| Theme | Measure | PrfTr | PrfTr | Diff ¹ |
|----------------------------------|---|--------------|--------------|-------------------|
| | Burdened Met ex (IM) d. Buread | AY 17_18 | AY 14_15 | |
| | Benchmark: Nature of Work: Research | 3.35 | 3.27 | |
| | Time spent on research | 3.47 | 3.40 | |
| Nature of Work: Research | Expectations for finding external funding Influence over focus of research | 3.26 | 3.20 | |
| | | 3.94 | 4.08 | |
| | Quality of grad students to support research | 3.53 3.02 | 3.55 2.89 | |
| | Support for research Support for engaging undergrads in research | 3.40 | 3.23 | |
| | Support for engaging undergrads in research Support for obtaining grants (pre-award) | 3.23 | 3.13 | |
| | Support for maintaining grants (pre-award) Support for maintaining grants (post-award) | 3.25 | 3.24 | |
| | Support for maintaining grants (post-award) Support for securing grad student assistance | 3.27 | 3.00 | <u></u> |
| | Support for travel to present/conduct research | 3.22 | 3.10 | <u> </u> |
| | Availability of course release for research | 2.58 | 2.65 | |
| | Benchmark: Nature of Work: Service | 3.52 | 3.62 | |
| Nature of Work: Service | Time spent on service | 3.81 | 3.92 | |
| | Support for faculty in leadership roles | 3.16 | 3.33 | |
| | Number of committees | 3.68 | 3.79 | |
| | Attractiveness of committees | 3.63 | 3.64 | |
| | Discretion to choose committees | 3.56 | 3.57 | |
| | Equitability of committee assignments | 3.24 | 3.27 | |
| | Number of student advisees | 3.62 | 3.91 | |
| | Support for being a good advisor | 3.26 | N/A | |
| | Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities | 3.11 | N/A N/A | |
| | Benchmark: Nature of Work: Teaching | 3.91 | 3.89 | |
| | Time spent on teaching | 4.15 | 4.27 | |
| | Number of courses taught | 3.87 | 3.97 | |
| | Level of courses taught | 4.09 | 4.06 | |
| | Discretion over course content | 4.31 | 4.31 | |
| | Number of students in classes taught | 3.92 | 3.83 | |
| Nature of Work: | Quality of students taught | 3.97 | 3.87 | |
| Teaching | Equitability of distribution of teaching load | 3.09 | 3.10 | |
| r caciming | Quality of grad students to support teaching | 3.55 | 3.55 | |
| | Teaching schedule | 4.20 | N/A | |
| | Support for teaching diverse learning styles | 3.89 | N/A | |
| | Support for assessing student learning | 3.94 | N/A | |
| | Support for developing online/hybrid courses | 3.83 | N/A | |
| | Support for teaching online/hybrid courses | 3.84 | N/A | |
| | Time spent on outreach | 3.77 | 3.83 | |
| Other Work | Time spent on administrative tasks | 3.40 | 3.49 | |
| Activities | Ability to balance teaching/research/service | 3.63 | 3.83 | |
| | Benchmark: Facilities and Work Resources | 3.88 | 3.80 | |
| | Support for improving teaching | 3.59 | 3.61 | |
| | Office | 3.79 | 3.84 | |
| Facilities and Work Resources | Laboratory, research, studio space | 3.63 | 3.52 | |
| | Equipment | 3.86 | 3.82 | |
| | Classrooms | 3.80 | 3.68 | |
| | Library resources | 4.42 | 4.20 | |
| | Computing and technical support | 4.00 | 3.88 | |
| | Clerical/administrative support | 3.82 | 3.69 | |

| | | AY 17_18 | AY 14_15 | Diff ¹ |
|---------------------|---|----------|----------|-------------------|
| | Benchmark: Personal and Family Policies | 3.35 | 3.40 | |
| | Right balance between professional/personal | 3.47 | 3.57 | |
| | Inst. supports family/career compatibility | 3.50 | 3.41 | |
| | Housing benefits | 2.92 | 2.53 | \uparrow |
| | Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange | 3.26 | 3.21 | |
| Personal and Family | Spousal/partner hiring program | 2.86 | 2.74 | |
| Policies | Childcare | 2.35 | 2.30 | |
| • | Eldercare | 2.97 | 3.30 | \downarrow |
| • | Family medical/parental leave | 3.34 | 3.50 | |
| • | Flexible workload/modified duties | 3.63 | 3.71 | |
| • | Stop-the-clock policies (pre-tenured only) | N/A | N/A | |
| • | Parking benefits | 3.09 | N/A | |
| | Benchmark: Health and Retirement Benefits | 3.34 | 3.51 | |
| Lloolth ond | Health benefits for yourself | 3.43 | 3.71 | \downarrow |
| Health and | Health benefits for family | 2.84 | 3.04 | |
| Retirement Benefits | Retirement benefits | 3.58 | 3.63 | |
| | Phased retirement options | 3.22 | 3.15 | |
| Salary | Salary | 2.87 | 2.87 | |
| · | Benchmark: Interdisciplinary Work | 3.09 | 3.00 | |
| • | Budgets encourage interdiscip. work | 2.84 | 2.86 | |
| • | Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work | 3.31 | 3.07 | |
| Interdisciplinary | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit | 2.95 | 2.74 | |
| Interdisciplinary | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion (PrfTr and tenured only) | 2.95 | 2.78 | |
| Work | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure (pre-tenured only) | N/A | N/A | |
| • | Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work | 2.91 | 2.92 | |
| • | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in reappointment (PrfTr only) | 2.92 | N/A | |
| • | Interest in interdisciplinary work | 3.55 | N/A | |
| | Benchmark: Collaboration | 3.70 | 3.56 | |
| Callabaration | Opportunities for collab. within dept | 3.92 | 3.79 | |
| Collaboration | Opportunities for collab. outside inst | 3.52 | 3.38 | |
| • | Opportunities for collab. outside dept | 3.61 | 3.44 | |
| | Benchmark: Mentoring | 3.45 | 3.20 | \uparrow |
| • | Effectiveness of mentoring within dept. | 3.93 | 3.97 | |
| Mentoring | Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept. | 3.73 | 3.61 | |
| | Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept (tenure track only) | N/A | N/A | |
| | Mentoring of tenured associate profs in dept (tenured only) | N/A | N/A | |
| | Mentoring of PrfTr faculty in dept (PrfTr only) | 2.76 | N/A | |
| | Support for faculty to be good mentors (tenured and PrfTr only) | 2.74 | 2.49 | \uparrow |
| | Being a mentor is fulfilling (tenured and PrfTr only) | 4.29 | 4.17 | |
| | Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst. | 3.84 | 3.61 | |

| Theme | Measure | PrfTr | PrfTr | Diff ¹ |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------|----------|-------------------|
| | | AY 17_18 | AY 14_15 | |
| Tenure Policies (pre-tenured only) | Benchmark: Tenure Policies | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of tenure process | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of tenure criteria | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of tenure standards | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure | N/A | N/A | |
| | Consistency of messages about tenure | N/A | N/A | |
| | Tenure decisions are performance-based | N/A | N/A | |
| | Benchmark: Tenure Expectations: Clarity | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of expectations: Scholar | N/A | N/A | |
| Tenure Clarity | Clarity of expectations: Teacher | N/A | N/A | |
| (pre-tenured only) | Clarity of expectations: Advisor | N/A | N/A | |
| () | Clarity of expectations: Colleague | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of expectations: Broader community | N/A | N/A | |
| | Benchmark: Promotion to Full | N/A | N/A | |
| | Dept. culture encourages promotion | N/A | N/A | |
| | Reasonable expectations: Promotion | N/A | N/A | |
| Promotion | Clarity of promotion process | N/A | N/A | |
| (tenured only) | Clarity of promotion criteria | N/A | N/A | |
| (tenured only) | Clarity of promotion standards | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of body of evidence for promotion | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of time frame for promotion | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of whether I will be promoted (assoc profs only) | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of departmental contract renewal process for prf track fac | 3.10 | 3.21 | |
| Contract Renewal | Clarity of departmental contract renewal criteria for prf track fac | 3.13 | 3.16 | |
| Clarity (professional | Clarity of departmental contract renewal standards for prof track fac | 3.00 | 3.02 | |
| track only) | Clarity of evidence considered for renewal of prf track fac | 3.14 | 3.24 | |
| | Clarity of sense of if my contract will be renewed | 3.35 | 3.39 | |
| ol 1: 60 | Clarity of dept promotion process for prf track fac | 2.78 | 2.59 | |
| Clarity of Promotion | Clarity of dept critieria for promotion for prf track fac | 2.72 | 2.59 | |
| Process | Clarity of dept standards for promotion of prf track faculty | 2.65 | 2.49 | |
| (professional track | Clarity of body of evidence considered for promotion of prf track fac | 2.78 | 2.67 | |
| only) | Clarity of sense of if I will be promoted | 2.89 | 2.63 | |
| | Benchmark: Leadership: Senior | 3.43 | 3.35 | |
| | Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making | 3.49 | 3.39 | |
| | Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities | 3.55 | 3.42 | |
| Leadership: Senior | Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities | 3.44 | 3.42 | |
| Leadership. Semon | CAO: Pace of decision making | 3.42 | 3.42 | |
| | CAO: Stated priorities | 3.39 | 3.29 | |
| | CAO: Communication of priorities | 3.34 | 3.27 | |
| | Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional | 3.34 | | |
| | · | | 3.15 | |
| Leadership: | Dean: Pace of decision making | 3.33 | 3.16 | |
| Divisional | Dean: Stated priorities | 3.35 | 3.19 | |
| | Dean: Communication of priorities | 3.28 | 3.17 | |
| | Dean: Ensuring faculty input | 3.19 | 3.06 | |
| | Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental | 3.80 | 3.69 | |
| Leadership: | Head/Chair: Pace of decision making | 3.78 | 3.67 | |
| | Head/Chair: Stated priorities | 3.83 | 3.66 | |
| Departmental | Head/Chair: Communication of priorities | 3.72 | 3.69 | |
| | Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input | 3.71 | 3.63 | |
| | Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work | 3.94 | 3.86 | |

| Theme | Measure | PrfTr AY 17_18 | PrfTr AY 14_15 | Dif |
|---------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-----|
| Leadership: Faculty | Benchmark: Leadership: Faculty | 3.25 | 3.27 | |
| | Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making | 3.26 | 3.26 | |
| | Faculty leaders: Stated priorities | 3.27 | 3.26 | |
| | Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities | 3.16 | 3.28 | |
| | Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input | 3.30 | 3.33 | |
| | Priorities are stated consistently | 3.41 | 3.20 | |
| Leadership: | Priorities are acted on consistently | 3.18 | 2.94 | |
| Institution-wide | Changed priorities negatively affect my work | 3.27 | N/A | |
| | Visible leadership for support of diversity | 4.07 | 3.95 | |
| | Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality | 3.88 | 3.77 | |
| | Colleagues support work/life balance | 3.96 | 3.88 | |
| | Meeting times compatible with personal needs | 4.24 | 4.18 | |
| | Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured | 3.42 | 3.43 | |
| Departmental | Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure | 3.53 | 3.53 | |
| Collegiality | Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr | 3.98 | 3.88 | |
| | How well you fit | 3.51 | 3.47 | |
| | Colleagues pitch in when needed | 3.92 | 3.75 | |
| | Department is collegial | 4.09 | 3.91 | |
| | Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion | 4.04 | 4.00 | |
| | Benchmark: Departmental Engagement | 3.49 | 3.42 | |
| | Discussions of undergrad student learning | 3.72 | 3.82 | |
| | Discussions of grad student learning | 3.00 | 2.78 | |
| 5 | Discussions of effective teaching practices | 3.74 | 3.71 | |
| Departmental | Discussions of effective use of technology | 3.73 | 3.57 | |
| Engagement | Discussions of current research methods | 3.12 | 3.00 | |
| | Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure | 3.59 | 3.54 | |
| | Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured | 3.51 | 3.44 | |
| | Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr | 4.05 | 3.95 | |
| | Benchmark: Departmental Quality | 3.61 | 3.64 | |
| | Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty | 3.76 | 3.75 | |
| | Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty | 4.06 | 4.16 | |
| | Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty | 4.22 | 4.11 | |
| | Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty | 3.64 | 3.75 | |
| December 1 | Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty | 3.94 | 4.04 | |
| Departmental | Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty | 3.87 | 3.86 | |
| Quality | Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty | 3.42 | 3.45 | |
| | Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty | 3.71 | 3.80 | |
| | Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty | 4.23 | 4.25 | |
| | Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) | 3.85 | 3.74 | |
| | Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) | 3.43 | 3.51 | |
| | Dept. addresses sub-standard performance | 2.59 | 2.64 | |

| Theme | Measure | PrfTr AY 17_18 | PrfTr AY 14_15 | Diff ¹ |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition | 3.40 | 3.35 | |
| | Recognition: For teaching | 3.38 | 3.34 | |
| | Recognition: For advising | 3.22 | 3.11 | |
| | Recognition: For scholarship | 3.34 | 3.21 | |
| | Recognition: For service | 3.27 | 3.16 | |
| A | Recognition: For outreach | 3.28 | 3.22 | |
| Appreciation and Recognition | Recognition: From colleagues | 3.76 | 3.72 | |
| | Recognition: From CAO (tenured only) | N/A | N/A | |
| | Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) | N/A | N/A | |
| | Recognition: From Head/Chair | 3.62 | 3.63 | |
| | School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) | N/A | N/A | |
| | Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) | N/A | N/A | |
| | CAO cares about faculty of my rank | 3.22 | 2.94 | <u> </u> |
| | Benchmark: Governance: Trust | 3.17 | 3.04 | |
| | I understand how to voice opinions about policies | 2.95 | 2.80 | |
| C | Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration | 3.34 | 3.24 | |
| Governance: Trust | Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement | 3.69 | 3.44 | |
| | Faculty and admin have an open system of communication | 3.34 | 3.07 | <u> </u> |
| | Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith | 3.57 | 3.42 | |
| | Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose | 3.33 | 3.19 | |
| Carrage and a Charact | Important decisions are not made until there is consensus | 2.75 | 2.71 | |
| Governance: Shared | Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input | 3.23 | 3.11 | |
| Sense of Purpose | Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view | 3.53 | 3.29 | |
| | Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility | 3.77 | 3.59 | |
| | Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand | 3.14 | 3.06 | |
| Governance: | Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input | 3.13 | 2.99 | |
| Understanding the | Admin communicate rationale for important decisions | 3.20 | 3.11 | |
| Issue at Hand | Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions | 3.18 | 2.97 | |
| | Faculty and admin define decision criteria together | 3.50 | 3.32 | |
| | Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability | 3.11 | 3.03 | |
| Governance: | Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances | 3.14 | 3.09 | |
| Adaptability | Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance | 3.09 | 2.99 | |
| | Institution cultivates new faculty leaders | 3.13 | 3.00 | |
| | Benchmark: Governance: Productivity | 3.22 | 3.09 | |
| Governance: | Overall effectiveness of shared governance | 3.33 | 3.17 | |
| Productivity | My committees make measureable progress towards goals | 3.35 | 3.24 | |
| | Public recognition of progress | 3.08 | 2.90 | |
| | | | | |