COACHE 2018: Faculty Satisfaction Survey
NC State Overall
Professional Track faculty*

Nature of Work: Teaching	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with time spent on teaching	4.2	38.8%	47.9%	6.8%	5.7%	0.8%	263
Satisfaction with the number of courses you teach	3.9	27.4%	48.9%	11.0%	11.0%	1.7%	237
Satisfaction with the level of courses you teach	4.1	34.3%	48.7%	11.4%	3.8%	1.7%	236
Satisfaction with the discretion you have over course content	4.3	52.1%	35.2%	7.2%	3.8%	1.7%	236
Satisfaction with the number of students in the classes you teach, on average	3.9	29.4%	46.2%	11.8%	10.9%	1.7%	238
Satisfaction with the quality of students you teach	4.0	27.6%	49.8%	15.9%	6.3%	0.4%	239
Satisfaction with how equitably the teaching workload is distributed	3.1	10.2%	31.9%	23.9%	24.8%	9.3%	226
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support your teaching	3.6	17.5%	43.7%	23.0%	11.9%	4.0%	126
Satisfaction with teaching schedule	4.2	41.2%	44.2%	9.9%	3.4%	1.3%	233
Satisfaction with support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.9	22.0%	45.8%	29.9%	2.3%	0.0%	214
Satisfaction with support for assessing student learning	3.9	21.4%	54.2%	20.6%	3.8%	0.0%	238
Satisfaction with support for developng online/hybrid courses	3.9	27.0%	40.2%	25.9%	4.6%	2.3%	174
Satisfaction with support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.9	28.7%	39.6%	23.2%	6.7%	1.8%	164

Nature of Work: Research	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with time spent on research	3.5	14.6%	42.9%	21.2%	17.2%	4.0%	198
Satisfaction with the amount of external funding you are expected to find	3.3	6.9%	34.6%	41.5%	11.5%	5.4%	130
Satisfaction with the influence you have over the focus of research/scholarly/creative work	3.9	29.9%	42.6%	20.6%	4.9%	2.0%	204
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support research/scholarly/creative work	3.5	13.7%	42.2%	31.4%	8.8%	3.9%	102
Satisfaction with NC State's financial support for research/scholarly/creative work	3.0	5.2%	30.2%	31.3%	29.2%	4.2%	192
Satisfaction with NC State's support for engaging undergrads in research/scholarly/creative work	3.4	12.7%	34.4%	34.4%	15.9%	2.5%	157
Satisfaction with NC State's support for obtaining externally funded grants	3.2	7.1%	33.9%	39.4%	15.0%	4.7%	127
Satisfaction with NC State's support for managing externally funded grants	3.3	8.4%	31.8%	43.9%	8.4%	7.5%	107
Satisfaction with NC State's support for securing graduate student assistance	3.3	14.8%	26.9%	36.1%	15.7%	6.5%	108
Satisfaction with NC State's support for traveling to present papers/conduct research/creative work	3.2	13.5%	33.8%	23.2%	20.8%	8.7%	207
Satisfaction with the availability of course release time to focus on research	2.6	4.8%	12.5%	35.6%	31.7%	15.4%	104

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included,
but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

Nature of Work: Service	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with time spent on service	3.8	17.1%	57.8%	17.1%	7.3%	0.7%	275
Satisfaction with the number of committees on which you serve	3.7	12.0%	57.0%	21.5%	8.3%	1.2%	242
Satisfaction with the attractiveness of the committees on which you serve	3.6	11.4%	51.5%	27.4%	8.4%	1.3%	237
Satisfaction with the discretion you have to choose the committees on which you serve	3.6	15.4%	44.7%	24.4%	13.4%	2.0%	246
Satisfaction with how equitably committee assignments are distributed	3.2	6.9%	33.6%	37.9%	18.1%	3.4%	232
Satisfaction with the number of students you advise/mentor	3.7	12.0%	56.0%	19.0%	10.5%	2.5%	200
Satisfaction with how equitability service work is compensated	2.7	2.6%	21.5%	32.2%	31.3%	12.4%	233
Satisfaction with relevance of committees you serve on	3.8	17.1%	53.4%	21.8%	6.8%	0.9%	234
Satisfaction with support for being a good advisor	3.2	10.1%	34.8%	31.8%	15.7%	7.6%	198
Satisfaction with equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	3.1	5.2%	33.3%	35.4%	18.8%	7.3%	192

Nature of Work: Other	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
NC State helps faculty who take on add'l leadership roles to sustain other aspects of their work	3.2	10.9%	34.8%	21.7%	26.1%	6.5%	230

	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with time spent on outreach	3.8	16.9%	53.1%	23.5%	6.1%	0.5%	213
Satisfaction with time spent on administrative tasks	3.4	9.4%	41.1%	32.1%	13.6%	3.8%	265

	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Able to balance the teaching, research, and service activities expected of me	3.7	20.6%	47.3%	13.4%	14.5%	4.2%	262

	Too much	Too little	Total (N)
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on teaching	64.7%	35.3%	17
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on research	4.9%	95.1%	41
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on service	54.5%	45.5%	22
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on outreach	14.3%	85.7%	14
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on administrative tasks	100.0%	0.0%	45

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included,
but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

Facilities and Work Resources	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with NC State's support for improving your teaching	3.6	22.6%	37.0%	25.1%	11.1%	4.3%	235
Satisfaction with office	3.8	31.2%	38.4%	14.3%	13.6%	2.5%	279
Satisfaction with laboratory, research, or studio space	3.6	21.9%	41.1%	19.9%	13.7%	3.4%	146
Satisfaction with equipment	3.9	22.4%	51.9%	17.9%	6.7%	1.1%	268
Satisfaction with classrooms	3.8	22.7%	49.4%	16.2%	10.9%	0.8%	247
Satisfaction with library resources	4.4	50.9%	40.2%	7.7%	1.1%	0.0%	271
Satisfaction with computing and technical support	4.0	26.9%	54.5%	10.8%	7.2%	0.7%	279
Satisfaction with clerical/administrative support	3.8	25.2%	47.1%	14.2%	11.7%	1.8%	274

Personal and Family Policies	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Able to find the right balance between professional life and personal/family life	3.5	24.5%	37.9%	7.9%	21.7%	7.9%	253
NC State does what it can to make personal/family obligations and an academic career compatible	3.5	20.6%	39.7%	20.1%	11.2%	8.4%	214

	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with housing benefits	2.9	5.7%	24.5%	35.8%	26.4%	7.5%	53
Satisfaction with tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	3.3	9.6%	36.1%	31.3%	16.9%	6.0%	166
Satisfaction with spousal/partner hiring program	2.9	9.7%	13.9%	44.4%	18.1%	13.9%	72
Satisfaction with childcare	2.4	1.6%	6.5%	35.5%	38.7%	17.7%	62
Satisfaction with eldercare	3.0	7.3%	17.1%	48.8%	24.4%	2.4%	41
Satisfaction with family medical/parental leave	3.4	11.7%	39.5%	28.4%	13.0%	7.4%	162
Satisfaction with flexible workload/modified duties for parental/family reasons	3.7	19.4%	45.7%	21.1%	7.4%	6.3%	175
Satisfaction with stop-the-clock (Pre-tenure only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Satisfaction with parking benefits	3.1	7.6%	36.7%	23.5%	22.3%	9.8%	264

Health and Retirement Benefits	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with health benefits for yourself	3.4	13.2%	44.7%	19.9%	16.5%	5.6%	266
Satisfaction with health benefits for your family	2.9	5.5%	27.6%	26.6%	29.1%	11.1%	199
Satisfaction with retirement benefits	3.6	10.3%	50.0%	30.2%	8.3%	1.2%	252
Satisfaction with phased retirement options	3.2	7.3%	34.4%	38.5%	13.5%	6.3%	96

Salary	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with salary	2.9	8.6%	30.2%	16.9%	27.7%	16.5%	278

coache18.NCSU.over.NTT.xlsx

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included, but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

Page 3 of 12

Mentoring	Yes	No	Total (N)
Mentored pre-tenure faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	9.1%	90.9%	275
Mentored tenured faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.3%	96.7%	275
Mentored pre-tenure faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	38.2%	61.8%	275
Mentored tenured faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.6%	96.4%	275
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.9%	97.1%	275
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	10.9%	89.1%	275
Mentored none of the above	57.1%	42.9%	275

	Mean	5: Very effective	4: Effective	3: Never effective nor ineffective	2: Ineffective	1: Very ineffective	Total (N)
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone in department	3.9	34.4%	43.5%	8.1%	8.6%	5.3%	209
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside department at NC State	3.7	18.8%	48.4%	22.7%	7.8%	2.3%	128
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside your institution	3.9	27.3%	42.1%	22.3%	5.8%	2.5%	121

	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Effective mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in my department (Pre-tenure and Tenured only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Effective mentoring of tenured associate professors in my department (Tenured only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Effective mentoring of professional track faculty in my department (Professional Track only)	2.8	11.3%	23.8%	19.4%	21.8%	23.8%	248
NC State provides adequate support for faculty to be good mentors (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.7	4.8%	23.8%	27.5%	28.0%	15.9%	189
Being a mentor is/has been fulfilling in role as a faculty member (Professional Track and Tenured only)	4.3	46.1%	42.6%	7.0%	3.5%	0.9%	115

	Mean Rating	5: Very important	4: Important	3: Neither important nor unimportant	2: Unimportant	1: Very unimportant	Total (N)
Importance of having mentor/mentors in department	4.4	47.5%	43.3%	6.1%	2.7%	0.4%	263
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside department at NC State	3.7	19.0%	41.7%	27.0%	10.3%	2.0%	252
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside institution	3.5	20.2%	31.5%	31.5%	12.5%	4.4%	248

Interdisciplinary Work	Mean	5: Extremely interested	4: Very interested	3: Moderately interested	2: Slightly interested	1: Not at all interested	Total (N)
Interest in engaging in interdisciplinary research/teaching	3.5	25.8%	27.0%	27.3%	14.6%	5.2%	267

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included, but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Budget allocations encourage interdisciplinary work	2.8	11.8%	18.1%	26.4%	28.5%	15.3%	144
Campus facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work	3.3	14.3%	32.7%	26.0%	20.4%	6.6%	196
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the merit process	2.9	11.3%	23.4%	27.4%	22.6%	15.3%	124
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the promotion process (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.9	9.0%	25.2%	32.4%	17.1%	16.2%	111
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the tenure process (Pre-tenure only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the reappointment process (Professional Track only)	2.9	9.1%	22.7%	32.7%	20.9%	14.5%	110
Department understands how to evaluate interdisciplinary work	2.9	12.0%	19.5%	30.1%	24.8%	13.5%	133

Collaboration	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with others in department	3.9	29.6%	45.2%	14.4%	8.1%	2.6%	270
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with faculty outside NC State	3.5	12.7%	36.2%	41.2%	9.5%	0.5%	221
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with NC State faculty outside department	3.6	14.6%	42.7%	32.1%	8.5%	2.0%	246

Contract Renewal: Clarity	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of departmental contract renewal process (Professional Track only)	3.1	19.1%	31.6%	7.4%	23.4%	18.4%	256
Clarity of departmental contract renewal criteria (Professional Track only)	3.1	17.6%	33.6%	12.1%	18.0%	18.8%	256
Clarity of departmental contract renewal standards (Professional Track only)	3.0	14.2%	32.3%	12.2%	22.4%	18.9%	254
Clarity of body of evidence considered in making contract renewal decisions (Professional Track only)	3.1	16.6%	35.6%	10.7%	19.4%	17.8%	253
Clarity of sense of whether my contract will be renewed (Professional Track only)	3.4	21.3%	35.3%	14.0%	15.9%	13.6%	258

Promotion Process: Clarity	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of departmental promotion process for non-tenure-track faculty (Professional Track only)	2.8	11.1%	28.6%	12.3%	23.4%	24.6%	252
Clarity of departmental critieria for promotion of non-tenure-track faculty (Professional Track only)	2.7	11.0%	26.4%	11.0%	27.2%	24.4%	254
Clarity of departmental standards for promotion of non-tenure-track faculty (Professional Track only)	2.7	9.1%	25.3%	13.4%	25.7%	26.5%	253
Clarity of body of evidence considered in making promotion decisions for non-tenure-track faculty (Professional Track only)	2.8	12.0%	26.4%	13.2%	24.0%	24.4%	250
Clarity of sense of whether I will be promoted (Professional Track only)	2.9	14.6%	25.7%	15.8%	21.3%	22.5%	253

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included, but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

Leadership: Senior	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's pace of decision making	3.5	12.4%	35.6%	42.9%	6.9%	2.1%	233
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's stated priorities	3.6	17.8%	34.7%	36.9%	8.1%	2.5%	236
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's communication of priorities to faculty	3.5	15.9%	33.9%	35.1%	10.9%	4.2%	239
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's pace of decision making	3.4	11.9%	32.8%	41.3%	11.1%	3.0%	235
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's stated priorities	3.4	11.8%	35.3%	39.1%	9.2%	4.6%	238
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's communication of priorities to faculty	3.4	11.3%	35.6%	36.4%	10.5%	6.3%	239

Leadership: Divisional	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with dean's pace of decision making	3.4	12.4%	35.5%	32.9%	12.8%	6.4%	234
Satisfaction with dean's stated priorities	3.4	13.2%	40.0%	26.8%	12.3%	7.7%	235
Satisfaction with dean's communication of priorities to faculty	3.3	15.6%	33.3%	27.0%	15.6%	8.4%	237
Satisfaction that dean ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into college priorities	3.2	15.0%	30.3%	29.1%	14.5%	11.1%	234

Leadership: Departmental	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with department head's pace of decision making	3.8	28.8%	39.4%	17.8%	9.3%	4.7%	236
Satisfaction with department head's stated priorities	3.8	31.8%	38.6%	15.7%	9.3%	4.7%	236
Satisfaction with department head's communication of priorities to faculty	3.7	31.6%	34.6%	15.8%	12.4%	5.6%	234
Satisfaction that dept head ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into departmental decisions	3.7	29.8%	36.2%	18.7%	7.7%	7.7%	235
Satisfaction with department head's fairness in evaluating work	4.0	33.1%	42.8%	15.3%	4.7%	4.2%	236

Leadership: Faculty	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction w/ pace of decision-making of faculty senate	3.3	4.0%	28.5%	59.5%	5.5%	2.5%	200
Satisfaction w/ stated priorities of faculty senate	3.3	4.5%	29.9%	56.2%	7.5%	2.0%	201
Satisfaction w/ communication of priorities by faculty senate	3.2	4.5%	28.7%	51.0%	11.4%	4.5%	202
Satisfaction w/ faculty senate including faculty in decision-making	3.3	6.9%	32.5%	48.8%	7.4%	4.4%	203

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included, but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

Leadership: Other	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
NC State's priorities are stated consistently across all levels of leadership	3.4	15.5%	40.3%	23.0%	14.6%	6.6%	226
NC State's priorities are acted upon consistently across all levels of leadership	3.2	11.0%	37.9%	21.9%	19.2%	10.0%	219
In the past 5 years, NC State's priorities have changed in ways that negatively affect work	3.3	25.6%	19.7%	23.3%	19.3%	12.1%	223
Dean/division head supports adaptation to the changing mission	2.2	4.9%	11.5%	14.8%	37.7%	31.1%	61
Department head/chair supports adaptation to the changing mission	3.2	20.6%	28.6%	9.5%	28.6%	12.7%	63
There is visible leadership at NC State for the support/promotion of diversity on campus	4.1	40.5%	36.4%	16.6%	4.9%	1.6%	247

Goveranance: Trust	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
I understand process for expressing opinions about instit policies	3.0	7.3%	25.7%	33.5%	23.9%	9.6%	218
My instit has clear rules about roles/authority of faculty and administration	3.4	6.3%	38.6%	40.6%	12.6%	1.9%	207

	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Fac leaders and sr admin follow agreed-upon rules of engagement when there are disagreements	3.7	12.9%	48.2%	31.8%	7.1%	0.0%	85
Fac leaders and sr admin have an open system of communication for making decisions	3.4	9.2%	40.8%	30.8%	15.0%	4.2%	120
Fac leaders and sr admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.6	12.4%	44.2%	32.7%	8.8%	1.8%	113

Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Important instit decisions are not make until consensus between fac leaders and admin is achieved	2.7	3.7%	16.5%	36.7%	36.7%	6.4%	109
Sr admin ensure that there is sufficient time for faculty to provide input on important decisions	3.2	3.6%	38.0%	40.1%	13.9%	4.4%	137
Fac leaders and sr admin respectfully consider each other views before making decisions	3.5	15.6%	37.7%	33.6%	11.5%	1.6%	122
Fac leaders and sr admin share a sense of responsibility for welfare of the instit	3.8	16.8%	53.3%	21.2%	7.3%	1.5%	137

Governance: Understanding the Issues at Hand	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Existing govrnce structures offer opportunities for input on instit policies	3.1	6.4%	27.0%	44.6%	17.2%	4.9%	204

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included,
but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Once an important decision is made sr admin communicate their rationale	3.2	9.9%	29.1%	39.1%	13.9%	7.9%	151
Fac leaders and sr admin have equal say in governance matters	3.2	7.4%	36.8%	30.5%	16.8%	8.4%	95
Fac leaders and sr admin encourage each other in defining decision criteria to evaluate options	3.5	11.0%	44.0%	30.0%	14.0%	1.0%	100

Governance: Adaptability	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
My instit shared governance model holds up under unusual situations	3.2	3.7%	21.1%	63.2%	10.5%	1.6%	190
My instit systematically reviews effectivenss of its decision making processes	3.1	3.1%	19.2%	62.7%	13.0%	2.1%	193

	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
My institution cultivates new leaders among faculty	3.1	3.6%	29.3%	46.4%	16.4%	4.3%	140

Governance: Productivity	Mean	5: Very effective	4: Effective	3: Never effective nor ineffective	2: Ineffective	1: Very ineffective	Total (N)
Effectiveness of shared governance system at institution	3.3	9.8%	42.0%	23.8%	19.6%	4.9%	143

	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Governance committees I serve on make observable progress toward goals	3.4	6.3%	35.8%	46.3%	9.5%	2.1%	95
Progress achieved through governance efforts is publicly recognized	3.1	3.3%	28.3%	45.0%	19.2%	4.2%	120

Departmental Collegiality	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Departmental colleagues do what they can to make personal/family obligations and an academic career compatible	4.0	35.8%	40.2%	13.1%	6.1%	4.8%	229
Department meetings occur at times that are compatible with personal/family needs	4.2	47.7%	36.1%	10.8%	3.3%	2.1%	241
Departmental colleagues pitch in when needed	3.9	36.3%	37.9%	11.7%	12.1%	2.0%	248
On the whole, department is collegial	4.1	43.8%	33.9%	13.1%	7.2%	2.0%	251
On the whole, department colleagues are committed to supporting/promoting diversity/inclusion	4.1	41.5%	32.9%	17.1%	6.9%	1.6%	246

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included,
but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

coache18.NCSU.over.NTT.xlsx

Page 8 of 12

	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with tenured faculty	3.5	14.7%	37.1%	29.4%	15.7%	3.0%	197
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure faculty	3.5	16.3%	35.9%	34.2%	12.5%	1.1%	184
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with professional track faculty	4.0	32.9%	41.2%	18.4%	7.0%	0.4%	228
Satisfaction with fit in department	3.5	24.2%	35.2%	18.0%	15.2%	7.4%	244

Departmental Engagement	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about undergraduate student learning	3.7	32.7%	31.5%	20.3%	7.6%	8.0%	251
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about graduate student learning	3.0	20.0%	20.8%	23.3%	12.1%	23.8%	240
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective teaching practices	3.8	30.3%	29.5%	27.9%	9.2%	3.2%	251
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective use of technology	3.7	25.6%	36.6%	28.3%	5.5%	3.9%	254
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about use of current research methodologies	3.1	13.8%	22.4%	32.9%	18.7%	12.2%	246

	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with pre-tenure faculty	3.6	19.8%	36.4%	29.9%	12.8%	1.1%	187
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with tenured faculty	3.5	17.5%	39.0%	25.0%	15.5%	3.0%	200
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with professional track faculty	4.1	35.2%	43.6%	14.4%	5.9%	0.8%	236

Departmental Quality	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of tenured faculty in department	3.8	24.6%	42.1%	22.6%	8.2%	2.6%	195
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.1	33.3%	46.4%	15.8%	3.8%	0.5%	183
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of professional track faculty in department	4.2	39.8%	44.7%	13.3%	1.8%	0.4%	226
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of tenured faculty in department	3.6	21.1%	38.3%	27.8%	9.4%	3.3%	180
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.0	27.6%	45.3%	22.9%	2.4%	1.8%	170
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of professional track faculty in department	3.9	26.4%	42.3%	24.5%	5.3%	1.4%	208
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty in department	3.4	17.1%	29.8%	33.1%	17.7%	2.2%	181
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty in department	3.7	21.3%	36.1%	36.1%	5.9%	0.6%	169
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of professional track faculty in department	4.2	39.5%	45.6%	14.0%	0.5%	0.5%	215

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included,
but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

Departmental: Other	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Department is successful at recruiting high-quality faculty members (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.9	30.2%	40.9%	16.6%	10.2%	2.1%	235
Department is successful at retaining high-quality faculty members (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.4	18.6%	38.1%	19.1%	16.1%	8.1%	236
Department is successful at addressing sub-standard tenured faculty performance	2.6	4.5%	19.2%	22.4%	39.1%	14.7%	156

Appreciation and Recognition	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with recognition of teaching efforts	3.4	18.6%	35.0%	20.5%	20.5%	5.5%	220
Satisfaction with recognition of student advising	3.2	9.3%	33.8%	31.1%	18.5%	7.3%	151
Satisfaction with recognition of scholarly/creative work	3.3	10.1%	39.9%	29.3%	15.2%	5.6%	198
Satisfaction with recognition of service contributions	3.3	9.9%	37.3%	27.9%	20.6%	4.3%	233
Satisfaction with recognition of outreach	3.3	9.3%	36.8%	30.8%	18.7%	4.4%	182
Satisfaction with recognition from colleagues/peers	3.8	23.0%	47.6%	16.1%	10.9%	2.4%	248
Satisfaction with recognition from provost (Tenured only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Satisfaction with recognition from dean (Tenured only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Satisfaction with recognition from department head	3.6	25.0%	39.0%	16.9%	13.1%	5.9%	236

	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
My school/college is valued by NC State's chancellor and provost (Tenured only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
My department is valued by NC State's chancellor and provost (Professional Track and Tenured only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Provost seems to care about the quality of life for faculty of my rank	3.2	20.9%	28.5%	15.7%	22.1%	12.8%	172

Retention	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Outside offers are not necessary as leverage in compensation negotiations (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.4	8.5%	15.9%	16.4%	24.9%	34.4%	189

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Actively sought an outside job offer	31.5%	68.5%	254
Received a formal job offer	13.0%	87.0%	254
Renegotiated terms of employment contract	20.1%	79.9%	254
None of the above	48.8%	51.2%	254

coache18.NCSU.over.NTT.xlsx

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included, but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

Page 10 of 12

Overall Satisfaction	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
All things considered, satisfaction with department as a place to work	4.0	36.8%	38.0%	13.2%	9.2%	2.8%	250
All things considered, satisfaction with NC State as a place to work	4.0	32.3%	43.4%	17.1%	6.0%	1.2%	251

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Best aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	38.3%	61.7%	253
Best aspect of work: Support of colleagues	20.2%	79.8%	253
Best aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	5.9%	94.1%	253
Best aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	7.5%	92.5%	253
Best aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	24.5%	75.5%	253
Best aspect of work: Quality of facilities	4.7%	95.3%	253
Best aspect of work: Support for research/creative work	2.8%	97.2%	253
Best aspect of work: Support for teaching	10.7%	89.3%	253
Best aspect of work: Support for professional development	4.0%	96.0%	253
Best aspect of work: Assistance for grant proposals	0.4%	99.6%	253
Best aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices	1.2%	98.8%	253
Best aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program	0.0%	100.0%	253
Best aspect of work: Compensation	4.0%	96.0%	253
Best aspect of work: Geographic location	25.7%	74.3%	253
Best aspect of work: Diversity	2.0%	98.0%	253
Best aspect of work: Presence of others like me	0.8%	99.2%	253
Best aspect of work: My sense of fit here	9.1%	90.9%	253
Best aspect of work: Protections from service/assignments	0.0%	100.0%	253
Best aspect of work: Commute	3.2%	96.8%	253
Best aspect of work: Cost of living	5.1%	94.9%	253
Best aspect of work: Teaching load	8.7%	91.3%	253
Best aspect of work: Manageable pressure to perform	4.3%	95.7%	253
Best aspect of work: Academic freedom	7.5%	92.5%	253
Best aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	0.0%	100.0%	253
Best aspect of work: Quality of leadership	1.2%	98.8%	253

coache18.NCSU.over.NTT.xlsx

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included, but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document

Page 11 of 12

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Worst aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	0.8%	99.2%	253
Worst aspect of work: Support of colleagues	4.3%	95.7%	253
Worst aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	2.4%	97.6%	253
Worst aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	0.4%	99.6%	253
Worst aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	2.8%	97.2%	253
Worst aspect of work: Quality of facilities	7.5%	92.5%	253
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for research/creative work	3.6%	96.4%	253
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for teaching	5.9%	94.1%	253
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for professional development	8.7%	91.3%	253
Worst aspect of work: Lack of assistance for grant proposals	1.6%	98.4%	253
Worst aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices (or lack thereof)	7.1%	92.9%	253
Worst aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program (or lack thereof)	2.4%	97.6%	253
Worst aspect of work: Compensation	40.7%	59.3%	253
Worst aspect of work: Geographic location	3.6%	96.4%	253
Worst aspect of work: Lack of diversity	5.5%	94.5%	253
Worst aspect of work: Absence of others like me	2.8%	97.2%	253
Worst aspect of work: My lack of "fit" here	5.5%	94.5%	253
Worst aspect of work: Too much service/too many assignments	11.1%	88.9%	253
Worst aspect of work: Commute	6.7%	93.3%	253
Worst aspect of work: Cost of living	3.2%	96.8%	253
Worst aspect of work: Teaching load	6.3%	93.7%	253
Worst aspect of work: Unrelenting pressure to perform	5.5%	94.5%	253
Worst aspect of work: Academic freedom	1.2%	98.8%	253
Worst aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	13.8%	86.2%	253
Worst aspect of work: Quality of leadership	8.7%	91.3%	253

*NOTE: Labels may indicate that tenure track faculty are included,
but they have been EXCLUDED from all results in this document