

COACHE 2018: Faculty Satisfaction Survey
 NC State Overall

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	4.0	25.5%	56.1%	11.3%	6.4%	0.8%	931
Satisfaction with the number of courses you teach	3.9	25.0%	53.2%	10.2%	10.5%	1.1%	895
Satisfaction with the level of courses you teach	4.1	30.1%	56.0%	8.7%	4.4%	0.8%	894
Satisfaction with the discretion you have over course content	4.3	47.9%	40.6%	6.6%	3.5%	1.5%	894
Satisfaction with the number of students in the classes you teach, on average	3.9	25.0%	50.3%	12.5%	10.0%	2.1%	896
Satisfaction with the quality of students you teach	3.7	16.7%	50.5%	21.6%	9.3%	1.9%	897
Satisfaction with how equitably the teaching workload is distributed	3.2	10.7%	37.7%	22.9%	19.1%	9.6%	884
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support your teaching	3.5	13.4%	44.5%	23.0%	14.3%	4.8%	649
Satisfaction with teaching schedule	4.1	29.1%	55.5%	10.1%	4.1%	1.2%	887
Satisfaction with support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.7	13.8%	49.2%	34.3%	2.5%	0.3%	791
Satisfaction with support for assessing student learning	3.8	12.4%	55.9%	26.0%	5.3%	0.3%	887
Satisfaction with support for developng online/hybrid courses	3.7	16.8%	44.9%	30.2%	6.0%	2.0%	612
Satisfaction with support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.7	16.3%	44.7%	29.7%	6.8%	2.4%	575

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	3.6	19.6%	47.3%	13.3%	16.8%	3.0%	877
Satisfaction with the amount of external funding you are expected to find	3.2	6.7%	38.8%	33.1%	14.7%	6.7%	780
Satisfaction with the influence you have over the focus of research/scholarly/creative work	4.2	43.0%	42.0%	9.8%	4.0%	1.3%	880
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support research/scholarly/creative work	3.4	12.0%	43.2%	23.2%	16.6%	5.0%	716
Satisfaction with NC State's financial support for research/scholarly/creative work	2.9	7.8%	26.0%	26.5%	28.0%	11.7%	857
Satisfaction with NC State's support for engaging undergrads in research/scholarly/creative work	3.3	13.0%	33.7%	30.9%	16.6%	5.7%	769
Satisfaction with NC State's support for obtaining externally funded grants	3.3	11.0%	37.5%	26.7%	16.7%	8.1%	779
Satisfaction with NC State's support for managing externally funded grants	3.2	11.7%	32.9%	28.8%	16.2%	10.3%	708
Satisfaction with NC State's support for securing graduate student assistance	3.0	6.7%	28.7%	29.1%	23.7%	11.8%	714
Satisfaction with NC State's support for traveling to present papers/conduct research/creative work	3.2	12.3%	34.3%	21.2%	20.6%	11.5%	867
Satisfaction with the availability of course release time to focus on research	2.8	7.2%	23.6%	29.6%	24.7%	14.9%	679

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	3.6	11.1%	54.4%	21.9%	10.9%	1.8%	964
Satisfaction with the number of committees on which you serve	3.6	9.3%	55.0%	24.7%	9.6%	1.4%	920
Satisfaction with the attractiveness of the committees on which you serve	3.5	7.5%	48.0%	31.8%	10.7%	2.1%	907
Satisfaction with the discretion you have to choose the committees on which you serve	3.6	13.5%	45.6%	27.9%	10.4%	2.6%	921
Satisfaction with how equitably committee assignments are distributed	3.2	6.9%	36.7%	30.8%	18.1%	7.5%	896
Satisfaction with the number of students you advise/mentor	3.7	13.9%	56.3%	17.5%	9.6%	2.8%	858
Satisfaction with how equitably service work is compensated	2.7	3.5%	22.3%	32.2%	28.4%	13.6%	883
Satisfaction with relevance of committees you serve on	3.7	12.8%	54.5%	23.9%	7.0%	1.8%	904
Satisfaction with support for being a good advisor	3.0	6.7%	30.6%	30.3%	22.5%	9.9%	849
Satisfaction with equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	3.1	6.1%	34.0%	31.0%	20.1%	8.7%	835

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	3.1	11.5%	31.5%	21.0%	24.1%	12.0%	844

	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	3.7	13.6%	51.1%	28.9%	5.9%	0.5%	800
Satisfaction with time spent on administrative tasks	3.0	5.8%	30.9%	29.6%	25.1%	8.6%	926

	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	3.5	19.2%	44.3%	10.0%	20.1%	6.3%	948

	Too much	Too little	Total (N)
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on teaching	81.5%	18.5%	65
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on research	2.9%	97.1%	171
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on service	87.2%	12.8%	117
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on outreach	23.9%	76.1%	46
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on administrative tasks	100.0%	0.0%	307

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	3.5	14.6%	40.2%	29.8%	11.0%	4.3%	875
Satisfaction with office	3.9	28.6%	45.6%	13.1%	10.2%	2.4%	960
Satisfaction with laboratory, research, or studio space	3.4	14.7%	40.9%	19.4%	18.4%	6.6%	685
Satisfaction with equipment	3.6	15.9%	50.2%	19.5%	10.4%	4.0%	919
Satisfaction with classrooms	3.7	18.1%	49.7%	17.9%	12.1%	2.3%	912
Satisfaction with library resources	4.4	47.1%	44.0%	6.6%	2.1%	0.2%	951
Satisfaction with computing and technical support	3.8	24.5%	48.0%	14.7%	8.7%	4.2%	959
Satisfaction with clerical/administrative support	3.3	17.5%	35.8%	16.6%	20.9%	9.2%	944

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	3.3	17.3%	38.0%	11.7%	22.3%	10.6%	886
NC State does what it can to make personal/family obligations and an academic career compatible	3.2	12.8%	36.4%	22.2%	17.0%	11.6%	752

	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with housing benefits	2.4	2.5%	13.9%	32.0%	27.5%	24.2%	244
Satisfaction with tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.7	5.0%	21.2%	27.4%	26.3%	20.1%	537
Satisfaction with spousal/partner hiring program	2.8	10.5%	16.9%	34.4%	18.4%	19.8%	343
Satisfaction with childcare	2.3	2.1%	7.9%	29.6%	37.9%	22.5%	280
Satisfaction with eldercare	2.6	3.4%	9.5%	46.6%	25.7%	14.9%	148
Satisfaction with family medical/parental leave	3.3	10.2%	38.6%	28.9%	14.1%	8.2%	547
Satisfaction with flexible workload/modified duties for parental/family reasons	3.6	16.9%	45.8%	24.7%	7.5%	5.1%	587
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	3.2	10.3%	38.3%	23.3%	18.9%	9.1%	919

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	3.2	8.6%	38.8%	20.9%	22.4%	9.3%	933
Satisfaction with health benefits for your family	2.6	3.5%	23.3%	20.1%	33.2%	19.9%	773
Satisfaction with retirement benefits	3.4	6.1%	44.3%	32.9%	13.0%	3.7%	875
Satisfaction with phased retirement options	3.3	8.3%	37.1%	39.5%	10.2%	5.0%	423

Salary	Mean Rating	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with salary	3.0	9.2%	33.7%	18.4%	26.2%	12.6%	959

Mentoring	Yes	No	Total (N)
Mentored pre-tenure faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	50.3%	49.8%	800
Mentored tenured faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	22.5%	77.5%	800
Mentored pre-tenure faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	33.1%	66.9%	800
Mentored tenured faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	15.5%	84.5%	800
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	9.0%	91.0%	800
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	11.5%	88.5%	800
Mentored none of the above	33.0%	67.0%	800

	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	3.8	32.9%	40.7%	9.0%	9.7%	7.7%	765
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside department at NC State	3.7	22.0%	43.7%	23.6%	6.6%	4.1%	542
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside your institution	4.0	34.9%	39.3%	18.6%	4.3%	2.8%	598

	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)	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)	2.6	4.5%	19.5%	26.5%	31.9%	17.5%	667
Being a mentor is/has been fulfilling in role as a faculty member (Professional Track and Tenured only)	4.3	43.9%	42.7%	9.4%	2.5%	1.5%	522

	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	51.4%	37.3%	6.4%	3.2%	1.6%	916
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside department at NC State	3.6	20.8%	37.4%	26.8%	11.9%	3.1%	891
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside institution	3.7	26.4%	34.7%	23.6%	10.9%	4.4%	895

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	3.7	29.6%	31.4%	24.0%	12.0%	3.0%	940

	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	8.9%	21.1%	27.8%	25.4%	16.8%	731
Campus facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work	3.0	11.0%	28.3%	25.1%	23.4%	12.2%	812
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the merit process	2.9	8.8%	23.7%	27.4%	25.0%	15.2%	697
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the promotion process (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.8	7.4%	23.5%	28.9%	24.3%	15.9%	567
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)	2.9	9.1%	22.7%	32.7%	20.9%	14.5%	110
Department understands how to evaluate interdisciplinary work	2.9	11.5%	23.9%	26.4%	23.8%	14.4%	715

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	29.0%	45.0%	14.5%	8.4%	3.1%	936
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with faculty outside NC State	3.8	24.3%	43.6%	23.3%	7.0%	1.7%	871
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with NC State faculty outside department	3.7	21.2%	44.8%	23.0%	8.7%	2.2%	904

Tenure Process: Clarity	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
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

	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
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

Tenure Expectation: Clarity	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
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

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

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

Promotion Process: Clarity	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
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

	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	15.6%	36.6%	39.1%	6.0%	2.8%	836
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's stated priorities	3.5	16.3%	37.4%	32.9%	9.6%	3.8%	851
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's communication of priorities to faculty	3.5	15.9%	35.7%	33.1%	10.2%	5.1%	857
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's pace of decision making	3.4	12.3%	33.5%	39.4%	9.5%	5.3%	843
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's stated priorities	3.4	12.8%	32.8%	37.1%	11.0%	6.3%	854
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's communication of priorities to faculty	3.3	12.5%	32.4%	34.3%	13.6%	7.2%	858

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	3.3	12.1%	34.0%	32.7%	12.9%	8.4%	862
Satisfaction with dean's stated priorities	3.2	11.1%	35.4%	25.6%	17.5%	10.4%	867
Satisfaction with dean's communication of priorities to faculty	3.2	12.8%	31.6%	26.8%	18.9%	10.0%	874
Satisfaction that dean ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into college priorities	3.1	12.7%	28.2%	27.4%	17.3%	14.4%	866

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	3.7	27.4%	38.8%	18.0%	10.4%	5.4%	829
Satisfaction with department head's stated priorities	3.7	28.6%	36.3%	18.2%	11.3%	5.7%	830
Satisfaction with department head's communication of priorities to faculty	3.7	31.8%	33.1%	17.9%	10.9%	6.3%	827
Satisfaction that dept head ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into departmental decisions	3.8	32.9%	34.1%	15.6%	10.0%	7.5%	828
Satisfaction with department head's fairness in evaluating work	3.9	36.6%	36.7%	15.4%	6.2%	5.1%	825

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	3.1	2.9%	22.6%	58.3%	10.5%	5.6%	713
Satisfaction w/ stated priorities of faculty senate	3.1	3.6%	23.8%	55.5%	11.8%	5.3%	719
Satisfaction w/ communication of priorities by faculty senate	3.0	3.0%	25.2%	50.6%	15.0%	6.2%	726
Satisfaction w/ faculty senate including faculty in decision-making	3.2	4.4%	31.1%	48.0%	10.4%	6.1%	732

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	3.2	11.8%	37.4%	22.7%	18.6%	9.5%	821
NC State's priorities are acted upon consistently across all levels of leadership	3.0	9.6%	32.8%	22.4%	22.5%	12.8%	805
In the past 5 years, NC State's priorities have changed in ways that negatively affect work	3.0	19.1%	18.2%	22.9%	23.0%	16.7%	820
Dean/division head supports adaptation to the changing mission	2.3	5.2%	15.5%	20.0%	25.8%	33.5%	310
Department head/chair supports adaptation to the changing mission	3.2	21.7%	26.1%	18.0%	17.6%	16.6%	295
There is visible leadership at NC State for the support/promotion of diversity on campus	4.0	40.1%	35.8%	14.4%	6.5%	3.2%	876

Governance: 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	2.9	7.0%	25.7%	30.4%	25.3%	11.6%	805
My instit has clear rules about roles/authority of faculty and administration	3.2	7.6%	33.3%	38.0%	15.8%	5.3%	774
	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	3.4	10.6%	40.1%	30.1%	14.2%	5.0%	379
Fac leaders and sr admin have an open system of communication for making decisions	3.1	6.5%	31.3%	33.1%	22.5%	6.5%	520
Fac leaders and sr admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.3	9.4%	36.1%	36.9%	12.4%	5.1%	490
	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Important instit decisions are not make until consensus between fac leaders and admin is achieved	2.6	3.5%	15.4%	31.5%	35.5%	14.2%	521
Sr admin ensure that there is sufficient time for faculty to provide input on important decisions	3.0	3.9%	28.6%	39.0%	22.3%	6.2%	611
Fac leaders and sr admin respectfully consider each other views before making decisions	3.3	10.6%	35.1%	35.9%	14.3%	4.1%	490
Fac leaders and sr admin share a sense of responsibility for welfare of the instit	3.6	15.9%	46.2%	26.0%	9.2%	2.7%	546
	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Governance: Understanding the Issues at Hand Existing govnrce structures offer opportunities for input on instit policies	3.0	5.8%	23.7%	42.0%	19.2%	9.3%	772
	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Once an important decision is made sr admin communicate their rationale	3.0	5.7%	27.1%	35.6%	24.1%	7.4%	646
Fac leaders and sr admin have equal say in governance matters	2.7	6.2%	20.4%	29.9%	28.1%	15.5%	452
Fac leaders and sr admin encourage each other in defining decision criteria to evaluate options	3.2	8.5%	30.7%	34.4%	21.5%	5.0%	424
	Mean Rating	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Governance: Adaptability My instit shared governance model holds up under unusual situations	3.0	4.4%	18.9%	54.9%	13.1%	8.7%	710
My instit systematically reviews effectiveness of its decision making processes	2.9	3.4%	16.5%	51.2%	19.3%	9.6%	740
	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
My institution cultivates new leaders among faculty	3.0	5.7%	24.8%	41.0%	21.9%	6.5%	612
	Mean	5: Very effective	4: Effective	3: Never effective nor ineffective	2: Ineffective	1: Very ineffective	Total (N)
Governance: Productivity Effectiveness of shared governance system at institution	2.9	5.1%	36.0%	20.2%	22.2%	16.4%	603

	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	4.5%	33.7%	44.7%	13.3%	3.8%	445
Progress achieved through governance efforts is publicly recognized	2.8	3.2%	19.3%	39.5%	30.3%	7.7%	534

	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	3.8	26.6%	43.3%	16.9%	7.5%	5.6%	797
Department meetings occur at times that are compatible with personal/family needs	4.2	44.6%	38.1%	10.5%	4.6%	2.1%	863
Departmental colleagues pitch in when needed	3.8	29.2%	40.7%	13.5%	13.3%	3.3%	881
On the whole, department is collegial	4.1	43.9%	34.4%	10.0%	7.4%	4.3%	887
On the whole, department colleagues are committed to supporting/promoting diversity/inclusion	4.0	40.4%	35.0%	13.3%	7.3%	4.0%	874

	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	3.6	17.6%	43.7%	25.3%	11.0%	2.3%	817
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure faculty	3.7	17.8%	43.8%	28.1%	9.0%	1.4%	804
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with professional track faculty	3.8	20.7%	43.2%	27.8%	6.7%	1.6%	826
Satisfaction with fit in department	3.6	26.0%	36.5%	16.8%	13.6%	7.2%	877

	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about undergraduate student learning	3.6	25.2%	31.0%	24.5%	12.1%	7.2%	886
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about graduate student learning	3.6	26.5%	32.3%	23.5%	8.8%	9.0%	877
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective teaching practices	3.6	21.3%	31.5%	32.9%	11.2%	3.1%	894
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective use of technology	3.5	17.5%	33.4%	33.4%	12.2%	3.5%	898
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about use of current research methodologies	3.4	18.6%	30.2%	30.1%	14.4%	6.8%	888

	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	3.8	23.4%	47.3%	20.1%	8.0%	1.2%	816
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with tenured faculty	3.7	22.1%	45.7%	18.8%	11.1%	2.3%	831
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with professional track faculty	3.8	23.7%	45.6%	22.9%	6.4%	1.4%	840

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	25.7%	44.4%	16.9%	10.7%	2.3%	822
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.2	40.4%	43.5%	12.5%	3.0%	0.6%	811
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of professional track faculty in department	4.0	28.5%	47.9%	18.5%	4.1%	1.0%	796
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of tenured faculty in department	3.8	24.0%	44.4%	19.5%	10.3%	1.7%	804
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.1	34.7%	46.0%	15.4%	3.2%	0.8%	792
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of professional track faculty in department	3.8	22.2%	45.8%	26.1%	4.7%	1.2%	731
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty in department	3.8	20.6%	47.0%	21.3%	9.5%	1.5%	776
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty in department	3.9	22.9%	51.9%	21.7%	3.0%	0.4%	755
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of professional track faculty in department	4.1	34.3%	46.8%	15.5%	2.7%	0.8%	776

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	31.1%	40.8%	15.3%	9.4%	3.4%	726
Department is successful at retaining high-quality faculty members (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.4	18.5%	36.9%	18.5%	17.3%	8.7%	723
Department is successful at addressing sub-standard tenured faculty performance	2.8	7.5%	22.5%	23.4%	30.6%	16.0%	683

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	13.9%	38.9%	22.4%	19.2%	5.7%	823
Satisfaction with recognition of student advising	3.2	7.6%	35.3%	30.9%	19.4%	6.8%	725
Satisfaction with recognition of scholarly/creative work	3.5	15.0%	42.2%	24.1%	13.4%	5.2%	820
Satisfaction with recognition of service contributions	3.2	10.2%	35.3%	29.4%	17.9%	7.2%	856
Satisfaction with recognition of outreach	3.3	9.5%	33.8%	34.7%	15.9%	6.1%	686
Satisfaction with recognition from colleagues/peers	3.8	24.3%	41.9%	21.1%	9.7%	2.9%	875
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	28.5%	36.0%	18.3%	10.8%	6.4%	814

	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)	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	18.3%	32.2%	21.5%	16.7%	11.3%	665

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)	2.1	6.9%	10.7%	10.2%	25.9%	46.3%	637

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Actively sought an outside job offer	24.9%	75.1%	889
Received a formal job offer	12.9%	87.1%	889
Renegotiated terms of employment contract	15.9%	84.1%	889
None of the above	55.6%	44.4%	889

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	3.9	34.8%	37.8%	14.4%	8.3%	4.7%	876
All things considered, satisfaction with NC State as a place to work	3.8	27.1%	43.9%	17.5%	7.6%	3.9%	876

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Best aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	36.7%	63.3%	884
Best aspect of work: Support of colleagues	15.8%	84.2%	884
Best aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	12.2%	87.8%	884
Best aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	11.2%	88.8%	884
Best aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	12.0%	88.0%	884
Best aspect of work: Quality of facilities	4.8%	95.2%	884
Best aspect of work: Support for research/creative work	4.5%	95.5%	884
Best aspect of work: Support for teaching	4.3%	95.7%	884
Best aspect of work: Support for professional development	1.9%	98.1%	884
Best aspect of work: Assistance for grant proposals	0.9%	99.1%	884
Best aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices	0.3%	99.7%	884
Best aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program	0.7%	99.3%	884
Best aspect of work: Compensation	2.5%	97.5%	884
Best aspect of work: Geographic location	31.7%	68.3%	884
Best aspect of work: Diversity	1.5%	98.5%	884
Best aspect of work: Presence of others like me	0.8%	99.2%	884
Best aspect of work: My sense of fit here	6.7%	93.3%	884
Best aspect of work: Protections from service/assignments	0.2%	99.8%	884
Best aspect of work: Commute	2.6%	97.4%	884
Best aspect of work: Cost of living	6.0%	94.0%	884
Best aspect of work: Teaching load	6.9%	93.1%	884
Best aspect of work: Manageable pressure to perform	5.0%	95.0%	884
Best aspect of work: Academic freedom	18.1%	81.9%	884
Best aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	2.6%	97.4%	884
Best aspect of work: Quality of leadership	1.0%	99.0%	884

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Worst aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	1.9%	98.1%	883
Worst aspect of work: Support of colleagues	4.4%	95.6%	883
Worst aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	1.9%	98.1%	883
Worst aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	7.4%	92.6%	883
Worst aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	2.5%	97.5%	883
Worst aspect of work: Quality of facilities	12.5%	87.5%	883
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for research/creative work	12.5%	87.5%	883
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for teaching	5.2%	94.8%	883
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for professional development	5.1%	94.9%	883
Worst aspect of work: Lack of assistance for grant proposals	6.0%	94.0%	883
Worst aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices (or lack thereof)	5.5%	94.5%	883
Worst aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program (or lack thereof)	3.7%	96.3%	883
Worst aspect of work: Compensation	33.4%	66.6%	883
Worst aspect of work: Geographic location	2.5%	97.5%	883
Worst aspect of work: Lack of diversity	5.1%	94.9%	883
Worst aspect of work: Absence of others like me	3.3%	96.7%	883
Worst aspect of work: My lack of "fit" here	5.0%	95.0%	883
Worst aspect of work: Too much service/too many assignments	13.6%	86.4%	883
Worst aspect of work: Commute	4.0%	96.0%	883
Worst aspect of work: Cost of living	1.5%	98.5%	883
Worst aspect of work: Teaching load	6.3%	93.7%	883
Worst aspect of work: Unrelenting pressure to perform	6.9%	93.1%	883
Worst aspect of work: Academic freedom	1.0%	99.0%	883
Worst aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	6.0%	94.0%	883
Worst aspect of work: Quality of leadership	9.2%	90.8%	883