NC State University
AY17-18 COACHE Survey
Mean Ratings
NCSU vs. Peers: Professional Track (PrfTr) (1 = low to 5 = high)

Theme	Measure	NCSU PrfTr	Peers PrfTr	Diff [1]
Nature of Work: Research	*Benchmark:Nature of Work: Research*	3.35	3.41	
	Time spent on research	3.47	3.43	
	Expectations for finding external funding	3.26	3.20	
	Influence over focus of research	3.94	3.95	
	Quality of grad students to support research	3.53	3.50	
	Support for research	3.03	3.02	
	Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.39	3.28	
	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.24	3.20	
	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	3.25	3.23	
	Support for securing grad student assistance	3.28	3.19	
	Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.23	3.58	↓
	Availability of course release for research	2.60	2.60	
Nature of Work: Service	*Benchmark: Nature of Work: Service*	3.53	3.51	
	Time spent on service	3.83	3.79	
	Support for faculty in leadership roles	3.17	3.09	
	Number of committees	3.70	3.63	
	Attractiveness of committees	3.63	3.67	
	Discretion to choose committees	3.58	3.49	
	Equitability of committee assignments	3.22	3.15	
	Number of student advisees	3.65	3.81	
	Support for being a good advisor	3.24	3.20	
	Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	3.10	3.27	
Nature of Work: Teaching	*Benchmark: Nature of Work: Teaching*	3.93	3.87	
	Time spent on teaching	4.18	4.15	
	Number of courses taught	3.89	3.88	
	Level of courses taught	4.10	4.10	
	Discretion over course content	4.32	4.29	
	Number of students in classes taught	3.91	3.75	
	Quality of students taught	3.98	3.98	
	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.09	3.14	
	Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.59	3.63	
	Teaching schedule	4.21	4.01	
	Support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.87	3.68	
	Support for assessing student learning	3.93	3.81	
	Support for developing online/hybrid courses	3.85	3.51	↑
	Support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.87	3.58	↑
Other Work Activities	Time spent on outreach	3.80	3.77	
	Time spent on administrative tasks	3.39	3.32	
	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.66	3.50	
Facilities and Work Resources	*Benchmark: Facilities and Work Resources*	3.89	3.79	
	Support for improving teaching	3.63	3.61	
	Office	3.82	3.88	
	Laboratory, research, studio space	3.64	3.52	
	Equipment	3.88	3.72	
	Classrooms	3.82	3.64	
	Library resources	4.41	4.14	↑
	Computing and technical support	4.00	3.91	
	Clerical/administrative support	3.82	3.76	

NC State University
AY17-18 COACHE Survey
Mean Ratings
NCSU vs. Peers: Professional Track (PrfTr) (1 = low to 5 = high)

Theme	Measure	NCSU PrfTr	Peers PrfTr	Diff [1]
Personal and Family Policies	*Benchmark: Personal and Family Policies*	3.37	3.46	
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.49	3.31	
	Inst. supports family/career compatibility	3.53	3.38	
	Housing benefits	2.94	2.78	
	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	3.27	3.05	
	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.88	3.10	
	Childcare	2.35	2.59	
	Eldercare	3.02	3.21	
	Family medical/parental leave	3.35	3.66	↓
	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.65	3.82	
	Stop-the-clock policies *(pre-tenured only)*	N/A	N/A	
	Parking benefits	3.10	2.95	
Health and Retirement Benefits	*Benchmark: Health and Retirement Benefits*	3.35	4.00	↓
	Health benefits for yourself	3.43	4.08	↓
	Health benefits for family	2.87	4.03	↓
	Retirement benefits	3.60	3.98	↓
	Phased retirement options	3.23	3.70	↓
Salary	Salary	2.87	3.20	↓
Interdisciplinary Work	*Benchmark: Interdisciplinary Work*	3.08	3.02	
	Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.83	2.90	
	Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	3.28	3.15	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.93	2.82	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion (PrfTr and tenured only)	2.94	2.84	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure *(pre-tenured only)*	N/A	N/A	
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.92	2.95	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in reappointment (PrfTr only)	2.91	2.81	
	Interest in interdisciplinary work	3.54	3.56	
Collaboration	*Benchmark: Collaboration*	3.70	3.60	
	Opportunities for collab. within dept	3.91	3.76	
	Opportunities for collab. outside inst	3.51	3.41	
	Opportunities for collab. outside dept	3.59	3.54	
Mentoring	*Benchmark: Mentoring*	3.45	3.33	
	Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	3.93	3.91	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept.	3.73	3.75	
	Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept *(tenure track only)*	N/A	N/A	
	Mentoring of tenured associate profs in dept *(tenured only)*	N/A	N/A	
	Mentoring of PrfTr faculty in dept (PrfTr only)	2.77	2.62	
	Support for faculty to be good mentors (tenured and PrfTr only)	2.74	2.56	
	Being a mentor is fulfilling (tenured and PrfTr only)	4.30	4.24	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst.	3.86	3.76	

NC State University
AY17-18 COACHE Survey
Mean Ratings
NCSU vs. Peers: Professional Track (PrfTr) (1 = low to 5 = high)

Theme	Measure	NCSU PrfTr	Peers PrfTr	Diff [1]
Tenure Policies *(pre-tenured only)*	*Benchmark: Tenure Policies*	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of tenure process	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of tenure criteria	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of tenure standards	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure	N/A	N/A	
	Consistency of messages about tenure	N/A	N/A	
	Tenure decisions are performance-based	N/A	N/A	
Tenure Clarity *(pre-tenured only)*	*Benchmark: Tenure Expectations: Clarity*	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of expectations: Scholar	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of expectations: Teacher	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of expectations: Advisor	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of expectations: Colleague	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of expectations: Broader community	N/A	N/A	
Promotion *(tenured only)*	*Benchmark: Promotion to Full*	N/A	N/A	
	Dept. culture encourages promotion	N/A	N/A	
	Reasonable expectations: Promotion	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of promotion process	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of promotion criteria	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of promotion standards	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of time frame for promotion	N/A	N/A	
	Clarity of whether I will be promoted (assoc profs only)	N/A	N/A	
Contract Renewal Clarity *(professional track only)*	Clarity of departmental contract renewal process for prf track fac	3.10	N/A	
	Clarity of departmental contract renewal criteria for prf track fac	3.13	N/A	
	Clarity of departmental contract renewal standards for prof track fac	3.00	N/A	
	Clarity of evidence considered for renewal of prf track fac	3.14	N/A	
	Clarity of sense of if my contract will be renewed	3.35	N/A	
Clarity of Promotion Process *(professional track only)*	Clarity of dept promotion process for prf track fac	2.78	N/A	
	Clarity of dept critieria for promotion for prf track fac	2.72	N/A	
	Clarity of dept standards for promotion of prf track faculty	2.65	N/A	
	Clarity of body of evidence considered for promotion of prf track fac	2.78	N/A	
	Clarity of sense of if I will be promoted	2.89	N/A	
Leadership: Senior	*Benchmark: Leadership: Senior*	3.43	3.27	
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.49	3.29	
	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.57	3.31	↑
	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.46	3.23	
	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.40	3.22	
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.40	3.30	
	CAO: Communication of priorities	3.35	3.27	
Leadership: Divisional	*Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional*	3.32	3.38	
	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.35	3.38	
	Dean: Stated priorities	3.39	3.46	
	Dean: Communication of priorities	3.32	3.38	
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	3.23	3.33	
Leadership: Departmental	*Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental*	3.81	3.74	
	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.78	3.73	
	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.83	3.77	
	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.74	3.68	
	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.73	3.71	
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.96	3.85	

NC State University
AY17-18 COACHE Survey
Mean Ratings
NCSU vs. Peers: Professional Track (PrfTr) (1 = low to 5 = high)

Theme	Measure	NCSU PrfTr	Peers PrfTr	Diff [1]
Leadership: Faculty	*Benchmark: Leadership: Faculty*	3.25	3.24	
	Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making	3.26	3.16	
	Faculty leaders: Stated priorities	3.27	3.30	
	Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities	3.17	3.18	
	Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input	3.30	3.29	
Leadership: Institution-wide	Priorities are stated consistently	3.43	3.22	
	Priorities are acted on consistently	3.21	3.04	
	Changed priorities negatively affect my work	3.27	3.15	
	Visible leadership for support of diversity	4.09	4.19	
Departmental Collegiality	*Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality*	3.89	3.86	
	Colleagues support work/life balance	3.96	3.88	
	Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.24	4.09	
	Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.45	3.58	
	Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.54	3.62	
	Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr	3.99	3.90	
	How well you fit	3.54	3.62	
	Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.94	3.85	
	Department is collegial	4.10	4.09	
	Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	4.06	4.13	
Departmental Engagement	*Benchmark: Departmental Engagement*	3.50	3.46	
	Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.73	3.53	
	Discussions of grad student learning	3.01	3.03	
	Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.75	3.69	
	Discussions of effective use of technology	3.74	3.50	
	Discussions of current research methods	3.07	3.07	
	Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.61	3.71	
	Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured	3.52	3.64	
	Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr	4.06	4.00	
Departmental Quality	*Benchmark: Departmental Quality*	3.63	3.70	
	Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.78	3.88	
	Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.08	4.08	
	Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty	4.22	4.08	
	Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.64	3.90	↓
	Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	3.95	4.02	
	Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty	3.87	3.85	
	Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.42	3.61	
	Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.72	3.80	
	Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty	4.23	4.18	
	Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only)	3.87	3.81	
	Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only)	3.43	3.56	
	Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.60	2.69	

NC State University
AY17-18 COACHE Survey
Mean Ratings
NCSU vs. Peers: Professional Track (PrfTr) (1 = low to 5 = high)

Theme	Measure	NCSU PrfTr	Peers PrfTr	Diff [1]
Appreciation and Recognition	*Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition*	3.41	3.44	
	Recognition: For teaching	3.41	3.47	
	Recognition: For advising	3.19	3.34	
	Recognition: For scholarship	3.34	3.42	
	Recognition: For service	3.28	3.31	
	Recognition: For outreach	3.28	3.35	
	Recognition: From colleagues	3.78	3.75	
	Recognition: From CAO *(tenured only)*	N/A	N/A	
	Recognition: From Dean *(tenured only)*	N/A	N/A	
	Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.64	3.59	
	School/college is valued by Pres/Provost *(tenured only)*	N/A	N/A	
	Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost *(tenured only)*	N/A	N/A	
	CAO cares about faculty of my rank	3.23	3.12	
Governance: Trust	*Benchmark: Governance: Trust*	3.18	3.16	
	I understand how to voice opinions about policies	2.97	2.89	
	Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	3.35	3.27	
	Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement	3.67	3.50	
	Faculty and admin have an open system of communication	3.36	3.24	
	Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.57	3.46	
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	*Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose*	3.33	3.33	
	Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.74	2.91	
	Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input	3.23	3.22	
	Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	3.54	3.36	
	Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.77	3.75	
Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	*Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand*	3.14	3.11	
	Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	3.13	2.95	
	Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	3.19	3.20	
	Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions	3.18	3.13	
	Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	3.50	3.41	
Governance: Adaptability	*Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability*	3.11	3.09	
	Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	3.15	3.05	
	Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	3.08	2.97	
	Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	3.11	3.28	
Governance: Productivity	*Benchmark: Governance: Productivity*	3.22	3.27	
	Overall effectiveness of shared governance	3.32	3.27	
	My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.35	3.51	
	Public recognition of progress	3.08	3.14	

[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 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.