

COACHE 2018: Faculty Satisfaction Survey  
 NC State Overall  
 Pre-tenured and tenured faculty, combined\*

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	3.9	20.2%	59.3%	13.0%	6.7%	0.7%	668
Satisfaction with the number of courses you teach	3.9	24.2%	54.7%	9.9%	10.3%	0.9%	658
Satisfaction with the level of courses you teach	4.1	28.6%	58.7%	7.8%	4.6%	0.5%	658
Satisfaction with the discretion you have over course content	4.3	46.4%	42.6%	6.4%	3.3%	1.4%	658
Satisfaction with the number of students in the classes you teach, on average	3.8	23.4%	51.8%	12.8%	9.7%	2.3%	658
Satisfaction with the quality of students you teach	3.6	12.8%	50.8%	23.7%	10.3%	2.4%	658
Satisfaction with how equitably the teaching workload is distributed	3.3	10.9%	39.7%	22.5%	17.2%	9.7%	658
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support your teaching	3.5	12.4%	44.7%	22.9%	14.9%	5.0%	523
Satisfaction with teaching schedule	4.0	24.8%	59.5%	10.2%	4.3%	1.2%	654
Satisfaction with support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.7	10.7%	50.4%	35.9%	2.6%	0.3%	577
Satisfaction with support for assessing student learning	3.7	9.1%	56.5%	28.0%	5.9%	0.5%	649
Satisfaction with support for developng online/hybrid courses	3.6	12.8%	46.8%	32.0%	6.6%	1.8%	438
Satisfaction with support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.6	11.4%	46.7%	32.4%	6.8%	2.7%	411

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	3.7	21.1%	48.6%	11.0%	16.6%	2.7%	679
Satisfaction with the amount of external funding you are expected to find	3.2	6.6%	39.7%	31.4%	15.4%	6.9%	650
Satisfaction with the influence you have over the focus of research/scholarly/creative work	4.3	46.9%	41.9%	6.5%	3.7%	1.0%	676
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support research/scholarly/creative work	3.4	11.7%	43.3%	21.8%	17.9%	5.2%	614
Satisfaction with NC State's financial support for research/scholarly/creative work	2.9	8.6%	24.8%	25.1%	27.7%	13.8%	665
Satisfaction with NC State's support for engaging undergrads in research/scholarly/creative work	3.3	13.1%	33.5%	30.1%	16.8%	6.5%	612
Satisfaction with NC State's support for obtaining externally funded grants	3.3	11.8%	38.2%	24.2%	17.0%	8.7%	652
Satisfaction with NC State's support for managing externally funded grants	3.2	12.3%	33.1%	26.1%	17.6%	10.8%	601
Satisfaction with NC State's support for securing graduate student assistance	2.9	5.3%	29.0%	27.9%	25.1%	12.7%	606
Satisfaction with NC State's support for traveling to present papers/conduct research/creative work	3.1	12.0%	34.4%	20.6%	20.6%	12.4%	660
Satisfaction with the availability of course release time to focus on research	2.9	7.7%	25.6%	28.5%	23.5%	14.8%	575

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

<b>Nature of Work: Service</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with time spent on service	3.5	8.7%	53.0%	23.8%	12.3%	2.2%	689
Satisfaction with the number of committees on which you serve	3.6	8.4%	54.3%	25.8%	10.0%	1.5%	678
Satisfaction with the attractiveness of the committees on which you serve	3.4	6.1%	46.7%	33.3%	11.5%	2.4%	670
Satisfaction with the discretion you have to choose the committees on which you serve	3.6	12.7%	45.9%	29.2%	9.3%	2.8%	675
Satisfaction with how equitably committee assignments are distributed	3.2	6.9%	37.8%	28.3%	18.1%	8.9%	664
Satisfaction with the number of students you advise/mentor	3.7	14.4%	56.4%	17.0%	9.3%	2.9%	658
Satisfaction with how equitably service work is compensated	2.8	3.8%	22.6%	32.2%	27.4%	14.0%	650
Satisfaction with relevance of committees you serve on	3.7	11.3%	54.9%	24.6%	7.0%	2.1%	670
Satisfaction with support for being a good advisor	3.0	5.7%	29.3%	29.8%	24.6%	10.6%	651
Satisfaction with equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	3.1	6.4%	34.2%	29.7%	20.5%	9.2%	643

<b>Nature of Work: Other</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
NC State helps faculty who take on add'l leadership roles to sustain other aspects of their work	3.0	11.7%	30.3%	20.7%	23.3%	14.0%	614

	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with time spent on outreach	3.7	12.4%	50.4%	30.8%	5.8%	0.5%	587
Satisfaction with time spent on administrative tasks	2.9	4.4%	26.8%	28.6%	29.7%	10.6%	661

	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Able to balance the teaching, research, and service activities expected of me	3.4	18.7%	43.1%	8.7%	22.3%	7.1%	686

	<b>Too much</b>	<b>Too little</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on teaching	87.5%	12.5%	48
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on research	2.3%	97.7%	130
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on service	94.7%	5.3%	95
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on outreach	28.1%	71.9%	32
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on administrative tasks	100.0%	0.0%	262

<b>Facilities and Work Resources</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with NC State's support for improving your teaching	3.5	11.7%	41.4%	31.6%	10.9%	4.4%	640
Satisfaction with office	3.9	27.6%	48.6%	12.6%	8.8%	2.3%	681
Satisfaction with laboratory, research, or studio space	3.3	12.8%	40.8%	19.3%	19.7%	7.4%	539
Satisfaction with equipment	3.5	13.2%	49.5%	20.1%	12.0%	5.2%	651
Satisfaction with classrooms	3.6	16.4%	49.8%	18.5%	12.5%	2.9%	665
Satisfaction with library resources	4.3	45.6%	45.4%	6.2%	2.5%	0.3%	680
Satisfaction with computing and technical support	3.7	23.5%	45.3%	16.3%	9.3%	5.6%	680
Satisfaction with clerical/administrative support	3.1	14.3%	31.2%	17.6%	24.6%	12.2%	670

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

<b>Personal and Family Policies</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Able to find the right balance between professional life and personal/family life	3.2	14.4%	38.1%	13.3%	22.6%	11.7%	633
NC State does what it can to make personal/family obligations and an academic career compatible	3.1	9.7%	35.1%	23.0%	19.3%	12.8%	538

	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with housing benefits	2.3	1.6%	11.0%	30.9%	27.7%	28.8%	191
Satisfaction with tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.4	3.0%	14.6%	25.6%	30.5%	26.4%	371
Satisfaction with spousal/partner hiring program	2.8	10.7%	17.7%	31.7%	18.5%	21.4%	271
Satisfaction with childcare	2.3	2.3%	8.3%	28.0%	37.6%	23.9%	218
Satisfaction with eldercare	2.5	1.9%	6.5%	45.8%	26.2%	19.6%	107
Satisfaction with family medical/parental leave	3.3	9.6%	38.2%	29.1%	14.5%	8.6%	385
Satisfaction with flexible workload/modified duties for parental/family reasons	3.6	15.8%	45.9%	26.2%	7.5%	4.6%	412
Satisfaction with stop-the-clock (Pre-tenure only)	3.7	14.6%	50.6%	23.6%	7.9%	3.4%	89
Satisfaction with parking benefits	3.3	11.5%	38.9%	23.2%	17.6%	8.9%	655

<b>Health and Retirement Benefits</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with health benefits for yourself	3.0	6.7%	36.4%	21.3%	24.7%	10.8%	667
Satisfaction with health benefits for your family	2.5	2.8%	21.8%	17.8%	34.7%	23.0%	574
Satisfaction with retirement benefits	3.3	4.3%	42.1%	34.0%	14.9%	4.7%	623
Satisfaction with phased retirement options	3.4	8.6%	37.9%	39.8%	9.2%	4.6%	327

<b>Salary</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with salary	3.1	9.4%	35.1%	18.9%	25.6%	11.0%	681

<b>Mentoring</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Mentored pre-tenure faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	71.8%	28.2%	525
Mentored tenured faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	32.6%	67.4%	525
Mentored pre-tenure faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	30.5%	69.5%	525
Mentored tenured faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	21.7%	78.3%	525
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	12.2%	87.8%	525
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	11.8%	88.2%	525
Mentored none of the above	20.4%	79.6%	525

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>5: Very effective</b>	<b>4: Effective</b>	<b>3: Never effective nor ineffective</b>	<b>2: Ineffective</b>	<b>1: Very ineffective</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone in department	3.8	32.4%	39.6%	9.4%	10.1%	8.6%	556
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside department at NC State	3.7	22.9%	42.3%	23.9%	6.3%	4.6%	414
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside your institution	4.0	36.9%	38.6%	17.6%	4.0%	2.9%	477

\*NOTE: Labels may indicate that professional 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)
Effective mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in my department (Pre-tenure and Tenured only)	3.4	20.3%	39.6%	11.6%	18.5%	9.9%	644
Effective mentoring of tenured associate professors in my department (Tenured only)	2.7	7.3%	23.6%	20.6%	27.9%	20.6%	491
Effective mentoring of professional track faculty in my department (Professional Track only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
NC State provides adequate support for faculty to be good mentors (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.6	4.4%	17.8%	26.2%	33.5%	18.2%	478
Being a mentor is/has been fulfilling in role as a faculty member (Professional Track and Tenured only)	4.2	43.2%	42.8%	10.1%	2.2%	1.7%	407

	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	4.3	53.0%	34.9%	6.6%	3.4%	2.1%	653
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside department at NC State	3.6	21.4%	35.7%	26.8%	12.5%	3.6%	639
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside institution	3.7	28.7%	36.0%	20.6%	10.4%	4.3%	647

<b>Interdisciplinary Work</b>	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	3.8	31.1%	33.1%	22.7%	11.0%	2.1%	673

	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	8.2%	21.8%	28.1%	24.7%	17.2%	587
Campus facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work	2.9	9.9%	26.9%	24.8%	24.4%	14.0%	616
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the merit process	2.8	8.2%	23.7%	27.4%	25.5%	15.2%	573
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the promotion process (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.8	7.0%	23.0%	28.1%	26.1%	15.8%	456
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the tenure process (Pre-tenure only)	3.2	14.3%	30.8%	29.7%	15.4%	9.9%	91
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the reappointment process (Professional Track only)	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Department understands how to evaluate interdisciplinary work	3.0	11.3%	24.9%	25.6%	23.5%	14.6%	582

<b>Collaboration</b>	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	28.7%	44.9%	14.6%	8.6%	3.3%	666
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with faculty outside NC State	3.9	28.3%	46.2%	17.2%	6.2%	2.2%	650
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with NC State faculty outside department	3.8	23.7%	45.6%	19.6%	8.8%	2.3%	658

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

<b>Tenure Process: Clarity</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>5: Very clear</b>	<b>4: Clear</b>	<b>3: Neither clear nor unclear</b>	<b>2: Unclear</b>	<b>1: Very unclear</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Clarity of departmental tenure process (Pre-tenure only)	3.8	26.7%	51.1%	5.9%	11.9%	4.4%	135
Clarity of departmental tenure criteria (Pre-tenure only)	3.6	22.2%	47.4%	6.7%	19.3%	4.4%	135
Clarity of departmental tenure standards (Pre-tenure only)	3.4	17.8%	45.9%	5.2%	23.0%	8.1%	135
Clarity of tenure body of evidence (Pre-tenure only)	3.9	27.6%	45.5%	12.7%	12.7%	1.5%	134
Clarity of sense of whether or not I will achieve tenure (Pre-tenure only)	3.7	20.9%	47.8%	15.7%	14.2%	1.5%	134

	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Received consistent messages from tenured faculty about the requirements for tenure (Pre-tenure only)	3.4	17.3%	39.1%	15.0%	20.3%	8.3%	133
Tenure decisions here are made primarily on performance-based criteria (Pre-tenure only)	4.0	35.6%	37.1%	20.5%	4.5%	2.3%	132

<b>Tenure Expectation: Clarity</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>5: Very clear</b>	<b>4: Clear</b>	<b>3: Neither clear nor unclear</b>	<b>2: Unclear</b>	<b>1: Very unclear</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as scholar (Pre-tenure only)	4.0	37.8%	43.0%	4.4%	12.6%	2.2%	135
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as teacher (Pre-tenure only)	3.9	27.8%	51.1%	7.5%	9.8%	3.8%	133
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as advisor to students (Pre-tenure only)	3.5	20.7%	37.8%	17.0%	18.5%	5.9%	135
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as department colleague (Pre-tenure only)	3.5	18.5%	38.5%	18.5%	19.3%	5.2%	135
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as campus citizen (Pre-tenure only)	3.1	12.7%	29.1%	22.4%	26.9%	9.0%	134
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as community member (Pre-tenure only)	3.1	10.4%	33.3%	20.0%	25.2%	11.1%	135

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Received formal feedback on progress toward tenure (Pre-tenure only)	82.3%	17.7%	130

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
At this time believe whether will achieve tenure or not (Pre-tenure only)	97.7%	88

<b>Promotion Process: Clarity</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Department culture encourages associate profs to work towards promotion to full professorship (Tenured only)	4.0	44.5%	32.0%	10.9%	7.6%	4.9%	512
Generally, the expectations for promotion from associate to full professor are reasonable (Tenured only)	4.0	41.3%	34.7%	10.3%	8.9%	4.8%	496

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

	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of departmental promotion process (Tenured only)	4.1	42.2%	37.6%	7.0%	8.9%	4.3%	516
Clarity of departmental promotion criteria (Tenured only)	4.0	37.6%	39.2%	7.9%	11.6%	3.7%	518
Clarity of departmental promotion standards (Tenured only)	3.7	28.8%	38.4%	12.5%	14.5%	5.8%	518
Clarity of promotion body of evidence (Tenured only)	4.0	40.9%	35.9%	11.8%	8.3%	3.1%	518
Clarity of time frame within which associate profs should apply for promotion (Tenured only)	3.5	26.3%	34.2%	15.1%	16.2%	8.1%	517
Clarity of sense of whether or not I will be promoted from associate to full prof (Tenured Assoc only)	3.3	20.8%	30.2%	19.3%	13.0%	16.7%	192

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Received formal feedback on progress toward promotion to full professor (Tenured Assoc only)	36.4%	63.6%	187

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Why not go up for full: Lack of support from department chair (Tenured Assoc only)	5.3%	94.7%	19
Why not go up for full: Lack of support from colleagues (Tenured Assoc only)	15.8%	84.2%	19
Why not go up for full: Lack of time/support for research (Tenured Assoc only)	10.5%	89.5%	19
Why not go up for full: Heavy teaching load (Tenured Assoc only)	26.3%	73.7%	19
Why not go up for full: Administrative responsibilities (Tenured Assoc only)	15.8%	84.2%	19
Why not go up for full: Family/personal responsibilities (Tenured Assoc only)	5.3%	94.7%	19
Why not go up for full: Not signaled to do so by someone in department (Tenured Assoc only)	10.5%	89.5%	19
Why not go up for full: Not interested in promotion (Tenured Assoc only)	21.1%	78.9%	19
Why not go up for full: Planning to leave the institution (Tenured Assoc only)	0.0%	100.0%	19
Why not go up for full: Plan to retire before promotion	47.4%	52.6%	19

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	3.6	16.7%	37.0%	37.6%	5.6%	3.0%	603
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's stated priorities	3.5	15.8%	38.4%	31.4%	10.2%	4.2%	615
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's communication of priorities to faculty	3.5	15.9%	36.4%	32.4%	9.9%	5.5%	618
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's pace of decision making	3.4	12.5%	33.7%	38.7%	8.9%	6.3%	608
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's stated priorities	3.3	13.1%	31.8%	36.4%	11.7%	7.0%	616
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's communication of priorities to faculty	3.3	12.9%	31.2%	33.4%	14.9%	7.6%	619

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

<b>Leadership: Divisional</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with dean's pace of decision making	3.3	11.9%	33.4%	32.6%	12.9%	9.1%	628
Satisfaction with dean's stated priorities	3.1	10.3%	33.7%	25.2%	19.5%	11.4%	632
Satisfaction with dean's communication of priorities to faculty	3.1	11.8%	30.9%	26.7%	20.1%	10.5%	637
Satisfaction that dean ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into college priorities	3.0	11.9%	27.4%	26.7%	18.4%	15.7%	632

<b>Leadership: Departmental</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with department head's pace of decision making	3.7	26.8%	38.6%	18.0%	10.8%	5.7%	593
Satisfaction with department head's stated priorities	3.7	27.3%	35.4%	19.2%	12.1%	6.1%	594
Satisfaction with department head's communication of priorities to faculty	3.7	31.9%	32.5%	18.7%	10.3%	6.6%	593
Satisfaction that dept head ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into departmental decisions	3.8	34.1%	33.2%	14.3%	11.0%	7.4%	593
Satisfaction with department head's fairness in evaluating work	3.9	38.0%	34.3%	15.4%	6.8%	5.4%	589

<b>Leadership: Faculty</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction w/ pace of decision-making of faculty senate	3.0	2.5%	20.3%	57.9%	12.5%	6.8%	513
Satisfaction w/ stated priorities of faculty senate	3.0	3.3%	21.4%	55.2%	13.5%	6.6%	518
Satisfaction w/ communication of priorities by faculty senate	3.0	2.5%	23.9%	50.4%	16.4%	6.9%	524
Satisfaction w/ faculty senate including faculty in decision-making	3.1	3.4%	30.6%	47.6%	11.5%	6.8%	529

<b>Leadership: Other</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
NC State's priorities are stated consistently across all levels of leadership	3.2	10.4%	36.3%	22.5%	20.2%	10.6%	595
NC State's priorities are acted upon consistently across all levels of leadership	3.0	9.0%	30.9%	22.5%	23.7%	13.8%	586
In the past 5 years, NC State's priorities have changed in ways that negatively affect work	2.9	16.8%	17.6%	22.8%	24.5%	18.4%	597
Dean/division head supports adaptation to the changing mission	2.4	5.2%	16.5%	21.3%	22.9%	34.1%	249
Department head/chair supports adaptation to the changing mission	3.2	22.0%	25.4%	20.3%	14.7%	17.7%	232
There is visible leadership at NC State for the support/promotion of diversity on campus	4.0	39.9%	35.6%	13.5%	7.2%	3.8%	629

<b>Governance: Trust</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
I understand process for expressing opinions about instit policies	2.9	6.8%	25.7%	29.3%	25.9%	12.3%	587
My instit has clear rules about roles/authority of faculty and administration	3.2	8.1%	31.4%	37.0%	16.9%	6.5%	567

\*NOTE: Labels may indicate that professional 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)
Fac leaders and sr admin follow agreed-upon rules of engagement when there are disagreements	3.3	9.9%	37.8%	29.6%	16.3%	6.5%	294
Fac leaders and sr admin have an open system of communication for making decisions	3.0	5.8%	28.5%	33.8%	24.8%	7.3%	400
Fac leaders and sr admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.3	8.5%	33.7%	38.2%	13.5%	6.1%	377

<b>Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose</b>	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Important instit decisions are not made until consensus between fac leaders and admin is achieved	2.5	3.4%	15.0%	30.1%	35.2%	16.3%	412
Sr admin ensure that there is sufficient time for faculty to provide input on important decisions	3.0	4.0%	25.9%	38.6%	24.7%	6.8%	474
Fac leaders and sr admin respectfully consider each other views before making decisions	3.3	9.0%	34.2%	36.7%	15.2%	4.9%	368
Fac leaders and sr admin share a sense of responsibility for welfare of the instit	3.6	15.6%	43.8%	27.6%	9.8%	3.2%	409

<b>Governance: Understanding the Issues at Hand</b>	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Existing gouvnce structures offer opportunities for input on instit policies	2.9	5.6%	22.5%	41.0%	19.9%	10.9%	568

	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Once an important decision is made sr admin communicate their rationale	2.9	4.4%	26.5%	34.5%	27.3%	7.3%	495
Fac leaders and sr admin have equal say in governance matters	2.6	5.9%	16.0%	29.7%	31.1%	17.4%	357
Fac leaders and sr admin encourage each other in defining decision criteria to evaluate options	3.1	7.7%	26.5%	35.8%	23.8%	6.2%	324

<b>Governance: Adaptability</b>	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	2.9	4.6%	18.1%	51.9%	14.0%	11.3%	520
My instit systematically reviews effectiveness of its decision making processes	2.8	3.5%	15.5%	47.2%	21.6%	12.2%	547

	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
My institution cultivates new leaders among faculty	3.0	6.4%	23.5%	39.4%	23.5%	7.2%	472

<b>Governance: Productivity</b>	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	2.8	3.7%	34.1%	19.1%	23.0%	20.0%	460

	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Governance committees I serve on make observable progress toward goals	3.2	4.0%	33.1%	44.3%	14.3%	4.3%	350
Progress achieved through governance efforts is publicly recognized	2.7	3.1%	16.7%	37.9%	33.6%	8.7%	414

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



<b>Departmental Collegiality</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Departmental colleagues do what they can to make personal/family obligations and an academic career compatible	3.7	22.9%	44.5%	18.5%	8.1%	6.0%	568
Department meetings occur at times that are compatible with personal/family needs	4.2	43.4%	38.9%	10.5%	5.1%	2.1%	622
Departmental colleagues pitch in when needed	3.7	26.4%	41.9%	14.2%	13.7%	3.8%	633
On the whole, department is collegial	4.0	43.9%	34.6%	8.8%	7.5%	5.2%	636
On the whole, department colleagues are committed to supporting/promoting diversity/inclusion	4.0	40.0%	35.8%	11.8%	7.5%	4.9%	628

	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with tenured faculty	3.7	18.5%	45.8%	24.0%	9.5%	2.1%	620
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure faculty	3.7	18.2%	46.1%	26.3%	7.9%	1.5%	620
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with professional track faculty	3.7	16.1%	44.0%	31.4%	6.5%	2.0%	598
Satisfaction with fit in department	3.6	26.7%	37.0%	16.3%	13.0%	7.1%	633

<b>Departmental Engagement</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>5: Often</b>	<b>4: Regularly</b>	<b>3: Occasionally</b>	<b>2: Seldom</b>	<b>1: Never</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about undergraduate student learning	3.5	22.2%	30.9%	26.1%	13.9%	6.9%	635
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about graduate student learning	3.8	28.9%	36.6%	23.5%	7.5%	3.5%	637
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective teaching practices	3.5	17.7%	32.3%	34.8%	12.0%	3.1%	643
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective use of technology	3.4	14.3%	32.1%	35.4%	14.9%	3.3%	644
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about use of current research methodologies	3.5	20.4%	33.2%	29.0%	12.8%	4.7%	642

	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with pre-tenure faculty	3.9	24.5%	50.6%	17.2%	6.5%	1.3%	629
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with tenured faculty	3.8	23.6%	47.9%	16.8%	9.7%	2.1%	631
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with professional track faculty	3.8	19.2%	46.4%	26.2%	6.6%	1.7%	604

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

<b>Departmental Quality</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of tenured faculty in department	3.8	26.0%	45.1%	15.2%	11.5%	2.2%	627
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.2	42.5%	42.7%	11.5%	2.7%	0.6%	628
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of professional track faculty in department	3.9	24.0%	49.1%	20.5%	5.1%	1.2%	570
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of tenured faculty in department	3.8	24.8%	46.2%	17.1%	10.6%	1.3%	624
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.2	36.7%	46.1%	13.3%	3.4%	0.5%	622
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of professional track faculty in department	3.8	20.5%	47.2%	26.8%	4.4%	1.1%	523
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty in department	3.9	21.7%	52.3%	17.6%	7.1%	1.3%	595
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.0	23.4%	56.5%	17.6%	2.2%	0.3%	586
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of professional track faculty in department	4.1	32.3%	47.2%	16.0%	3.6%	0.9%	561

<b>Departmental: Other</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Department is successful at recruiting high-quality faculty members (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.9	31.6%	40.7%	14.7%	9.0%	4.1%	491
Department is successful at retaining high-quality faculty members (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.4	18.5%	36.3%	18.3%	17.9%	9.0%	487
Department is successful at addressing sub-standard tenured faculty performance	2.8	8.3%	23.5%	23.7%	28.1%	16.3%	527

<b>Appreciation and Recognition</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Satisfaction with recognition of teaching efforts	3.3	12.1%	40.3%	23.1%	18.7%	5.8%	603
Satisfaction with recognition of student advising	3.2	7.1%	35.7%	30.8%	19.7%	6.6%	574
Satisfaction with recognition of scholarly/creative work	3.5	16.6%	42.9%	22.5%	12.9%	5.1%	622
Satisfaction with recognition of service contributions	3.2	10.3%	34.5%	30.0%	16.9%	8.3%	623
Satisfaction with recognition of outreach	3.2	9.5%	32.7%	36.1%	14.9%	6.7%	504
Satisfaction with recognition from colleagues/peers	3.7	24.9%	39.7%	23.1%	9.3%	3.0%	627
Satisfaction with recognition from provost (Tenured only)	3.0	8.9%	25.3%	35.8%	17.8%	12.2%	450
Satisfaction with recognition from dean (Tenured only)	3.1	11.8%	29.8%	29.4%	16.1%	12.9%	473
Satisfaction with recognition from department head	3.7	29.9%	34.8%	18.9%	9.9%	6.6%	578

	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
My school/college is valued by NC State's chancellor and provost (Tenured only)	3.5	29.1%	30.9%	13.4%	16.7%	10.0%	492
My department is valued by NC State's chancellor and provost (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.3	21.2%	29.5%	15.7%	20.2%	13.4%	491
Provost seems to care about the quality of life for faculty of my rank	3.3	17.4%	33.5%	23.5%	14.8%	10.8%	493

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

<b>Retention</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Strongly agree</b>	<b>4: Agree</b>	<b>3: Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2: Disagree</b>	<b>1: Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Outside offers are not necessary as leverage in compensation negotiations (Professional Track and Tenured only)	1.9	6.3%	8.5%	7.6%	26.3%	51.3%	448

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Actively sought an outside job offer	22.2%	77.8%	635
Received a formal job offer	12.9%	87.1%	635
Renegotiated terms of employment contract	14.2%	85.8%	635
None of the above	58.3%	41.7%	635

<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>	<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>5: Very satisfied</b>	<b>4: Satisfied</b>	<b>3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</b>	<b>2: Dissatisfied</b>	<b>1: Very dissatisfied</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
All things considered, satisfaction with department as a place to work	3.9	34.0%	37.7%	14.9%	8.0%	5.4%	626
All things considered, satisfaction with NC State as a place to work	3.8	25.0%	44.2%	17.6%	8.3%	5.0%	625

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Best aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	36.0%	64.0%	631
Best aspect of work: Support of colleagues	14.1%	85.9%	631
Best aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	14.7%	85.3%	631
Best aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	12.7%	87.3%	631
Best aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	7.0%	93.0%	631
Best aspect of work: Quality of facilities	4.8%	95.2%	631
Best aspect of work: Support for research/creative work	5.2%	94.8%	631
Best aspect of work: Support for teaching	1.7%	98.3%	631
Best aspect of work: Support for professional development	1.1%	98.9%	631
Best aspect of work: Assistance for grant proposals	1.1%	98.9%	631
Best aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices	0.0%	100.0%	631
Best aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program	1.0%	99.0%	631
Best aspect of work: Compensation	1.9%	98.1%	631
Best aspect of work: Geographic location	34.1%	65.9%	631
Best aspect of work: Diversity	1.3%	98.7%	631
Best aspect of work: Presence of others like me	0.8%	99.2%	631
Best aspect of work: My sense of fit here	5.7%	94.3%	631
Best aspect of work: Protections from service/assignments	0.3%	99.7%	631
Best aspect of work: Commute	2.4%	97.6%	631
Best aspect of work: Cost of living	6.3%	93.7%	631
Best aspect of work: Teaching load	6.2%	93.8%	631
Best aspect of work: Manageable pressure to perform	5.2%	94.8%	631
Best aspect of work: Academic freedom	22.3%	77.7%	631
Best aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	3.6%	96.4%	631
Best aspect of work: Quality of leadership	1.0%	99.0%	631

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

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Total (N)</b>
Worst aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	2.4%	97.6%	630
Worst aspect of work: Support of colleagues	4.4%	95.6%	630
Worst aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	1.7%	98.3%	630
Worst aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	10.2%	89.8%	630
Worst aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	2.4%	97.6%	630
Worst aspect of work: Quality of facilities	14.4%	85.6%	630
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for research/creative work	16.0%	84.0%	630
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for teaching	4.9%	95.1%	630
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for professional development	3.7%	96.3%	630
Worst aspect of work: Lack of assistance for grant proposals	7.8%	92.2%	630
Worst aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices (or lack thereof)	4.9%	95.1%	630
Worst aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program (or lack thereof)	4.3%	95.7%	630
Worst aspect of work: Compensation	30.5%	69.5%	630
Worst aspect of work: Geographic location	2.1%	97.9%	630
Worst aspect of work: Lack of diversity	4.9%	95.1%	630
Worst aspect of work: Absence of others like me	3.5%	96.5%	630
Worst aspect of work: My lack of "fit" here	4.8%	95.2%	630
Worst aspect of work: Too much service/too many assignments	14.6%	85.4%	630
Worst aspect of work: Commute	2.9%	97.1%	630
Worst aspect of work: Cost of living	0.8%	99.2%	630
Worst aspect of work: Teaching load	6.3%	93.7%	630
Worst aspect of work: Unrelenting pressure to perform	7.5%	92.5%	630
Worst aspect of work: Academic freedom	1.0%	99.0%	630
Worst aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	2.9%	97.1%	630
Worst aspect of work: Quality of leadership	9.4%	90.6%	630

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