SUMMARY REPORT OF SURVEY REGARDING NTT FACULTY, AND NEXT STEPS IN LIGHT OF NTT TASK FORCE ACTION ITEMS
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In Fall 2015, a web-based survey was sent to all UA faculty; 37.8% responded. Responses reveal a great degree of shared culture among faculty of different categories across all units/departments and colleges. There is general agreement that Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty play a critical role in the University’s mission, and that they should be given appropriate titles, access to support and resources, fair compensation, and opportunities for career progression. A majority of respondents in all categories agreed that reliance on NTT faculty does not undermine the institution of tenure. The survey results further suggest that work can be done to improve the work lives of NTT faculty in the following areas: the annual review process; clear and consistent titling and contracting practices; ensuring a ladder for career progression; improved access to various support resources; and a share in institutional governance.

INTRODUCTION

The Non-Tenure Track Task Force, originally convened by Faculty Senate in spring 2013, was reconstituted in spring 2015 to review progress on 23 Action Items recommended by the original Task Force. The report, including the 23 Action Items, is available in Appendix A.

These recommended action items fell under four major areas:

1. Establish better processes for contracts, reviews, promotion, and career advancement of Non-Tenure Track faculty (clarify career ladder, timing and processes, make better use of multi-year contracts)

2. Support NTT faculty and their supervisors (orientations, access to resources and instructional support, professional development, policy training and awareness)

3. Improve definitions of NTT titles (better define and differentiate title options, make better use of existing title options, better define “Adjunct“)

4. Consider enfranchisement options vis-à-vis faculty governance

In fall 2015, the Task Force conducted an online survey to gather input from all categories of UA faculty (TT, NTT, CS) in service of moving Action Items forward appropriately and strategically.
METHODS

The survey consisted of 25 questions, including 7 that were conditional, based on faculty appointment type, and 4 open-ended/text response questions. The survey instrument is attached as Appendix B.

A total of 3,793 faculty members were invited to participate. They included tenured/tenure-eligible (TT), continuing status/continuing-eligible (CS), and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty of all titles and ranks – across all UA colleges (including College of Medicine-Phoenix). The list of faculty was pulled from UAccess Analytics and represents the entirety of the faculty body at the time (fall 2015).

A total of 1,435 faculty members completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 38%. Response rates by category of employment and by college are available in Appendix C.

Of the 1,435 respondents, 88% (1,255) identified themselves as faculty, 4% (58) as department heads/directors, 3% (44) as administrators above heads/directors, and 5% (74) as “other” (though their ‘please specify’ responses suggest that most of these were NTT faculty).

The breakdown of respondents by self-reported classification is reported below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/Tenure-eligible</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing/Continuing Eligible</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINDINGS

Highest Priorities

All respondents were asked to prioritize various goals by assigning each a rank of 1 (Highest Priority) through 4 (Should not be a Priority at all). Respondents were allowed to use rankings more than once. The following elements were ranked as of highest priority. We found no differences in prioritization between respondents of different categories (TT, CE or NTT):

1. Ensuring that NTT faculty compensation is equitable for their work and contributions (n = 1038);
2. Ensuring that NTT faculty have clear options for promotion or career advancement (n = 867);
3. Ensuring that NTT faculty have transparent access to the institutional support, resources, and information necessary to perform their work (n = 756)
We identified four areas for focus of analysis, and these map closely with the priorities expressed by respondents. The areas are: contracts, reviews, promotion, and career advancement; support for NTT faculty and their supervisors; improvement of definitions of NTT titles; and consideration of enfranchisement in faculty governance. We take each of these areas in turn.

Area 1: Contracts, reviews, promotion, and career advancement

- Hundreds of UA NTT faculty think of themselves as career UA employees
- While the majority of NTT faculty are generally satisfied with the annual review process, for many, peer review and supervisory feedback components are lacking
- Most UA NTT faculty have service and/or research obligations to the University, though the compensation for and evaluation of these obligations is inconsistent across the institution
- The number of long-term NTT faculty in entry-level ranks suggests opportunities for improvement around career progression

National narratives around adjunct and NTT faculty suggest that many cobble together full-time employment by teaching, researching, or serving at multiple institutions. At the UA, this does not appear to be the case: Of the NTT respondents polled, only 4% indicated that they work at other institutions in service to a full time career in academia. While these findings are encouraging, the survey findings suggest specific areas of opportunity to improve the UA experience for faculty.

Distribution of Effort

With regard to allocation of effort, national narratives tend to focus on NTT faculty’s primary role in instruction. At the UA, the situation is more complex. While more than 90% of survey respondents reported a significant teaching obligation (mean reported obligation = 53%, mode = 80%), we also had 60% report a service obligation (mean reported obligation =21%, mode = 10%); 51% report a research or creative expression obligation (mean reported obligation = 30%, mode = 10%), and 40% reported some form of administrative work (mean reported obligation =22%, mode =10%).

Relative to teaching, the trends shown by the open-ended questions (which 34% of NTT survey respondents chose to complete) skewed heavily negative, with concerns about overwork, under-compensation for additional work, overly large class sizes impacting quality of instruction, and strenuous teaching loads (“inhumane,” as one respondent put it).

On the positive side, those respondents who indicated satisfaction with their teaching wrote of appropriate or even light course loads, a high degree of autonomy, and balance in their various duties (research, instruction, service, supervision).

In all cases, evaluation of teaching was seen to be largely fair.
Open-ended questions around **research and creative activity**: NTT faculty identify lack of time or lack of FTE for research in their contracts as a barrier to scholarship. Over half of NTT respondents indicated a preference for a larger research assignment. A number of those who do conduct research reported that such work is done on their own time, and/or that their research is not recognized in annual performance reviews, and/or that the research they produced is compared unfavorably to similar work by TT colleagues. ¹

**Service**, meanwhile, plays a clearer role in NTT faculty work lives: 85% reported service to their programs or units, 70% reported service to the profession, and 58% reported service to the community.

Of the NTT respondents providing comments around their experiences with Service, most reported problematic experiences: they are encouraged to perform service without compensation, and/or the amount of service they perform is more than allocated in their FTE workloads, and/or their institutional service is not as valued or recognized as that of their tenured colleagues, and/or the opportunities that are presented to them are limited or under-utilize their expertise (i.e., being largely clerical). Only 1 in 5 (20%) of the respondents (n =11) reported satisfaction with their service expectations and experiences.

**Reviews, Performance Evaluations, and Career Advancement**

Just over half of NTT respondents reported satisfaction with their performance evaluations, while 20% are dissatisfied. In terms of process: 58% of NTT respondents reported that they meet with their supervisors as part of their annual performance review (25% do not) and, despite the UHAP call for peer reviews, just under half of respondents indicated that peer evaluation is part of their review (with 30% reporting that it is not).

While the data suggest positive review experiences for many NTT faculty, the open-ended questions, drawing comments from about a quarter of respondents, provide a different impression. The vast majority of respondents offering comments report negative experiences, including receiving limited or no feedback from supervisors, feeling not truly evaluated, feeling that too much weight is placed on TCEs, vague evaluation criteria, and a lack of connection between evaluation and promotion opportunities.

Of NTT respondents, only 43% indicated awareness of a career progression ‘ladder’ associated with their current position, and only 45% of NTT faculty indicated they had had a conversation with their supervisor about promotion (with more than 33% of respondents reporting never having discussed promotion with their supervisor). Further, only half of the NTT respondents reported having a mentor (official or unofficial) to whom they could turn with questions about career progression, while about one-third indicated they had none.

¹ Relative to the Colleges of Medicine (Phoenix and Tucson), many clinical faculty report that they do not feel they have time to devote to research (“clinical dominates”).
Perhaps not surprising in light of the above, our findings are that many NTT faculty, despite years of service, are still in the lowest ranks.²

These findings are particularly problematic when considered against faculty hopes for the future: When asked about career path, 51% of NTT faculty responded that they would like to be career employees at the UA (meaning, work at the UA through retirement), if possible. A similar percent felt confident that, should they want to continue in their position, it will be available to them (though over a quarter of NTT faculty indicated lack of confidence in their UA employment into the future). Relative to NTT vs TT/CS track: 41% of NTT faculty indicated a preference for a tenure-track path, while one-third expressed a preference for their current, nontenure-track path over one with tenure. Just 6% identified their UA employment as a means to a future TT position elsewhere.

Our contract system was also identified as an area of opportunity for improvement. The UA requires that faculty who will not be renewed be given 90 days’ notice from the time of the new contract period,³ but less than half (46%) of NTT faculty reported that they get their contracts for the new term in a timely matter, and 29% reported they do not have appropriate notification (at least 90 days) about contract renewals.

² UA Access tells us that there are no Principal Lecturers at the UA; despite this, seven faculty reported Principal Lecturer as their title.
³ Unlike appointed personnel, who also have contracts with 90 day notices, faculty notices are from the date the new position would start – typically 90 days from the start of the new semester. Appointed personnel receive their notice 90 days before the end of the contract period, typically April 1 for a position that ends with the fiscal year. This means that NTT faculty who aren’t being renewed are only told as much as late as June – too late in many cases to find a faculty position elsewhere.
Area 2: Support for NTT faculty and their supervisors

- TT and NTT faculty report having similar access (or lack of access) to support resources, but stark differences appear specific to the areas of access to career mentoring, awards and recognition, professional development opportunities, information on grant availability, and participation in shared governance, with more NTT than TT faculty reporting challenges accessing information and resources.

All faculty members were asked whether they felt they had appropriate access to instructional policies and resources. Results for TT and NTT respondents are shown below, ranked from the smallest to the largest difference between TT and NTT ‘Yes’ responses. The data suggest very close similarities between TT and NTT groups and positive experiences in the experiences of both groups on many of these items. While the institution does an excellent job providing access to resources for many faculty, perceptions about access varied most between these two groups in terms of support for conference travel (Δ =18%), ability to participate in shared governance (Δ =21%), invitations to college-level gatherings (Δ =25%), and an orientation to duties of the job (Δ =37%).
Area 3: Improvement of definitions of NTT titles

- The working definition of “Adjunct” currently in UHAP is causing confusion. An alternate title is being proposed.

The definition currently in UHAP reads that Adjunct is “a title that is given only to nontenure-eligible faculty members on an appointment that is less than .75 FTE or less than a full academic or fiscal year, and which is not expected to be renewed beyond a single fiscal or academic year.”

Yet it is unclear as to whether both, or only one, of the two clauses is necessary, as evidenced by the fact that 36% (43) of respondents with an Adjunct title indicated it was inappropriately applied to their situation, when informed of the UHAP definition. Most who indicated that the title was inappropriate indicated that they were employed at less than .75 FTE, but that they did have an expectation of renewal. Respondents did note that ‘expectation of renewal’ was not the same as a guarantee – but rather was a reasonable expectation based on their understanding of their own situation.

Area 4: Consideration of enfranchisement options vis-à-vis faculty governance

- The majority of all categories of respondents report enjoying close working relationships with faculty in other categories.
- There is uneven access to shared decision making at the department, college, and university levels.
- The majority of respondents across all categories agree that reliance on NTT faculty does not undermine tenure.

NTT faculty report mixed experiences with enfranchisement opportunities, indicating that the three biggest barriers are lack of information generally, lack of knowledge of specific opportunities, and an absence of invitation (or active dis-invitations) to participate in shared decision-making or governance. Many commented that there were no conversations about shared governance or participation in faculty decision-making upon hire, so the expectation for participation was not initially established.

- Just over half of NTT respondents indicated that they can participate in department-level governance; 30% indicated they cannot.
- Relative to shared governance outside their departments (meaning, at College- or University-level), only 38% responded they can participate in governance.
- Specific to voting rights, 45% of NTT respondents agreed that they have appropriate voting rights within their department, while 33% disagreed.

Not unrelated, 70.9% of all responding faculty members agreed that the effectiveness of their units is or could be enhanced through collaboration between TT and NTT faculty, with only 4.7% disagreeing.
SUMMARY

The findings of the survey, both qualitative and quantitative, suggest there exists opportunities for policy clarifications and practice improvements that align with the action items identified by the NTT Task Force. This is particularly true given that about half of all NTT respondents indicate they would like an improved career track with possible continuation to retirement.

While some faculty are aware of promotion ladders and have the types of substantive conversations with supervisors that are essential to career progression, many others have had insufficient access to information and promotion opportunities, and they would welcome career planning and promotion (including consideration for time served for a more immediate, fair promotion, where appropriate, and including possible moves to the tenure track, either here or elsewhere). Certainly this is an area where training and additional resources could be leveraged to improve opportunity and satisfaction, and at a low cost relative to benefit.

Also, relative to practice, many NTT faculty report that multi-year contracts would increase job security. Our hiring practices currently involve repeated year-to-year contracts for many faculty, with only a few colleges utilizing the multi-year option. Yet unlike in other metropolitan areas where multiple colleges and universities provide alternate employment opportunities for NTT faculty, Tucson is served only by the UA and Pima. In light of the local market, job security is particularly important.

With regard to shared governance, the results suggest that while participation in shared governance is not the highest-ranked objective in and of itself, there are opportunities for broader enfranchisement. Nearly a third of NTT respondents reported some lack of appropriate access to shared governance, with significant differences across contexts (within unit versus College- and/or University-wide). We will also note that it may be the lack of access to shared governance that results in the unscrupulous behavior reported around the employment of NTT faculty elsewhere in the nation. While the challenges at the UA do not seem nearly as egregious as they are in some other institutions, there are still definite areas for improvement.

Respondents’ perceptions of effort allocation suggest that the tradition of counting teaching effort in terms of ‘courses per semester’ is problematic. This practice fails to capture teaching obligations in clinical programs and in a number of other areas across the University. While this issue is certainly not unique to NTT faculty, the facts that more than 90% of NTT faculty report some teaching obligation and that many NTT faculty are employed in units for which the ‘courses per semester’ rubric is ill-suited, suggest opportunities for campus-wide conversations around teaching allocations in FTE. We also see that service and research obligations are ill-defined for a number of NTT faculty, with effort either not accounted for in FTE, and/or not considered in annual performance reviews.

Relative to the College of Medicine, both in Phoenix and Tucson, many respondents wrote of concerns with the Banner transition, particularly about inferior benefits and status, challenges with grant funding as a criterion for continued employment, and a sense that the College of Medicine is becoming a “two-tiered” system.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Area 1: Improve processes for contracts, reviews, promotion, and career advancement of Non-Tenure Track faculty

Relates to the following NTT Task Force recommended Action Items: (4) Making better use of the title “Principal Lecturer”; (7) Institutional prompt for nonrenewal notices; (8) Better defined renewal dates; (12) Work with departments to establish formal decision-points/career tracks for multi-year contracts; (13) Develop more flexible renewal process for multi-year contracts; (14) Share best practices across campus for multi-year contracts; (15) Gather/make available unit career path options from across campus

Prior to the survey, in spring 2015, the reconvened Task Force made recommendations regarding the compensation of NTT faculty (Appendix A). Those recommendations have, at the time of this summary, already been enacted in a few key units (i.e., the Writing Program, units in the College of Humanities).

We recommend both policy and practice adjustments to enable further adoption of the recommendations across campus. Specifically, we suggest policy language within UHAP Chapter that directs supervisors to address promotion timelines and expectations for NTT faculty. We further recommend the establishment of workshops for NTT promotion (not unlike those provided for P&T/CS&P), which will aide NTT faculty in the crafting of a dossier and teaching portfolios, as appropriate. Such workshops would first require some institutional baseline expectations for promotion processes and documentation, and training for supervisors so they can be prepared to evaluate NTT faculty for promotion appropriately (i.e., utilizing peer review, etc.). We recommend that all units (or colleges, if that is the preference) have processes for NTT promotion vetted with the Provost's office and available on the Provost's website.

With regard to the high percentage of NTT respondents who report working outside their contracts (and beyond their compensation), we recommend the establishment of a clear protocol with regard to the crafting of offer letters. Such letters should delineate distribution of effort and assignments, and indicate clearly what is expected in each of teaching, research, and service, as appropriate.

Relative to length of contracts: while we appreciate that multi-year contracts create salary obligations that limit flexibility on the part of RCU's, our goals as an institution are to grow the student body, and the university will need a labor force to match. Between that and the many NTT faculty that have been at the UA for multiple years, our practice of contract terms does not match our pattern of hiring.

Area 2: Support NTT faculty and their supervisors

Relates to the following NTT Task Force recommended Action Items: (11) Establish set of required/core elements for NTT annual reviews; (16) Orientations for all new NTT faculty; (17) Creation of instructional portal; (18) Gather/share professional development opportunities and leaves offered by colleges across campus; (19) Trainings for H/D and other administrators around policies and practices for NTT faculty; (20) Provide support to individual faculty members who have policy questions
Our recommendations in this area follow the recommendations in Area 1: more clarification in policy, and more trainings and resources with respect to practice. We appreciate that the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs has already made significant steps to include NTT faculty in orientations and networking opportunities. That spirit of inclusion could also extend to career mentoring, perhaps via a resource contact or staff person in the Provost's office.

We also strongly recommend that an Instructor Portal be created, to help all faculty (TT/CS/NTT) connect with resources on an as-needed basis (syllabus templates, academic integrity policies, Title IX requirements, FERPA, grants through ORD and elsewhere, etc).

With regard to grievance recourse, the Task Force recommends assessment of alignments (and lack thereof) in current policy and practice to maximize clarity and equity across faculty groups as appropriate.

**Area 3: Improve definitions of NTT titles**

*Relates to the following NTT Task Force recommended Action Item: (1) Defining Adjunct*

With regard to the title Adjunct, the Task Force has made a recommendation to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs to better define Adjunct in UHAP. Given that use of the Adjunct title has specific policy implications (no requirement for annual performance reviews, no requirement for non-renewal notice, no promotion ladder), the NTT Task Force commends recent efforts to define Adjunct in UHAP. Based on interpretations from Adjunct faculty on the current definition, we recommend changes as follows:

**Current:** Adjunct means a title that is given only to nontenure-eligible faculty members on an appointment that is less than .75 FTE or less than a full academic or fiscal year, and which is not expected to be renewed beyond a single fiscal or academic year.

**Recommended:** Adjunct should generally not be used for full fiscal or academic year appointments that are reasonably expected to extend beyond a single academic or fiscal year, though units have discretion whether or not to use adjunct when such appointments are at less than .75 FTE. Adjunct should never be used for full fiscal or academic year appointments at .75 FTE or greater.

**Area 4: Consider enfranchisement options vis-à-vis faculty governance**

*Relates to the following NTT Task Force recommended Action Item: (23) Investigate unifying all faculty under common policy and governance structures, as appropriate*

With regard to shared governance, the Task Force is weighing a proposal to Faculty Senate regarding the enfranchisement of NTT faculty who are not employed under multi-year contracts. The goal would be to unify all faculty and continuing status professionals under common governance and representation, and to expand eligibility for active participation to long-term year-to-year NTT faculty with lecturer and ranked professor titles. Such a change would bring greater intellectual consistency and fairness to shared governance by prioritizing length of employment over length of contract, and would allow the University to benefit from the insights of NTT faculty with multiple years of institutional engagement in service to sound decision-making.
A Note about NTT Faculty and the Institution of Tenure

The NTT Task Force recognizes that the tenets of academic freedom rests on the institution of tenure, and that shared governance is only possible in higher education with robust participation of tenured faculty. That said, we also recognize that the national conversations around unscrupulous use of people’s time, effort, and skills in NTT roles may be in part a function of the fact that NTT faculty have not had enough of a shared governance role in institutional decision-making. With these issues in mind, we posed the following statement to all respondents, asking them to express agreement or disagreement: 

Reliance on NTT faculty undermines the institution of tenure.

The results of the aggregate responses to the survey (N=1380) were that 51% disagreed with this statement, 27% agreed, and the remaining 22% neither agreed nor disagreed. Disaggregated by category (TT, N=547 or NTT, N=631), the responses were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both categories, disagreement was more frequent than agreement. A smaller proportion of NTT faculty agreed with the statement than TT faculty did, but there was also a slightly greater proportion of NTT faculty who expressed neither.

We conclude from this that the question of the relationship of NTT faculty to the institution of tenure is of concern to a significant percentage of respondents; but that a majority of respondents do not see reliance on NTT faculty as a fundamental threat to the institution of tenure.
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Non-Tenure Track Task Force Report and Action Items

The Non-Tenure Track Task Force was charged by the Chair of the Faculty, Wanda Howell, to “study the clarity and consistency in the use of non-tenure track titles, comparable job expectations, and compensation and career track options.”

Principles:

• Non-Tenure Track faculty are mission-critical, contributing in a variety of significant ways to the teaching, research/innovation, and outreach/impact goals of the institution.

• Both the institution and Non-Tenure Track faculty benefit when goals and expectations for this group are clearly identified.

• To be effective, units need clear campus guidelines concerning Non-Tenure Track appointments, but they also need flexibility locally in order to describe, employ, and manage their Non-Tenure Track workforce in ways that meet their unique needs.

Stakeholder Input

Task Force members have conferred with, solicited feedback from, or presented to the following units:

• Faculty Senate, Senate Executive Committee, & Faculty Officers;
• Heads Up/Dept Heads;
• Academic Personnel Policy Committee [APPC];
• The Council of Academic Business Officers [CABO];
• Division of Human Resources;
• Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs;
• Provost’s Council & Deans’ Council [pending]; and
• The Office of Institutional Research and Planning Support.

Action Items

This report contains a number of action items. Each has an accompanying timeline that details when the item is expected to be addressed. The Task Force also recommends that the Chair of the Faculty formally appoint a group to review and report on progress, as well as on any continuing (or new) issues related to Non-Tenure Track faculty no later than FY 2015/16.

Non-Tenure Track Titles

Currently, there are minimal campus-wide definitions for Non-Tenure Track faculty titles. As a result, there has been little uniformity in how these titles are applied. Establishing clearer
definitions of and distinctions between different Non-Tenure Track titles (based on the nature of assigned work, the distribution of effort, and the term and/or FTE of the position/appointment) could allow units to:

1) More consistently and appropriately allocate work;
2) Provide campus with a better understanding of the nature of service and the distribution of effort for individuals with different Non-Tenure Track titles;
3) Provide Non-Tenure Track faculty with titles that more clearly represent their work and their level of engagement with and value to the university; and
4) Lead to a stronger shared understanding of the different potential career paths for our Non-Tenure Track faculty.

Action Item: Defining “Adjunct”

Action Item 1: Standardize the use and meaning of “adjunct” across campus so that it is used solely as a modifier to describe Non-Tenure Track appointments that are less than full fiscal or academic year appointments in term and are below .75 FTE in effort.¹

Timeline: The new definition should be in place and used on contracts across campus beginning July 1, 2014.

See Appendix A: Conditions for Adjunct Appointments.

The Task Force initially looked at using the same criteria for adjunct as we will be using for ACA and UA benefits eligibility (see Appendix B). However, after investigating the very low numbers of appointments throughout the campus which are both benefits eligible and also less than fulltime or full effort; and thinking as well about the purpose of assigning (or not assigning) the adjunct modifier (to, as much as possible, delineate “fully engaged” NTT appointments from those that are not), we settled on the above criteria.

Action Item: Defining “Visiting”

Action Item 2: Standardize the use and meaning of the title modifier “visiting,” so that there is greater clarity and consistency in how it is used across campus.

Timeline: The new definition should be in place and used on contracts beginning July 1, 2014.

The Task Force recommends that the campus establish guidelines to 1) primarily limit the use of “visiting” to appointments that are not expected to be renewed multiple times, and 2) to use this title only for appointments of individuals who have held, are on leave from, or are retired from an academic or research position at another educational institution; and/or whose
research, creative activities, or professional achievement makes a visiting appointment the most appropriate title choice. It may be decided that in rare cases when an appointment meets all the criteria for “adjunct,” but an adjunct appointment is inappropriate because of the stature of the individual (e.g., distinguished professor, former high government official, etc.) units should be allowed to use “visiting” as a qualifier instead. The Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Division of Human Resources should work with APPC to finalize the definition.

**Action Item: Differentiating Between Common Non-Tenure Track Titles**

*Action Item 3: Provide greater clarity at the campus level for how units should approach defining and differentiating between Non-Tenure Track Titles, based on the nature of the assigned work and on the distribution of effort.*

*Timeline: The Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will begin working with units to use the broad campus definitions and framework to inform local practice for applying NTT titles. By 2015, all units are expected to have codified their local practice for applying NTT titles and file a description of that practice centrally (with their college and with the office of the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs or other appropriate unit).*

**Action Item: Making Better Use of Principal Lecturer**

*Action Item 4: Principal Lecturer is a title that is described in ABOR (and is referenced in official UA documents, including the Faculty Constitution) but is not in use at the UA. The Task Force recommends that this title be made available for use by units, as appropriate.*

The Task Force recommends that the campus continue to concentrate the distribution of our Non-Tenure Track faculty appointments in either the Lecturer “series” of titles (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer), or in one of the ranked Professor series of titles (Asst./Assoc./Full Clinical, Research, or Professor of Practice; or Asst./Assoc./Full Professor, Non-Tenure Track [NTT]) and use the “Instructor” title sparingly, if at all, as has been our general practice.

These two “series” of titles, however, need to be more formally differentiated to allow us to achieve greater consistency in their use (across campus and within colleges/units), and to provide our Non-Tenure Track faculty with titles that reflect the nature of their assigned work and/or the distribution of their effort. Toward this goal, the Task Force recommends that the campus establish better guidelines and support for units in identifying which titles to use for Non-Tenure Track appointments. These guidelines would concentrate the use of the Lecturer series on those Non-Tenure Track faculty who are primarily engaged in teaching, and use the appropriate ranked Professor title for those Non-Tenure Track faculty whose distribution of effort includes significant additional responsibilities (e.g., leadership on curriculum design,
assessment, advising, program management, or significant service or research responsibilities, etc.) or who are more heavily engaged in graduate education.

Because the specific needs of individual colleges or units will differ, the Task Force suggests that a framework and broad definitions be developed at the campus level (including more descriptive definitions in UHAP) and that those be further fleshed out by colleges or units, using differences in nature of assigned work and distribution of effort to differentiate between these titles locally. Colleges or units should be required to develop these criteria locally, based on the work and needs of their units, and keep an updated copy of those criteria on file centrally (with the office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs or other appropriate unit).

See Appendix B: Selecting Appropriate Non-Tenure Track Faculty Titles.

Contracts, Reviews, Promotion, & Career Advancement

90 Day Notice of Renewal/Non-Renewal: Currently, language is added to contracts that waives the rights in UHAP to notice of nonrenewal or review for employees with appointments of less than six months or for any appointments with “adjunct” in their title.6

Related Action Items:

Action Item 5: The Task Force Recommends that the University curtail the practice of adding language to faculty contracts that waives rights given to them by UHAP (or ABOR).

Action Item 6: The Task Force recommends that UHAP be modified so that Non-Tenure Track faculty members with the adjunct or visiting modifiers in their title (under the revised definition) are not afforded the same right to notice of non-renewal or to notice of eligibility for review7 as are other NTT faculty appointments.

Action Item 7: The Task Force recommends that units be prompted 100 days prior to the renewal date for each of their Non-Tenure Track faculty appointments (other than those with the adjunct or visiting modifiers in their titles), so that notices of non-renewal may be sent out, if necessary.8

Action Item 8: The Task Force recommends that “renewal date” be clearly defined in UHAP (and/or elsewhere in UA policy, as appropriate), so that it is clear when a 90 day notice of nonrenewal must be received in order to comply with policy.9

Timeline: The timing of all of these actions are interrelated and also depend on the implementation of the recommended changes in the use of adjunct and visiting modifiers. As such, they should be put into practice no later than FY2015/16.
Reviews: Regular and thorough reviews are essential to realizing the goals the institution has for Non-Tenure Track faculty, and for those faculty to meet their own professional goals.

- Department heads or supervisors need to review their NTT faculty employees in order to ensure the quality of the product (teaching, research, etc.) they are receiving (toward future decisions concerning renewals/non-renewals, performance improvement plans, or promotion or career advancement), and ensure they are acting good stewards of the fiscal and human resources the University has entrusted to them.

- Non-Tenure Track faculty need to be reviewed in order to understand the value of their contributions to the goals of the unit, to understand areas they might have for improvement or growth, and to be aware of the career path options that may be available to them in the short and longer term.

- UHAP currently requires all faculty (with no distinction between NTT and TT faculty, or between fulltime/effort faculty and limited term/effort appointments) to have annual reviews with peer review (UHAP 3.10).

- In UHAP, recommendations for the promotion of Non-Tenure Track faculty are to be considered by departmental committees on faculty status. If departmental faculty are expected to weigh in on promotions, it is important that they also have the opportunity to provide meaningful feedback for Non-Tenure Track faculty as part of their annual reviews.

- The UA currently utilizes two types of reviews for Non-Tenure Track faculty: those with peer-review and those without. There may also be a significant number of NTT faculty who are not receiving regular reviews.

It is the Task Force’s recommendation that all NTT faculty receive reviews (per current policy), but that reviews with a peer element only be required for NTT faculty without the adjunct or visiting modifiers. As is current policy, the type and extent of the peer element of the review should be at the discretion of each department; some departments may (as they do now) elect to conduct a full peer review to parallel reviews completed for TT and CS faculty, while other departments may elect to conduct a supervisory review with a more formative or developmental peer review component (course observation, evaluation of teaching materials, TCE assessments, etc.).

Establishing required elements for the annual reviews for NTT (or other) faculty could help to ensure there are shared, written assumptions between supervisor and employee about performance in assigned work (strengths, areas needing improvement, etc.), work and workload expectations for the coming year, review of any plans for promotion or opportunities for career advancement, etc.

Action Items: Reviews
Action Item 9: The Task Force recommends that UHAP be modified to require that all NTT faculty receive reviews (as is current policy), but that reviews with a peer element only be required for NTT faculty without adjunct or visiting modifiers. As a result, units would only be required to provide adjunct and visiting NTT faculty with a supervisory review. As is current policy, the type and extent of the peer element of the review should be at the discretion of each department.

Timeline: These changes should go into effect when the rewrite of UHAP goes into effect, preferably prior to FY 2014/15.

Action Item 10: The Task Force recommends that the quality and extent of annual reviews of faculty conducted in a unit be formally included as a data point in the annual and five-year evaluations of unit heads.10

Timeline: As the new processes and competencies for administrative reviews (for both 5-year and annual reviews) are developed and then implemented across campus, this data point should be included as part of those reviews.

Action Item 11: Establish a set of required/core elements for annual reviews for NTT faculty.

Promotion/Career Advancement

Promotion or Career Advancement options for Non-Tenure Track faculty include promotion, which occurs within a title (e.g., Lecturer to Senior Lecturer), or advancement into a different title (e.g., moving from Lecturer to a ranked Non-Tenure Track title) depending on performance, job expectations, departmental funds, and unit priorities.11

Notice of Eligibility for Review

Minimally, Non-Tenure Track faculty who are not in adjunct appointments should be informed of their eligibility to be considered for promotion in rank at reasonable intervals (UHAP currently reads every 5 years). To facilitate this, the Task Force suggests that all annual performance reviews include a component discussing the Non-Tenure Track faculty member’s progress toward promotion/career advancement.

3-Year/Multiple-Year Employment [MYE] Contracts

Many colleges elect to hire their Non-Tenure Track faculty on one-year contracts, though often for many years running. MYE contracts increase job security (thus advancing engagement with the campus and the community); allow for more robust participation in leadership and shared governance; and may increase the retention of valued institutional professionals.

Non-Tenure Track faculty with single-year contracts are currently not considered Faculty for purposes of shared governance (Faculty Senate ARTICLE II Section 1 c. and d.) – and the
decision point rests not on the nature of the service, but rather, on the length of the contract. In addition to a category of “Non-Voting” Members of the General Faculty being proposed later in this document, it is also the Task Force’s recommendation that departments establish formal decision points at which to consider moving their NTT faculty to MYE appointments, particularly in those cases where the individual holds a ranked title (under the new definitions), has consistently exceeded expectations, and where unit budgets allow.

**Action Items: Multiple-Year Contracts**

*Action Item 12*: Work with departments to establish formal decision points for, or career tracks leading to MYE contracts for NTT faculty.

*Action Item 13*: Develop (and market to departments) a more flexible renewal process for those on MYE contracts in order to make these contracts more attractive to units, while still remaining fair to those on the contracts.

**Proposal**: MYE reviews for renewals (done at the end of the second year, as is current ABOR policy) would have three possible outcomes (instead of just two):

1) **Nonrenewal** – the individual is guaranteed a terminal year (as is the case now), but is not renewed beyond that. They could still be rehired in some capacity following the terminal year, but the nonrenewal makes clear that there is no expectation of that;

2) **Conditional Renewal** – the individual is guaranteed a second contract following the terminal year of the MYE contract (is “renewed”), but the type of contract that will be offered [Y2Y or MYE] is determined at least 90 days prior to the renewal date [beginning of the fourth year], when budgets and priorities are more clear; or

3) **Renewal** – the individual is renewed for another three-year contract a year before the end of the current contract (as is current practice).

**Timeline**: The Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs should work with campus stakeholders to develop a more flexible process (or processes) and market it to units beginning in FY2014/15.

**Action Items: Career Path Options**

*Action Item 14*: Gather and make available to campus how some units have established criteria, expectations, and processes/career paths for the awarding of multiple year contracts for NTT faculty.

*Action Item 15*: Gather and make available to campus how some units have established career paths that include a move into continuing status for some of their long term NTT faculty.
Timeline: This work should be undertaken by the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs beginning in FY 2014/15. Information on how units have accomplished the above should be made easily available to other units.

Support for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and their Supervisors

While not specifically mandated as part of the charge, the issue of support for Non-Tenure Track faculty deserves attention. To fully realize the myriad strengths that Non-Tenure Track faculty bring to the institution, in particular, specific content or methods expertise, it will be necessary that Non-Tenure Track faculty be given the tools to fully meet both their own and the institution’s expectations.

Action Item: Orientation

Action Item 16: All incoming NTT faculty should have access to an orientation to the institution to help them succeed in the positions they’ve accepted.

Timeline: Colleges should ensure delivery of orientations to their NTT faculty, but Faculty Affairs should coordinate with colleges, campus HR, and other units to ensure a baseline of information about university policies, procedures, and services are communicated to all incoming NTT faculty.

Orientations allow new faculty to better understand campus culture and values, develop a sense of belonging and buy-in, and situate their particular contributions within the broader goals of the University. From a practical perspective, orientations help create a successful transition to the UA, and can make an often-steep learning curve much more manageable.

Action Item: Instructional support

Action Item 17: Units and colleges currently provide varying kinds (and amounts) of instructional support for faculty. The Task Force recommends the creation of an Instructional Portal to ensure that all faculty have centralized access to the full range of institutional resources, and that all instructional support units have a venue through which to expose their services directly to teaching faculty.

Timeline: An instructional portal should be in place and available to all faculty, no later than the beginning of FY 2015/16.

At a minimum, the instructional portal should include the following:

- Instructional forms (e.g., Change of Schedule Form, Report of Incomplete Grade, Code of Academic Integrity, Record of Faculty/Student Conference, TCE request forms);
• Instructional policies, procedures and guidelines (e.g., FERPA, Grading Policy Manual, UA Undergraduate Course Syllabus Policy, Summary of Course Evaluation Rubric for Tier 1 and Tier 2 General Education Courses, University General Petitions);

• Instructional resources for course improvement, classroom management, and other resources to maximize teaching and learning effectiveness (e.g., Office of Instruction and Assessment; D2L course site request/support; DRC resources and recommendations for Universal Design; Dean of Students office; Think Tank; University Libraries content & services; UA BookStores’ order forms and calendar; TCE calendar, forms, and information; etc.);

• “Where Am I Teaching?” with a link to UITS’s classroom information (note: hundreds of requests are made by instructors to change rooms after classes have started. Not only does this present a burden to Room and Course Scheduling, but it also seriously impacts students who may have crafted their schedules with attention to the amount of time needed to travel from one class to another); and

• Providing (or requiring) online training (FERPA, Sexual Harassment, Information Security, etc.) through the portal would also be a possibility.

**Action Item: Professional Development**

*Action Item 18: Gather and make available to campus examples of “best practices,” from units that have established criteria, expectations, and processes for NTT faculty to take periods of professional leave for defined purposes (analogous to faculty sabbaticals) and other forms of professional development and/or support.*

*Timeline: This work should be undertaken by the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs beginning in FY 2014/15. Information on how units have accomplished the above should be made easily available to other units.*

**Action Items: Policy Awareness and Training for Faculty and Administrators**

While we have mandatory online modules that cover policy and best practice surrounding things such as preventing sexual harassment; understanding IRB/Human Subjects, FERPA, computer security; or even training required for use of campus vehicles or electric carts, we do not require faculty to be trained (or to elect to opt out of such training) in the policies and bylaws that govern their own employment. Likewise, the new heads’ lunches and seminars, while useful for networking and information sharing, are not sufficient for preparing those new to (or returning to) administrative duties on our campus.

*Action Item 19: Training for Administrators: A mandatory core curriculum (online modules, workshops, assessments, etc.) should be developed for new department*
heads or other administrators, in order to familiarize them with their responsibilities, campus (and ABOR) policies and bylaws, avenues for support or mentorship, etc.

Action Item 20: Faculty Awareness: The Task Force recommends that we consider iteratively asking our faculty to validate their understanding of a core set of UA policies, bylaws, and campus practices (concerning employment, governance, etc.), much as we do the areas listed above.

Action Item 21: Support for Faculty on Specific Policy Questions: The Task Force recommends a faculty group be charged with providing support for individual faculty who have questions about policy (or the implementation of policy) that would fall under the purview of faculty governance.

Suggested Model: Currently, the Academic Personnel Policy Committee’s [APPC] primary role is to review policy changes or proposals that would affect faculty and forward appropriate action items to Senate:

[APPC] receives reports and considers and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to promotion and tenure/continuing status (policy and procedures; statistical report on decisions from the previous year, sabbatical and leave of absence policy, performance evaluation policy and procedures and their relationship to salaries, definition of faculty membership, and governance)

Charging APPC to take on this additional function would not only offer faculty a point of contact for these questions, it would also provide the members of APPC with a better understanding of any nagging issues with or misconceptions about policy among the faculty at large.

Action Item 22: Policy Portal: the Task Force recommends the campus invest in the development of a campus policy portal or other mechanism through which campus (and ABOR) policies could be more easily (and exclusively) browsed or searched.

Faculty Governance

- Currently, the “General Faculty” of the University of Arizona includes tenure-eligible and tenure track faculty, continuing-eligible and continuing status professionals, and MYE [Multiple Year Employment – i.e. 3 year contract] Non-Tenure Track faculty.¹³ General Faculty members have voting rights, may hold office in faculty positions, and have full access faculty governance at the college and unit levels.

- Non-Tenure Track faculty who are NOT on multiple year contracts are represented in shared governance at the campus level by APAC, but at the college and department level, their representation/participation is mixed. Some of these faculty are represented within their colleges’ or departments’ faculty governance bodies (and may have some voting rights within the college or unit) while others are not.
• While Non-Tenure Track faculty are not defined as members of the “General Faculty” in the Faculty Constitution, because they are defined as “faculty” in UHAP, they are governed by many of the same policies that apply to Tenure-Track faculty. This often puts Non-Tenure Track faculty in the unusual position of being represented by different shared governance entities, depending on the situation (APAC for some things and Faculty Senate for others).

**Action Item: Unify Faculty under Common Policies and Governance Structures**

*Action Item 23: Have the Constitution & Bylaws Committee investigate unifying all faculty under common policies and governance structures, as appropriate, by modifying the definition of “General Faculty” in the Faculty Constitution and bring potential model(s) to the Faculty Senate and APAC for discussion and/or vote.***

**Timeline:** The Constitution & Bylaws Committee should investigate the options and bring their findings to the Senate and APAC for discussion and/or vote within 12 months.

**Proposal:** One approach would be to include Non-Tenure Track faculty who are not on multiple-year contracts as “Non-Voting Members” of the General Faculty. These non-voting members would have full, elected representation in Faculty Senate14 (number to be determined) and, if appropriate, could be appointed to serve on Faculty Senate committees. They would not, however, be allowed to hold other elected office or vote on other matters. This change would not directly affect faculty governance decisions or practice at the college or departmental levels.

*The Task Force recommends that the Faculty Senate Constitution & Bylaws Committee investigate this, or other options and bring a recommendation back to Senate for a vote or for further discussion. This would include closely reviewing the Constitution, Bylaws, and other pertinent policies or documents to see where and how these documents would have to be modified. The University of Utah has recently unified their faculty, and some of the approaches and wording they’ve used could also be useful in our work here: [http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-300.php](http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-300.php)*

**See Appendix C: Suggested Changes to the Faculty Constitution and By Laws.**

---

1 Adjunct may modify any Non-Tenure Track title (e.g., adjunct senior lecturer, adjunct associate clinical professor, etc.). While “adjunct” should not be used for appointments that do not meet the above criteria, there may be times when units decide not to use the adjunct modifier for appointments that do meet those criteria. Examples might include “visiting” appointments, but could also include situations where a longer-term Y2Y NTT faculty member (with a non-adjunct appointment) reduces their FTE below the .75 threshold (in a move toward retirement or for other reasons, etc.). The Task Force expects that these types of uses will be rare, and will be dealt with on a case by case basis.
Should it be decided, for whatever reason, that the UA will continue not to take advantage of the Principal Lecturer title, it should be removed from official UA documents (such as UHAP and the Faculty Constitution & Bylaws).

Principal Lecturer is a title that is described in ABOR (and is referenced in official UA documents, for example, in the Faculty Constitution), but its use has been discouraged (and it has not been used in at least the past 15 years). The Task Force recommends that the use of this title no longer be discouraged.

The Assistant/Associate/Full Professor, Non-Tenure Track series of titles was developed by and is used in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. While this title does not exist in ABOR, ABOR allows the three universities to develop their own local Non-Tenure Track titles, as needed [ABOR Policy 6-201E.2].

Instructor was historically used (and seems to have been created as a category in ABOR) as a way of allowing universities to hire doctoral candidates without having a dissertation in hand (ABD), either as TT or Non-Tenure Track, and then to move that person into a TT professor appointment once the terminal degree was granted. This practice seems to have ended in 2007 and was only used a handful of times since 2000. In 2009, UHAP was modified to remove tenure-eligible Instructors as a category of employment on our campus. The title has more recently been used synonymously with Lecturer.

This practice seems to have been in place in some form since at least 2002.

This means that their supervisor would not be obligated to inform them in writing (at 5 year intervals) that they are eligible to be reviewed for promotion, as is required by UHAP. It does not mean that they do not have the right to have their work reviewed by their supervisor. The Task Force believes that the performance of all Non-Tenure Track faculty should be reviewed.

For the academic year, this would be 100 days prior to August 1st. For the fiscal year, it would be 100 days prior to June 30th.

At present, while the renewal date is often considered the same as the start date, for academic year contracts, some may equate the renewal date with the end of the contract (which is different than the start date).

Suggested data points might include things such as:

1. All faculty reporting to the supervisor (or who report to their direct reports) receive an appropriate annual review;
2. Each annual review meets certain requirements (has a peer element, if required; is based on multiple data points, not just generalizations; includes both a summary of the work, the outcomes, impact and individual’s role in the successes [or failures]; includes a section detailing areas that need improvement and what would constitute improvement; includes a section on career path/plans – promotion, advancement, etc., as appropriate; includes an annual goals and expectations section, detailing assigned duties and work for the coming year, etc.);
3. Any NTT faculty who are not renewed receive 90-day nonrenewal notices; and
4. Administrators (and their direct reports) adhere to local, college, and university policies and bylaws, and ensure an understanding of and compliance with these policies and bylaws within their units.

Some units have conflated promotion and career advancement in developing potential career paths for their NTT faculty (e.g., “promoting” Senior Lecturers into Full Professors of Practice). While this in some ways is contrary to the approach recommended by this Task Force, it is in pursuit of the same broader goals. As such, units that have developed effective career path options locally should not feel compelled to change them.

“Conditional” may be a poor word to use here, as the renewal is not exactly conditional – a renewal is guaranteed, but the type of contract is not.

We currently have approximately 80 MYE Non-Tenure Track Faculty, 900 Y2Y Non-Tenure Track Faculty, 1500 TT Faculty, and 230 CS faculty/professionals.
These elected representatives would have all the rights and responsibilities of other Senate members (i.e. they would be allowed to vote on any topics put to a Senate vote). The Constitution & Bylaws Committee may want to consider whether adjunct or visiting faculty (using the new definitions) should be eligible to vote for Senate representatives (both for logistical and philosophical reasons).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Category</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Tenure-Eligible Faculty</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing/Continuing-Eligible Faculty &amp; Professionals;</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Year Employment (MYE) Non-Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track Faculty (Year-to-Year &amp; Less than a Year Contracts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NTT Faculty at more than ½ time</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NTT Faculty at less than ½ time</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>467</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conditions for Adjunct Appointments*

Is the NTT contract for a full, fiscal or academic year [Y2Y contract]?

YES

Is the FTE .75 or greater?

YES

Meets the Criteria for an Adjunct Appointment

NO

DOES NOT meet the Criteria for an Adjunct Appointment

NO

*This chart does not apply to multiple-year [MYE] contracts. The “adjunct” modifier should NOT be used for any MYE faculty appointments.
Selecting Appropriate Non-Tenure Track Faculty Titles

1. Is the primary purpose of the appointment only to teach undergraduate courses?
   - **NO**
   - **YES**

2. Are service or scholarship/research responsibilities expected of this position? [and/or] Is the position responsible for mission critical work such as leadership in curriculum design, assessment, advising, program management, etc.?2
   - **YES, A LOT**
   - **YES, SOME**
   - **NO, NONE**

3. Instructor3
4. Lecturer (or Senior Lecturer)

5. Is the primary purpose of the appointment [also] to teach graduate or clinical courses?
   - **NO**
   - **YES**

6. Is the primary purpose of the appointment to engage in, be responsible for or oversee a significant area of research or scholarship?
   - **NO**
   - **YES**

7. [Asst., Assoc., Full] Research Professor
8. [Asst., Assoc., Full] Clinical Professor

---

1. This flow chart is intended to be a starting point to help units to consider the appropriateness of appointments at different NTT titles based on the nature of service and workload distribution of the position. It is not intended to be used as a prescriptive tool. Units should develop their own criteria to inform these decisions.

2. The nature of the work and distribution of effort in a position are the key criteria in differentiating between the lecturer title and any type of NTT professor title. Colleges or units should develop criteria to differentiate between these series of titles locally, based on the work and needs of the unit, and keep an updated copy of those criteria on file with the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.

3. While the Instructor title should largely be limited to adjunct appointments, if used at all, in some units it could be appropriate for non adjunct appointments with 100% teaching responsibilities.

4. SBS uses the series of titles Asst./Assoc./Full Professor, Non-Tenure Track as well as Professor of Practice.
Appendix B - The Survey Instrument

Default Question Block

Q1.
The Task Force on Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty's charges are twofold.

- Follow up on and assess the status of the recommendations made in the 2014 NTT Task Force report (starts on page 75 in the packet available here); and

- Better understand issues facing NTT Faculty at the UA, as a way of informing current and future discussions and recommendations for action.

A quick note to clarify what is meant by "NTT faculty" at the UA:

NTT Faculty have a number of job titles at the UA, including (but not necessarily limited to) 'Instructor', 'Lecturer (various ranks)', 'Professor of Practice (various ranks)', 'Clinical Professor (various ranks)', 'Research Professor (various ranks)' and 'Professor - Non-Tenure Eligible (various ranks)'. Some NTT Faculty have 'Adjunct' or 'Limited Term Adjunct' modifiers in front of their job titles. NTT Faculty may be hired on limited term (shorter than 1 semester), semester-long, year-long, or multi-year contracts (three years maximum, renewable).
**A quick note about the survey:**

All of the items on this survey are optional, but we hope you'll respond candidly to each item that pertains to you. The presence of an option below does NOT imply that the option is in (or out of) compliance with UA policies and procedures, and we will NOT utilize this survey for purposes of 'policing' your work.

Your participation in this survey is anonymous, although the survey system (Qualtrics) does capture IP address information of respondents. We will use (and/or present) results only in aggregate, with any data we believe might render participants personally identifiable redacted.

We hope you will respond candidly, and that if you have additional feedback for us you will contact us. Please send questions or comments to Mika Galilee-Belfer, NTT Task Force member, at mikagb@email.arizona.edu

Q2. Which of the following best describes your primary position (select the MOST applicable in your view):

- Faculty
- Administrator (above Department Head)
- Department Head or Director of School
- Other (please specify)

Q3. Which of the following best describes your current contract status (select the MOST applicable in your view):

- Tenure/Tenure-eligible
- I don't know
- Continuing/Continuing-Eligible
- Other (please specify)
- Non-Tenure Track faculty
Q4. Which of the following best describes your highest faculty rank?

- [ ] Full
- [ ] Associate
- [ ] Other (please specify)

Q5. Which of the following best describes your highest faculty rank?

- [ ] Assistant
- [ ] Instructor
- [ ] Principal Lecturer
- [ ] Other (please specify)
- [ ] Associate
- [ ] Lecturer
- [ ] It's complicated (please specify)
- [ ] Full
- [ ] Senior Lecturer
Q6. With which College(s) is your position affiliated? Select all that apply.

- Agriculture and Life Sciences
- Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture
- Colleges of Letters Arts and Sciences (Paradise Valley)
- Education
- Eller College of Management
- Engineering
- Fine Arts
- Honors
- Humanities
- James E. Rogers College of Law
- Medicine - Phoenix
- Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health
- Nursing
- Optical Sciences
- Pharmacy
- Science
- Social and Behavioral Sciences
- UA South
- Other (please specify)
- I don't know

Q7. Is the term 'adjunct' in your title?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know
Q8. The University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP) defines *adjunct* as:

"a title that is given only to nontenure-eligible faculty members on an appointment that is less than .75 FTE or less than a full academic or fiscal year, and which is not expected to be renewed beyond a single fiscal or academic year."

Given this definition, do you feel that *adjunct* is an appropriate modifier for your title?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No (please explain)
Q9. Which of the following best describes your work with Tenure Track or Continuing Status Faculty in your own unit(s)? (NOTE: if you do not have CS or TT faculty in your unit, please skip this question).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work closely with my TT/CS colleagues.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel respected by my TT/CS colleagues.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my role is valued by my TT/CS colleagues.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my voice is heard in discussions my TT/CS colleagues.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10. Which of the following best describes your work with Non-Tenure Track Faculty in your own unit(s)?
(NOTE: if you do not have NTT faculty in your unit, please skip this question).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work closely with my NTT colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effectiveness of my unit is enhanced through collaboration between TT and NTT faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

| All UA Faculty, Tenure Track or not, should have a research, discovery, or creative product obligation. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Reliance on NTT Faculty undermines the institution of tenure. | O | O | O | O | O |
| The UA underutilizes NTT Faculty. | O | O | O | O | O |
| The effectiveness of my unit is enhanced (or could be enhanced) through collaboration between TT and NTT faculty. | O | O | O | O | O |
Q12.

How long have you been a faculty member at the UA, irrespective of title (i.e. adjunct, instructor, research scientist, etc.)? Please do not include time as a Graduate Assistant.

- [ ] Less than one full Academic year.
- [ ] 1-3 years.
- [ ] 4-5 years.
- [ ] 6-10 years.
- [ ] Longer than 10 years.
- [ ] It’s complicated (please specify).
Q13. You indicated that your career path is not on the Tenure Track. Which, if any, of the following apply to you? You may select as many as apply.

- I prefer a NTT career path over a Tenure Track path.
- I would prefer a Tenure Track career path, if one were available.
- I would like to be a career employee at the UA (meaning, work at the UA through retirement, if possible).
- My employment at the UA is primarily to gain experience that will help me in a Tenure Track job search later.

- I consider my employment at the UA to be supplemental to my primary career outside of academia. Please indicate the nature of your primary career.
- I consider my employment at the UA to be supplemental to my primary career inside of academia. Please indicate your other academic institutions, and your roles in those institutions.
- Other (please explain).

Q14. We would like to learn more about your distribution of effort. If your distribution of effort does NOT include one or more if these categories, please leave the relevant fields BLANK (do not enter '0' or '0%').
Please indicate % of effort in your worklife (NOTE: total should equal your total FTE% - 100% if full-time, 50% if half-time, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Creative Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15. Please indicate how many courses you are expected to teach in a typical semester. If you receive a course release for any of these, please explain in the comments in the question that immediately follows.

○ 5  
○ 4  
○ 3  
○ 2  
○ 1  
○ None of the above (please specify)

Q16. Do you have any comments particular to your teaching workload that you would like to share? If so, please provide them.
Q17. Please indicate the type of service you do, select all that apply.

- Service to the profession
- Service to the institution (unit, college, student advising/mentoring, etc.)
- Service to the community
- Other (please explain)

Q18. Do you have any comments particular to your service workload that you would like to share? If so, please provide them.

Q19. Do you have any comments particular to your research/creative activity workload that you would like to share? If so, please provide them.
Q20. The UA requires that all employees receive an annual performance evaluation. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My evaluation includes a peer review component.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department head/director and I meet to review my performance evaluation together.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with how I am evaluated (please elaborate if necessary).</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q21. With regard to **shared governance**, and thinking about your own current situation, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can participate in Department-level governance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have appropriate voting rights within my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can participate in shared governance activities outside of my department (i.e. at the College or University level).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to exercise <strong>Academic Freedom</strong> in my duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sufficient recourse should I have a grievance on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q22. You indicated that you can not participate in shared governance activities outside of your department. Please select the option(s) that best reflect(s) the barrier(s) to your participation.

☐ My immediate supervisor does not allow this.

☐ My department does not allow this.

☐ My college does not allow this.

☐ University policy does not allow this.

☐ My other work obligations prevent me from doing this.

☐ Other (please explain).

[Box for other explanation]
Q23. With regard to **job security and career progression**, and thinking about your own current situation, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Q24. With regard to **access to resources**, please respond based on your assessment of what would be most appropriate and useful for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timely access to instructional resources (syllabus policies and templates, link to examine the physical and technological configuration of assigned rooms, teaching resources).</th>
<th>I have no access</th>
<th>I have insufficient access</th>
<th>I have sufficient access</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An orientation to the duties of and resources for your position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular updates on campus opportunities and resources relevant to your job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitations to college-level social and informal gatherings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to instructional/research/clinical support relevant to your duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to administrative support staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q25. The following items represent a set of Principles about Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Faculty that has been proposed by the Task Force. Please rate the priority you believe each item should have at the UA, using the following numbers. You may use each number as many (or as few) times as you would like:

1 = Highest Priority
2 = Moderate Priority
3 = Lowest Priority
4 = Should not be a Priority at all

☐ Ensuring that NTT faculty are adequately represented in Shared Governance.
☐ Ensuring that NTT faculty have titles that represent their work and contributions.
☐ Ensuring that NTT faculty have clear options for promotion or career advancement.
☐ Ensuring that NTT faculty have transparent access to the institutional support, resources, and information necessary to perform their work.
☐ Ensuring that NTT faculty compensation is equitable for their work and contributions.
☐ Ensuring that use of limited-term contract or adjunct faculty by units does not occur where it reasonably could be avoided.
☐ Ensuring that units have clear guidelines from campus administration concerning NTT appointments.
☐ Ensuring that units be given some flexibility locally in order to describe, employ, and manage their NTT workforce in ways that meet their unique needs.
Q26. What would you like this Task Force to know that we haven't asked you about, or that the structure of this survey has not allowed you to express?

Q27. Thank you again for your participation in this survey. We value your input, and appreciate your candor. If you have other comments, questions or suggestions you'd like us to hear, please contact Mika Galilee-Belfer, NTT Task Force member, at mikagb@email.arizona.edu
## Appendix C - Response Rates by Category of Employment and College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty Code</th>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>% Participated by College by Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Life Sciences</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Planning and Landscape</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine-Tucson</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine-Phoenix</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare, Nursing</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5% of total participants)</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5% of total participants)</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Optical Sciences
(2% of total participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pharmacy
(2% of total participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Science
(13% of total participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social and Behavioral Sciences
(15% of total participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eller College of Management
(6% of total participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Law
(2% of total participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Public Health
(3% of total participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UA South
(2% of total participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>NTT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>