



# SCORE CARD

---

## University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Year: 2015



## *Score Card at a glance:*

### **1. CLIMATE AND LEADERSHIP SCORE CARD**

### **2. FACULTY PROFILE AND DIVERSITY**

### **3. FACULTY WORK RELATED VISION AND SATISFACTION**

*Score card values are based on aggregate reports from the COACHE survey conducted in 2014-15. **Parameters** are items explored in the survey. **Constructs** are umbrella concepts related to the parameters explored in the survey. **Peers** represents peer institutions to UNC Charlotte. Our peer institutions are:*

*Florida International University*

*Kent State University*

*University of Massachusetts at Lowell*

*University of Missouri at Kansas City*

*Virginia Commonwealth University*

**Previous Cohort** represents UNCC faculty responses from a previous survey year.

*There were 323 respondents from the UNC Charlotte community and 1298 respondents from selected peer community to the survey in 2015.*

## Climate and Leadership Scorecard

Institution	Constructs	Parameters	Peers	Previous Cohort
University of North Carolina at Charlotte	Nature of Work	Research	At Par	At Par
		Service	At Par	At Par
		Teaching	Worse	Worse
	Work Support Climate	Facilities and Work Resources	Better	Better
		Interdisciplinary Work	Better	At Par
		Collaboration	At Par	At Par
		Mentoring	Better	At Par
	Personal Support Climate	Personal and Family Policies	Worse	At Par
		Health and Retirement Benefits	Worse	Worse
	Tenure	Policy	Worse	At Par
		Clarity	Worse	At Par
		Reasonableness	N/A	N/A
	Work Incentives	Promotion	Worse	Worse
		Appreciation and Recognition	At Par	At Par
	Leadership	Senior	Better	Better
		Divisional	Worse	Worse
		Departmental	At Par	Worse
	Departmental Climate	Collegiality	At Par	At Par
		Engagement	Better	Better
		Quality	Better	At Par

### Score Card Legend

*At Par:* The Institutions score for a given construct is at par with the concomitant scores of peer institution's or a previous cohort's.

*Better:* The Institutions score for a given construct is better than concomitant scores of peer institution's or a previous cohort's.

*Worse:* The Institutions score for a given construct is worse than concomitant scores of peer institution's or a previous cohort's.

## Faculty Profile and Diversity

Constructs	Parameters	UNCC n= 323	Peers n= 1298
<b>Appointment Status</b>	<i>Full Time</i>	100%	100%
<b>Rank</b>	<i>Professor</i>	30%	35%
	<i>Associate professor</i>	52%	41%
	<i>Assistant professor</i>	18%	24%
<b>Tenure Status</b>	<i>Tenured</i>	81%	76%
	<i>On tenure track</i>	19%	24%
<b>Administrative position</b>	<i>Yes</i>	26%	19%
<b>Race/ Ethnicity</b>	<i>Native American</i>	0%	1%
	<i>Asian</i>	8%	11%
	<i>Non Hispanic White</i>	76%	78%
	<i>Non Hispanic Black</i>	6%	4%
	<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>	4%	5%
	<i>Other</i>	0%	1%
	<i>Multiracial</i>	1%	1%
<b>Sex</b>	<i>Female</i>	42%	47%
<b>Age</b>	<i>30 or younger</i>	0%	1%
	<i>31-40</i>	20%	18%
	<i>41-50</i>	31%	27%
	<i>51-60</i>	28%	29%
	<i>61-70</i>	19%	22%
	<i>71 and above</i>	1%	4%
<b>Marital Status</b>	<i>Single</i>	11%	10%
	<i>Married Or in Civil Union</i>	77%	77%
	<i>Unmarried, living with partner</i>	3%	4%
	<i>Divorced Or Separated Or Widowed</i>	9%	9%
<b>Citizenship Status</b>	<i>Citizen</i>	90%	90%
	<i>Permanent resident</i>	9%	9%
	<i>Non-resident</i>	2%	2%

# Faculty Vision and Satisfaction

Constructs	Parameters	Overall	Sex		Race		Rank		
		%	Male %	Female %	White %	Other %	Assistant %	Associate %	Professor %
<b>Vision: University Research Funding</b>	<i>High</i>	63	58	80	67	68	53	55	43
	<i>Moderate</i>	42	44	47	43	54	41	35	39
	<i>No Change</i>	7	9	7	7	10	0	8	3
<b>Vision: Education</b>	<i>G : UG student ratio = 40:60</i>	8	6	14	8	17	10	9	3
	<i>G : UG student ratio = 30:70</i>	19	23	16	20	17	12	13	26
	<i>G : UG student ratio = 20:80</i>	10	11	9	11	10	3	11	7
	<i>Emphasis on Grad. Ed.</i>	63	61	77	70	53	49	57	44
	<i>Teaching Collaboration</i>	32	28	44	32	44	34	25	23
	<i>Emphasis on G and U.G Ed,</i>	19	22	19	19	27	8	17	12
	<i>Emphasis on U. G. Ed.</i>	12	12	15	13	15	10	6	13
<b>Level of satisfaction- Integrating teaching with research</b>	<i>Very Satisfied</i>	17	21	14	18	15	5	16	23
	<i>Satisfied</i>	40	42	43	41	49	39	40	29
	<i>Ambivalent</i>	26	21	36	27	27	24	23	24
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	14	11	20	14	17	15	14	6
	<i>Very Dissatisfied</i>	8	9	7	9	7	5	4	8
<b>Level of satisfaction- Integrating teaching with outreach</b>	<i>Very Satisfied</i>	11	12	12	13	8	5	8	14
	<i>Satisfied</i>	35	35	39	38	32	29	31	24
	<i>Ambivalent</i>	31	28	39	31	39	25	30	26
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	11	10	15	12	14	19	11	5
	<i>Very Dissatisfied</i>	3	4	3	3	7	5	1	3
<b>Level of satisfaction- Integrating research with outreach</b>	<i>Very Satisfied</i>	13	14	13	16	5	5	13	13
	<i>Satisfied</i>	30	30	35	30	37	30	28	26
	<i>Ambivalent</i>	29	32	30	29	39	24	29	27
	<i>Dissatisfied</i>	8	6	12	7	14	5	9	3
	<i>Very Dissatisfied</i>	4	4	4	4	5	5	1	3

## *ADVANCE Faculty Affairs and Diversity Office (FADO) Review*

As per reports from the COACHE 2015 survey, 249 out of 323 respondents (77.08%) had attended at least 1 program presented by the ADVANCE Faculty Affairs and Diversity Office. 41% of the respondents reported having not attended any programming presented by the ADVANCE FADO. About 57% respondents felt that this program was supportive of their development as a faculty member or administrator. The demographic breakdown of the responses has been presented in the table below:

	<b>HAVE ATTENDED 1 ADVANCE PROGRAM</b>	<b>PROGRAM SUPPORTIVE OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT</b>
<b>MALE</b>	66%	44%
<b>FEMALE</b>	100%	84%
<b>WHITE</b>	80%	59%
<b>OTHER RACE</b>	88%	68%
<b>ASSITANT PROFESSOR</b>	64%	49%
<b>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</b>	71%	52%
<b>FULL PROFESSOR</b>	65%	19%