



Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE)
Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey
 2005-2006

Purpose of the Survey

This survey was commissioned by the ACES group to examine how tenure-track faculty at Case perceive their current job environment and satisfaction relative to similar other tenure-track faculty at peer institutions. Approval was obtained through the Case IRB to use the results for research purposes.

Identification of subjects

All eligible subjects at Case were invited to complete the survey. Eligibility was determined according to the following criteria: Full-time; Tenure-track/ladder rank; Pre-tenure; Hired prior to Summer 2005 (new hires are unable to respond meaningfully to many questions); Not *clinical* faculty in such areas as Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine; Not in terminal year after being denied tenure.

Procedure for subject recruitment and participation

Subjects first received an e-mail about the survey from the Provost, John Anderson on October 15, 2006. Next, subjects received an email from COACHE (coache@gse.harvard.edu) on October 19th, inviting them to complete the survey, followed by reminders on the following November 21st and December 15th. The survey remained open online for participation until January 18, 2006. Participants accessed a secure server through their own unique link provided by COACHE and responded to a series of 50 multiple-choice and open ended questions. The average survey completion time was approximately 20 minutes.

Participants

Rank	Base	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor/Lecturer	Decline to answer
Case Western Reserve University	62	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
All Universities	4506	1%	10%	89%	0%	0%

Rank	Male	Female	Total
Assistant Professor	38	24	62

Race/ Ethnicity	Base	White, Non- Hispanic	American Indian/ Native Alaskan	Asian / Pacific Islander	Black, Non- Hispanic	Hispanic	Other	Decline to answer
Case Western Reserve University	62	76%	0%	16%	8%	0%	0%	0%
All Universities	4506	74%	1%	14%	6%	4%	1%	0%

Age	Base	30 or less	31-35	36-40	41-45	46+	Decline to answer
Case Western Reserve University	62	0%	30%	34%	24%	6%	5%
All Universities	4506	4%	27%	31%	17%	17%	4%

Annual salary	Base	Less than \$30,000	\$30,000 to \$44,999	\$45,000 to \$59,999	\$60,000 to \$74,999	\$75,000 to \$89,999	\$90,000 or above	Decline to answer
Case Western Reserve University	62	0%	0%	28%	20%	27%	23%	2%
All Universities	4506	0%	4%	38%	25%	14%	16%	3%

The comparison/peers institutions chosen by Case were:

Brown University
Dartmouth University
Northeastern University
Stanford University
Tufts University

Response rates of the faculty population

	Total	Males	Females	White Faculty	Faculty of Color	Missing Race Data
N of Population	115	70	45	87	28	-
N of Responders	62	32	30	45	17	-
Response Rate	54%	46%	67%	52%	61%	

Summary of Results

In the current document, given the initial stages of data analysis and the breadth of information contained in the COACHE feedback report, we highlight areas in which Case scored at least one standard deviation above or below the mean of its peer institutions.

Overall Results

Tenure

Higher Scores at Case

Compared to junior faculty at peer institutions, junior faculty at Case rated the following *more than* one standard deviation **above** the mean:

- clarity of their own prospects for earning tenure

Lower Scores at Case

Compared to junior faculty at peer institutions, junior faculty at Case rated the following *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean:

- clarity of
 - the body of evidence that will be considered in making decisions about their own tenure
 - the expectations for performance as a student advisor and
- reasonableness of the expectations for performance as a student advisor

Nature of Work

Lower Scores at Case

Compared to junior faculty at peer institutions, junior faculty at Case were *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean on:

- satisfaction with
 - the way they spend their time as faculty members
 - the level of the courses they teach
 - the number of courses they teach
 - the influence they have over which courses they teach
 - the discretion they have over the content of the courses they teach
- the quality of
 - graduate students with whom they interact
 - clerical/administrative services
 - teaching services
 - computing services
- the amount of
 - time they have to conduct research

- research funding they are expected to find
- access they have to Teaching Fellows, Graduate Assistants, et al
- the influence they have over the focus of their research

Policies and Practices

Higher Scores at Case

Compared to junior faculty at peer institutions, junior faculty at Case were *more than one* standard deviation *above* the mean on reporting that:

- their departmental colleagues do what they can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible

Lower Scores at Case

Compared to junior faculty at peer institutions, Case junior faculty were *more than one* standard deviation *below* the mean on:

- the institution does what it can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible
- satisfaction with
 - how well they "fit" in their department
 - the intellectual vitality of the senior colleagues in their department
 - their department as a place to work
 - their institution as a place to work
- reporting
 - a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty in their department
 - a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty in their School
 - that their department treats junior faculty fairly compared to one another
 - that the chief academic officer at their institution seems to care about the quality of life for junior faculty
 - that if they had to do it over again, they would accept their current position
- rating their institution as a place for junior faculty to work

The following items were most frequently rated as **IMPORTANT** to junior faculty success, but **INEFFECTIVE** at Case overall:

1. Childcare
2. Professional assistance in obtaining externally funded grants
3. Spousal/partner hiring program

Global Satisfaction

Lower Scores at Case

Compared to junior faculty at peer institutions, junior faculty at Case were *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean on satisfaction with

- the fairness of their immediate supervisor's evaluation of their work

In addition to or instead of checking the two best/worst aspects about working at Case, some junior faculty provided the following comments:

BEST ASPECTS

- Data access from Community.
- Long tenure clock.
- Interdisciplinary collaboration opportunities.

WORST ASPECTS

- Culture for women in Engineering/Science is negative and uncomfortable.
- Faculty morale and cohesion at the School level.
- Lack of interest of the school Administration in our research.
- Administrative chaos.
- Lack of funding for Graduate students.
- Collegiality of department (lack thereof).
- Incompetent administration (business manager, secretary support).
- Small number of colleagues in Department.
- Absence of a vibrant Doctoral program.
- Percentage of salary recovery from grants for Junior faculty.
- Terrible Facilities.

	These items were most frequently rated as the best aspects about working at Case.	These items were most frequently rated as the worst aspects about working at Case.
Overall	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality of undergraduate students 2. Support of colleagues 2. Teaching load 2. Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of assistance for grant proposals 2. Quality of facilities 3. Availability/quality of childcare facilities 4. Spousal/partner hiring program (or lack thereof) 4. Quality of graduate students 4. Unrelenting pressure to perform 4. Support of colleagues
Males	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues 2. My sense of "fit" here 3. Quality of undergraduate students 4. Quality of colleagues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of assistance for grant proposals 2. Quality of facilities 3. Support of colleagues 4. Availability/quality of childcare facilities 4. Spousal/partner hiring program (or lack thereof) 4. Lack of support for research
Females	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support of colleagues 2. Teaching load 3. Quality of undergraduate students 4. Cost of living 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of diversity 2. Quality of graduate students 3. Unrelenting pressure to perform 4. Availability/quality of childcare facilities
White Faculty	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality of undergraduate students 2. Teaching load 3. Support of colleagues 4. Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues 4. My sense of "fit" here 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality of facilities 2. Lack of assistance for grant proposals 3. Availability/quality of childcare facilities 3. Unrelenting pressure to perform 3. Absence of others like me
Faculty of Color	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost of living 2. Support of colleagues 2. Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues 4. My sense of "fit" here 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality of graduate students 2. Geographic location 3. Quality of colleagues 4. My lack of "fit" here 4. Tenure criteria clarity

Gender Results

A. Within Case:

Female junior faculty were **more** satisfied than were male junior faculty with:

- the number of students they teach
- their compensation

B. Compared to peer institutions:

Male Junior Faculty

Higher Scores at Case

Compared to male junior faculty at peer institutions, male junior faculty at Case rated the following *more than* one standard deviation **above** the mean:

- reasonableness of the expectations for performance as a scholar
- efforts by departmental colleagues to make
 - having children and the tenure-track compatible
 - raising children and the tenure-track compatible

Lower Scores at Case

Compared to *male* junior faculty at peer institutions, male junior faculty at Case rated the following *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean:

- clarity of the body of evidence that will be considered in making decisions about their own tenure
- reasonableness of the expectations for performance as a student advisor

Compared to male junior faculty at peer institutions, male junior faculty at Case were *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean on:

- satisfaction with
 - the way they spend their time as faculty members
 - the balance they are able to strike between professional time and personal or family time
 - their department as a place to work
 - their institution as a place to work
- the level of the courses they teach
- the number of
 - courses they teach
 - students they teach
- the influence they have over which courses they teach
- the discretion they have over the content of the courses they teach
- the amount of
 - time they have to conduct research
 - access they have to Teaching Fellows, Graduate Assistants, et al.

- the quality of
 - clerical/administrative services
 - teaching services
 - computing services
- effort by the institution to make having children and the tenure-track compatible
- a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty
 - in their department
 - in their School
- perception that the chief academic officer at their institution cares about the quality of life for junior faculty
- rating their institution as a place for junior faculty to work

Female Junior Faculty

Higher Scores at Case

Compared to female junior faculty at peer institutions, female junior faculty at Case rated clarity of the following *more than* one standard deviation **above** the mean:

- the standards for tenure
- their own prospects for earning tenure
- the expectations for performance as a teacher

Compared to female junior faculty at peer institutions, female junior faculty at Case were *more than* one standard deviation **above** the mean on satisfaction with

- the number of students they teach

Lower Scores at Case

Compared to female junior faculty at peer institutions, female junior faculty at Case rated the following *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean:

- reasonableness of the expectations for performance as
 - a student advisor
 - a department colleague
 - a campus citizen
- the level of the courses they teach
- the influence they have over the focus of their research
- the amount of access they have to Teaching Fellows, Graduate Assistants, et al.,
- the quality of
 - clerical/administrative services
 - teaching services
 - graduate students with whom they interact
- efforts by their institution to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible
- satisfaction with
 - the way they spend their time as faculty members

- the amount of personal interaction they have with junior colleagues in their department
- the intellectual vitality of the senior colleagues in their department
- their department as a place to work
- their institution as a place to work
- a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty in their School
- the perception that the chief academic officer at their institution cares about the quality of life for junior faculty

Race Results

A. Within Case

White junior faculty *more* than junior faculty of color:

- found the tenure process to be clearer

White junior faculty were *more* satisfied than were junior faculty of color with:

- the quality of undergraduate students with whom they interact
- the amount of
 - professional interaction they have with junior colleagues in their department
 - personal interaction they have with junior colleagues in their department

White junior faculty agreed *to a greater extent* than did junior faculty of color that their departmental colleagues do what they can to make:

- having children and the tenure-track compatible
- raising children and the tenure-track compatible

B. Compared to peer institutions:

White Junior Faculty

Higher Scores at Case

Compared to white junior faculty at peer institutions, white junior faculty at Case rated clarity of the following *more than* one standard deviation *above* the mean:

- the criteria for tenure
- the standards for tenure

Compared to white junior faculty at peer institutions, white junior faculty at Case were *more than* one standard deviation *above* the mean on:

- reporting that their departmental colleagues do what they can to make
 - having children and the tenure-track compatible
 - raising children and the tenure-track compatible

- satisfaction with the amount of professional interaction they have with junior colleagues in their department

Lower Scores at Case

Compared to white junior faculty at peer institutions, white junior faculty at Case rated the following *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean:

- clarity of the expectations for performance as a student advisor
- reasonableness of
 - the expectations for performance as a student advisor
 - the expectations for performance as a department colleague

Compared to white junior faculty at peer institutions, white junior faculty at Case were *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean on:

- the level of the courses they teach
- the number of courses they teach
- the influence they have over which courses they teach
- the discretion they have over the content of the courses they teach
- the amount of
 - access they have to Teaching Fellows, Graduate Assistants, et al
 - personal interaction they have with senior colleagues in their department
- the quality of
 - clerical/administrative services
 - teaching services
 - computing services
 - graduate students with whom they interact
- satisfaction with
 - how well they "fit" in their department
 - the way they spend their time as faculty members
 - the intellectual vitality of the senior colleagues in their department
 - their department as a place to work
 - their institution as a place to work
- reporting
 - that the chief academic officer at their institution seems to care about the quality of life for junior faculty
 - a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty in their department
 - a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty in their School
 - that their department treats junior faculty fairly compared to one another
- rating their institution as a place for junior faculty to work

Junior Faculty of Color

Higher Scores at Case

Compared to junior faculty of color at peer institutions, junior faculty of color at Case rated clarity of the following *more than* one standard deviation **above** the mean:

- their own prospects for earning tenure
- the expectations for performance as a teacher

Lower Scores at Case

Compared to junior faculty of color at peer institutions, junior faculty of color at Case rated the following *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean:

- clarity of
 - the tenure process
 - criteria for tenure
 - the standards for tenure
 - the body of evidence that will be considered in making decisions about their own tenure
- reasonableness of
 - the expectations for performance as a student advisor
 - the expectations for performance as a community member

Compared to junior faculty of color at peer institutions, junior faculty of color at Case were *more than* one standard deviation **below** the mean on:

- reporting
 - the perception that tenure decisions are based primarily on performance
 - the way they spend their time as faculty members
 - that their institution does what it can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible
 - that their departmental colleagues do what they can to make having children and the tenure-track compatible
 - that their departmental colleagues do what they can to make raising children and the tenure-track compatible
 - a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty in their department
 - a feeling of unity and cohesion among the faculty in their School
 - that their department treats junior faculty fairly compared to one another
 - that the chief academic officer at their institution seems to care about the quality of life for junior faculty
- satisfaction with
 - the discretion they have over the content of the courses they teach
 - the number of students they teach
 - the quality of undergraduate students with whom they interact
 - what's expected of them as researchers
 - the amount of time they have to conduct research
 - the amount of research funding they are expected to find
 - the influence they have over the focus of their research
 - the amount of access they have to Teaching Fellows, Graduate Assistants, et al.
 - the quality of clerical/administrative services, satisfaction with the quality of teaching services
 - the quality of computing services

- the amount of professional interaction they have with junior colleagues in their department
- the amount of personal interaction they have with junior colleagues in their department
- their department as a place to work
- their institution as a place to work
- rating their institution as a place for junior faculty to work

Examples of Open-ended Responses from Case

Q27b. On what are tenure decisions in your department primarily based? *Subjects responding "Somewhat disagree" or "Strongly disagree" to Question 27a ("From what I can gather, tenure decisions here are based primarily on performance rather than on politics, relationships, or demographics.") were asked this follow-up question.*

Female junior faculty who disagree that tenure decisions in their department are based primarily on performance think they are based on:

“Scholarship (quantity and quality), being at least a marginally acceptable teacher, and getting along (and maintaining the appropriate relationships) with fellow faculty. I also get the feeling that much of it is beyond the individual professor's control and depends on politics which are not entirely known or understood to me.”

“In my Department, not necessarily at the School level, I think the decision to recommend me for tenure (or not) would be based on: 1) Publication record (quantity and status of publication outlets); 2) Do the Senior members think work is "interesting," "unique/original," and well-regarded by their peers at other institutions; 3) Do they like me personally -- do they think I make a "positive" contribution to the Department?”

Male junior faculty who disagree that tenure decisions in their department are based primarily on performance think they are based on:

“It's difficult to say for sure. Ostensibly on your creative work, teaching, and service. However, senior colleagues have been tenured without doing any of these to any substantial degree and despite of departmental votes. The political situation in my department is very, very unpleasant and the university doesn't seem to have the courage to take the necessary steps to correct it.”

“Money.”

“According to their interests and biases.”

“It is very unclear to me. Right now, a colleague of mine is promoted to tenured faculty although he does not meet the research and student training standards that are said to be required. I am confused.”

Q47. Assuming you achieve tenure, how long do you plan to remain at your institution?

Subjects responding "For no more than 5 years after earning tenure" to this question were asked to specify their reasons:

Female junior faculty who plan to leave within 5 years of tenure will do so because:

"My children will be older, and being near family will be less of a priority, so I will likely seek out another institution."

"Location and lack of good collaborations."

"Lack of fit."

"It depends on whether my husband, also an academic, can get a position in the area."

"I am dissatisfied here."

"I would like to move to an area closer to family."

"The facilities look like they will not improve and my life will not improve."

"Hostile atmosphere to women."

Male junior faculty who plan to leave within 5 years of tenure will do so because:

"The Department politics are unbearable and the facilities are awful. Otherwise I'd stay for my career."

"Geographic Preferences."

"Better facilities elsewhere."

"I'd like to work with better undergraduate students."

"Hate this place."

"Incompetent administration in Department and University; lack of facilities; grad student tuition and course load is too high to afford grad students, and to give students enough time for research outside the classroom."

"I hope for a place for scientists, not businessmen."

"Better for me."

“I do not fit here.”

Conclusions

The junior faculty experience at Case appears to be more negative and less satisfying than that at other similar institutions. The preponderance of statistically significant item differences showed Case to be at least one standard deviation below the means of other schools. The results highlight certain key problem areas in the work experience of junior faculty at Case, as follows.

1. Lack of clarity about the body of evidence required for tenure. Lack of clarity and perceived unfairness of the tenure process are particularly problematic for junior faculty of color.
2. Dissatisfaction related to teaching and student advising.
3. Dissatisfaction about the time available to conduct research.
4. Low quality of infrastructure to support academic activities (including clerical/administrative services, teaching services, computing services, access to high-quality TAs and RAs, grant proposal assistance)
5. Ineffective childcare and spousal/partner hiring program at Case
6. Institution does not do enough to enable junior faculty with children to move toward tenure
7. Lack of fairness in evaluation and treatment of junior faculty
8. Low ratings that the chief academic officer seems to care about the quality of life for junior faculty
9. Lack of faculty unity and cohesion in the department and School
10. Low quality of students with whom junior faculty interact
11. Few personal interactions with departmental colleagues experienced by women faculty and faculty of color, and few professional interactions with departmental colleagues experienced by faculty of color
12. Unreasonable expectations for women and faculty of color as department colleagues and community members