

COACHE 2021: Faculty Satisfaction Survey
 NC State Overall
 Professional Track 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	4.2	34.4%	53.4%	7.4%	4.9%	0.0%	163
Satisfaction with the number of courses you teach	3.9	24.2%	55.0%	11.4%	8.1%	1.3%	149
Satisfaction with the level of courses you teach	4.2	31.5%	57.0%	6.7%	4.7%	0.0%	149
Satisfaction with the discretion you have over course content	4.3	48.3%	37.7%	7.3%	5.3%	1.3%	151
Satisfaction with the number of students in the classes you teach, on average	3.7	21.9%	47.0%	13.9%	15.2%	2.0%	151
Satisfaction with the quality of students you teach	4.0	28.2%	48.3%	18.8%	3.4%	1.3%	149
Satisfaction with how equitably the teaching workload is distributed	3.3	15.0%	35.4%	24.5%	19.0%	6.1%	147
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support your teaching	3.7	27.0%	38.2%	18.0%	12.4%	4.5%	89
Satisfaction with teaching schedule	4.2	35.3%	54.0%	8.0%	2.7%	0.0%	150
Satisfaction with support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.7	11.9%	53.1%	28.7%	6.3%	0.0%	143
Satisfaction with support for assessing student learning	3.9	18.1%	55.0%	21.5%	5.4%	0.0%	149
Satisfaction with support for developng online/hybrid courses	3.9	21.5%	51.7%	19.5%	7.4%	0.0%	149
Satisfaction with support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.8	19.2%	52.3%	17.9%	9.3%	1.3%	151

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	3.3	8.4%	37.8%	28.6%	21.8%	3.4%	119
Satisfaction with the amount of external funding you are expected to find	3.5	19.2%	30.8%	35.9%	11.5%	2.6%	78
Satisfaction with the influence you have over the focus of research/scholarly/creative work	3.9	28.5%	43.8%	20.0%	6.2%	1.5%	130
Satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support research/scholarly/creative work	3.6	17.0%	41.5%	28.3%	11.3%	1.9%	53
Satisfaction with NC State's financial support for research/scholarly/creative work	3.2	10.5%	32.5%	31.6%	19.3%	6.1%	114
Satisfaction with NC State's support for engaging undergrads in research/scholarly/creative work	3.3	12.6%	29.9%	36.8%	16.1%	4.6%	87
Satisfaction with NC State's support for obtaining externally funded grants	3.3	9.7%	37.5%	31.9%	16.7%	4.2%	72
Satisfaction with NC State's support for managing externally funded grants	3.4	14.3%	34.9%	34.9%	12.7%	3.2%	63
Satisfaction with NC State's support for securing graduate student assistance	3.3	12.1%	31.0%	34.5%	17.2%	5.2%	58
Satisfaction with NC State's support for traveling to present papers/conduct research/creative work	3.5	17.1%	41.0%	21.4%	14.5%	6.0%	117
Satisfaction with the availability of course release time to focus on research	2.6	8.3%	13.3%	21.7%	41.7%	15.0%	60

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	3.7	13.6%	51.7%	23.9%	10.8%	0.0%	176
Satisfaction with the number of committees on which you serve	3.6	12.8%	48.3%	28.9%	9.4%	0.7%	149
Satisfaction with the attractiveness of the committees on which you serve	3.6	13.9%	41.0%	34.0%	10.4%	0.7%	144
Satisfaction with the discretion you have to choose the committees on which you serve	3.5	16.6%	39.7%	26.5%	15.9%	1.3%	151
Satisfaction with how equitably committee assignments are distributed	3.1	6.0%	25.5%	39.6%	26.2%	2.7%	149
Satisfaction with the number of students you advise/mentor	3.6	14.9%	47.9%	24.0%	10.7%	2.5%	121
Satisfaction with support for being a good advisor	3.3	11.7%	34.2%	34.2%	14.2%	5.8%	120
Satisfaction with equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	3.1	6.4%	24.0%	44.0%	19.2%	6.4%	125

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

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	3.3	15.1%	34.9%	18.4%	23.7%	7.9%	152

	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	15.3%	42.7%	32.1%	9.2%	0.8%	131
Satisfaction with time spent on administrative tasks	3.3	8.0%	36.2%	38.0%	15.3%	2.5%	163

	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	3.6	21.4%	42.9%	12.5%	17.9%	5.4%	168

	Too much	Too little	Total (N)
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on teaching	75.0%	25.0%	8
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on research	0.0%	100.0%	28
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on service	78.9%	21.1%	19
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on outreach	7.7%	92.3%	13
Re dissatisfaction with: Time spent on administrative tasks	96.4%	3.6%	28

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	3.8	30.7%	35.9%	20.9%	11.1%	1.3%	153
Satisfaction with office	4.0	34.1%	42.8%	11.6%	8.1%	3.5%	173
Satisfaction with laboratory, research, or studio space	3.7	22.4%	43.5%	18.8%	7.1%	8.2%	85
Satisfaction with equipment	4.0	26.3%	53.1%	15.0%	5.0%	0.6%	160
Satisfaction with classrooms	3.8	23.5%	47.7%	13.7%	13.1%	2.0%	153
Satisfaction with library resources	4.4	55.2%	35.6%	7.5%	1.7%	0.0%	174
Satisfaction with computing and technical support	4.0	36.7%	41.2%	13.0%	7.3%	1.7%	177
Satisfaction with clerical/administrative support	3.7	25.7%	35.7%	24.6%	13.5%	0.6%	171

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	3.3	18.8%	37.5%	8.8%	25.6%	9.4%	160
NC State does what it can to make personal/family obligations and an academic career compatible	3.5	19.1%	39.0%	19.1%	13.5%	9.2%	141

	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with housing benefits	2.5	0.0%	14.7%	41.2%	23.5%	20.6%	34
Satisfaction with tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	3.2	8.6%	41.0%	23.8%	18.1%	8.6%	105
Satisfaction with spousal/partner hiring program	2.7	9.8%	17.1%	34.1%	14.6%	24.4%	41
Satisfaction with childcare	2.3	2.1%	4.3%	34.0%	40.4%	19.1%	47
Satisfaction with eldercare	2.3	0.0%	8.0%	40.0%	28.0%	24.0%	25
Satisfaction with family medical/parental leave	3.5	16.0%	36.0%	36.0%	6.0%	6.0%	100
Satisfaction with flexible workload/modified duties for parental/family reasons	3.6	18.6%	41.6%	23.9%	10.6%	5.3%	113
Satisfaction with parking benefits	3.1	7.8%	37.7%	24.6%	20.4%	9.6%	167

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	3.5	17.8%	42.0%	21.3%	13.6%	5.3%	169
Satisfaction with health benefits for your family	3.0	10.7%	28.9%	20.7%	24.8%	14.9%	121
Satisfaction with retirement benefits	3.6	11.3%	49.4%	28.1%	8.1%	3.1%	160
Satisfaction with phased retirement options	3.3	8.3%	38.3%	36.7%	8.3%	8.3%	60

Salary	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with salary	2.7	6.9%	25.3%	17.8%	31.6%	18.4%	174

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

Mentoring	Yes	No	Total (N)
Mentored none of those below	55.2%	44.8%	172
Mentored pre-tenure faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	7.6%	92.4%	172
Mentored tenured faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.9%	97.1%	172
Mentored pre-tenure faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.5%	96.5%	172
Mentored tenured faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.3%	97.7%	172
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty in department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	40.1%	59.9%	172
Mentored non-tenure-track faculty outside department (Professional Track and Tenured only)	9.9%	90.1%	172

	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	4.0	42.9%	34.6%	9.8%	9.0%	3.8%	133
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside department at NC State	3.7	23.1%	38.5%	24.2%	11.0%	3.3%	91
Effectiveness of mentoring from someone outside your institution	3.8	26.1%	42.4%	20.7%	8.7%	2.2%	92

	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)	3.9	30.6%	43.1%	18.1%	4.2%	4.2%	72
NC State provides adequate support for faculty to be good mentors (Professional Track and Tenured only)	2.6	4.5%	17.4%	28.0%	29.5%	20.5%	132

	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	52.8%	38.5%	5.6%	2.5%	0.6%	161
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside department at NC State	3.7	22.3%	42.0%	23.6%	11.5%	0.6%	157
Importance of having mentor/mentors outside institution	3.6	19.1%	38.9%	28.0%	12.7%	1.3%	157

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	3.5	22.6%	31.5%	28.0%	13.1%	4.8%	168

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Budget allocations encourage interdisciplinary work	2.7	2.2%	26.1%	30.4%	22.8%	18.5%	92
Campus facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work	3.2	10.4%	36.0%	26.4%	19.2%	8.0%	125
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the merit process	3.0	4.5%	40.4%	21.3%	16.9%	16.9%	89
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the promotion process (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.0	5.0%	41.3%	20.0%	20.0%	13.8%	80
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	3.1	10.9%	30.4%	28.3%	15.2%	15.2%	92

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	20.5%	48.2%	21.7%	5.4%	4.2%	166
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with faculty outside NC State	3.3	6.8%	33.3%	44.9%	12.2%	2.7%	147
Satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with NC State faculty outside department	3.5	12.7%	38.9%	35.7%	10.2%	2.5%	157

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

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	12.0%	38.6%	33.5%	13.3%	2.5%	158
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's stated priorities	3.6	14.5%	43.4%	29.6%	10.7%	1.9%	159
Satisfaction with NC State's chancellor's communication of priorities to faculty	3.4	14.4%	40.0%	26.3%	13.8%	5.6%	160
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's pace of decision making	3.4	10.8%	37.6%	35.7%	12.1%	3.8%	157
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's stated priorities	3.5	12.0%	42.4%	31.6%	9.5%	4.4%	158
Satisfaction with NC State's provost's communication of priorities to faculty	3.4	12.6%	39.0%	31.4%	10.7%	6.3%	159

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	3.5	15.0%	40.6%	26.3%	13.1%	5.0%	160
Satisfaction with dean's stated priorities	3.6	17.4%	41.6%	24.2%	13.7%	3.1%	161
Satisfaction with dean's communication of priorities to faculty	3.5	22.8%	30.9%	26.5%	14.2%	5.6%	162
Satisfaction that dean ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into college priorities	3.4	19.8%	32.7%	27.8%	11.1%	8.6%	162

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	28.8%	35.0%	21.3%	11.3%	3.8%	160
Satisfaction with department head's stated priorities	3.8	31.1%	36.6%	18.6%	8.1%	5.6%	161
Satisfaction with department head's communication of priorities to faculty	3.9	37.3%	30.4%	18.6%	9.3%	4.3%	161
Satisfaction that dept head ensures opportunities for faculty to have input into departmental decisions	3.8	36.9%	30.0%	17.5%	7.5%	8.1%	160
Satisfaction with department head's fairness in evaluating work	4.0	42.1%	30.9%	17.1%	5.3%	4.6%	152

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	3.1	3.5%	26.1%	54.2%	12.0%	4.2%	142
Satisfaction w/ stated priorities of faculty senate	3.3	4.9%	32.2%	47.6%	14.0%	1.4%	143
Satisfaction w/ communication of priorities by faculty senate	3.2	5.6%	30.6%	43.1%	18.8%	2.1%	144
Satisfaction w/ faculty senate including faculty in decision-making	3.3	10.3%	28.1%	41.8%	17.1%	2.7%	146

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	3.4	16.0%	40.0%	20.0%	19.3%	4.7%	150
NC State's priorities are acted upon consistently across all levels of leadership	3.1	7.3%	35.1%	25.8%	23.2%	8.6%	151
In the past 5 years, NC State's priorities have changed in ways that negatively affect work	3.5	25.9%	20.3%	32.2%	17.5%	4.2%	143
Dean/division head supports adaptation to the changing mission	3.0	19.4%	25.8%	6.5%	32.3%	16.1%	31
Department head/chair supports adaptation to the changing mission	3.7	37.9%	27.6%	6.9%	20.7%	6.9%	29
There is visible leadership at NC State for the support/promotion of diversity on campus	4.2	46.9%	38.1%	8.8%	3.1%	3.1%	160

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

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	7.1%	32.5%	22.7%	27.9%	9.7%	154
My instit has clear rules about roles/authority of faculty and administration	3.2	8.7%	30.9%	38.3%	19.5%	2.7%	149
Mean	3.6	5: Often 20.3%	4: Regularly 34.8%	3: Occasionally 30.4%	2: Seldom 11.6%	1: Never 2.9%	Total (N) 69
Fac leaders and sr admin follow agreed-upon rules of engagement when there are disagreements	3.4	11.8%	36.6%	30.1%	18.3%	3.2%	93
Fac leaders and sr admin have an open system of communication for making decisions	3.5	16.3%	34.8%	35.9%	8.7%	4.3%	92
Mean	2.7	5: Often 4.3%	4: Regularly 14.1%	3: Occasionally 38.0%	2: Seldom 35.9%	1: Never 7.6%	Total (N) 92
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose							
Important instit decisions are not make until consensus between fac leaders and admin is achieved	2.7	4.3%	14.1%	38.0%	35.9%	7.6%	92
Sr admin ensure that there is sufficient time for faculty to provide input on important decisions	3.1	5.4%	26.8%	43.8%	18.8%	5.4%	112
Fac leaders and sr admin respectfully consider each other views before making decisions	3.5	16.7%	33.3%	32.1%	15.4%	2.6%	78
Fac leaders and sr admin share a sense of responsibility for welfare of the instit	3.9	25.7%	47.6%	17.1%	5.7%	3.8%	105
Mean	3.1	5: Often 8.7%	4: Regularly 30.2%	3: Occasionally 34.9%	2: Seldom 18.8%	1: Never 7.4%	Total (N) 149
Governance: Understanding the Issues at Hand							
Existing gornvce structures offer opportunities for input on instit policies	3.1	8.7%	30.2%	34.9%	18.8%	7.4%	149
Mean	3.3	5: Often 10.6%	4: Regularly 33.3%	3: Occasionally 32.5%	2: Seldom 21.1%	1: Never 2.4%	Total (N) 123
Once an important decision is made sr admin communicate their rationale	3.3	10.6%	33.3%	32.5%	21.1%	2.4%	123
Fac leaders and sr admin have equal say in governance matters	3.0	10.0%	26.3%	30.0%	23.8%	10.0%	80
Fac leaders and sr admin encourage each other in defining decision criteria to evaluate options	3.4	13.9%	32.9%	32.9%	17.7%	2.5%	79
Mean	3.0	5: Strongly agree 6.3%	4: Agree 22.5%	3: Neither agree nor disagree 43.7%	2: Disagree 19.7%	1: Strongly disagree 7.7%	Total (N) 142
Governance: Adaptability							
My instit shared governance model holds up under unusual situations	3.0	6.3%	22.5%	43.7%	19.7%	7.7%	142
My instit systematically reviews effectiveness of its decision making processes	3.0	4.9%	18.1%	56.3%	17.4%	3.5%	144
Mean	3.2	5: Often 9.5%	4: Regularly 24.8%	3: Occasionally 47.6%	2: Seldom 13.3%	1: Never 4.8%	Total (N) 105
Governance: Productivity							
My institution cultivates new leaders among faculty	3.2	9.5%	24.8%	47.6%	13.3%	4.8%	105
Mean	3.1	5: Very effective 7.0%	4: Effective 39.1%	3: Never effective nor ineffective 22.6%	2: Ineffective 20.0%	1: Very ineffective 11.3%	Total (N) 115
Governance: Productivity							
Effectiveness of shared governance system at institution	3.1	7.0%	39.1%	22.6%	20.0%	11.3%	115
Mean	3.4	5: Often 5.4%	4: Regularly 39.2%	3: Occasionally 41.9%	2: Seldom 12.2%	1: Never 1.4%	Total (N) 74
Governance: Productivity							
Governance committees I serve on make observable progress toward goals	3.4	5.4%	39.2%	41.9%	12.2%	1.4%	74
Progress achieved through governance efforts is publicly recognized	3.0	5.5%	22.0%	46.2%	22.0%	4.4%	91

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

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	3.9	34.5%	40.7%	13.1%	6.2%	5.5%	145
Department meetings occur at times that are compatible with personal/family needs	4.2	43.5%	40.3%	9.1%	5.2%	1.9%	154
Departmental colleagues pitch in when needed	4.0	38.5%	37.2%	11.5%	9.0%	3.8%	156
On the whole, department is collegial	4.2	49.0%	30.6%	12.7%	5.7%	1.9%	157
On the whole, department colleagues are committed to supporting/promoting diversity/inclusion	4.1	43.0%	37.3%	11.4%	5.1%	3.2%	158

	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	3.5	12.9%	40.5%	30.2%	12.1%	4.3%	116
Satisfaction with fit in department	3.5	21.8%	38.5%	13.5%	17.9%	8.3%	156
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with tenured faculty	3.3	11.8%	29.9%	40.9%	12.6%	4.7%	127
Satisfaction with amount of personal interaction with professional track faculty	3.8	21.2%	48.3%	20.5%	7.3%	2.6%	151

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	3.8	39.1%	29.5%	14.1%	9.6%	7.7%	156
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about graduate student learning	2.9	14.8%	18.1%	25.2%	21.3%	20.6%	155
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective teaching practices	3.9	34.4%	36.9%	19.1%	5.1%	4.5%	157
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about effective use of technology	3.9	27.5%	41.9%	22.5%	6.3%	1.9%	160
Frequency of faculty conversations in dept about use of current research methodologies	3.0	14.7%	19.2%	33.3%	19.2%	13.5%	156

	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	3.6	14.8%	44.3%	27.0%	10.4%	3.5%	115
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with tenured faculty	3.4	13.3%	39.1%	27.3%	15.6%	4.7%	128
Satisfaction with amount of professional interaction with professional track faculty	3.9	24.0%	51.3%	15.6%	5.8%	3.2%	154

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	28.3%	36.7%	25.8%	6.7%	2.5%	120
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.2	35.4%	49.6%	12.4%	0.9%	1.8%	113
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of tenured faculty in department	3.9	28.8%	40.5%	26.1%	4.5%	0.0%	111
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of pre-tenure faculty in department	4.2	36.6%	46.5%	14.9%	2.0%	0.0%	101
Satisfaction with the intellectual vitality of professional track faculty in department	4.1	34.2%	45.0%	15.4%	4.7%	0.7%	149
Satisfaction with the research/scholarly/creative productivity of professional track faculty in department	3.8	27.1%	41.4%	20.3%	11.3%	0.0%	133
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty in department	3.6	22.4%	30.8%	29.9%	14.0%	2.8%	107
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty in department	3.8	23.0%	45.0%	25.0%	4.0%	3.0%	100
Satisfaction with the teaching effectiveness of professional track faculty in department	4.3	45.6%	43.4%	9.6%	1.5%	0.0%	136

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	24.7%	49.4%	16.9%	6.5%	2.6%	154
Department is successful at retaining high-quality faculty members (Professional Track and Tenured only)	3.4	19.5%	36.2%	18.1%	20.1%	6.0%	149
Department is successful at addressing sub-standard tenured faculty performance	2.5	6.7%	7.8%	30.0%	38.9%	16.7%	90

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

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	3.4	18.1%	38.4%	15.9%	21.0%	6.5%	138
Satisfaction with recognition of student advising	3.3	16.1%	30.1%	25.8%	23.7%	4.3%	93
Satisfaction with recognition of scholarly/creative work	3.2	10.9%	30.2%	34.9%	19.4%	4.7%	129
Satisfaction with recognition of service contributions	3.2	10.9%	26.5%	36.7%	19.7%	6.1%	147
Satisfaction with recognition of outreach	3.3	10.8%	32.4%	37.8%	15.3%	3.6%	111
Satisfaction with recognition from colleagues/peers	3.6	20.9%	36.7%	26.6%	11.4%	4.4%	158
Satisfaction with recognition from department head	3.7	29.1%	33.8%	19.9%	9.9%	7.3%	151

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Provost seems to care about the quality of life for faculty of my rank	3.3	18.8%	27.4%	24.8%	17.9%	11.1%	117

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)	2.4	11.5%	9.7%	16.8%	28.3%	33.6%	113

	Yes	No	Total (N)
None of those below	54.1%	45.9%	159
Actively sought an outside job offer	27.0%	73.0%	159
Received a formal job offer	12.6%	87.4%	159
Renegotiated terms of employment contract	18.9%	81.1%	159

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	4.0	38.9%	38.2%	11.5%	9.6%	1.9%	157
All things considered, satisfaction with NC State as a place to work	4.0	33.5%	41.8%	18.4%	5.7%	0.6%	158

	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	4.2	48.3%	33.1%	9.7%	4.1%	4.8%	145

	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	56.9%	38.6%	4.6%	153

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Best aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	36.7%	63.3%	158
Best aspect of work: Assistance for grant proposals	0.6%	99.4%	158
Best aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices	0.0%	100.0%	158
Best aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program	0.6%	99.4%	158
Best aspect of work: Compensation	6.3%	93.7%	158
Best aspect of work: Geographic location	24.7%	75.3%	158
Best aspect of work: Diversity	0.6%	99.4%	158
Best aspect of work: Presence of others like me	0.0%	100.0%	158
Best aspect of work: My sense of fit here	7.0%	93.0%	158
Best aspect of work: Protections from service/assignments	0.6%	99.4%	158
Best aspect of work: Support of colleagues	17.7%	82.3%	158
Best aspect of work: Commute	5.1%	94.9%	158
Best aspect of work: Cost of living	3.8%	96.2%	158
Best aspect of work: Teaching load	10.8%	89.2%	158
Best aspect of work: Manageable pressure to perform	1.3%	98.7%	158
Best aspect of work: Academic freedom	9.5%	90.5%	158
Best aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	0.0%	100.0%	158
Best aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	5.7%	94.3%	158
Best aspect of work: Quality of leadership	1.3%	98.7%	158
Best aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	8.2%	91.8%	158
Best aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	19.6%	80.4%	158
Best aspect of work: Quality of facilities	9.5%	90.5%	158
Best aspect of work: Support for research/creative work	1.9%	98.1%	158
Best aspect of work: Support for teaching	9.5%	90.5%	158
Best aspect of work: Support for professional development	5.1%	94.9%	158

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Worst aspect of work: Quality of colleagues	1.9%	98.1%	158
Worst aspect of work: Lack of assistance for grant proposals	2.5%	97.5%	158
Worst aspect of work: Childcare policies/practices (or lack thereof)	3.8%	96.2%	158
Worst aspect of work: Spousal/partner hiring program (or lack thereof)	1.9%	98.1%	158
Worst aspect of work: Compensation	42.4%	57.6%	158
Worst aspect of work: Geographic location	2.5%	97.5%	158
Worst aspect of work: Lack of diversity	15.8%	84.2%	158
Worst aspect of work: Absence of others like me	7.0%	93.0%	158
Worst aspect of work: My lack of "fit" here	5.1%	94.9%	158
Worst aspect of work: Too much service/too many assignments	15.2%	84.8%	158
Worst aspect of work: Support of colleagues	3.2%	96.8%	158
Worst aspect of work: Commute	7.0%	93.0%	158
Worst aspect of work: Cost of living	0.6%	99.4%	158
Worst aspect of work: Teaching load	6.3%	93.7%	158
Worst aspect of work: Unrelenting pressure to perform	6.3%	93.7%	158
Worst aspect of work: Academic freedom	1.9%	98.1%	158
Worst aspect of work: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	7.0%	93.0%	158
Worst aspect of work: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	1.3%	98.7%	158
Worst aspect of work: Quality of leadership	5.7%	94.3%	158
Worst aspect of work: Quality of graduate students	0.6%	99.4%	158
Worst aspect of work: Quality of undergraduate students	2.5%	97.5%	158
Worst aspect of work: Quality of facilities	9.5%	90.5%	158
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for research/creative work	5.1%	94.9%	158
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for teaching	5.1%	94.9%	158
Worst aspect of work: Lack of support for professional development	3.2%	96.8%	158

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