Theme	Measure	Tenured	Tenured	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Research	AY 17_18 3.28	AY 14_15 3.21	
	Time spent on research	3.68	3.60	
	Expectations for finding external funding	3.18	3.18	
	Influence over focus of research	4.32	4.32	
	Quality of grad students to support research	3.45	3.42	
Nature of Work:	Support for research	2.79	2.79	
Research	Support for research Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.24	3.06	
researen	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.22	3.14	
	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	3.16	2.93	
	Support for securing grad student assistance	2.83	2.77	
	Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.06	3.00	
	Availability of course release for research	2.86	2.80	
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Service	3.37	3.33	
	Time spent on service	3.54	3.51	
	Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.96	2.71	
	Number of committees	3.56	3.55	
Nature of Work:	Attractiveness of committees	3.42	3.45	
Service	Discretion to choose committees	3.61	3.57	
3611166	Equitability of committee assignments	3.12	3.16	
	Number of student advisees	3.69	3.70	
	Support for being a good advisor	2.93	N/A	
	Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	3.04	N/A	
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Teaching	3.82	3.77	
	Time spent on teaching	3.97	3.92	
	Number of courses taught	3.91	3.97	
	Level of courses taught	4.11	4.12	
	Discretion over course content	4.33	4.39	
	Number of students in classes taught	3.85	3.75	
Nature of Work:	Quality of students taught	3.64	3.56	
Teaching	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.21	3.09	
	Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.49	3.37	
	Teaching schedule	4.05	N/A	
	Support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.69	N/A	
	Support for assessing student learning	3.70	N/A	
	Support for developing online/hybrid courses	3.64	N/A	
	Support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.58	N/A	
	Time spent on outreach	3.72	3.72	
Other Work	Time spent on administrative tasks	2.83	2.78	
Activities	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.51	3.38	
	Benchmark: Facilities and Work Resources	3.62	3.60	
	Support for improving teaching	3.43	3.36	
	Office	3.89	3.94	
	Laboratory, research, studio space	3.32	3.36	
Facilities and Work	Equipment	3.47	3.51	
Resources	Classrooms	3.63	3.68	
	Library resources	4.34	4.24	
	Computing and technical support	3.70	3.58	
	Clerical/administrative support	3.02	3.00	
	οιοποίη ασιπιπιστιατίνο σαρροίτ	3.02	3.00	

Theme	Measure	Tenured AY 17_18	Tenured AY 14_15	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Personal and Family Policies	3.01	2.95	
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.31	3.35	
	Inst. supports family/career compatibility	3.08	3.03	
	Housing benefits	2.29	2.26	
	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.35	2.09	\uparrow
Personal and Family	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.81	2.77	
Policies	Childcare	2.30	2.31	
	Eldercare	2.41	2.45	
	Family medical/parental leave	3.26	3.30	
	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.59	3.54	
	Stop-the-clock policies (pre-tenured only)	N/A	N/A	
	Parking benefits	3.22	N/A	
	Benchmark: Health and Retirement Benefits	2.97	3.02	
U a a likla i a sa al	Health benefits for yourself	2.99	3.06	
Health and	Health benefits for family	2.46	2.50	
Retirement Benefits	Retirement benefits	3.21	3.20	
	Phased retirement options	3.34	3.40	
Salary	Salary	2.98	3.00	
•	Benchmark: Interdisciplinary Work	2.80	2.76	
	Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.66	2.58	
	Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	2.84	2.69	
1.1	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.75	2.78	
Interdisciplinary	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion (PrfTr and tenured only)	2.79	2.81	
Work	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure (pre-tenured only)	N/A	N/A	
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.91	2.85	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in reappointment (PrfTr only)	N/A	N/A	
	Interest in interdisciplinary work	3.73	N/A	
	Benchmark: Collaboration	3.86	3.75	
Callahanatian	Opportunities for collab. within dept	3.89	3.76	
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. outside inst	3.91	3.83	
	Opportunities for collab. outside dept	3.77	3.65	
	Benchmark: Mentoring	3.13	3.06	
	Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	3.73	3.68	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept.	3.69	3.55	
	Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept (tenure track only)	3.41	3.36	
Mentoring	Mentoring of tenured associate profs in dept (tenured only)	2.69	2.72	
-	Mentoring of PrfTr faculty in dept (PrfTr only)	N/A	N/A	
	Support for faculty to be good mentors (tenured and PrfTr only)	2.57	2.38	
	Being a mentor is fulfilling (tenured and PrfTr only)	4.24	4.15	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst.	3.96	3.85	

Theme	Measure	Tenured AY 17_18	Tenured AY 14_15	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Tenure Policies	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of tenure process	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of tenure criteria	N/A	N/A	
Tenure Policies	Clarity of tenure standards	N/A	N/A	
(pre-tenured only)	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	
T	Clarity of expectations: Teacher	N/A	N/A	
Tenure Clarity	Clarity of expectations: Advisor	N/A	N/A	
(pre-tenured only)	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	3.88	3.82	
	Dept. culture encourages promotion	4.04	3.95	
	Reasonable expectations: Promotion	3.99	3.89	
	Clarity of promotion process	4.05	4.00	
Promotion	Clarity of promotion criteria	3.96	3.85	
(tenured only)	Clarity of promotion standards	3.70	3.63	
	Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	4.03	3.98	
	Clarity of time frame for promotion	3.54	3.55	
	Clarity of whether I will be promoted (assoc profs only)	3.26	3.19	
	Benchmark: Leadership: Senior	3.41	3.20	
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.60	3.41	
	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.51	3.22	<u></u>
Leadership: Senior	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.48	3.36	
20000.0р. 000.	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.35	3.18	
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.30	3.01	
	CAO: Communication of priorities	3.26	3.07	<u> </u>
	Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional	3.07	2.88	
	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.21	3.06	
Leadership:	Dean: Stated priorities	3.05	2.82	
Divisional	Dean: Communication of priorities	3.06	2.86	
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	2.95	2.78	
	Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental	3.68	3.62	
	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.65	3.61	
Leadership:	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.58	3.49	
Departmental	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.66	3.49	
Depai (IIIeIItal	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.69	3.64	
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.85	3.84	
	ricau, Chair. Fairness in Evaluating WOTK	3.63	3.64	

Theme	Measure	Tenured	Tenured	Diff ¹
		AY 17_18	AY 14_15	
Leadership: Faculty	Benchmark: Leadership: Faculty	2.99	2.99	
	Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making	2.95	2.92	
	Faculty leaders: Stated priorities	2.96	2.98	
	Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities	2.94	2.99	
	Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input	3.08	3.09	
	Priorities are stated consistently	3.11	2.82	<u> </u>
Leadership:	Priorities are acted on consistently	2.93	2.60	
Institution-wide	Changed priorities negatively affect my work	2.84	N/A	
	Visible leadership for support of diversity	4.01	3.93	
	Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality	3.81	3.77	
	Colleagues support work/life balance	3.68	3.68	
	Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.16	4.14	
	Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.69	3.63	
Departmental	Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.70	3.64	
Collegiality	Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr	3.66	N/A	
	How well you fit	3.62	3.51	
	Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.70	3.71	
	Department is collegial	3.99	3.96	
	Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.96	3.92	
	Benchmark: Departmental Engagement	3.61	3.60	
	Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.46	3.39	
	Discussions of grad student learning	3.78	3.80	
Danantosantal	Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.47	3.46	
Departmental	Discussions of effective use of technology	3.40	3.47	
Engagement	Discussions of current research methods	3.49	3.55	
	Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.89	3.78	
	Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured	3.84	3.78	
	Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr	3.76	N/A	
	Benchmark: Departmental Quality	3.75	3.66	
	Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.83	3.72	
	Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.20	4.12	
	Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty	3.85	N/A	
	Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.85	3.65	
	Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.11	4.00	
Departmental	Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty	3.77	N/A	
Quality	Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.87	3.76	
	Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.97	3.93	
	Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty	4.04	N/A	
	Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only)	3.87	3.74	
	Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only)	3.37	3.29	
	Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.81	2.74	
	Topa. dad. cooct day starradia periormanic	2.01	,,	

Recognition: For teaching 3.33 3.19	Theme	Measure	Tenured AY 17_18	Tenured AY 14_15	Diff ¹
Appreciation and Recognition: For advising Appreciation and Recognition: For scholarship Appreciation and Recognition: For service Recognition: For service Recognition: For service Recognition: For outreach Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Cao (tenured only) Rec		Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition	3.33	3.19	
Appreciation and Recognition: For scholarship Recognition: For service 3.16 3.06 Recognition: For service 3.16 3.06 Recognition: For outreach 3.22 3.08 Recognition: For colleagues 3.74 3.62 Recognition: From Colleagues 3.74 3.62 Recognition: From Colleagues 3.74 3.62 Recognition: From Coll (tenured only) 3.01 2.85 Second for From Dean (tenured only) 3.01 2.85 Second for From Dean (tenured only) 3.01 2.85 Second for School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.52 3.17 ↑ Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.52 2.97 ↑ Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.25 2.97 ↑ Dept. is valued by Pres/P		Recognition: For teaching	3.33	3.30	
Appreciation and Recognition: For service Recognition: For outreach 3.22 3.08 Recognition: From coutreach 3.22 3.08 Recognition: From CAO (tenured only) 3.01 2.85 Recognition: From CAO (tenured only) 3.01 2.85 Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) 3.12 3.00 Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) 3.12 3.00 Recognition: From Head (tenured only) 3.52 3.07 ↑ Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.52 2.97 ↑ CAO cares about faculty of my rank 3.29 3.04 Benchmark: Governance: Trust 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		Recognition: For advising	3.14	3.10	
Appreciation and Recognition Recognition Recognition Recognition Recognition Recognition: From colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Leaf (tenu		Recognition: For scholarship	3.47	3.41	
Recognition and Recognition: From Colleagues 3.74 3.62 Recognition: From CAO (tenured only) 3.01 2.85 Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) 3.01 2.85 Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) 3.12 3.00 Recognition: From Head/Chair 3.68 3.59 School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.52 3.17 ↑ Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.25 2.97 ↑ CAO cares about faculty of my rank 3.29 3.00 Loderstand how to voice opinions about policies 2.92 3.00 Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 3.16 3.09 Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement 3.23 3.02 Faculty and admin in scuss difficult issues in good faith 3.21 3.05 Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose 3.01 2.90 Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 2.45 2.33 Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 2.91 2.84 Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.55 3.36 Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 2.83 2.77 Faculty governances trutures offer opportunities for input 2.90 2.89 Honderstanding the Issue at Hand 5.20 Governance: Adaptability 6.20 Governance: Shared Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 2.83 2.77 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.90 2.79 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.90 2.79 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.90 2.79 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.90 2.79 Faculty and admin define decision criteria together 2.99 2.77 Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability 3.28 2.74 Adaptability 1.51 Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance 2.72 2.60 Institution cultivates new faculty leaders 2.94 2.86 Benchmark: Governance: Productivity 2.81 2.72 Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09		Recognition: For service	3.16	3.06	
Recognition: From colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Head/Chair School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) CAO cares about faculty of my rank Benchmark: Governance: Trust Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration I understand how to voice opinions about policies Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Important decisions are not made until there is consensus Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Paculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Senchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Reculty and admin have ead shared sense of responsibility Senchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Reculty and admin have ead shared sense of responsibility Admin communicate rationale for important decisions Description Faculty and admin have ead shared sense of responsibility Admin communicate rationale for important decisions Description Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance Penchmark: Governance: Productivity Recognition: From Head Chalar And productivity Alexandre of the present only and admin of the productivity Alexandre of the productivity Alexand	A managiation and	Recognition: For outreach	3.22	3.08	
Recognition: From CAO (tenured only) Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) CAO cares about faculty of my rank Benchmark: Governance: Trust I understand how to voice opinions about policies Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Clear rules about the roles of faculty input Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Important decisions are not made until there is consensus Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Covernance: Shared Sense of Purpose Important decisions are not made until there is consensus Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Covernance: Shared Sense of responsibility Covernance: Shared Sense of responsibility Covernance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Covern	• •	Recognition: From colleagues	3.74	3.62	
Recognition: From Head/Chair School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.52 3.17 ↑	Recognition	Recognition: From CAO (tenured only)	3.01	2.85	
School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) CAO cares about faculty of my rank Benchmark: Governance: Trust I understand how to voice opinions about policies Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement Faculty and admin in lave an open system of communication Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Important decisions are not made until there is consensus Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Issue at Hand Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability Governance: Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.17 ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑		Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)	3.12	3.00	
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.25 2.97 ↑ CAO cares about faculty of my rank 3.29 3.04 Governance: Trust Age of Covernance: Trust Age of Purpose 3.02 3.00 Inderstand how to voice opinions about policies 2.92 3.00 Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 3.16 3.09 Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement 3.23 3.02 Faculty and admin have an open system of communication 2.97 2.78 Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith 3.21 3.05 Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose 3.01 2.90 Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 2.45 2.33 Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 2.91 2.84 Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.23 3.01 Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.55 3.36 Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 2.83 2.77 Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input 2.90 2.79 Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability		Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.68	3.59	
CAO cares about faculty of my rank Benchmark: Governance: Trust 1 understand how to voice opinions about policies 2.92 3.00 2 understand how to voice opinions about policies 2.92 3.00 3 understand how to voice opinions about policies 2.92 3.00 Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 3.16 3.09 Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement 3.23 3.02 Faculty and admin have an open system of communication 2.97 2.78 Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith 3.21 3.05 Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose 3.01 2.90 Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 2.45 2.33 Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 2.91 2.84 Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view 3.23 3.01 Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.55 3.36 Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 2.83 2.77 Governance: Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.90 2.79 Issue at Hand Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.52 2.35 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.52 2.35 Faculty and admin define decision criteria together 2.99 2.77 Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability 2.83 2.74 Governance: Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances 2.85 2.71 Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance 2.72 2.60 Institution cultivates new faculty leaders 2.94 2.86 Benchmark: Governance: Productivity 2.81 2.72 Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09		School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)	3.52	3.17	\uparrow
Benchmark: Governance: Trust 3.02 3.00 I understand how to voice opinions about policies 2.92 3.00 Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 3.16 3.09 Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement 3.23 3.02 Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement 3.23 3.02 Faculty and admin have an open system of communication 2.97 2.78 Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith 3.21 3.05 Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose 3.01 2.90 Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 2.45 2.33 Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 2.91 2.84 Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view 3.23 3.01 Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.55 3.36 Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 2.83 2.77 Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input 2.90 2.89 Understanding the Issue at Hand 5.20 2.79 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.50 2.79 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.52 2.35 Faculty and admin define decision criteria together 2.99 2.77 Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability 2.83 2.74 Governance: Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances 2.85 2.71 Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance 2.72 2.60 Institution cultivates new faculty leaders 2.94 2.86 Benchmark: Governance: Productivity 2.81 2.72 Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09		Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)	3.25	2.97	\uparrow
Governance: Trust I understand how to voice opinions about policies 2.92 3.00		CAO cares about faculty of my rank	3.29	3.04	
Governance: Trust Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 3.16 3.09		Benchmark: Governance: Trust	3.02	3.00	
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith 3.21 3.05 Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Important decisions are not made until there is consensus Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Paculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability Faculty and admin have equal say in unusual circumstances Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.23 3.01 2.90 2.45 2.33 3.01 2.91 2.84 3.01 3.03 3.01 3.0		I understand how to voice opinions about policies	2.92	3.00	
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith 3.21 3.05 Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Sense of Purpose Faculty and admin decisions are not made until there is consensus Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty and admin communicate rationale for important decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Senechmark: Governance: Adaptability Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Faculty and admin there is consensus Facul	C	Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	3.16	3.09	
Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith 3.21 3.05 Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Sense of Purpose Important decisions are not made until there is consensus Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Paculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Faculty and admin have a public decision criteria together Faculty and admin have a public decision criteria together Faculty and admin have a public decision criteria together Faculty and admin have a public decision criteria together Faculty and admin have a shared sense of governance Faculty and admin have a shared sense of popuration and the faculty in the faculty in the faculty in	Governance: Trust	Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement	3.23	3.02	
Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Sense of Purpose Important decisions are not made until there is consensus Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Sense at Hand Issue at Hand Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance Benchmark: Governance: Productivity Governance: Overall effectiveness of shared governance My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.01 2.45 2.33 3.01 3.28 3.01 3.29 2.84 3.27 3.28 3.27 4.290 2.89 2.77 2.83 2.74 2.85 2.71 2.60 2.72 2.60 2.72 2.60 2.72 2.60 2.72 2.60 2.72 2.60 2.72 3.60 3.73 3.09			2.97	2.78	
Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 2.45 2.33 Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 2.91 2.84 Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view 3.23 3.01 Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.55 3.36 Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 2.83 2.77 Governance: Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input 2.90 2.89 Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance 2.90 2.79 Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability 2.83 2.74 Governance: Adaptability 2.83 2.74 Institution cultivates new faculty leaders 2.94 2.86 Benchmark: Governance: Productivity 2.81 2.72 Governance: Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09		Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.21	3.05	
Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Sense of Purpose Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Sense of Purpose Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Paculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Admin communicate rationale for important decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Adaptability Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin have		Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	3.01	2.90	
Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Sense of Purpose Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Sense of Purpose Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Paculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Admin communicate rationale for important decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Adaptability Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin have	Carrage Channel	Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.45	2.33	
Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Covernance: Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Covernance: Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Covernance: Admin communicate rationale for important decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Faculty and admin respectfully Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions			2.91	2.84	
Governance:Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand2.832.77Understanding the Issue at HandFaculty governance structures offer opportunities for input2.902.89Understanding the Issue at HandAdmin communicate rationale for important decisions2.902.79Issue at HandFaculty and admin have equal say in decisions2.522.35Faculty and admin define decision criteria together2.992.77Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability2.832.74Governance:Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances2.852.71AdaptabilityInstitution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance2.722.60Institution cultivates new faculty leaders2.942.86Benchmark: Governance: Productivity2.812.72Governance:Overall effectiveness of shared governance2.712.57ProductivityMy committees make measureable progress towards goals3.143.09	Sense of Purpose	Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	3.23	3.01	
Governance:Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input2.902.89Understanding the Issue at HandAdmin communicate rationale for important decisions2.902.79Issue at HandFaculty and admin have equal say in decisions2.522.35Faculty and admin define decision criteria together2.992.77Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability2.832.74Governance:Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances2.852.71AdaptabilityInstitution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance2.722.60Institution cultivates new faculty leaders2.942.86Benchmark: Governance: Productivity2.812.72Governance:Overall effectiveness of shared governance2.712.57ProductivityMy committees make measureable progress towards goals3.143.09		Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.55	3.36	
Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.52 2.35 Faculty and admin define decision criteria together 2.99 2.77 Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability 2.83 2.74 Governance: Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance 2.72 2.60 Institution cultivates new faculty leaders 2.94 2.86 Benchmark: Governance: Productivity 2.81 2.72 Governance: Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09		Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	2.83	2.77	
Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.52 2.35 Faculty and admin define decision criteria together 2.99 2.77 Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability 2.83 2.74 Governance: Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances 2.85 2.71 Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance 2.72 2.60 Institution cultivates new faculty leaders 2.94 2.86 Benchmark: Governance: Productivity 2.81 2.72 Governance: Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09	Governance:	Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	2.90	2.89	
Faculty and admin define decision criteria together Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance Institution cultivates new faculty leaders Benchmark: Governance: Productivity Governance: Overall effectiveness of shared governance Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 2.99 2.71 2.80 2.81 2.72 2.57 3.09	Understanding the	Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	2.90	2.79	
Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability2.832.74Governance:Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances2.852.71AdaptabilityInstitution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance2.722.60Institution cultivates new faculty leaders2.942.86Benchmark: Governance: Productivity2.812.72Governance:Overall effectiveness of shared governance2.712.57ProductivityMy committees make measureable progress towards goals3.143.09	Issue at Hand	Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions	2.52	2.35	
Governance: Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances 2.85 2.71 Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance 2.72 2.60 Institution cultivates new faculty leaders 2.94 2.86 Benchmark: Governance: Productivity 2.81 2.72 Governance: Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09		Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	2.99	2.77	
Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance 2.72 2.60 Institution cultivates new faculty leaders 2.94 2.86 Benchmark: Governance: Productivity 2.81 2.72 Governance: Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09		Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability	2.83	2.74	
Institution cultivates new faculty leaders Benchmark: Governance: Productivity Governance: Overall effectiveness of shared governance Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 2.94 2.86 2.72 2.57 Productivity 3.09	Governance:	Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	2.85	2.71	
Benchmark: Governance: Productivity2.812.72Governance:Overall effectiveness of shared governance2.712.57ProductivityMy committees make measureable progress towards goals3.143.09	Adaptability	Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.72	2.60	
Governance: Overall effectiveness of shared governance 2.71 2.57 Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09		Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	2.94	2.86	
Productivity My committees make measureable progress towards goals 3.14 3.09		Benchmark: Governance: Productivity	2.81	2.72	
	Governance:	Overall effectiveness of shared governance	2.71	2.57	
	Productivity	My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.14	3.09	
			2.67	2.62	