Benchmarks Dashboard

COACHE Dashboard Guide

This is the overall score (*between 1 and 5*) for all faculty respondents at your institution.

These columns describe how your faculty's responses compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions: tenured vs. tenured, men vs. men, faculty of color vs. faculty of color, etc.

These columns compare groups on your campus: pre-tenure/tenured, associate/full, women/men, white/faculty of color.

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	tenure	rank	gender	race	2008
Health and retirement benefits	3.43	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	pre-ten	full	women		
Interdisciplinary work	3.00	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	pre-ten	assoc	women	white	
Collaboration	3.46	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	tenured		women	white	
Mentoring	3.18	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	◄►	tenured	assoc		foc	
Tenure policies	3.64	◄►	N/A	◄►	N/A	N/A	◄►	◄►	◄►	N<5	N/A	N/A		+
Tenure clarity	3.33	◄►	N/A	◄►	N/A	N/A	◄►	◄►	◄►	N<5	N/A	N/A	men	

What do these triangles mean?

These symbols represent results that fit COACHE's criteria for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

Your ranking among peers: Your percentile among your cohort:
- 1st or 2nd   ◄ ►   Top 30%
- 3rd or 4th   ◄ ►   Middle 40%
- 5th or 6th   ◄ ►   Bottom 30%
- *insufficient data for reporting*   ◁

*This result, for example, shows that your female faculty are **less satisfied** than are women at your peers (◄), but **more satisfied** than are women at 70% of other institutions (►). Although the women at your institution are "less satisfied" than women at peers, they still fare better than most.*

And these results?

Here, the faculty subgroup with the *lower* rating appears. Shading conveys the *magnitude* of sub-group differences: small effects appear as text only, moderate effects are shaded yellow, and large effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as +/-.

Regardless of your results compared to peers and others (on the left), you should direct your concern to subgroups who consistently appear here in yellow or orange shaded cells.

Your results compared to PEERS ◄
Your results compared to COHORT ►

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) med. (.3) lrg. (.5)

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	2014
Departmental Collegiality	3.75																	foc		urm	
Colleagues support work/life balance	3.67														tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	+
Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.04															assoc		foc	asian	urm	
Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.65													tenured				foc	white	urm	
How well you fit	3.56														ntt	assoc		foc	white	urm	
Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.56														ntt			foc	white	urm	
Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.78														tenured			foc		urm	
Department is collegial	3.92																	foc		urm	
Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.87													pre-ten		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	
Departmental Engagement	3.51													pre-ten	ntt	assoc		foc	white	urm	+
Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.61														tenured			foc	asian	urm	+
Discussions of grad student learning	3.55													pre-ten	ntt	assoc		foc		urm	
Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.48														tenured			foc		urm	+
Discussions of effective use of technology	3.35													pre-ten	tenured			foc	white	urm	
Discussions of current research methods	3.24													pre-ten	ntt	assoc	women	foc	white	urm	
Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.79														ntt	assoc		foc	white	urm	
Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured	3.64														ntt	assoc		foc	white	urm	
Departmental Quality	3.62													tenured	ntt	assoc		foc		urm	+
Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.74													pre-ten	ntt	assoc		foc		urm	+
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.14													tenured		assoc		foc		urm	+
Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.72													pre-ten	ntt	assoc	men	foc		urm	+
Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.00													tenured			men	foc		urm	
Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.63														ntt			foc	white	urm	
Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.93													tenured	ntt					urm	
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment	3.62			N<5										N<5		assoc	men	foc	asian	urm	
Dept. is successful at faculty retention	3.21			N<5										N<5	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.54																women		white	urm	
Related Survey Items	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Intellectual vitality of NTT faculty	3.77													tenured	tenured		men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Scholarly productivity of NTT faculty	3.60													tenured	tenured		men	foc		urm	N/A
Teaching effectiveness of NTT faculty	3.98													tenured	tenured	full	men	foc		urm	N/A
Amount of professional interaction w/NTT	3.77														tenured		men	foc		urm	N/A
Amount of personal interaction w/NTT	3.67														tenured	full		foc	white	urm	N/A
Recruiting part-time faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Managing part-time faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Your results compared to PEERS ◄
Your results compared to COHORT ►

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) med (.3) lrg (.5)

The central panel (columns: overall, Hum, Soc, Phy, Bio, VPA, ECM, HHE, Agr, Bus, Edu, Med, Oth) contains directional comparison arrows (◄ ►) colored green/red/gray and is reproduced graphically.

Item	mean	Hum vs other	Soc vs other	Phy vs other	Bio vs other	VPA vs other	ECM vs other	HHE vs other	Agr vs other	Bus vs other	Edu vs other	Med vs other	Oth vs other	2014
Departmental Collegiality	3.75	Hum		Phy	other	other	ECM	other		other	other	Med	Oth	
Colleagues support work/life balance	3.67	Hum	other	Phy	other		ECM			other	other		Oth	+
Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.04	Hum		other			ECM	other	Agr	other	other	Med		
Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.65	other				other	ECM	other			Edu		Oth	
How well you fit	3.56		Soc	Phy	other	other			Agr	other			Oth	
Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.56	Hum		Phy		other	ECM	other			Edu	Med	Oth	
Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.78	Hum	Soc	Phy		other	ECM			other	other	Med	other	
Department is collegial	3.92	Hum			other	other				other	other	Med	Oth	
Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.87			Phy	other		ECM	other		other	other		Oth	
Departmental Engagement	3.51				other	other	ECM	other	Agr	other	Edu	other	Oth	+
Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.61	other	other	other	other				Agr	other	Edu	Med	Oth	+
Discussions of grad student learning	3.55	Hum	other	other	Bio	other	ECM	other	Agr		Edu			
Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.48				other	other			Agr		other	other	Oth	+
Discussions of effective use of technology	3.35	Hum	Soc	Phy		other		HHE	Agr	other	other		other	
Discussions of current research methods	3.24	Hum	other	other	other	VPA	ECM				Edu		Oth	
Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.79	other				other		other	Agr		Edu	Med		
Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured	3.64	Hum				other		other			Edu	Med		
Departmental Quality	3.62	Hum	other				ECM	other		other		Med	Oth	+
Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.74	Hum	other			VPA	ECM	other	Agr	other	Edu	Med		+
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.14		other	Phy	other	VPA	ECM		Agr	other	Edu		Oth	+
Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.72	Hum	other	other	Bio	VPA	ECM	other		other	Edu	Med		+
Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.00	other	other		Bio		ECM			other	Edu	Med	Oth	
Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.63	Hum		Phy	other	other	ECM	other		other		Med		
Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.93	other	other	Phy	Bio	other	ECM	other	Agr	other		Med	Oth	
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment	3.62		other	other	other	VPA	ECM	other		other		Med	Oth	
Dept. is successful at faculty retention	3.21		Soc	other			ECM			other			Oth	
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.54			Phy		VPA	other		Agr	other	Edu	Med	Oth	
Related Survey Items	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Intellectual vitality of NTT faculty	3.77	Hum	other	other	other		ECM	HHE		other	other		Oth	N/A
Scholarly productivity of NTT faculty	3.60	Hum	other				ECM		other	other		Med	Oth	N/A
Teaching effectiveness of NTT faculty	3.98	Hum	other			VPA		HHE		other	other	Med	Oth	N/A
Amount of professional interaction w/NTT	3.77	Hum		Phy	Bio	other	ECM	other	Agr	other		other		N/A
Amount of personal interaction w/NTT	3.67			Phy	Bio	other		other	Agr	other		other	Oth	N/A
Recruiting part-time faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Managing part-time faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Hum: Humanities
Soc: Social Sciences
Phy: Physical Sciences
Bio: Biological Sciences
VPA: Visual and Performing Arts
ECM: Engineering, Computer Science, Math and Statistics
HHE: Health and Human Ecology
Agr: Agriculture, Natural Resources, & Environmental Sciences
Bus: Business
Edu: Education
Med: Medicine
Oth: Other Professions (Law & Journalism)