# 2011 COACHE Survey

#### **Nature of Work**

**Peer Comparions of Mean Ratings** (1=low to 5=high)

Benchmark: Nature of work: research   3.23   3.25	Sub-theme	Question	NCSU	Peers 1	Diff <sup>2</sup>
Expectations for finding external funding   3.24   3.15		Benchmark: Nature of work: research	3.23	3.25	
Influence over focus of research		Time spent on research	3.63	3.46	
Quality of grad students to support research   3.31   3.23		Expectations for finding external funding	3.24	3.15	
Research         Support for research         2.72         2.87           Support for engaging undergrads in research         3.07         3.13           Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)         3.12         3.32           Support for maintaining grants (post-award)         3.03         3.19           Support for securing grad student assistance         2.86         2.87           Support for travel to present/conduct research         3.01         3.19           Availability of course release for research         2.83         2.76           Benchmark: Nature of work: service         3.37         3.25           Time spent on service         3.54         3.39           Support for faculty in leadership roles         2.88         2.82           Number of committees         3.59         3.39           Attractiveness of committees         3.42         3.37           Discretion to choose committees         3.49         3.43           Equitability of committee assignments         3.25         3.02           Number of student advisees         3.71         3.54           Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         4.10 </td <td></td> <td>Influence over focus of research</td> <td>4.34</td> <td>4.36</td> <td></td>		Influence over focus of research	4.34	4.36	
Support for engaging undergrads in research   3.07   3.13		Quality of grad students to support research	3.31	3.23	
Support for engaging undergrads in research   3.07   3.13	Dosoarch	Support for research	2.72	2.87	
Support for maintaining grants (post-award)   3.03   3.19	Research	Support for engaging undergrads in research	3.07	3.13	
Support for securing grad student assistance   2.86   2.87		Support for obtaining grants (pre-award)	3.12	3.32	
Support for travel to present/conduct research   3.01   3.19     Availability of course release for research   2.83   2.76     Benchmark: Nature of work: service   3.37   3.25     Time spent on service   3.54   3.39     Support for faculty in leadership roles   2.88   2.82     Number of committees   3.59   3.39     Attractiveness of committees   3.42   3.37     Discretion to choose committees   3.49   3.43     Equitability of committee assignments   3.25   3.02     Number of student advisees   3.71   3.54     Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching   3.75   3.74     Time spent on teaching   3.90   3.86     Number of courses taught   3.88   3.88     Level of courses taught   4.10   4.06     Teaching   Discretion over course content   4.40   4.43     Number of students in classes taught   3.73   3.71		Support for maintaining grants (post-award)	3.03	3.19	
Availability of course release for research   2.83   2.76     Benchmark: Nature of work: service   3.37   3.25     Time spent on service   3.54   3.39     Support for faculty in leadership roles   2.88   2.82     Number of committees   3.59   3.39     Attractiveness of committees   3.42   3.37     Discretion to choose committees   3.49   3.43     Equitability of committee assignments   3.25   3.02     Number of student advisees   3.71   3.54     Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching   3.75   3.74     Time spent on teaching   3.90   3.86     Number of courses taught   3.88   3.88     Level of courses taught   4.10   4.06     Teaching   Discretion over course content   4.40   4.43     Number of students in classes taught   3.73   3.71		Support for securing grad student assistance	2.86	2.87	
Benchmark: Nature of work: service         3.37         3.25           Time spent on service         3.54         3.39           Support for faculty in leadership roles         2.88         2.82           Number of committees         3.59         3.39           Attractiveness of committees         3.42         3.37           Discretion to choose committees         3.49         3.43           Equitability of committee assignments         3.25         3.02           Number of student advisees         3.71         3.54           Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71		Support for travel to present/conduct research	3.01	3.19	
Service         3.54         3.39           Support for faculty in leadership roles         2.88         2.82           Number of committees         3.59         3.39           Attractiveness of committees         3.42         3.37           Discretion to choose committees         3.49         3.43           Equitability of committee assignments         3.25         3.02           Number of student advisees         3.71         3.54           Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71		Availability of course release for research	2.83	2.76	
Service         Support for faculty in leadership roles         2.88         2.82           Number of committees         3.59         3.39           Attractiveness of committees         3.42         3.37           Discretion to choose committees         3.49         3.43           Equitability of committee assignments         3.25         3.02           Number of student advisees         3.71         3.54           Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71		Benchmark: Nature of work: service	3.37	3.25	
Number of committees         3.59         3.39           Attractiveness of committees         3.42         3.37           Discretion to choose committees         3.49         3.43           Equitability of committee assignments         3.25         3.02           Number of student advisees         3.71         3.54           Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71		Time spent on service	3.54	3.39	
Service         Attractiveness of committees         3.42         3.37           Discretion to choose committees         3.49         3.43           Equitability of committee assignments         3.25         3.02           Number of student advisees         3.71         3.54           Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71		Support for faculty in leadership roles	2.88	2.82	
Attractiveness of committees         3.42         3.37           Discretion to choose committees         3.49         3.43           Equitability of committee assignments         3.25         3.02           Number of student advisees         3.71         3.54           Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71	Sonvico	Number of committees	3.59	3.39	
Equitability of committee assignments         3.25         3.02           Number of student advisees         3.71         3.54           Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71	Service	Attractiveness of committees	3.42	3.37	
Number of student advisees         3.71         3.54           Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71		Discretion to choose committees	3.49	3.43	
Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching         3.75         3.74           Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71		Equitability of committee assignments	3.25	3.02	
Time spent on teaching         3.90         3.86           Number of courses taught         3.88         3.88           Level of courses taught         4.10         4.06           Teaching         Discretion over course content         4.40         4.43           Number of students in classes taught         3.73         3.71		Number of student advisees	3.71	3.54	
Number of courses taught 3.88 3.88  Level of courses taught 4.10 4.06  Teaching Discretion over course content 4.40 4.43  Number of students in classes taught 3.73 3.71		Benchmark: Nature of work: teaching	3.75	3.74	
Level of courses taught 4.10 4.06  Teaching Discretion over course content 4.40 4.43  Number of students in classes taught 3.73 3.71		Time spent on teaching	3.90	3.86	
Teaching Discretion over course content 4.40 4.43  Number of students in classes taught 3.73 3.71	Teaching	Number of courses taught	3.88	3.88	
Number of students in classes taught 3.73 3.71		Level of courses taught	4.10	4.06	
<u></u>		Discretion over course content	4.40	4.43	
		Number of students in classes taught	3.73	3.71	
Quality of students taught 3.36 3.33		Quality of students taught	3.36	3.33	
Equitability of distribution of teaching load 3.15 3.19		Equitability of distribution of teaching load	3.15	3.19	
Quality of grad students to support teaching 3.33 3.33		Quality of grad students to support teaching	3.33	3.33	
Other work Time spent on outreach 3.74 3.60	Other work activities	Time spent on outreach	3.74	3.60	
Time enent on administrative tacks 286 205		Time spent on administrative tasks	2.86	2.95	
Ability to balance teaching/research/service 3.41 3.32		Ability to balance teaching/research/service	3.41	3.32	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

#### 2011 COACHE Survey

### Facilities, Personal/Family Policies, Benefits, and Salary

**Peer Comparions of Mean Ratings** (1=low to 5=high)

Sub-theme	Question	NCSU	Peers 1	Diff <sup>2</sup>
	Benchmark: Facilities and work resources	3.58	3.44	
	Support for improving teaching	3.30	3.39	
	Office	3.95	3.69	<b>↑</b>
Facilities and	Laboratory, research, studio space	3.41	3.23	
work resources	Equipment	3.50	3.35	
work resources	Classrooms	3.71	3.23	<b>↑</b>
	Library resources	4.17	3.76	<b>↑</b>
	Computing and technical support	3.48	3.46	
	Clerical/administrative support	2.98	3.31	$\downarrow$
	Benchmark: Personal and family policies	2.95	2.96	
	Housing benefits	2.20	2.34	
	Tuition waivers, remission, or exchange	2.16	2.70	$\downarrow$
	Spousal/partner hiring program	2.76	2.52	
Derseneland	Childcare	2.33	2.47	
Personal and family policies	Eldercare	2.59	2.73	
larrilly policies	Family medical/parental leave	3.33	3.32	
	Flexible workload/modified duties	3.54	3.43	
	Stop-the-clock policies <sup>3</sup>	3.66	3.43	
	Inst. does what it can for work/life compatibility	2.99	2.90	
	Right balance between professional/personal	3.36	3.31	
Health and retirement benefits	Benchmark: Health and retirement benefits	2.81	3.47	$\downarrow$
	Health benefits for yourself	2.78	3.58	$\downarrow$
	Health benefits for family	2.25	3.46	$\downarrow$
	Retirement benefits	3.06	3.44	$\downarrow$
	Phased retirement options	3.27	3.23	
Salary	Salary	2.78	2.97	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

# 2011 COACHE Survey Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration, and Mentoring Peer Comparions of Mean Ratings (1=low to 5=high)

Sub-theme	Question	NCSU	Peers 1	Diff <sup>2</sup>
	Benchmark: Interdisciplinary work	2.67	2.67	
	Budgets encourage interdiscip. work	2.52	2.52	
Intendicajalinam,	Facilities conducive to interdiscip. work	2.59	2.58	
Interdisciplinary work	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in merit	2.61	2.63	
WOIK	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in promotion <sup>3</sup>	2.66	2.66	
	Interdiscip. work is rewarded in tenure <sup>4</sup>	2.86	2.78	
	Dept. knows how to evaluate interdiscip. work	2.87	2.84	
	Benchmark: Collaboration	3.75	3.62	
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. within dept.	3.77	3.68	
Collaboration	Opportunities for collab. outside dept.	3.61	3.43	
	Opportunities for collab. outside inst.	3.86	3.75	
	Benchmark: Mentoring	3.05	3.01	
	Effectiveness of mentoring from within dept.	3.49	3.49	
	Effectiveness of mentoring from outside dept.	3.33	3.28	
	Effectiveness of mentoring from outside inst.	3.70	3.82	
	Mentoring of pre-tenure faculty	3.29	3.25	
Mentoring	Mentoring of associate faculty <sup>3</sup>	2.69	2.42	1
	Support for faculty to be good mentors <sup>3</sup>	2.37	2.36	
	Being a mentor is fulfilling <sup>3</sup>	4.10	4.05	
	Importance of mentoring within dept.	4.18	4.20	
	Importance of mentoring outside dept.	3.31	3.42	
	Importance of mentoring outside inst.	3.57	3.63	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Asked of tenured faculty only

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

# 2011 COACHE Survey

#### **Tenure and Promotion**

**Peer Comparions of Mean Ratings** (1=low to 5=high)

Sub-theme	Question	NCSU	Peers 1	Diff <sup>2</sup>
	Benchmark: Tenure policies	3.64	3.62	
	Clarity of tenure process	3.87	3.78	
	Clarity of tenure criteria	3.73	3.72	
Tanura nalisisa <sup>3</sup>	Clarity of tenure standards	3.49	3.36	
Tenure policies <sup>3</sup>	Clarity of body of evidence for deciding tenure	3.76	3.82	
	Clarity of whether I will achieve tenure	3.70	3.65	
	Consistency of messages about tenure	3.25	3.33	
	Tenure decisions are performance-based	3.69	3.73	
	Benchmark: Tenure clarity	3.31	3.38	
	Clarity of expectations: Scholar	3.84	3.87	
	Clarity of expectations: Teacher	3.65	3.84	
Tenure clarity <sup>3</sup>	Clarity of expectations: Advisor	3.30	3.35	
•	Clarity of expectations: Colleague	3.24	3.29	
	Clarity of expectations: Campus citizen	2.92	3.02	
	Clarity of expectations: Broader community	2.90	2.93	
	Benchmark: Tenure reasonableness	3.85	3.86	
	Reasonable expectations: Scholar	4.01	4.00	
Tanuna	Reasonable expectations: Teacher	4.15	4.11	
Tenure	Reasonable expectations: Advisor	3.84	3.83	
reasonableness	Reasonable expectations: Colleague	3.92	3.91	
	Reasonable expectations: Campus citizen	3.68	3.72	
	Reasonable expectations: Community member	3.63	3.67	
Promotion <sup>4</sup>	Benchmark: Promotion	3.86	3.69	
	Reasonable expectations: Promotion	3.91	3.81	
	Dept. culture encourages promotion	3.97	3.68	<b>↑</b>
	Clarity of promotion process	4.05	3.87	
	Clarity of promotion criteria	3.94	3.78	
	Clarity of promotion standards	3.64	3.53	
	Clarity of body of evidence for promotion	4.00	3.85	
	Clarity of time frame for promotion	3.66	3.44	
	Clarity of whether I will be promoted <sup>5</sup>	3.28	3.09	
	Decision to remain here based on promotion <sup>5</sup>	3.32	3.27	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Asked of pre-tenure faculty only

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Asked of tenured faculty only

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Asked of associate faculty only

#### 2011 COACHE Survey

### Leadership and Governance

**Peer Comparions of Mean Ratings** (1=low to 5=high)

Sub-theme	Question	NCSU	Peers 1	Diff <sup>2</sup>
Institutional	Priorities are stated consistently	2.68	2.87	
Governance and	Priorities are acted on consistently	2.50	2.65	
Leadership	Changed priorities negatively affect my work	3.34	3.22	
	Benchmark: Leadership: senior	3.24	3.07	
	Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.35	3.14	
Loodorobio	Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.30	3.10	
Leadership: Senior	Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.38	3.16	
Senioi	CAO: Pace of decision making	3.18	3.01	
	CAO: Stated priorities	3.11	2.99	
	CAO: Communication of priorities	3.09	2.99	
	Benchmark: Leadership: divisional	2.95	3.16	
	Dean: Pace of decision making	3.01	3.26	
Leadership:	Dean: Stated priorities	2.95	3.14	
Divisional	Dean: Communication of priorities	2.97	3.14	
	Dean: Ensuring faculty input	2.90	3.09	
	Dean: Support in adapting to change	2.56	2.57	
	Benchmark: Leadership: departmental	3.68	3.64	
Leadership: Departmental	Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.67	3.62	
	Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.56	3.56	
	Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.60	3.55	
	Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.66	3.62	
	Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.92	3.85	
	Head/Chair: Support in adapting to change	3.39	3.22	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

#### 2011 COACHE Survey

### Departmental Collegiality, Engagement, and Quality

**Peer Comparions of Mean Ratings** (1=low to 5=high)

Sub-theme	Question	NCSU	Peers 1	Diff <sup>2</sup>
	Benchmark: Departmental collegiality	3.80	3.77	
	Colleagues support work/life balance	3.63	3.62	
	Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.13	4.03	
Dependence	Amount of personal interaction w/ pre-tenure	3.64	3.68	
Departmental collegiality	How well you fit	3.67	3.66	
concegianty	Amount of personal interaction w/ tenured	3.62	3.63	
	Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.73	3.73	
	Dept. is collegial	3.97	3.93	
	Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.96	3.92	
	Benchmark: Departmental engagement	3.49	3.48	
	Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.28	3.44	
	Discussions of grad student learning	3.59	3.58	
Departmental	Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.29	3.31	
engagement	Discussions of effective use of technology	3.30	3.20	
	Discussions of current research methods	3.40	3.28	
	Amount of professional interaction w/ pre-tenure	3.82	3.82	
	Amount of professional interaction w/ tenured	3.76	3.74	
	Benchmark: Departmental quality	3.65	3.56	
	Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.62	3.57	
Departmental quality	Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.09	4.03	
	Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.55	3.45	
	Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	3.94	3.92	
	Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.76	3.62	
	Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.96	3.89	
	Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment <sup>3</sup>	3.70	3.56	
	Dept. is successful at faculty retention <sup>3</sup>	3.45	3.23	
	Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.79	2.69	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Asked of tenured faculty only

### 2011 COACHE Survey

## **Appreciation and Recognition**

**Peer Comparions of Mean Ratings** (1=low to 5=high)

Question	NCSU	Peers 1	Diff <sup>2</sup>
Benchmark: Appreciation and recognition	3.26	3.26	
Recognition: For teaching	3.30	3.23	
Recognition: For advising	3.13	3.02	
Recognition: For scholarship	3.41	3.41	
Recognition: For service	3.18	3.13	
Recognition: For outreach	3.14	3.11	
Recognition: From colleagues	3.63	3.64	
Recognition: From CAO <sup>3</sup>	2.79	2.87	
Recognition: From Dean <sup>3</sup>	3.00	3.05	
Recognition: From Head/Chair	3.64	3.62	
School/college is valued by Pres/Provost <sup>3</sup>	3.37	3.37	
Dept. is valued by Pres/Provost <sup>3</sup>	3.10	3.15	
CAO cares about faculty of my rank	3.03	3.06	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Asked of tenured faculty only

### 2011 COACHE Survey

### **Retention and Negotiations**

**Peer Comparions of Mean Ratings** (1=low to 5=high)

Question	NCSU	Peers 1	Diff <sup>2</sup>
Outside offers are necessary in negotiations <sup>3</sup>	1.85	2.06	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Asked of tenured faculty only

### 2011 COACHE Survey

#### **Global Satisfaction**

**Peer Comparions of Mean Ratings** (1=low to 5=high)

Question	NCSU	Peers 1	Diff <sup>2</sup>
Visible leadership for support of diversity	3.96	3.77	
I would again choose this institution	3.73	3.60	
Department as a place to work	3.82	3.77	
Institution as a place to work	3.60	3.50	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Peers include Clemson University, Kansas State University, Purdue University, SUNY - Albany and the University of Tennessee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 mean rating is notably higher than the grand mean of our COACHE peer group, whereas down arrows indicate that NC State's mean is lower. If no arrow is present, differences in mean ratings are not considered large enough to be meaningful.