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)

Item	mean	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	2014
Governance: Trust	2.92		tenured	assoc		foc	white	urm	N/A
I understand how to voice opinions about policies	2.88	pre-ten	ntt	assoc			white	urm	N/A
Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	2.98	tenured	tenured	assoc			white	urm	N/A
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement	3.16	tenured	tenured		men	foc		urm	N/A
Faculty and admin have an open system of communication	2.87	tenured	tenured	assoc			white	urm	N/A
Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.10		tenured			foc	white	urm	N/A
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	2.98	tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.57	tenured	tenured		white	white			N/A
Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input	2.94	tenured	tenured				white		N/A
Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	3.09	tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.38		tenured		men	foc		urm	N/A
Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	2.85		tenured				white	urm	N/A
Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	2.91						white	urm	N/A
Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	2.81	tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions	2.66	tenured	tenured		white	white	white		N/A
Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	2.97	tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Governance: Adaptability	2.79	tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	2.72	tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.61	tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	3.03		tenured	assoc		foc		urm	N/A
Governance: Productivity	2.90	tenured	tenured		men		white	urm	N/A
Overall effectiveness of shared governance	2.84	tenured	tenured	assoc	men		white	urm	N/A
My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.24	tenured	tenured			foc	white	urm	N/A
Public recognition of progress	2.77	tenured	tenured				white		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)

	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
Governance: Trust	2.92	Hum	Soc	Phy	Bio			other		other		other	other	N/A
I understand how to voice opinions about policies	2.88	Hum			Bio					other		other	other	N/A
Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	2.98		Soc	Phy				other		other			other	N/A
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement	3.16	Hum	Soc	Phy	other	other		other		other	Edu	other		N/A
Faculty and admin have an open system of communication	2.87	Hum	Soc	Phy			other		other	other	Edu	other		N/A
Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.10		Soc		Bio	other		other		other	Edu			N/A
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	2.98	Hum	Soc		Bio	other		other		other	Edu	other		N/A
Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.57	Hum	Soc	Phy	other	other	other		Agr	other	Edu	other	other	N/A
Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input	2.94		Soc	Phy	Bio	other	other			other		other		N/A
Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	3.09	Hum	Soc			other		other		other	Edu			N/A
Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.38	Hum	Soc	Phy	other			other		other		other	other	N/A
Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	2.85	Hum	Soc			other		other		other	Edu	other	other	N/A
Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	2.91	Hum	Soc				other	other		other	Edu		other	N/A
Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	2.81	Hum	Soc	Phy	Bio	other	ECM	other	Agr	other	Edu	other	other	N/A
Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions	2.66	other	Soc	Phy	Bio					other	Edu	other	other	N/A
Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	2.97	Hum	Soc			other	other			other	Edu	other	other	N/A
Governance: Adaptability	2.79		Soc					other		other				N/A
Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	2.72		Soc		other	VPA		other			other			N/A
Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.61		Soc	Phy	other	other		other		other				N/A
Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	3.03		Soc				ECM	other		other				N/A
Governance: Productivity	2.90		Soc	Phy	other	other				other	other	other		N/A
Overall effectiveness of shared governance	2.84	Hum	Soc		other	ECM	other			other	other	other	Oth	N/A
My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.24	other	Soc			ECM	HHE			other		other	other	N/A
Public recognition of progress	2.77		Soc				HHE			other			other	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)