COACHE 2024: Faculty Satisfaction Survey
NC State Overall
All faculty

Nature of Work: Research	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Time spent on research	3.6	17.7%	46.3%	15.1%	18.6%	2.3%	598
Expectations for finding external funding	3.4	8.4%	43.6%	30.4%	12.3%	5.4%	514
Influence over focus of research	4.2	41.2%	47.2%	8.0%	1.7%	1.8%	599
Quality of grad students to support research	3.4	15.5%	38.8%	20.8%	20.0%	4.9%	466
Support for research	2.9	8.7%	27.7%	25.4%	24.6%	13.7%	578
Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.4	13.5%	40.0%	23.8%	17.0%	5.7%	512
Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.0	10.6%	30.1%	23.0%	20.7%	15.5%	521
Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	2.7	6.7%	24.9%	23.1%	24.3%	21.0%	481
Support for securing grad student assistance	2.8	5.9%	26.3%	26.5%	26.5%	14.7%	475
Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.2	14.1%	32.2%	21.0%	21.6%	11.1%	596
Availability of course release for research	2.7	5.1%	19.6%	29.0%	27.2%	19.0%	448

Nature of Work: Service	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Time spent on service	3.5	10.7%	47.2%	23.0%	16.1%	3.0%	665
Number of committees	3.5	8.8%	50.8%	24.9%	12.9%	2.6%	651
Attractiveness of committees	3.4	9.7%	39.5%	33.1%	14.7%	3.1%	641
Discretion to choose committees	3.5	14.7%	39.4%	29.0%	13.7%	3.2%	648
Equitability of committee assignments	3.0	6.7%	32.1%	29.3%	21.7%	10.1%	641
Number of student advisees	3.6	14.7%	51.5%	19.4%	10.1%	4.3%	577
Equitability of service work compensation	2.6	2.8%	17.6%	31.3%	28.6%	19.6%	601
Relevance of committees	3.7	14.2%	52.3%	23.1%	7.7%	2.7%	640
Support for being a good advisor	3.0	9.3%	28.5%	26.7%	23.3%	12.2%	572
Equity of the distribution of advising responsibilities	3.0	7.5%	28.2%	30.0%	22.2%	12.2%	550

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.9	8.9%	30.5%	17.7%	25.9%	17.0%	583

Nature of Work: Teaching	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Time spent on teaching	3.9	24.8%	51.3%	15.6%	5.9%	2.4%	628
Number of courses taught	3.9	24.9%	49.6%	13.6%	10.1%	1.9%	587
Level of courses taught	4.1	29.8%	55.4%	9.9%	4.4%	0.5%	588
Discretion over course content	4.3	49.7%	38.6%	7.3%	3.1%	1.4%	590
Number of students in classes taught	3.9	27.0%	47.2%	13.1%	9.5%	3.2%	589
Quality of students taught	3.6	17.8%	46.4%	20.8%	12.0%	2.9%	590
Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.0	9.0%	31.6%	23.3%	23.8%	12.3%	579
Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.4	14.5%	40.6%	24.5%	13.4%	7.0%	441
Teaching schedule	4.0	29.4%	53.5%	10.0%	5.4%	1.7%	589
Support for teaching diverse learning styles	3.7	12.7%	52.2%	30.9%	2.6%	1.5%	534
Support for assessing student learning	3.8	13.2%	59.0%	19.6%	6.9%	1.4%	583
Support for developing online/hybrid courses	3.7	16.5%	48.1%	26.9%	6.7%	1.9%	480
Support for teaching online/hybrid courses	3.7	15.5%	48.9%	24.8%	8.3%	2.5%	472

Nature of Work: Other	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Time spent on outreach	3.7	15.6%	45.8%	28.2%	9.0%	1.5%	546
Time spent on administrative tasks	2.7	4.1%	24.8%	25.8%	29.9%	15.4%	636

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.3	15.6%	41.4%	12.3%	20.7%	10.0%	652

	Too much	Too little	Total (N)
Time spent on teaching	93.9%	6.1%	49
Time spent on research	6.6%	93.4%	121
Time spent on service	92.0%	8.0%	125
Time spent on outreach	30.8%	69.2%	52
Time spent on administrative tasks	99.3%	0.7%	286

Facilities and Work Resources	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Support for improving teaching	3.5	15.8%	38.6%	30.6%	10.2%	4.8%	581
Office	3.8	28.7%	42.7%	14.1%	7.5%	7.0%	654
Laboratory, research, studio space	3.3	18.1%	37.3%	16.6%	15.5%	12.5%	464
Equipment	3.7	19.6%	45.5%	18.8%	12.6%	3.4%	611
Classrooms	3.6	18.7%	47.6%	16.4%	13.9%	3.5%	605
Library resources	4.4	46.7%	44.1%	7.4%	1.2%	0.5%	646
Computing and technical support	3.6	24.6%	40.5%	15.4%	12.2%	7.3%	655
Clerical/administrative support	3.1	11.9%	32.5%	17.1%	25.1%	13.3%	637

Personal and Family Policies	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Right balance between professional/personal	3.2	16.7%	35.5%	11.9%	20.9%	15.1%	623
Inst. supports family/career compatibility	3.0	12.5%	27.7%	22.9%	22.2%	14.7%	545

	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Housing benefits	2.3	3.7%	7.4%	32.7%	25.9%	30.2%	162
Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.8	6.4%	28.4%	25.9%	18.7%	20.6%	359
Spousal/partner hiring program	2.8	15.2%	14.8%	29.6%	18.4%	22.0%	223
Childcare	2.2	1.1%	8.2%	29.9%	28.8%	32.1%	184
Eldercare	2.5	2.6%	8.8%	47.4%	18.4%	22.8%	114
Family medical/parental leave	3.3	10.3%	38.9%	30.4%	12.4%	8.0%	388
Flexible workload/modified duties	3.7	18.7%	49.1%	20.7%	7.3%	4.2%	450
Stop-the-clock policies (pre-tenured only)	3.5	7.3%	58.5%	17.1%	14.6%	2.4%	41
Parking benefits	3.1	9.7%	33.9%	22.8%	23.4%	10.2%	628

Health and Retirement Benefits	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Health benefits for yourself	3.4	10.1%	47.5%	19.3%	17.9%	5.1%	642
Health benefits for family	2.8	4.9%	31.5%	20.3%	28.1%	15.2%	527
Retirement benefits	3.4	5.7%	47.4%	31.8%	12.1%	3.0%	601
Phased retirement options	3.4	7.7%	40.4%	40.4%	5.6%	5.9%	287

Salary	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Salary	2.9	8.2%	29.6%	18.8%	27.7%	15.7%	658

Interdisciplinary Work	Mean	5: Extremely interested	4: Very interested	3: Moderately interested	2: Slightly interested	1: Not at all	Total (N)
Interest in teaching and/or research with faculty from other disciplines	3.7	29.4%	31.1%	23.0%	14.3%	2.2%	643

	Currently	Not currently, but previously at this institution	Never at this institution	Total (N)
Engaged in collaborative teaching with faculty in other disciplines	24.1%	21.0%	54.9%	572
Engaged in collaborative research with faculty in other disciplines	55.0%	19.9%	25.1%	589
Engaged in solo interdisciplinary teaching and/or research	52.9%	14.2%	32.9%	541

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.7	6.6%	24.7%	21.6%	28.9%	18.3%	515
Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	3.0	11.3%	30.4%	22.1%	21.9%	14.3%	566
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.9	9.8%	27.3%	24.6%	22.2%	16.1%	491
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion (prof track, assoc and full prof only)	2.9	8.7%	31.0%	21.3%	22.9%	16.1%	423
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure (pre-tenured only)	3.3	14.5%	32.7%	27.3%	14.5%	10.9%	55
Interdiscip. work is rewarded in reappointment (prof track only)	3.0	9.1%	30.9%	21.8%	24.5%	13.6%	110
Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	3.0	12.4%	29.7%	19.6%	20.0%	18.3%	509

Collaboration	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Opportunities for collab. within dept	3.8	28.9%	41.1%	14.3%	10.9%	4.8%	644
Opportunities for collab. outside inst	3.9	28.0%	42.1%	20.3%	6.5%	3.1%	611
Opportunities for collab. outside dept	3.7	21.3%	43.9%	20.7%	10.1%	3.9%	633

Mentoring	Mean	5: Very effective	4: Somewhat effective	3: Neither effective nor ineffective	2: Somewhat ineffective	1: Very ineffective	Total (N)
Effectiveness of mentoring within dept.	3.9	34.3%	42.1%	8.4%	8.8%	6.4%	534
Effectiveness of mentoring outside dept.	3.8	21.8%	48.9%	19.5%	6.1%	3.7%	380
Effectiveness of mentoring outside inst.	4.1	38.3%	43.1%	13.4%	4.1%	1.1%	441

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Being a mentor is fulfilling	4.3	44.3%	41.8%	9.3%	3.6%	1.0%	388
There is effective mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in dept (tenure track only)	3.5	20.5%	40.3%	12.9%	15.8%	10.5%	419
There is effective mentoring of tenured associate profs in dept (tenured assoc and full prof only)	2.7	9.5%	25.3%	18.3%	23.5%	23.5%	328
Institution provides support for faculty to be good mentors (tenured and prf tr only)	2.7	8.1%	19.0%	26.5%	26.3%	20.0%	479
There is effective mentoring of prof track faculty in dept (prof track only)	2.8	10.0%	28.9%	12.1%	24.2%	24.7%	190

	Mean	5: Very important	4: Important	3: Neither important nor unimportant	2: Unimportant	1: Very unimportant	Total (N)
Importance of mentoring within dept.	4.3	50.0%	39.0%	5.7%	3.5%	1.9%	634
Importance of mentoring outside dept.	3.7	23.0%	39.4%	22.6%	11.7%	3.4%	625
Importance of mentoring outside inst.	3.8	30.0%	36.6%	23.1%	7.1%	3.2%	623

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Did not serve as mentor to other faculty at inst. (tenured and prf tr only)	29.8%	70.2%	567
Served as mentor to pre-tenure fac outside dept (tenured and prf tr only)	8.5%	91.5%	567
Served as mentor to tenured fac outside dept (tenured and prf tr only)	35.1%	64.9%	567
Served as mentor to prof track fac in dept (tenured and prf tr only)	18.0%	82.0%	567
Served as mentor to pre-tenure fac in dept (tenured and prf tr only)	49.6%	50.4%	567
Served as mentor to tenured fac in dept (tenured and prf tr only)	21.7%	78.3%	567
Served as mentor to prof track fac outside dept (tenured and prf tr only)	11.6%	88.4%	567

Tenure Policies	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Somewhat clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Somewhat unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of tenure process (pre-tenured only)	3.7	23.6%	46.1%	10.1%	13.5%	6.7%	89
Clarity of tenure criteria (pre-tenured only)	3.5	20.2%	42.7%	7.9%	20.2%	9.0%	89
Clarity of tenure standards (pre-tenured only)	3.0	14.6%	31.5%	15.7%	19.1%	19.1%	89
Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure (pre-tenured only)	3.7	24.1%	42.5%	13.8%	16.1%	3.4%	87
Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure (pre-tenured only)	3.6	13.6%	48.9%	21.6%	10.2%	5.7%	88

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Consistency of messages about tenure (pre-tenured only)	3.0	9.1%	34.1%	19.3%	19.3%	18.2%	88
Tenure decisions are performance-based (pre-tenured only)	3.8	27.1%	44.7%	12.9%	10.6%	4.7%	85

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Have received formal feedback on progress toward tenure (pre-tenured only)	77.5%	22.5%	89

Tenure Expectations: Clarity	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Somewhat clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Somewhat unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of expectations: Scholar (pre-tenured only)	3.7	25.8%	40.4%	16.9%	13.5%	3.4%	89
Clarity of expectations: Teacher (pre-tenured only)	3.7	27.4%	38.1%	14.3%	15.5%	4.8%	84
Clarity of expectations: Advisor (pre-tenured only)	3.5	20.2%	35.7%	21.4%	17.9%	4.8%	84
Clarity of expectations: Colleague (pre-tenured only)	3.0	10.2%	31.8%	20.5%	25.0%	12.5%	88
Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen (pre-tenured only)	2.7	1.1%	28.7%	24.1%	28.7%	17.2%	87
Clarity of expectations: Broader community (pre-tenured only)	2.9	5.8%	30.2%	29.1%	20.9%	14.0%	86

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Believe will achieve tenure (pre-tenured only)	100.0%	0.0%	53

Promotion to Full	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Dept. culture encourages promotion (tenured only)	4.0	44.5%	30.1%	9.0%	8.7%	7.8%	335
Reasonable expectations: Promotion (tenured only)	4.0	40.5%	36.9%	8.8%	7.6%	6.3%	331

	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Somewhat clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Somewhat unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of promotion process (tenured only)	3.9	35.8%	42.5%	6.9%	8.7%	6.1%	346
Clarity of promotion criteria (tenured only)	3.8	32.4%	41.6%	7.2%	11.0%	7.8%	346
Clarity of promotion standards (tenured only)	3.6	25.4%	42.8%	10.1%	11.8%	9.8%	346
Clarity of body of evidence for promotion (tenured only)	4.0	39.3%	35.3%	11.6%	9.8%	4.0%	346
Clarity of time frame for promotion (tenured only)	3.6	28.9%	33.8%	14.5%	12.1%	10.7%	346
Clarity of whether I will be promoted (tenured assoc prof only)	3.1	13.2%	36.8%	17.5%	13.2%	19.3%	114

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Have received formal feedback on progress toward promotion to full professor (tenured assoc prof only)	32.1%	67.9%	109

Contract Renewal: Clarity	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Somewhat clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Somewhat unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of departmental contract renewal process (prf tr only)	3.3	19.9%	37.4%	10.9%	19.4%	12.3%	211
Clarity of departmental contract renewal criteria (prf tr only)	3.3	18.0%	37.0%	10.4%	23.2%	11.4%	211
Clarity of departmental contract renewal standards (prf tr only)	3.1	13.3%	36.0%	13.3%	25.1%	12.3%	211
Clarity of body of evidence for deciding contract renewal (prf tr only)	3.1	15.6%	29.3%	18.0%	22.9%	14.1%	205
Sense of contract renewal (prf tr only)	3.5	21.5%	41.1%	14.4%	13.9%	9.1%	209

Promotion Process: Clarity	Mean	5: Very clear	4: Somewhat clear	3: Neither clear nor unclear	2: Somewhat unclear	1: Very unclear	Total (N)
Clarity of promotion process (prf tr only)	2.9	13.1%	28.8%	11.1%	25.3%	21.7%	198
Clarity of critieria for promotion (prf tr only)	2.8	13.6%	27.3%	8.1%	28.8%	22.2%	198
Clarity of promotion standards (prf tr only)	2.7	11.2%	26.5%	10.2%	29.6%	22.4%	196
Clarity of body of evidence for promotion decisions (prf tr only)	2.8	13.3%	27.2%	10.8%	26.7%	22.1%	195
Sense of promotion (prf tr only)	3.0	15.6%	30.7%	15.6%	15.6%	22.4%	192

Leadership: Senior	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.2	9.5%	30.1%	37.5%	16.3%	6.6%	589
Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.3	12.1%	36.3%	30.6%	13.8%	7.2%	601
Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.1	9.9%	31.1%	28.8%	18.5%	11.7%	607
CAO: Pace of decision making	3.1	9.1%	27.1%	37.3%	17.2%	9.3%	582
CAO: Stated priorities	3.2	10.8%	29.5%	33.3%	16.5%	9.9%	594
CAO: Communication of priorities	3.0	9.0%	27.0%	30.7%	18.9%	14.4%	597

Leadership: Divisional	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Dean: Pace of decision making	3.3	12.5%	34.0%	32.5%	14.2%	6.8%	606
Dean: Stated priorities	3.4	15.4%	34.9%	26.7%	16.7%	6.4%	611
Dean: Communication of priorities	3.3	16.8%	32.5%	25.2%	17.0%	8.5%	612
Dean: Ensuring faculty input	3.2	14.4%	32.8%	24.1%	16.7%	12.0%	610

Leadership: Departmental	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.6	23.9%	36.9%	19.4%	12.8%	7.1%	578
Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.6	24.4%	38.0%	18.5%	10.9%	8.3%	579
Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.5	26.3%	32.8%	19.1%	12.4%	9.5%	582
Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.7	30.5%	34.3%	16.5%	8.2%	10.5%	583
Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.8	33.6%	36.7%	17.5%	4.4%	7.8%	566

Leadership: Faculty	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making	3.2	5.9%	26.1%	55.0%	8.8%	4.2%	525
Faculty leaders: Stated priorities	3.3	7.2%	33.6%	47.4%	8.1%	3.8%	530
Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities	3.4	8.4%	36.5%	43.6%	7.4%	4.1%	537
Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input	3.5	10.2%	38.3%	41.6%	6.3%	3.5%	538

Institutional Governance and Leadership	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Priorities are stated consistently	3.2	11.1%	37.1%	20.6%	20.4%	10.9%	588
Priorities are acted on consistently	2.9	7.9%	28.7%	24.3%	24.0%	15.2%	572
Changed priorities negatively affect my work	2.9	15.0%	18.3%	24.2%	26.8%	15.7%	574
Dean: Support in adapting to change	2.6	8.7%	17.7%	21.2%	30.3%	22.1%	231
Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change	3.2	20.8%	32.6%	14.0%	13.1%	19.5%	221
Visible leadership for support of diversity	4.0	37.8%	36.7%	12.7%	9.0%	3.8%	608

Shared Governance: Trust	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
I understand how to voice opinions about policies	2.9	7.1%	27.9%	26.7%	26.1%	12.3%	595
Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	3.1	8.4%	28.6%	34.1%	20.3%	8.4%	580

	Mean	5: Frequently	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement	3.2	7.7%	36.9%	31.4%	15.7%	8.3%	312
Faculty and admin have an open system of communication	2.9	5.4%	23.5%	34.0%	26.3%	10.7%	429
Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.1	9.5%	28.9%	31.6%	23.2%	6.8%	440

Shared Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	Mean	5: Frequently	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.4	2.9%	12.4%	27.7%	37.5%	19.6%	419
Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input	2.9	4.3%	24.2%	37.7%	26.3%	7.5%	483
Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	3.1	8.2%	30.2%	33.7%	19.8%	8.2%	404
Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.4	13.8%	39.1%	28.8%	12.1%	6.3%	448

Shared Governance: Understanding the Issues at Hand	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	2.9	6.1%	26.2%	32.3%	21.3%	14.1%	588

	Mean	5: Frequently	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	2.9	4.2%	23.6%	36.4%	26.3%	9.5%	525
Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions	2.5	2.7%	17.5%	28.9%	32.9%	18.0%	377
Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	2.9	5.6%	24.4%	36.9%	24.2%	8.9%	360

Shared Governance: Adaptability	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	2.8	4.3%	18.9%	42.1%	19.6%	15.2%	561
Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.6	4.5%	12.4%	42.2%	25.0%	16.0%	557

	Mean	5: Frequently	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	3.2	6.1%	28.2%	44.8%	15.7%	5.1%	489

Shared Governance: Productivity	Mean	5: Very effective	4: Somewhat effective	3: Neither effective nor ineffective	2: Somewhat ineffective	1: Very ineffective	Total (N)
Overall effectiveness of shared governance	2.9	6.9%	32.4%	19.4%	24.3%	17.0%	552

	Mean	5: Frequently	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.2	4.7%	33.1%	39.1%	19.8%	3.3%	338
Public recognition of progress	2.7	3.0%	15.8%	39.3%	32.3%	9.5%	430

Departmental Collegiality	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Colleagues support work/life balance	3.8	31.1%	38.8%	16.3%	7.9%	5.9%	572
Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.0	41.8%	33.0%	12.0%	7.4%	5.8%	619
Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.7	27.9%	37.7%	15.3%	12.4%	6.6%	620
Department is collegial	4.0	39.3%	38.3%	9.0%	6.7%	6.7%	624
Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	4.1	43.8%	34.0%	10.2%	8.1%	3.8%	605

	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Amount of personal interaction w/pre-tenured faculty	3.6	17.7%	42.1%	28.4%	9.3%	2.5%	525
How well you fit	3.5	23.7%	34.3%	18.7%	13.3%	10.1%	616
Amount of personal interaction w/tenured faculty	3.6	17.1%	41.7%	26.5%	11.1%	3.6%	532
Amount of personal interaction w/professional track faculty	3.7	18.4%	44.4%	28.2%	6.7%	2.2%	581

Departmental Engagement	Mean	5: Frequently	4: Regularly	3: Occasionally	2: Seldom	1: Never	Total (N)
Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.6	30.1%	30.8%	20.2%	10.9%	8.1%	608
Discussions of grad student learning	3.6	24.3%	34.1%	23.2%	9.5%	9.0%	613
Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.6	19.9%	37.6%	27.5%	9.4%	5.5%	614
Discussions of effective use of technology	3.5	19.1%	34.7%	29.9%	12.0%	4.4%	619
Discussions of current research methods	3.3	16.7%	31.4%	25.6%	18.1%	8.2%	609

	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Amount of professional interaction w/pre-tenured faculty	3.7	22.4%	45.7%	18.3%	11.2%	2.4%	536
Amount of professional interaction w/tenured faculty	3.7	20.2%	44.3%	19.7%	11.6%	4.2%	544
Amount of professional interaction w/professional track faculty	3.8	20.3%	47.2%	24.1%	6.9%	1.5%	597

Departmental Quality	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.8	24.1%	47.2%	16.7%	9.2%	2.8%	532
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenured faculty	4.1	40.0%	42.0%	11.6%	4.5%	1.9%	528
Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.8	26.0%	43.9%	19.4%	9.1%	1.6%	515
Scholarly productivity of pre-tenured faculty	4.1	37.3%	39.5%	16.2%	5.4%	1.5%	517
Intellectual vitality of prf tr faculty	4.0	32.5%	44.4%	15.0%	6.2%	1.9%	567
Scholarly productivity of prf tr faculty	3.8	27.1%	41.2%	23.0%	6.2%	2.4%	531
Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.7	22.2%	44.1%	21.5%	9.3%	2.8%	492
Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenured faculty	3.9	24.7%	49.8%	20.6%	3.4%	1.4%	494
Teaching effectiveness of prf tr faculty	4.2	40.3%	42.6%	11.9%	3.9%	1.3%	544

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment (tenured and prf tr only)	3.8	29.3%	41.2%	13.2%	10.2%	6.1%	522
Dept. is successful at faculty retention (tenured and prf tr only)	3.3	17.0%	35.3%	17.7%	20.2%	9.8%	519
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.6	7.1%	18.8%	22.8%	29.7%	21.7%	448

Appreciation and Recognition	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Recognition: For teaching	3.2	12.8%	36.9%	20.4%	19.0%	10.8%	563
Recognition: For advising	3.0	8.9%	30.1%	28.1%	21.8%	11.0%	481
Recognition: For scholarship	3.3	12.8%	38.2%	27.3%	13.8%	7.9%	579
Recognition: For service	3.1	9.3%	30.9%	28.6%	20.2%	11.1%	605
Recognition: For outreach	3.2	9.8%	29.1%	36.3%	15.4%	9.4%	468
Recognition: From colleagues	3.6	21.1%	40.3%	24.0%	9.7%	4.9%	616
Recognition: From CAO (tenured only)	2.8	8.1%	22.1%	31.8%	19.8%	18.2%	308
Recognition: From Dean (tenured only)	3.0	11.7%	24.1%	30.8%	19.0%	14.3%	315
Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.6	24.6%	36.4%	17.8%	12.0%	9.3%	569

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
School/college is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)	3.3	23.0%	31.1%	12.7%	20.2%	13.0%	322
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost (tenured only)	3.0	18.0%	23.5%	20.1%	20.4%	18.0%	323
CAO cares about faculty of my rank	3.0	11.6%	28.1%	22.2%	21.4%	16.7%	491

Retention	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
Outside offers not necessary as leverage in compensation negotiations	2.1	9.2%	11.1%	7.7%	20.7%	51.3%	468

	Yes	No	Total (N)
Have actively sought an outside job offer in past five years	31.6%	68.4%	624
Have received a formal job offer in past five years	13.9%	86.1%	624
Have renegotiated the terms of employment in past five years	20.8%	79.2%	624
Have done none of the above in past five years	48.9%	51.1%	624

	Use offer as leverage to renegotiate employment terms	To leave	Total (N)
Primary motivation for searching for outside offer	30.5%	69.5%	164

	Mean	5: Extremely seriously	4: Quite seriously	3: Moderately seriously	2: Slightly seriously	1: Not at all seriously	Total (N)
How seriously considered another job offer in last five years	4.0	41.9%	31.4%	10.5%	14.0%	2.3%	86

	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with institution's efforts to retain you	3.2	16.8%	26.9%	30.5%	11.4%	14.4%	167

Why would leave institution:	Yes - is primary reason would leave
To improve salary/benefits	24.8%
To find a more collegial work environment	3.3%
To find employer who provides more resources to support work	8.5%
To work at an institution whose priorities match own	6.3%
To pursue an administrative position	6.0%
To pursue a nonacademic job	2.7%
To improve employment opportunities for spouse/partner	2.5%
For other family or personal needs	5.0%
To improve quality of life	10.0%
To retire	20.8%
To move to preferred geographic location	4.5%
Other	4.3%
There is no reason why I would choose to leave this institution	1.2%
Total (N=600)	100.0%

Overall Satisfaction	Mean	5: Very satisfied	4: Satisfied	3: Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2: Dissatisfied	1: Very dissatisfied	Total (N)
Satisfaction with department as a place to work	3.8	32.5%	41.2%	10.6%	8.9%	6.8%	616
Satisfaction with institution as a place to work	3.7	22.0%	43.3%	17.8%	11.8%	5.0%	617

	Mean	5: Strongly agree	4: Somewhat agree	3: Neither agree nor disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	1: Strongly disagree	Total (N)
I would again choose to work at this institution	3.8	35.5%	31.9%	17.4%	9.7%	5.5%	580

	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)
Response if faculty candidate asked about department as a place to work	47.6%	44.8%	7.6%	603

Best aspect about working at institution	Yes - is best aspect*
Best aspect of working at institution: Quality of colleagues	35.4%
Best aspect of working at institution: Assistance for grant proposals	0.6%
Best aspect of working at institution: Childcare policies/support/availability	0.2%
Best aspect of working at institution: Spousal/partner hiring program	1.0%
Best aspect of working at institution: Compensation	3.2%
Best aspect of working at institution: Geographic location	37.0%
Best aspect of working at institution: Diversity	1.8%
Best aspect of working at institution: Presence of others like me	0.2%
Best aspect of working at institution: My sense of fit here	5.8%
Best aspect of working at institution: Protections from service/assignments	0.3%
Best aspect of working at institution: Support of colleagues	16.4%
Best aspect of working at institution: Cost of living	4.5%
Best aspect of working at institution: Teaching load	4.8%
Best aspect of working at institution: Manageable pressure to perform	6.8%
Best aspect of working at institution: Academic freedom	17.9%
Best aspect of working at institution: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	1.4%

Best aspect about working at institution (cont.)	Yes - is best aspect*
Best aspect of working at institution: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	11.1%
Best aspect of working at institution: Quality of leadership	1.6%
Best aspect of working at institution: Quality of graduate students	11.1%
Best aspect of working at institution: Quality of undergraduate students	11.9%
Best aspect of working at institution: Quality of facilities	4.3%
Best aspect of working at institution: Support for research/creative work	3.7%
Best aspect of working at institution: Support for teaching	2.3%
Best aspect of working at institution: Support for professional development	2.6%
*Respondents could select up to two best aspects	

Worst aspect about working at institution	Yes - is worst aspect*
Worst aspect of working at institution: Quality of colleagues	1.5%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Lack of assistance for grant proposals	8.9%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Childcare policies/support/availability (or lack thereof)	6.5%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Spousal/partner hiring program (or lack thereof)	2.1%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Compensation	31.1%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Geographic location	2.9%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Lack of diversity	3.9%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Absence of others like me	3.2%
Worst aspect of working at institution: My lack of fit here	4.7%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Too much service/too many assignments	10.0%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Support of colleagues	4.0%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Cost of living	6.9%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Teaching load	5.6%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Unrelenting pressure to perform	7.4%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Academic freedom	1.5%

Worst aspect about working at institution (cont.)	Yes - is worst aspect*
Worst aspect of working at institution: Tenure/promotion clarity or requirements	5.3%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues	1.5%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Quality of leadership	10.2%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Quality of graduate students	5.8%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Quality of undergraduate students	2.1%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Quality of facilities	13.7%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Lack of support	10.2%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Lack of support for teaching	2.6%
Worst aspect of working at institution: Lack of support for professional development	2.7%
*Respondents could select up to two worst aspects	

What adjustment to employment would most like to negotiate	Yes - would most like to adjust
Most like to adjust: Base salary	49.7%
Most like to adjust: Supplemental salary	3.5%
Most like to adjust: Tenure clock	0.2%
Most like to adjust: Teaching load	6.2%
Most like to adjust: Administrative responsibilities	5.5%
Most like to adjust: Equipment	1.6%
Most like to adjust: Lab/research support	11.3%
Most like to adjust: Employment for spouse/partner	2.1%
Most like to adjust: Sabbatical or other leave time	4.9%
Most like to adjust: Other	9.2%
There is nothing about my employment that I wish to adjust	5.8%
Total (N=487)	100.0%