What has always been strong at Iowa State?

- Iowa State faculty have been satisfied with academic freedom, a Faculty Core Value.
- Faculty have rated senior leadership as well as their health and retirement benefits and commute as strengths.
- Iowa State faculty have noted few areas of concern.
- Iowa States response rate has been stronger than their peers.
- Iowa State faculty have been satisfied with the quality of their colleagues and the opportunity to collaborate, noting this as one of the best aspects of working at Iowa State.
What opportunities for growth remain?

Faculty have consistently rated geographic location and compensation among the least favorable aspects of working at Iowa State.

Faculty cited a lack of research support as a concern.

The demands of teaching responsibilities are a challenge for faculty.

Faculty noted their dissatisfaction with service.

Department collegiality and engagement are a salient concern.

Which key actions were implemented?

Improved clarity in guidelines and criteria for faculty advancement and review.

Established flexible faculty policies, programs, and practices and improved relevant resources.

Strengthened faculty mentoring.

Enhanced faculty leadership programming.

Enriched honors, awards, and recognition.
In 2021, COACHE emailed a unique survey link to 1527 faculty. The sample comprised full-time, tenure-eligible and term faculty as of November 2020. Administrators (at assistant dean level or above), faculty who were in final year after tenure denial, and faculty who submitted resignations/retirements for 2020 were excluded.

In total, 904 of 1527 eligible faculty responded to the survey, comprising a 56% response rate. The average survey completion time was 22 minutes. As Iowa State faculty work toward fulfilling the land-grant mission and meeting institutional strategic goals, COACHE data affords administrators and faculty an opportunity to examine data and explore within-campus differences for the overall faculty and across faculty subgroups.

### Faculty Response Rates by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivy College of Business</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture and Life Sciences</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Human Sciences</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Design</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the low number of faculty in the Library (n<5), COACHE did not compute a response rate to protect their confidentiality.

**Which institutions were used for comparison?**

A hallmark of the COACHE data is the opportunity to compare and contrast Iowa State with selected peer institutions as well as approximately 80 institutions who took part in COACHE over the past three years (i.e., the COACHE cohort).

A primary advantage of the 2021 COACHE survey data administration is that Iowa State leaders selected five peer institutions for comparison. Iowa State remained consistent and again selected five peer institutions. We refer to this group of institutions as the Peer Five. It is noteworthy that Iowa States response rate (56%) was considerably higher than the Peer Five (40%) and COACHE cohort (42%).
**Peer Five**

- North Carolina State University
- Purdue University
- Texas Tech University
- University of California, Davis
- Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

**What are the COACHE benchmarks?**

COACHE summarizes each survey theme using a “benchmark,” which comprises the mean of several five-point Likert-scale survey questions that share a common theme. The COACHE Benchmarks reflect themes that are curated based on research and ability to effect change.

**These themes include:**

- Nature of Work
  - Research
  - Service
  - Teaching
- Resources & Support
  - Facilities and Work Resources
  - Health and Retirement Benefits
  - Personal and Family Policies
- Collaboration, Interdisciplinary Work, and Mentoring
- Tenure and Promotion
- Leadership
- Governance
- Faculty Senate
- The Department: Collegiality, Engagement, Quality, and Leadership
- Appreciation and Recognition

For additional information about COACHE’s benchmarks, review Survey Themes on the COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey website.

**What are areas of strength for Iowa State?**

Iowa State is in the top two of their peer group for 19 benchmarks, including:

- Governance (five benchmarks: trust, shared purpose, understanding issues, adaptability, and productivity)
- Leadership (four benchmarks: senior, divisional, department, and faculty)
- Nature of Work: Research and Service
- Collaboration, Mentoring, Interdisciplinary Work, and Appreciation/Recognition
- Facilities & Resources, Personal/Family Policies, and Health/Retirement Benefits
- Tenure Policies

Iowa State ranks in the middle of the peer group for five benchmarks, including departmental engagement, Nature of Work: Teaching, Tenure Expectation: Clarity, Departmental Quality, and Promotion to Professor.

Iowa State had one area of concern: department collegiality. This represents an opportunity for growth as Iowa State is ranked in the bottom of the peer group.
What will each benchmark report include?

1. COACHE’s definition of the benchmark
2. Sources of dissatisfaction, derived from the COACHE benchmark definition and the questionnaire items
3. Questionnaire items with the highest percentages of satisfaction or agreement
4. Subpopulation differences. COACHE considers the following groups—

- appointment type: tenured, tenure-eligible, and term. Response rates: Tenured 57% (peers: 43%, cohort: 45%); Tenure-eligible 57% (peers: 43%, cohort: 45%); Term 52% (peers: 32%, cohort: 38%).

- rank: professors and associate professors. Response rates: Professor 59% (peers: 42%, cohort: 46%); associate professor 54% (peers: 43%, cohort: 43%).


- race: White, Asian, faculty of color (which includes Asians) and underrepresented (which excludes Whites and Asians). Response rates: White 60% (peers: 43%, cohort: 46%); Asian/Asian American 42% (peers: 30%, cohort: 35%); faculty of color 49% (peers: 34%, cohort: 40%); underrepresented (excludes White or Asian) 64% (peers: 38%, cohort: 44%).

We choose to highlight subpopulation differences varying by 25 percentage points or more in satisfaction or agreement. We will explore sources of variability in subgroups and faculty characteristics and share important insights in the 2022-2023 academic year.

5. Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages of satisfaction or agreement
6. Promising action items, developed based on the aforementioned items and institutional priorities, resources, and assets.

How did the COVID-19 pandemic influence the COACHE data?

COACHE carefully attended to the ways in which the COVID-19 pandemic may have influenced campus operations and faculty perceptions of the campus environment. All participating COACHE institutions experienced this disruption. COACHE only noted negligible impacts to benchmark items related to leadership, governance, and decision-making. Read more in the COVID-19 Impact Study: Technical Report online.
Faculty had an opportunity to rate the best and least favorable aspects of working at Iowa State as well as communicate whether they would choose Iowa State again. Among faculty who responded to these questions,

**Best aspects of working at Iowa State -**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of colleagues</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic freedom</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of colleagues</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Among the least favorable aspects noted were -**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Responses About Choosing Iowa State

Nearly 70% expressed some level of agreement with the statement, “If I had to do it all over, I would again choose to work at this institution.” There was somewhat less agreement with this statement as compared to the Peer Five and the COACHE Cohort.

Faculty Recommendation About Their Department

Faculty level of comfort with their departments was less positive than the overall institution. While 70% of faculty agreed that they would choose to work at Iowa State again, only approximately 55% would strongly recommend their department as a place to work (See Figure 3). About 35% would recommend their department with reservations. But this trend is similar to the Peer Five and the overall COACHE Cohort.

Take action on equity at the department level.
**COACHE definition:**
Faculty satisfaction with research is a function not just of the time to commit to research, but also of the clarity and consistency of institutional expectations and the resources provided to meet them.

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Lack of time to commit to research
- Lack of clarity and consistency in institutional expectations
- Lack of resources to meet goals

**Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:**
- **96%** were satisfied with their control over the focus of their research.
- **81%** were satisfied with the support they received for obtaining grants.
- **80%** were satisfied with the time available to spend on research.
   #1 among in our peer group!

**Notable subpopulation difference:**
With regard to the availability of course release for research, Asian faculty were more satisfied than underrepresented faculty (82% vs. 51%).

**Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:**
- **74%** were satisfied with quality of graduate students to support research.
- **68%** were satisfied with support for securing graduate student assistance.
- **64%** were satisfied with availability of course release for research.

**Promising action items:**
- Improve alignment of time and resources with research priorities and expectations.
- Increase faculty satisfaction with course releases and support for travel to present/conduct research.
- Enhance graduate student assistance and availability of graduate students to support research.
COACHE definition:
The challenge for every faculty member is to strike a balance between institutional expectations for teaching and the time and ability available to invest in it.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
• Expectations for teaching are unreasonable or contrary to what faculty were promised at the point of hire
• Institutional support is lacking or when the distribution of work is inequitable.

Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:
95% were satisfied with their level of discretion over course content, level of courses taught, and support for teaching diverse learning styles.
94% were satisfied with the teaching schedule they were given.
93% were satisfied with the support they received for assessing student learning.

#1 among in our peer group!

Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:
85% were satisfied with presenting online/hybrid courses.
87% were satisfied with support for developing courses.
69% were satisfied with equitability of distribution of teaching load.

Promising action items:
• Examine disparities in teaching.
• Promote equity in teaching loads.
• Catalyze course creation and online innovation, such as through internal mini-grants and professional development opportunities.
COACHE definition:
Health benefits, once a given, are now less certain for faculty. Also, some faculty across the country have put their retirements on hold in the wake of the recent economic recession.

Many institutions have adopted phased programs to encourage timely retirements. Some allow individuals to enjoy institutional affiliation, intellectual engagement, and contact with students and colleagues, while the institutions realize salary savings and more reliable staffing projections.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
• Lack of desirable health benefits and retirement options
• Benefits viewed as not being competitive with the market

Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:
97% were satisfied with the health benefits provided for themselves and their families.
93% were satisfied with the retirement benefits offered by Iowa State.

Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:
85% were satisfied with phased retirement options.

Promising action items:
• Raise awareness about Emeritus status.
• Enhance communication about phased retirement.
• Explore ways to strengthen phased retirement.
**COACHE definition:**
The physical workplace (e.g., office, lab, research or studio space, equipment, classrooms), plus technology, administrative work, and improvements to teaching.

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Lack of facilities appropriate for the work
- Insufficient technology, administrative, and teaching resources

**Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:**
- 94% were satisfied with available library resources.
- 90% were satisfied with their office space.
  
  **#1 among in our peer group!**

**Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:**
- 70% were satisfied with clerical/administrative support.
- 67% satisfied with time spent on administrative tasks.

**Promising action items:**
- Invest in administrative support.
- Enhance administrative support efficiency and effectiveness.
- Strengthen climate to foster administrative support.

“More administrative assistance.”
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Nature of Work: Service

COACHE definition:
Service is infused in the ethos of faculty life: service to the discipline and university.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
• Committee work is unproductive or unfulfilling
• Colleagues evade service commitments
• Service is not recognized in evaluations or advancement and promotion cases

Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:

91% were satisfied with the number of student advisees.
88% found the committees they were offered attractive.
86% were satisfied with the number of committees they were part of.

#1 within our peer group in all three categories!

Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:

70% were able to balance teaching/research/service.
68% were satisfied with the support for being a good advisor.
62% were satisfied with the support for faculty in leadership roles.

#1 among in our peer group!

Promising action items:
• Enhance department awareness about the flexibility of the Position Responsibility Statement.
• Cultivate strategies for balancing position responsibilities.
• Provide professional development on best practices in advising.
• Elevate recognition of leadership successes.
**COACHE definition:**
Faculty beliefs about the effectiveness of various policies related to work-family balance and support for families.

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Perceptions that the various policies are not effective for supporting work-family balance and support for families.
- Policies which do not adequately support faculty goals related to work-family balance.

**Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:**

- 92% were satisfied with stop-the-clock policies.
- 88% were satisfied with family medical or parental leave policies.
- #1 among in our peer group! 88% were satisfied with flexible workload/modified duty policies.

**Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:**

- 66% were satisfied with professional/personal balance.
- 58% were satisfied with childcare.

**Promising action items:**
- Strengthen work-life integration policies, programs, and practices.
- Enhance child care support on and options.
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Collaboration, Interdisciplinary Work, and Mentorship

**COACHE definition:**

**Collaboration:** Most faculty work requires collaboration whether with students, peers, administrators, or other colleagues in the classroom or the lab, and with the broader community through service or outreach programs.

**Interdisciplinary research:** Research collaboration within and between institutions and with off-campus partners. Interdisciplinary research has become more common due to its intrinsic motivation for researchers to cross-fertilize; this type of work attracts many graduate students and early-career faculty.

**Mentorship:** Mentoring has always been important in the academic workplace. Only recently, however, has the practice evolved more widely from incidental to intentional as academic leaders have come to appreciate that mentorship is too valuable to be left to chance.

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**

- Policies, structures or cultures that do not support collaboration, interdisciplinary research, and mentorship
- Tenure-eligible faculty or Associate Professors lack sufficient mentoring they feel is essential on their path to promotion in rank.

**Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:**

- **94%** satisfied with time spent on outreach.
- **92%** agreed that being a faculty mentor is fulfilling.
- **91%** were satisfied with effectiveness of mentoring outside the institution.

- #1 among in our peer group!

**Subpopulation differences varying by 25 percentage points or more in satisfaction or agreement:**

**Interdisciplinary Work**

- Tenure-eligible faculty were more satisfied with interdisciplinary work being rewarded in promotion than term faculty (100% vs. 60%).
- Tenured faculty were more satisfied with how interdisciplinary work was rewarded in tenure than tenure-eligible faculty (100% vs. 60%).
- Asian faculty were more likely to agree that interdisciplinary work was rewarded in reappointment than White faculty (100% vs. 60%).
Mentoring

• Tenure-eligible faculty were most satisfied with support for faculty to be good mentors than term faculty (100% vs. 42%).

• Of tenured associate professors, men were more satisfied with the mentoring of tenured associate professors in the department than their female counterparts (52% vs. 23%).

• Tenure-eligible faculty were more satisfied with mentoring of term faculty in the department than term faculty (100% vs. 36%); Asian faculty were more satisfied with mentoring of term faculty than White faculty (78% vs. 36%).

Questionnaire items with the lowest agreement or satisfaction:

60% agreed that interdisciplinary work is rewarded in reappointment.

54% agreed that there is support for faculty to be good mentors.

49% were satisfied with mentoring of tenured associate professors by department.

Promising action items:

• Enhance recognition and equity for collaboration, interdisciplinary research, and mentoring, especially at the time of reappointment.

• Strengthen and expand optimal mentoring, particularly for associate professors and term faculty.

• Provide rank-and diversity-responsive workshops for faculty and academic leaders that attend to disparities and illuminate equity-oriented practices.

A mentoring program would be amazing for term faculty.
COACHE definition:

Tenure (tenure-eligible faculty only): Administrators and faculty alike acknowledge that, at most institutions, the bar to achieve tenure has risen over time. Academic leaders can improve the clarity of tenure policies, requirements, and expectations and provide credible assurances of fairness and equity.

Promotion (tenured faculty only): While the academy has recently improved many policies for assistant professors, it has done far less for associate professors. New practices have emerged from related to modified duties such as reduced teaching load; sabbatical planning and other workshops; workload shifts (i.e., more teaching or more research); improved communication about timing for promotion and a nudge to prepare materials for promotion to Professor; small grants to support mid-career faculty (e.g., matching funds, travel support); and broader, more inclusive criteria.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:

- Anxiety about tenure and promotion
- Lack of clarity and communication about tenure and promotion
- Inconsistent messages and practices relative to tenure and promotion

Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:

- 88% were satisfied with clarity of promotion process.
- 87% were satisfied with clarity of body of evidence for promotion.

Subpopulation differences varying by 25 percentage points or more in satisfaction or agreement:

- Tenure-eligible faculty were more satisfied with clarity of whether they would be promoted to professor than tenured faculty (100% vs. 70%).
- Relative to clarity of expectations, tenured faculty were more satisfied than tenure-eligible faculty about being an advisor (100% vs. 70%), a colleague (100% vs. 70%), a campus citizen (100% vs. 64%), and engaged in the broader community (100% vs. 60%).
- Asian faculty were more satisfied with clarity of expectations than underrepresented faculty about being a scholar (100% vs. 74%), an advisor (94% vs. 68%), a colleague (91% vs. 53%), a campus citizen (90% vs. 47%), and engaged in the broader community (86% vs. 58%).
- Tenured faculty were more satisfied than tenure-eligible faculty about clarity of tenure criteria (100% vs. 75%) and tenure standards (100% vs. 63%).
• Tenured faculty were more satisfied with consistency of messages about tenure than tenure-eligible faculty (100% vs. 65%).
• Asian faculty were more satisfied than underrepresented faculty about clarity of tenure process (94% vs. 63%), clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure (88% vs. 63%), clarity of tenure criteria (91% vs. 63%), consistency of messages about tenure (77% vs. 42%), and clarity of tenure standards (79% vs. 33%).

Questionnaire items with the lowest agreement or satisfaction:

75% were satisfied with clarity of tenure criteria. 65% agreed that there was consistency in messages about tenure.

64% were satisfied with clarity of tenure standards.

Promising action items:
• Improve clarity, consistency, and equity.
• Provide rank-and diversity-responsive workshops for promotion, tenure, and advancement.
COACHE definition:
Academic leaders—in this case defined as the president, provost, and deans, play critical roles in shaping the retention and success of faculty members. Faculty desire an administration with a clearly-articulated institutional mission and vision that do not change in ways that adversely affect faculty.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
- Slow decision making
- Inconsistent priorities
- Poor communication
- Failure to take input
- Perceived unfairness

Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:
- 89% were satisfied with the visibility of leadership support for diversity.
- 86% were satisfied with the pace of decision making by the president and provost.
- 83% were satisfied with the university priorities as stated by the president and provost.

Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:
- 72% agreed that priorities were stated consistently across levels of leadership.
- 65% agreed that priorities were acted on consistently across levels of leadership.

Promising action items:
- Explore ways to strengthen alignment between the university’s mission and practices.
- Strengthen messaging clarity and consistency among academic leaders.
- Increase communication about academic leaders, their philosophies, and their priorities.
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Governance

**COACHE definition:**
Governance is working when faculty, administrators, and other stakeholders listen respectfully to different perspectives and then work together to make decisions aligned with their shared understanding of their institution’s best interests. Specifically, to what degree does the culture and climate surrounding governance, which create the conditions that foster—or undermine—collaborative relationships between faculty and administrators?

**Adaptability:** Do stakeholders reflect on the effectiveness of their governance practices and pursue improvements in the status quo?

**Productivity:** Does governance produce meaningful results?

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Lack of effective governance
- Perceived lack of value for good governance

**Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:**
- 84% agreed that the committees to which they belonged made measurable progress toward goals.
- 81% agreed that Iowa State effectively cultivates new faculty leaders. #1 among in our peer group!

**Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:**
- 70% agreed the institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance.
- 68% were satisfied with the overall effectiveness of shared governance.

**Promising action items:**
- Raise awareness about shared governance, Faculty Core Value 1.
- Communicate regular assessments of governance.
- Develop institutional standards and best practices for self-governance.
- Cultivate leaders.
**Shared sense of purpose:** Are stakeholders with diverse interests and perspectives united by a shared sense of purpose?

**Trust:** Do the stakeholders involved in governance trust each other and the decision-making processes at their institution?

**Understanding the issues at hand:** Is decision-making informed by inclusive dialogue that promotes fuller understanding of the complex issues facing the institution?

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Lack of clear communication
- Lack of a clear structure for governance
- Lack of a shared goal

**Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:**

- **88%** agreed that faculty and administrators have a shared sense of responsibility.
- **86%** agreed that faculty and administrators respectfully consider other’s view.
- **82%** agreed that faculty and administrators defined decision criteria together.

**Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:**

- **70%** agreed that faculty and administrators had an equal say in decisions.
- **66%** agreed important decisions were not made until there was a consensus.

**Promising action items:**
- Raise awareness about shared governance, a faculty core value.
- Offer professional development for academic leaders on collaborative decision-making practices.
COACHE definition:
“Shared governance” is working when faculty, administrators, and other stakeholders listen respectfully to different perspectives and then work together to make decisions aligned with their shared understanding of their institution’s best interests. The Faculty Senate represents the general faculty of Iowa State University and participates in shared governance of the university with the administration. For more information, visit the Faculty Senate website.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
• Slow decision making
• Inconsistent priorities
• Poor communication
• Failure to take input

Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:
82% were satisfied with steps taken by the Faculty Senate to gather faculty input.
81% were satisfied with the stated priorities of the Faculty Senate.

Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:
78% were satisfied with the pace of decision-making.

Promising action items:
• Raise awareness about the Faculty Senate and its structure and process.
• Examine Faculty Senate practices for growth opportunities and improvement.
• Strengthen department level communication about the Faculty Senate or adopt a modified structure of the Faculty Senate at the department level.
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The Department

COACHE Definition:
Institutions employ faculty, but faculty spend most of their time in departments, where culture has perhaps the greatest influence on faculty satisfaction and morale.

COACHE CONSIDERS FOUR ASPECTS OF THE DEPARTMENT

1. Collegiality
2. Engagement
3. Quality
4. Leadership

Each aspect is detailed next.
**COACHE definition:**
A faculty member’s sense of “fit” among their colleagues, their personal interactions with colleagues, whether their colleagues “pitch in” when needed, and support work-life balance.

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Lack of personal interaction
- Lack of colleagues who “pitch in”
- Lack of colleague support for work-life balance
- Inability to balance teaching responsibilities and available time

**Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:**
- 89% agreed that meeting times were compatible with their personal needs.
- 87% agreed that their colleagues were committed to diversity and inclusion.
- 85% were satisfied with the amount of personal interaction between tenured and term faculty.

**Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:**
- 83% agreed that colleagues pitch in when needed.
- 79% were satisfied with sense of fit.

**Promising action items:**
- Examine the climate and culture of collegiality and sense of belonging.
- Cultivate inclusion and raise awareness about community and intentionality.
- Improve awareness about the significance and impact of equity and sharing the load.
COACHE definition:
Faculty engagement with one another includes professional interactions, such as departmental discussions about undergraduate and graduate learning, pedagogy, the use of technology, and research methodologies.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
• Lack of satisfaction with professional interactions
• Institutional support is lacking, or when the distribution of work is inequitable.

Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:

89% were satisfied with professional interactions with term faculty.

86% were satisfied with the level of professional interaction with tenure-eligible and tenured faculty.

86% were satisfied with discussions of effective teaching practices.

Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:

80% were satisfied with discussions of graduate student learning.

74% were satisfied with discussions of current research methods.

Promising action items:
• Enhance graduate student pedagogical practices.
• Dialogue about graduate student learning and research methods.
• Create a university wide open seminar on methodological diversity.
COACHE definition:
Department chairs play a critical role in the success of faculty members. Faculty desire an administration with clearly articulated priorities and vision that do not change in ways that adversely affect faculty.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
• Slow decision making
• Inconsistent priorities
• Poor communication
• Failure to take input
• Perceived unfairness

Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:

87% were satisfied with the department chair’s fairness.

82% were satisfied with the reception of their input.

Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:

80% were satisfied with communication of priorities.

Promising action items:
• Work with academic leaders to cultivate communication practices.
• Highlight effective and innovative approaches to communication.
**COACHE definition:**
Departmental quality is a function of the intellectual vitality of faculty, the scholarship that is produced, the effectiveness of teaching, how well the department recruits and retains excellent faculty, and whether and how poor faculty performance is handled.

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Perceived ineffectiveness
- Response to poor performance by department leadership

**Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:**
- 96% were satisfied with the teaching effectiveness of term faculty.
- 95% were satisfied with the teaching effectiveness of tenure-eligible faculty.
- 93% were satisfied with the intellectual vitality of tenure-eligible faculty.

**Subpopulation differences varying by 25 percentage points or more in satisfaction or agreement:**
- Tenure-eligible faculty were more satisfied with the department’s success at faculty retention than tenured faculty (100% vs. 60%).

**Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:**
- 67% agreed that the department is successful at faculty retention.
- 53% were satisfied with department addressing sub-standard performance.

**Promising action items:**
- Develop supports for faculty.
- Launch university and college initiative to raise awareness about faculty retention.
- Pro-actively cultivate faculty retention tools and strategies with academic leaders.
COACHE definition:
Faculty, at all ranks (like other employees), want colleagues to appreciate and recognize them for doing good work. This includes not only undergraduate and graduate students with whom relationships can be especially gratifying, but also fellow faculty and upper-level administrators.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
• Showing appreciation and recognition in ways that are not meaningful
• Gap between expectations and recognition

Questionnaire items with the highest percentages:
- 85% felt their college was valued by the president and provost.
- #1 among in our peer group!
- 80% were satisfied with the recognition received from their department chair.
- 80% were satisfied with the recognition received for scholarship and outreach.

Subpopulation differences varying by 25 percentage points or more in satisfaction or agreement:
• Asian Faculty were more satisfied with the recognition for advising than underrepresented faculty (89% vs. 63%).

Questionnaire items with the lowest percentages:
- 73% agreed that the president and provost value the department.
- 69% were satisfied with recognition from colleagues.

Promising action items:
• Strengthen communication channels between the president, provost, and departments.
• Explore opportunities to increase recognition for advising among underrepresented faculty.

Recognize the hard work of those who do not always go in front of a camera.
COACHE provides comparisons by faculty appointments, rank, race, and gender. There were notable subpopulations differences by faculty appointments (e.g., tenured vs. tenure-eligible vs. term), gender (e.g., women, men), and race (e.g., White, Asian, underrepresented). Underrepresented faculty include faculty who do not identify as White or Asian, such as Latino, Black, and/or Native American. These variations are described next. Given data limitations or restrictions with data confidentiality, it is not possible to fully explore sources of heterogeneity among these subgroups.

No subpopulation differences varying by 25 percentage points in satisfaction or agreement were found for the following COACHE benchmarks: Nature of Work: Service, Nature of Work: Teaching, Facilities and Work Resources, Health and Retirement Benefits, Leadership, Governance, Faculty Senate, and three Department areas, including Collegiality, Engagement, and Leadership. In addition, there were no subpopulations differences varying by 25 percentage points in satisfaction or agreement for faculty rank (Professor vs. Associate Professor) for any COACHE benchmark.
**COACHE definition:**
Faculty beliefs about the effectiveness of various policies related to work-family balance and support for families.

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Perceptions that the various policies are not effective for supporting work-family balance and support for families.
- Policies which do not adequately support faculty goals related to work-family balance.

**SUBPOPULATION DIFFERENCE:**

**By Race**
Asian faculty were more satisfied with tuition waivers, remission, or exchange than underrepresented faculty and White faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Satisfaction (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promising action items:**
- Engage faculty subgroups to learn more about the reasons for their satisfaction
- Enhance the effectiveness of personal and family policies
- Provide more communication about personal and family policies to key subgroup
Interdisciplinary research:
Research collaboration within and between institutions and with off-campus partners. Interdisciplinary research has become more common due to its intrinsic motivation for researchers to cross-fertilize; this type of work attracts many graduate students and early-career faculty.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
• Policies, structures or cultures that do not support collaboration, interdisciplinary research, and mentorship.
• Tenure-eligible faculty or Associate Professors lack sufficient mentoring they feel is essential on their path to promotion in rank.

SUBPOPULATION DIFFERENCES:
By Faculty Rank
Associate professors were more likely to agree that interdisciplinary work was rewarded in reappointment as compared to assistant professors and professors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COACHE Definition:**
Departmental quality is a function of the intellectual vitality of faculty, the scholarship that is produced, the effectiveness of teaching, how well the department recruits and retains excellent faculty, and whether and how poor faculty performance is handled.

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Perceived ineffectiveness
- Response to poor performance by departmental leadership

**SUBPOPULATION DIFFERENCES:**
**By Race**
Asian faculty expressed more satisfaction with department quality than underrepresented faculty and White faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promising action items:**
- Engage faculty subgroups to learn more about the reasons for their satisfaction with mentoring
- Enhance the effectiveness of faculty mentoring
- Provide more communication about faculty mentoring to key subgroups
By Race

Underrepresented faculty were more likely to agree that interdisciplinary work was rewarded in reappointment than White faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Underrepresented Faculty</th>
<th>White Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Faculty</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promising action items:

- Engage faculty subgroups to learn more about the reasons for their satisfaction with being rewarded for interdisciplinary work
- Enhance ways to document contributions in interdisciplinary work in evaluation, promotion, tenure, and advancement
- Provide more communication about the significance of interdisciplinary work and opportunities to reward this work and celebrate contributions and impacts
Mentorship:
Mentoring has always been important in the academic workplace. Only recently, however, has the practice evolved more widely from incidental to intentional as academic leaders have come to appreciate that mentorship is too valuable to be left to chance.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
• Policies, structures or cultures that do not support collaboration, interdisciplinary research, and mentorship.
• Tenure-eligible faculty or Associate Professors lack sufficient mentoring they feel is essential on their path to promotion in rank.

SUBPOPULATION DIFFERENCES:
By Gender
Men were more satisfied with mentoring of tenured Associate Professors in the department than women.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Race
Asian faculty were more satisfied with term faculty mentoring than underrepresented faculty and White faculty.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promising action items:
• Engage faculty subgroups to learn more about the reasons for their satisfaction with mentoring
• Enhance the effectiveness of faculty mentoring
• Provide more communication about faculty mentoring to key subgroups
COACHE definition:
Tenure (tenure-eligible faculty only): Administrators and faculty alike acknowledge that, at most institutions, the bar to achieve tenure has risen over time. Academic leaders can improve the clarity of tenure policies, requirements, and expectations and provide credible assurances of fairness and equity.

Promotion (tenured faculty only): While the academy has recently improved many policies for assistant professors, it has done far less for associate professors. New practices have emerged from related to modified duties such as reduced teaching load; sabbatical planning and other workshops; workload shifts (i.e., more teaching or more research); improved communication about timing for promotion and a nudge to prepare materials for promotion to Professor; small grants to support mid-career faculty (e.g., matching funds, travel support); and broader, more inclusive criteria.

Dissatisfaction can occur from:
- Anxiety about tenure and promotion.
- Lack of clarity and communication about tenure and promotion.
- Inconsistent messages and practices relative to tenure and promotion.

SUBPOPULATION DIFFERENCES:
By Race
Asian faculty were more satisfied with clarity of expectations than their peers:

As an advisor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### As a colleague:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Satisfaction Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### As a campus citizen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Satisfaction Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### As a broader community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Satisfaction Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asian faculty were more satisfied with clarity of the tenure process than White faculty and underrepresented faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Satisfaction Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asian faculty were more satisfied with clarity of tenure criteria than White faculty and underrepresented faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asian faculty were more satisfied with consistency of messages about tenure than White faculty and underrepresented faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promising action items:
- Engage faculty subgroups to learn more about satisfaction with clarity of expectations, tenure process, and tenure criteria as well as consistency in messages about tenure
- Enhance the promotion, tenure, and advancement procedures and processes
- Provide more communication about promotion, tenure, and advancement procedures and processes
**COACHE definition:**
Faculty, at all ranks (like other employees), want colleagues to appreciate and recognize them for doing good work. This includes not only undergraduate and graduate students with whom relationships can be especially gratifying, but also fellow faculty and upper-level administrators.

**Dissatisfaction can occur from:**
- Showing appreciation and recognition in ways that are not meaningful
- Gap between expectations and recognition

**SUBPOPULATION DIFFERENCES:**
**By Faculty Rank**
Associate Professors were more satisfied with recognition from their colleagues than Professors and Assistant Professors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By Race**
Asian faculty were more satisfied with recognition for advising than White faculty and underrepresented faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian faculty</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White faculty</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented faculty</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promising action items:**
- Engage faculty subgroups to learn more about satisfaction with appreciation and recognition
- Enhance avenues and resources to cultivate appreciation and recognition
- Provide more communication about appreciation and recognition
In summary, the 2021 COACHE Faculty Satisfaction Survey confirmed that Iowa State is an institution with many strengths including the following: governance; leadership; nature of work (research and service); collaboration, mentoring, interdisciplinary work, and appreciation/recognition; facilities and resources, personal/family policies, and health/retirement benefits; and tenure policies. Though Iowa State ranked in the middle of our peer group, there is an opportunity to strengthen departmental engagement, nature of work: teaching, tenure expectation: clarity, departmental quality, and promotion to professor. Department collegiality was one area of concern. Across many areas, notable subgroup differences emerged. This constitutes an opportunity to focus on equity in the Iowa State community.

COACHE provided a resource titled, COACHE Data as a Voice for Underrepresented Faculty, to further this goal.

As Iowa State faculty work toward fulfilling the land-grant mission and meeting institutional strategic goals, COACHE data affords administrators and faculty an opportunity to examine data and explore within-campus differences for the overall faculty and across faculty subgroups. It is important to work together to enhance areas of strength and collaboratively address opportunities for growth. Results will be used to guide and inform initiatives for improvement.

The COACHE Action Team will be leading these efforts. They will review COACHE data and implement action plans and solutions across the institution and within academic colleges. Iowa State faculty and other key stakeholders are welcomed to share their recommendations and observations with their COACHE Action Team representative.

Persons can request access to the COACHE data for research purposes. For more information, complete this COACHE Data Request form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Unit</th>
<th>Name, Rank, and Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Aileen Keating, Professor, Animal Science &amp; Equity Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Vladimir Kulić, Associate Professor, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberly Moss, Associate Professor, Art and Visual Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Carmen Gomes, Associate Professor, Mechanical Engineering &amp; College of Engineering Faculty Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Zambreno, Professor &amp; Associate Chair, Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>Ann Gansemer-Topf, Associate Professor, School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark Coffman, Associate Professor, Genetics, Development, and Cell Biology, CELT Faculty Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences</td>
<td>Katherine Bruna, Professor, School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>Susan Ray, Data Analyst II, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Zunkel, Executive Director, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy College of Business</td>
<td>Toyin Clotey, Associate Professor, Supply Chain Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Elizabeth Swanner, Associate Professor, Geological and Atmospheric Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Susan Vega Garcia, Assistant Dean, Library &amp; Equity Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Rodney Bagley, Professor, Veterinary Clinical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Populations</td>
<td>Chunhui Chen, Professor, Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>