In spring 2018, faculty reported their satisfaction in a broad range of areas on a survey conducted by the Collaboration on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at Harvard. COACHE provides benchmarks from five peer universities and a cohort of 109 universities. 2100 tenure-track, career-track, and continuing-status faculty who were here for more than a year and were not on leave were surveyed, 886 responded. The 42% response rate equals those of our peers.

The top strengths identified by our faculty are opportunities to collaborate and the quality of colleagues available at UA. Personnel policies and benefits were our most highly evaluated area. Faculty expressed the greatest concern about college, department, and faculty leadership, including shared governance leadership.

AREAS OF STRENGTH

Opportunities for Collaboration (responses place us in top 30% of cohort)
High ratings for collaboration opportunities within and outside of departments.

Personal/Family Policies and Benefits (top 30% of peers and cohort)
High ratings for policies such as flexible workload and modified duties, spousal/partner hiring, and family medical/parental leave. High ratings for health and retirement benefits and phased retirement options.

Promotion to Full (top 30% of cohort)
High assessments of the clarity of the promotion process for full, including criteria, departmental support and time clock schedule. Assessments have significantly improved since the last survey in 2013.

AREAS OF CONCERN

College, Department, and Faculty Leadership (bottom 30% of peers and cohort)
Faculty criticized UA leaders on their pace of decision making, stated priorities, communication, and securing faculty input.

Governance Trust & Productivity (bottom 30% of peers and cohort)
Low assessments of governance, including open communication between faculty and administration, understanding how to voice opinions, public recognition of progress, and overall effectiveness of shared governance.

Clarity of Tenure Expectations (bottom 30% of peers and cohort)
Pre-tenure faculty offered low ratings for clarity of tenure expectations.

CHANGES SINCE THE 2013 COACHE SURVEY

Assessments of overall research support improved significantly, particularly for support for obtaining grants (pre-award), managing grants (post-award), and availability of course releases for research.

More pre-tenure faculty are receiving formal feedback on their progress toward tenure. In 2013, more than 30% had *not* received formal feedback, placing us below our peers and the cohort. In 2018, 23% had *not* received formal feedback, which is better than our peers and cohort. This improvement is paralleled by increases in assessments of mentoring.

Interdisciplinarity has become less of a competitive advantage. Ratings dropped from top 30% to the midrange in comparison to our peers and cohort in the 2018 survey.

CT faculty and TT faculty responses only differed significantly in a few areas such as support for research and graduate instruction. Both CT and tenured faculty expressed high levels of dissatisfaction with the amount personal interaction they had with each other. CT faculty were not surveyed in 2013.

The COACHE Survey Asked Faculty to Assess

- Research Expectations & Support
- Service Expectations & Support
- Teaching Expectations & Support
- Facilities & Work Resources
- Personnel Policies & Benefits
- Interdisciplinary Support
- Collaboration Opportunities
- Mentoring
- Tenure Policies & Expectations
- Leadership
- Shared Governance
- Departmental Collegiality & Quality
- Appreciation & Recognition

The Five Best Aspects of Working at UA

- Quality of colleagues (36%)
- Geographic location (32%)
- Support of colleagues (17%)
- Academic freedom (14%)
- Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues (13%)

Five Worst Aspects of UA

- Compensation (31%) [All 5 peers and 95% of the cohort had this as their worst aspect.]
- Quality of leadership (17%)
- Too much service (12%)
- Quality of facilities (11%)
- Quality of undergrads (10%)

DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

Underrepresented minority (URM) faculty had notably lower assessments of department climate, engagement, and quality, including related items such as fit, collegiality, and shared commitment to diversity. URM faculty also had more negative assessments of departmental mentoring, retention efforts, and diversity efforts.

URM faculty had lower levels of satisfaction in nearly all areas. Less significant differences are also evident in the responses of women faculty, who were less satisfied in almost half of the areas, including research support, service, opportunities for collaboration and interdisciplinarity, tenure policies and clarity, departmental leadership, and appreciation and recognition.

	% Agreeing or Strongly Agreeing			
	Men	Women	White	URM
There is visible leadership at my institution for the support and promotion of diversity on campus.	64%	57%	65%	43%
Recent searches in my department have prioritized the need to diversify the faculty.	48%	41%	48%	28%
The UA offers effective programs to improve the ability of faculty to support the success of underrepresented students.	46%	41%	46%	32%
The UA offers effective programs to improve climate, respond to harassment and bias, and support diverse perspectives and experiences.	50%	38%	46%	29%

THE UA LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE

UA faculty have traditionally had low assessments of our leadership of their deans, heads, provosts, and presidents. In the 2013 COACHE survey, the assessments of heads and deans placed us in the bottom 30% of the 100 universities who did the COACHE survey and also the peer universities in our cohort. While the 2018 survey was conducted amidst changes in senior leadership, the assessments of heads and faculty leaders were even lower than in 2013. The shared governance items were added since 2013. Our responses on those items also fall in the bottom 30% of peer and cohort institutions.

The COACHE Program provides [research on best practices](#) that can help us build on our strengths to address areas where we need to improve leadership development and accountability. These reports focus on the impact of [departmental leadership](#) on [departmental effectiveness,](#) including involving faculty in making decisions and fairness in assessing faculty.

The collaborative dynamics of departmental leadership are the general area where there is the greatest difference between the responses of white and under-represented minority faculty. As noted above, the two groups had major differences in their responses to some individual items, but the area that has a cluster of major differences is the series of items on departmental collegiality, engagement, quality, and recognition. All these items have implications for leadership.

These differences take on broader significance in colleges where faculty see weaknesses in leadership, engagement, and climate. The COACHE survey provides faculty assessments of colleges along with national benchmarks drawn from comparable colleges from other institutions. The comparisons to peer and cohort institutions do not always align with the disciplines in UA colleges. Nonetheless, all UA colleges received faculty assessments that place them in the top rankings in particular areas. Those strengths provide leverage points to strengthen collaborations within and across colleges.

The differences among UA colleges provide lessons in the collaborative dynamics of leadership that we are becoming better able to address. After the 2013 survey, the COACHE leadership expectations were integrated into the criteria we use in annual and five-year reviews of administrators. Those reviews provide opportunities to improve the effectiveness of our leaders. We now have increased capacity to provide coaching and formative feedback to leaders through the new Leadership and Organizational Development unit in Human Resources (LOD). LOD is preparing to help launch leadership programs to respond to the concerns of diverse faculty and help diversify the ranks of faculty and staff prepared to step into collaborative leadership roles. Discussions are also beginning on requiring professional development for all heads and directors. Such training could be used to address the concerns of URM faculty in ways that could also help us advance our HSI mission.

> **How can we help UA leaders improve in the areas of faculty concern**?
> - Pace of decision making,
> - Clearly defined priorities,
> - Effective communication of priorities,
> - Opportunities for faculty to offer input on decisions, and
> - Fairness in evaluating faculty work.
>
> **The collaborative dimensions of leadership are also highlighted in the COACHE items on shared governance:**
> - Trust,
> - Shared sense of purpose,
> - Understanding of issues,
> - Adaptability, and
> - Productivity.
>
> **What else can we do to strengthen our collaborative leadership?**