NC State University
COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey
Mean Ratings
NC State Trend: Tenured Faculty
(1 = low, 5 = high)

Theme	Measure	2024 Tenured	2021 Tenured	Diff [1]
Nature of Work: Research	*Benchmark: Nature of Work: Research*	3.19	3.29	
	Time spent on research	3.67	3.72	
	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	
	Support for research	2.80	2.74	
	Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.36	3.30	
	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	2.95	3.20	↓
	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	2.69	3.10	↓
	Support for securing grad student assistance	2.77	2.87	
	Support for travel to present/conduct research	2.91	3.19	↓
	Availability of course release for research	2.61	2.68	
Nature of Work: Service	*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	
	Discretion to choose committees	3.43	3.55	
	Equitability of committee assignments	2.97	3.04	
	Number of student advisees	3.61	3.69	
	Equitability of service work compensation	2.53	2.59	
	Relevance of committees	3.55	3.77	
	Support for being a good advisor	2.88	2.93	
	Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	2.88	2.88	
Nature of Work: Teaching	*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	
	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	
Other Work Activities	Time spent on outreach	3.65	3.64	
	Time spent on administrative tasks	2.53	2.73	
	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.24	3.32	
Facilities and Work Resources	*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	
	Equipment	3.53	3.63	
	Classrooms	3.63	3.70	
	Library resources	4.33	4.31	
	Computing and technical support	3.50	3.78	↓
	Clerical/administrative support	2.87	2.99	

NC State University
COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey
Mean Ratings
NC State Trend: Tenured Faculty
(1 = low, 5 = high)

Theme	Measure	2024 Tenured	2021 Tenured	Diff [1]
	Benchmark: Personal and Family Policies	3.02	2.99	
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.18	3.22	
	Inst. supports family/career compatibility	2.90	2.97	
	Housing benefits	2.11	2.29	
Personal and Family Policies	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.51	2.46	
	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.79	2.92	
	Childcare	2.16	2.15	
	Eldercare	2.32	2.71	↓
	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	
Health and Retirement Benefits	Health benefits for yourself	3.29	3.21	
	Health benefits for family	2.75	2.59	
	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 interdisc. work	2.69	2.74	
	Facilities conducive to interdisc. work	2.91	2.91	
Interdisciplinary Work	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 interdisc. work	2.98	2.93	
	Benchmark: Collaboration	3.82	3.85	
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. within dept	3.74	3.84	
	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 outside 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)*			
	Being a mentor is fulfilling	4.27	4.26	
	Importance of mentoring within dept.	4.28	4.28	
	Importance of mentoring outside dept.	3.62	3.64	
	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	
	Dept. culture encourages promotion	3.95	4.01	
	Reasonable expectations: Promotion	3.98	4.02	
	Clarity of promotion process	3.93	4.03	
Promotion *(tenured 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	

Theme	Measure	2024 Tenured	2021 Tenured	Diff [1]
Leadership: Senior	*Benchmark: Leadership: Senior*	3.12	3.44	↓
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.21	3.44	
	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.31	3.49	
	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.08	3.43	↓
	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.08	3.45	↓
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.11	3.44	↓
	CAO: Communication of priorities	2.94	3.40	↓
Leadership: Divisional	*Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional*	3.17	3.09	
	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.22	3.20	
	Dean: Stated priorities	3.24	3.10	
	Dean: Communication of priorities	3.17	3.08	
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	3.04	2.96	
Leadership: Departmental	*Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental*	3.50	3.59	
	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.42	3.57	
	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.46	3.50	
	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.43	3.52	
	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.48	3.56	
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.73	3.83	
Leadership: Faculty	*Benchmark: Leadership: Faculty*	3.21	3.03	
	Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making	3.09	2.97	
	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	
Leadership: Institution-wide	Priorities are stated consistently	3.08	3.14	
	Priorities are acted on consistently	2.87	2.99	
	Changed priorities negatively affect my work	2.80	3.05	↓
	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	
Departmental Collegiality	*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	
	How well you fit	3.47	3.56	
	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	
Departmental Engagement	*Benchmark: Departmental Engagement*	3.61	3.63	
	Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.53	3.54	
	Discussions of grad student learning	3.76	3.72	
	Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.49	3.58	
	Discussions of effective use of technology	3.45	3.55	
	Discussions of current research methods	3.49	3.44	
	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	3.68	3.68	

Theme	Measure	2024 Tenured	2021 Tenured	Diff [1]
Departmental Quality	*Benchmark: Departmental Quality*	3.74	3.77	
	Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.83	3.84	
	Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.12	4.16	
	Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.87	3.87	
	Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.03	4.16	
	Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty	3.94	3.83	
	Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty	3.81	3.75	
	Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.79	3.83	
	Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.98	4.04	
	Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr 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. addresses sub-standard performance	2.70	2.79	
Appreciation and Recognition	*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	3.42	3.44	
	Recognition: For service	3.02	3.10	
	Recognition: For outreach	3.11	3.14	
	Recognition: From colleagues	3.60	3.61	
	Recognition: From CAO *(tenured only)*	2.82	2.88	
	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	
Governance: Trust	*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	↓
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	*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 respectfully consider the other's view	3.04	3.24	
	Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.35	3.60	↓
Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	*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	
Governance: Adaptability	*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	↓
	Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	3.09	3.00	

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

[1] 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.