D-Q185G for University Faculty

Q185. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following: My dean’s or division head’s:

D. **Pace of decision making**

- Very satisfied: 126
- Satisfied: 245
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 201
- Dissatisfied: 61
- Very dissatisfied: 43

E. **Stated priorities**

- Very satisfied: 112
- Satisfied: 229
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 198
- Dissatisfied: 86
- Very dissatisfied: 50

F. **Communication of priorities to faculty**

- Very satisfied: 128
- Satisfied: 236
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 175
- Dissatisfied: 89
- Very dissatisfied: 51

G. **Ensuring opportunities for faculty to have input into school/college priorities**

- Very satisfied: 106
- Satisfied: 206
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 195
- Dissatisfied: 97
- Very dissatisfied: 73
My department head’s or chair’s:

**H. Pace of decision making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I. Stated priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**J. Communication of priorities to faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K. Ensuring opportunities for faculty to have input into departmental policy decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L. Fairness in evaluating my work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q186. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following:

A. The pace of decision making by my institution-wide faculty governing body

- Very satisfied.................................................................33
- Satisfied.............................................................................155
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied...........................................305
- Dissatisfied.........................................................................85
- Very dissatisfied...............................................................46

B. The stated priorities of my institution-wide faculty governing body

- Very satisfied.................................................................41
- Satisfied..............................................................................166
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied...........................................288
- Dissatisfied.........................................................................90
- Very dissatisfied...............................................................45

C. The communication of priorities by my institution-wide faculty governing body

- Very satisfied.................................................................43
- Satisfied..............................................................................174
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied...........................................266
- Dissatisfied.........................................................................111
- Very dissatisfied...............................................................40

D. The steps taken by my institution-wide faculty governing body to ensure faculty are included in that body's decision making

- Very satisfied.................................................................40
- Satisfied..............................................................................190
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied...........................................252
- Dissatisfied.........................................................................97
- Very dissatisfied...............................................................53

SECTION 11A. SHARED GOVERNANCE

Q187B. On the whole, rate the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the shared governance system at your institution.

- Very effective.................................................................32
- Somewhat effective...........................................................180
- Neither effective nor ineffective...........................................90
- Somewhat ineffective.........................................................139
- Very ineffective...............................................................125
Q188. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following:

A. The existing faculty governance structures offer sufficient opportunities for me to provide input on institution-wide policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. I understand the process by which I can express my opinions about institutional policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. My institution has clear rules about the various roles and authority of the faculty and administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. My institution's shared governance model holds up under unusual situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. My institution systematically reviews the effectiveness of its decision making processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q189A. How often do you experience the following?

A. **The governance committees on which I currently serve make observable progress toward goals.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **The progress achieved through governance efforts is publicly recognized.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **My institution cultivates new leaders among faculty.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. **Important institutional decisions are not made until consensus among faculty leaders and senior administrators is achieved.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. **Senior administrators ensure that there is sufficient time for faculty to provide input on important decisions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Once an important decision is made, senior administrators communicate their rationale (e.g., data used for decision, weight of faculty input, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q189B. How often do faculty leaders and senior administrators...

A. Have equal say in governance matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Engage each other in defining decision criteria used to evaluate options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Respectfully consider one another's views before making important decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Follow agreed-upon rules of engagement when there are disagreements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Have an open system of communication for making decisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Share a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the institution.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G. Discuss difficult issues in good faith.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 12. ENGAGEMENT

Q190. How often do you engage with faculty in your department in conversations about:

A. Undergraduate student learning

Frequently ................................................................. 142
Regularly ................................................................. 169
Occasionally ............................................................ 156
Seldom ................................................................. 103
Never ................................................................. 113

B. [University Faculty] Graduate student learning

Frequently ................................................................. 180
Regularly ................................................................. 222
Occasionally ............................................................ 145
Seldom ................................................................. 72
Never ................................................................. 66

C. Effective teaching practices

Frequently ................................................................. 148
Regularly ................................................................. 209
Occasionally ............................................................ 197
Seldom ................................................................. 117
Never ................................................................. 43

D. Effective use of technology

Frequently ................................................................. 116
Regularly ................................................................. 178
Occasionally ............................................................ 239
Seldom ................................................................. 127
Never ................................................................. 49

E. Use of current research methodologies

Frequently ................................................................. 155
Regularly ................................................................. 216
Occasionally ............................................................ 191
Seldom ................................................................. 90
Never ................................................................. 55
Q195. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following:

A. The intellectual vitality of tenured faculty in your department

Very satisfied .................................................. 225
Satisfied .......................................................... 288
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ....................... 78
Dissatisfied ...................................................... 62
Very dissatisfied ............................................. 24

B. The intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty in your department

Very satisfied .................................................. 277
Satisfied .......................................................... 295
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ....................... 59
Dissatisfied ...................................................... 19
Very dissatisfied ............................................. 5

C. The research/scholarly/creative productivity of tenured faculty in your department

Very satisfied .................................................. 213
Satisfied .......................................................... 292
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ....................... 95
Dissatisfied ...................................................... 52
Very dissatisfied ............................................. 18

D. The research/scholarly/creative productivity of pre-tenure faculty in your department

Very satisfied .................................................. 242
Satisfied .......................................................... 295
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ....................... 80
Dissatisfied ...................................................... 25
Very dissatisfied ............................................. 6

F. The teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty in your department

Very satisfied .................................................. 130
Satisfied .......................................................... 259
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ....................... 132
Dissatisfied ...................................................... 60
Very dissatisfied ............................................. 26
G. The teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty in your department

Very satisfied ......................................................... 165
Satisfied ................................................................. 285
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ..................... 115
Dissatisfied .............................................................. 13
Very dissatisfied ......................................................... 9
SECTION 13. WORK & PERSONAL LIFE
BALANCE

Q200. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

A. I have been able to find the right balance, for me, between my professional life and my personal/family life.

Strongly agree ................................................................. 163
Somewhat agree .............................................................. 261
Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 66
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 153
Strongly disagree ............................................................ 61

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

Strongly agree ................................................................. 119
Somewhat agree .............................................................. 211
Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 123
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 103
Strongly disagree ............................................................ 59

C. My departmental colleagues do what they can to make personal/family obligations (e.g. childcare or eldercare) and an academic career compatible.

Strongly agree ................................................................. 191
Somewhat agree .............................................................. 236
Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 106
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 56
Strongly disagree ............................................................ 37

D. Department meetings occur at times that are compatible with my personal/family needs.

Strongly agree ................................................................. 320
Somewhat agree .............................................................. 226
Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 67
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 40
Strongly disagree ............................................................ 31
### SECTION 14. CLIMATE

Q205. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following:

**A. The amount of professional interaction you have with pre-tenure faculty in your department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. The amount of personal interaction you have with pre-tenure faculty in your department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. How well you fit in your department (e.g. your sense of belonging in your department)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. The amount of professional interaction you have with tenured faculty in your department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. The amount of personal interaction you have with tenured faculty in your department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Very dissatisfied ................................................................. 27

Q210. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

A. My departmental colleagues “pitch in” when needed.

Strongly agree ............................................................... 227
Somewhat agree ............................................................ 262
Neither agree nor disagree ........................................... 74
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 97
Strongly disagree .......................................................... 38

C. On the whole, my department is collegial.

Strongly agree ............................................................... 299
Somewhat agree ............................................................ 240
Neither agree nor disagree ........................................... 59
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 65
Strongly disagree .......................................................... 39

Q212. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

A. On the whole, my department colleagues are committed to supporting and promoting diversity and inclusion in the department.

Strongly agree ............................................................... 280
Somewhat agree ............................................................ 241
Neither agree nor disagree ........................................... 83
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 62
Strongly disagree .......................................................... 32

B. There is visible leadership at my institution for the support and promotion of diversity on campus.

Strongly agree ............................................................... 317
Somewhat agree ............................................................ 242
Neither agree nor disagree ........................................... 71
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 38
Strongly disagree .......................................................... 29
SECTION 15. APPRECIATION & RECOGNITION

Q215. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following: How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for your…

A. Teaching efforts

Very satisfied .................................................................................................................. 89
Satisfied ......................................................................................................................... 240
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ..................................................................................... 166
Dissatisfied ..................................................................................................................... 12
Very dissatisfied ............................................................................................................ 56

B. Student advising

Very satisfied .................................................................................................................. 50
Satisfied ......................................................................................................................... 173
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ..................................................................................... 204
Dissatisfied ..................................................................................................................... 127
Very dissatisfied ............................................................................................................ 70

C. Scholarly/creative work

Very satisfied .................................................................................................................. 97
Satisfied ......................................................................................................................... 260
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ..................................................................................... 159
Dissatisfied ..................................................................................................................... 98
Very dissatisfied ............................................................................................................ 56

D. Service contributions (e.g., department/program administration, faculty governance, committee work, advising/mentoring students, speaking to alumni or prospective students/parents)

Very satisfied .................................................................................................................. 61
Satisfied ......................................................................................................................... 198
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ..................................................................................... 219
Dissatisfied ..................................................................................................................... 119
Very dissatisfied ............................................................................................................ 71

E. [College or University Faculty] Outreach (e.g., extension, community engagement, technology transfer, economic development, K-12 education)

Very satisfied .................................................................................................................. 34
Satisfied ......................................................................................................................... 129
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ........................................ 210
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 70
Very dissatisfied .......................................................... 50

For all of your work, how satisfied are you with the recognition you receive from…

J. [Tenured Associate and Tenured Full] Your chief academic officer (provost, VPAA, dean of faculty)

Very satisfied .............................................................. 31
Satisfied ........................................................................ 73
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied........................................ 115
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 69
Very dissatisfied .......................................................... 49

K. [Tenured Associate and Tenured Full] Your dean or division head

Very satisfied .............................................................. 59
Satisfied ........................................................................ 95
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied........................................ 88
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 61
Very dissatisfied .......................................................... 40

L. Your department head or chair

Very satisfied .............................................................. 171
Satisfied ........................................................................ 209
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied........................................ 109
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 72
Very dissatisfied .......................................................... 60

I. Your colleagues/peers

Very satisfied .............................................................. 151
Satisfied ........................................................................ 291
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied........................................ 156
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 63
Very dissatisfied .......................................................... 33
Q220A-Q220B for Tenured Associate and Tenured Full

Q220. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

A. [University Faculty] I feel that my school/college is valued by this institution’s President/Chancellor and Provost.

- Strongly agree ................................................................. 122
- Somewhat agree ............................................................. 104
- Neither agree nor disagree ................................................. 46
- Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 57
- Strongly disagree ............................................................ 28

B. I feel that my department is valued by this institution’s President/Chancellor and Provost.

- Strongly agree ................................................................. 72
- Somewhat agree ............................................................. 85
- Neither agree nor disagree ................................................. 61
- Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 74
- Strongly disagree ............................................................ 48
SECTION 16. RECRUITMENT & RETENTION

Q240. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement(s):

A. [NTT or Tenured Associate or Tenured Full Faculty] Outside offers are not necessary as leverage in compensation negotiations

Strongly agree ................................................................. 30
Somewhat agree .............................................................. 62
Neither agree nor disagree ................................................. 48
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 141
Strongly disagree ............................................................ 239

My department is successful at...

B. [NTT or Tenured Associate or Tenured Full Faculty] Recruiting high-quality faculty members

Strongly agree ................................................................. 204
Somewhat agree .............................................................. 235
Neither agree nor disagree ................................................. 75
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 49
Strongly disagree ............................................................ 35

C. [NTT or Tenured Associate or Tenured Full Faculty] Retaining high-quality faculty members

Strongly agree ................................................................. 156
Somewhat agree .............................................................. 247
Neither agree nor disagree ................................................. 72
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 70
Strongly disagree ............................................................ 46

D. Addressing sub-standard tenured faculty performance

Strongly agree ................................................................. 49
Somewhat agree .............................................................. 131
Neither agree nor disagree ................................................. 116
Somewhat disagree ......................................................... 164
Strongly disagree ............................................................ 91
SECTION 17. GLOBAL SATISFACTION

Q245. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

A. The person who serves as the chief academic officer at my institution seems to care about the quality of life for faculty of my rank.

Strongly agree ................................................................. 106
Somewhat agree ............................................................ 164
Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 135
Somewhat disagree ........................................................... 87
Strongly disagree ............................................................. 72

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

Strongly agree ................................................................. 288
Somewhat agree ............................................................ 194
Neither agree nor disagree .............................................. 79
Somewhat disagree ........................................................... 55
Strongly disagree ............................................................. 43

Q250. Please rate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following:

A. All things considered, your department as a place to work

Very satisfied ................................................................. 231
Satisfied ......................................................................... 287
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ................................. 89
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 58
Very dissatisfied ............................................................. 38

B. All things considered, your institution as a place to work

Very satisfied ................................................................. 217
Satisfied ......................................................................... 283
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ................................. 111
Dissatisfied ................................................................. 66
Very dissatisfied ............................................................. 27
GUIDE TO GRAPHICS

The Final Report includes three sets of graphics in an effort to communicate as much detail as possible while still making meaningful comparison possible.

The first set of graphics shows the distribution of responses to all questions (pages 1-176 of the graphics). For each question, we have created two histograms: the top diagram shows the relative frequency with which Vanderbilt respondents chose each answer (labeled “VU Response”) and the bottom diagram shows the frequency with which peer institutions’ respondents chose each answer (labeled “Peer Response”). The histograms allow readers to see the distribution of responses, to visually compare it to Vanderbilt faculty’s responses to other questions, and to visually compare it to peers’ responses. There are more peer respondents because the Peer Response graph includes responses from all five of the provided peer institutions.

The second set of graphics compares levels of satisfaction by faculty subgroup (Pages 177-352 of the graphics). Most COACHE questions offer a Likert scale response format where two responses are normatively positive about the institution, one is neutral, and two are negative. The most common question format asks respondent’s level of satisfaction with a specific feature of work or the workplace. The next most common question format asks the level of agreement with a normatively positive statement about the institution. Thus, the satisfaction graphic reports the percentage of faculty who pick the top two answers to a question. The horizontal axis label indicates the question format for the specific question. The question itself is indicated by the main title for each graphic.

The satisfaction graphs are broken out by faculty subgroup. The subgroup is listed on the left vertical axis. A respondent is assigned to a subgroup based on self-identification. (If a respondent refused to identify, she is excluded from the responses when broken out by subgroup, but is reflected in the “Overall” number.) COACHE reports results based on the following subgroups:

- Race or Ethnicity: Asian/Asian-American (“Asian”), Under-Represented Minority (“URM”), or White (Non-Hispanic) (“White”).
- Gender: Male or Female.
- Rank: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Full Professor. (Rank reflects title not tenure-status.)

10 The survey is available at https://www4.vanderbilt.edu/secure/provost/SurveyQuestionsCOACHE.pdf.

11 The URM category includes any respondent who answered the race/ethnicity questions and did not identify as Asian, Asian-American or Pacific Islander or as White (Non-Hispanic).
- Tenure Status: Non-tenure track, tenure-track (pre-tenure), or tenured.

Vanderbilt responses in each subgroup are noted by a black dot and the corresponding rate of satisfaction for each of the five peer institutions is plotted using different colored dots. The line segments around each dot are the 95% confidence interval based on the responses and sample size in each group. The number on the right vertical axis is the number of respondents in each category for each institution. We include the overall satisfaction level for all respondents as the bottom category.

The third set of graphics shows the distribution of responses to the Vanderbilt-specific questions on equity, diversity, and inclusion (pages 352-367 of the graphics). We do not have peer data on these questions, thus the graphics only report the distribution for Vanderbilt respondents.
Distribution of Responses to All Questions
Expectations for finding external funding

**VU Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>250</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very 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>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Influence over focus of research

VU Response

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5

0 100 300

Very dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied Satisfied Very satisfied

Influence over focus of research

Peer Responses

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5

0 500 1500

Very dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied Satisfied Very satisfied

Peer Responses
Support for travel to present/conduct research

VU Response

Frequency

Very dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Satisfied
Very satisfied

Support for travel to present/conduct research

Peer Responses

Frequency

Very dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Satisfied
Very satisfied
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Support for faculty in leadership roles

VU Response

Support for faculty in leadership roles

Peer Responses
Equitability of committee assignments

VU Response

Equitability of committee assignments

Peer Responses
Number of courses taught

VU Response

- Very dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very satisfied

Number of courses taught

Peer Responses

- Very dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very satisfied
Quality of students taught

VU Response

Frequency

0 100 200 300

Very dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Satisfied
Very satisfied

Quality of students taught

Peer Responses

Frequency

0 400 800 1400

Very dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Satisfied
Very satisfied
Ability to balance teaching/research/service

VU Response

Frequency

0 100 200 300

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

VU Response

Ability to balance teaching/research/service

Frequency

0 400 800 1400

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

Peer Responses
Spousal/partner hiring program

VU Response

Frequency

0 40 80 120

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Very dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very satisfied

Spousal/partner hiring program

Peer Responses

Frequency

0 200 400

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Very dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very satisfied

Spousal/partner hiring program

Peer Responses
Right balance between professional and personal

VU Response

Strongly disagree
Somewhat disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat agree
Strongly agree

Peer Responses

Strongly disagree
Somewhat disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat agree
Strongly agree
Retirement benefits

VU Response

- Very dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very satisfied

Peer Responses

- Very dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Satisfied
- Very satisfied
Budgets encourage interdiscip. work

VU Response

Peer Responses
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit

VU Response

Peer Responses

Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion

VU Response

Frequency

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

Peer Responses

Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion

Frequency

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree
Interdiscip. work rewarded in tenure

VU Response

Peer Responses

Interdiscip. work rewarded in tenure
Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work

VU Response

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5
0 50 100 200

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree

Peer Responses

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5
0 200 600

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree

Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5
0 600

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
Collaboration opportunities in dept.

Frequency

0 100 200 300

VU Response

0 500 1000 1500

Collaboration opportunities in dept.

Frequency

0 500 1000 1500

Peer Responses
Collaboration opportunities external to VU

Frequency

VU Response

Collaboration opportunities external to VU

Frequency

Peer Responses
Mentoring within VU

VU Response

Mentoring within VU

Peer Responses
Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept.

VU Response

Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept.

Peer Responses
Mentoring of tenured assoc. prof. in dept.

VU Response

Frequency

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree

Mentoring of tenured assoc. prof. in dept.

Peer Responses
Being a mentor is fulfilling

VU Response

Peer Responses
Importance of dept. mentors to success

VU Response

Peer Responses

Importance of dept. mentors to success
Importance of VU mentors outside of dept. to success

VU Response

Importance of VU mentors outside of dept. to success

Peer Responses
Mentoring externally

VU Response

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5

0 50 150 250

Very ineffective Somewhat ineffective Neither effective nor ineffective Somewhat effective Very effective

Mentoring externally

Peer Responses

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5

0 400 800

Very ineffective Somewhat ineffective Neither effective nor ineffective Somewhat effective Very effective
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Consistency of messages about tenure

VU Response

Consistency of messages about tenure

Peer Responses
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Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen

VU Response

Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen

Peer Responses
Clarity of expectations: Broader community

VU Response

Clarity of expectations: Broader community

Peer Responses
Dept. encourages work toward promotion

Frequency

0 50 100

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree

VU Response

1 2 3 4 5

Dept. encourages work toward promotion

Frequency

0 200 600

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree

Strongly agree Somewhat agree

Peer Responses

1 2 3 4 5
Clarity of promotion process

VU Response

Clarity of promotion process

Peer Responses
Clarity of promotion dossier's contents

**VU Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Very unclear</th>
<th>Somewhat unclear</th>
<th>Neither clear nor unclear</th>
<th>Somewhat clear</th>
<th>Very clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Very unclear</th>
<th>Somewhat unclear</th>
<th>Neither clear nor unclear</th>
<th>Somewhat clear</th>
<th>Very clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VU’s priorities are stated consistently by leadership

Peer Responses

VU’s priorities are stated consistently by leadership

Peer Responses
VU's priorities are acted on consistently by leadership

VU Response

Peer Responses

VU's priorities are acted on consistently by leadership
Changed VU priorities negatively affect my work

VU Response

Strongly disagree  Neither agree nor disagree  Somewhat agree  Strongly agree

Peer Responses

Strongly disagree  Neither agree nor disagree  Somewhat agree  Strongly agree
Dean: Ensuring faculty input

VU Response

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5

0 50 150 250

Very dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied Satisfied Very satisfied

Dean: Ensuring faculty input

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5

0 200 600

Very dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied Satisfied Very satisfied

Peer Responses
Dean: Support for adapting to changed mission

**VU Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree

**Peer Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
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Effectiveness of shared governance

VU Response

Effectiveness of shared governance

Peer Responses
My governance committee makes progress toward goals

VU Response

Peer Responses

My governance committee makes progress toward goals
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Shared governance progress is publicly recognized

VU Response

Peer Responses
Understanding of process to express opinions on policies

**VU Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Faculty leaders and administrators follow rules of engagement

VU Response

Peer Responses

Faculty leaders and administrators follow rules of engagement
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Faculty leaders and admin. have open system of communication

VU Response

Faculty leaders and admin. have open system of communication

Peer Responses
Faculty leaders and admin. discuss difficult issues in good faith

VU Response

Faculty leaders and admin. discuss difficult issues in good faith

Peer Responses
Imp. decisions are not made until consensus among fac. leaders and admin.

VU Response

Peer Responses

Imp. decisions are not made until consensus among fac. leaders and admin.
Administrators allow time for faculty input

VU Response

Peer Responses

Administrators allow time for faculty input
Fac. leaders and admin. respectfully consider the other's view

VU Response

Fac. leaders and admin. respectfully consider the other's view

Peer Responses
Fac. leaders and admin. share responsibility for VU welfare

VU Response

Peer Responses

Fac. leaders and admin. share responsibility for VU welfare
Faculty governance structure allows individual input

VU Response

Peer Responses

Faculty governance structure allows individual input
Faculty leaders and administrators have equal say in governance

VU Response

Peer Responses

Faculty leaders and administrators have equal say in governance
Faculty leaders and administrators define decision criteria

VU Response

Frequency

Never

Seldom

Occasionally

Regularly

Frequently

Peer Responses

Faculty leaders and administrators define decision criteria

Frequency

Never

Seldom

Occasionally

Regularly

Frequently
Shared governance holds up under unusual circumstances

VU Response

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

Peer Responses

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree
Instit. systematically reviewed effectiveness of dec. making processes

VU Response

Peer Responses
VU cultivates new faculty leaders

Frequency

Never Seldom Occasionally Regularly Frequently

VU Response

VU cultivates new faculty leaders

Frequency

Never Seldom Occasionally Regularly Frequently

Peer Responses
Dept. meetings are at time compatible to family needs

VU Response

Frequency

0 100 200

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree

VU Response

Dept. meetings are at time compatible to family needs

Frequency

0 400 800 1200

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree

Peer Responses
Discussions of undergrad student learning (frequency)

VU Response

Peer Responses

Discussions of undergrad student learning (frequency)
Discussions of grad student learning (frequency)

VU Response

Peer Responses

Discussions of grad student learning (frequency)
Discussions of effective use of technology (frequency)

VU Response

Peer Responses
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Dept. successful retaining high-quality faculty

VU Response

Frequency

0 100 200

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree

Dept. successful retaining high-quality faculty

Peer Responses

Frequency

0 400 800

Strongly disagree Somewhat disagree Neither agree nor disagree Somewhat agree Strongly agree
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Dept. is valued by Chancellor and Provost

VU Response

Peer Responses
Provost cares about quality of life for faculty at my rank

VU Response

Peer Responses
Outside offers unnecessary for compensation negotiations

VU Response

Peer Responses
Visible leadership support and promotion of diversity

VU Response

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5

0 100 200 300

Strongly disagree
Somewhat disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat agree
Strongly agree

Visible leadership support and promotion of diversity

Peer Responses

Frequency

1 2 3 4 5

0 400 800 1200

Strongly disagree
Somewhat disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Somewhat agree
Strongly agree
I would still choose VU

VU Response

I would still choose VU

Peer Responses
Levels of Satisfaction by Faculty Subgroup
Expectations for finding external funding

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

- Overall
  - Tenured
  - Tenure Track
  - Non-Tenure Track
  - URM
  - Asian
  - White
  - Male
  - Female
  - Asst. Prof.
  - Assoc. Prof.
  - Full Prof.
  - Overall

Percent values range from 0.0 to 1.0.
Influence over focus of research

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Percent satisfied or very satisfied
### Quality of grad students to support research

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied/Very Satisfied</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall: 46.8%  Tenured: 54.9%  Tenure Trk.: 56.8%  Non-Tenure Trk.: 50.0%  Asst. Prof.: 51.6%  Assoc. Prof.: 49.4%  Full Prof.: 51.7%
Support for engaging undergrads in research

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured Trk.

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenured

Overall

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Support for maintaining grants (post-award)

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Support for securing grad student assistance

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Support for travel to present/conduct research

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non–Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for travel to present/conduct research</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for travel to present/conduct research</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for travel to present/conduct research</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for travel to present/conduct research</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for travel to present/conduct research</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for travel to present/conduct research</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for travel to present/conduct research</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for travel to present/conduct research</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Support for Faculty in Leadership Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent Agrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent somewhat or strongly agree**
Attractiveness of committees

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non–Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non–Tenure Trk</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Time spent on teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>373</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent satisfied</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Time spent on teaching is measured on a scale from 0.0 to 1.0, where 1.0 represents the highest level of satisfaction.
- Each category (Overall, Tenured, Tenure Trk., Non-Tenure Trk., Asst. Prof., Assoc. Prof., Full Prof., Female, Male, White, Asian, URM) represents a group of educators.
- The data points for each category are plotted on a graph, with the x-axis representing the percent satisfied or very satisfied and the y-axis representing the counts.
- The graph includes markers for different racial and gender categories, with categories like 'Female', 'Male', 'White', 'Asian', and 'URM'.

---

**Note:** The graph and table above represent the distribution of time spent on teaching among different groups of educators, with a focus on those who are very satisfied or satisfied with their teaching efforts.
Discretion over course content

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall
Quality of students taught

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Equitability of distribution of teaching load

Percent satisfied or very satisfied
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent satisfied or very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>9 126 26 122 68 50 12 96 31 137 45 30 104 1016 227 933 685 369 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>35 722 173 743 513 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30 516 100 449 285 179 29 267 40 378 105 119 32 367 59 406 260 101 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29 267 40 378 105 119 32 367 59 406 260 101 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29 267 40 378 105 119 32 367 59 406 260 101 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>29 267 40 378 105 119 32 367 59 406 260 101 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>29 267 40 378 105 119 32 367 59 406 260 101 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>29 267 40 378 105 119 32 367 59 406 260 101 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non–Tenure Trk</td>
<td>24 234 39 210 103 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>24 234 39 210 103 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>24 234 39 210 103 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>24 234 39 210 103 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent satisfied or very satisfied
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent satisfied or very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Trk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Right balance between professional and personal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non–Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent somewhat or strongly agree
Budgets encourage interdiscip. work

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk.

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

White

URM

Asian

Female

Male

Overall

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Female

Male

Overall

Percent somewhat or strongly agree
Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

URM

Asian

White

Male

Female

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

 Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non–Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaboration opportunities in dept.

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Non−T enure Trk

White

Male

Female

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Non−Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Overall
### Collaboration opportunities within VU

#### Percent satisfied or very satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>URM</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>URM</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>URM</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentoring within dept.

Percent somewhat or very effective

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept.

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>3,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Trk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent somewhat or strongly agree
Being a mentor is fulfilling

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non–Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages are shown on the x-axis.
Importance of dept. mentors to success

Percent important or very important

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall
Importance of VU mentors outside of dept. to success

Percent important or very important

Overall

Non-Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall
### Clarity of tenure standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent somewhat or very clear</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Consistency of messages about tenure

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Tenure is based on performance

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

URM

Asian

White

Male

Female

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Overall

Percent somewhat or strongly agree
Clarity of expectations: Scholar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Trk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent somewhat or very clear
Clarity of expectations: Advisor

Percent somewhat or very clear

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

White
Clarity of expectations: Colleague

Percent somewhat or very clear
Clarity of expectations: Broader community

Percent somewhat or very clear

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.
Dept. encourages work toward promotion

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

White

Male

Female

Asian

URM
Clarity of promotion process

Percent somewhat or very clear

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Clarity
### Clarity of likelihood of promotion

#### Percent somewhat or very clear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non–Tenure Trk</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non–Tenure Trk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VU’s priorities are stated consistently by leadership

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.
VU's priorities are acted on consistently by leadership

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Changed VU priorities negatively affect my work

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Provost: Stated priorities

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Dean: Communication of priorities

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

URM

Asian

White

White

Female

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Overall

Percent satisfied or very satisfied
Dean: Ensuring faculty input

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non–Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>729</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent satisfied or very satisfied
Chair: Ensuring faculty input

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent satisfaction ranges from 0.0 to 1.0.
Chair: Support for adapting to changed mission

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall
Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM

Non−T enure Trk

Tenured

Overall

Percent satisfied or very satisfied
Effectiveness of shared governance

Percent somewhat or very effective

Overall
Tenured
Tenure Trk.
Non−Tenure Trk
Asst. Prof.
Assoc. Prof.
Full Prof.
Male
Female
White
Asian
URM
My governance committee makes progress toward goals

Percent regularly or frequently

- URM
- Asian
- White
- Male
- Female
- Asst. Prof.
- Assoc. Prof.
- Full Prof.
- Non-Tenure Trk
- Tenure Trk.
- Tenured
- Overall

Overall 236 235 312 164 296 136
Tenured 35 29 57 16 43 28
Non-Tenure Trk 105 120 210 164 177
Tenure Trk. 28 43 16 57 29
Assoc. Prof. 55 125 44 198 115
Asst. Prof. 19 87 17 130 35
Female 19 45 9 127 317
Male 317 280 433 170 400
White 143 170 433 280 317
URM 12 44 20 46 39
Asian 9 45 12 59 15
Full Prof. 12 115 198 44 125
Assoc. Prof. 55 125 44 198 115
Non-Tenure Trk 105 120 210 164 177
Tenure Trk. 28 43 16 57 29
Tenured 35 105 120 210 164
Overall 236 235 312 164 296
Shared governance progress is publicly recognized

Percent regularly or frequently

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Understanding of process to express opinions on policies

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall  
Tenured  
Tenure Trk.  
Non–Tenure Trk  
Asst. Prof.  
Assoc. Prof.  
Full Prof.  
Female  
Male  
White  
Asian  
URM

Percent somewhat or strongly agree
Faculty leaders and administrators follow rules of engagement

Percent regularly or frequently

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Faculty leaders and admin. have open system of communication

Percent regularly or frequently

Overall

Non-Tenure Trk.

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Faculty leaders and admin. discuss difficult issues in good faith

Percent regularly or frequently

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Imp. decisions are not made until consensus among fac. leaders and admin.
Administrators allow time for faculty input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non–Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent regularly or frequently
Fac. leaders and admin. respectfully consider the other's view

Percent regularly or frequently

URM
Asian
White
Male
Female
Asst. Prof.
Assoc. Prof.
Full Prof.
Non–Tenure Trk
Tenure Trk
Tenured
Overall
Faculty governance structure allows individual input

Percent regularly or frequently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non–Tenure Trk</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Faculty leaders and administrators have equal say in governance

Percent regularly or frequently

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Faculty leaders and administrators define decision criteria

Percent regularly or frequently
Shared governance holds up under unusual circumstances

Percent regularly or frequently

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk

Non-Tenure Trk

Full Prof

Assoc. Prof

Asst. Prof

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Instit. systematically reviewed effectiveness of dec. making processes

Percent regularly or frequently
VU cultivates new faculty leaders

Percent regularly or frequently

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non-Tenure Trk

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

16 76 29 58 47 40 14 58 75 25 43 179 644 194 604 365 483 132 413 434 251 232 77 365 83 303 186 253 42 163 27 220 49 112 59 228 48 273 142 134 108 331 137 244 208 236 0 250 25 258 106 185 34 84 26 101 36 63 185 444 185 378 295 317 209 778 236 737 437 565
Dept. meetings are at time compatible to family needs

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

URM

Asian

White

Male

Female

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent satisfied or very satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0

URM
Asian
White
Male
Female
Asst. Prof.
Assoc. Prof.
Full Prof.
Non–Tenure Trk
Tenure Trk.
Tenured
Overall
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Dept. colleagues pitch in when needed

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non−Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

Overall
### Department is collegial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent somewhat or strongly agree</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3434</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dept. colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non–Tenure Trk</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussions of effective teaching practices (frequency)

Percent regularly or frequently
Discussions of current research methods (frequency)

Percent regularly or frequently

Overall

Tenured

Tenure Trk.

Non–Tenure Trk

Full Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Asst. Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM
Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

- URM
- Asian
- White
- Male
- Female
- Asst. Prof.
- Assoc. Prof.
- Full Prof.
- Non-Tenure Trk
- Tenure Trk.
- Tenured
- Overall
Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

URM

Asian

White

Male

Female

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Overall
## Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty in dept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Trk</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td>3540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>2128</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>3920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent satisfied or very satisfied

![Graph showing satisfaction levels across different categories](image)

- Overall: 675
- Tenured: 1020
- Tenure Trk.: 1656
- Non-Tenure Trk: 298
- Full Prof.: 1800
- Assoc. Prof.: 1856
- Asst. Prof.: 134
- Female: 1020
- Male: 1538
- White: 867
- Asian: 354
- URM: 367
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Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty in dept.

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Non-Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

White

Male

Female

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Non-Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

White

Male

Female

Asian

URM

Overall

Tenured

Non-Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.
Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty in dept.

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall

Tenured

Non-Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Male

Female

White

Asian

URM
Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty in dept.

Overall

Percent satisfied or very satisfied
Dept. addresses sub-standard tenured faculty performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Trk.</td>
<td>1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Trk</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>1188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0
## Recognition: For teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>618</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>753</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>680</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>494</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>793</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>859</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent satisfied or very satisfied
Recognition: For advising

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

URM

Asian

White

Male

Female

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Tenured

Overall
Recognition: For scholarship

Percent satisfied or very satisfied

Overall
Tenured
Tenure Trk.
Tenured
Non–Tenure Trk
Tenure Trk.
Full Prof.
Assoc. Prof.
Asst. Prof.
Female
Male
White
Asian
URM
### Recognition: For outreach

#### Percent satisfied or very satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non–Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The diagram shows the distribution of satisfaction levels across different categories, with bars representing the number of individuals. The percentages at the bottom indicate the proportion of satisfied or very satisfied responses within each category.
### Provost cares about quality of life for faculty at my rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>URM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asst. Prof.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assoc. Prof.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Prof.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Tenure Trk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Trk.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenured</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent somewhat or strongly agree
Outside offers unnecessary for compensation negotiations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Trk.</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Trk</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent somewhat or strongly agree</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall | 305 | 580 | 686 | 185 | 935 | 771 | 564 |
| Tenured | 64  | 77  | 160 | 29  | 176 | 54  | 195 |
| Tenure Trk. | 133 | 364 | 438 | 30  | 253 | 98  | 130 |
| Non-Tenure Trk | 220 | 400 | 438 | 139 | 1053| 1140| 1140|
| Asst. Prof. | 252 | 280 | 252 | 398 | 398 | 398 | 398 |
| Assoc. Prof. | 312 | 280 | 252 | 30  | 253 | 129 | 129 |
| Full Prof. | 69   | 86   | 130 | 364 | 364 | 364 | 364 |
| Female | 312 | 491 | 802 | 155 | 797 | 129 | 312 |
| Male | 472 | 655 | 1053| 199 | 131 | 131 | 131 |
| White | 40   | 46   | 131 | 19  | 93  | 14  | 40   |
| Asian | 52   | 70   | 108 | 29  | 77  | 14  | 52   |
| URM | 18   | 29   | 70  | 14  | 19  | 46  | 18   |
Visible leadership support and promotion of diversity

Percent somewhat or strongly agree

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Asian

URM

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.

Asst. Prof.

Assoc. Prof.

Full Prof.

Female

Male

White

Overall

Tenured

Non–Tenure Trk

Tenure Trk.
Vanderbilt-Specific Questions
Overall, do you feel the university is an inclusive environment for community members from all backgrounds?
Overall, do you feel the university is an equitable environment for community members from all backgrounds?

![Survey Results Chart]

- **Strongly agree**
- **Somewhat agree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Somewhat disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-ten</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian Amer.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The chart reflects the percentage of responses for each category.*
How satisfied are you with the university's efforts to recruit a diverse faculty?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Pre-Ten</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Assoc</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian/Asian Amer.</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Experience of Discriminatory Behavior in Last Year: Percent Answering Very Often, Often, or Sometimes

- Income and Socioeconomic Status
- Sexual orientation
- Religious Views/Affiliation
- Race
- Pregnancy
- Political Views/Affiliation
- Physical Characteristics
- Gender Identity
- Ethnicity/National Origin
- English Language Proficiency
- Disability Status
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your age?

- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-ten</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian Amer.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your disability status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Pre-ten</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Assoc</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian/Asian Amer.</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your English language proficiency?
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your gender identity?
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your physical characteristics?

- **Very often**
- **Often**
- **Sometimes**
- **Seldom**
- **Never**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Pre-ten</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Assoc</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian/Asian Amer.</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>604</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**75%**

**80%**

**85%**

**90%**

**95%**

**100%**

**Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your physical characteristics?**
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your political affiliation?
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your pregnancy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Pre-ten</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Assoc</th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian/Asian Amer.</th>
<th>URM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your race?
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your religious views/affiliation?
Within the past year, how often (if ever) have you personally experienced any discriminatory behavior at Vanderbilt University that you believe was based on your income and socioeconomic status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-ten</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian Amer.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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