

NC State University
 AY20-21 COACHE Survey
 Mean Ratings
 Associate Professors AY 20_21 vs. AY17_18 (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Associate AY20_21 | Associate AY17_18 | Diff ¹ |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | <i>Benchmark: Nature of Work: Research</i> | 3.20 | 3.23 | |
| Nature of Work: Research | Time spent on research | 3.41 | 3.53 | |
| | Expectations for finding external funding | 3.05 | 3.01 | |
| | Influence over focus of research | 4.15 | 4.23 | |
| | Quality of grad students to support research | 3.33 | 3.32 | |
| | Support for research | 2.82 | 2.78 | |
| | Support for engaging undergrads in research | 3.29 | 3.19 | |
| | Support for obtaining grants (pre-award) | 3.05 | 3.22 | |
| | Support for maintaining grants (post-award) | 3.03 | 3.21 | |
| | Support for securing grad student assistance | 2.91 | 2.79 | |
| | Support for travel to present/conduct research | 3.27 | 3.20 | |
| | Availability of course release for research | 2.51 | 2.75 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Nature of Work: Service</i> | 3.23 | 3.29 | |
| Nature of Work: Service | Time spent on service | 3.41 | 3.41 | |
| | Support for faculty in leadership roles | 2.80 | 2.89 | |
| | Number of committees | 3.45 | 3.49 | |
| | Attractiveness of committees | 3.44 | 3.37 | |
| | Discretion to choose committees | 3.44 | 3.49 | |
| | Equitability of committee assignments | 2.91 | 3.00 | |
| | Number of student advisees | 3.51 | 3.58 | |
| | Support for being a good advisor | 2.93 | 2.90 | |
| | Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities | 2.85 | 2.99 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Nature of Work: Teaching</i> | 3.83 | 3.76 | |
| Nature of Work: Teaching | Time spent on teaching | 3.92 | 3.85 | |
| | Number of courses taught | 3.96 | 3.85 | |
| | Level of courses taught | 4.12 | 4.08 | |
| | Discretion over course content | 4.45 | 4.32 | |
| | Number of students in classes taught | 3.84 | 3.81 | |
| | Quality of students taught | 3.70 | 3.57 | |
| | Equitability of distribution of teaching load | 3.04 | 3.11 | |
| | Quality of grad students to support teaching | 3.40 | 3.34 | |
| | Teaching schedule | 4.08 | 4.07 | |
| | Support for teaching diverse learning styles | 3.71 | 3.66 | |
| | Support for assessing student learning | 3.74 | 3.64 | |
| | Support for developing online/hybrid courses | 3.69 | 3.54 | |
| | Support for teaching online/hybrid courses | 3.65 | 3.50 | |
| Other Work Activities | Time spent on outreach | 3.42 | 3.56 | |
| | Time spent on administrative tasks | 2.77 | 2.80 | |
| | Ability to balance teaching/research/service | 3.19 | 3.20 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Facilities and Work Resources</i> | 3.69 | 3.61 | |
| Facilities and Work Resources | Support for improving teaching | 3.57 | 3.43 | |
| | Office | 3.88 | 3.91 | |
| | Laboratory, research, studio space | 3.21 | 3.19 | |
| | Equipment | 3.71 | 3.52 | |
| | Classrooms | 3.63 | 3.52 | |
| | Library resources | 4.31 | 4.30 | |
| | Computing and technical support | 3.83 | 3.76 | |
| | Clerical/administrative support | 3.17 | 3.11 | |

NC State University
 AY20-21 COACHE Survey
 Mean Ratings
 Associate Professors AY 20_21 vs. AY17_18 (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Associate AY20_21 | Associate AY17_18 | Diff ¹ |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | <i>Benchmark: Personal and Family Policies</i> | 2.92 | 2.98 | |
| Personal and Family Policies | Right balance between professional/personal | 2.98 | 3.13 | |
| | Inst. supports family/career compatibility | 2.93 | 3.06 | |
| | Housing benefits | 2.07 | 2.44 | ↓ |
| | Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange | 2.48 | 2.38 | |
| | Spousal/partner hiring program | 2.85 | 2.76 | |
| | Childcare | 2.11 | 2.28 | |
| | Eldercare | 2.61 | 2.50 | |
| | Family medical/parental leave | 3.28 | 3.11 | |
| | Flexible workload/modified duties | 3.38 | 3.60 | |
| | Stop-the-clock policies (<i>pre-tenured only</i>) | N<5 | N<5 | |
| | Parking benefits | 3.13 | 3.22 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Health and Retirement Benefits</i> | 3.13 | 2.96 | |
| Health and Retirement Benefits | Health benefits for yourself | 3.22 | 3.01 | |
| | Health benefits for family | 2.70 | 2.53 | |
| | Retirement benefits | 3.31 | 3.20 | |
| | Phased retirement options | 3.26 | 3.25 | |
| Salary | Salary | 2.72 | 2.82 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Interdisciplinary Work</i> | 2.93 | 2.71 | |
| Interdisciplinary Work | Budgets encourage interdiscip. work | 2.88 | 2.66 | |
| | Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work | 2.99 | 2.83 | |
| | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit | 2.87 | 2.64 | |
| | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion (PrfTr and tenured only) | 2.97 | 2.59 | ↑ |
| | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure (<i>pre-tenured only</i>) | N/A | N/A | |
| | Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work | 2.86 | 2.73 | |
| | Interdiscip. work is rewarded in reappointment (PrfTr only) | 3.35 | N/A | |
| | Interest in interdisciplinary work | 3.84 | 3.80 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Collaboration</i> | 3.63 | 3.69 | |
| Collaboration | Opportunities for collab. within dept | 3.61 | 3.75 | |
| | Opportunities for collab. outside inst | 3.72 | 3.72 | |
| | Opportunities for collab. outside dept | 3.55 | 3.59 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Mentoring</i> | 2.96 | 2.97 | |
| Mentoring | Effectiveness of mentoring within dept. | 3.69 | 3.65 | |
| | Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept. | 3.56 | 3.64 | |
| | Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept (<i>tenure track only</i>) | 3.23 | 3.18 | |
| | Mentoring of tenured associate profs in dept (<i>tenured only</i>) | 2.29 | 2.31 | |
| | Mentoring of PrfTr faculty in dept (PrfTr only) | 2.16 | N/A | |
| | Support for faculty to be good mentors (tenured and PrfTr only) | 2.33 | 2.37 | |
| | Being a mentor is fulfilling (tenured and PrfTr only) | 4.06 | 4.09 | |
| | Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst. | 3.98 | 3.98 | |

NC State University
 AY20-21 COACHE Survey
 Mean Ratings
 Associate Professors AY 20_21 vs. AY17_18 (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Associate AY20_21 | Associate AY17_18 | Diff ¹ |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Tenure Policies (pre-tenured only) | <i>Benchmark: Tenure Policies</i> | 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) | <i>Benchmark: Tenure Expectations: Clarity</i> | 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) | <i>Benchmark: Promotion to Full</i> | 3.42 | 3.41 | |
| | Dept. culture encourages promotion | 3.52 | 3.62 | |
| | Reasonable expectations: Promotion | 3.56 | 3.48 | |
| | Clarity of promotion process | 3.70 | 3.58 | |
| | Clarity of promotion criteria | 3.54 | 3.52 | |
| | Clarity of promotion standards | 3.26 | 3.28 | |
| | Clarity of body of evidence for promotion | 3.62 | 3.66 | |
| | Clarity of time frame for promotion | 2.97 | 2.93 | |
| | Clarity of whether I will be promoted (assoc profs only) | 3.32 | 3.26 | |
| Leadership: Senior | <i>Benchmark: Leadership: Senior</i> | 3.32 | 3.41 | |
| | Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making | 3.29 | 3.57 | ↓ |
| | Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities | 3.37 | 3.50 | |
| | Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities | 3.28 | 3.47 | |
| | CAO: Pace of decision making | 3.32 | 3.34 | |
| | CAO: Stated priorities | 3.34 | 3.31 | |
| | CAO: Communication of priorities | 3.27 | 3.28 | |
| Leadership: Divisional | <i>Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional</i> | 3.11 | 3.09 | |
| | Dean: Pace of decision making | 3.21 | 3.25 | |
| | Dean: Stated priorities | 3.14 | 3.04 | |
| | Dean: Communication of priorities | 3.11 | 3.06 | |
| | Dean: Ensuring faculty input | 2.99 | 3.03 | |
| Leadership: Departmental | <i>Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental</i> | 3.75 | 3.74 | |
| | Head/Chair: Pace of decision making | 3.74 | 3.68 | |
| | Head/Chair: Stated priorities | 3.67 | 3.62 | |
| | Head/Chair: Communication of priorities | 3.70 | 3.71 | |
| | Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input | 3.70 | 3.80 | |
| | Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work | 3.96 | 3.90 | |

NC State University
 AY20-21 COACHE Survey
 Mean Ratings
 Associate Professors AY 20_21 vs. AY17_18 (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Associate AY20_21 | Associate AY17_18 | Diff ¹ |
|--|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | <i>Benchmark: Leadership: Faculty</i> | 2.98 | 3.06 | |
| Leadership: Faculty | Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making | 2.89 | 3.03 | |
| | Faculty leaders: Stated priorities | 3.06 | 3.08 | |
| | Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities | 2.98 | 2.99 | |
| | Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input | 3.01 | 3.16 | |
| | Priorities are stated consistently | 3.10 | 3.07 | |
| Leadership: Institution-wide | Priorities are acted on consistently | 2.82 | 2.92 | |
| | Changed priorities negatively affect my work | 3.07 | 2.82 | ↑ |
| | Visible leadership for support of diversity | 3.97 | 3.90 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality</i> | 3.70 | 3.79 | |
| Departmental Collegiality | Colleagues support work/life balance | 3.71 | 3.72 | |
| | Meeting times compatible with personal needs | 4.01 | 4.16 | |
| | Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured | 3.53 | 3.69 | |
| | Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure | 3.61 | 3.71 | |
| | Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr | 3.61 | 3.60 | |
| | How well you fit | 3.45 | 3.50 | |
| | Colleagues pitch in when needed | 3.62 | 3.65 | |
| | Department is collegial | 3.92 | 4.02 | |
| | Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion | 3.88 | 3.93 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Departmental Engagement</i> | 3.58 | 3.55 | |
| Departmental Engagement | Discussions of undergrad student learning | 3.75 | 3.46 | ↑ |
| | Discussions of grad student learning | 3.51 | 3.73 | |
| | Discussions of effective teaching practices | 3.72 | 3.40 | ↑ |
| | Discussions of effective use of technology | 3.52 | 3.34 | |
| | Discussions of current research methods | 3.28 | 3.38 | |
| | Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure | 3.77 | 3.83 | |
| | Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured | 3.62 | 3.78 | |
| | Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr | 3.66 | 3.65 | |
| <i>Benchmark: Departmental Quality</i> | 3.69 | 3.70 | | |
| Departmental Quality | Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty | 3.71 | 3.74 | |
| | Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty | 4.18 | 4.17 | |
| | Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty | 3.88 | 3.84 | |
| | Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty | 3.85 | 3.83 | |
| | Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty | 4.21 | 4.03 | |
| | Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty | 3.83 | 3.78 | |
| | Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty | 3.70 | 3.93 | |
| | Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty | 3.97 | 3.99 | |
| | Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty | 4.21 | 4.05 | |
| | Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) | 3.78 | 3.70 | |
| | Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) | 3.26 | 3.34 | |
| | Dept. addresses sub-standard performance | 2.64 | 2.68 | |

NC State University
 AY20-21 COACHE Survey
 Mean Ratings
 Associate Professors AY 20_21 vs. AY17_18 (1 = low to 5 = high)

| Theme | Measure | Associate AY20_21 | Associate AY17_18 | Diff ¹ |
|---|--|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Appreciation and Recognition | <i>Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition</i> | 3.19 | 3.26 | |
| | Recognition: For teaching | 3.20 | 3.23 | |
| | Recognition: For advising | 3.00 | 3.03 | |
| | Recognition: For scholarship | 3.29 | 3.39 | |
| | Recognition: For service | 2.99 | 3.04 | |
| | Recognition: For outreach | 3.14 | 3.13 | |
| | Recognition: From colleagues | 3.55 | 3.69 | |
| | Recognition: From CAO (<i>tenured only</i>) | 2.79 | 2.96 | |
| | Recognition: From Dean (<i>tenured only</i>) | 2.99 | 3.09 | |
| | Recognition: From Head/Chair | 3.56 | 3.73 | |
| | School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (<i>tenured only</i>) | 3.25 | 3.39 | |
| | Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (<i>tenured only</i>) | 2.99 | 3.10 | |
| CAO cares about faculty of my rank | 3.12 | 3.19 | | |
| Governance: Trust | <i>Benchmark: Governance: Trust</i> | 2.94 | 3.00 | |
| | I understand how to voice opinions about policies | 2.73 | 2.93 | |
| | Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration | 3.08 | 3.17 | |
| | Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement | 3.31 | 3.31 | |
| | Faculty and admin have an open system of communication | 2.97 | 3.03 | |
| | Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith | 3.28 | 3.23 | |
| Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose | <i>Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose</i> | 3.05 | 3.09 | |
| | Important decisions are not made until there is consensus | 2.54 | 2.53 | |
| | Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input | 2.99 | 2.98 | |
| | Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view | 3.19 | 3.31 | |
| Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand | Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility | 3.53 | 3.62 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand</i> | 2.82 | 2.90 | |
| | Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input | 2.82 | 2.99 | |
| | Admin communicate rationale for important decisions | 2.98 | 2.92 | |
| | Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions | 2.59 | 2.58 | |
| Governance: Adaptability | Faculty and admin define decision criteria together | 3.01 | 3.09 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability</i> | 2.79 | 2.93 | |
| | Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances | 2.69 | 2.98 | ↓ |
| Governance: Productivity | Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance | 2.74 | 2.80 | |
| | Institution cultivates new faculty leaders | 2.97 | 3.06 | |
| | <i>Benchmark: Governance: Productivity</i> | 2.81 | 2.83 | |
| Overall effectiveness of shared governance | Overall effectiveness of shared governance | 2.61 | 2.77 | |
| | My committees make measurable progress towards goals | 3.20 | 3.17 | |
| | Public recognition of progress | 2.80 | 2.73 | |