2011 COACHE Survey

Nature of Work: Research, Service, Teaching

Comparions of Mean Ratings by Rank (1=low to 5=high)

(Tenured faculty only, except where noted)

			NCSU	
Sub-theme	Question	Associate	Full	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Nature of work: research	3.16	3.26	
	Time spent on research	3.44	3.74	\downarrow
	Expectations for finding external funding	3.08	3.31	
	Influence over focus of research	4.19	4.43	
	Quality of grad students to support research	3.18	3.42	
Research	Support for research	2.81	2.63	
Research	Support for engaging undergrads in research	2.99	3.16	
	Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.07	3.10	
	Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	3.12	2.97	
	Support for securing grad student assistance	2.79	2.90	
	Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.00	2.95	
	Availability of course release for research	2.67	2.91	
	Benchmark: Nature of work: service	3.23	3.42	
	Time spent on service	3.40	3.60	
	Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.70	2.91	
Service	Number of committees	3.49	3.59	
Service	Attractiveness of committees	3.30	3.47	
	Discretion to choose committees	3.34	3.59	\downarrow
	Equitability of committee assignments	3.08	3.32	
	Number of student advisees	3.51	3.82	\downarrow
	Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching	3.72	3.80	
	Time spent on teaching	3.90	3.94	
	Number of courses taught	3.82	3.94	
	Level of courses taught	4.07	4.16	
Teaching	Discretion over course content	4.40	4.45	
	Number of students in classes taught	3.68	3.83	
	Quality of students taught	3.30	3.40	
	Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.11	3.14	
	Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.21	3.46	\downarrow
Other work	Time spent on outreach	3.63	3.81	
activities	Time spent on administrative tasks	2.82	2.86	
activities	Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.15	3.59	\downarrow

2011 COACHE Survey

Facilities, Personal/Family Policies, Benefits, and Salary

Comparions of Mean Ratings by Rank (1=low to 5=high)

(Tenured faculty only, except where noted)

			NCSU	
Sub-theme	Question	Associate	Full	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Facilities and work resources	3.57	3.57	
	Support for improving teaching	3.17	3.35	
	Office	3.85	3.99	
Facilities and	Laboratory, research, studio space	3.31	3.49	
work resources	Equipment	3.58	3.40	
work resources	Classrooms	3.71	3.75	
	Library resources	4.17	4.19	
	Computing and technical support	3.61	3.43	
	Clerical/administrative support	3.00	2.90	
	Benchmark: Personal and family policies	2.93	2.94	
	Housing benefits	2.29	2.20	
	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.23	2.03	
	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.68	2.88	
Personal and	Childcare	2.29	2.44	
family policies	Eldercare	2.87	2.51	1
ianiny policies	Family medical/parental leave	3.39	3.34	
	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.56	3.55	
	Stop-the-clock policies ²	n<5	N/A	N/A
	Inst. does what it can for work/life compatibility	2.93	3.00	
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.23	3.55	\downarrow
Health and retirement benefits	Benchmark: Health and retirement benefits	2.79	2.79	
	Health benefits for yourself	2.73	2.76	
	Health benefits for family	2.18	2.28	
	Retirement benefits	3.13	2.93	
	Phased retirement options	3.28	3.26	
Salary	Salary	2.64	2.92	\downarrow

¹ Arrows indicate when mean ratings differ by 5 percent or more of the response scale (i.e., a difference of at least 0.25). Up arrows indicate that NC State's associate faculty have a mean rating that is notably higher than that of NC State's full faculty, whereas down arrows indicate that associate faculty's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful. ² Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

Prepared by University Planning and Analysis September, 2012

2011 COACHE Survey

Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring

Comparions of Mean Ratings by Rank (1=low to 5=high)

(Tenured faculty only, except where noted)

			NCSU	
Sub-theme	Question	Associate	Full	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Interdisciplinary work	2.59	2.69	
	Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.54	2.46	
latendie einlinen .	Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	2.47	2.68	
Interdisciplinary work	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.55	2.60	
WOIK	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion	2.53	2.73	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure ²	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.71	2.92	
	Benchmark: Collaboration	3.60	3.85	\downarrow
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. within dept.	3.64	3.91	\downarrow
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. outside dept.	3.48	3.71	
	Opportunities for collab. outside inst.	3.65	3.94	\downarrow
	Benchmark: Mentoring	2.79	3.11	\downarrow
	Effectiveness of mentoring from within dept.	3.40	3.53	
	Effectiveness of mentoring from outside dept.	3.30	3.31	
	Effectiveness of mentoring from outside inst.	3.67	3.63	
	Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty	3.07	3.47	\downarrow
Mentoring	Mentoring of associate faculty	2.28	2.94	\downarrow
	Support for faculty to be good mentors	2.10	2.51	\downarrow
	Being a mentor is fulfilling	4.04	4.13	
	Importance of mentoring within dept.	4.27	4.05	
	Importance of mentoring outside dept.	3.46	3.17	1
	Importance of mentoring outside inst.	3.67	3.40	1

2011 COACHE Survey

Tenure and Promotion

Comparions of Mean Ratings by Rank (1=low to 5=high)

(Tenured faculty only, except where noted)

			NCSU	
Sub-theme ²	Question	Associate	Full	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Tenure policies	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of tenure process	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of tenure criteria	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of tenure standards	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tenure policies ²	Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Consistency of messages about tenure	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Tenure decisions are performance-based	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Benchmark: Tenure clarity	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Scholar	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Teacher	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tenure clarity ²	Clarity of expectations: Advisor	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Colleague	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Clarity of expectations: Broader community	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Benchmark: Tenure reasonableness	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reasonable expectations: Scholar	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tenure	Reasonable expectations: Teacher	N/A	N/A	N/A
reasonableness ²	Reasonable expectations: Advisor	N/A	N/A	N/A
reasonableness	Reasonable expectations: Colleague	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reasonable expectations: Campus citizen	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reasonable expectations: Community member	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Benchmark: Promotion	3.38	4.13	\downarrow
	Reasonable expectations: Promotion	3.46	4.14	\downarrow
	Dept. culture encourages promotion	3.45	4.26	\downarrow
	Clarity of promotion process	3.56	4.33	\downarrow
Promotion	Clarity of promotion criteria	3.54	4.17	\downarrow
	Clarity of promotion standards	3.28	3.84	\downarrow
	Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	3.56	4.24	\downarrow
	Clarity of time frame for promotion	3.06	4.00	\downarrow
	Clarity of whether I will be promoted ³	3.28	N/A	N/A
	Decision to remain here based on promotion ³	3.32	N/A	N/A

¹ Arrows indicate when mean ratings differ by 5 percent or more of the response scale (i.e., a difference of at least 0.25). Up arrows indicate that NC State's associate faculty have a mean rating that is notably higher than that of NC State's full faculty, whereas down arrows indicate that associate faculty's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

² Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

³ Asked of associate faculty only

2011 COACHE Survey Leadership and Governance

Comparions of Mean Ratings by Rank (1=low to 5=high)

(Tenured faculty only, except where noted)

			NCSU	
Sub-theme	Question	Associate	Full	Diff ¹
Institutional	Priorities are stated consistently	2.71	2.63	
Governance and	Priorities are acted on consistently	2.51	2.46	
Leadership	Changed priorities negatively affect my work	3.26	3.36	
	Benchmark: Leadership: senior	3.21	3.24	
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.32	3.37	
Loodorohin	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.23	3.31	
Leadership: Senior	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.31	3.40	
Senior	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.20	3.18	
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.09	3.11	
	CAO: Communication of priorities	3.06	3.08	
	Benchmark: Leadership: divisional	2.98	2.92	
	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.07	2.98	
Leadership:	Dean: Stated priorities	2.97	2.92	
Divisional	Dean: Communication of priorities	3.02	2.93	
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	2.90	2.85	
	Dean: Support in adapting to change	2.53	2.53	
	Benchmark: Leadership: departmental	3.59	3.67	
Leadership: Departmental	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.57	3.70	
	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.50	3.53	
	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.59	3.57	
	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.63	3.62	
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.73	3.95	
	Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change	3.45	3.31	

2011 COACHE Survey

Departmental Collegiality, Engagement, and Quality

Comparions of Mean Ratings by Rank (1=low to 5=high)

(Tenured faculty only, except where noted)

			NCSU	
Sub-theme	Question	Associate	Full	Diff ¹
	Benchmark: Departmental collegiality	3.68	3.86	
	Colleagues support work/life balance	3.57	3.70	
	Meeting times compatible with personal needs	3.97	4.19	
Depertmentel	Amount of personal interaction w/ pre-tenure	3.53	3.66	
Departmental collegiality	How well you fit	3.41	3.77	Ļ
conceptancy	Amount of personal interaction w/ tenured	3.57	3.67	
	Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.58	3.84	Ļ
	Dept. is collegial	3.84	4.02	
	Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.94	4.02	
	Benchmark: Departmental engagement	3.38	3.56	
	Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.24	3.32	
	Discussions of grad student learning	3.45	3.69	
Departmental	Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.25	3.31	
engagement	Discussions of effective use of technology	3.13	3.42	\downarrow
	Discussions of current research methods	3.24	3.51	↓
	Amount of professional interaction w/ pre-tenure	3.72	3.83	
	Amount of professional interaction w/ tenured	3.62	3.83	
	Benchmark: Departmental quality	3.56	3.70	
	Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.56	3.72	
	Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	3.97	4.12	
Departmental quality	Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.46	3.65	
	Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	3.89	3.95	
	Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.72	3.83	
	Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.88	3.98	
	Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment	3.63	3.74	
	Dept. is successful at faculty retention	3.32	3.52	
	Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.70	2.84	

2011 COACHE Survey

Appreciation and Recognition

Comparions of Mean Ratings by Rank (1=low to 5=high)

(Tenured faculty only, except where noted)

		NCSU	
Question	Associate	Full	Diff ¹
Benchmark: Appreciation and recognition	3.11	3.31	
Recognition: For teaching	3.18	3.38	
Recognition: For advising	3.01	3.18	
Recognition: For scholarship	3.22	3.51	\downarrow
Recognition: For service	2.94	3.30	\downarrow
Recognition: For outreach	2.95	3.24	\downarrow
Recognition: From colleagues	3.55	3.67	
Recognition: From CAO	2.68	2.84	
Recognition: From Dean	2.91	3.05	
Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.49	3.71	
School/college is valued by Pres/Provost	3.24	3.45	
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost	2.97	3.17	
CAO cares about faculty of my rank	3.00	3.05	

2011 COACHE Survey Retention and Negotiations Comparions of Mean Ratings by Rank (1=low to 5=high)

(Tenured faculty only, except where noted)

	NCSU		
Question	Associate	Full	Diff ¹
Outside offers are necessary in negotiations	1.78	1.88	

2011 COACHE Survey Global Satisfaction Comparions of Mean Ratings by Rank (1=low to 5=high)

(Tenured faculty only, except where noted)

		NCSU	
Question	Associate	Full	Diff ¹
Visible leadership for support of diversity	3.90	4.06	
I would again choose this institution	3.63	3.77	
Department as a place to work	3.65	3.87	
Institution as a place to work	3.52	3.65	