2019 COACHE Results on 25 Key Benchmarks

	Your results compared to PEERS ◀ Areas of strength in GREEN Your results compared to COHORT ► Areas of concern in RED													Within campus differences sm (.1) med. (.3 lrg (.5)							
	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	2016
Nature of Work: Research	3.36	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		ntt	assoc	women	white	white	-	
Nature of Work: Service	3.33	*		•	•		•			*		•			tenured	assoc			white		
Nature of Work: Teaching	3.85	•	•	•	•		*	*	•	*	*	*	•	pre-ten		assoc		foc	asian	urm	
Facilities and Work Resources	3.64	•								•				pre-ten		assoc					
Personal and Family Policies	3.44	•	•	*	•	•	*	•		•	*		•	pre-ten	tenured			foc	asian	urm	
Health and Retirement Benefits	4.17	•	•		•									pre-ten			men	foc	asian	urm	+
Interdisciplinary Work	2.80	•	*	\	*	*		•		•				tenured			women	white	white	white	
Collaboration	3.68	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		ntt	assoc	women		white	urm	
Mentoring	3.22	*	*		*			•		*	*		*	tenured	tenured	assoc			white		
Tenure Policies	3.46	•	N/A	•	N/A	N/A	N/A	•			*	*		N/A	N/A	N/A	women		white		
Tenure Expectations: Clarity	3.33	•	N/A	•	N/A	N/A	N/A	•		*	*	◆	*	N/A	N/A	N/A	women	white	white	white	+
Promotion to Full	3.53	•		N/A	N/A	•				•				N/A	N/A	assoc	women	white	white	white	
Leadership: Senior	3.37	•	•	•	*	•	•	•	*	•		*	•	pre-ten		assoc	men				
Leadership: Divisional	3.38	•	•	*		•	•	*	•	•						assoc					+
Leadership: Departmental	3.59	•	◆	•		*		•	◆	•	◆	*	*	tenured		assoc					
Leadership: Faculty	3.19	•	*	•	•	*	*	•		•					tenured		men				
Governance: Trust	3.11	-		•	•	*	*	-	◆	-			*	pre-ten		assoc		foc	asian	urm	
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	3.30	•	•		*	•	•	•	•	•		*	•		tenured		men	foc		urm	
Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	3.06	•	•	*	•	•	*	*	•	•	*	•	•	tenured	tenured	assoc	men			urm	
Governance: Adaptability	2.96	•		*	•		*	•	*	•	•		•		tenured	assoc				urm	
Governance: Productivity	3.11	-		•	•	-	•	*		-	•	•	*		tenured		men				
Departmental Collegiality	3.90	-	*	•		•	•	•		*	*	•	•	pre-ten				foc	asian	urm	
Departmental Engagement	3.56	-	*	•		•	*	*		*			*		ntt	assoc		foc	asian	urm	
Departmental Quality	3.64	•	◆	•	•	*	•		•	•		•	*		ntt					urm	
Appreciation and Recognition	3.36	*	*	*		•	•	•	*	•		*	•		ntt	assoc	women				

The first column (mean) is the overall score (between 1 and 5) for all faculty respondents at Pitt. The next columns (overall through urm) describe how faculty responses at Pitt compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions, i.e. tenured, men vs. men, etc.

The triangle symbols represent the results that fit COACHE's criteria for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

The triangle symbol on the left is the comparison of Pitt with its five peers¹. If the triangle is green (◀), it means that Pitt ranks 1st or 2nd among peers. If the triangle is grey (◀) Pitt ranks 3rd or 4th, and if the triangle is red (◀) Pitt ranks 5th or 6th. If the triangle is white (◁), there is insufficient data for comparison.

The triangle symbol on the right is the comparison of Pitt with all members of the cohort. The green triangle () means that Pitt is in the top 30%, the grey triangle () means that Pitt is in the middle 40%, and the red triangle () means that Pitt is in the bottom 30%.

This result, for example, shows that female faculty at Pitt are less satisfied than women at peer institutions (), but more satisfied than women at 70% of other institutions in the cohort ().

The final set of columns (ten vs. pre-ten through 2016) compare groups within Pitt: associate vs. full, men vs. women etc. The faculty subgroup with the lower rating appears in the column and the shading conveys the magnitude of subgroup differences. Small effects appear as text only, moderate effects are shaded yellow, and large effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as + / -.

¹ For purposes of this report, Pitt's peers are Indiana University - Bloomington, University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill, Purdue University, University of Virginia, and University of Texas at Austin.