

NC State University
 AY14-15 COACHE Survey

Mean Ratings

Tenure Track Faculty Only: Full vs. Associate (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Tenure Track | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|-----------|-------------------|
| | | Full | Associate | Diff ¹ |
| | <i>Benchmark: Nature of Work Research</i> | 3.24 | 3.16 | |
| Nature of work: Research | Time spent on research | 3.76 | 3.34 | ↑ |
| | Expectations for finding external funding | 3.22 | 3.14 | |
| | Influence over focus of research | 4.38 | 4.22 | |
| | Quality of grad students to support research | 3.45 | 3.37 | |
| | Support for research | 2.76 | 2.86 | |
| | Support for engaging undergrads in research | 3.04 | 3.09 | |
| | Support for obtaining grants (pre-award) | 3.13 | 3.16 | |
| | Support for maintaining grants (post-award) | 2.87 | 3.04 | |
| | Support for securing grad student assistance | 2.79 | 2.78 | |
| | Support for travel to present/conduct research | 2.99 | 3.04 | |
| | Availability of course release for research | 2.89 | 2.63 | ↑ |
| | | <i>Benchmark: Nature of Work: Service</i> | 3.37 | 3.28 |
| Nature of work: Service | Time spent on service | 3.56 | 3.44 | |
| | Support for faculty in leadership roles | 2.68 | 2.78 | |
| | Number of committees | 3.60 | 3.47 | |
| | Attractiveness of committees | 3.51 | 3.36 | |
| | Discretion to choose committees | 3.60 | 3.54 | |
| | Equitability of committee assignments | 3.26 | 2.99 | ↑ |
| | Number of student advisees | 3.76 | 3.61 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Nature of Work: Teaching</i> | 3.79 | 3.74 | |
| Nature of work: Teaching | Time spent on teaching | 3.97 | 3.85 | |
| | Number of courses taught | 4.02 | 3.90 | |
| | Level of courses taught | 4.14 | 4.09 | |
| | Discretion over course content | 4.39 | 4.38 | |
| | Number of students in classes taught | 3.72 | 3.81 | |
| | Quality of students taught | 3.58 | 3.55 | |
| | Equitability of distribution of teaching load | 3.16 | 2.98 | |
| | Quality of grad students to support teaching | 3.46 | 3.25 | |

NC State University
 AY14-15 COACHE Survey

Mean Ratings

Tenure Track Faculty Only: Full vs. Associate (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Tenure Track | | |
|--|--|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | | Full | Associate | Diff ¹ |
| Other Work Activities | Time spent on outreach | 3.74 | 3.69 | |
| | Time spent on administrative tasks | 2.80 | 2.74 | |
| | Ability to balance teaching/research/service | 3.49 | 3.18 | ↑ |
| <i>Benchmark: Facilities and work resources</i> | | 3.60 | 3.62 | |
| Facilities and work resources | Support for improving teaching | 3.35 | 3.42 | |
| | Office | 3.96 | 3.91 | |
| | Laboratory, research, studio space | 3.42 | 3.25 | |
| | Equipment | 3.51 | 3.51 | |
| | Classrooms | 3.66 | 3.72 | |
| | Library resources | 4.27 | 4.20 | |
| | Computing and technical support | 3.52 | 3.71 | |
| | Clerical/administrative support | 2.96 | 3.09 | |
| <i>Benchmark: Personal and family policies</i> | | 3.01 | 2.85 | |
| Personal and family policies | Housing benefits | 2.31 | 2.26 | |
| | Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange | 2.15 | 1.97 | |
| | Spousal/partner hiring program | 2.90 | 2.56 | ↑ |
| | Childcare | 2.52 | 2.03 | ↑ |
| | Eldercare | 2.51 | 2.31 | |
| | Family medical/parental leave | 3.38 | 3.14 | |
| | Flexible workload/modified duties | 3.54 | 3.56 | |
| | Stop-the-clock policies | N/A | N<5 | |
| | Inst. does what it can for work/life compatibility | 3.11 | 2.92 | |
| | Right balance between professional/personal | 3.44 | 3.19 | ↑ |
| <i>Benchmark: Health and retirement benefits</i> | | 3.05 | 2.96 | |
| Health and retirement benefits | Health benefits for yourself | 3.08 | 3.01 | |
| | Health benefits for family | 2.56 | 2.38 | |
| | Retirement benefits | 3.21 | 3.18 | |
| | Phased retirement options | 3.39 | 3.43 | |
| | Salary | 3.14 | 2.78 | ↑ |

NC State University
 AY14-15 COACHE Survey

Mean Ratings

Tenure Track Faculty Only: Full vs. Associate (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Tenure Track | | |
|------------------------|---|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | | Full | Associate | Diff ¹ |
| Interdisciplinary work | <i>Benchmark: Interdisciplinary work</i> | 2.78 | 2.75 | |
| | Budgets encourage interdiscip. work | 2.59 | 2.61 | |
| | Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work | 2.71 | 2.67 | |
| | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit | 2.83 | 2.73 | |
| | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion | 2.88 | 2.67 | |
| | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure | N/A | N/A | |
| | Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work | 2.88 | 2.84 | |
| Collaboration | <i>Benchmark: Collaboration</i> | 3.80 | 3.65 | |
| | Opportunities for collab. within dept. | 3.79 | 3.71 | |
| | Opportunities for collab. outside dept. | 3.70 | 3.56 | |
| | Opportunities for collab. outside inst. | 3.91 | 3.71 | |
| Mentoring | <i>Benchmark: Mentoring</i> | 3.15 | 2.91 | ↑ |
| | Effectiveness of mentoring within dept. | 3.66 | 3.71 | |
| | Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept. | 3.51 | 3.63 | |
| | Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty | 3.48 | 3.15 | ↑ |
| | Mentoring of associate faculty | 2.96 | 2.28 | ↑ |
| | Support for faculty to be good mentors | 2.50 | 2.15 | ↑ |
| | Being a mentor is fulfilling | 4.22 | 3.98 | ↑ |
| | Importance of mentoring within dept. | 4.03 | 4.40 | ↓ |
| | Importance of mentoring outside dept. | 3.30 | 3.62 | ↓ |
| | Importance of mentoring outside inst. | 3.42 | 3.84 | ↓ |
| Tenure policies | <i>Benchmark: Tenure policies</i> | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of tenure process | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of tenure criteria | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of tenure standards | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure | N/A | N/A | |
| | Consistency of messages about tenure | N/A | N/A | |
| | Tenure decisions are performance-based | N/A | N/A | |

NC State University
 AY14-15 COACHE Survey

Mean Ratings

Tenure Track Faculty Only: Full vs. Associate (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Tenure Track | | |
|---|--|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | | Full | Associate | Diff ¹ |
| Tenure clarity | <i>Benchmark: Tenure clarity</i> | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of expectations: Scholar | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of expectations: Teacher | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of expectations: Advisor | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of expectations: Colleague | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen | N/A | N/A | |
| | Clarity of expectations: Broader community | N/A | N/A | |
| Promotion | <i>Benchmark: Promotion</i> | 4.07 | 3.35 | ↑ |
| | Reasonable expectations: Promotion | 4.14 | 3.37 | ↑ |
| | Dept. culture encourages promotion | 4.21 | 3.45 | ↑ |
| | Clarity of promotion process | 4.26 | 3.51 | ↑ |
| | Clarity of promotion criteria | 4.07 | 3.44 | ↑ |
| | Clarity of promotion standards | 3.82 | 3.26 | ↑ |
| | Clarity of body of evidence for promotion | 4.18 | 3.60 | ↑ |
| | Clarity of time frame for promotion | 3.84 | 2.99 | ↑ |
| Institutional Governance and Leadership | Clarity of whether I will be promoted | N/A | 3.19 | |
| | Priorities are stated consistently | 2.86 | 2.78 | |
| | Priorities are acted on consistently | 2.63 | 2.57 | |
| Leadership: Senior | Changed priorities negatively affect my work** | 2.63 | 2.59 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Leadership: Senior</i> | 3.23 | 3.17 | |
| | Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making | 3.44 | 3.36 | |
| | Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities | 3.26 | 3.16 | |
| | Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities | 3.41 | 3.30 | |
| | CAO: Pace of decision making | 3.22 | 3.14 | |
| | CAO: Stated priorities | 3.04 | 3.00 | |
| | CAO: Communication of priorities | 3.11 | 3.03 | |
| Leadership: Senior | CAO: Ensuring faculty input | N/A | N/A | |
| | CAO: Support in adapting to change | N/A | N/A | |

NC State University
 AY14-15 COACHE Survey

Mean Ratings

Tenure Track Faculty Only: Full vs. Associate (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Tenure Track | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | | Full | Associate | Diff ¹ |
| Leadership: Divisional | <i>Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional</i> | 2.92 | 2.83 | |
| | Dean: Pace of decision making | 3.13 | 2.96 | |
| | Dean: Stated priorities | 2.88 | 2.73 | |
| | Dean: Communication of priorities | 2.91 | 2.79 | |
| | Dean: Ensuring faculty input | 2.76 | 2.85 | |
| | Dean: Support in adapting to change | 2.38 | 2.20 | |
| Leadership: Departmental | <i>Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental</i> | 3.58 | 3.71 | |
| | Head/Chair: Pace of decision making | 3.59 | 3.66 | |
| | Head/Chair: Stated priorities | 3.46 | 3.56 | |
| | Head/Chair: Communication of priorities | 3.52 | 3.69 | |
| | Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input | 3.59 | 3.75 | |
| | Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work | 3.77 | 3.96 | |
| | Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change | 3.25 | 3.30 | |
| Departmental collegiality | <i>Benchmark: Departmental collegiality</i> | 3.81 | 3.72 | |
| | Colleagues support work/life balance | 3.69 | 3.70 | |
| | Meeting times compatible with personal needs | 4.19 | 4.08 | |
| | Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure | 3.62 | 3.68 | |
| | How well you fit | 3.57 | 3.40 | |
| | Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured | 3.62 | 3.65 | |
| | Colleagues pitch in when needed | 3.79 | 3.57 | |
| | Dept. is collegial | 4.00 | 3.89 | |
| | Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion | 4.02 | 3.76 | ↑ |
| Departmental engagement | <i>Benchmark: Departmental engagement</i> | 3.60 | 3.61 | |
| | Discussions of undergrad student learning | 3.39 | 3.42 | |
| | Discussions of grad student learning | 3.81 | 3.78 | |
| | Discussions of effective teaching practices | 3.41 | 3.55 | |
| | Discussions of effective use of technology | 3.46 | 3.47 | |
| | Discussions of current research methods | 3.57 | 3.48 | |
| | Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure | 3.78 | 3.79 | |
| | Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured | 3.80 | 3.75 | |

NC State University
 AY14-15 COACHE Survey

Mean Ratings

Tenure Track Faculty Only: Full vs. Associate (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Tenure Track | | |
|------------------------------|--|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | | Full | Associate | Diff ¹ |
| Departmental quality | <i>Benchmark: Departmental quality</i> | 3.68 | 3.65 | |
| | Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty | 3.75 | 3.69 | |
| | Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty | 4.14 | 4.09 | |
| | Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty | 3.66 | 3.63 | |
| | Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty | 4.04 | 3.94 | |
| | Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty | 3.77 | 3.76 | |
| | Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty | 3.98 | 3.85 | |
| | Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment | 3.73 | 3.76 | |
| | Dept. is successful at faculty retention | 3.29 | 3.28 | |
| | Dept. addresses sub-standard performance | 2.74 | 2.78 | |
| Appreciation and recognition | <i>Benchmark: Appreciation and recognition</i> | 3.24 | 3.12 | |
| | Recognition: For teaching | 3.37 | 3.20 | |
| | Recognition: For advising | 3.19 | 2.94 | ↑ |
| | Recognition: For scholarship | 3.45 | 3.35 | |
| | Recognition: For service | 3.12 | 2.96 | |
| | Recognition: For outreach | 3.12 | 3.01 | |
| | Recognition: From colleagues | 3.65 | 3.56 | |
| | Recognition: From CAO | 2.87 | 2.80 | |
| | Recognition: From Dean | 3.06 | 2.89 | |
| | Recognition: From Head/Chair | 3.56 | 3.67 | |
| | School/college is valued by Pres/Provost | 3.25 | 3.02 | |
| | Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost | 3.03 | 2.86 | |
| | CAO cares about faculty of my rank | 3.09 | 2.97 | |
| Recruitment and retention | Outside offers are necessary in negotiations | 2.00 | 1.83 | |
| Global satisfaction | Visible leadership for support of diversity | 4.02 | 3.79 | |
| | I would again choose this institution | 3.64 | 3.61 | |
| | Department as a place to work | 3.74 | 3.72 | |
| | Institution as a place to work | 3.56 | 3.55 | |

¹Arrows indicate when mean ratings differ by 5 percent or more of the response scale (i.e., a difference of at least 0.25). Up arrows indicate that the individual college mean rating is notably higher than the mean of combined respondents from the other colleges, whereas down arrows indicate that the college mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.