

Report of the Committee on Faculty Rank Distribution

This committee was tasked with examining issues regarding faculty rank distribution at Duke that address three primary questions. First, has the mix of faculty shifted over the last 10-15 years at Duke across the categories of (i) tenured and tenure track faculty (TT), non-tenure track regular rank faculty (NTTR; examples include Professors of the Practice and Research Professors) and non-regular rank faculty (NRR, often called adjunct faculty)? Second, what are the factors that have led to a shift, and what is the impact of the shift? And third, what recommendations regarding faculty rank distribution should be considered at Duke going forward? This report is organized by these three questions.

As described in depth below, the faculty mix has shifted dramatically in recent years at Duke, toward NRR faculty. This is also true at many of our peer institutions. We believe the issue is of critical importance as it impacts the core of the university in two primary ways. First, it signals a shift away from the generation of research. Second, it has negatively impacted faculty morale and the sense of community across campus. Our committee believes that it is only fitting with Duke's ambitions to be a leader in higher education for it to have a positive impact on this central issue in the post-secondary education community across the country.

Question 1. Has faculty rank distribution changed at Duke?

With the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research we examined whether the mix of faculty has shifted at Duke. Exhibit 1 summarizes the change in each of the three categories of faculty at Duke. Across the entire university, TT faculty numbers decreased slightly over the 2008-2017 time period (-3% growth), while NTTR faculty numbers (e.g., Professors of the Practice (POPs), etc.) grew 66% and NRR faculty numbers grew 72%. Excluding schools with large numbers of clinical faculty (i.e., Medicine and Nursing) TT faculty numbers grew slightly between 2008-2017 (3% growth), while NTTR faculty numbers grew 34% and NRR faculty numbers grew 36%. We worked with the administration in each of the schools to ensure accuracy, and our Committee is convinced that this shift in faculty rank is real, with TT faculty numbers not growing, while NTTR faculty and NRR faculty numbers have grown substantially. While we don't have reliable data on NRR faculty numbers at Duke prior to 2008, the Committee's qualitative assessment combined with what quantitative data we could gather suggests that this category has grown most significantly over the past 15 years.

We also examined whether similar shifts have occurred at our peer institutions using data from the AAU Private University pool (The Association of American Universities is an association of leading comprehensive research universities distinguished by the breadth and quality of their programs of research and graduate education. The AAU only collects data for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty and does not have a group analogous to Duke's NTTR faculty category. Faculty at our peer institutions that are in Duke's NTTR category are included as non-tenure track faculty only as the NTTR category is relatively unique to Duke. As can be seen in Exhibits 2a and 2b, the pattern of changes in faculty mix is quite similar at many of our peer institutions. While there are some reporting inconsistencies across institutions, our Committee believes that

our peer institutions have also grown their non-tenure track faculty numbers at a considerably higher rate than their tenure track faculty.

We conclude that the faculty mix at Duke has unambiguously shifted away from tenure track faculty toward non-tenure track regular rank faculty, and especially toward non-regular rank faculty.

Question 2a. What are the factors that have led to the shift in faculty mix at Duke?

To understand the factors that led to the shift in faculty mix, this Committee conducted a “listening tour” that consisted of interviews with key constituencies across campus. Those interviewed included the Deans of all of the schools, the Provost, chairs of several Institutes and Departments, leaders of Duke’s Faculty Union, administrators responsible for financial management within the schools, as well as a large number of our peer faculty across faculty rank. While it is difficult to clearly attribute causality to changes in faculty mix over time, our Committee feels that the following issues (some of which are unique to Duke) have played an important role.

1. The global financial crisis that occurred in 2008 placed greater emphasis on balancing budgets within the university. Individual schools were treated increasingly as profit and loss centers, with Deans held accountable for ensuring their school’s revenues matched their expenses. This has led to an increased focus on the cost of hiring faculty, with faculty in the least costly categories (NRR in the vast majority of circumstances) being the easiest way to “balance the books.”
2. A side effect of the enhanced emphasis on balancing the books was a large increase in Master’s programs in many schools at Duke. In some cases, the skill set required to teach in such programs did not align well with the expertise of our TT faculty, leading to the hiring of NRR faculty. In others, uncertainty in demand for new programs made it less risky (and typically much less costly) to staff such programs with NRR faculty. In virtually all cases, the introduction of a new Master’s program leads to a shift away from TT faculty.
3. Not surprisingly, as the faculty mix has shifted toward more NRR faculty the number of TT (and NTTR) faculty able to do the administration, service and teaching required to cover all of the various Centers, Institutes, Interdisciplinary initiatives, Certificates, majors, etc. has declined. As a result, relative to a TT/NTTR faculty member 15 years ago current faculty at Duke are expected to do more non-research work. (As an aside, the Committee does not feel that our NRR faculty peers should be asked to do more than teach their classes, as such roles are typically not part of their job descriptions and they are not compensated for such work.) As our TT/NTTR faculty fill roles in all of the domains mentioned above, they cannot teach as much as they otherwise would (or are unable to teach our introductory level classes, for example), thus necessitating the

hiring of NRR faculty to cover the holes in the teaching schedule, which further perpetuates the problem.

4. The dramatic growth of Duke's medical system and increased competitive pressure in the healthcare market have led to more liberal use of the use of NRR faculty titles for Clinical faculty. For example, a clinician who does no teaching or research and focuses entirely on patient care is often given a title as part of their recruitment to the Duke network.

Question 2b. What are the implications of the shift in faculty mix at Duke?

With such a dramatic shift in faculty mix a number of implications emerged during our discussions with various stakeholders on campus. The most consequential of these implications are summarized below.

1. For reasons discussed above, many of the NRR appointments that were intended to be short term have essentially become permanent appointments (especially in Trinity College). Such appointments traditionally have not come with benefits, a guarantee of consistent employment, or administrative support. Many NRR faculty were unhappy with their treatment and felt forced to unionize to increase their voice within the University. Our Committee was very impressed by the leaders of the Faculty Union. They were articulate and passionate in their belief that the NRR faculty need to be better supported and integrated into the broader faculty community. It is the belief of the Committee that all NRR faculty must have improved support and collaboration to ensure they do the best job they can and feel a part of the broader faculty. Each of our Committee members were relatively naïve about the history that led to the formation of the faculty union, and feel that the broader faculty community would benefit from an educational program that explained its history. Most importantly, the Committee recommends that the Academic Council receive an annual report on the faculty union from both the union leadership and Duke administration.
2. While there are clearly exceptions, NRR appointments in professional schools are largely supplementary positions for working professionals who want to "give back" and stay involved in education. NRR appointments in Trinity, by contrast, are much more likely to be a means of making a (limited) living. The diversity of the faculty is interwoven with the shift toward NRR hiring over the past ten years. In professional schools, recruitment of available local professionals from limited personal networks, and bypassing the usual faculty search process often leads to low diversity (e.g., in many schools most NRR faculty are white males). In Trinity, where the NRR position is a primary source of income, faculty are much more likely to be female or underrepresented minorities. While the Committee supports diversity across all faculty ranks, it is unacceptable that the faculty rank category with the highest levels of diversity is the one that does not pay a living wage. While we did not examine it from a quantitative perspective, we believe

NTTR faculty (who are often paid lower salaries relative to their TT peers) may have similar issues of overrepresentation of women.

3. As a leading global institution of higher education, Duke's mission is to both generate and disseminate knowledge. The shift in faculty mix toward NRR faculty, whose job descriptions and subsequent evaluations have the least emphasis on generating research, means that Duke is shifting away from being a source of the world's new, innovative insights.

Question 3. What does the Committee recommend regarding faculty mix going forward?

The Committee has focused our recommendations on those we feel are highest priority. Because many of our peer institutions are similarly shifting faculty mix we believe it is unlikely that Duke can reverse the shift that has occurred over the past ten years. That said, we feel that any future shifts should be made with much more deliberation and involvement of the faculty. We recommend the following policies be implemented as soon as possible:

1. Long term strategies for faculty mix must be submitted annually to the Provost by each school/division. Rather than submit annual plans that address only the current year's hiring needs (largely focused on TT and ignoring NTTR and NRR faculty hiring) the Deans of each school must put together a long term (e.g., five year) plan for their mix of faculty.
 - To the degree that these strategic plans involve significant numbers of NRR faculty hires, the Deans in consultation with the Chairs must have explicit plans and time lines for converting these NRR hires to regular rank positions. Exceptions should be made in professional schools where the skills required to teach some classes require an active professional practice – for example, an Intensive Care Unit (ICU) nurse is likely best suited to teach a class on nursing in the ICU).
 - Each Dean's five-year plan with respect to rank should be shared not only with the Provost but also with the faculty in their schools, and be voted upon by the faculty.
2. Any high-level curriculum changes that are anticipated to impact faculty mix must be explicit about this impact and have a strategy for addressing it, as outlined in recommendation 1 above. For example, adding or removing a language requirement, a statistics or math requirement, or a writing requirement to the curriculum have had or would have substantial impact on the faculty mix. Explicit acknowledgement and strategies addressing the change should be part of any dialogue around curriculum shifts.

3. We recommend that the Academic Council receive an annual report on the status of the faculty union and its relationship with the broader Duke community, both from the faculty union itself as well as from Duke administration.
4. Diversity goals must be applied in both RR and NRR faculty hiring. It is not acceptable to have dramatic differences in the approach to faculty diversity across both groups. Faculty diversity should be a goal at all levels of faculty rank, whether expanding beyond limited personal networks for professional school NRR hiring (which often lack diversity), or ensuring that NRR hires who depend on the NRR faculty appointment as a primary source of their livelihood are not disproportionately female and underrepresented minorities. Duke should be certain that lower-compensated faculty positions (such as many NRR and even NTTR positions) are not the primary source of faculty diversity at Duke.
5. All tenure track faculty at Duke must be committed to teaching in addition to their other critical roles. Hiring research faculty who are not committed to teaching should be strongly discouraged. While this is a very small actual driver of the change in faculty mix, it sends the wrong message and can easily be eliminated. Similarly, for Duke to continue to build its role as a leader amongst research institutions globally, the majority of its faculty ought to be hired and evaluated as researchers as well as instructors. That balance shapes the institution on the inside—in terms of collaboration in the production of new knowledge—and shapes its international reputation.
6. Finally, the use of the title of Professor, Clinical Professor, Adjunct Professor, Lecturer, etc. should be more standard across schools and divisions at Duke. A future faculty committee will be required to facilitate this standardization. To illustrate the challenge of standardization, currently Duke employs almost 60 titles to describe its faculty members.

Exhibit 1. Changes in Faculty Rank Distribution at Duke by School/Division from 2008-2017

Duke Regular Rank and Non-Regular Rank Faculty

% Change in Number of Faculty 2008 to 2017

		Tenured/Tenure Track	Other Reg Rank	Non-Regular Rank
Arts & Sciences	Humanities	-6%	34%	77%
	Natural Scienc..	13%	24%	2%
	Social Scienc..	-3%	31%	34%
Divinity	Divinity	11%	-7%	-58%
Fuqua	Fuqua	-19%	-18%	141%
Law	Law	17%	200%	-6%
Medicine	Basic Scienc..	-16%	36%	42%
	Clinical Scie..	-11%	76%	72%
Nicholas	Nicholas	16%	42%	-6%
Nursing	Nursing	65%	100%	262%
Pratt	Pratt	18%	17%	44%
Sanford	Public Policy	28%	63%	116%
Total		-3%	66%	72%
University Total (excl. Medicine & Nursing)		3%	34%	36%

Number of Faculty

	Tenured/Tenure..		Other Reg Rank		Non-Regular Ra..	
	2008	2017	2008	2017	2008	2017
Humanities	144	135	59	79	103	182
Natural Scien..	150	170	42	52	42	43
Social Sciences	192	187	26	34	50	67
Divinity	27	30	14	13	26	11
Fuqua	106	86	17	14	17	41
Law	42	49	10	30	47	44
Basic Sciences	138	116	55	75	31	44
Clinical Scien..	740	659	859	1,510	742	1,276
Nicholas	44	51	12	17	36	34
Nursing	23	38	24	48	74	268
Pratt	95	112	23	27	34	49
Public Policy	29	37	19	31	25	54
Total	1,730	1,670	1,160	1,930	1,227	2,113
University Total (excl. Medicine ..	829	857	222	297	386	525

Exhibit 2a. Changes in Non-Medical Faculty Rank Distribution at Peer Institutions from 2005-2015

FT Non-Medical	Non-Tenure Track			Tenured/TT		
	<u>2005</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Duke University	417	518	24%	758	851	12%
Boston University	732	912	25%	793	882	11%
Brandeis University	103	111	8%	252	251	0%
Brown University	125	226	81%	559	644	15%
California Institute Of Technology	94	67	-29%	276	287	4%
Carnegie Mellon University	616	545	-12%	622	695	12%
Case Western Reserve University	137	288	110%	509	505	-1%
Columbia University	152	396	161%	1,137	1,087	-4%
Cornell University	359	375	4%	1,448	1,477	2%
Dartmouth College	95	116	22%	422	487	15%
Emory University	379	378	0%	651	688	6%
Georgetown University	253	412	63%	594	654	10%
Harvard University	1,072	485	-55%	1,291	1,256	-3%
Johns Hopkins University	646	974	51%	654	816	25%
Mit	220	8	-96%	902	999	11%
New York University	744	1,383	86%	1,299	1,615	24%
Northwestern University	353	502	42%	894	1,009	13%
Princeton University	113	168	49%	702	762	9%
Rice University	103	175	70%	475	532	12%
Stanford University	63	64	2%	928	1,072	16%
University Of Chicago	485	426	-12%	849	996	17%
University Of Pennsylvania	155	486	214%	1,044	1,091	5%
University Of Rochester	94	158	68%	460	501	9%
University Of Southern California	632	1,143	81%	1,081	1,152	7%
Vanderbilt University	263	409	56%	589	686	16%
Washington University In St Louis	222	313	41%	604	687	14%
Yale University	403	555	38%	810	848	5%

Exhibit 2b. Changes in Medical Faculty Rank Distribution at Peer Institutions from 2005-2015

<u>FT Medical</u>	<u>Non-Tenure Track</u>			<u>Tenured/TT</u>		
	<u>2005</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Duke University	977	1,435	47%	823	841	2%
Boston University	943	873	-7%	4	0	-100%
Case Western Reserve University	398	264	-34%	387	288	-26%
Columbia University	1,479	1,737	17%	624	516	-17%
Dartmouth College	100	144	44%	149	106	-29%
Emory University	1,174	1,780	52%	431	344	-20%
Georgetown University	184	161	-13%	147	139	-5%
Harvard University	629	45	-93%	377	344	-9%
Johns Hopkins University	346	382	10%	1,697	2,279	34%
New York University	553	1,937	250%	606	385	-36%
Northwestern University	408	617	51%	273	315	15%
Stanford University	428	554	29%	292	376	29%
University Of Chicago	570	738	29%	250	123	-51%
University Of Pennsylvania	845	1,917	127%	468	500	7%
University Of Rochester	516	775	50%	766	799	4%
University Of Southern California	912	1,291	42%	378	314	-17%
Vanderbilt University	1,218	2,299	89%	586	587	0%
Washington University In St Louis	890	1,330	49%	596	615	3%
Yale University	886	912	3%	507	1,291	155%