

Good morning. Let's go ahead and get started, please. Thank you. This is just a great opportunity for us to, first off, report the results of the recent COACHE survey and then to engage in a conversation both in person as well as virtually. And we sat up to entertain and respond to questions, both from those of you who are seated in the room here as well as those who are back in their offices and elsewhere. What we'd like to do is to have Dr. Rachel Gabriele go ahead. Rachel serves as the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, she is at the very center of the COACHE survey in terms of conducting the survey and understanding its processes and its context. And we'll be able to provide faculty with some guidance in terms of how to navigate that survey, to dip into many of the details to get a better understanding of where we stand as a faculty in terms of our climate here at Virginia Tech.

I'm going to just in a moment, I'll ask Rachel to come forward and to start us off. And then when she has accomplished the task of introducing you, and explaining to you, the COACHE survey and suggesting to you how you may understand some of the detail. I'll then take on the responsibility of addressing some of the outcomes that are relevant to our strategic positioning. Particularly in regards to one of two aspirant and high priority goals. Which are the one that I will address, of course, is the global top 100 goal. Then our colleague, Professor Joe Merola, who serves as president of the Faculty Senate will then take over and address some of the responses also. But moving forward from the goals to really address the particular issues that involve shared governance and faculty climate. The two of us will then finish up. Hopefully this is not confusing, too confusing with people moving backwards and forwards from the podium. And then we'll have plenty of opportunity, I'm sure, to engage in a conversation with that. Rachel, please get us going.

I keep getting more slides from him, man. Hi everyone. I'm Rachel Gabriele Welcome. Glad you can make it. Welcome to people on the webinar as well. Just a couple of housekeeping issues. This session is being recorded. We're going to post it on the COACHE webpage as soon as possible. After this session. You will find the COACHE web page and these results on our dashboard, which is, you can find on www.faculty.vt.edu do I think there will drop that in the chat online as well. What you'll find there is a dashboard that COACHE provides - that's university wide results. And those will be available along with results from past years. Again, that's at the university level. After this session and our talk and questions, we can continue some informal conversations. We'll have a light reception afterward. Please join us for that. if you can.

So, COACHE stands for the Collaborative on Academic Careers and Higher Education, and it's a research center out of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, which we're talking about today, is one of several research studies that COACHE conducts that are focused on faculty careers. We are participants in their research studies, but as part of those studies, we receive access to our results and the results of other schools that have participated. The COACHE survey this year included all regular, tenured and non tenure track instructional faculty, as well as clinical faculty in the Vet school. And continued appointment and continued appointment track faculty in the university libraries. Faculty had to have been employed for one calendar year to be eligible to take the survey.

This year COACHE surveyed 1,923 Virginia Tech faculty and we had a response rate of 50% was noticeably larger than the participation rate of all the universities that took the survey. This year is the largest response rate we have received since COACHE expanded the eligibility to include non tenure track faculty ten years ago.

More impressive is the response rates we saw by college. We saw an increase in participation over the 2020 survey in every single college. I'll note that the two colleges that have new incoming deans this year, Architecture, Arts and Design, and the Pamplin College of Business, saw response rates over 60% which will provide incredibly valuable information to those new deans. In terms of the types of faculty who participated.

Although our overall number of participants has varied over the past few cycles, you'll see that the general proportion of faculty has remained relatively steady across the categories.

Just to give you an overview of how the COACHE results are structured, they are grouped into eight broad thematic areas, and within those are benchmark areas. The results from the individual survey questions are then categorized into one of these benchmark areas. As part of our participation in the survey, we were given the opportunity to choose peer schools to compare our results to. In choosing these schools, we looked at those who are either our SCHEV or top 20 land grant peers or similar. And who had taken the COACHE survey in the last two years. These are the five schools that we chose as our peer group this year. Iowa State, NC State, Purdue, Rutgers, and UT Austin.

In addition to our peers, COACHE also chose a group of schools who are generally similar to us in some way, by location, size, public, private, land grant, et cetera. This year, our cohort consisted of 86 schools. Here are a few examples of those schools that were included. When you view the COACHE dashboard, you'll see comparisons that reference both our peer group and our cohort group. That's what they're talking about.

Here, there's often a perception that surveys like this, the results will just sit on a shelf gathering dust and not truly inform any of the work of the university. With such a longstanding relationship with COACHE, over the last 15 years, we have learned how valuable the information we received from this survey is. We can point quite directly to programs and initiatives that have been informed by these results. I say informed because the results are just one of many tools that we use to guide our work, amplify and provide data to support things we have heard anecdotally, or provide us direction to ask more questions and get additional context before proceeding. In some cases, we draft a program or initiative and go back to the COACHE data to see how we might adjust or improve it. A few examples of initiatives informed by the 2020 survey results include piloting the dependent care travel grant program. This program came about from conversations with faculty, but when coupled with data from COACHE that showed a decline in satisfaction with institutional support for family and career compatibility, we were able to make a stronger case for implementing it. After noting in

the 2020 results that post tenure faculty were feeling less supported by the institution in a number of areas as compared to pre tenure faculty. We began developing new programs focused on the areas that post tenure faculty indicated a particular interests or need for, including a session on public writing, a mid career mentoring workshop, as well as a number of other programs currently in the works. Although the 2020 survey was taken just before the pandemic, those survey results show that pre tenure faculty were struggling more than other ranks of faculty in a number of areas related to time spent on teaching and the tenure process as a whole. We expected that those concerns were only amplified further by the pandemic which informed our development of the pre tenure pandemic course relief program. These are just a few examples of how we've used the COACHE data in our work, but I hope they demonstrate how valuable the results are to us in the work that we do and how often we refer to them. All right, I'm going to get into the results. I want to do this first. If you can hold them to the end, Kevin, that'd be great. Thanks.

This is just a snapshot of what you'll see when you look at the COACHE dashboard. I just want to explain the pies. You'll see a pie graph that reminds me of trivial pursuit. On the left side of the pie is our comparison to our peers at. If you see blue at the top, that means we're in the top third of our peers. The middle is the third and the bottom is the bottom third on the right side of the pie is compared to our cohort. Same thing. Top, middle, and bottom. You'll see that on the dashboard I've highlighted over here, analysis and visualizations and means and frequencies. Those are the areas that you'll really be able to dig into the data for. So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Cyril.

Okay, Thanks Rachel. Thanks so much for all the effort that you've committed to bringing us to this point. Dean Pitts, did you have a question that is answerable now? Yeah, thank you. Rachel? Yeah, the cohort is much broader. So you'll see R1s, R2s, if they have different characteristics that are similar to us. So they're pretty broad. All right, thank you. Good question. I'm just going to focus on a few of the outcomes here. But before I go into more detail, I thought we would just take a look at this really global assessment of satisfaction. Let me move a little screen out here. If you take a closer look at this, you'll see that there's a comparison here. First, satisfaction at the department level and then at the institutional level. And you'll see a comparison within each of those categories. Then between Virginia Tech peer group, which you saw listed, and then the cohort group. You see that we're pretty consistent, we're pretty well aligned with other institutions irrespective of whether they peer or cohort institutions. But interesting that this difference at the department and the institution level is reflected not just at Virginia Tech, but other institutions too. I would be really interested if you could reflect on that. And when we get to the end of the presentation of selected data, perhaps discuss this because I find this really in, in some senses somewhat disappointing academic career. I have yet to identify over several decades now, many other careers that provide more job security, more flexibility of choice in terms of the pursuit of intellectual interests and passions. And more opportunity to establish a legacy of advancing and developing human capital. When I look at the general context here, irrespective of whether it's at the department or the institutional level, I scratch my head and thinking what is not connecting. I suspect that part of the answer to that, the particular framework, at least at the departmental level here, where the question

reads, If a candidate for a faculty position asked you about your department as a place to work, would you recommend it to them? Without reservation? I think without reservation part. That brings us to the point of saying, well, hold on. That's looking for perfect as opposed to good. Maybe I'm just making an excuse in my mind to avoid thinking about something that you no doubt will raise up in our conversation going forward, let's take a look at some selected data.

Now, as Rachel, I think appropriately has explained to me, there are two perspectives that one can take here. One is to just find the data and look for stuff that's interesting. All right, which is worth doing if you want to spend the time going through the detail. The other approach is to say no. Let's start off by identifying what we've decided is of interest to us. What is it that we really care about in terms of our strategic positioning? And then from that viewpoint, proceed to an analysis of what the data may do to inform our progress around or in a manner aligned with those particular interests. Of course, we're choosing the latter, and as I indicated further, in particular, we're focusing on the top 100 goal here. Just as a reminder, President Sands has very effectively articulated that amongst all of the really important goals, objectives, and metrics that we have in our strategic plan, that many of those can be folded into two really important high level strategic goals. Those goals include the Virginia Tech advantage, which is our commitment to access and affordability. And then as the second goal, our commitment to global top 100 ranking. Understanding that that ranking is simply used as a proxy for us to understand and to advance our development, our reputational excellence nationwide. And indeed beyond that, if we focus in on the particular metrics, the particular outcomes that relate to that top 100 standing, the following are included amongst those. Let me go through these because we'll deal with each of these in terms of what the data may do to inform us in terms of our progress or perhaps lack of progress here. To move forward in terms of global top 100, we're interested, of course, in elevating the productivity and impact of our faculty scholarship across all domains of scholarly activity in support of that, particularly in the STEM and the social sciences STEM. H, in the social sciences area, we do need to work on securing more extramural funding in support of research. We need to also continue to increase our representational diversity of students, faculty, and staff and be sure that those individuals thrive. That we foster an environment in which all those individuals can thrive. Then of course, if you look through particularly the first bullet year in terms of elevating the productivity and impact of faculty scholarship. And indeed the second one, and the third one. This commitment to interdisciplinary and trans disciplinary learning and discovery is important, really. Are there any important problems that we would like to solve or relevant questions that we'd like to ask that are not complicated, that are not multi or transdisciplinary by their very nature. To address those particular issues, we need to bring together the disciplinary context of our land ground institution. Okay?

The way the information has been organized here, I think is relevant to our interest because it's organized in the context of faculty recruitment and faculty retention. The faculty recruitment then allows us to look at how we perform across these various outcomes relative to our peers and relative to the cohort institutions. In terms of retention, retention has to do with the ability to improve and to sustain our commitment

across certain outcomes and criteria that are relevant and important, not just to faculty, but are well aligned with our strategic interest. That's the way those recruitment and then the respective retention columns are organized in this table. Looking through this you in terms of recruitment, if we take a closer look at the productivity and impact of faculty scholarship. And look particularly at survey questions with measured outcomes on time spent on research, expectations for funding, influence over focus of research, availability of course release, lab research and studio space, and then recognition for scholarship. We'll see that relative to our peers we perform either, I'll summarize this by saying in the middle or on average in comparative way, in one area we perform very well in terms of a top performance there, but in another area we're not doing so well, and that is the influence of a focus of research. Now the comparison to peers is a higher standard than the comparison to the cohort. All right, so you see that generally the performance in regards to comparison of the cohort is higher than that for peers, generally speaking. But even if you look at the comparison relative to the cohort, you'll see that while we have a top grad of performance over four of those six criteria, the areas that are not weak in themselves, but are relatively weak or influence of a focus of research. And then lab research and studio space, we need to dip into the in focus of research because I don't understand that part yet. We need to figure out what that means. I don't need any coaching by the COACHE survey to understand that lab research and studio space is an issue that's a challenge for our institution. I got it. The reality I think you recognize here is that we have a lot of top march research space. We have significant capital investments that you see occurring and developing around you that will further enhance that. But we also have a differentiated span of the quality of research space we need to continue to address that. Studio space, absolutely. For those disciplinary areas, and you'll find those, particularly, for example, in the College of Architecture, Art and Design, we have some real work to do there, particularly for example, in the performing, in the visual arts. And so, I recognize that part that actually resonates with me in a manner that I understand that we need to continue the work that we're doing in that area. But to keep this influence of a focus of research in mind, perhaps we can discuss that later because I need a clear understanding of that. If we proceed then- Okay, good. That's nice. I need to talk about the good things, says Rachel, availability of course, release for research. I want to just point out here that in terms of the assessment in the retention column, which is a comparison to how are we doing as a functional time, that's an improvement. All right. We're doing something well here.

Okay, So what about securing more extramural funding in support of research? Here again, you see the same pattern. It's the quality of grad students to support research, support for research, support for obtaining grants, Pre award and then post award. Support for securing grad student assistance. And then support for travel to present and conduct research. And if we were to take the column there relative to Oh okay, relative to our cohort. You'll see that while we are ranked fairly highly in terms of quality of grad students who support research, we're not doing so well in terms of the peer institutions. I'll come back to that in just a moment. Then you'll see the other outcome that is being highlighted here is support for maintaining grants post award. Let me deal with that first. This also for me was not a surprise. Rachel, when was the survey actually administered? It ran from February to April of this year. Of this year. Okay.

That explains it for those of you who are very reliant on extramural grants and contracts, who rely on the office of sponsored programs and the research unit in our institution to manage grants post award. In terms of receiving the approval and the funding and then making the necessary arrangements so you can access that funding, you will know that we've actually gone through quite a difficult period here as a consequence of significant constraint in terms of maintaining our personnel in OSP during the period of the pandemic. Frankly, that situation has yet to resolve itself. But I can assure you that the Senior Vice President for Research and Innovation is working hard to address that. I suspect that that's what's popping up here. It's nice to know as a control that there's something that clearly should have popped up that indeed guess what it does. Quality of grad students to support research. Interesting as I'm sure you are aware, certainly those of you who have engaged in shared governance will know, that there's been a lot of conversation around graduate students in general. There are two areas of particular concern and interests around graduate students at this time. The first is, is that we're a little out of balance now in terms of the enrollment of graduate students across both professional graduate programs as well as research based from an enrollment perspective, we are now focusing on growing our enrollment and graduate students. And if you look at the enrollment data for this fall, you'll see that we have some early success there, which is very gratifying. We have more work to do. The other area of conversation has been around graduate student compensation. The most recent updates and graduate student compensation include the following points, and that is that we were successful this year in raising the minimum graduate student assistantship level, that as a consequence of repetitive years of 5% salary increase, We also are making progress in terms of graduate student compensation. Why graduate student compensation? Graduate student compensation goes to the center of our institution's ability to be competitive for graduate student talent. Rest assured, we continue to commit our time, attention, and money, but we need to continue our work in that area. This makes sense to, but it's great to see that from a retention viewpoint that the improvement in the area of support for research, support for obtaining grants, and support for travel are moving in the right direction.

Let's take a look at the next one, which is the third bullet point that I illustrated at the start of my portion here. Which was to increase representational diversity of students, faculty and staff, and foster environment in which all individuals can thrive. This all falls under what we have Virginia Tech, called Inclusive VT. This is Inclusive VT. We continue, of course, to commit to the imperative of representational diversity and creating a climate within which all members of our community can thrive. How are we doing here? I think it's something of a mixed bag. You'll see that the first two bullets there speak to our ability to recruit and retain a diverse faculty, Then the perspective of faculty in terms of college level, how we are succeeding or not in that area. I would like this to be better. You'd probably agree with me there. As we go down the list, you'll see that there's some difference, maybe not significantly so, between the college and departmental perspective here. I think that makes sense. I think faculty are more closely connected with what's happening in the department. They're more invested and engaged in those particular activities. Then the last three have to do with faculty feeling comfortable raising concerns or issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The proportion of faculty who believe that the department is a place that faculty feel free to

express their views and opinions. Then the last one has to do with the availability of resources and support systems. Should faculty have concerns or issues related to discriminatory behavior. So these outcomes actually touch on a number of really current and pertinent, pertinent issues. They deal with the administrative and cultural infrastructure of a university in terms of being able to talk about issues that concern us in regards to diversity, they address matters actually that relate also to freedom of expression and possibly freedom of inquiry. As we look down here, we cannot be satisfied. I think we can appreciate that we are making progress, but at the same time we have work to do. I might add just to go back to the top two bullets here, perhaps especially the first. We've been very successful as a university in the last few years in advancing representational diversity amongst our students, particularly our undergraduate students. And it's a success that needs to be sustained, sustained with concerted effort. We still have a lot of work to do in terms of meeting our goals in regards to faculty diversity. I think we're doing reasonably well in terms of our trajectory, our progress in regards to recruitment. We have work to do. In terms of retention, that's a good conversation point I think as we go forward as well.

So then the inter and trans disciplinary learning and discovery piece here. There we go. So you'll see here that in general, relative to the cohorts we're doing well. I note that relative to the other outcomes, we still have work to do in having interdisciplinary work rewarded in tenure. Perhaps I'll just say a few brief words about this- Virginia Tech. promotion and tenure system is a comprehensive one that has a demonstrated record for being effective and fair. That doesn't mean to say it's perfect. As we move forward in advancing the importance of interdisciplinary or trans disciplinary work, we need to make sure that we create the flexibility and the opportunity for faculty to work in that domain and not fall short in terms of principally their disciplinary and departmental expectations. You know what I'm talking about here. It has in part to do with this commitment to senior authorship, or first authorship, and how you manage that in the context of having more than two or three equal partners on an important research project. The way to solve this is to solve it at the disciplinary and departmental level. Indeed, I'm pleased that Ron Fricker and his team in the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Office are really, I think, achieving some real traction here in terms of having departments finalize the process of articulating more explicitly and with greater clarity, what quality looks like at the disciplinary and departmental level- to create those documents so that they can fit into and indeed guide the promotion and tenure process in substantive ways. As we do that, those documents will be reviewed at the university level and we'll be looking at whether those documents reflect the relevance and importance of trans disciplinary work. What else to say about this one. So, that's negative, although I don't think Rachel included that there's a negative here. But budgets encourage interdisciplinary work. I'm pleased you've seen that we don't want to drive all innovation at the university level through money. But I acknowledge that investment does make a difference. Yeah, a fundamental concept around the destination areas and the DA 2.0 process has to do with transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary work. Clearly, faculty recognize that and they're responding in very creative and innovative ways. Oh, okay, here we go. There is a opportunities for collaboration outside institution. I don't get this one either, all right? I need some context. I need some help understanding what we're not getting right in terms of

opportunities for collaboration outside the institution. I know we have a robust research leave program, that's the Commonwealth of Virginia's description for a sabbatical, is research leave. But that's probably only one element in a package of strategies that we need to think about to see if we can improve more in this particular outcome. With that, I'm going to turn over to Joe. He can talk about shared governance and then some elements of faculty climate.

Thank you. Thank you, Cyril. Thank you all for attending and those on the webinar, and hopefully people will have the opportunity to also see the recording because I think this is an extremely important activity for the university. Those of you who know me know that I'm in my 37th year here at the university. I've seen quite a lot over that period of time and a lot of changes. One of the things that I remember in the early days of COACHE is that after looking at some of the same issues about perhaps departmental leadership was not necessarily doing the best. Then, Ron Fricker's predecessor Jack Finney, chose to pull together a number of departments that fared well and put together a program of going across the university to try to share- not a great term, I don't like the term best practices because the practices vary in terms of what may be best. But nevertheless, that is again one of the early uses of the COACHE survey to try to improve those kinds of climate. And what I'd also like to say now as we talk about shared governance, that's also a term that I think some faculty don't understand well and I think we are learning that, number one, we're getting a better understanding of it. But then we've got a lot of progress to be made. One of the things I can say related to this particular slide is ten years ago I was also President of Faculty Senate. I'm seeing now a ten year evolution of what we are calling shared governance. And I have to say that we have made great progress, and I am pleased to see the progress we've made certainly in the last five years, especially in perception of the faculty, is that shared governance seems to understand what's going on. There is greater trust in shared governance. So, all across those areas we've seen a tremendous improvement. But I think we need to do even more. I think this is really good, especially in light of the fact that probably the last two years have been our biggest evolution of shared governance. There are some things one can point to, is that now for example, the faculty senate president is co chair of the university cabinet, excuse me, the university council. And when the president or provost are not available, you actually have a faculty member chairing the highest policy making body in the university. So, 39% of participants saying I don't know about some of the issues around decisions and the faculty input and governance clearly says that we've got some work to do. And it was work that we had planned because there is a lot of change that we need to get out to the faculty and to get a better understanding in the departments about what shared governance now does. And I'm both pleased to see this and as well seeing this as an opportunity to do a better job in getting out the word about what we can accomplish.

All right, as with many of the slides that Cyril presented, we're giving a pretty broad brush stroke of many things. One more time, Rachel told you about the dashboard, so you can go to that dashboard and look at some more detail. But in terms of the broad brush strokes, we are among our peers, both in, again, the peers and the cohort, those two distinct groups, in terms of how faculty feel about our work life policies. That isn't to

say that there isn't work to be done in each of these areas. We can't rest on our laurels, but flexible work load and modified duties, ability to tailor what you are doing in discussion with your department leadership as to how you would like to carry out your duties. I think faculty see that as a plus. Institutional support for family and career compatibility. The whole work life issue has been a major focus of Virginia Tech in the last several years. Family medical parental leave and phased retirement benefits. I'm not retiring yet, so I'm not really sure what those phased retirement benefits are, but they must be good. Maybe I'll take a look at them. In any event, these are where the faculty are expressing a lot of contentment. But again, broad brush, There's probably a lot of room for us to not rest on our laurels, but to continue that trajectory.

Some of the not so good things that could be attributed to the pandemic are probably attributable to the pandemic. But now this is not a great slide because we are lowest among our peers and our cohorts, and these are areas where we've seen a significant decline since 2017. Was colleagues pitch in when needed, We had good ratings on that. Now again, given that people were isolated, it's not a surprise, perhaps that they didn't find opportunities to call on colleagues or they didn't have an appropriate colleague who could pitch in during our time, during our pandemic operations. Amount of personal and professional interaction with pre tenure and tenured faculty. That is clearly attributable to the isolation of the pandemic. Because we just weren't interacting. And, while Zoom was able to fill in a gap, it certainly for a lot of things like this, because a lot of personal and professional interaction is happenstance meetings and informal conversations and things like that. That just can't be programmed into Zoom satisfaction with the amount of recognition from colleagues. Again, partly because maybe colleagues don't know what people are doing during this period. As well as the various forums to allow faculty to talk about their colleagues isn't there. And then ultimately, all aspects of departmental leadership, again, one more time, interactions were just not good during the pandemic because of the mode in which we were forced to operate. So again, not surprising, but we can't just say, oh, that was the pandemic, all is well, we're now back in again. We really do need to put some attention into these areas to make sure that they don't languish in those spots. Simply because we say, oh, that's pandemic, we don't need to do anything. I think we do need to do some things.

All right. What are our best aspects of employment regardless of interactions? As is the same with our peers and our cohort. We think that the quality of our colleagues like the best we have here at Virginia Tech. I can give my personal answer. That was my answer to this. I think the faculty here at Virginia Tech, and again, I said I've been here, I'm in my 37th year. Clearly I have job satisfaction because I'm still here. Geographic location for Virginia Tech that ranked high. I think a lot of people like the quality of life in a small town. Academic freedom. And I think that is something that all levels of Virginia Tech have worked hard to give to make sure that our academic freedom has been protected. And one of the things that faculty and faculty groups have put a lot of effort into, the support of colleagues and the quality of undergraduate students has been seen as one of the top areas. One of the interesting thing as, again, over my time here, it was a given that the cost of living in Blacksburg was a plus. That's not the case anymore. Cost of living, especially dictated by a cost of housing,

among other things, has really made it to what we can't say to other faculty that we're trying to recruit. Hey, this is a really low cost of living place. So that is a change around that we have to acknowledge and have to deal with. But in general, those are the top that people say for employment here in Virginia Tech.

If we break that down by gender, race and ethnicity, not a whole lot of change between women and men, but we do see a bit of a change when we talk about our underrepresented groups. In a lot of cases, one has to ask ourselves why is not the quality of colleagues, the top academic freedom is the top. That to me is very interesting. Quality of graduate students really didn't make the top of the whole group. But it's interesting to see that for our underrepresented minorities and our Asian faculty that did rise to the top. And for underrepresented minorities, the support for research and creative work actually made it into one of the top. I honestly don't have a conclusion. It's something that I think we need to look at and talk about and discuss, especially with our faculty from underrepresented groups and in our Asian groups.

What are the worst aspects? We have to be important to not just cherry pick what we find to be the best we need to look at the worst to. Compensation everybody- our cohort, our peers and Virginia Tech faculty felt compensation was at the top. Again, I can say that compensation is a problem still. We have historically a number of years that it takes a while to get out of some problematic years. I think for a lot of people, things like salary compression are a problem, that enters into the compensation problem. Because I think the university has done well in hiring and in retention. And of course, hiring and retention does tend to cause the problem, what we call salary compression, that we're hiring people in at a very good salary. We're retaining some faculty and leaving some others to not particularly feel that they are being compensated well. We think quality of facilities are good. That's intriguing. Given some of the data that Cyril presented a little bit ago. That is an issue where we have to know what lens of facilities people were looking into in this particular case. Too much service and too many assignments. Yeah, that has been an issue here, Virginia Tech. I do know that in many cases, a lot of faculty, especially women and minority, that, boy, what they're being called on to do in terms of service and not given a whole lot of credit for it, is quite a lot. So that certainly comes in line with what I've seen. Unrelenting pressure to perform. I don't know exactly what to say about that, but perhaps feel that with the lack of compensation that they're not get recognized for that but it's hard to say. Those are worst. Lack of support for research and creative work did not come up to one of our worst. Although that did show up in the cohort. And geographic location was not one of our worst, although that showed up in the peers. Okay, those are our worst aspects of employment.

Breaking that down now. Again, for the most part here is where that one issue of unrelenting pressure to perform comes in. Note that men did not put that up there, a lot of women faculty did. Maybe that is the better lens that we need to look at. Where are we putting that pressure to perform? Why aren't men feeling that pressure? Why are women feeling that pressure? Underrepresented minorities. Their number one worst aspect of Virginia Tech is the lack of diversity. Asians also said that although it wasn't number one, white men and women did not say that there was a problem with

diversity, which I think itself speaks some volumes as well, that we need to make sure people understand. I think that whole aspect of diversity, again, we've made progress. I think both here and on the national front, we know that we've got some very careful work to do to preserve what gains we have made and to continue to make gains. Beyond that, again, we need to look at that dashboard and to take a look at some of the greater detail.

Okay, if we take a look at the most common things, how to improve. The final item in the survey was an open text response asking people, what is the one thing your institution could do to improve the workplace for your faculty? Here's the opportunity to faculty that says, "this is what we need." Facilities and resources for work. There's going to be a lot of changes on campus. There's been a lot of changes on campus as well. We'll stay tuned for that leadership in general. It's hard to know exactly what people mean on that. But I think oftentimes I'll have to say that many times that's begging for better communication and transparency. And we'll see where that goes. Compensation and benefits, culture, nature of work, teaching. Again, without looking into the minds, I'm not really sure what we're thinking about there. But these are some areas food for thought. One of the things is one looks at now this whole global survey, where it appears that some people thought that there were problems at their department level. We often don't have enough data at that level, we might only have one or two or three responses from any individual problem. But that is where that rubber hits the road with respect to things like teaching duties and teaching and the like. But that's still a good point for faculty to start discussions at all levels. Their own departmental unit and levels up the line. Cyril, are you joining here for our next steps? Yes. Thank you. I'll just briefly go through the proceeds here so we sharing the data right now. Okay. Is the opportunity for you to dip into that and for us collectively and individually to analyze the data, We want this to be useful. As Rachel indicated earlier, our practice has been to make these data useful. That's part of the step three act. And then, of course, this is an iterative process to see where we're, where we are perhaps declining, where we're not improving, in areas where we absolutely need to improve.

Rather than go through the detail here of the tools. Let me just mention that. First off, I invite and encourage you to take a look at the data. Rachel, I believe that a dashboard is being published today or later today is that correct? Yeah, The COACHE university wide dashboard is published on our web page now. This dashboard is proprietary. Okay. Okay. Then of course, the last bullet is probably the most important here as you continue to investigate and analyze the data. And that is to get in touch with Rachel. I think with that, let's entertain any questions, conversation. Let me put in one more plug next spring, not that far away. We'll get the opportunity next spring, two years, every three years. We don't forget, make sure we get a really good response the next time around. Because that's the only way that we'll know if progress has been made and where we may not have made progress.

I just want to highlight too on our web page is the COACHE university wide data now, on the UDC, we have an internal dashboard that we've developed over the last three years with analytics and institutional effectiveness. Can you go back one slide, Corey

or Cliff? This is a collection of data over the last three COACHE cycles to allow colleges and departments to look at themselves and their progress over the last three cycles of coach in as much as we can protect confidentiality. Once we start playing around with demographics, we start limiting. And if we get below a certain number, then we're not able to do that anymore. But it's a really great tool for digging into the data, having conversation with it, any groups that are interested. Because we're piloting this, it's still a little clunky. I'd like to participate in these conversations and facilitate those with the dashboard. So we're not opening it up publicly. But I'm happy to meet with any groups, department, executive leadership, et cetera, to talk through the dashboard with you and have those conversations. Thanks, Rachel.

This is a quick technical follow up. Is that data that you just mentioned, the department college wide data, is that similar to what you've shared with us in the past? Is just in a different format or is it a little bit different? 2020 Survey? I think we had it as a Excel worksheet. Yeah, so it's similar to that, it's just a little easier to navigate. We have one online comment or question here, which is facilities and resources for research appear to be consistently a low point for VT. What can be done to help address this? That is, we have lots of new buildings going up. So is there a mismatch between what is being built and what is needed for research? No. There isn't a mismatch. Let's just think specifically about the buildings that have either been renovated or built recently, or currently under construction. We can start in Northern Virginia where we have the first academic building more than rising out of the ground. Now at the innovation campus. That building will accommodate absolute top notch research that is relevant to the university. Research that is connected to a scaffolding or a substrate of computer science. And that ultimately is designed to encompass everything from a digital art, sports and entertainment, public interest technology, business analytics and entrepreneurship, across to various applications of AI, machine learning, quantum information sciences. With an additional application potential in health sciences. It's a research priority and the building is going to support that, and it's designed to do that. We only have to take a step over the Potomac River to appreciate that the University recently leased almost 15, 16,000 square foot within the Children's National Research and Innovation Campus. Specifically designed to support research in Pediatric Neuro oncology, which is a sweet spot in terms of our capacity to advance cancer research across the institution. I can go through all of these buildings to the current project, which is the replacement of Randolph Hall with Mitchell Hall encompassing areas of mechanical engineering, aerospace, and ocean engineering. It's again, right in the center of our research interest, and so on, as we go forward. The problem is, is that we also have buildings, as I mentioned earlier, where we have space in many cases. But it's space that's not well tuned, that is not appropriate for the high quality research being accomplished there. It's going to take us a while to address that. Capital resources, we've actually done very well competing at the state level to advance instructional as well as research space. But there are limitations in terms of us being able to accommodate needs of our faculty and available space. At this point in time, we have stress and concerns across the university in terms of space. But I do want to highlight again that we have particular concerns around the creative and the performing arts, as well as architecture and design. We're trying to figure out a way, how to move forward in that area. Morning everyone Reese with the Ombuds office.

Even though it's not a report card only. I think it's wonderful having this data because it tells us maybe what are some of the things we should focus on. Right. One of my questions has to do with the slide that indicated the response rate for the colleges. What's being done to include more folks? Because I think one of the colleges, what was it, 37% response rate. I'm always curious about the unspoken, all those voices that are not speaking up and identifying what's the issue for them. What is being done to encourage more participation for the next, in what, 2-3 years, 2025 I think, 26. Reese, I'll answer that. We saw a 36% response rate overall in our 2020 survey. We were trying very hard to increase that participation for this one, including offering some incentives to participants. And I think that, that has seen some improvement in our response rate. And I hope that we can do some form of that in the future. Again, the more we're communicating and getting the word out of the value of the data and protecting the participants confidentiality, that they'll be more comfortable participating in the future. I fully expect in the coming years we'll be able to increase that even further. I might add that of course, you all know that I'm not a social scientist. I shouldn't probably speak to this issue. But in my experience trying to assess outcomes on the basis of surveys, particularly for example, in professional contexts, post graduation outcomes. A response rate of 50% I would have drooled over that. That's pretty rare. I think there's another important element so we need to keep in mind, it's not just the response rate, but it's the ability to look at responses and trends over successive surveys. Even in some instances where you can have a lower response rate, there's additional utility that is provided if you have successive survey instruments so that you can identify trends over a period of time. I think we have both of those elements that need to be pertinent in this kind of survey. Another online question to the issue of opportunities for interdisciplinary research outside the university. Are there events, publications, grants, or other opportunities the university facilitates that encourage this or is this usually left up to departments? I think that answer is probably best answered by faculty. Given your experience, What I can tell you is that at the university level, we don't just encourage trans disciplinary research, but we actually expect that in the context of being able to compete for significant investment from the university level. I give you an example of that in the recent round of the destination 2.0 process we originally received in the first phase, which is the proposal development phase, I think 31 applications, all of them good and competitive. We selected four from amongst those and then worked with those groups, the content experts, develop full proposals there. As we did that, we specifically wanted to know where the university was in terms of its assets, its strength, and what the gaps were. The opportunity gaps in terms of what we had to build to develop really effective and reputational programs in these areas. Part of that process involved thinking about partners. What partners do you have? These are outside the institution. It could be other education institutions. It could be industry, government foundations, whatever. What partners do you have and what partners do you need to succeed here? And that was an important outcome that was evaluated in the selection of the two programs that ultimately were approved for funding going forward. We're doing this at the university level, but ultimately, I think the answer here is one that should be answered by faculty at the departmental level. If I could add to that, it's hard to know exactly what dimension those respondents were thinking about. But number one, if you take a look at institutes and centers on campus,

they have their own internal conferences that bring people from often all over the world in their own disciplines that give a great opportunity for people to meet folks outside the institution with whom they can collaborate. In one dimension of that, for example, often holds an HBCU summit to try to get faculty to meet colleagues at the HBCU's with whom they could collaborate and the like. The opportunities are there. Is there a case of there needs to be some more seed funding at the university? I'm reading into the question. I do know that again, various colleges and others have some of that as well. But again, to me, ultimately, this is on the individual faculty member. What do you need to do your work? To whom do you feel you need to reach out to do your work? I think the abilities to do that often lie within your own domain, more so than as a university wide issue. But that's my own personal opinion. Thinking about that just a little bit more. We should, of course, consider what we can do to promote transdisciplinary work across institutions. But at the very least, we should be able to identify whether there are any impediments to it and see if we can remove those. Think about that and share with us if there are any particular impediments. Are the issues that have to do with the administration over grants that have PI's from different institutions? Are there issues over difficult conversations that have to do with intellectual property? What are those things that may be out there that actually serve as impediments to that kind of work? Let us know what that is please. As Cyril said, he thought about it more something triggered. One of the things is are we rewarding the work? We say we want it but our pre tenure faculty not being given credit if they're involved in that work. Because baby, there is still a bias towards individual work and not necessarily in these kinds of group work. That's another important question. We say on the one hand we want it, but perhaps at the department level, it isn't honored and rewarded. Is that an issue? We need to know that. I'm just looking at some of the several things from shared governance to pandemic effects, and then also the improvements. And some of what's sticking out to me, for example, in pandemic effects, lowest and colleagues are willing to pitch in interaction between pre tenure tenure faculty and department leadership. And then some of the shared governance issues or the improvements. And I'm wondering what effects our reliance upon telecommunications and video communications has on the interaction of our relationships with our colleagues and how that translates into share governance and what can be done to help work to improve in those particular areas. Well, I can give my impression on one aspect of that. We have found that certainly allowing people to participate in meetings by Zoom is a good thing in terms of allowing people to fit in a meeting that they may not have been able to fit in. More conveniently, being able to deal with some work life issues by holding their participation from home. On the other hand, if I think about Faculty Senate specifically, it's just actually not quite the same. Having a Faculty Senate meeting where most of the people are participating by zoom. I think in many respects people don't speak up as much as they might if we were all in one forum. As I mentioned during my part of the talk, I think that a lot of the interactions that can occur are not good over Zoom. They're not even fostered over zoom. Having you sit next to a colleague there and make a comment, push your elbow into their ribs, saying, "did he really say that?" Things like that really do lend to better interactions that I think we do lose. Now where's the balance? Participation is improved, but the quality of that participation may not be. So where do we draw the

line? Do I start saying no? You must come to a faculty senate meeting in person. You may not do it by zoom. I think we would see the first impeachment of a faculty senate president in the history of the university. But I don't know what the answer is. So Dr. Merola, I'm going to think make a public announcement here for something we just talked about. But part of the answer also is just community among faculty. And the pandemic certainly didn't help. And as Joe said, Zoom certainly doesn't help. But the faculty senate has just agreed to sponsor what we're going to call the very first Pop-up Faculty Club, probably in early December for the exact purpose of bringing faculty together, in this case, socially, so they can engage and hopefully develop a set of community. So we're hoping that's a small part of this and that is an outgrowth, sort of back to Rachel's original point. That's a bit of an outgrowth of some of the things we've seen in COACHE and other places. If I can put in one more plug here, a bit of an advertisement and let me put it into the chat. Based on some of these results, faculty affairs is working with a couple of our psychology faculty to do a study of work life balance, and quality of life of faculty post pandemic. And these are some psychology faculty specialized in that. And I just put the link in the chat here. We would encourage, we are looking for 300 faculty to participate in this study to help us understand some of these effects. And so when that study is done complementing the COACHE results, we'll be in a better place to sort of answer some of these questions. And put policies and procedures and things in place to help mitigate it. I'm actually participating in that. And it's funny every morning I get an email saying, here's your morning before work survey. Have you thought about your day? You, are you angry about something? You know, they're very thoughtful questions and very interesting. And the bottom line is a whole series of match sticks, one of them pristine, the other one burnt down to the nub is how do you feel about your burnout issue? I think it's an interesting thing and I'll be interested to see what the results are. Just before we wrap up, I want to thank a couple of people in our office who have been really engaged in the COACHE work. Melody Warnick, raise your hand. Thank you. Melody and Catherine Piche, who's up front here. Thank you, Catherine. I think we're actually just out of time. We're over time. So let me just again, thank you for your attendance. Thank you for your attendance, attention, attendance, both. This is just the start. This is the sharing part. We have to get here in terms of our analysis and figure out what this means for us in terms of continuing to commit to advancing our institution. And to do that, we need to make sure that faculty have the opportunity to come to work every day and be excited most days about that opportunity. Again, thank you and thank you Rachel and team for putting this all together. Thanks, Ron. All right.