

Report of Findings from Values, Practices, and Faculty Hiring Decisions of Academic Leaders Study for CCAS 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 6 to March 21, 2012. A total of 157 members of CCAS responded and fully completed the survey that was sent out over the CCAS list-serve. 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 30% or less of the faculty, and of those NTTF they feel that about only 20% or less should be part-time NTTF.

We think that this finding warrants further exploration among the CCAS 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 the ideal composition of faculty should be predominantly tenure-track faculty? Nearly 80% 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	16	39	75	22	3.59	.98

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.
53	79	22	1.76	.71

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.
48	81	28	1.87	.69

Changes in the past ten years: The use of FULL TIME NTTF in the professoriate has:						
Significantly Decreased	Decreased	Remained the Same	Increased	Significantly Increased	Mean	S.D.
1	20	14	90	28	3.71	1.08

Changes in the past ten years: The use of PART TIME NTTF in the professoriate has:						
Significantly Decreased	Decreased	Remained the Same	Increased	Significantly Increased	Mean	S.D.
0	4	13	81	57	4.18	.85

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?												
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	Mean	S.D.
1	38	54	42	9	7	4	0	0	0	2	2.46	1.48

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?												
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	Mean	S.D.
3	48	50	28	13	4	4	0	0	4	3	2.51	1.94

Do you think the composition of tenure-track to non-tenure-track faculty should vary by academic discipline?			
Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
121	36	.77	.42

Engaging Stakeholders

Roughly two-thirds of participants engage department chairs and the provost regarding the composition of the faculty, while only one-quarter engage the president, faculty senate, or faculty body as a whole. Most presidents and nearly all provosts/chief academic affairs officers are aware of composition of the faculty body, yet most of them communicate awareness mainly through private means. The 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 through informal means of private conversations. Additionally, few 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 CCAS 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.
109	48	.69	.46

Please select the stakeholders you engage on your campus regarding the composition of the faculty:				
	Marked	Not Marked	Mean	S.D.
General Faculty Body	45	112	.29	.45
Faculty Senate	39	118	.25	.43
Department Chairs	108	49	.69	.47
Provost	101	56	.64	.48
President	40	117	.25	.44
Board of Trustees	11	146	.07	.26

Are the following administrators at your institution aware of the current composition of the faculty?				
	Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
President	124	33	.79	.41
Provost/Chief Academic Officer	152	5	.97	.18
Board of Trustees	49	108	.31	.47

How does your President, Provost, and/or Board communicate awareness of the composition of the faculty? (Total: 157)			
	President	Provost/CAO	Board of Trustees
Through Public Statements	53 (34%)	69 (44%)	12 (8%)
Through Public Memorandums	27 (17%)	40 (26%)	6 (4%)
Through Private Conversations	83 (53%)	117 (75%)	17 (11%)
Through Discussions at Faculty Meetings	45 (29%)	92 (59%)	3 (2%)
Does Not Communicate	37 (24%)	10 (6%)	84 (54%)

FACULTY HIRING PRACTICES

Setting Priorities

Similar to findings pertaining to faculty composition, provosts, deans, and chairs 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? While only one-third of campuses have a staffing plan, it is encouraging that most address the hiring of NTTF and student learning as a priority in faculty hiring.

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	44	113	.28	.45
Provost	107	50	.68	.47
Deans	96	61	.61	.49
Department and/or Division Heads	63	94	.40	.49
Faculty Senate	4	153	.03	.16

Does your campus have a staffing plan?			
Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
52	105	.33	.47
Does your staffing plan address the hiring of non-tenure-track faculty?			
Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
41	116	.26	.44
Does your staffing plan address student learning as a priority in faculty hiring?			
Yes	No	Mean	S.D.
46	111	.29	.46

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 deal 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. Some that stand out in our analyses deal with responding to surge in enrollments. 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 to fill positions at the last minute played the largest role.

We encourage the CCAS 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. With regards to the recession, we were not surprised that the most prevalent response was to hire more NTTF, both full and part-time faculty.

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	26	25	40	66	2.93	1.12
Pressure from administration to reduce reliance on tenure-track faculty	105	25	15	11	1.56	.93
Pressure from administration to meet institutional goals	32	39	58	27	2.51	1.01
Pressure from tenure-track faculty to hire NTTF to teach lower-level courses	83	43	21	9	1.72	.91
Pressure from accrediting agencies concerned about the ration of tenure-track to NTTF	63	53	31	8	1.90	.90
Pressure to hire the partner of a current faculty member	76	56	19	4	1.68	.79

How has your institution responded to the recession?				
	Marked	Not Marked	Mean	S.D
We have hired a larger proportion of tenure-track faculty	19	138	.12	.33
We have hired a larger proportion of full-time NTTF	58	99	.37	.48
We have hired a larger proportion of part-time NTTF	69	88	.44	.50
We have instituted a hiring freeze on all new faculty appointments	19	138	.12	.33
We have not renewed year-to-year contracts for NTTF	28	129	.18	.38
We have not changed our hiring practices as a result of the recession	40	117	.25	.44

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	57	37	27	31	2.21	1.15
The need to provide opportunities for retiring faculty who want to remain involved in teaching	71	52	19	7	1.74	.86
The need to replace tenure-track faculty on long-term leave or sabbatical	26	49	45	34	2.56	1.02
The need to expand course offerings due to surges in enrollment	14	25	37	75	3.15	1.01
The need to provide teaching experience to graduate students, post-doctoral students, and/or recent graduates	76	42	19	9	1.73	.91
The need to fill positions in a new program	55	48	34	14	2.05	.98
The need to hire teachers and/or researchers in an emerging field	64	47	18	16	1.90	1.00
The need to fill positions at the last-minute	5	40	44	65	3.10	.90

Participant Beliefs

When we examine the *beliefs that participants* have about NTTF, we are struck by the predominantly 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 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	14	37	84	22	3.73	.81
FULL TIME NTTF will teach introductory courses that tenure-track faculty will not teach	14	39	33	58	13	3.11	1.14
The use of FULL TIME NTTF undermines tenure	23	62	28	34	9	2.62	1.16
The use of FULL TIME NTTF undermines shared governance	31	59	25	31	11	2.57	1.21
The use of FULL TIME NTTF improves overall teaching quality	10	31	68	38	10	3.04	.98
The use of FULL TIME NTTF adds flexibility to departmental offerings	1	7	12	112	24	3.94	.75
The use of FULL TIME NTTF threatens academic freedom	56	61	25	10	5	2.03	1.03
The use of FULL TIME NTTF limits creativity in curriculum design	36	67	24	25	5	2.34	1.10
The use of FULL TIME NTTF solves budgetary problems	3	23	35	81	15	3.52	.92
The use of FULL TIME NTTF is beneficial in meeting student learning outcomes	7	16	64	63	5	3.24	.94
The use of FULL TIME NTTF is beneficial in meeting institutional objectives	2	15	43	87	9	3.53	.84
The use of FULL TIME NTTF is problematic because they lack the time to engage students outside of the classroom	32	58	25	29	13	2.57	1.24

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	4	9	42	78	20	3.57	1.04
PART TIME NTTF will teach introductory courses that tenure-track faculty will not teach	13	42	28	54	16	3.04	1.26
The use of PART TIME NTTF undermines tenure	24	69	27	26	7	2.43	1.15
The use of PART TIME NTTF undermines shared governance	27	61	22	30	12	2.52	1.28
The use of PART TIME NTTF improves overall teaching quality	12	48	69	23	1	2.62	.94
The use of PART TIME NTTF adds flexibility to departmental offerings	0	11	17	111	14	3.74	.91
The use of PART TIME NTTF threatens academic freedom	40	73	25	11	4	2.07	1.01
The use of PART TIME NTTF limits creativity in curriculum design	25	64	26	33	5	2.47	1.16
The use of PART TIME NTTF solves budgetary problems	2	7	20	90	33	3.83	1.06
The use of PART TIME NTTF is beneficial in meeting student learning outcomes	7	31	73	41	1	2.91	.94

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 is beneficial in meeting institutional objectives	4	18	42	84	5	3.36	.99
The use of PART TIME NTTF is problematic because they lack the time to engage students outside of the classroom	11	21	21	64	36	3.52	1.32

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: 157)		
	Full-Time NTTF	Part-Time NTTF
Introductory courses	131 (83%)	120 (76%)
Professionally oriented courses	119 (76%)	109 (69%)
Highly specialized courses	84 (54%)	94 (60%)
Low enrollment courses	27 (17%)	20 (13%)
High enrollment courses	60 (38%)	33 (21%)
Remedial courses	69 (44%)	55 (35%)

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. The next question indicates most participants are able to effectively strategize in order to make hiring decisions, which seems in conflict with the previous question. What is the reality when it comes to taking time to strategize, reflect, and seek out others in strategizing for faculty hiring? We recommend further exploration of the CCAS 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	101	56	.64	.48
I seek out stakeholders (faculty, staff, administrators) internally and discuss strategies	143	14	.91	.29
I seek out peers (other deans) externally and discuss strategies	63	94	.40	.49
I gather data about hiring internally and externally	91	66	.58	.50
I make decisions alone because other people often sway me from the appropriate decision	0	157	.00	.00
I do not have the time or opportunity to focus on the decision process; it just seems to happen without a conscious strategy	4	153	.03	.16

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.
83	67	6	1.50	.58

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.
2	2	7	3	8	12	8	0	0	18	96	8.22	2.82

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, rather than being held accountable to a set staffing plan or other guidelines.

Does your college track data about non-tenure-track faculty relating to:				
	Yes	No	Mean	S.D
Numbers hired per semester	134	23	.85	.36
Salary	136	21	.87	.34
Benefits	120	37	.76	.43
Contract renewals	113	44	.72	.45

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	100	57	.64	.48
Follow a college staffing plan	50	107	.32	.47
Receive feedback from a member of the central administration	101	56	.64	.48
Receive feedback from President	23	134	.15	.36
Receive feedback from Board of Trustees	3	154	.02	.14

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 supports. When examining policies in place, we are most struck by the fact that mentoring and long-term contracts are valued by participants, yet less than 60% of campuses provide these supports. 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	0	0	0	37	117	4.67	.78
FULL TIME NTTF should be provided with medical benefits	1	0	3	37	114	4.64	.78
FULL TIME NTTF should be provided with family leave	2	5	12	39	96	4.36	1.06
FULL TIME NTTF should be provided with an office	1	0	0	46	108	4.62	.76
FULL TIME NTTF should have access to office supplies	1	0	0	42	112	4.64	.75
FULL TIME NTTF should have access to administrative support	1	1	3	44	106	4.57	.81
FULL TIME NTTF should be provided with structured mentoring from another faculty member	1	0	9	61	84	4.41	.83
FULL TIME NTTF should have access to professional development opportunities related to teaching	1	1	5	70	77	4.35	.89
FULL TIME NTTF should have access to professional development opportunities related to research interests	4	30	41	41	39	3.48	1.20
FULL TIME NTTF should be able to take a paid sabbatical	31	54	35	14	21	2.58	1.31
FULL TIME NTTF should be able to be hired through multi-year contracts	2	9	15	70	58	4.04	1.06
FULL TIME NTTF should serve on departmental/college committees	2	9	27	71	46	3.92	1.01
FULL TIME NTTF should formally advise students	0	17	24	68	45	3.84	1.08
FULL TIME NTTF should participate in institutional governance	2	15	24	68	44	3.80	1.14

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	131	2	7	2	10	86%
Medical benefits	143	6	3	0	2	93%
Family leave	123	11	7	2	7	82%
Office space	150	2	1	0	1	97%
Office supplies	153	1	1	0	0	99%
Administrative support	148	4	1	1	1	95%
Structured mentoring	87	8	22	6	26	58%
Professional development opportunities related to teaching	121	17	5	2	6	80%
Professional development opportunities related to research interests	64	25	16	23	23	42%
Paid sabbaticals	19	35	26	29	41	13%
Multi-year contracts	89	16	16	8	22	59%
Service on departmental/college committees	118	2	9	6	16	78%
Formal advising of students	113	1	10	9	21	73%
Participation in institutional governance	94	1	16	12	24	64%

Policies for Part Time NTTF

In general, responses indicate that participants feel that full time NTTF should be supported more than part time. Again, mentoring 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	1	2	9	61	78	4.24	1.11
PART TIME NTTF should be provided with medical benefits	14	47	40	33	17	2.83	1.28
PART TIME NTTF should be provided with family leave	20	63	33	24	11	2.52	1.21
PART TIME NTTF should be provided with an office	1	7	18	92	32	3.80	1.11
PART TIME NTTF should have access to office supplies	0	1	4	90	57	4.20	.94
PART TIME NTTF should have access to administrative support	0	4	5	88	55	4.14	.99
PART TIME NTTF should be provided with structured mentoring from another faculty member	1	7	26	84	34	3.82	1.05
PART TIME NTTF should have access to professional development opportunities related to teaching	5	14	32	75	26	3.56	1.16
PART TIME NTTF should have access to professional development opportunities related to research interests	29	66	28	19	10	2.36	1.19
PART TIME NTTF should be able to take a paid sabbatical	79	65	4	2	2	1.52	.77
PART TIME NTTF should be able to be hired through multi-year contracts	35	49	27	34	7	2.45	1.26
PART TIME NTTF should serve on departmental/college committees	38	50	36	23	5	2.31	1.18
PART TIME NTTF should formally advise students	40	55	36	16	5	2.21	1.13
PART TIME NTTF should participate in institutional governance	38	46	31	29	5	2.32	1.26

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	96	3	23	15	13	64%
Medical benefits	33	41	26	16	28	23%
Family leave	16	47	34	19	33	11%
Office space	129	9	4	2	6	86%
Office supplies	147	1	1	1	0	98%
Administrative support	138	5	4	2	1	92%
Structured mentoring	47	12	29	26	36	31%
Professional development opportunities related to teaching	79	17	25	14	14	53%
Professional development opportunities related to research interests	18	33	33	38	26	12%

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
Paid sabbaticals	2	32	38	39	37	1%
Multi-year contracts	29	25	37	29	28	20%
Service on departmental/college committees	29	14	29	43	33	20%
Formal advising of students	27	10	33	39	41	18%
Participation in institutional governance	21	9	32	41	44	14%

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 very few participants.

Please select the three policies/supports (in no particular order) that are most important for contributing to student learning.		
	Marked	%
Orientation	89	57%
Medical benefits	4	3%
Family leave	1	<1%
Office space	58	37%
Office supplies	5	3%
Administrative support	44	28%
Structured mentoring	76	48%
Professional development opportunities related to teaching	110	70%
Professional development opportunities related to research interests	8	5%
Paid sabbaticals	1	<1%
Multi-year contracts	27	17%
Service on departmental/college committees	7	5%
Formal advising of students	16	10%
Participation in institutional governance	8	5%

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
0	25	25	57	31	13	4	0
0%	16%	16%	36%	20%	8%	3%	0%

Please select which choice best describes your institution.	
Private	Public
49	106
31%	68%

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	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (12%)	46 (29%)	44 (28%)	48 (31%)
Graduate Students	3 (2%)	41 (26%)	64 (41%)	37 (24%)	8 (5%)	4 (3%)

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	4 (3%)	4 (3%)	30 (19%)	28 (18%)	22 (14%)	26 (17%)	20 (13%)	11 (7%)	12 (8%)
Non-tenure-track faculty, full-time	39 (25%)	47 (30%)	43 (27%)	14 (9%)	5 (3%)	3 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	4 (3%)
Non-tenure-track faculty, part-time	17 (11%)	31 (20%)	35 (22%)	28 (18%)	20 (13%)	10 (6%)	9 (6%)	3 (2%)	4 (3%)

Are the following faculty unionized on your campus?			
	Yes	No	%
Tenure-track faculty	43	114	27%
Full time non-tenure-track faculty	40	117	26%
Part time non-tenure-track faculty	32	125	20%

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
21	54	49	19	14
13%	34%	31%	12%	9%

To whom do you directly report?	
Provost	President
154	3
98%	2%

Please select the organization in which you are a member.	
ACAD	CCAS
29	157
19%	100%