NC State University
AY14-15 COACHE Survey
Mean Ratings
Tenure Track Faculty (Tenured & Pre-Tenured)) vs. Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTT) (1 = low to 5 = high)

Theme	Measure	Tenure Track Status		
		TT	NTT	Diff[1]
Nature of work: Research	*Benchmark: Nature of work: Research*	3.21	3.27	
	Time spent on research	3.60	3.40	
	Expectations for finding external funding	3.18	3.20	
	Influence over focus of research	4.32	4.08	
	Quality of graduate student to support research	3.42	3.55	
	Support for research	2.79	2.89	
	Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.06	3.23	
	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.14	3.13	
	Support for managing grants (post-award)	2.93	3.24	↓
	Support for securing grad student assistance	2.77	3.00	
	Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.00	3.10	
	Availability of course release for research	2.80	2.65	
Nature of work: Service	*Benchmark: Nature of work: Service*	3.33	3.62	↓
	Time spent on service	3.51	3.92	↓
	Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.71	3.33	↓
	Number of committees	3.55	3.79	↓
	Attractiveness of committees	3.45	3.64	
	Discretion to choose committees	3.57	3.57	
	Equitability of committee assignments	3.16	3.27	
	Number of student advisees	3.70	3.91	
Nature of work: Teaching	*Benchmark: Nature of work: Teaching*	3.77	3.89	
	Time spent on teaching	3.92	4.27	↓
	Number of courses taught	3.97	3.97	
	Level of courses taught	4.12	4.06	
	Discretion over course content	4.39	4.31	
	Number of students in classes taught	3.75	3.83	
	Quality of students taught	3.56	3.87	↓
	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.09	3.10	
	Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.37	3.55	

Theme	Measure	Tenure Track Status		
		TT	NTT	Diff[1]
Other Work Activities	Time spent on outreach	3.72	3.83	
	Time spent on administrative tasks	2.78	3.49	↓
	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.38	3.83	↓
Facilities and work resources	*Benchmark: Facilities and work resources*	3.60	3.80	
	Support for improving teaching	3.36	3.61	
	Office	3.94	3.84	
	Laboratory, research, or studio space	3.36	3.52	
	Equipment	3.51	3.82	↓
	Classrooms	3.68	3.68	
	Library resources	4.24	4.20	
	Computing and technical support	3.58	3.88	↓
	Clerical/administrative support	3.00	3.69	↓
Personal and family policies	*Benchmark: Personal and family policies*	2.95	3.40	↓
	Housing benefits	2.26	2.53	↓
	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.09	3.21	↓
	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.77	2.74	
	Childcare	2.31	2.30	
	Eldercare	2.45	3.30	↓
	Family medical/parental leave	3.30	3.50	
	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.54	3.71	
	Inst. does what it can for work/life compatibility	3.03	3.41	↓
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.35	3.57	
Health and retirement benefits	*Benchmark: Health and retirement benefits*	3.02	3.51	↓
	Health benefits for yourself	3.06	3.71	↓
	Health benefits for your family (i.e. spouse, partner, and dependen	2.50	3.04	↓
	Retirement benefits	3.20	3.63	↓
	Phased retirement options	3.40	3.15	
	Salary	3.00	2.87	

Theme	Measure	Tenure Track Status		
		TT	NTT	Diff[1]
Interdisciplinary work	*Benchmark: Interdisciplinary work*	2.76	3.00	
	Budget encourages interdisciplinary work	2.58	2.86	↓
	Facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work	2.69	3.07	↓
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.78	2.74	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion	2.81	2.78	
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscp. work	2.85	2.92	
Collaboration	*Benchmark: Collaboration*	3.75	3.56	
	Opportunities for collab. within dept.	3.76	3.79	
	Opportunities for collab. outside dept.	3.65	3.44	
	Opportunities for collab. outside inst.	3.83	3.38	↑
Mentoring	*Benchmark: Mentoring*	3.06	3.20	
	Effectiveness of mentoring from within dept.	3.68	3.97	↓
	Effectiveness of mentoring from outside dept.	3.55	3.61	
	Support for faculty to be good mentors	2.38	2.49	
	Being a mentor is fulfilling	4.15	4.17	
	Importance of mentoring within dept.	4.16	4.25	
	Importance of mentoring outside dept.	3.42	3.55	
	Importance of mentoring outside instit.	3.57	3.36	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside instit.	3.85	3.61	
Institutional Governance and Leadership	Priorities are stated consistently	2.82	3.20	↓
	Priorities are acted on consistently	2.60	2.94	↓
	Changed priorities negatively affect my work**	2.61	2.77	
Leadership: Senior	*Benchmark: Leadership: Senior*	3.20	3.35	
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.41	3.39	
	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.22	3.42	
	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.36	3.42	
	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.18	3.28	
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.01	3.29	↓
	CAO: Communication of priorities	3.07	3.27	

Theme	Measure	Tenure Track Status		
		TT	NTT	Diff[1]
Leadership: Divisional	*Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional*	2.88	3.15	↓
	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.06	3.16	
	Dean: Stated priorities	2.82	3.19	↓
	Dean: Communication of priorities	2.86	3.17	↓
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	2.78	3.06	↓
	Dean: Support in adapting to change	2.31	2.34	
Leadership: Departmental	*Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental*	3.62	3.69	
	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.61	3.67	
	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.49	3.66	
	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.57	3.69	
	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.64	3.63	
	Head/Chair: Fairness of evaluating my work	3.84	3.86	
	Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change	3.27	3.37	
Departmental collegiality	*Benchmark: Departmental collegiality*	3.77	3.77	
	Colleagues support work/life balance	3.68	3.88	
	Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.14	4.18	
	Amount of personal interaction w/ pre-tenure	3.64	3.53	
	How well you fit	3.51	3.47	
	Amount of personal interaction w/ tenured	3.63	3.43	
	Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.71	3.75	
	Dept. is collegial	3.96	3.91	
	Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.92	4.00	
	Amount of personal interaction w/ NTT	3.60	3.88	↓

Theme	Measure	Tenure Track Status		
		TT	NTT	Diff[1]
Departmental engagement	*Benchmark: Departmental engagement*	3.60	3.42	
	Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.39	3.82	↓
	Discussions of grad student learning	3.80	2.78	↑
	Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.46	3.71	↓
	Discussions of effective uses of technology	3.47	3.57	
	Discussions of current research methods	3.55	3.00	↑
	Amount of professional interaction w/ pre-tenure	3.78	3.54	
	Amount of professional interaction w/ tenured	3.78	3.44	↑
	Amount of professional interaction w/ NTT	3.68	3.95	↓
Departmental quality	*Benchmark: Departmental quality*	3.66	3.64	
	Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.72	3.75	
	Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.12	4.16	
	Intellectual vitality of NTT faculty	3.74	4.11	↓
	Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.65	3.75	
	Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.00	4.04	
	Scholarly productivity of NTT faculty	3.59	3.86	↓
	Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.76	3.45	↑
	Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.93	3.80	
	Teaching effectiveness of NTT faculty	3.98	4.25	↓
	Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment	3.74	3.74	
	Dept. is successful at faculty retention	3.29	3.51	
	Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.74	2.64	
Appreciation and recognition	*Benchmark: Appreciation and recognition*	3.19	3.35	
	Recognition: For teaching	3.30	3.34	
	Recognition: For advising	3.10	3.11	
	Recognition: For scholarship	3.41	3.21	
	Recognition: For service	3.06	3.16	
	Recognition: For outreach	3.08	3.22	
	Recognition: From colleagues	3.62	3.72	
	Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.59	3.63	
	CAO cares about faculty of my rank	3.04	2.94	

Theme	Measure	Tenure Track Status		
		TT	NTT	Diff[1]
Recruitment and retention	Outside offers are not necessary in negotiations	1.94	2.57	↓
Global satisfaction	Visible leadership for support of diversity	3.93	3.95	
	I would again choose this institution	3.61	4.08	↓
	Department as a place to work	3.73	3.99	↓
	Institution as a place to work	3.54	3.87	↓

[1]Arrows 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.