

COACHE 2021: Faculty Satisfaction Survey
 NC State Overall
 All faculty

Nature of Work: Teaching	Mean	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	26.2%	55.7%	10.8%	6.0%	1.2%	564
Satisfaction with the number of courses you teach	4.0	27.0%	50.9%	13.3%	7.5%	1.3%	534
Satisfaction with the level of courses you teach	4.1	32.2%	53.2%	9.2%	5.1%	0.4%	534
Satisfaction with the discretion you have over course content	4.3	51.8%	37.2%	5.6%	3.9%	1.5%	537
Satisfaction with the number of students in the classes you teach, on average	3.9	25.6%	48.6%	13.3%	10.1%	2.4%	535
Satisfaction with the quality of students you teach	3.8	20.9%	50.7%	19.6%	6.5%	2.2%	535
Satisfaction with how equitably the teaching workload is distributed	3.2	12.1%	34.0%	25.7%	20.0%	8.2%	536
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support your teaching	3.6	19.5%	41.0%	21.5%	12.2%	5.8%	395
Satisfaction with teaching schedule	4.1	29.2%	53.2%	12.5%	4.1%	0.9%	534
Satisfaction with support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.7	11.6%	49.8%	33.9%	4.3%	0.4%	490
Satisfaction with support for assessing student learning	3.7	12.8%	55.1%	25.6%	5.8%	0.8%	532
Satisfaction with support for developing online/hybrid courses	3.7	16.4%	49.4%	23.0%	9.1%	2.1%	518
Satisfaction with support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.7	16.3%	48.8%	21.5%	11.0%	2.3%	520

Nature of Work: Research	Mean	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	20.0%	44.0%	16.3%	16.3%	3.4%	534
Satisfaction with the amount of external funding you are expected to find	3.2	8.8%	36.8%	30.8%	16.1%	7.5%	467
Satisfaction with the influence you have over the focus of research/scholarly/creative work	4.2	43.4%	42.5%	8.9%	3.5%	1.7%	537
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support research/scholarly/creative work	3.4	14.4%	40.4%	22.0%	19.4%	3.8%	418
Satisfaction with NC State's financial support for research/scholarly/creative work	2.9	7.8%	27.3%	25.8%	26.6%	12.6%	516
Satisfaction with NC State's support for engaging undergrads in research/scholarly/creative work	3.3	13.0%	35.9%	28.4%	15.4%	7.3%	454
Satisfaction with NC State's support for obtaining externally funded grants	3.3	11.5%	37.7%	23.7%	19.8%	7.2%	469
Satisfaction with NC State's support for managing externally funded grants	3.1	10.4%	32.5%	27.3%	20.2%	9.6%	425
Satisfaction with NC State's support for securing graduate student assistance	3.0	7.0%	27.2%	30.9%	23.5%	11.4%	430
Satisfaction with NC State's support for traveling to present papers/conduct research/creative work	3.3	12.2%	36.9%	24.8%	20.0%	6.1%	509
Satisfaction with the availability of course release time to focus on research	2.7	6.6%	20.8%	26.7%	27.9%	18.1%	409

Nature of Work: Service	Mean	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	12.1%	47.7%	25.7%	12.1%	2.4%	595
Satisfaction with the number of committees on which you serve	3.5	9.8%	50.4%	25.6%	11.6%	2.5%	559
Satisfaction with the attractiveness of the committees on which you serve	3.5	10.7%	41.1%	35.1%	11.1%	2.0%	552
Satisfaction with the discretion you have to choose the committees on which you serve	3.5	15.1%	41.9%	26.5%	12.9%	3.6%	558
Satisfaction with how equitably committee assignments are distributed	3.1	7.9%	30.7%	32.2%	20.0%	9.2%	544
Satisfaction with the number of students you advise/mentor	3.7	13.2%	56.8%	16.3%	10.1%	3.7%	516
Satisfaction with support for being a good advisor	3.0	8.7%	28.2%	29.4%	22.8%	10.8%	517
Satisfaction with equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	3.0	5.1%	27.8%	35.6%	19.7%	11.8%	508

Nature of Work: Other	Mean	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	3.0	10.8%	31.6%	18.9%	25.9%	12.7%	544

	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with time spent on outreach	3.6	14.9%	42.1%	33.1%	8.2%	1.7%	477
Satisfaction with time spent on administrative tasks	2.9	5.2%	28.9%	28.2%	25.7%	12.1%	561

	Mean	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	3.4	17.5%	41.4%	11.6%	20.3%	9.2%	587

	Too much	Too little	Total (N)
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on teaching	89.5%	10.5%	38
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on research	3.0%	97.0%	101
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on service	91.8%	8.2%	85
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on outreach	24.4%	75.6%	45
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on administrative tasks	99.0%	1.0%	209

Facilities and Work Resources	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with NC State's support for improving your teaching	3.6	18.6%	40.3%	28.6%	9.5%	3.0%	538
Satisfaction with office	4.0	31.5%	46.0%	12.6%	7.2%	2.8%	581
Satisfaction with laboratory, research, or studio space	3.5	18.8%	39.7%	19.5%	14.4%	7.7%	416
Satisfaction with equipment	3.7	19.3%	50.6%	18.0%	9.0%	3.1%	545
Satisfaction with classrooms	3.8	22.1%	50.0%	14.0%	11.4%	2.6%	544
Satisfaction with library resources	4.4	50.2%	37.4%	10.3%	1.7%	0.3%	580
Satisfaction with computing and technical support	3.9	29.1%	44.6%	13.8%	9.2%	3.2%	585
Satisfaction with clerical/administrative support	3.3	17.1%	31.9%	20.9%	22.0%	8.0%	573

Personal and Family Policies	Mean	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	3.2	16.2%	35.7%	11.0%	24.1%	12.9%	543
NC State does what it can to make personal/family obligations and an academic career compatible	3.1	13.8%	33.8%	17.5%	19.4%	15.6%	480

	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with housing benefits	2.4	1.4%	10.4%	37.5%	22.9%	27.8%	144
Satisfaction with tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.7	4.7%	25.2%	29.2%	19.2%	21.7%	318
Satisfaction with spousal/partner hiring program	2.9	13.6%	17.7%	29.5%	21.4%	17.7%	220
Satisfaction with childcare	2.2	2.6%	5.3%	31.6%	29.5%	31.1%	190
Satisfaction with eldercare	2.6	2.0%	9.9%	52.5%	18.8%	16.8%	101
Satisfaction with family medical/parental leave	3.4	8.7%	40.4%	35.2%	9.6%	6.1%	344
Satisfaction with flexible workload/modified duties for parental/family reasons	3.5	15.9%	40.7%	28.6%	10.5%	4.3%	391
Satisfaction with stop-the-clock (Pre-tenure only)	3.4	10.0%	40.0%	38.0%	8.0%	4.0%	50
Satisfaction with parking benefits	3.1	8.1%	36.0%	24.7%	21.5%	9.8%	559

Health and Retirement Benefits	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with health benefits for yourself	3.3	10.8%	41.4%	24.0%	16.6%	7.2%	572
Satisfaction with health benefits for your family	2.7	4.7%	26.4%	22.1%	29.4%	17.4%	470
Satisfaction with retirement benefits	3.4	7.9%	44.1%	30.6%	12.5%	4.8%	542
Satisfaction with phased retirement options	3.4	7.5%	38.1%	40.7%	9.7%	4.1%	268

Salary	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with salary	2.9	9.1%	28.0%	19.2%	27.1%	16.5%	582

Mentoring	Yes	No	Total (N)
Mentored none of those below	29.3%	70.7%	484
Mentored pre-tenure faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	51.9%	48.1%	484
Mentored tenured faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	23.3%	76.7%	484
Mentored pre-tenure faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	18.0%	82.0%	484
Mentored tenured faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	7.9%	92.1%	484
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	38.0%	62.0%	484
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	11.2%	88.8%	484

	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	36.5%	35.2%	10.4%	10.7%	7.2%	469
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside department at NC State	3.7	23.5%	39.8%	26.2%	7.0%	3.5%	344
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside your institution	4.0	37.5%	37.8%	18.1%	4.8%	1.8%	392

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Being a mentor is/has been fulfilling in role as a faculty member (Professional Track and Tenured only)	4.2	43.7%	39.2%	11.1%	3.9%	2.1%	334
Effective mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in my department (Pre-tenure and Tenured only)	3.5	23.0%	41.3%	10.6%	13.7%	11.4%	387
Effective mentoring of tenured associate professors in my department (Tenured only)	2.9	10.3%	28.8%	18.9%	22.1%	19.9%	281
NC State provides adequate support for faculty to be good mentors (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.6	4.7%	18.4%	25.8%	29.8%	21.3%	423

	Mean	5: Very important	4: Important	3: Neither important nor unimportant	2: Unimportant	1: Very unimportant	Total (N)
Importance of having mentor/mentors in department	4.4	55.2%	34.1%	6.0%	2.3%	2.3%	554
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside department at NC State	3.7	26.0%	36.3%	24.9%	9.6%	3.1%	542
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside institution	3.8	29.7%	35.8%	23.1%	8.3%	3.1%	542

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	29.4%	32.2%	23.7%	11.3%	3.3%	574

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Budget allocations encourage interdisciplinary work	2.8	6.1%	25.0%	26.8%	25.0%	17.0%	440
Campus facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work	3.0	12.0%	27.3%	23.7%	24.3%	12.7%	490
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the merit process	2.9	7.7%	31.8%	22.3%	20.7%	17.5%	440
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the promotion process (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.0	7.6%	31.2%	25.6%	20.8%	14.9%	356
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the tenure process (Pre-tenure only)	3.2	15.3%	40.7%	13.6%	11.9%	18.6%	59
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the reappointment process (Professional Track only)	3.1	5.1%	41.8%	24.1%	16.5%	12.7%	79
Department understands how to evaluate interdisciplinary work	2.9	11.9%	27.3%	22.2%	20.3%	18.3%	454

Collaboration	Mean	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	3.8	26.4%	43.0%	17.3%	9.5%	3.9%	568
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with faculty outside NC State	3.8	23.4%	43.1%	23.6%	7.1%	2.8%	538
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with NC State faculty outside department	3.7	19.6%	44.9%	22.3%	10.1%	3.2%	557

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)	3.7	19.5%	53.7%	7.3%	11.0%	8.5%	82
Clarity of departmental tenure criteria (Pre-tenure only)	3.5	19.5%	46.3%	8.5%	18.3%	7.3%	82
Clarity of departmental tenure standards (Pre-tenure only)	3.2	13.4%	41.5%	8.5%	26.8%	9.8%	82
Clarity of tenure body of evidence (Pre-tenure only)	3.6	19.5%	45.1%	12.2%	19.5%	3.7%	82
Clarity of sense of whether or not I will achieve tenure (Pre-tenure only)	3.6	18.5%	48.1%	12.3%	16.0%	4.9%	81

	Mean	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)	3.0	12.2%	32.9%	17.1%	20.7%	17.1%	82
Tenure decisions here are made primarily on performance-based criteria (Pre-tenure only)	3.7	22.2%	48.1%	17.3%	6.2%	6.2%	81

Tenure Expectations: 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)	3.7	24.4%	46.3%	4.9%	19.5%	4.9%	82
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as teacher (Pre-tenure only)	3.9	29.1%	45.6%	11.4%	10.1%	3.8%	79
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as advisor to students (Pre-tenure only)	3.5	19.5%	42.7%	13.4%	18.3%	6.1%	82
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as department colleague (Pre-tenure only)	3.3	12.2%	42.7%	13.4%	23.2%	8.5%	82
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as campus citizen (Pre-tenure only)	3.0	9.8%	31.7%	22.0%	23.2%	13.4%	82
Clarity of tenure expectations in performance as community member (Pre-tenure only)	3.1	9.8%	37.8%	15.9%	22.0%	14.6%	82

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Received formal feedback on progress toward tenure (Pre-tenure only)	78.8%	21.3%	80

	Yes	No	Total (N)
At this time believe whether will achieve tenure or not (Pre-tenure only)	100.0%	0.0%	52

Promotion Process: Clarity	Mean	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	41.6%	35.3%	11.6%	5.6%	5.9%	303
Generally, the expectations for promotion from associate to full professor are reasonable (Tenured only)	4.0	39.2%	41.3%	6.5%	8.5%	4.4%	293

	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)	4.0	42.7%	36.8%	5.9%	10.1%	4.6%	307
Clarity of departmental promotion criteria (Tenured only)	3.9	35.2%	41.7%	7.2%	10.1%	5.9%	307
Clarity of departmental promotion standards (Tenured only)	3.7	28.3%	38.4%	10.4%	16.6%	6.2%	307
Clarity of promotion body of evidence (Tenured only)	4.0	38.4%	39.0%	8.9%	9.5%	4.3%	305
Clarity of time frame within which associate profs should apply for promotion (Tenured only)	3.6	30.0%	34.9%	12.1%	13.7%	9.4%	307
Clarity of sense of whether or not I will be promoted from associate to full prof (Tenured Assoc only)	3.3	17.0%	39.6%	15.1%	15.1%	13.2%	106

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Received formal feedback on progress toward promotion to full professor (Tenured Assoc only)	40.0%	60.0%	105

Contract Renewal: Clarity	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of departmental contract renewal process (Professional Track only)	3.3	20.2%	35.6%	12.3%	22.1%	9.8%	163
Clarity of departmental contract renewal criteria (Professional Track only)	3.2	16.6%	36.2%	10.4%	26.4%	10.4%	163
Clarity of departmental contract renewal standards (Professional Track only)	3.0	9.8%	38.7%	11.7%	25.8%	14.1%	163
Clarity of body of evidence considered in making contract renewal decisions (Professional Track only)	3.3	18.9%	34.6%	10.1%	25.8%	10.7%	159
Clarity of sense of whether my contract will be renewed (Professional Track only)	3.5	24.8%	33.5%	16.1%	15.5%	9.9%	161

Promotion Process: Clarity	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of departmental promotion process for non-tenure-track faculty (Professional Track only)	2.8	14.3%	24.8%	11.2%	26.7%	23.0%	161
Clarity of departmental criteria for promotion of non-tenure-track faculty (Professional Track only)	2.8	13.0%	24.8%	13.7%	27.3%	21.1%	161
Clarity of departmental standards for promotion of non-tenure-track faculty (Professional Track only)	2.7	9.9%	24.8%	14.9%	28.0%	22.4%	161
Clarity of body of evidence considered in making promotion decisions for non-tenure-track faculty (Professional Track only)	2.9	18.4%	20.9%	14.6%	26.6%	19.6%	158
Clarity of sense of whether I will be promoted (Professional Track only)	2.8	16.5%	20.9%	14.6%	24.7%	23.4%	158

Leadership: Senior	Mean	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	3.4	12.8%	38.5%	32.9%	11.2%	4.6%	538
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's stated priorities	3.5	14.8%	41.7%	29.2%	10.0%	4.4%	542
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's communication of priorities to faculty	3.4	16.5%	36.6%	26.7%	13.6%	6.6%	546
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's pace of decision making	3.4	13.1%	36.3%	35.6%	10.9%	4.1%	534
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's stated priorities	3.5	13.9%	38.0%	33.6%	9.5%	5.0%	539
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's communication of priorities to faculty	3.4	15.1%	34.9%	31.4%	12.2%	6.5%	542

Leadership: Divisional	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with dean's pace of decision making	3.4	13.5%	37.8%	27.4%	13.9%	7.5%	548
Satisfaction with dean's stated priorities	3.3	14.0%	37.2%	23.5%	17.3%	8.0%	549
Satisfaction with dean's communication of priorities to faculty	3.3	15.9%	31.9%	26.1%	17.0%	9.1%	552
Satisfaction that dean ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into college priorities	3.2	14.5%	28.5%	28.5%	15.1%	13.4%	551

Leadership: Departmental	Mean	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	27.5%	34.8%	20.4%	11.7%	5.6%	520
Satisfaction with department head's stated priorities	3.7	27.9%	35.8%	17.8%	10.8%	7.7%	517
Satisfaction with department head's communication of priorities to faculty	3.7	31.2%	32.4%	16.8%	12.3%	7.3%	519
Satisfaction that dept head ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into departmental decisions	3.7	33.8%	31.5%	15.6%	9.2%	9.8%	520
Satisfaction with department head's fairness in evaluating work	3.9	38.3%	33.6%	15.5%	7.3%	5.3%	509

Leadership: Faculty	Mean	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	3.0	3.9%	22.6%	53.1%	13.3%	7.1%	482
Satisfaction w/ stated priorities of faculty senate	3.1	5.1%	26.3%	49.4%	13.8%	5.3%	486
Satisfaction w/ communication of priorities by faculty senate	3.1	5.1%	28.6%	43.3%	16.5%	6.5%	490
Satisfaction w/ faculty senate including faculty in decision-making	3.1	6.9%	28.5%	42.5%	15.2%	6.9%	494

Leadership: Other	Mean	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	3.3	12.9%	37.4%	21.2%	20.0%	8.5%	519
NC State's priorities are acted upon consistently across all levels of leadership	3.1	9.5%	32.1%	24.1%	22.9%	11.4%	507
In the past 5 years, NC State's priorities have changed in ways that negatively affect work	3.2	20.9%	20.1%	27.8%	21.1%	10.1%	503
Dean/division head supports adaptation to the changing mission	2.5	9.0%	16.8%	15.5%	28.4%	30.3%	155
Department head/chair supports adaptation to the changing mission	3.2	20.4%	30.3%	13.4%	17.6%	18.3%	142
There is visible leadership at NC State for the support/promotion of diversity on campus	4.1	44.2%	35.0%	9.6%	6.9%	4.3%	534

Governance: Trust	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
I understand process for expressing opinions about instit policies	3.0	6.8%	31.4%	24.2%	25.6%	11.9%	512
My instit has clear rules about roles/authority of faculty and administration	3.2	9.1%	30.8%	35.6%	18.3%	6.2%	503
	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	12.6%	38.7%	29.0%	15.2%	4.5%	269
Fac leaders and sr admin have an open system of communication for making decisions	3.1	7.4%	29.5%	34.6%	22.3%	6.1%	376
Fac leaders and sr admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.4	13.3%	35.1%	31.8%	13.8%	6.1%	362
	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	3.6%	15.9%	31.2%	34.8%	14.5%	359
Sr admin ensure that there is sufficient time for faculty to provide input on important decisions	3.0	5.6%	27.3%	37.0%	24.4%	5.8%	414
Fac leaders and sr admin respectfully consider each other views before making decisions	3.3	13.5%	32.6%	31.1%	16.8%	6.0%	334
Fac leaders and sr admin share a sense of responsibility for welfare of the instit	3.7	20.3%	45.1%	20.5%	10.1%	4.1%	395
	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Governance: Understanding the Issues at Hand Existing gornce structures offer opportunities for input on instit policies	3.0	7.5%	26.1%	33.9%	20.6%	11.9%	505
	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Once an important decision is made sr admin communicate their rationale	3.1	7.6%	28.5%	34.7%	24.1%	5.1%	449
Fac leaders and sr admin have equal say in governance matters	2.7	5.4%	20.4%	29.3%	28.7%	16.2%	334
Fac leaders and sr admin encourage each other in defining decision criteria to evaluate options	3.1	9.4%	26.9%	37.0%	20.5%	6.2%	308
	Mean	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	6.1%	19.3%	44.1%	19.1%	11.5%	488
My instit systematically reviews effectiveness of its decision making processes	2.9	4.7%	17.1%	48.9%	20.0%	9.3%	485
	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
My institution cultivates new leaders among faculty	3.1	7.2%	26.2%	39.9%	20.4%	6.3%	416
	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	6.1%	32.0%	18.6%	25.4%	17.9%	413
	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Governance committees I serve on make observable progress toward goals	3.3	4.9%	39.0%	39.0%	13.8%	3.3%	305
Progress achieved through governance efforts is publicly recognized	2.8	5.3%	18.7%	40.1%	26.5%	9.5%	359

Departmental Collegiality	Mean	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	3.7	28.7%	38.6%	15.6%	9.9%	7.3%	495
Department meetings occur at times that are compatible with personal/family needs	4.1	43.9%	35.8%	11.4%	5.1%	3.8%	533
Departmental colleagues pitch in when needed	3.8	32.3%	37.8%	11.8%	12.5%	5.6%	535
On the whole, department is collegial	4.0	41.4%	36.2%	10.6%	7.2%	4.5%	538
On the whole, department colleagues are committed to supporting/promoting diversity/inclusion	4.1	41.9%	37.0%	9.6%	6.8%	4.7%	532

	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure faculty	3.6	14.5%	43.9%	28.2%	10.8%	2.7%	483
Satisfaction with fit in department	3.5	23.3%	38.2%	15.1%	14.9%	8.4%	536
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with tenured faculty	3.5	14.8%	40.3%	29.7%	11.8%	3.4%	501
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with professional track faculty	3.6	15.6%	43.2%	31.0%	7.9%	2.4%	507

Departmental Engagement	Mean	5: Often	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about undergraduate student learning	3.6	27.0%	31.5%	23.8%	10.1%	7.6%	537
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about graduate student learning	3.5	21.2%	33.8%	24.9%	11.2%	8.9%	538
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective teaching practices	3.7	24.8%	31.8%	31.8%	7.7%	3.9%	544
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective use of technology	3.6	20.1%	36.7%	31.3%	8.8%	3.1%	547
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about use of current research methodologies	3.3	16.6%	29.2%	30.3%	16.6%	7.4%	542

	Mean	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	21.0%	47.7%	20.8%	8.4%	2.1%	486
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with tenured faculty	3.7	18.9%	46.9%	18.7%	11.2%	4.1%	507
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with professional track faculty	3.7	18.0%	47.7%	25.4%	6.2%	2.7%	516

Departmental Quality	Mean	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	25.8%	43.6%	18.6%	9.2%	2.8%	500
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.2	39.7%	44.4%	11.0%	3.1%	1.9%	484
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of tenured faculty in department	3.9	26.4%	44.6%	18.6%	8.6%	1.8%	489
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.2	37.3%	45.8%	13.2%	3.2%	0.4%	469
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of professional track faculty in department	3.9	29.1%	44.1%	18.3%	7.3%	1.2%	492
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of professional track faculty in department	3.8	25.0%	43.4%	22.3%	7.1%	2.2%	452
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty in department	3.8	22.5%	45.6%	19.9%	9.9%	2.1%	467
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.0	28.0%	50.3%	17.4%	2.6%	1.5%	453
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of professional track faculty in department	4.1	37.3%	45.1%	12.2%	4.4%	1.0%	477

Departmental: Other	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Department is successful at recruiting high-quality faculty members (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.9	30.2%	43.0%	14.5%	7.5%	4.8%	454
Department is successful at retaining high-quality faculty members (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.4	18.4%	37.7%	16.8%	19.5%	7.6%	446
Department is successful at addressing sub-standard tenured faculty performance	2.7	5.2%	21.7%	24.9%	31.0%	17.2%	406

Appreciation and Recognition	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with recognition of teaching efforts	3.3	15.4%	38.2%	19.9%	18.1%	8.3%	492
Satisfaction with recognition of student advising	3.1	9.7%	28.0%	30.2%	24.5%	7.6%	421
Satisfaction with recognition of scholarly/creative work	3.4	15.2%	37.3%	25.1%	15.6%	6.8%	501
Satisfaction with recognition of service contributions	3.1	10.3%	28.8%	32.3%	19.6%	8.9%	514
Satisfaction with recognition of outreach	3.2	9.3%	30.7%	36.7%	16.8%	6.5%	398
Satisfaction with recognition from colleagues/peers	3.6	23.8%	33.9%	26.6%	9.9%	5.8%	534
Satisfaction with recognition from provost (Tenured only)	2.9	9.1%	21.7%	33.7%	19.2%	16.3%	276
Satisfaction with recognition from dean (Tenured only)	3.0	11.6%	27.2%	26.9%	18.0%	16.3%	294
Satisfaction with recognition from department head	3.6	26.8%	34.3%	19.3%	11.0%	8.7%	493

	Mean	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)	3.4	26.8%	26.1%	14.7%	24.1%	8.4%	299
My department is valued by NC State's chancellor and provost (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.1	19.1%	26.8%	15.1%	25.4%	13.7%	299
Provost seems to care about the quality of life for faculty of my rank	3.3	17.4%	30.3%	24.3%	15.8%	12.2%	419

Retention	Mean	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	7.3%	9.1%	10.2%	28.1%	45.3%	384

	Yes	No	Total (N)
None of those below	62.2%	37.8%	539
Actively sought an outside job offer	26.0%	74.0%	539
Received a formal job offer	11.7%	88.3%	539
Renegotiated terms of employment contract	14.5%	85.5%	539

Overall Satisfaction	Mean	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	3.8	32.8%	37.9%	14.3%	10.7%	4.3%	533
All things considered, satisfaction with NC State as a place to work	3.8	28.7%	40.3%	18.4%	10.3%	2.4%	534

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
If starting over, I would again choose to work at NC State	3.9	40.5%	30.5%	14.2%	9.6%	5.2%	501

	Strongly recommend your department as a place to work	Recommend your department with reservations	Not recommend your department as a place to work	Total (N)
Recommend your department as a place to work to same-rank candidate	52.6%	40.5%	6.9%	519

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Best aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	33.8%	66.2%	536
Best aspect of work: Assistance for grant proposals	1.1%	98.9%	536
Best aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices	0.2%	99.8%	536
Best aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program	1.7%	98.3%	536
Best aspect of work: Compensation	3.2%	96.8%	536
Best aspect of work: Geographic location	32.6%	67.4%	536
Best aspect of work: Diversity	1.7%	98.3%	536
Best aspect of work: Presence of others like me	0.2%	99.8%	536
Best aspect of work: My sense of fit here	5.4%	94.6%	536
Best aspect of work: Protections from service/assignments	0.6%	99.4%	536
Best aspect of work: Support of colleagues	14.0%	86.0%	536
Best aspect of work: Commute	2.1%	97.9%	536
Best aspect of work: Cost of living	5.0%	95.0%	536
Best aspect of work: Teaching load	5.0%	95.0%	536
Best aspect of work: Manageable pressure to perform	5.8%	94.2%	536
Best aspect of work: Academic freedom	20.1%	79.9%	536
Best aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	3.2%	96.8%	536
Best aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	12.1%	87.9%	536
Best aspect of work: Quality of leadership	1.5%	98.5%	536
Best aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	9.7%	90.3%	536
Best aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	10.6%	89.4%	536
Best aspect of work: Quality of facilities	6.2%	93.8%	536
Best aspect of work: Support for research/creative work	3.9%	96.1%	536
Best aspect of work: Support for teaching	4.5%	95.5%	536
Best aspect of work: Support for professional development	2.2%	97.8%	536

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Worst aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	3.0%	97.0%	536
Worst aspect of work: Lack of assistance for grant proposals	6.0%	94.0%	536
Worst aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices (or lack thereof)	4.7%	95.3%	536
Worst aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program (or lack thereof)	2.6%	97.4%	536
Worst aspect of work: Compensation	34.3%	65.7%	536
Worst aspect of work: Geographic location	2.1%	97.9%	536
Worst aspect of work: Lack of diversity	9.9%	90.1%	536
Worst aspect of work: Absence of others like me	3.9%	96.1%	536
Worst aspect of work: My lack of "fit" here	3.7%	96.3%	536
Worst aspect of work: Too much service/too many assignments	13.6%	86.4%	536
Worst aspect of work: Support of colleagues	4.3%	95.7%	536
Worst aspect of work: Commute	3.4%	96.6%	536
Worst aspect of work: Cost of living	1.3%	98.7%	536
Worst aspect of work: Teaching load	6.0%	94.0%	536
Worst aspect of work: Unrelenting pressure to perform	6.5%	93.5%	536
Worst aspect of work: Academic freedom	0.9%	99.1%	536
Worst aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	4.3%	95.7%	536
Worst aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	1.5%	98.5%	536
Worst aspect of work: Quality of leadership	7.5%	92.5%	536
Worst aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	5.6%	94.4%	536
Worst aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	2.4%	97.6%	536
Worst aspect of work: Quality of facilities	11.9%	88.1%	536
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for research/creative work	10.1%	89.9%	536
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for teaching	3.7%	96.3%	536
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for professional development	2.4%	97.6%	536