

## Summary of Resolution

On November 2, 2016 the full Academic Programs committee met to discuss the October 20, 2016 version of the document *Proposed revisions to the faculty handbook concerning regular rank nontenure track faculty*. APC members were joined by guests Professor Judith Kelley, lead author of the report and Kevin Moore, Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs. In preparation for the conversation APC members were asked to review the report and were provided with a summary table prepared by David Jamieson-Drake detailing the distribution of TT and non TT regular rank faculty across Duke departments, divisions and schools for the years 2006-2016.

## Preamble

Our conversation began by asking Judith Kelley to provide some background and context to explain the origins of this suggested set of faculty handbook revisions. Dr. Kelley illustrated the Dean's Cabinet concerns that initiated this effort by showing us the 3" thick dossier compiled for the five year review of a Sanford School professor of the practice alongside the 2.5" thick dossier from a review just five years earlier. This simple demonstration summarizes the frustration of many University administrators who feel that review procedures are too frequent, too onerous and too poorly matched to non tenure track regular rank (hereafter nonTTRR) faculty strengths. Through a year of discussions Dr. Kelley and her committee uncovered tremendous variation in the standards and expectations of nonTTRR faculty across the University as well as general frustration by nonTTRR faculty with the lack of clear guidelines and standards for the preparation and evaluation of their promotion materials. Guidance was limited to a section of appendix C of the Duke Faculty Handbook (FHB) that was written in 1988 and last updated in the early 1990s ([https://provost.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/FHB\\_App\\_C.pdf](https://provost.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/FHB_App_C.pdf)).

The standing document describes the criteria for appointment and promotion as follows (emphasis added as underline):

"C. Criteria for appointment, reappointment and promotion Each department (unit) establishes its own criteria for evaluating candidates for appointment, reappointment and promotion in regular, non-tenure track ranks, which are appropriate to its discipline, and submits these in writing to the Dean for approval. The Dean will then submit the proposed guidelines to the provost for review and modification so as to <sup>1</sup>insure comparable standards throughout the University. Units that report directly to the provost will submit guidelines to the provost for review. Candidates for reappointment or promotion <sup>2</sup>will have access to these criteria prior to their review. Criteria should be more rigorous for each higher level of faculty rank and in general should parallel, but not necessarily be equivalent to those used for tenure track faculty. In the case where criteria differ among departments (units), the <sup>3a</sup>Dean is responsible for assuring that they are equally rigorous for equivalent ranks in different departments (units). The <sup>3b</sup>provost is responsible for assuring equally rigorous criteria in different schools and institutes. Appointment or promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor, Research Professor or Professor of the Practice of ... requires outside review according to procedures that are determined by the Dean (or provost). Individual departments (units) determine whether outside review is required for appointments or promotions at lower levels."

It is clear from the recent assessment that

<sup>1</sup>standards for promotion and review are not standard throughout the University

<sup>2</sup>appointment and promotion criteria are not always made available to candidates

<sup>3</sup>equally rigorous criteria are not necessarily being applied in A&P decisions (or at least there is limited centralized oversight or coordination of these guidelines)

The current document was drafted to provide a base expectation for all nonTTRR faculty at Duke outside of the Schools of Medicine and Nursing while still allowing necessary flexibility to tailor these non TT positions to the divergent needs and priorities of hiring departments, divisions and schools. APC members are supportive of the need to bring greater clarity and centralized oversight to the appointment and promotion of nonTTRR faculty and we applaud this addition to the faculty handbook. APC members support the accompanying recommendation that individual contracts for nonTTRR faculty should: be consistent with published departmental guidelines; provide transparent and clearly defined expectations for promotion at the time of the original appointment; and, be updated upon reappointment or promotion to include any change in expectations required for subsequent reappointment and promotion decisions. Individual contracts should be a part of all A&P evaluations, and department guidelines must be publicly available. We applaud this effort to formalize A&P guidelines and to insist on far greater transparency about individual expectations at every stage of career review. Upon enactment of the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook, all hiring units should review their respective bylaws regarding A&P for consistency with the new guidelines and revise them accordingly. APC recommends that this effort be emulated by faculty of the School of Medicine and the School of Nursing which were not included in the current effort.

While these revisions to the FHB represent an important step in improving the working environment for nonTTRR faculty across Duke University, APC members raised questions about the roles, responsibilities and representation of this growing component of the University faculty. Since 2006, the number of Duke nonTTRR faculty has nearly doubled (from 997 to 1852), with nonTTRR faculty now exceeding the number of TT faculty (1670 in 2016). Like many of our peer institutions, Duke needs to thoughtfully consider the implications of growing the population of non-tenured faculty while holding the number of tenure lines static. In 2016, 24% of the faculty of Arts and Sciences and 66% of faculty in the School of Medicine are nonTTRR, with proportions in our professional schools ranging from 15-42% of faculty. It is clear that there has been substantive change in the prevalence and importance of nonTTRR faculty in the University's mission over the last decade and the resulting shifts (or lack thereof) in University culture, governance and approaches to education deserves attention. We urge central administration to take up overarching questions, such as:

What is the appropriate distribution of nonTT and TT faculty at the level of the University or within its component units? Is it appropriate and desirable that a significant fraction of Duke's undergraduate teaching is being accomplished by nonTTRR faculty or that TT faculty may be less engaged in service teaching efforts? Is it appropriate or desirable that a large proportion of our faculty scholars are not protected by tenure and what are the consequences for academic freedom and governance? What are the implications for units in which nonTTRR faculty form a

substantial minority or the majority of the voting faculty? These are questions that rise above the individual strategic decisions of the University's component units, representing important philosophical and ethical questions about how we define and envision our faculty.

### **Resolution**

APC supports the proposed revisions to the Duke University Faculty Handbook that seek to clarify expectations for appointment and promotion for non tenure track regular rank faculty at Duke University.

APC recommends that Duke undertake a detailed self study of the historic and current distribution of faculty among tenured, non-tenured regular rank and non regular rank faculty. Such a study should have two aims. The first is to better understand the diverse expectations and primary concerns of nonTT faculty across campus. The second is to understand the consequences of this growing faculty constituency on Duke's scholarship and education. Such a self study should inform our forward looking strategy for future hiring and evaluation, policy setting and community building in all three faculty categories.

**Vote** - 28 approved