

Report of Findings from Values, Practices, and Faculty Hiring Decisions of Academic Leaders Study for ACAD Leadership

- Prepared by Adrianna Kezar and Sean Gehrke, University of Southern California -

This report outlines the comprehensive findings from the *Values, Practices, and Faculty Hiring Decisions of Academic Leaders* survey. Data collection for this study ran from February 3 to March 21, 2012. A total of 148 members of ACAD responded and fully completed the survey that was sent out through personal invitations. We have organized the findings of this study based on the following topical areas of the survey: faculty composition, faculty hiring practices, gathering data related to faculty hiring, policies regarding non-tenure-track faculty, institutional demographics, and individual demographics. Within each section we provide tables with frequencies and descriptive statistics for each question and a brief review of findings.

FACULTY COMPOSITION

The data within the faculty composition section examines:

- academic leaders' perceptions of the use of non-tenure-track faculty on their campuses and in the academy,
- their views on the ideal composition of the faculty, and
- the awareness of and engagement with campus stakeholders regarding the composition of the faculty.

Most participants report the increasing use of NTTF over the past ten years on their campuses, yet most leaders perceive their campuses as employing either fewer or the same levels of NTTF to peer institutions. Participants accurately perceive the increased use of NTTF in the academy. Despite the reality of the increasing use of NTTF in the academy, most participants feel that NTTF should comprise 40% or less of the faculty, and of those NTTF they feel that about only 20% or less should be part-time NTTF. There are also a handful of participants who feel that all faculty should be part-time non-tenure-track faculty.

We think that this finding warrants further exploration among the ACAD membership. What does it mean that the use of NTTF is increasing and that a majority of faculty in the academy are part-time NTTF, yet participants think the ideal composition of faculty should be predominantly tenure-track faculty? Seventy-five percent of participants think that the proportion of tenure-track to NTTF should vary by academic discipline, another finding worth exploring with your membership.

College's faculty compared to ten years ago: The percentage of non-tenure-track faculty (including full and part-time) has:						
Significantly Decreased	Decreased	Remained the Same	Increased	Significantly Increased	Mean	S.D.
4	18	45	56	23	3.47	1.07

My campus employs:				
A smaller proportion of FULL TIME NTTF than peer institutions	Roughly the same proportion of FULL TIME NTTF compared to peer institutions	A larger proportion of FULL TIME NTTF than peer institutions	Mean	S.D.
58	66	22	1.73	.73

My campus employs:

A smaller proportion of PART TIME NTTF than peer institutions	Roughly the same proportion of PART TIME NTTF compared to peer institutions	A larger proportion of PART TIME NTTF than peer institutions	Mean	S.D.
44	67	35	1.91	.76

Changes in the past ten years: The use of FULL TIME NTTF in the professoriate has:					Mean	S.D.
Significantly Decreased	Decreased	Remained the Same	Increased	Significantly Increased		
2	17	19	73	34	3.75	1.10

Changes in the past ten years: The use of PART TIME NTTF in the professoriate has:					Mean	S.D.
Significantly Decreased	Decreased	Remained the Same	Increased	Significantly Increased		
1	4	9	68	62	4.18	1.03

What percentage of the faculty at your college should NTTF comprise in order to best meet institutional and student needs over the next five years?													Mean	S.D.
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%				
6	30	49	32	10	6	2	0	0	5	8	2.91	2.40		

What percentage of the NTTF at your college should be comprised of PART-TIME faculty in order to best meet institutional and student needs over the next five years?													Mean	S.D.
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%				
7	49	38	18	10	7	3	0	0	5	11	2.89	2.71		

Do you think the composition of tenure-track to non-tenure-track faculty should vary by academic discipline?			
Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
111	37	.75	.43

Engaging Stakeholders

Approximately half of the participants engage department chairs and the provost regarding the composition of the faculty, while a third consult the faculty and president and less than one-quarter engage the faculty senate or board of trustees. We were encouraged that most presidents, nearly all provosts/chief academic affairs officers, and half of the boards are aware of composition of the faculty body. Trends in the data reveal to us that while others are aware of the composition of the faculty and participants engage others, communication and awareness are primarily through informal means of private conversations, although provosts tend to engage the faculty at meetings and through public memoranda. Additionally, only a third of presidents are brought in to conversations regarding the composition of the faculty. Could this informality and lack of top leadership engagement in discussing the composition of the faculty be a factor that results in more NTTF being hired than what participants believe are best for the future of the academy? We encourage the ACAD membership to further explore these issues related to the composition of the faculty.

Do you engage campus stakeholders at your institution in dialogue about the ideal

composition of the faculty body (e.g. tenured vs. non-tenures, full-time NTTF vs. part-time NTTF)?			
Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
90	58	.61	.49

Please select the stakeholders you engage on your campus regarding the composition of the faculty:				
	Marked	Not Marked	Mean	S.D.
General Faculty Body	49	99	.33	.47
Faculty Senate	32	116	.22	.41
Department Chairs	82	66	.55	.50
Provost	73	75	.49	.50
President	51	97	.34	.48
Board of Trustees	32	116	.22	.41

Are the following administrators at your institution aware of the current composition of the faculty?				
	Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
President	122	26	.82	.38
Provost/Chief Academic Officer	142	6	.96	.20
Board of Trustees	72	76	.49	.50

How does your President, Provost, and/or Board communicate awareness of the composition of the faculty? (Total: 148)			
	President	Provost/CAO	Board of Trustees
Through Public Statements	48 (32%)	72 (49%)	12 (8%)
Through Public Memorandums	19 (13%)	38 (26%)	6 (4%)
Through Private Conversations	77 (52%)	102 (69%)	28 (19%)
Through Discussions at Faculty Meetings	55 (37%)	101 (68%)	5 (3%)
Does Not Communicate	22 (15%)	7 (5%)	66 (45%)

FACULTY HIRING PRACTICES

Setting Priorities

Provosts and deans are predominantly tasked with setting priorities for faculty hiring. Should presidents and the faculty senate be more involved in these processes? How would less pressure placed on these individuals and more shared governance in the priority setting process impact faculty hiring? Nearly 50% of participants indicate utilizing a campus staffing plan, a trend that ACAD members should be proud of. We were even more encouraged by the inclusion of NTTF in most plans and the inclusions of student learning in all plans.

Who is responsible for setting priorities (e.g. ratio of tenure to non-tenure track, % of part-time versus

full-time, credentials and qualifications) for faculty hiring?				
	Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
President	60	88	.41	.49
Provost	113	35	.76	.43
Deans	75	73	.51	.50
Department and/or Division Heads	49	99	.33	.47
Faculty Senate	5	143	.03	.18

Does your campus have a staffing plan?			
Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
70	78	.47	.50
Does your staffing plan address the hiring of non-tenure-track faculty?			
Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
60	88	.41	.49
Does your staffing plan address student learning as a priority in faculty hiring?			
Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
70	78	.47	.50

Pressures and Needs

When it comes to needs and pressures, we draw your attention to responses with a mean larger than 2, as they indicate that they play a medium to large role in choosing to hire NTTF. Many of these needs and pressures have to do with budgetary constraints, while others deal with filling positions in new programs, as a response to surges in enrollment, or needing to fill positions at the last minute. Responding to surge in enrollments stood out to us as the most pressing need. Research has shown (Cross & Goldberg, 2009) that institutions routinely have surges in enrollment (the pressure that plays the largest role), and we wonder if more long-term, formal planning and increased dialogue among campus stakeholders could mitigate this need. Additionally, the need fill positions at the last minute played the second largest role.

We encourage the ACAD membership to examine strategies to mitigate this need for last-minute hiring, as the lack of preparation time that comes from last-minute hiring is one of the factors that most adversely impacts student learning in classes taught by NTTF. While nearly half of participants have not had to adjust hiring due to the recession, the next most common responses were to hire more NTTF.

Please indicate the extent to which the following pressures play a role in choosing to hire non-tenure-track faculty.						
	Does Not Play a Role	Plays a Small Role	Plays a Medium Role	Plays a Large Role	Mean	S.D
Pressure from administration to lower operational costs	30	37	42	36	2.58	1.08
Pressure from administration to reduce reliance on tenure-track faculty	94	29	13	8	1.55	.89
Pressure from administration to meet institutional goals	41	34	42	26	2.37	1.09
Please indicate the extent to which the following pressures play a role in choosing to hire non-tenure-track faculty.						

	Does Not Play a Role	Plays a Small Role	Plays a Medium Role	Plays a Large Role	Mean	S.D
Pressure from tenure-track faculty to hire NTTF to teach lower-level courses	87	40	8	7	1.54	.81
Pressure from accrediting agencies concerned about the ration of tenure-track to NTTF	65	38	27	11	1.89	.98
Pressure to hire the partner of a current faculty member	85	49	10	1	1.50	.66

How has your institution responded to the recession?					
	Marked	Not Marked	Mean	S.D	
We have hired a larger proportion of tenure-track faculty	21	127	.14	.35	
We have hired a larger proportion of full-time NTTF	28	120	.19	.39	
We have hired a larger proportion of part-time NTTF	40	108	.27	.45	
We have instituted a hiring freeze on all new faculty appointments	13	135	.09	.28	
We have not renewed year-to-year contracts for NTTF	16	132	.11	.31	
We have not changed our hiring practices as a result of the recession	62	86	.42	.50	

Please indicate the extent to which the following pressures and needs play a role in choosing to hire non-tenure-track faculty.						
	Does Not Play a Role	Plays a Small Role	Plays a Medium Role	Plays a Large Role	Mean	S.D
The need to replace retiring tenure-track faculty with a lower-cost option	72	33	20	11	1.78	.98
The need to provide opportunities for retiring faculty who want to remain involved in teaching	57	55	21	4	1.80	.81
The need to replace tenure-track faculty on long-term leave or sabbatical	20	33	41	48	2.82	1.05
The need to expand course offerings due to surges in enrollment	16	23	41	60	3.04	1.03
The need to provide teaching experience to graduate students, post-doctoral students, and/or recent graduates	97	17	4	2	1.26	.60
The need to fill positions in a new program	33	43	37	24	2.38	1.04
The need to hire teachers and/or researchers in an emerging field	46	51	19	16	2.04	.99
The need to fill positions at the last-minute	11	38	38	52	2.94	.98

Participant Beliefs

When we examine the beliefs that participants have about NTTF, we are struck by the predominantly neutral and positive perceptions of the use of NTTF. While acknowledging the special expertise they bring and the benefits to using NTTF is important, we wonder if a more balanced picture of some of the drawbacks to overly relying on NTTF should be examined more. What proof is there that the use of NTTF has largely positive outcomes? Do these outcomes vary by campus? We recommend that members look at these perceptions on each of their campuses to try to understand the impact of the reliance/over-reliance on NTTF. In fact, it may be necessary for campuses to consider collecting data about both the costs and benefits so that they are able to address this issue based on data not anecdote. We suspect the cost may be higher than they anecdotally understand given research nationally about negative outcomes.

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements regarding FULL TIME non-tenure-track faculty.							
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	S.D
FULL TIME NTTF provide special knowledge and skills to their subject areas	0	5	20	85	33	3.89	1.01
FULL TIME NTTF will teach introductory courses that tenure-track faculty will not teach	19	41	39	40	3	2.66	1.18
The use of FULL TIME NTTF undermines tenure	19	58	28	31	6	2.52	1.19
The use of FULL TIME NTTF undermines shared governance	20	66	18	32	7	2.49	1.20
The use of FULL TIME NTTF improves overall teaching quality	1	36	67	33	6	2.95	.98
The use of FULL TIME NTTF adds flexibility to departmental offerings	0	4	13	104	22	3.87	.94
The use of FULL TIME NTTF threatens academic freedom	49	65	15	10	4	1.92	1.04
The use of FULL TIME NTTF limits creativity in curriculum design	34	73	17	15	3	2.07	1.05
The use of FULL TIME NTTF solves budgetary problems	3	27	34	68	10	3.25	1.14
The use of FULL TIME NTTF is beneficial in meeting student learning outcomes	1	20	60	56	6	3.21	.99
The use of FULL TIME NTTF is beneficial in meeting institutional objectives	1	15	42	77	8	3.41	1.00
The use of FULL TIME NTTF is problematic because they lack the time to engage students outside of the classroom	23	59	21	31	7	2.45	1.25

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements regarding PART TIME non-tenure-track faculty.							
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	S.D
PART TIME NTTF provide special knowledge and skills to their subject areas	0	5	17	87	34	3.91	1.01
PART TIME NTTF will teach introductory courses that tenure-track faculty will not teach	14	46	28	45	10	2.84	1.25

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements regarding PART TIME non-tenure-track faculty.							
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	S.D
The use of PART TIME NTTF undermines tenure	24	72	18	25	3	2.28	1.11
The use of PART TIME NTTF undermines shared governance	23	62	20	29	9	2.49	1.24
The use of PART TIME NTTF improves overall teaching quality	6	41	70	25	1	2.72	.93
The use of PART TIME NTTF adds flexibility to departmental offerings	0	6	12	94	30	3.88	1.04
The use of PART TIME NTTF threatens academic freedom	39	73	19	9	3	1.98	.98
The use of PART TIME NTTF limits creativity in curriculum design	27	76	18	19	3	2.19	1.05
The use of PART TIME NTTF solves budgetary problems	1	14	22	76	29	3.68	1.16
The use of PART TIME NTTF is beneficial in meeting student learning outcomes	2	27	60	49	5	3.09	1.00
The use of PART TIME NTTF is beneficial in meeting institutional objectives	2	13	47	74	7	3.38	1.00
The use of PART TIME NTTF is problematic because they lack the tie to engage students outside of the classroom	7	22	21	68	25	3.45	1.26

Values around Courses

We are struck by a lack of alignment between values and the reality of the use of NTTF. High enrollment courses and remedial courses were identified by the fewest participants (besides low enrollment courses) as the types of courses NTTF are best-suited to teach, yet most remedial and high enrollment courses are trending to be taught by NTTF.

What type of courses do you feel NTTF are best-suited to teach? (Total: 148)		
	Full-Time NTTF	Part-Time NTTF
Introductory courses	116 (78%)	95 (64%)
Professionally oriented courses	109 (74%)	110 (74%)
Highly specialized courses	100 (68%)	107 (72%)
Low enrollment courses	32 (22%)	23 (16%)
High enrollment courses	55 (37%)	34 (23%)
Remedial courses	54 (37%)	43 (29%)

Strategizing and Time

When examining the following three questions related to strategizing and time, on the whole, most participants indicate they engage with others when setting strategies for faculty hiring, yet most participants either have little time or occasionally have time to reflect and gather information. However, the following question indicates most participants are able to effectively strategize in order to make hiring decisions. There seems to be some sort of conflict about taking time to strategize, reflect, and seek out others in strategizing for faculty hiring, and we recommend further exploration of the ACAD membership into this phenomenon. The responses here are contradictory and perhaps belie a problem.

Please select the choice that best reflects your decision-making process when setting strategies for faculty hiring.				
	Marked	Not Marked	Mean	S.D
I seek out colleagues (administrators) internally and discuss strategies	93	55	.63	.49
I seek out stakeholders (faculty, staff, administrators) internally and discuss strategies	120	28	.81	.39
I seek out peers (other deans) externally and discuss strategies	55	93	.37	.49
I gather data about hiring internally and externally	87	61	.59	.49
I make decisions alone because other people often sway me from the appropriate decision	1	147	.01	.08
I do not have the time or opportunity to focus on the decision process; it just seems to happen without a conscious strategy	9	139	.06	.24

Please select the choice that best represents how time impacts your decision-making process related to strategies for faculty hiring.				
I have little to no time to reflect and/or gather information when making decisions related to faculty hiring.	I sometimes have time to reflect and/or gather information when making decisions related to faculty hiring.	I have time to reflect and/or gather information when making decisions related to faculty hiring	Mean	S.D.
70	66	8	1.45	.70

In what percentage of hiring decisions do you feel you are able to adequately strategize before hiring new faculty?												
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	Mean	S.D.
11	0	5	8	5	13	5	0	0	14	87	7.74	3.35

GATHERING DATA RELATED TO FACULTY HIRING

Based on participant responses, data is gathered with regards to relevant information in hiring NTTF. We advise the membership to examine how these data are utilized and how accessible they are. The manner in which participants are held accountable suggest more passive than active forms of accountability – reporting data to an office or receiving feedback. Despite the fact that nearly half of participants reported utilizing a staffing plan, only 28% are held accountable by these plans, a finding worth examining further.

Does your college track data about non-tenure-track faculty relating to:				
	Yes	No	Mean	S.D
Numbers hired per semester	126	22	.85	.36
Salary	129	19	.87	.34
Benefits	113	35	.76	.43
Contract renewals	116	32	.78	.41

In what ways are you held accountable for faculty hiring?				
	Marked	Not Marked	Mean	S.D
Report hiring data to an office on your campus	80	68	.54	.50
Follow a college staffing plan	41	107	.28	.45
Receive feedback from a member of the central administration	71	77	.48	.50
Receive feedback from President	55	93	.37	.49
Receive feedback from Board of Trustees	18	130	.12	.33

POLICIES REGARDING NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Policies for Full Time NTTF

For the most part, participants feel that full-time NTTF should be provided with most of the following policies. When examining policies in place, we are most struck by the fact that mentoring and multi-year contracts are valued by participants, yet only 60% and 52% of campuses provide these supports, respectively. It is commendable that many campuses have a host of policies and practices in place for NTTF.

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements regarding policies for FULL TIME non-tenure-track faculty.							
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	S.D.
FULL TIME NTTF should be provided with a formal orientation	1	0	0	31	111	4.59	1.00
FULL TIME NTTF should be provided with medical benefits	0	0	2	32	108	4.55	1.05
FULL TIME NTTF should be provided with family leave	1	6	14	38	82	4.17	1.27
FULL TIME NTTF should be provided with an office	0	1	2	31	109	4.57	1.00
FULL TIME NTTF should have access to office supplies	0	0	0	30	113	4.63	.96
FULL TIME NTTF should have access to administrative support	0	0	3	33	107	4.57	.98
FULL TIME NTTF should be provided with structured mentoring from another faculty member	0	1	8	58	76	4.31	1.02
FULL TIME NTTF should have access to professional development opportunities related to teaching	0	0	7	52	84	4.39	1.01
FULL TIME NTTF should have access to professional development opportunities related to research interests	1	9	33	40	60	3.91	1.21
FULL TIME NTTF should be able to take a paid sabbatical	17	56	32	14	21	2.61	1.36
FULL TIME NTTF should be able to be hired through multi-year contracts	4	10	18	54	57	3.91	1.25
FULL TIME NTTF should serve on departmental/college committees	1	9	28	52	53	3.89	1.18
FULL TIME NTTF should formally advise students	3	17	19	59	45	3.75	1.25
FULL TIME NTTF should participate in institutional governance	3	9	27	50	53	3.83	1.26

Please indicate whether or not your institution offers the following support/policies to FULL TIME non-tenure-track faculty:						
	Yes	No, due to budgetary constraints	No, this policy is not a priority of senior leadership	No, these policies are not believed to be important	No, for other reasons	% with policy
Orientation	133	0	3	1	5	94%
Medical benefits	132	2	2	1	4	94%
Family leave	105	9	5	4	13	77%
Office space	136	1	1	0	3	96%
Office supplies	137	1	1	0	3	96%
Administrative support	133	2	2	1	3	94%
Structured mentoring	84	4	21	9	22	60%
Professional development opportunities related to teaching	116	15	2	3	5	82%
Professional development opportunities related to research interests	85	18	14	10	11	62%
Paid sabbaticals	26	26	26	26	33	19%
Multi-year contracts	72	14	14	11	28	52%
Service on departmental/college committees	106	2	7	4	19	77%
Formal advising of students	97	4	7	6	27	69%
Participation in institutional governance	97	1	10	6	23	71%

Policies for Part Time NTTF

In general, responses indicate that participants feel that full time NTTF should be supported more than part time. Mentoring and professional development related to teaching appears to be valued more than it is offered in reality. The use of part time NTTF in advising students, on campus committees, and in governance struck us as being quite low.

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements regarding policies for PART TIME non-tenure-track faculty.							
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	S.D
PART TIME NTTF should be provided with a formal orientation	0	1	4	53	83	4.33	1.13
PART TIME NTTF should be provided with medical benefits	9	60	31	29	11	2.66	1.23
PART TIME NTTF should be provided with family leave	17	72	29	15	8	2.35	1.13
PART TIME NTTF should be provided with an office	2	6	17	68	46	3.83	1.29
PART TIME NTTF should have access to office supplies	0	1	5	76	59	4.16	1.10
PART TIME NTTF should have access to administrative support	0	3	4	77	56	3.85	1.16
PART TIME NTTF should be provided with structured mentoring from another faculty member	0	7	21	72	41	3.59	1.30
PART TIME NTTF should have access to professional development opportunities related to teaching	1	25	16	62	37	3.59	1.30
PART TIME NTTF should have access to professional development opportunities related to research interests	14	53	34	25	15	2.68	1.28
PART TIME NTTF should be able to take a paid sabbatical	60	68	9	1	1	1.57	.78

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements regarding policies for PART TIME non-tenure-track faculty.							
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	S.D
PART TIME NTTF should be able to be hired through multi-year contracts	27	43	27	36	8	2.55	1.31
PART TIME NTTF should serve on departmental/college committees	23	52	38	24	4	2.41	1.15
PART TIME NTTF should formally advise students	26	64	38	10	3	2.18	1.02
PART TIME NTTF should participate in institutional governance	28	51	31	25	6	2.39	1.22

Please indicate whether or not your institution offers the following support/policies to PART TIME non-tenure-track faculty:						
	Yes	No, due to budgetary constraints	No, this policy is not a priority of senior leadership	No, these policies are not believed to be important	No, for other reasons	% with policy
Orientation	119	1	9	3	8	85%
Medical benefits	17	53	28	15	26	12%
Family leave	11	57	25	19	27	8%
Office space	117	13	3	1	6	84%
Office supplies	134	3	2	0	1	96%
Administrative support	125	8	5	0	2	89%
Structured mentoring	60	13	28	13	25	43%
Professional development opportunities related to teaching	74	29	19	7	11	53%
Professional development opportunities related to research interests	21	45	29	20	22	15%
Paid sabbaticals	1	49	33	28	28	1%
Multi-year contracts	22	25	34	24	32	16%
Service on departmental/college committees	33	14	27	30	33	24%
Formal advising of students	19	12	30	33	44	14%
Participation in institutional governance	30	10	30	25	34	23%

Policies Supporting Learning

When asked to select the most important policies for contributing to student learning, we find that two are not well-supported on campuses despite their indicated level of importance – mentoring (for both full time and part time NTTF) and professional development related to teaching (part time NTTF). Two values that the literature supports as being important for impacting student learning – advising students and participation in governance – were selected by relatively few participants.

Please select the three policies/supports (in no particular order) that are most important for contributing to student learning.		
	Marked	%
Orientation	80	54%
Medical benefits	5	3%
Family leave	0	0%
Office space	52	35%
Office supplies	4	3%

Please select the three policies/supports (in no particular order) that are most important for contributing to student learning.		
	Marked	%
Administrative support	32	22%
Structured mentoring	76	51%
Professional development opportunities related to teaching	106	72%
Professional development opportunities related to research interests	11	7%
Paid sabbaticals	1	<1%
Multi-year contracts	14	10%
Service on departmental/college committees	5	3%
Formal advising of students	19	13%
Participation in institutional governance	5	3%

INSTITUTIONS DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Please select the Carnegie Classification of your institution.							
Associate	Doctoral-Extensive	Doctoral-Intensive	Master I	Master II	Baccalaureate-Liberal Arts	Baccalaureate-General	Baccalaureate-Associates
7	2	10	31	34	49	6	3
5%	1%	7%	21%	23%	33%	4%	2%

Please select which choice best describes your institution.	
Private	Public
105	39
71%	26%

What is the total enrollment of the following students within your college?						
	Unmarked	Less than 500	500-1,999	2,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000 or more
Undergraduate Students	4 (3%)	5 (3%)	44 (30%)	59 (40%)	19 (13%)	17 (12%)
Graduate Students	37 (25%)	53 (36%)	44 (30%)	12 (8%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)

How many of the following faculty members does your college employ?									
	Fewer than 20	20-49	50-99	100-149	150-199	200-299	300-399	400-499	500 or more
Tenure-track faculty	21 (14%)	7 (5%)	29 (20%)	33 (22%)	26 (18%)	20 (14%)	4 (3%)	5 (3%)	3 (2%)
Non-tenure-track faculty, full-time	74 (50%)	40 (27%)	22 (15%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)	5 (3%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)
Non-tenure-track faculty, part-time	28 (19%)	36 (24%)	35 (24%)	14 (10%)	12 (8%)	9 (6%)	6 (4%)	2 (1%)	6 (4%)

Are the following faculty unionized on your campus?			
	Yes	No	%
Tenure-track faculty	26	122	18%
Full time non-tenure-track faculty	20	128	14%
Part time non-tenure-track faculty	14	134	10%

INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

For how long have you served in your current position?				
Less than 1 year	1-3 years	3-7 years	7-10 years	More than 10 years
17	39	65	12	14
12%	26%	44%	8%	10%

To whom do you directly report?	
Provost	President
113	35
76%	24%

Please select the organization in which you are a member.	
ACAD	CCAS
148	29
100%	20%