

2011 COACHE Survey

Nature of Work: Research, Service, Teaching

Peer Comparisons of Mean Ratings by Tenure Status (1=low to 5=high)

(Pre-tenure and tenured faculty, except where noted)

Sub-theme	Question	Pre-tenure			Tenured		
		NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²	NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²
	<i>Benchmark: Nature of work: research</i>	3.27	3.36		3.22	3.21	
	Time spent on research	3.64	3.46		3.63	3.45	
	Expectations for finding external funding	3.29	3.26		3.22	3.12	
	Influence over focus of research	4.30	4.33		4.35	4.36	
	Quality of grad students to support research	3.19	3.17		3.34	3.25	
Research	Support for research	2.91	3.16	↓	2.68	2.76	
	Support for engaging undergrads in research	2.99	3.24	↓	3.09	3.09	
	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.24	3.48		3.09	3.27	
	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	3.10	3.38	↓	3.02	3.13	
	Support for securing grad student assistance	2.85	3.00		2.86	2.83	
	Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.26	3.37		2.96	3.13	
	Availability of course release for research	2.89	2.85		2.81	2.73	
		<i>Benchmark: Nature of work, service</i>	3.52	3.37		3.34	3.20
	Time spent on service	3.65	3.44		3.52	3.36	
	Support for faculty in leadership roles	3.13	3.03		2.83	2.76	
Service	Number of committees	3.76	3.55		3.55	3.33	
	Attractiveness of committees	3.50	3.44		3.40	3.34	
	Discretion to choose committees	3.50	3.34		3.49	3.46	
	Equitability of committee assignments	3.36	3.20		3.22	2.95	↑
	Number of student advisees	3.79	3.57		3.70	3.53	
		<i>Benchmark: Nature of work, teaching</i>	3.68	3.73		3.77	3.74
	Time spent on teaching	3.82	3.78		3.91	3.88	
	Number of courses taught	3.89	3.91		3.88	3.86	
	Level of courses taught	4.01	4.05		4.12	4.06	
Teaching	Discretion over course content	4.27	4.32		4.43	4.45	
	Number of students in classes taught	3.59	3.67		3.77	3.71	
	Quality of students taught	3.37	3.29		3.35	3.34	
	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.27	3.40		3.12	3.11	
	Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.15	3.27		3.37	3.35	
Other work activities	Time spent on outreach	3.71	3.55		3.74	3.62	
	Time spent on administrative tasks	2.99	3.12		2.84	2.89	
	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.34	3.40		3.43	3.29	

¹ Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

² 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 NC State's mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

2011 COACHE Survey

Facilities, Personal/Family Policies, Benefits, and Salary

Peer Comparisons of Mean Ratings by Tenure Status (1=low to 5=high)

(Pre-tenure and tenured faculty, except where noted)

Sub-theme	Question	Pre-tenure			Tenured		
		NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²	NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²
Facilities and work resources	<i>Benchmark: Facilities and work resources</i>	3.61	3.46		3.57	3.44	
	Support for improving teaching	3.43	3.52		3.27	3.34	
	Office	3.96	3.65	↑	3.95	3.70	↑
	Laboratory, research, studio space	3.30	3.24		3.44	3.23	
	Equipment	3.67	3.45		3.47	3.31	
	Classrooms	3.62	3.25	↑	3.73	3.23	↑
	Library resources	4.10	3.61	↑	4.18	3.81	↑
	Computing and technical support	3.43	3.37		3.50	3.49	
	Clerical/administrative support	3.21	3.52	↓	2.93	3.24	↓
Personal and family policies	<i>Benchmark: Personal and family policies</i>	3.03	2.96		2.93	2.95	
	Housing benefits	2.18	2.30		2.21	2.35	
	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.43	2.80	↓	2.10	2.67	↓
	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.60	2.40		2.80	2.56	
	Childcare	2.22	2.43		2.36	2.50	
	Eldercare	2.48	3.00	↓	2.62	2.68	
	Family medical/parental leave	3.24	3.18		3.35	3.35	
	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.50	3.45		3.55	3.42	
	Stop-the-clock policies ³	3.66	3.43		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Inst. does what it can for work/life compatibility	3.06	3.04		2.98	2.84	
Right balance between professional/personal	3.02	3.16		3.43	3.35		
Health and retirement benefits	<i>Benchmark: Health and retirement benefits</i>	2.93	3.52	↓	2.78	3.46	↓
	Health benefits for yourself	2.92	3.53	↓	2.74	3.60	↓
	Health benefits for family	2.33	3.42	↓	2.24	3.48	↓
	Retirement benefits	3.35	3.59		3.00	3.40	↓
	Phased retirement options	3.29	3.41		3.27	3.19	
Salary	Salary	2.65	3.08	↓	2.80	2.92	

¹ Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

² 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 NC State's mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

³ Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey

Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring

Peer Comparisons of Mean Ratings by Tenure Status (1=low to 5=high)

(Pre-tenure and tenured faculty, except where noted)

Sub-theme	Question	Pre-tenure			Tenured		
		NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²	NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²
Interdisciplinary work	<i>Benchmark: Interdisciplinary work</i>	2.78	2.80		2.64	2.62	
	Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.70	2.76		2.48	2.44	
	Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	2.56	2.72		2.60	2.52	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.81	2.74		2.57	2.59	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.66	2.66	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure ⁴	2.86	2.78		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	3.05	2.86		2.84	2.83	
Collaboration	<i>Benchmark: Collaboration</i>	3.73	3.59		3.75	3.63	
	Opportunities for collab. within dept.	3.61	3.60		3.81	3.70	
	Opportunities for collab. outside dept.	3.60	3.40		3.61	3.44	
	Opportunities for collab. outside inst.	3.99	3.74	↑	3.83	3.75	
Mentoring	<i>Benchmark: Mentoring</i>	3.34	3.35		2.98	2.90	
	Effectiveness of mentoring from within dept.	3.58	3.60		3.47	3.44	
	Effectiveness of mentoring from outside dept.	3.44	3.21		3.30	3.29	
	Effectiveness of mentoring from outside inst.	3.92	3.92		3.64	3.78	
	Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty	3.11	3.20		3.33	3.27	
	Mentoring of associate faculty ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.69	2.42	↑
	Support for faculty to be good mentors ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.37	2.36	
	Being a mentor is fulfilling ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.10	4.05	
	Importance of mentoring within dept.	4.41	4.45		4.13	4.12	
	Importance of mentoring outside dept.	3.53	3.63		3.26	3.35	
Importance of mentoring outside inst.	3.93	3.94		3.49	3.53		

¹ Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

² 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 NC State's mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

³ Asked of tenured faculty only

⁴ Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey

Tenure and Promotion

Peer Comparisons of Mean Ratings by Tenure Status (1=low to 5=high)

(Pre-tenure and tenured faculty, except where noted)

Sub-theme	Question	Pre-tenure			Tenured		
		NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²	NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²
Tenure policies ³	<i>Benchmark: Tenure policies</i>	3.64	3.62		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of tenure process	3.87	3.78		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of tenure criteria	3.73	3.72		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of tenure standards	3.49	3.36		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure	3.76	3.82		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure	3.70	3.65		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Consistency of messages about tenure	3.25	3.33		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Tenure decisions are performance-based	3.69	3.73		N/A	N/A	N/A
Tenure clarity ³	<i>Benchmark: Tenure clarity</i>	3.31	3.38		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Scholar	3.84	3.87		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Teacher	3.65	3.84		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Advisor	3.30	3.35		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Colleague	3.24	3.29		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen	2.92	3.02		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Broader community	2.90	2.93		N/A	N/A	N/A
Tenure reasonableness ³	<i>Benchmark: Tenure reasonableness</i>	3.85	3.86		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reasonable expectations: Scholar	4.01	4.00		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reasonable expectations: Teacher	4.15	4.11		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reasonable expectations: Advisor	3.84	3.83		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reasonable expectations: Colleague	3.92	3.91		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reasonable expectations: Campus citizen	3.68	3.72		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reasonable expectations: Community member	3.63	3.67		N/A	N/A	N/A
Promotion ⁴	<i>Benchmark: Promotion</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.86	3.69	
	Reasonable expectations: Promotion	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.91	3.81	
	Dept. culture encourages promotion	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.97	3.68	↑
	Clarity of promotion process	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.05	3.87	
	Clarity of promotion criteria	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.94	3.78	
	Clarity of promotion standards	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.64	3.53	
	Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.00	3.85	
	Clarity of time frame for promotion	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.66	3.44	
	Clarity of whether I will be promoted ⁵	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.28	3.09	
	Decision to remain here based on promotion ⁵	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.32	3.27	

¹ Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

² 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 NC State's mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

³ Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

⁴ Asked of tenured faculty only

⁵ Asked of associate faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey

Leadership and Governance

Peer Comparisons of Mean Ratings by Tenure Status (1=low to 5=high)

(Pre-tenure and tenured faculty, except where noted)

Sub-theme	Question	Pre-tenure			Tenured		
		NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²	NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²
Institutional	Priorities are stated consistently	2.85	3.13	↓	2.64	2.80	
Governance and Leadership	Priorities are acted on consistently	2.70	2.89		2.46	2.58	
	Changed priorities negatively affect my work	3.33	3.03	↑	3.34	3.27	
Leadership: Senior	<i>Benchmark: Leadership: Senior</i>	3.30	3.23		3.22	3.02	
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.35	3.23		3.35	3.12	
	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.41	3.21		3.27	3.08	
	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.45	3.20	↑	3.36	3.15	
	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.19	3.24		3.18	2.94	
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.17	3.23		3.10	2.91	
	CAO: Communication of priorities	3.23	3.17		3.06	2.93	
	<i>Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional</i>	3.08	3.38	↓	2.93	3.08	
Leadership: Divisional	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.10	3.44	↓	3.00	3.19	
	Dean: Stated priorities	3.09	3.41	↓	2.92	3.05	
	Dean: Communication of priorities	3.06	3.37	↓	2.95	3.06	
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	3.09	3.31		2.86	3.02	
	Dean: Support in adapting to change	2.78	2.88		2.52	2.50	
Leadership: Departmental	<i>Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental</i>	3.85	3.85		3.64	3.56	
	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.80	3.77		3.64	3.56	
	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.72	3.82		3.52	3.46	
	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.75	3.79		3.57	3.46	
	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.86	3.85		3.62	3.53	
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	4.17	4.03		3.86	3.78	
	Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change	3.55	3.35		3.36	3.17	

¹ Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

² 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 NC State's mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

2011 COACHE Survey

Departmental Collegiality, Engagement, and Quality

Peer Comparisons of Mean Ratings by Tenure Status (1=low to 5=high)

(Pre-tenure and tenured faculty, except where noted)

Sub-theme	Question	Pre-tenure			Tenured		
		NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²	NCSU	Peers ¹	Diff ²
Departmental collegiality	<i>Benchmark: Departmental collegiality</i>	3.84	3.80		3.79	3.76	
	Colleagues support work/life balance	3.52	3.68		3.66	3.60	
	Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.22	4.14		4.11	4.00	
	Amount of personal interaction w/ pre-tenure	3.78	3.76		3.61	3.66	
	How well you fit	3.87	3.66		3.63	3.65	
	Amount of personal interaction w/ tenured	3.59	3.57		3.63	3.65	
	Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.72	3.75		3.73	3.73	
	Dept. is collegial	4.10	3.99		3.95	3.91	
	Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.84	3.85		3.99	3.93	
Departmental engagement	<i>Benchmark: Departmental engagement</i>	3.49	3.44		3.49	3.49	
	Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.19	3.40		3.30	3.45	
	Discussions of grad student learning	3.54	3.54		3.61	3.59	
	Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.30	3.31		3.29	3.31	
	Discussions of effective use of technology	3.26	3.11		3.31	3.23	
	Discussions of current research methods	3.39	3.29		3.40	3.27	
	Amount of professional interaction w/ pre-tenure	4.02	3.82		3.78	3.81	
	Amount of professional interaction w/ tenured	3.79	3.61		3.75	3.79	
Departmental quality	<i>Benchmark: Departmental quality</i>	3.69	3.64		3.64	3.54	
	Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.47	3.51		3.66	3.58	
	Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.27	4.11		4.06	4.01	
	Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.41	3.41		3.57	3.46	
	Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.02	4.03		3.92	3.88	
	Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.66	3.57		3.79	3.63	
	Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	4.03	3.98		3.94	3.86	
	Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.70	3.56	
	Dept. is successful at faculty retention ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.45	3.23	
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.75	2.63		2.79	2.71		

¹ Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

² 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 NC State's mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

³ Asked of tenured faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey

Appreciation and Recognition

Peer Comparisons of Mean Ratings by Tenure Status (1=low to 5=high)

(Pre-tenure and tenured faculty, except where noted)

Question	Pre-tenure			Tenured		
	<i>NCSU</i>	<i>Peers¹</i>	<i>Diff²</i>	<i>NCSU</i>	<i>Peers¹</i>	<i>Diff²</i>
<i>Benchmark: Appreciation and recognition</i>	3.41	3.42		3.23	3.20	
Recognition: For teaching	3.33	3.33		3.30	3.19	
Recognition: For advising	3.23	3.16		3.11	2.96	
Recognition: For scholarship	3.46	3.53		3.40	3.37	
Recognition: For service	3.26	3.30		3.17	3.08	
Recognition: For outreach	3.20	3.25		3.13	3.06	
Recognition: From colleagues	3.68	3.66		3.62	3.63	
Recognition: From CAO ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.79	2.87	
Recognition: From Dean ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.00	3.05	
Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.74	3.76		3.62	3.56	
School/college is valued by Pres/Provost ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.37	3.37	
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.10	3.15	
CAO cares about faculty of my rank	3.05	3.20		3.03	3.02	

¹ Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

² 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 NC State's mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

³ Asked of tenured faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey

Retention and Negotiations

Peer Comparisons of Mean Ratings by Tenure Status (1=low to 5=high)

(Pre-tenure and tenured faculty, except where noted)

Question	Pre-tenure			Tenured		
	<i>NCSU</i>	<i>Peers</i> ¹	<i>Diff</i> ²	<i>NCSU</i>	<i>Peers</i> ¹	<i>Diff</i> ²
Outside offers are necessary in negotiations ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.85	2.06	

¹ Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

² 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 NC State's mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

³ Asked of tenured faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey

Global Satisfaction

Peer Comparisons of Mean Ratings by Tenure Status (1=low to 5=high)

(Pre-tenure and tenured faculty, except where noted)

Question	Pre-tenure			Tenured		
	<i>NCSU</i>	<i>Peers¹</i>	<i>Diff²</i>	<i>NCSU</i>	<i>Peers¹</i>	<i>Diff²</i>
Visible leadership for support of diversity	3.77	3.68		4.00	3.79	
I would again choose this institution	3.82	3.79		3.71	3.53	
Department as a place to work	3.98	3.87		3.78	3.73	
Institution as a place to work	3.65	3.58		3.59	3.47	

¹ Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

² 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 NC State's mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.