		Associate	Accociata	
Theme	Measure	ASSOCIATE AY 17_18	Associate AY 14_15	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Research	3.23	3.16	
	Time spent on research	3.53	3.34	
	Expectations for finding external funding	3.01	3.14	
	Influence over focus of research	4.23	4.22	
	Quality of grad students to support research	3.32	3.37	
Nature of Work:	Support for research	2.78	2.86	
Research	Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.19	3.09	
	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.22	3.16	
	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	3.21	3.04	
	Support for securing grad student assistance	2.79	2.78	
	Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.20	3.04	
	Availability of course release for research	2.75	2.63	
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Service	3.29	3.28	
	Time spent on service	3.41	3.44	
	Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.89	2.78	
	Number of committees	3.49	3.47	
Nature of Work:	Attractiveness of committees	3.37	3.36	
Service	Discretion to choose committees	3.49	3.54	
	Equitability of committee assignments	3.00	2.99	
	Number of student advisees	3.58	3.61	
	Support for being a good advisor	2.90	N/A	
	Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	2.99	N/A	
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Teaching	3.76	3.74	
	Time spent on teaching	3.85	3.85	
	Number of courses taught	3.85	3.90	
	Level of courses taught	4.08	4.09	
	Discretion over course content	4.32	4.38	
	Number of students in classes taught	3.81	3.81	
Nature of Work:	Quality of students taught	3.57	3.55	
Teaching	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.11	2.98	
	Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.34	3.25	
	Teaching schedule	4.07	N/A	
	Support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.66	N/A	
	Support for assessing student learning	3.64	N/A	
	Support for developing online/hybrid courses	3.54	N/A	
	Support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.50	N/A	
Other Work	Time spent on outreach	3.56	3.69	
Other Work Activities	Time spent on administrative tasks	2.80	2.74	
Activities	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.20	3.18	
	Benchmark: Facilities and Work Resources	3.61	3.62	
	Support for improving teaching	3.43	3.42	
Facilities and Work Resources	Office	3.91	3.91	
	Laboratory, research, studio space	3.19	3.25	
	Equipment	3.52	3.51	
nesources	Classrooms	3.52	3.72	
	Library resources	4.30	4.20	
	Computing and technical support	3.76	3.71	
	Clerical/administrative support	3.11	3.09	
	·	-		

Theme	Measure		Associate	Diff ¹
	The double of th	AY 17_18	AY 14_15	J
	Benchmark: Personal and Family Policies	2.98	2.85	
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.13	3.19	
	Inst. supports family/career compatibility	3.06	2.92	
	Housing benefits	2.44	2.26	
	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.38	1.97	\uparrow
	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.76	2.56	
Policies	Childcare	2.28	2.03	\uparrow
	Eldercare	2.50	2.31	
	Family medical/parental leave	3.11	3.14	
	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.60	3.56	
	Stop-the-clock policies (pre-tenured only)	N<5	N<5	
	Parking benefits	3.22	N/A	
	Benchmark: Health and Retirement Benefits	2.96	2.96	
المصاطعات المصاط	Health benefits for yourself	3.01	3.01	
	Health benefits for family	2.53	2.38	
Retirement Benefits	Retirement benefits	3.20	3.18	
	Phased retirement options	3.25	3.43	
Salary	Salary	2.82	2.78	
,	Benchmark: Interdisciplinary Work	2.71	2.75	
	Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.66	2.61	
	Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	2.83	2.67	
Later Park Park	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.64	2.73	
• • •	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion (PrfTr and tenured only)	2.59	2.67	
Work	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure (pre-tenured only)	N/A	N/A	
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.73	2.84	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in reappointment (PrfTr only)	N/A	N/A	
	Interest in interdisciplinary work	3.80	N/A	
	Benchmark: Collaboration	3.69	3.65	
C. H. L	Opportunities for collab. within dept	3.75	3.71	
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. outside inst	3.72	3.71	
	Opportunities for collab. outside dept	3.59	3.56	
	Benchmark: Mentoring	2.97	2.91	
	Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	3.65	3.71	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept.	3.64	3.63	
	Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept (tenure track only)	3.18	3.15	
Mentoring	Mentoring of tenured associate profs in dept (tenured only)	2.31	2.28	
J	Mentoring of PrfTr faculty in dept (PrfTr only)	N/A	N/A	
	Support for faculty to be good mentors (tenured and PrfTr only)	2.37	2.15	
	Being a mentor is fulfilling (tenured and PrfTr only)	4.09	3.98	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst.	3.98	3.94	

Theme	Measure	Associate AY 17_18	Associate AY 14_15	Diff ¹
Tenure Policies (pre-tenured only) Tenure Clarity (pre-tenured only) Promotion (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	
- a	Clarity of expectations: Teacher	N/A	N/A	
•	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	3.41	3.35	
	Dept. culture encourages promotion	3.62	3.45	
	Reasonable expectations: Promotion	3.48	3.37	
	Clarity of promotion process	3.58	3.51	
	Clarity of promotion criteria	3.52	3.44	
(tenured only)	Clarity of promotion standards	3.28	3.26	
	Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	3.66	3.60	
	Clarity of time frame for promotion	2.93	2.99	
	Clarity of whether I will be promoted (assoc profs only)	3.26	3.19	
	Benchmark: Leadership: Senior	3.41	3.17	
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.57	3.36	
	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.50	3.16	\uparrow
Leadership: Senior	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.47	3.30	
·	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.34	3.14	
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.31	3.00	\uparrow
	CAO: Communication of priorities	3.28	3.03	\uparrow
	Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional	3.09	2.83	\uparrow
1 1 1	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.25	2.96	\uparrow
Leadership:	Dean: Stated priorities	3.04	2.73	\uparrow
Divisional	Dean: Communication of priorities	3.06	2.79	\uparrow
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	3.03	2.85	
	Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental	3.74	3.71	
	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.68	3.66	
Leadership:	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.62	3.56	
Departmental	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.71	3.69	
	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.80	3.75	
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.90	3.96	

Benchmark: Leadership: Faculty 3.06 3.04 Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making 3.03 2.99 Faculty leaders: Stated priorities 3.08 3.04 Faculty leaders: Stated priorities 2.99 3.02 Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input 3.16 3.13 Priorities are stated consistently 3.07 2.78 ↑ Priorities are stated consistently 2.92 2.57 ↑ Leadership: Institution-wide Changed priorities negatively affect my work 2.82 N/A Visible leadership for support of diversity 3.90 3.79 Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality 3.79 3.72 Colleagues support work/life balance 3.72 3.70 Meeting times compatible with personal needs 4.16 4.08 Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured 3.69 3.65 Amount of personal interaction w/Pert-enure 3.71 3.68 Collegiality Amount of personal interaction w/Pert-enure 3.71 3.68 Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion 3.93 3.76 Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of grad student learning 3.46 3.42 Discussions of effective teaching practices 3.40 3.55 Discussions of effective teaching practices 3	Theme	Measure	Associate	Associate	Diff ¹
Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making 3.03 2.99			AY 17_18	AY 14_15	
Faculty leaders: Stated priorities 3.08 3.04					
Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities Paculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input 3.16 3.13 Priorities are stated consistently 3.07 2.78 ↑ Leadership: Institution-wide Institution-wide Institution-wide Priorities are acted on consistently Visible leadership for support of diversity Visible leadership for support of diversity 3.90 3.79 Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality Colleagues support work/life balance Meeting times compatible with personal needs Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured 3.69 Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.71 3.60 Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure Colleagues pitch in when needed Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion Benchmark: Department of Discussions of Interaction w/Pre-tenure Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective use of technology Discussions of effective use of te	Loo donabies Cersul				
Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input Priorities are stated consistently Priorities are stated consistently Changed priorities are acted on consistently Sible leadership for support of diversity 3.90 3.79 Benchmark: Departmental Collegality Colleagues support work/life balance Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure Colleagues pitch in when needed Colleagues ormitted to diversity/inclusion Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of undergrad student learning Discussions of grad student learning Discussions of effective teaching practices Amount of professional interaction w/Prenure Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure facu	Leadership: Faculty				
Priorities are stated consistently 3.07 2.78 ↑	Leadership: Faculty Leadership: Institution-wide Departmental Collegiality Departmental Engagement Departmental Collegiality	·			
Leadership: Institution-wide Changed priorities are acted on consistently Visible leadership for support of diversity Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality Colleagues support work/life balance Meeting times compatible with personal needs Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured Collegiality Amount of personal interaction w/Ferture Colleagues pitch in when needed Colleagues pitch in when needed Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion Benchmark: Departmental Collegial Colleagues of undergrad student learning Discussions of undergrad student learning Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective use of technology Amount of professional interaction w/Prefir Amount of professional interaction w/Prefir Benchmark: Departmental Collegial Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective use of technology Amount of professional interaction w/Prefir Amount of professional interaction w/Prefir Benchmark: Departmental Quality Departmental Quality Departmental Quality Departmental Quality Departmental Quality Departmental Quality Departmental Quality of renured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only)					
Institution-wide Changed priorities negatively affect my work Visible leadership for support of diversity Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality Colleagues support work/life balance Amount of personal interaction w/Fre-tenure Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure Colleagues pitch in when needed Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of ungergrad student learning Discussions of pad student learning Discussions of effective use of technology Discussions of effective use of technology Discussions of effective use of technology Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Benchmark: Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenure faculty Scholarly productivity of PrFT faculty Scholarly productivity of Pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of Pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of PrFT faculty Dept. is successful at faculty reentiment (tenured and PrFTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty reentiment (tenured and PrFTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty reentiment (tenured and PrFTr only) Joba Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Dept. is successful at faculty reentiment (tenured and PrFTr only) Joba Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Dept. is successful at faculty reentiment (tenured and PrFTr only) Joba Scholarly Productivity of pr		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Visible leadership for support of diversity Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality Colleagues support work/life balance Amount of personal interaction w/Preunure Collegiality Amount of personal interaction w/Preunure Amount of personal interaction w/Preunure Collegiality Amount of personal interaction w/Preunure Colleagues pitch in when needed Colleagues pitch in when needed Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion Department is collegial Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of undergrad student learning Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective teaching practices Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Benchmark: Departmental Quality Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Benchmark: Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 1.74 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.74 3.78 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.74 3.78 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.77 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty 3.78 Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.37 3.76 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.35		·			<u> </u>
Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality 3.79 3.72 3.70	Institution-wide		2.82	N/A	
Colleagues support work/life balance Meeting times compatible with personal needs Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.69 Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.71 3.68 Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.71 Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.71 3.60 N/A How well you fit Colleagues pitch in when needed 3.65 3.57 Department is collegial Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion 3.93 3.76 Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of undergrad student learning 3.73 3.78 Discussions of grad student learning 3.73 3.78 Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.75 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.75 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.76 Departmental Quality Departmental Quality Departmental Quality Feaching effectiveness of renured faculty 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.85 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.89 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of renured faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76			3.90	3.79	
Meeting times compatible with personal needs Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured 3.69 3.65 Amount of personal interaction w/Per-tenure 3.71 3.68 Amount of personal interaction w/Per-tenure 3.71 3.68 Amount of personal interaction w/Per-tenure 3.71 3.60 N/A How well you fit 3.50 3.40 Colleagues pitch in when needed 3.65 3.57 Department is collegial Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion 3.93 3.76 Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of undergrad student learning Discussions of grad student learning 3.73 3.78 Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Discussions of current research methods 3.38 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/Preured 3.78 3.75 Amount of professional interaction w/Preured 3.78 Amount of professional interaction w/Preured 3.78 Benchmark: Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 1.17 1.409 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.78 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.78 N/A Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.93 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76	Leadership: Institution-wide Departmental Collegiality Departmental Engagement		3.79	3.72	
Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured 3.69 3.65 Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.71 3.68 Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.71 3.68 Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr 3.60 N/A How well you fit 3.50 3.40 Colleagues pitch in when needed 3.65 3.57 Department is collegial 4.02 3.89 Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion 3.93 3.76 Benchmark: Departmental Engagement 3.55 3.61 Discussions of undergrad student learning 3.73 3.78 Discussions of effective teaching practices 3.40 3.55 Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.75 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.65 N/A Benchmark: Departmental Quality 3.70 3.65 Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 4.17 4.09 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28		Colleagues support work/life balance	3.72	3.70	
Departmental Collegiality Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr 3.68 Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr 3.60 N/A How well you fit Colleagues pitch in when needed 3.65 3.57 Department is collegial Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion 3.93 3.76 Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of undergrad student learning Discussions of grad student learning Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective use of technology Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Benchmark: Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Colleagues committed to diversity department faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.78 3.70 3.65 Departmental Quality Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.85 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.70 3.70 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28		Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.16	4.08	
Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr 3.60 N/A		Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.69	3.65	
How well you fit Colleagues pitch in when needed 3.65 3.57 Department is collegial A.02 3.89 Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion 3.93 3.76 Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of undergrad student learning 3.46 3.42 Discussions of grad student learning 3.73 3.78 Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective teaching practices 3.40 3.55 Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Discussions of current research methods 3.38 3.48 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/Prenured 3.78 3.75 Amount of professional interaction w/Prenured 3.78 3.75 Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty 3.70 3.65 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 4.17 4.09 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.26 Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.28	Departmental	Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.71	3.68	
Colleagues pitch in when needed 3.65 3.57 Department is collegial 4.02 3.89 Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion 3.93 3.76 Benchmark: Departmental Engagement 3.55 3.61 Discussions of undergrad student learning 3.46 3.42 Discussions of grad student learning 3.73 3.78 Discussions of effective teaching practices 3.40 3.55 Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Discussions of current research methods 3.38 3.48 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/Prenured 3.78 3.75 Amount of professional interaction w/Prenured 3.78 3.75 Benchmark: Departmental Quality 3.70 3.65 Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 4.17 4.09 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.78 N/A Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28	Collegiality	Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr	3.60	N/A	
Department is collegial Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion 3.93 3.76 Benchmark: Departmental Engagement Discussions of undergrad student learning 3.46 3.42 Discussions of grad student learning 3.73 3.78 Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Discussions of effective use of technology 3.38 3.48 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty 3.70 3.65 Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 4.17 4.09 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.26 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.28	Conceptancy	How well you fit	3.50	3.40	
Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion 3.93 3.76 Benchmark: Departmental Engagement 2.55 3.61 Discussions of undergrad student learning 3.46 3.42 Discussions of grad student learning 3.73 3.78 Discussions of effective teaching practices 3.40 3.55 Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Discussions of current research methods 3.38 3.48 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr 3.65 N/A Benchmark: Departmental Quality 3.70 3.65 Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 4.17 4.09 Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of Pre-tenure faculty 3.76 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28		Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.65	3.57	
Departmental Engagement 3.55 3.61		Department is collegial	4.02	3.89	
Discussions of undergrad student learning Discussions of grad student learning Discussions of grad student learning Discussions of effective teaching practices Discussions of effective use of technology Discussions of effective use of technology Discussions of current research methods Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr Benchmark: Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectivene		Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.93	3.76	
Discussions of grad student learning 3.73 3.78 Discussions of effective teaching practices 3.40 3.55 Discussions of effective use of technology 3.34 3.47 Discussions of current research methods 3.38 3.48 Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure 3.83 3.79 Amount of professional interaction w/PreTr 3.65 N/A Benchmark: Departmental Quality 3.70 3.65 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 4.17 4.09 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 4.03 3.94 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28		Benchmark: Departmental Engagement	3.55	3.61	
Departmental Engagement Discussions of effective use of technology Discussions of current research methods Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professi		Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.46	3.42	
Discussions of effective use of technology Discussions of current research methods Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr 3.65 N/A Benchmark: Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Auguality Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.47 3.48 3.48 3.48 3.48 3.49 3.79 3.70 3.65 N/A 4.09 3.70 3.65 N/A 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.83 3.63 3.63 3.74 4.09 3.83 3.63 3.63 3.76 3.81 Anount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure faculty 3.83 3.63 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.83 3.63 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.83 3.63 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.83 3.63 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28		Discussions of grad student learning	3.73	3.78	
Engagement Discussions of effective use of technology Discussions of current research methods Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr Benchmark: Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Auos Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.47 3.48 3.48 3.48 3.49 3.79 3.70 3.65 N/A 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 3.83 3.63 3.63 3.63 3.76 3.78 N/A 3.78 N/A 3.78 N/A 3.78 N/A 3.78 N/A 3.78 3.78 3.78 N/A 3.78 3.78 3.78 3.78 N/A 3.78 3.78 3.78 N/A 3.78	Donartmontal	Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.40	3.55	
Discussions of current research methods Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure Amount of professional interaction w/Prenured Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr 3.65 N/A Benchmark: Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 4.03 3.94 Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty 3.78 N/A Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28	•	Discussions of effective use of technology	3.34	3.47	
Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr 3.65 N/A Benchmark: Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 4.03 3.94 Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty 3.78 N/A Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28	Departmental Collegiality Departmental Engagement Departmental	Discussions of current research methods	3.38	3.48	
Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr 3.65 N/A Benchmark: Departmental Quality 3.70 3.65 Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty 3.74 3.69 Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 4.17 4.09 Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 4.03 3.94 Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty 3.78 N/A Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28		Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.83	3.79	
Departmental Quality		Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured	3.78	3.75	
Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 4.03 3.94 Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty 3.78 N/A Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28		Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr	3.65	N/A	
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty 1.17 1.09 Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty 3.84 N/A Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty 3.83 3.63 Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty 4.03 3.94 Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty 3.78 N/A Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty 3.93 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty 3.99 3.85 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28		Benchmark: Departmental Quality	3.70	3.65	
Departmental Quality Departmental Quality Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.84 N/A 3.83 3.63 3.63 N/A 3.76 Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76		Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.74	3.69	
Departmental Quality Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.83 3.63 N/A 3.76 N/A 3.76 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76		Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.17	4.09	
Departmental Quality Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.94 3.76 N/A 3.76 N/A 3.76 3.76 3.76 3.76		Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty	3.84	N/A	
Ouality Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.78 N/A 3.76 N/A 3.76 N/A 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76		Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.83	3.63	
Quality Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.78 N/A 3.76 N/A 3.76 N/A 3.76 N/A 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.37 3.28	Danastasastal	Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.03	3.94	
Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 3.76 3.76 3.76 3.76 3.76 3.76	- 1	Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty	3.78	N/A	
Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty 4.05 N/A Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28	Quality		3.93		
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28		Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.99	3.85	
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.70 3.76 Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28					
Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) 3.34 3.28				-	

Theme	Measure	Associate AY 17_18	Associate AY 14_15	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition	3.26	3.12	
	Recognition: For teaching	3.23	3.20	
	Recognition: For advising	3.03	2.94	
	Recognition: For scholarship	3.39	3.35	
	Recognition: For service	3.04	2.96	
A managiation and	Recognition: For outreach	3.13	3.01	
Appreciation and	Recognition: From colleagues	3.69	3.56	
Recognition	Recognition: From CAO (tenured only)	2.96	2.80	
	Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)	3.09	2.89	
	Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.73	3.67	
	School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)	3.39	3.02	\uparrow
	Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)	3.10	2.86	
	CAO cares about faculty of my rank	3.19	2.97	
	Benchmark: Governance: Trust	3.00	2.94	
	I understand how to voice opinions about policies	2.93	2.88	
Carramanas Turat	Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	3.17	3.03	
Governance: Trust	Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement	3.31	2.94	\uparrow
	Faculty and admin have an open system of communication	3.03	2.78	\uparrow
	Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.23	3.06	
	Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	3.09	2.89	
Governance: Shared	Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.53	2.33	
Sense of Purpose	Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input	2.98	2.90	
sense of Purpose	Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	3.31	2.92	\uparrow
	Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.62	3.34	\uparrow
	Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	2.90	2.80	
Governance:	Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	2.99	2.87	
Understanding the	Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	2.92	2.78	
Issue at Hand	Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions	2.58	2.32	\uparrow
	Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	3.09	2.76	\uparrow
	Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability	2.93	2.75	
Governance: Adaptability	Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	2.98	2.73	
	Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.80	2.55	
	Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	3.06	2.87	
	Benchmark: Governance: Productivity	2.83	2.77	
Governance:	Overall effectiveness of shared governance	2.77	2.68	
Productivity	My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.17	3.10	
	Public recognition of progress	2.73	2.56	