**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

NC State vs. Peers: Professional Track Faculty

		NC State Prof	Peers Prof	
Theme	Measure	Track (PrfTr)	Track (PrfTr)	Diff <sup>1</sup>
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Research	3.40	3.25	
	Time spent on research	3.32	3.33	
	Expectations for finding external funding	3.49	3.16	<b>1</b>
	Influence over focus of research	3.99	3.89	
	Quality of grad students to support research	3.53	3.40	
Nature of Work:	Support for research	3.12	2.93	
Research	Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.33	3.13	
	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.02	3.03	
	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	2.86	2.97	
	Support for securing grad student assistance	3.11	2.95	
	Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.60	3.25	1
	Availability of course release for research	2.60	2.57	
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Service	3.42	3.32	
	Time spent on service	3.71	3.62	
	Support for faculty in leadership roles	3.15	2.95	
	Number of committees	3.64	3.58	
	Attractiveness of committees	3.56	3.52	
Nature of Work:	Discretion to choose committees	3.60	3.57	
Service	Equitability of committee assignments	3.18	3.05	
	Number of student advisees	3.61	3.62	
	Equitability of service work compensation	2.63	2.55	
	Relevance of committees	3.89	3.79	
	Support for being a good advisor	3.27	2.85	
	Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	3.13	2.91	
	Benchmark: Nature of Work: Teaching	3.87	3.77	
	Time spent on teaching	4.17	4.02	
	Number of courses taught	3.90	3.81	
	Level of courses taught	4.08	4.05	
	Discretion over course content	4.37	4.19	
	Number of students in classes taught	3.75	3.70	
Nature of Work:	Quality of students taught	3.85	3.83	
Teaching	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.04	3.02	
. o	Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.51	3.54	
	Teaching schedule	4.14	3.93	
	Support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.80	3.64	
	Support for assessing student learning	3.84	3.73	
	Support for developing online/hybrid courses	3.80	3.60	
	Support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.82	3.65	
	Time spent on outreach	3.67	3.62	
Other Work Activities	Time spent on administrative tasks	3.17	3.18	
	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.52	3.37	
	Benchmark: Facilities and Work Resources	3.83	3.61	
	Support for improving teaching	3.79	3.51	1
	Office	3.78	3.70	
	Laboratory, research, studio space	3.35	3.25	
Facilities and Work	Equipment	3.88	3.56	1
Resources	Classrooms	3.63	3.27	<u>†</u>
	Library resources	4.41	4.09	1
	Computing and technical support	3.92	3.76	·
	Clerical/administrative support	3.46	3.41	
	σιοποαιγασιπιποτιατίνο σαρροτί	J. <del>7</del> 0	J. <del>T</del> I	

**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

NC State vs. Peers: Professional Track Faculty

		NC State Drof	Deere Dref	
Theme	Measure	NC State Prof	Track (PrfTr)	Diff 1
THEITIE	Benchmark: Personal and Family Policies	3.27	3.22	DIII ·
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.33	3.20	
	Inst. supports family/career compatibility	3.28	3.24	
	Housing benefits	2.73	2.27	<u></u>
		3.33	3.49	
Personal and Family	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange			
Policies	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.87	2.88	
	Childcare	2.27	2.54	<u> </u>
	Eldercare	2.75	2.87	
	Family medical/parental leave	3.52	3.60	
	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.97	3.69	
	Parking benefits	3.03	2.51	
	Benchmark: Health and Retirement Benefits	3.40	3.69	
Health and	Health benefits for yourself	3.56	3.79	
Retirement Benefits	Health benefits for family	3.00	3.74	
	Retirement benefits	3.54	3.68	
	Phased retirement options	3.22	3.29	
Salary	Salary	2.90	3.02	
	Benchmark: Interdisciplinary Work	2.99	2.77	
	Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.61	2.59	
Interdisciplinary	Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	3.18	2.89	1
Work	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.82	2.60	
VV OIIX	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion	2.83	2.75	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in reappointment	2.97	2.70	1
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.98	2.74	
	Benchmark: Collaboration	3.72	3.47	
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. within dept	3.94	3.65	1
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. outside inst	3.52	3.32	
	Opportunities for collab. outside dept	3.66	3.37	1
	Benchmark: Mentoring	3.15	3.15	
	Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	4.04	3.91	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept.	3.80	3.81	
	Mentoring of PrfTr faculty in dept (PrfTr only)	2.75	2.63	
	Support for faculty to be good mentors (tenured and PrfTr only)	2.69	2.56	
Mentoring	Related items (not included in benchmark)			
Wichtoning	Being a mentor is fulfilling	4.19	4.15	
	Importance of mentoring within dept.	4.29	4.35	
	Importance of mentoring outside dept.	3.64	3.79	
	Importance of mentoring outside inst.	3.62	3.66	
	Effectiveness of mentoring outside the inst.	3.93	3.88	
	Interest in interdisciplinary work	3.50	3.51	
Contract Renewal Clarity (professional track only)	Clarity of departmental contract renewal process for prf track fac	3.33	3.08	
	Clarity of departmental contract renewal criteria for prf track fac	3.27	3.13	
	Clarity of departmental contract renewal standards for prof track fac	3.13	2.98	
	Clarity of body of evidence for deciding contract renewal of prf track fac	3.09	3.00	
	Sense of contract renewal	3.52	3.49	

**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

NC State vs. Peers: Professional Track Faculty

Theme	Measure	NC State Prof	Peers Prof Track (PrfTr)	Diff 1
	Clarity of promotion process for prf track fac	2.86	3.17	
Clarity of Promotion	Clarity of critieria for promotion for prf track fac	2.81	3.14	<u> </u>
Process	Clarity of promotion standards for prf track fac	2.74	2.96	Ψ
(professional track	Clarity of body of evidence for promotion decisions for prf track fac	2.83	3.08	
only)	Sense of promotion	3.02	3.17	
	Benchmark: Leadership: Senior	3.24	3.01	
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.31	2.94	<b>↑</b>
	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.46	3.06	<u></u>
Leadership: Senior	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.23	2.96	<u> </u>
,	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.16	3.02	
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.25	3.07	
	CAO: Communication of priorities	3.08	3.02	
	Benchmark: Leadership: Divisional	3.46	3.29	
	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.44	3.33	
Leadership:	Dean: Stated priorities	3.52	3.35	
Divisional	Dean: Communication of priorities	3.50	3.30	
	·	3.35	3.21	
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input  Benchmark: Leadership: Departmental	3.80	3.69	
	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.77	3.65	
Leadership:	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.73	3.67	
Departmental	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.71	3.66	
Departmental	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.84	3.65	
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.94	3.85	
	Benchmark: Leadership: Faculty	3.55	3.18	<b>↑</b>
	Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making	3.41	3.10	<u> </u>
Leadershin: Faculty	Faculty leaders: Stated priorities	3.54	3.22	<u> </u>
Loadoromp. 1 dodity	Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities	3.58	3.18	<u> </u>
	Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input	3.70	3.26	<u> </u>
	Priorities are stated consistently	3.37	2.90	<u> </u>
	Priorities are acted on consistently	2.97	2.68	<u> </u>
Leadership:	Changed priorities negatively affect my work	3.09	2.80	<u> </u>
Institution-wide	Dean: Support in adapting to change	2.65	2.77	
motitution wide		3.49	3.42	
	Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change Visible leadership for support of diversity	4.04	3.42	
	Benchmark: Departmental Collegiality	3.95	3.79	
	Colleagues support work/life balance	4.11	3.83	<u> </u>
	Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.07	4.13	
Departmental Collegiality	Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.48	3.45	
	How well you fit	3.56	3.48	
	Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.46	3.46	
	Amount of personal interaction w/PrfTr	3.90	3.80	
	Colleagues pitch in when needed	4.00	3.78	
	Department is collegial	4.20	4.01	
	Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	4.21	4.01	

**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

NC State vs. Peers: Professional Track Faculty

Page			NO 04 4 D 4	(	
Benchmark: Departmental Engagement   3.59   3.40	Thomas	Macaura			Diff 1
Discussions of undergrad student learning   3.91   3.56   ↑	Ineme			` ,	י זזוט
Discussions of grad student learning					
Departmental Engagement   Discussions of effective teaching practices   3.82   3.52   1					<u> </u>
Discussions of effective use of fechnology   3.72   3.45   1					
Discussions of current research methods   2.92   2.94	Departmental				
Amount of professional interaction w/Pro-tenure					
Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured   3.48   3.51					
Amount of professional interaction w/PrfTr   3.99   3.89		·			
Benchmark: Departmental Quality   3.80   3.62   3.84   Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty   3.82   3.84   3.84   Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty   4.11   4.03   4.04   4.05   5.06					
Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty		•		3.89	
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty   3.90   3.87					
Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty   Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty   4.03   4.04     Intellectual vitality of preference faculty   4.09   4.07     Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty   3.92   3.86     Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty   3.92   3.86     Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty   3.78   3.71     Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty   3.78   3.71     Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty   4.28   4.21     Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only)   3.85   3.60   ↑     Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only)   3.42   3.29     Dept. addresses sub-standard performance   2.30   2.45     Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition   3.19   3.34     Recognition: For teaching   3.19   3.34     Recognition: For advising   3.21   3.02     Recognition: For scholarship   3.19   3.13     Recognition: For scholarship   3.19   3.13     Recognition: For scholarship   3.19   3.13     Recognition: For outreach   3.16   3.06     Recognition: For outreach   3.16   3.06     Recognition: For more lead/Chair   3.61   3.59     CAO cares about faculty of my rank   2.91   2.93     Benchmark: Covernance: Trust   2.91   2.93     Governance: Trust   Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration   3.30   2.91     Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith   3.18   3.07     Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose   3.17   2.99     Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose   3.10   3.86     Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand   3.01   2.86     Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility   3.50   3.30     Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand   3.01   2.86     Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions   2.70   2.70     Paculty and admin have equal say in decisions   2.70   2.70     Teaching effectiveness of tenure and prefer in purpor tand decisions   2.70   2.70     Recognition: For service   3.12   3.12   3.12     Recognition: For service   3.12   3.12   3.12		Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.82	3.84	
Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty		Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.11	4.03	
Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty		Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.90	3.87	
Intellectual vitality of PrfTr faculty		Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.03	4.04	
Scholarly productivity of PrfTr faculty   3.92   3.86					
Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty   3.59   3.39     Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty   3.78   3.71     Teaching effectiveness of PriTr faculty   4.28   4.21     Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PriTr only)   3.85   3.60   ↑     Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PriTr only)   3.42   3.29     Dept. addresses sub-standard performance   2.30   2.45     Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition   3.30   3.28     Recognition: For teaching   3.19   3.34     Recognition: For advising   3.21   3.02     Recognition: For scholarship   3.19   3.13     Recognition: For scholarship   3.19   3.13     Recognition: For scholarship   3.19   3.13     Recognition: For outreach   3.16   3.06     Recognition: From Head/Chair   3.61   3.59     CAO cares about faculty of my rank   2.91   2.93     Benchmark: Governance: Trust   1 understand how to voice opinions about policies   3.07   2.80   ↑     Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration   3.37   3.16     Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement   3.27   3.16     Faculty and admin in lave an open system of communication   3.00   2.91     Faculty and admin in lave an open system of communication   3.00   2.91     Faculty and admin in lave an open system of communication   3.07   2.99     Important decisions are not made until there is consensus   2.58   2.56     Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input   3.11   2.87     Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility   3.50   3.30     Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand   3.01   2.86     Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input   3.10   2.86     Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions   2.99   2.88     Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions   2.70   2.70	Departmental Quality			3.86	
Teaching effectiveness of PrfTr faculty Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only) Dept. addresses sub-standard performance Dept. addresses			3.59	3.39	
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only)   3.85   3.60 ↑		Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.78	3.71	
Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only)   3.42   3.29			4.28	4.21	
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance   2.30   2.45		Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and PrfTr only)	3.85	3.60	<b>1</b>
Recognition: For teaching   3.30   3.28		Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and PrfTr only)	3.42	3.29	
Appreciation and Recognition: For teaching Recognition: For advising Recognition: For advising Recognition: For scholarship Recognition: For scholarship Recognition: For scholarship Recognition: For service Recognition: For outreach Recognition: For outreach Recognition: For outreach Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Head/Chair Recognition: From Head/Chair Recognition: From Head/Chair Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Head/Chair Recognition: From Head/Chair Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: For outreach Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: From Colleagues Recognition: For outreach Recognition: Recognition: For outreach Recog		Dept. addresses sub-standard performance			
Appreciation and Recognition: For advising  Recognition: For scholarship  Recognition: For scholarship  Recognition: For scholarship  Recognition: For service  Recognition: For outreach  Recognition: From Colleagues  Recognition: From Colleagues  Recognition: From Head/Chair  CAO cares about faculty of my rank  Benchmark: Governance: Trust  I understand how to voice opinions about policies  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration  Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement  Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Sense of Purpose  Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose  Important decisions are not made until there is consensus  Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  Governance:  Governance: Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Governance:  Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  2.99  2.88  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.70  2.70					
Recognition and Recognition: For scholarship   Recognition: For service   Recognition: For service   Recognition: For service   Recognition: For outreach   Recognition: For outreach   Recognition: From colleagues   Recognition: From Head/Chair   Recognition: For service   Recognition: For outreach   Recognition:					
Recognition and Recognition: For service Recognition: For outreach Recognition: For outreach Recognition: From colleagues 3.16 3.06 Recognition: From colleagues 3.73 3.66 Recognition: From colleagues 3.73 3.66 Recognition: From Head/Chair 3.61 3.59 CAO cares about faculty of my rank 2.91 2.93    Benchmark: Governance: Trust   I understand how to voice opinions about policies 3.07 2.80 ↑ Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 3.33 2.97 ↑ Faculty and admin have an open system of communication 3.00 2.91 Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith 3.18 3.07   Renchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose   Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 2.58 2.56   Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 3.11 2.87   Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.50 3.30   Renchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand   Sample of the other's view 3.10 2.86   Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input 3.10 2.86   Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.99 2.88   Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.70 2.70   Sample of the content of the properties					
Recognition         Recognition: For outreach Recognition: For outreach Recognition: For outreach Recognition: From Colleagues         3.16         3.06           Recognition: From Colleagues         3.73         3.66           Recognition: From Head/Chair         3.61         3.59           CAO cares about faculty of my rank         2.91         2.93           Benchmark: Governance: Trust         3.14         2.91           I understand how to voice opinions about policies         3.07         2.80         ↑           Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration         3.33         2.97         ↑           Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement         3.27         3.16           Faculty and admin have an open system of communication         3.00         2.91           Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith         3.18         3.07           Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose         3.17         2.99           Important decisions are not made until there is consensus         2.58         2.56           Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input         3.11         2.87           Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility         3.50         3.30           Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand         3.01         2.86 <t< td=""><td>Appreciation and</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Appreciation and				
Recognition: For outreach Recognition: From colleagues Recognition: From colleagues Recognition: From Head/Chair CAO cares about faculty of my rank  Benchmark: Governance: Trust I understand how to voice opinions about policies  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith Sense of Purpose  Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose  Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  3.10  3.30  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Governance: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Governance: Shared Sense of responsibility  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.99  2.88  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.70  2.70					
Recognition: From Head/Chair3.613.59CAO cares about faculty of my rank2.912.93Benchmark: Governance: Trust3.142.91I understand how to voice opinions about policies3.072.80↑Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration3.332.97↑Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement3.273.16Faculty and admin have an open system of communication3.002.91Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith3.183.07Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose3.172.99Important decisions are not made until there is consensus2.582.56Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input3.112.87Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility3.503.30Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand3.012.86Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand3.012.86Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input3.102.86Understanding the Issue at Hand3.012.86Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions2.992.88	J				
CAO cares about faculty of my rank  Benchmark: Governance: Trust  I understand how to voice opinions about policies  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration  Clear rules about the roles of engagement  Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement  Faculty and admin have an open system of communication  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Faculty and admin decisions are not made until there is consensus  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  Faculty 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  2.91  2.93  3.14  2.91  3.14  2.91  3.16  3.27  3.16  3.27  3.16  3.17  2.99  Important decisions are not made until there is consensus  2.58  2.58  2.56  3.07  3.11  2.87  3.11  2.87  3.07  5.00  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility  3.50  3.30  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  3.01  2.86  4.26  4.27  4.29  2.88					
Benchmark: Governance: Trust I understand how to voice opinions about policies  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 3.33 2.97 ↑  Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration 3.33 2.97 ↑  Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement 5.27  Faculty and admin have an open system of communication 7.00  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith 7.00  Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose 7.00  Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 7.00  Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 7.00  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 7.00  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 7.00  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 7.00  Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input 7.00  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions 7.00  2.91  3.16  3.27  3.16  3.17  2.99  Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 7.00  3.17  3.18  3.07  2.58  2.56  Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 7.00  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 7.00  3.10  3.11  3.11  3.11  3.11  3.12  3.15  3.07  4.00  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.50  3.30  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 3.01  3.10  3.286  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions 3.29  2.88  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 3.27  3.16  3.27		<u> </u>			
I understand how to voice opinions about policies   3.07   2.80   ↑		• • •			
Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration3.332.97↑Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement3.273.16Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement3.273.16Faculty and admin have an open system of communication3.002.91Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith3.183.07Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose3.172.99Important decisions are not made until there is consensus2.582.56Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input3.112.87Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view3.153.07Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility3.503.30Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand3.012.86Governance:Admin communicate rationale for important decisions2.992.88Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions2.702.70					
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement Faculty and admin have an open system of communication Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose  Important 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  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Governance:  Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.31 2.99 2.86 3.17 2.99 3.11 2.87 3.10 2.86 3.07 4.30 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00					<u> </u>
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 Important 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  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.58 2.56 3.17 2.99 3.11 2.87 3.10 2.86 3.07 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.01 3.00 3.01 3.00 3.01 3.00 3.01 3.00 3.00	Governance: Trust				<u> </u>
Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith  Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose  Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose  Important 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  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Governance:  Understanding the Issue at Hand  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  Solution  3.18  3.07  2.99  3.17  2.99  3.11  2.87  3.07  Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view 3.15  3.07  3.30		<u> </u>			
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose Important decisions are not made until there is consensus 2.58 2.56  Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input 3.11 2.87  Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view 3.15 3.07  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.50 3.30  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 3.01 2.86  Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Admin communicate rationale for important decisions 2.99 2.88  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.70 2.70					
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose    Important decisions are not made until there is consensus   2.58   2.56					
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  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  2.86  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  2.99  2.88  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.70  2.70		Benchmark: Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	3.17	2.99	
Sense of Purpose  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  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand  Governance:  Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  3.11  2.87  3.15  3.07  3.30  2.86  4.86  4.86  4.86  5.86  5.99  5.88  5.70  5.70  5.70	Governance: Shared				
Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view 3.15 3.07  Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility 3.50 3.30  Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand 3.01 2.86  Governance: Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input 3.10 2.86  Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.99 2.88  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.70 2.70		Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input	3.11	2.87	
Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand Governance: Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Understanding the Issue at Hand Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input Admin communicate rationale for important decisions Eaculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.86 2.88 2.99 2.88 2.70 2.70		Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	3.15	3.07	
Governance: Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input  Understanding the Issue at Hand  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.86  2.99  2.88  Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions  2.70  2.70		Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.50	3.30	
Understanding the Issue at Hand  Admin communicate rationale for important decisions  2.99 2.88 Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.70 2.70		Benchmark: Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	3.01	2.86	
Issue at Hand Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.70 2.70	Governance:	Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	3.10	2.86	
Issue at Hand Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions 2.70 2.70	0	Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	2.99	2.88	
Faculty and admin define decision criteria together 3.03 2.99		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
r douby and definit domino devicion entena tegether 0.00 2.33		Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	3.03	2.99	

**COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey** 

**Mean Ratings** 

NC State vs. Peers: Professional Track Faculty

		NC State Prof	Peers Prof
Theme	Measure	Track (PrfTr)	Track (PrfTr) Diff 1
	Benchmark: Governance: Adaptability	3.01	2.82
Governance:	Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	3.01	2.80
Adaptability	Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.88	2.68
	Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	3.18	3.02
Governance: Productivity	Benchmark: Governance: Productivity	3.10	3.03
	Overall effectiveness of shared governance	3.11	2.99
	My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.31	3.34
	Public recognition of progress	2.91	2.81

<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.