**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

**NC State Trend: Tenured Faculty** 

		2024	2021	
Theme	Measure	Tenured	Tenured	Diff <sup>1</sup>
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Research	3.19	3.29	
	Time spent on research	3.67	3.72	
Nature of Work	Expectations for finding external funding	3.31	3.18	
	Influence over focus of research	4.32	4.33	
	Quality of grad students to support research	3.41	3.42	
Nature of Work:	Support for research	2.80	2.74	
Research	Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.36	3.30	
	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	2.95	3.20	$\downarrow$
	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	2.69	3.10	$\downarrow$
	Support for securing grad student assistance	2.77	2.87	
Nature of Work: Service	Support for travel to present/conduct research	2.91	3.19	$\downarrow$
	Availability of course release for research	2.61	2.68	
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Service	3.16	3.33	
	Time spent on service	3.32	3.49	
	Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.75	2.88	
	Number of committees	3.41	3.48	
	Attractiveness of committees	3.26	3.46	
Nature of Work:	Discretion to choose committees	3.43	3.55	
	Equitability of committee assignments	2.97	3.04	
0011100	Number of student advisees	3.61	3.69	
	Equitability of service work compensation	2.53	2.59	
	Relevance of committees	3.55	3.77	
		2.88	2.93	
	Support for being a good advisor			
	Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	2.88	2.88	
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Teaching	3.74	3.84	
	Time spent on teaching	3.79	3.93	
	Number of courses taught	3.81	3.96	
	Level of courses taught	4.08	4.13	
	Discretion over course content	4.29	4.39	
	Number of students in classes taught	3.85	3.89	
	Quality of students taught	3.56	3.75	
Teaching	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	2.94	3.10	
	Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.34	3.52	
	Teaching schedule	4.00	4.05	
	Support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.68	3.68	
	Support for assessing student learning	3.71	3.68	
	Support for developing online/hybrid courses	3.66	3.62	
	Support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.61	3.60	
	Time spent on outreach	3.65	3.64	
Other Work Activities	Time spent on administrative tasks	2.53	2.73	
	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.24	3.32	
	Benchmark: Facilities and Work Resources	3.57	3.69	
	Support for improving teaching	3.37	3.52	
	Office	3.80	3.98	
	Laboratory, research, studio space	3.33	3.46	
Facilities and Work	Equipment	3.53	3.63	
Resources	Classrooms	3.63	3.70	
	Library resources	4.33	4.31	
	Computing and technical support	3.50	3.78	J
	Clerical/administrative support	2.87	2.99	· · ·
	σιοποαιγααιτιπιστιατίνο σαρροτί	2.01	۷.۵۵	

**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

**NC State Trend: Tenured Faculty** 

Theme	Measure	2024 Tenured	2021 Tenured	Diff <sup>1</sup>
Theme	Benchmark: Personal and Family Policies	3.02	2.99	י וווט
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.18	3.22	
Personal and Family	Inst. supports family/career compatibility	2.90	2.97	
	Housing benefits	2.90	2.29	
	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.51	2.46	
Policies	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.79	2.92	
	Childcare	2.16	2.15	
	Eldercare	2.32	2.71	$\downarrow$
	Family medical/parental leave	3.24	3.32	
,	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.61	3.55	
	Parking benefits	3.12	3.08	
	Benchmark: Health and Retirement Benefits	3.18	3.10	
Hoolth and	Health benefits for yourself	3.29	3.21	
	Health benefits for family	2.75	2.59	
Retirement Benefits	Retirement benefits	3.33	3.24	
	Phased retirement options	3.46	3.39	
Salary	Salary	2.87	2.88	
,	Benchmark: Interdisciplinary Work	2.91	2.87	
	Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.69	2.74	
	Facilities conducive to interdiscip, work	2.91	2.91	
Interdisciplinary	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.92	2.84	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion	2.97	2.93	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure	N/A	N/A	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in reappointment	N/A	N/A	
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.98	2.93	
	Benchmark: Collaboration	3.82	3.85	
	Opportunities for collab. within dept	3.74	3.84	
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. outside inst	4.02	3.93	
	Opportunities for collab. outside dept	3.71	3.77	
	Benchmark: Mentoring	3.20	3.22	
	Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	3.82	3.74	
	Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	3.77	3.77	
	Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept (tenure track only)	3.46	3.57	
	Mentoring of tenured associate profs in dept (tenured only)	2.74	2.88	
	Support for faculty to be good mentors (tenured and PrfTr only)	2.68	2.55	
Mentoring	Related items (not included in benchmark)	2.00	2.00	
Montoning	Being a mentor is fulfilling	4.27	4.26	
	Importance of mentoring within dept.	4.28	4.28	
	Importance of mentoring within dept.	3.62	3.64	
	Importance of mentoring outside dept.  Importance of mentoring outside inst.	3.85	3.78	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst.	4.17	4.04	
	Interest in interdisciplinary work	3.81	3.80	
	Benchmark: Promotion to Full	3.82	3.87	
		3.95	4.01	
	Dept. culture encourages promotion  Reasonable expectations: Promotion	3.98	4.01	
	·			
Promotion (tenured	Clarity of promotion process	3.93	4.03	
only)	Clarity of promotion criteria	3.80	3.90	
	Clarity of promotion standards	3.62	3.66	
	Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	3.96	3.98	
	Clarity of time frame for promotion	3.58	3.62	
	Clarity of whether I will be promoted	3.11	3.32	

**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

**NC State Trend: Tenured Faculty** 

Theme	Measure	2024 Tenured	2021 Tenured	Diff <sup>1</sup>
THOME	Benchmark: Leadership: Senior			
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making			<b>\</b>
	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities			
Leadership: Senior	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities			
Leadership: Divisional  Leadership: Divisional  Leadership: Departmental  Leadership: Faculty  Leadership: Institution-wide  Departmental Collegiality	CAO: Pace of decision making			<u> </u>
	CAO: Stated priorities			<del>*</del>
	CAO: Communication of priorities		2024         Z021           Tenured         3.12         3.44           3.21         3.44           3.31         3.49           3.08         3.45           3.11         3.44           2.94         3.40           3.17         3.09           3.22         3.20           3.24         3.10           3.17         3.08           3.04         2.96           3.50         3.59           3.42         3.57           3.46         3.50           3.43         3.52           3.48         3.56           3.73         3.83           3.21         3.03           3.09         2.97           3.19         3.03           3.26         3.02           3.29         3.08           3.14         2.87         2.99           2.80         3.05           2.55         2.23           3.02         2.97           3.94         3.61           3.67         3.61           3.63         3.93           4.04         3.99           3.61         3	<del>_</del>
	Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional			<u> </u>
	Dean: Pace of decision making			
•	Dean: Stated priorities		3.10	
Leadership: Senior  Leadership: Divisional  Leadership: Departmental  Leadership: Faculty  Leadership: Institution-wide	Dean: Communication of priorities			
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input			
Departmental	Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental			
	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making			
Leadership:	Head/Chair: Stated priorities			
· ·	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.43	3.52	
·	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input			
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.73	3.83	
	Benchmark: Leadership: Faculty	3.21	3.03	
	Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making	3.09	2.97	
Leadership: Faculty	Faculty leaders: Stated priorities	3.19	3.03	
	Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities	3.26	3.02	
	Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input	3.29	3.08	
	Priorities are stated consistently		3.14	
	Priorities are acted on consistently	2.87	2.99	
Leadership:	Changed priorities negatively affect my work	2.80	3.05	$\downarrow$
Institution-wide	Dean: Support in adapting to change	2.55	2.23	
·	Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change	3.02	2.97	
	Visible leadership for support of diversity	3.94	3.99	
·	Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality	3.70	3.76	
	Colleagues support work/life balance	3.68	3.63	
	Meeting times compatible with personal needs	3.94	4.07	
	Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.67	3.61	
Departmental	How well you fit	3.47	3.56	
Collegiality	Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.64	3.62	
	Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr	3.61	3.57	
	Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.50	3.68	
	Department is collegial	3.83	3.93	
	Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	4.04	3.99	
	Benchmark: Departmental Engagement	3.61	3.63	
	Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.53	3.54	
	Discussions of grad student learning			
Donortmontol	Discussions of effective teaching practices		3.58	
	Discussions of effective use of technology			
Engagement	Discussions of current research methods	3.49		
	Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.77	3.84	
	Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured	3.73	3.80	·
	Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr			
	p	2.20		

**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

**NC State Trend: Tenured Faculty** 

			2024	2021	
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	Theme	Measure	Tenured	Tenured	Diff <sup>1</sup>
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty		Benchmark: Departmental Quality	3.74	3.77	
Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty   3.87   3.87   3.87   Scholarly productivity of pre-lenure faculty   4.03   4.16   4.03   4.04   4.05   4.05   4.04   4.05   4.05   4.04   4.05   4.05   4.04   4.05   4.05   4.04   4.05   4.05   4.04   4.05   4.05   4.04   4.05   4.05   4.04   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.04   4.05		Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.83	3.84	
Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty   3.94   3.63   3.84   3.63   3.64   3.64   3.64   3.64   3.64   3.65   3.64   3.65   3.		Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.12	4.16	
Intellectual vitality of Prff'r faculty   3.94   3.83   3.75   3.86   3.86		Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.87	3.87	
Intellectual vitality of Prff'r faculty   3.94   3.83   3.75   3.86   3.86		Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.03	4.16	
Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty   3.79   3.83     Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty   3.98   4.04     Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty   3.98   4.04     Teaching effectiveness of Pre-tenure faculty   4.14   4.05     Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only)   3.73   3.86     Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only)   3.21   3.38     Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only)   3.21   3.38     Dept. addresses sub-standard performance   2.70   2.79     Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition   3.18   3.24     Recognition: For advising   3.00   2.98     Recognition: For advising   3.00   2.98     Recognition: For advising   3.00   2.98     Recognition: For service   3.02   3.10     Recognition: For service   3.02   3.10     Recognition: For outreach   3.11   3.14     Recognition: For colleagues   3.60   3.61     Recognition: From Calo (tenured only)   2.82   2.88     Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)   3.00   3.00     Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)   3.03   3.12     School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)   3.31   3.39     Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)   3.03   3.12     CAO cares about faculty of my rank   2.99   3.22     Benchmark: Governance: Trust   2.90   3.07     I understand how to voice opinions about policies   2.88   2.97     Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration   2.97   3.16     Faculty and admin have an open system of communication   2.75   2.99     Faculty and admin have an open system of communication   2.75   2.99     Faculty and admin in leave an open system of communication   2.76   2.99     Faculty and admin in leave an open system of communication   2.77   2.98     Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input   2.79   2.98     Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input   2.79   2.98     Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input   2.79   2.98     Faculty and admin have an open structures of proporturities for		Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty	3.94	3.83	
Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	Departmental Quality	Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty	3.81	3.75	
Teaching effectiveness of PriTr faculty   Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PriTr only)   3.73   3.86		Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty		3.83	
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only)   3.73   3.86					
Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only)   3.21   3.38					
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance					
Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition   3.18   3.24					
Recognition: For teaching   3.22   3.29					
Recognition: For advising   3.00   2.98					
Recognition: For scholarship Recognition: For service Recognition: For outreach Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Coll (tenured only) Recognition: From Coll (tenured only) Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Head/Chair School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.00 3.00 Recognition: From Head/Chair School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.31 3.39 Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.31 3.39 Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.03 3.12 CAO cares about faculty of my rank 2.99 3.22  Benchmark: Governance: Trust Lunderstand how to voice opinions about policies 2.88 2.97 Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 2.97 3.16 Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin have an open system of communication 2.75 2.99 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin have an open system of communication 2.75 2.99 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin have an open system of communication 2.75 2.99 Faculty and admin have an open system of communication 2.75 2.99 Faculty and admin in follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 4.30 4.31 4.32 4.32 5.51 4.34 4.34 4.34 4.34 4.34 4.34 4.34 4.3					
Recognition: For service  Appreciation and Recognition: For outreach  Recognition: From colleagues  Recognition: From CAO (tenured only)  Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)  Recognition: From CAO (tenured only)  South Peach Prevotation (tenured only)  Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)  South Peach Prevotation (tenured only)  South Peach Prevotation (tenured only)  Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)  South Peach Prevotation (tenured only)  South Peach					
Appreciation and Recognition: For outreach Recognition: From Colleagues 3.60 3.61 Recognition: From Colleagues 3.60 3.61 Recognition: From Colleagues 3.60 3.61 Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) 3.00 3.00 Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) 3.00 3.00 Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) 3.00 3.00 Recognition: From Head/Chair 3.46 3.51 School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.31 3.39 Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) 3.03 3.12 CAO cares about faculty of my rank 2.99 3.22  Benchmark: Governance: Trust 2.90 3.07 I understand how to voice opinions about policies 2.88 2.97  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 2.97 3.16 Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement 3.09 3.29 Faculty and admin in lave an open system of communication 2.75 2.99 Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith 3.03 3.29 ↓ Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose 2.88 3.08  Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose 2.88 3.08  Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 3.31 Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 2.79 2.98 Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.35 3.60 ↓ Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 2.72 2.86  Governance: Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input 2.76 2.89  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions 2.78 3.00 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.43 2.54 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 3.60 2.43 2.54 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 3.60 2.78 3.00  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability 3.75 2.85 Shared governance effectiveness of governance 3.65 2.83 Adaptability 4.60 2.65 2.83			-		
Recognition: From colleagues Recognition: From CAO (tenured only) Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Dean (tenured only) Recognition: From Head/Chair School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only) Dept. is valued by Pres/Provest (tenured					
Recognition: From CAO (tenured only)  Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)  School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)  Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)  CAO cares about faculty of my rank  Penchmark: Governance: Trust  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration  Paculty and admin follow rules of engagement  Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)  3.03  3.12  CAO cares about faculty of my rank  2.99  3.07  Indestand how to voice opinions about policies  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration  2.97  3.16  Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement  3.09  3.29  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  3.03  3.29  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  3.03  3.29  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  3.03  3.29  Important decisions are not made until there is consensus  Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input  2.75  2.98  Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  3.35  3.60  Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)  3.03  3.12  CAO cares about the roles of faculty input  2.76  2.89  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  2.78  3.00  Paculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.78  3.00  Paculty and admin define decision criteria together  2.88  3.01  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Paculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.75  2.85  Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances  Adaptability  Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance					
Recognition: From Head/Chair   3.46   3.51	Recognition		2.82	2.88	
Recognition: From Head/Chair   3.46   3.51		Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)	3.00	3.00	
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)   3.03   3.12			3.46	3.51	
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)   3.03   3.12		•		3.39	
CAO cares about faculty of my rank  2.99 3.22    Benchmark: Governance: Trust   2.90 3.07     I understand how to voice opinions about policies   2.88 2.97     Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration   2.97 3.16     Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement   3.09 3.29     Faculty and admin have an open system of communication   2.75 2.99     Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith   3.03 3.29 ↓   Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose   2.88 3.08     Important decisions are not made until there is consensus   2.33 2.51     Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input   2.79 2.98     Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility   3.35 3.60 ↓   Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand   2.72 2.86     Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand   2.72 2.86     Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions   2.78 3.00     Faculty and admin define decision criteria together   2.88 3.01     Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability   2.75 2.85     Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances   2.65 2.83     Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance   2.51 2.78 ↓					
Tunderstand how to voice opinions about policies   2.88   2.97   3.16			2.99	3.22	
Tunderstand how to voice opinions about policies   2.88   2.97   3.16		Benchmark: Governance: Trust	2.90	3.07	
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Faculty and admin decisions are not made until there is consensus  Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Governance:  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances  Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance  2.75 2.99  2.88 3.08  3.08  2.33 2.51  2.79 2.98  3.04 3.24  3.25 2.79 2.86  4.70 2.89  4.71 2.76 2.89  4.72 2.86  5.78 3.00 5.78			2.88	2.97	
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Faculty and admin decisions are not made until there is consensus  Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Governance:  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances  Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance  2.75 2.99  2.88 3.08  3.08  2.33 2.51  2.79 2.98  3.04 3.24  3.25 2.79 2.86  4.70 2.89  4.71 2.76 2.89  4.72 2.86  5.78 3.00 5.78	Carramanas Trust	Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	2.97	3.16	
Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose  Sense of Purpose    Important decisions are not made until there is consensus   2.33   2.51     Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input   2.79   2.98     Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility   3.35   3.60   ↓     Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand   Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input   2.76   2.89     Important decisions are not made until there is consensus   2.33   2.51     Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input   2.79   2.98     Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility   3.35   3.60   ↓     Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand   2.72   2.86     Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input   2.76   2.89     Admin communicate rationale for important decisions   2.78   3.00     Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions   2.43   2.54     Faculty and admin define decision criteria together   2.88   3.01     Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability   2.75   2.85     Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances   2.65   2.83     Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance   2.51   2.78   ↓	Governance: Trust	·	3.09	3.29	
Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose2.883.08Governance: Shared Sense of PurposeImportant decisions are not made until there is consensus2.332.51Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input2.792.98Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view3.043.24Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility3.353.60↓Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand2.722.86Understanding the Issue at Hand2.762.89Issue at HandAdmin communicate rationale for important decisions2.783.00Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions2.432.54Faculty and admin define decision criteria together2.883.01Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability2.752.85Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances2.652.83Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance2.512.78↓	Governance: Trust  Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose  Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Governance:	Faculty and admin have an open system of communication	2.75	2.99	
Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose2.883.08Governance: Shared Sense of PurposeImportant decisions are not made until there is consensus2.332.51Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input2.792.98Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view3.043.24Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility3.353.60↓Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand2.722.86Understanding the Issue at Hand2.762.89Issue at HandAdmin communicate rationale for important decisions2.783.00Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions2.432.54Faculty and admin define decision criteria together2.883.01Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability2.752.85Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances2.652.83Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance2.512.78↓		Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.03	3.29	
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose         Sense of Purpose       Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input       2.79       2.98         Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view       3.04       3.24         Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility       3.35       3.60       ↓         Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand       2.72       2.86         Faculty governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand       2.76       2.89         Understanding the Issue at Hand       2.76       2.89         Admin communicate rationale for important decisions       2.78       3.00         Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions       2.43       2.54         Faculty and admin define decision criteria together       2.88       3.01         Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability       2.75       2.85         Governance: Adaptability       2.75       2.85         Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances       2.65       2.83         Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance       2.51       2.78       ↓			2.88	3.08	•
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose         Sense of Purpose       Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input       2.79       2.98         Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view       3.04       3.24         Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility       3.35       3.60       ↓         Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand       2.72       2.86         Faculty governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand       2.76       2.89         Understanding the Issue at Hand       2.76       2.89         Admin communicate rationale for important decisions       2.78       3.00         Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions       2.43       2.54         Faculty and admin define decision criteria together       2.88       3.01         Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability       2.75       2.85         Governance: Adaptability       2.75       2.85         Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances       2.65       2.83         Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance       2.51       2.78       ↓	O	Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.33	2.51	
Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  Condense Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability  Governance:  Adaptability Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability  Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances  Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance  2.84  3.04  3.24  3.25  2.89  3.00  2.78  3.00  2.78  3.01  2.75  2.85  3.01  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability  2.75  2.85  3.01  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability  2.75  2.85  3.01  2.75  2.85			2.79	2.98	
Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Governance: Adaptability  Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability  Governance: Adaptability  Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance  2.88  3.01  2.75  2.85  3.60  ↓  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  2.78  3.00  2.54  2.55  2.88  3.01  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability  3.35  3.60  ↓  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  2.78  3.00  2.54  2.55  3.01  2.75  2.85  3.01  3.01  4.01  4.02  4.03  4.0	Sense of Purpose	Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	3.04	3.24	
Governance: Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  Understanding the Issue at Hand  Issue at Hand  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Governance: Adaptability  Governance: Adaptability  Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance  Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  2.76  2.89  3.00  2.43  2.54  3.01  2.88  3.01  2.75  2.85  3.01  2.75  2.85  3.01  3.			3.35	3.60	$\downarrow$
Understanding the Issue at Hand  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability  Governance:  Adaptability  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  2.78  3.00  2.43  2.54  3.01  2.88  3.01  3.		Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	2.72	2.86	·
Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions   2.43   2.54	Governance:	Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	2.76	2.89	
Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions   2.43   2.54					
Faculty and admin define decision criteria together  Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability  Governance:  Adaptability  Adaptability  Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance  2.88  3.01  2.75  2.85  2.83  Adaptability  Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance  2.51  2.78	_				
Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability2.752.85Governance:Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances2.652.83AdaptabilityInstitution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance2.512.78↓					
Governance: Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances 2.65 2.83  Adaptability Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance 2.51 2.78					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Governance:				
	Adaptability	Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.51	2.78	$\downarrow$
			3.09	3.00	

**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

**NC State Trend: Tenured Faculty** 

		2024	2021	
Theme	Measure	Tenured	Tenured	Diff <sup>1</sup>
	Benchmark: Governance: Productivity	2.79	2.81	
Governance:	Overall effectiveness of shared governance	2.73	2.67	
Productivity	My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.10	3.26	
	Public recognition of progress	2.59	2.72	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Arrows indicate mean ratings that differ by 5 percent or more of the response scale (i.e., a difference of at least 0.25). Up arrows indicate that the mean rating of the group in the first column is notably higher than that of the group in the second column, whereas down arrows indicate that the mean of the group in the first column is lower than that of the group in the second column. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.