

NC State University COACHE AY11-12 Faculty Satisfaction Survey Overview Report

Introduction

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) Faculty Satisfaction Survey, administered by the Harvard Graduate School of Education, is designed to collect information from faculty on areas deemed critical to their professional success. Benchmark measures cover such areas as the nature of work in research, teaching and service; resources; compensation; departmental collegiality; leadership and governance; mentoring; and the tenure and promotion process. The purpose is to provide campus leaders with insight into the experiences and concerns of faculty in order to better enable the institution to provide a quality work life, thereby enhancing recruitment and retention efforts.

NC State tenure-track faculty (i.e., those who are either pre-tenured or tenured) as well as non-tenure track faculty participated in the COACHE survey during the 2011-2012 academic year. A complete discussion of the survey design and response rates is available online, in the “Introduction: Survey Methods, Response Rates and Respondent Profile” report. Also available online are detailed tables with results, overall and for various subgroups of the faculty, and a report highlighting key findings from the survey.

This report provides a comprehensive overview of the results from the AY11-12 survey. Specifically, it first offers a comparison of the results from NC State pre-tenured and tenured faculty to those at our COACHE peer institutions. We then focus on results for NC State faculty (including non-tenure track). First we look at measures of overall satisfaction, then turn to the individual items in each of the benchmark categories. Results include those for all faculty, as well as highlights of notable differences between ratings for various subgroups, specifically, by gender, by race, by tenure-track status (i.e., non-tenure track vs tenure-track), by tenure status (pre-tenured, tenured), and by rank (Associate vs Full Professor). This report ends with a brief summary of changes in findings between the current survey, and when NC State last participated in the COACHE survey in 2008.

Additional reports on the AY11-12 COACHE Survey are available online at http://www2.acs.ncsu.edu/UPA/archives/survey/reports/coache/coache.ay11_12.toc.htm

COACHE Peer Comparisons

A primary benefit of participating in the COACHE survey is to obtain comparative data for pre-tenured and tenured faculty (“tenure-track”) from other participating institutions.¹ Each participating institution is invited to select five other schools to include in an aggregated comparison group. The five institutions NC State selected were

- Clemson University
- Kansas State University
- Purdue University
- SUNY – University at Albany
- University of Tennessee

In what follows we explore those benchmark areas in which NC State tenure-track faculty overall are more or less satisfied that their COACHE peers, and highlight differences in ratings between specific groups of faculty (e.g., women, faculty of color) and their respective COACHE peers. A complete list of items on which they notably differed, including average ratings, is available online.

Tenure-Track Faculty Overall

¹ Peer comparisons are not available for non-tenure track faculty.

There were relatively few items for which NC State tenure-track faculty overall (pre-tenured and tenured) gave notably different ratings than their COACHE peers. NC State tenure-track faculty overall gave similar ratings to faculty at our COACHE peer institutions on virtually all of the individual items in each of the following benchmark areas:

- Nature of Work: Research, Service, Teaching, Other
- Interdisciplinary work
- Collaboration
- Tenure policies, clarity, and reasonableness
- Institutional governance and Leadership: Senior, Divisional, Departmental
- Department collegiality, engagement, quality
- Recognition
- Retention
- Overall Satisfaction

There were a small number of areas in which NC State tenure-track faculty overall were more satisfied than their COACHE peers, most notably for *classrooms*, *library resources*, and *offices*. NC State tenured faculty also gave more favorable ratings than their COACHE peers to the *department culture encouraging promotion*. And, while tenured faculty's satisfaction regarding the *mentoring of associate faculty* is relatively low, NC State's average ratings were notably higher than were those from our COACHE peers.

NC State tenure-track faculty were notably less satisfied than their COACHE peers with *clerical/administrative support* and with several items related to benefits. Average ratings for *health benefits for family* and *health benefits for the employee* were among the least positive of all items asked about on the survey, and were substantially lower than ratings given by our COACHE peers. While NC State tenure-track faculty were more positive about *retirement benefits*, their average ratings were still notably lower than those of our COACHE peers. Finally, when asked about *tuition waivers, remission or exchange* - - which NC State does not offer - - our tenure-track faculty were notably less satisfied than their COACHE peers.

Sub-Group Comparisons

With minimal variations, the ratings of specific sub-groups of faculty (e.g., women, pre-tenured, faculty-of-color) on the items noted above for faculty overall were similarly higher or lower than those given by their respective counterparts at our aggregated COACHE peer institutions. The individual groups of faculty, however, gave notably different ratings than their COACHE peers on various other items as well.

By Gender

In addition to the aforementioned differences in ratings, female faculty at NC State had notably lower ratings than women at our COACHE peer institutions on several items, particularly those related to *divisional leadership* and *appreciation and recognition*. They also gave lower ratings to *priorities being consistently stated* and *acted on* by university leaders, and to *salary*. Female faculty at NC State gave more favorable rating than their COACHE peers, however, to the *number of committees on which they are asked to serve*, and to *spousal/partner hiring programs*.

Male faculty at NC State were generally somewhat more positive than their male counterparts at our COACHE peer institutions. They gave consistently higher ratings to various areas related to *senior leadership*, as well as to the *equity of committee assignments*, and the *mentoring of pre-tenured faculty*. Male faculty at NC State gave lower ratings than their COACHE peers to *pre- and post-award grant support*, to the *equity of committee assignments*, and to *childcare policies*.

By Race

Faculty of color at NC State gave notably different ratings than did those at our COACHE peer institutions in a number of areas. They were more positive than their peers about the *quality of their department*, the *quality of graduate students to support their research*, and *equipment* available to them. They were also more positive about the *support faculty get in leadership roles*, and their *opportunities to collaborate with*

those outside their department. They gave lower ratings to some areas related to *divisional leadership*, and to *childcare and eldercare policies* (the latter of which NC State does not have).

Pre-tenured faculty of color at NC State gave more favorable ratings than their COACHE peers to *interdisciplinary work being rewarded in the tenure process*, but gave less favorable rating to the *clarity of expectations for teaching*. NC State faculty of color with the rank of Associate Professor, however, were more positive than their COACHE peers about the *reasonableness of the expectations for successful promotion* to Full Professor.

Other than the areas noted above for faculty overall, white faculty at NC State generally did not differ from white faculty at our COACHE peer institutions, the exception being those at NC State gave more favorable ratings to *senior leadership's communication of priorities*. In addition, pre-tenured white faculty at NC State were more positive than their peers about *stop-the-clock policies*, and white Associate Professors were more positive about the *clarity of whether they would be promoted to Full*.

By Tenure Status

Pre-tenured faculty at NC State were consistently less satisfied than their COACHE peers with various aspects of *support for research* and with *divisional leadership*. They were also less satisfied with their *salary*. And, while they are also less likely than their COACHE peers to believe that *priorities are stated consistently* by university leaders, they gave higher ratings than their peers to *the communication of priorities* by senior leadership. Pre-tenured faculty gave more favorable ratings than their COACHE peers to the *equity of committee assignments*, and to *opportunities to collaborate outside the institution*.

Other than the items noted above for faculty overall, the only notable difference between tenured faculty at NC State and their COACHE peers is that NC State tenured faculty gave more favorable ratings to the *mentoring of pre-tenured faculty*.

By Rank

While Associate Professors at NC State were consistently less satisfied than Full Professors (discussed below), they gave notably more favorable ratings than did the Associate Professors at our COACHE peer institutions on several items. Specifically, our Associate Professors were more positive than their COACHE peers with *committee assignments*, the *time they have to spend on research*, and the *equipment* available to them. They also gave more favorable ratings to the *pace of decision making by senior leadership*, and to the *support they get from their department head in adapting to changing priorities*. They were more likely to say their *department is successful at faculty retention*, that there is *visible leadership in support for diversity*, and that they *would again choose to work at NC State*.

Other than those items for which NC State faculty overall were less satisfied than our COACHE peers, NC State pre-tenured faculty did not give notably lower ratings than their counterparts at our COACHE peer institutions. Similarly, the only other notable difference between Full Professors at NC State and those at our COACHE peers was that NC State Full Professors were less satisfied that their COACHE peer counterparts with the *pace of decision making at the divisional level*.

Overall Satisfaction of NC State Faculty

The COACHE survey included several items designed to measure the overall satisfaction of faculty. In this section of the report we present results from these items, both for faculty overall (i.e., non-tenure track, pre-tenured, and tenured combined) and by specific groups (i.e., NTT vs tenure-track faculty; pre-tenured vs tenured faculty; associate vs full professors; women vs men; and faculty of color vs white faculty).

Overall Satisfaction with Department and University

Based on their responses to a small number of items measuring their general satisfaction, the majority of faculty feel favorably about working at NC State, especially with respect to their own department. Three-

fourths of the faculty overall reported being either “very satisfied” (30%) or “satisfied” (43%) with their *department as a place to work*. Just over half of faculty (51%) would “strongly recommend” their department as a place to work to someone of their same rank, and another 42 percent would recommend it “with reservations.” When asked to think more broadly about NC State as a whole, about two-thirds said they were either “very satisfied” (18%) or “satisfied” (45%) with *NC State as a place to work*. Two-thirds of the faculty “strongly agree” (36%) or “somewhat agree” (31%) that if they had it do over, they would *again choose to work at NC State*. There were some notable variations between groups of faculty in their overall satisfaction.

Non-Tenure Track vs Tenure-Track Faculty

Non-tenure track faculty generally expressed more overall satisfaction with their *department as a place to work* and *NC State as a place to work* than did faculty on the tenure-track (pre-tenured and tenured combined). However, while they were more likely than tenure-track faculty to “strongly agree” that they would *again choose to work at NC State* if starting over (42% vs 34%), they were less likely to say they would “strongly recommend” *NC State as a place to work to a colleague of their same rank* (44% vs 53%).

Pre-tenured vs Tenured Faculty

Pre-tenured faculty were more likely than tenured faculty to be “very satisfied” with their *department as a place to work* (36% vs 27%) and with *NC State as a place to work* (26% vs 16%). They were also more likely to “strongly agree” that they would *again choose to work at NC State* (42% vs 33%).

Associate vs Full Professors

Associate professors were slightly less positive than full professors on all measures of general satisfaction. They were less likely to be “very satisfied” with their *department* (24% vs 30%) and *NC State* (14% vs 19%) *as a place to work*, to “strongly agree” that they would *again choose to work at NC State* (30% vs 35%), and to “strongly recommend” their *department as a place to work* (48% vs 56%).

Women vs Men

The only gender difference evident in measures of the overall satisfaction of faculty was that women were slightly less likely than men to say they would “strongly recommend” their *department as a place to work* (46% vs 54%).

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty

While there were no racial/ethnic difference in satisfaction with either their *department* or *NC State as a place to work*, faculty of color were less likely than white faculty to “strongly agree” that they would *again choose this institution* (30% vs 37%), and were more than twice as likely as white faculty to “strongly disagree” that they would *again choose to work at NC State* (12% vs 5%).

“Best” and “Worst” Aspects of Working at NC State

When asked to select two items from a long list of possible best aspects about working at NC State, *geographic location* and *quality of colleagues* topped the list, selected by 40 percent and 32 percent, respectively, of NC State faculty. The next most commonly selected best aspects were *academic freedom* (18%) and *my sense of “fit” here* (15%). Using the same list, when asked to identify the two worst aspects of working at NC State, *compensation* was by far the most common response, selected by 42% of faculty. The other most commonly mentioned aspects were *lack of support for research/creative work* (15%), and *quality of the facilities* (11%). There were some noteworthy differences between groups and their opinions about the best and worst aspects of working at NC State, described below.

Non-Tenure Track vs Tenure-Track Faculty

Non-tenure track and tenure-track (pre-tenured and tenured) faculty generally gave similar responses to what they consider to be the best aspects of working at NC State, with *geographic location*, *quality of colleagues*, *academic freedom*, *support of colleagues*, and *sense of fit* topping the list for both groups. The only notable difference between them was that non-tenure track faculty were more likely than those on the tenure-track to say that the *quality of undergraduate students* was one of the two best aspects of working at NC State (10% vs 3%).

Perceptions of the worst aspects of working at NC State varied by tenure-track status. While *compensation* topped the list for both groups, NTTs were more likely than tenure-track faculty to cite compensation as a worst aspect (49% vs 40%). Tenure-track faculty were more likely to mention *lack of support for research/creative work* (17% vs 8%), while NTTs were more likely to mention *lack of support for professional development* (10% vs 5%) and for *teaching* (9% vs 5%). NTTs were twice as likely as those on the tenure-track to select *teaching load* as among the two worst aspects of their work at NC State (12% vs 5%). The four best and worst aspects to be selected by non-tenure track and tenure-track faculty were:

| Best Aspects | | Worst Aspects | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| Non-Tenure Track | Tenure-Track | Non-Tenure Track | Tenure-Track |
| Geographic location (40%) | Geographic location (40%) | Compensation (49%) | Compensation (40%) |
| Quality of colleagues (28%) | Quality of colleagues (32%) | Teaching load (12%) | Lack of support for creative/scholarly work (17%) |
| Academic freedom (18%) | Academic freedom (19%) | Lack of support for professional development (10%) | Quality of facilities (12%) |
| Support of colleagues (16%) | My sense of “fit” here (16%) | Lack of support for teaching (9%) / Quality of facilities (9%) | Quality of graduate students (11%) |

Pre-tenured vs Tenured Faculty

Pre-tenured faculty were more likely than tenured faculty to say that their *sense of “fit” here* is one of the two best aspects of working at NC State (21% vs 15%), while tenured faculty were more likely than pre-tenured faculty to say *geographic location* (42% vs 32%) and *academic freedom* (19% vs 14%) were among the best aspects of working here. With respect to **worst** aspects, pre-tenured faculty were slightly more likely than tenured faculty to mention *quality of graduate students* (14% vs 10%), and slightly less likely to mention *lack of support for research/creative work* (12% vs 18%). The four best and worst aspects most likely to be selected by pre-tenured and tenured faculty were:

| Best Aspects | | Worst Aspects | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| Pre-Tenured | Tenured | Pre-Tenured | Tenured |
| Quality of colleagues (33%) | Geographic location (42%) | Compensation (38%) | Compensation (38%) |
| Geographic location (32%) | Quality of colleagues (32%) | Quality of graduate students (14%) | Lack of support for creative/scholarly work (18%) |
| My sense of “fit” here (21%) | Academic freedom (19%) | Lack of support for creative/scholarly work (12%) | Quality of facilities (12%) |
| Support of colleagues (15%) | My sense of “fit” here (14%) | Lack of assistance for grant proposals (11%) | Quality of graduate students (10%) |

Associate vs Full Professors

Associate and full professors shared many similarities in their assessments of the best and worst aspects of working at NC State. The most notable differences between them with respect to the best aspects are

that full professors were more likely than associate professors to mention *quality of colleagues* (36% vs 26%), but were less likely than associate professors to mention *support of colleagues* (11% vs 15%). With respect to the worst aspects, full professors were more likely than associate professors to mention *quality of facilities* (15% vs 7%). The four best and worst aspects most likely to be selected by associate and full professors were:

| Best Aspects | | Worst Aspects | |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Associate Professors | Full Professors | Associate Professors | Full Professors |
| Geographic location (39%) | Geographic location (43%) | Compensation (38%) | Compensation (40%) |
| Quality of colleagues (26%) | Quality of colleagues (36%) | Lack of support for creative/scholarly work (16%) | Lack of support for creative/scholarly work (19%) |
| Academic freedom (19%) | Academic freedom (19%) | Too much service/too many assignments (11%) | Quality of facilities (15%) |
| My sense of "fit" here (16%) | Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues (14%) | My lack of "fit" here (10%) | Quality of graduate students (11%) |

Women vs Men

There were only minimal gender differences in what faculty identify as the best and worst aspects of working at NC State. The only notable difference is that men were more likely than women to cite *compensation* as drawback (44% vs 38%). The four best and worst aspects most likely to be selected by women and men were:

| Best Aspects | | Worst Aspects | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| Women | Men | Women | Men |
| Geographic location (40%) | Geographic location (40%) | Compensation (38%) | Compensation (44%) |
| Quality of colleagues (30%) | Quality of colleagues (32%) | Lack of support for creative/scholarly work (15%) | Lack of support for creative/scholarly work (16%) |
| Academic freedom (17%) | Academic freedom (19%) | Too much service/too many assignments (10%) | Quality of facilities (12%) |
| Support of colleagues (15%) | My sense of "fit" here (16%) | Quality of facilities (9%) | Quality of graduate students (10%) |

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty

There were fairly substantial differences in what faculty of color consider the best and worst aspects of working at NC State compared to what white faculty consider to be the best and worst aspects of working here. For example, faculty of color were much more likely than white faculty to say the *cost of living* is among the best aspects (15% vs 7%), and less likely than white faculty to say *quality of colleagues* (20% vs 34%), *support of colleagues* (7% vs 15%), *opportunities to collaborate with colleagues* (11% vs 15%), or *my sense of "fit" here* (12% vs 16%). With respect to their perceptions of the worst aspects of working at NC State, faculty of color were slightly more likely than white faculty to select *absence of others like me*

(10% vs 6%) and *spousal/partner hiring program* (8% vs 2%). Faculty of color were less likely than white faculty to say that *compensation* (36% vs 42%), and *quality of facilities* (8% vs 12%) were among the worst aspects of working at NC State. The four best and worst aspects most likely to be selected by faculty of color and white faculty were:

| Best Aspects | | Worst Aspects | |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|
| Faculty of Color | White Faculty | Faculty of Color | White Faculty |
| Geographic location (41%) | Geographic location (40%) | Compensation (36%) | Compensation (42%) |
| Quality of colleagues (25%) | Quality of colleagues (33%) | Lack of support for creative/scholarly work (14%) | Lack of support for creative/scholarly work (15%) |
| Academic freedom (22%) | Academic freedom (18%) | Absence of others like me (10%) | Quality of facilities (12%) |
| Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues (15%) | My sense of "fit" here (16%) | Quality of graduate students (9%) | Quality of graduate students (9%) |

Retention

When faculty were asked what would be their primary reason for ever leaving NC State, aside from *retirement* (mentioned by 23% of faculty), the most common reason given was *to improve my salary/benefits* (22%), followed by *to find an employer who provides more resources to support my work* (10%) and *to work at an institution whose priorities match my own* (10%).

There were only a few variations in reasons for possibly leaving NC State given by different groups. Non-tenure track faculty often cited *to improve my prospects for promotion* as a reason for possibly leaving (12%). Pre-tenured professors, not surprisingly, were less like than others to cite *retirement* as a reason for leaving. In addition to the most commonly mentioned reasons noted above, pre-tenured faculty often mentioned *to improve my quality of life* (11%) or *to move to a preferred geographic location* (9%).

COACHE Benchmark Measures

In this section of the report we first present an overview of results from all NC State faculty (non-tenure track, pre-tenured, and tenured combined; except where noted) on the various items in each COACHE benchmark area, noting those items on the survey that received the most and least positive average ratings. We then turn to the specific items in each of the benchmark areas covered in the survey, focusing on differences in responses by tenure-track status (NTT vs tenure-track faculty; and pre-tenured vs tenured faculty), rank (associate vs full professors), gender (women vs men), and race (faculty of color vs white faculty).

NC State Faculty: Overall Highs and Lows

Average ratings for the approximately 150 individual items on the COACHE survey ranged from a high of 4.38 to a low of 2.26 on a 5-point scale, with a "5" being the most positive rating.² In general, faculty

² Based on a five-point scale, where "5"="very satisfied," "4"="satisfied," "3"="neither satisfied nor dissatisfied," "2"="dissatisfied," and "1"="very dissatisfied" or, in some cases, where "5"="strongly agree," "4"="somewhat agree," "3"="neither agree nor disagree," "2"="somewhat disagree," and "1"="strongly disagree." Note that for all items a higher average rating would indicate a more favorable or positive response. Those who declined to answer the question or who responded "not applicable" or "don't know" were excluded from the analyses.

overall tended to be most positive about issues related to academic freedom, and with the clarity and reasonableness of various tenure and promotion processes and expectations. In contrast, areas that tended to be viewed less favorably were those related to benefits (several of which are not offered at NC State), and to support and rewards for interdisciplinary work.

The following areas were viewed most favorably by faculty overall, with each receiving an average rating of at least 4.0:

- Discretion of course content (4.38)
- Influence over focus of research (4.28)
- Importance of mentoring within the department (4.21)
- Library resources (4.19)
- Reasonableness of tenure expectations as a scholar (pre-tenured only) (4.15)
- Being a mentor is fulfilling (NTT and tenured faculty only) (4.10)
- Department meeting times are compatible with personal needs (4.09)
- Level of courses taught (4.06)
- Intellectual vitality of pre-tenured faculty (4.06)
- Clarity of the promotion process (tenured faculty only) (4.05)
- Reasonableness of tenure expectations as a teacher (pre-tenured only) (4.01)
- Clarity of the body of evidence for promotion (tenured faculty only) (4.00)

The specific areas asked about that received the lowest average ratings (below 2.75) were:

- Housing benefits (2.26)
- Health benefits for family (2.34)
- Child care (2.35)
- Support for faculty to be good mentors (*NTT and tenured faculty only*) (2.42)
- Tuition waivers, remission or exchange (2.43)
- Mentoring of non-tenure track faculty (*NTT faculty only*) (2.56)
- Dean's support in adapting to changing mission (2.56)
- Budgets encourage interdisciplinary work (2.57)
- Institutional priorities are acted on consistently (2.57)
- Clarity of the promotion process for NTT faculty (*NTT faculty only*) (2.58)
- Clarity of the promotion standards for NTT faculty (*NTT faculty only*) (2.59)
- Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in merit (2.62)
- Eldercare (2.64)
- Clarity of the promotion criteria for NTT faculty (*NTT faculty only*) (2.64)
- Facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work (2.65)
- Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in promotion (*NTT and tenured faculty only*) (2.67)
- Mentoring of associate faculty (*tenured faculty only*) (2.69)
- Clarity of the body of evidence for promotion for NTT faculty (*NTT faculty only*) (2.69)
- Clarity of whether I will be promoted (*NTT faculty only*) (2.69)
- Department addresses sub-standard performance (2.73)
- Institutional priorities are stated consistently (2.74)

Benchmark: Nature of Work (Research, Teaching, & Service)

The COACHE survey included 29 items asking faculty about the "nature of work," specifically as related to research, teaching, service, or other activities. Average ratings for all NC State faculty combined (pre-tenured, tenured, and NTT) varied substantially on these items, ranging from a high of 4.38 (*discretion over course content*) to a low of 2.77 (*support for research*).

Research

Faculty overall were overwhelmingly positive about the influence they have over the focus of their research, and very satisfied with the time they have to spend on research. Ratings for other aspects of

research were generally positive, with the exception of support for securing graduate student assistance, availability of course release for research, and support for research, all of which had average ratings of less than 3.0.

Service

Satisfaction with service expectations and experiences was generally high, most notably for number of committees and time spend on service. Faculty were least satisfied with support for faculty in leadership roles.

Teaching

Faculty were generally satisfied with their work as related to teaching, but were most satisfied with their discretion over course content, and, though still positive, relatively less satisfied the distribution of the teaching load.

Average ratings for many of the items in the area of “Nature of Work” varied, sometimes widely, by group, as discussed below.

Non-Tenure Track vs Tenure-Track Faculty

Non-tenure track faculty tended to be more satisfied than pre-tenured and tenured faculty (combined) with various aspects of their work as related to research, teaching and service. Non-tenure track faculty gave notably higher average ratings than pre-tenures/tenure-track faculty to:

- Support for research (3.04 NTT vs 2.72 tenure-track)
- Support for obtaining grants (pre-award) (3.38 vs 3.12)
- Support for travel to present/conduct research (3.45 vs 3.01)
- Support for faculty in leadership roles (3.12 vs 2.87)
- Time spent on service (3.81 vs 3.54)
- Time spent on teaching (4.24 vs 3.90)
- Time spent on administrative tasks (3.40 vs 2.86)
- Quality of students taught (3.69 vs 3.36)
- Quality of grad students to support teaching (3.62 vs 3.33)

The only item in this benchmark area that non-tenure track faculty were notably less satisfied than pre-tenured/tenured faculty was *influence over focus of research* (3.99 vs 4.34).

Pre-tenured vs Tenured Faculty

There were relatively few differences between pre-tenured and tenured faculty with respect to their satisfaction with the nature of their work as related to research, service and teaching. In no case did pre-tenured faculty give notably lower average ratings than tenured faculty, and for only two items did they give notably higher ratings:

- Support for travel to present/conduct research (3.26 pre-tenured vs 2.96 tenured)
- Support for faculty in leadership roles (3.13 vs 2.83)

Associate vs Full Professors

Associate Professors were consistently less satisfied than Full Professors with the areas asked about in the COACHE survey. The specific areas related to their research, teaching, and service in which they were notably less satisfied were:

- Time spent on research (3.44 vs 3.74)
- Discretion to choose committees (3.30 vs 3.59)
- Number of student advisees (3.51 vs 3.82)
- Quality of grad students to support teaching (3.21 vs 3.46)
- Ability to balance teaching/research/service (3.15 vs 3.59)

Women vs Men

NTT, Pre-tenured, and Tenured Faculty Combined: In looking at faculty overall, in no case did male faculty members give lower average ratings than female faculty to any aspect of their work as related to

research, service, and teaching. Female faculty gave notably lower ratings than male faculty on three items:

- Time spent on research (3.42 vs 3.68)
- Equitability of committee assignments (3.06 vs 3.37)
- Ability to balance teaching/research/teaching (3.25 vs 3.53)

Pre-tenured and Tenured Combined: Females on the tenure-track (pre-tenured and tenured combined), gave notably lower average ratings than their male counterparts on several other areas in addition to those listed above:

- Time spent on research (3.42 vs 3.71)
- Support for securing grad student assistance (2.66 vs 2.93)
- Support for faculty in leadership roles (2.68 vs 2.95)
- Equitability of committee assignments (2.96 vs 3.37)
- Number of student advisees (3.53 vs 3.79)
- Time spent on teaching (3.70 vs 3.97)
- Ability to balance teaching/research/service (3.11 vs 3.53)

Non-Tenure-track Only: The only notably gender difference in average ratings in this area for NTT faculty was for *expectations for finding external funding*, with female NTTs having an average rating of 3.25 compared to males average rating of 3.58.

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty (NTT, Pre-tenured, and Tenured Faculty Combined)

Overall, faculty of color were notably more satisfied than white faculty with three specific areas related to research, teaching and research, and in no case were they notably less satisfied. Faculty of color gave higher average ratings than white faculty to

- Support for faculty in leadership roles (3.23 vs 2.87)
- Ability to balance teaching/research/service (3.69 vs 3.39)
- Support to travel to present/conduct research (3.30 vs 3.04)

Benchmark: Facilities, Personal/Family Policies, Benefits, and Salary

The COACHE survey includes a total of 23 questions asking faculty specifically about their satisfaction with the facilities and resources available to them, personal and family policies, their health and retirement benefits, and their salary. As noted above, it was in these areas that NC State pre-tenured and tenured faculty were most likely to notably differ from those at our COACHE peer institutions. Specifically, NC State faculty were notably more satisfied than those faculty at our COACHE peer institutions with *offices, classrooms, and library resources* and notably less satisfied than our COACHE peers with *clerical/administrative support*, and with a range of *benefits*.

Facilities and Work Resources

As noted above, faculty overall gave favorable ratings to facilities and work resources, such as labs, computing, and equipment. They were most positive about library resources, and least positive about clerical/administrative support.

Personal and Family Policies

Faculty were asked about their satisfaction with a number of different types of personal and family policies, some of which are not offered at NC State. While faculty were satisfied with policies related to tenure (i.e., stop-the-clock), flexible workload/modified duties, and family medical/parental leave, they gave some of the lowest ratings on the survey to benefits related to housing (which we do not offer), childcare, and tuition waivers, remission, or exchange (which we also do not offer). Also receiving relatively low ratings were policies related to eldercare (not offered) and spousal/partner hiring program.

Health and Retirement Benefits

Faculty overall were satisfied with retirement benefits and phased retirement options. They were generally less satisfied with health benefits for themselves, and particularly dissatisfied with health benefits for their family.

Salary

As noted above in the section above on “overall satisfaction,” faculty identify “compensation” as one of the two worst aspects of working at NC State. Not surprisingly, similar to health benefits, when asked specifically about salary, satisfaction ratings are relatively low.

Average ratings for many of the items in the benchmark area of “Facilities, Personal/Family Policies, Benefits and Salary” varied, sometimes widely, by group, as discussed below.

Non-Tenure Track vs Tenure-Track Faculty

Non-tenure track faculty at NC State were more satisfied than those on the tenure-track (pre-tenured and tenured combine) with numerous areas related to facilities and work resources, personal/family policies, and benefits, and in no case were they notably less satisfied. NTT gave notably higher average ratings than tenure-track faculty for:

- Facilities and work resources
 - Equipment (3.83 vs 3.50)
 - Computing and technical support (3.90 vs 3.48)
- Personal and family policies
 - Housing benefits (2.63 vs 2.20)
 - Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange (3.45 vs 2.16)
 - Eldercare (2.93 vs 2.59)
 - Flexible workload/modified duties (3.90 vs 3.54)
 - Institution does what it can for work/life compatibility (3.46 vs 2.99)
 - Right balance between professional/personal (3.63 vs 3.36)
- Health and retirement benefits
 - Health benefits for employee (3.35 vs 2.77)
 - Health benefits for family (2.75 vs 2.25)
 - Retirement benefits (3.53 vs 3.06)

Pre-tenured vs Tenured Faculty

Pre-tenured faculty gave notably higher average ratings than tenured faculty on three items in this area, and notably lower ratings on one item. They were more satisfied with

- Clerical/administrative support (3.21 vs 2.93)
- Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange (2.43 vs 2.10)
- Retirement benefits (3.35 vs 3.00)

Pre-tenured faculty were less satisfied than tenured faculty with *right balance between professional and personal life* (3.02 vs 3.43). It is important to note that this is the only item on the COACHE survey that pre-tenured faculty rated, on average, lower than did tenured faculty.

Associate vs Full Professors

Associate professors gave notably lower average ratings than full professors to only two items in this area:

- Right balance between professional/personal (3.23 vs 3.55)
- Salary (2.64 vs 2.92)

They were, however, more satisfied than their tenured peers with *eldercare* (2.87 vs 2.51).

Women vs Men (NTT, Pre-tenured, and Tenured Faculty Combined)

Overall, there were few meaningful gender differences in satisfaction with respect to facilities, personal/family policies, benefits, and salary. Female faculty gave notably higher ratings than men to two

benefits that do not actually exist at NC State (housing, and tuition waivers/remission/exchange), as well as to *spousal/partner higher program* (2.94 vs 2.97) Women, however, were notably less satisfied than men with *right balance between professional/personal life* (3.22 vs 3.51)

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty (NTT, Pre-tenured, and Tenured Faculty Combined)

Faculty of color gave notably lower average ratings than white faculty for two items in this area:

- Stop the clock policies (pre-tenured faculty only) (3.42 vs 3.71)
- Salary (2.50 vs 2.80)

Benchmark: Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring

There are 20 items related to interdisciplinary work, collaboration, and mentoring on the COACHE survey. In general, while faculty overall give favorable ratings to opportunities for collaboration, they are notably less satisfied with various aspects of engaging in and being rewarded for interdisciplinary work. Satisfaction with mentoring is somewhat more mixed.

Interdisciplinary Work

As noted above, specific items related to interdisciplinary work received some of the lowest average ratings of all items on the survey, with all six items in this area having an average rating of less than 3.0. In general, faculty are relatively less satisfied with budgets and facilities being supportive of interdisciplinary work, and the extent to which such work is evaluative and rewarded.

Collaboration

Faculty are satisfied with the opportunities they have to collaborate with others, including those in and out of their department, and outside the university.

Mentoring

Overall, faculty see mentoring, particularly from within the department, to be important. They think there is effective mentoring in general, especially from outside the institution. However, they are more positive about the mentoring of pre-tenured faculty than they are of associate faculty. Lowest ratings in the area of mentoring were given to support for faculty to be good mentors.

Average ratings for many of the items in the benchmark area of "Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring" varied, sometimes widely, by group, as discussed below.

Non-Tenure Track vs Tenure-Track Faculty

NTT faculty gave, on average, notably higher ratings than tenure-track faculty on some areas related to interdisciplinary work, collaboration, and mentoring, and lower average ratings on other items in these areas. Specifically, NTTs were more likely than tenure-track faculty to be satisfied with:

- Budgets encourage interdisciplinary work (2.91 vs 2.52)
- Facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work (2.93 vs 2.59)
- Support for faculty to be good mentors (2.64 vs 2.37)

NTTs were less likely to be satisfied with:

- Opportunities for collaboration outside the institution (3.39 vs 3.86)
- Effectiveness of mentoring from outside the institution (3.44 vs 3.70)

NTT faculty also gave low ratings to the *effectiveness of mentoring of non-tenure track faculty* (2.56).

Pre-Tenured vs Tenured Faculty

Pre-tenured faculty gave notably higher ratings, on average, than tenured faculty to a number of specific areas related to mentoring. There were differences between the two groups in their ratings for interdisciplinary work or collaboration. Pre-tenured faculty were more likely than tenured faculty to see each of the following as effective or important:

- Effectiveness of mentoring from outside the institution (3.92 vs 3.64)

- Importance of mentoring within department (4.41 vs 4.13)
- Importance of mentoring outside department (3.53 vs 3.26)
- Importance of mentoring outside the institution (3.93 vs 3.49)

Associate vs Full Professors

Associate professors were consistently less satisfied than full professors with opportunities for collaboration and mentoring, and more likely to see mentoring as important. Specifically, associate professors gave notably lower ratings, on average, than full professors for

- Opportunities for collaboration within department (3.64 vs 3.91)
- Opportunities for collaboration outside the institution (3.65 vs 3.94)
- Mentoring of pre-tenured faculty (3.07 vs 3.47)
- Mentoring of associate faculty (2.28 vs 2.94)
- Support for faculty to be good mentors (2.10 vs 2.51)

Associate professors gave notably higher average ratings to

- Importance of mentoring outside department (3.46 vs 3.17)
- Importance of mentoring outside the institution (3.67 vs 3.40)

Women vs Men (NTT, Pre-tenured, and Tenured Faculty Combined)

Overall, female faculty members were generally less satisfied than men with rewards for interdisciplinary work and with mentoring in their department. They were also more likely than their NC state male peers to see mentoring from outside their department as important and effective. Specifically, women overall gave higher lower average ratings than men to

- Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in tenure (pre-tenured faculty only) (2.69 vs 2.98)
- Department knows how to evaluate interdisciplinary work (2.63 vs 2.98)
- Mentoring of pre-tenured faculty (pre-tenured and tenured faculty only)

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty (NTT, Pre-tenured, and Tenured Faculty Combined)

Faculty of color give, on average, lower ratings than white faculty to *opportunities to collaborate within the department* (3.52 vs 3.79) and give higher ratings to the *importance of mentoring outside the department* (3.56 vs 3.29). Pre-tenured faculty of color, however, are more likely than pre-tenured white faculty to say that *interdisciplinary work is rewarded in tenure* (3.11 vs 2.80).

Benchmark: Tenure (Pre-tenured faculty only)

The COACHE survey included a series of questions about tenure policies, the clarity of expectations for achieving tenures, and for the reasonableness of those expectations. As discussed above, overall, NC State pre-tenured faculty did not differ from their colleagues at our COACHE peer institutions in their perceptions of the various aspects of tenure asked about in the survey.

Pre-tenured faculty at NC State gave very positive ratings to almost all aspects of tenure, especially to the reasonableness of the expectations and the clarity of the process. The only item in these areas that gets a relatively lower rating in comparison to the other areas is the consistency of the messages they get about tenure. Satisfaction with the clarity of expectations for achieving tenure was slightly lower, and was more variable. For example, pre-tenured faculty reported having much more clarity on the expectations as a scholar compared to the expectations as a campus citizen and as a member of the broader community.

There are, however, notable differences in satisfaction with various aspects of tenure by gender, and a few differences by race.

Women vs Men (Pre-tenured faculty only)

Pre-tenured female faculty gave consistently lower ratings than their male counterparts to various aspects of tenure. On average, pre-tenured women were notably less satisfied than pre-tenured men with:

- Tenure decisions are performance based (3.44 vs 3.89)
- Clarity of tenure expectations as a:
 - scholar (3.14 vs 3.46)
 - advisor (3.07 vs 3.47)
 - colleague (3.05 vs 3.39)
 - campus citizen (2.78 vs 3.04)
 - member of the broader community (2.69 vs 3.07)
- Reasonableness of tenure expectations as a
 - scholar (3.83 vs 4.16)
 - colleague (3.76 vs 4.04)
 - member of the broader community (3.45 vs 3.77)

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty (*Pre-tenured and tenured faculty only*)

Pre-tenured faculty of color and their white peers expressed similar levels of satisfaction on most aspects of tenure, with the exception that the faculty of color gave higher ratings than white faculty to *clarity of the body of evidence for deciding tenure* (4.00 vs 3.70) and the *clarity of tenure expectations as an advisor* (3.56 vs 3.23).

Benchmark: Promotion (*Tenured faculty only*)

Tenured faculty were asked about the clarity of the promotion process, the reasonableness of expectations, and the extent to which their department encourages promotion. Associate professors were also asked the clarity of whether or not they themselves thought they would be promoted. Although associate professors were relatively less clear on their own tenure prospects, overall, NC State tenured faculty gave very positive ratings to all areas. Their ratings did not differ notably from their colleagues at our COACHE peer institutions, with the single exception being that NC State tenured faculty gave notably higher average ratings than peers to the *department culture encouraging promotion* (3.97 vs 3.68). There were, however, notable differences in ratings by rank, by gender, and by race.

Associate vs Full Professors

Some of the largest differences in ratings found in the survey are associate versus full professors' evaluations of promotion. While associate professors do not, on average, give extremely negative ratings, they give lower ratings than full professors to each area asked about. Specifically,

- Reasonableness of expectations for promotion (3.46 vs 4.14)
- Department culture encourages promotion (3.45 vs 4.26)
- Clarity of
 - promotion process (3.56 vs 4.33)
 - promotion criteria (3.54 vs 4.17)
 - promotion standards (3.28 vs 3.84)
 - body of evidence for promotion (3.56 vs 4.24)
 - time frame for promotion (3.06 vs 4.00)

Women vs Men (*Tenured faculty only*)

Tenured female faculty gave consistently lower ratings than their male counterparts to various aspects of the promotion process. Tenured women were notably less satisfied than tenured men with

- Reasonableness of expectations for promotion (3.72 vs 3.97)
- Department culture encourages promotion (3.56 vs 4.11)
- Clarity of:
 - promotion process (3.70 vs 4.17)
 - promotion criteria (3.64 vs 4.04)
 - promotion standards (3.36 vs 3.73)
 - body of evidence for promotion (3.70 vs 4.09)
 - time frame for promotion (3.31 vs 3.78)
 - whether I will be promoted (associate faculty only) (3.08 vs 3.38)

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty (Tenured faculty only)

In general, faculty of color tended to give similar ratings than white faculty to the myriad of areas asked about in the COACHE survey. One of the few exceptions relates to promotion, with faculty of color being notably less satisfied than white faculty. Specifically, among the tenured faculty, faculty of color gave, on average, lower ratings than white faculty to:

- Clarity of
 - promotion process (3.81 vs 4.09)
 - promotion criteria (3.68 vs 3.99)
 - promotion standards (3.41 vs 3.68)
 - time frame for promotion (3.39 vs 3.71)
 - whether I will be promoted (associate professors only) (3.08 vs 3.34)

Benchmark: Reappointment and Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTs only)

Non-tenure track faculty were asked about the clarity of various aspects of their contract renewal and for their promotion. Overall, the clarity of the renewal process, criteria, standards, body of evidence, and sense of whether one's contract would be renewed were each rated more positively than the corresponding questions about promotion, which were among the lowest rated items in the survey (ranging, on average from 3.09 to 3.35 for the contract renewal items compared to 2.58 to 2.69 for the items related to promotion).

Benchmark: Leadership and Governance

Faculty were asked a series of questions assessing the governance style and abilities of the University senior leadership, their dean, and their department chair. Questions focused on institutional/unit priorities and communication of them, pace of decision making, faculty input, dean/chair support for faculty in adapting to changing missions, and fairness in evaluation of faculty work.

Of the various leadership traits assessed in this COACHE benchmark measure, faculty overall gave highest average ratings to the fairness of their department chair in evaluating faculty work. When asked a series of questions about each level of leadership, faculty gave highest average ratings to their department chair for his/her pace of decision-making, stated priorities, and communication of priorities, followed by the Chancellor and the CAO, and lowest ratings to their college dean. Faculty on average also gave their department chair higher ratings than their dean for ensuring opportunities for faculty to have input into department, or, respectively, college priorities.

Faculty gave relatively low ratings to institutional priorities being consistently stated and acted upon across all levels of leadership. Almost half of the faculty agreed that over that past five years *NC State's priorities have changed in ways that negatively affect their work in their department*. Among these faculty 55 percent believe they have received sufficient support from their department chair in adapting to changing priorities, compared to 30 percent saying they have such gotten support from their college dean.

Faculty overall gave high ratings to their being *visible leadership at NC State for the support and promotion of diversity on campus*.

Average ratings for many of the items in the benchmark area of "Institutional Governance and Leadership" varied somewhat by tenure-track status, but less so for other groups.

Non-Tenure Track vs Tenure-Track Faculty

Overall, NTTs were more positive than tenure-track faculty about the extent to which institutional priorities are consistently stated and acted on. In addition, while NTTs gave generally similar ratings as tenure-track faculty to NC State senior leadership and to their department heads, they gave notably higher ratings than tenure-track faculty to their college deans.

- Priorities are stated consistently (3.04 NTT vs 2.68 tenure-track)
- Priorities are acted on consistently (2.89 vs 2.50)
- CAO: Communication of priorities (3.35 vs 3.09)

- Dean:
 - Pace of decision making (3.28 vs 3.01)
 - Stated priorities (3.21 vs 2.95)
 - Communication of priorities (3.33 vs 2.97)
 - Ensuring faculty input (3.22 vs 2.90)

Pre-Tenured vs Tenured Faculty

There were almost no differences between pre-tenured and tenured faculty in their evaluation of leadership and governance. The only exceptions are that pre-tenured faculty, on average, gave higher ratings than tenured faculty to the *support they get from their dean in adapting to changing priorities* (2.78 vs 2.52), and in the *fairness of the department chair in evaluation their work* (4.17 vs 3.86).

Associate vs Full Professors

Leadership and governance is one of the only COACHE benchmark areas in which there are no notably differences between associate and full professions in their average ratings on any of the individual items.

Women vs Men

Looking at women and men overall, there are no notable differences in their average ratings for any of the specific leadership and governance items. However, women on the tenure-track (pre-tenured and tenured combined), gave lower ratings than tenure-track men to their *chair's pace of decision making* (3.47 vs 3.76) and to the *fairness of their chair in evaluating their work* (3.73 vs 3.99). Among NTT faculty, women gave lower ratings than men to the *support they get from their department chair in adapting to changing priorities* (3.13 vs 3.62).

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty

There were no differences by race/ethnicity in evaluations of leadership and governance, with one notable exception. Average ratings for their *being visible leadership for supporting diversity and inclusion* were much lower for faculty of color than for white faculty (3.50 vs 4.04).

Benchmark: Department Collegiality, Engagement and Quality

The COACHE survey included a number of items asking about specific aspects of department life, including collegiality, engagement, and the quality of faculty in the department. Overall, faculty give high marks to their department, with 22 of the 29 items getting an average rating of 3.5 or higher. NC State faculty believe their department is collegial and supportive of family/personal needs, that they have good professional and personal interactions with their colleagues, and that their colleagues and intellectually vital and productive.

Department Collegiality

Of the 29 different specific items asked about in the “Department collegiality, engagement, and quality” benchmark faculty overall expressed the highest level of satisfaction with *meeting times being compatible with personal needs*. They also give high marks to their colleagues being committed to diversity and inclusion, to their pitching in when needed, and to their support of a work/life balance.

Departmental Engagement

While still very positive, overall satisfaction with department engagement was just slightly lower than was expressed for collegiality and quality. Faculty give consistently high ratings to the extent to which they interact with their colleagues, and have discussions about things like student learning, teaching practices, and research methods.

Departmental Quality

Overall, faculty are very satisfied with the intellectual vitality of their colleagues, their scholarly productivity, and teaching effectiveness. However, as noted below such ratings vary somewhat depending on one’s own tenure status and/or rank and who they are evaluating. Faculty also think their departments are successful at faculty recruitment and retention. There is more concern with the

department addressing sub-standard performance, an area that received among the lowest ratings of all items asked about in the survey.

Average ratings for many of the items in the benchmark area of “Departmental Collegiality, Engagement, and Quality” varied, sometimes extensively, by group.

Non-Tenure Track vs Tenure-Track Faculty

Of all topics covered in the survey, it is in the area of department collegiality, engagement and quality that NTT faculty were most likely to less positive than were those on the tenure-track. NTTs, however, did give higher average ratings than tenure-track faculty to the extent to which *discussions of undergraduate student learning* (3.65 vs 3.28) and to *discussions of effective teaching practices* (3.62 vs 3.29) take place among their department colleagues. Most notably, they also rated the abilities and contributions of NTTs more positively than did those on the tenure-track. NTT gave higher average ratings than tenure-track faculty to:

- Teaching effectiveness of NTT faculty (4.12 NTT vs 3.88 TT)
- The intellectual vitality of NTT faculty (3.98 vs 3.57)
- Research/scholarly/creative productivity of NTT faculty (3.70 vs 3.41)

NTTs gave lower average ratings than did those on the tenure-track to 10 of the items, including their sense of fit in the department, the extent of professional and personal interaction they have with their tenure-track colleagues, and the teaching effectiveness of their tenure-track colleagues. Specifically, NTTs were notably less satisfied with each of the following:

- How well you fit (3.34 NTT vs 3.64 tenure-track)
- Amount of person interaction have w/ pre-tenured faculty (3.34 vs 3.64)
- Amount of personal interaction with tenured faculty (3.27 vs 3.62)
- Amount of professional interaction with pre-tenured faculty (3.43 vs 3.82)
- Amount of professional interaction with tenured faculty (3.36 vs 3.76)
- Discussions of graduate student learning (2.56 vs 3.59)
- Discussions of current research methods (2.93 vs 3.40)
- Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenured faculty (3.67 vs 3.96)
- Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty (3.37 vs 3.76)
- Department addresses sub-standard performance (2.42 vs 2.79)

Pre-Tenured vs Tenured Faculty

There were no notable differences between pre-tenured and tenured faculty in their evaluations of the collegiality of their department, their sense of engagement in the department, nor the quality of their peers in the department.

Associate vs Full Professors

Associate professors were notably less positive than full professors on four of the specific items asked about:

- How well you fit (3.41 Associate vs 3.77 Full)
- Colleagues pitch in when needed (3.58 vs 3.84)
- Discussions of effective use of technology (3.13 vs 3.42)
- Discussions of current research methods (3.24 vs 3.51)

Women vs Men

For the most part, women and men overall gave similar ratings to various aspects of their department life, with a few notable exceptions. Although their ratings were still quite positive, women were less likely than men to see their department as *collegial* (3.77 vs 4.02) and to believe their *colleagues are committed to diversity and inclusion* (3.77 vs 4.06). In addition, while the item asking about the *department addressing sub-standard performance* was rated low, on average, for all faculty, women gave notably lower ratings to it than did men (2.50 vs 2.83).

Findings were similar when looking specifically at women on the tenure-track compared to their tenure-track male peers. In no case did tenure-track women give notably higher ratings than men to department life, and they gave notably lower ratings to

- Colleagues support work/life balance (3.44 vs 3.71)
- Department is collegial (3.79 vs 4.04)
- Colleagues are committed to diversity/inclusion (3.68 vs 4.08)

Among non-tenure track faculty, the women were more positive than the men about having discussions of effective teaching practices with their colleagues (3.77 vs 4.46), and less positive *about the amount of professional and personal interaction they have with tenured faculty* (2.23 vs 3.51 and 3.11 vs 3.44, respectively), and with the *department addressing sub-standard performance* (2.17 vs 2.67).

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty

Similar to differences by gender, there were almost no differences between faculty of color and white faculty in their evaluation of department life, with two key exceptions. Although still generally rated favorably, faculty of color gave notably lower ratings than white faculty to their *colleagues being committed to diversity and inclusion* (3.60 vs 4.01) and to *the department being successful at faculty retention* (3.21 vs 3.49).

Benchmark: Appreciation and Recognition

The COACHE survey asked faculty about their perception of the recognition they and other faculty receive for various activities expected of them, and the recognition they receive from those in leadership positions. Overall, faculty were slightly less likely to feel they are recognized for their *outreach, advising, and service* (3.12, 3.14, and 3.16, respectively), than for their *scholarship and teaching* (3.37 and 3.29, respectively). Faculty gave relatively high ratings to the recognition they feel they receive from their *colleagues* and their *department chair* (3.59 and 3.60). Only tenure-track faculty were asked about recognition from their dean and from the CAO, but they were notably less positive about getting such recognition from these campus leaders (3.00 and 2.70, respectively).

Different groups of faculty had only minimal variations in satisfaction with the appreciation and recognition they receive.

Non-Tenure Track vs Tenure-Track Faculty

With only one exception, NTT and tenure-track faculty give similar ratings to the recognition they receive. NTTs give notably lower average ratings than do those on the tenure-track to recognition for their *scholarship* (3.16 vs 3.41).

Pre-Tenured vs Tenured Faculty

There were no notable differences in the perceptions of pre-tenured and tenured faculty regarding the recognition they receive for their work-related activities.

Associate vs Full Professors

Associate professors, on average, gave lower ratings than did full professors to the recognition they receive for their:

- Scholarship (3.22 vs 3.51)
- Service (2.94 vs 3.30)
- Outreach (2.95 vs 3.24)

Women vs Men

Among all tenure-track faculty, women gave lower ratings than men to the recognition they get for their *service* activities (3.00 vs 3.25), and, among just tenured faculty, women gave lower ratings than men to the recognition they receive from their *college Dean* (2.81 vs 3.07).

Faculty of Color vs White Faculty

There were no notable differences in the perceptions of faculty of color and white faculty regarding the recognition they receive for their work-related activities.

Trends in Pre-Tenured Faculty Satisfaction

NC State pre-tenured faculty participated in the COACHE survey in 2008, providing the opportunity for some trend comparisons for that group. The survey instrument, however, was extensively revised between the two administrations, thereby limiting the number of items available for a trend analysis. For those items that were comparable, there were few notable differences in the satisfaction of pre-tenured faculty in the 2008 versus the 2011 COACHE surveys.

Pre-tenured faculty gave slightly higher or more favorable ratings in 2011 compared to 2008 on:

- Expectations for finding external funding (3.29 vs 3.04)
- Reasonableness of tenure expectations
 - as a teacher (4.15 vs 3.84)
 - as a colleague (3.92 vs 3.50)
 - as a campus citizen (3.68 vs 3.42)

Pre-tenured faculty in 2011 were less satisfied or gave less positive responses than their counterparts in 2008 with:

- Clerical/administrative support (3.21 vs 3.63)
- CAO cares about faculty of my rank (3.05 vs 3.34)
- I would again choose this institution (3.82 vs 4.16)