The purpose of this report is to provide data about the composition of our faculty with respect to other research active, private universities. As the university continues to improve, rise in national rankings, and compete with aspirant universities for students and research funding, the quality and composition of the faculty will play critical role. Strategic decisions about the composition of faculty must take into account many factors, including opportunities and challenges in the ever-changing landscape of higher education, our mission, goals, signature strengths, weaknesses and values as a university. It is hoped that this report will help inform the Senate and the discussions between faculty and administrators about these issues.

The two principal data sources for this report are the annual Northeastern University Fact Book and the federal government’s Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds). IPEDS was used to create a comparison group of 45 private, non-profit U.S. universities that had a Carnegie classification of high or very high research activity. A list of the universities is in the Appendix. Although this list contains elite universities, such as Stanford, it also contains peer institutions (e.g., Syracuse), as well as universities (e.g., Hofstra) that NU has surpassed in the US News & World Report rankings. In order to minimize the effect of skewed distributions and extreme scores on the comparisons between NU and the comparison group, the median was used as a measure of central tendency for the comparison group.

Subsequent to the University’s 1990 financial crisis, the university purposefully pursued a “smaller and better” undergraduate enrollment strategy. Budgeting constraint resulted in a reduction of the number of the faculty, especially the professoriate (i.e., tenured and tenure-track faculty). The professoriate declined from 775 in 1990-91 to 590 in 2000-01 (Lowndes, 2001).
The last decade has brought a concerted effort and the resources needed to hire more full-time faculty at NU. The success of this commitment is reflected in Figure 1. The number of NU full-time faculty has increased 42% from 785 in 2002-03 to 1,111 in 2011-12. NU’s percentage increase is double that of the median increase of the comparison group of private universities. Moreover, the hiring has substantially accelerated during the last few years.

The increase in NU faculty was needed to cope with a 30% increase in the number of NU full-time equivalent graduate and undergraduate students since 2002-03. The addition of NU faculty has helped to substantially close the gap between NU’s student-to-faculty ratio and the median student-to-faculty ratio of this comparison group of private universities (Figure 2). In only three years, NU reduced its student-to-faculty ratio from 19-to-1 to 13-to-1, and is on a trajectory to approach the 11-to-1 ratio of the comparison group. It is important to note that Figure 2 excludes
some types of graduate students, and NU has had a particularly strong increase in graduate student enrollment during the last several years.

Whereas the comparison group of private universities has not increased its median number of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty during the last several years (Figure 3), NU has steadily increased the number of these faculty members. NU had 121 tenure-track faculty in 2002-03, 22 below the median number of the other 45 private universities. Nine years later, NU had 178 tenure-track faculty members, while these other universities had a median number of 155. Given the depth and length of the recent economic recession and its concomitant effect on the hiring at many universities, this is a remarkably positive development for NU.

Although the number of NU tenured faculty has also increased since 2002-03 (Figure 4), the rate of increase is a relatively modest 16% across the decade and is similar to the increase of the comparison group (15% during the decade).
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The sharpest increase in any faculty group during the last decade has been among full-time, non-tenure track faculty (Figure 5). Although the number of these faculty increased a noteworthy 50% among the comparison group of private universities, that number pales in comparison to the 92% increase of NU non-tenure track faculty. At NU, the number of these faculty members has nearly doubled from 218 in 2002-03 to 419 in 2011-12. Even when excluding NU’s College of Professional Studies (CPS), NU’s increase from 2002-03 to 2011-12 is 60%. However, it is important to note that the data for the 45 private universities include units similar to NU’s CPS.

The shift toward hiring non-tenure track faculty is having a major impact on the overall composition of universities’ faculties. In 2002-03, non-tenure track faculty comprised 28% and 27% of the total full-time faculty of NU and the comparison group of universities, respectively (see Figure 6 for NU’s composition in 2002). In 2011-12, non-tenure track faculty comprised 38% of the total full-time NU faculty and 33% of the comparison group’s faculties (see Figures 7 and 8). Although the percentage of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty is consistent over time and between
NU and the comparison group, the major change at NU is the declining percentage of tenured faculty relative to the percentage of non-tenure track faculty. Figures 9 and 10 in Appendix C provide the same data for NU excluding the College of Professional Studies, which is primarily composed of non-tenure track faculty. Although the effect is less dramatic without CPS, the trend is similar.
Within the professoriate, the percentage of NU faculty in the three ranks is similar to the comparison group of 45 private universities (Table 1). About one-quarter are assistant professors, one-third associate professors, and a little more than 40% are full professors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Northeastern</th>
<th>Private Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>42% (313)</td>
<td>42% (263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>34% (256)</td>
<td>32% (217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>24% (176)</td>
<td>26% (177)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to gender, two aspects of NU’s faculty demographics stand out: (a) NU has a greater proportion of full-time women faculty than the comparison group; and (b) unlike the comparison group, NU has more non-tenure track women faculty than non-tenure-track men faculty (Table 2). As recently as 2002, only 36% of NU’s full-time faculty members were women. In 2011, 41 percent NU’s full-time faculty members were women.
Table 2: Faculty by Gender (Fall 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northeastern</th>
<th></th>
<th>Private Universities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Faculty</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure track</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 3 and 4 provide a comparison between NU and the 45 private universities with respect to full-time faculty from underrepresented racial/ethnic minority backgrounds. The IPEDS website identifies the following groups as being underrepresented: American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Asians/Pacific Islanders, African Americans/Blacks, and Hispanics/Latinos. As Table 3 indicates, NU faculty members are slightly more diverse with respect to these groups than the comparison set of private universities.

Table 3: All Full-time Faculty from Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Minority Backgrounds (Fall 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northeastern</th>
<th>Private Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>&gt; 1%</td>
<td>&gt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>&gt; 1%</td>
<td>&gt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>&gt; 1%</td>
<td>&gt; 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In regard to underrepresented racial/ethnic minority backgrounds, both NU’s tenured and tenure-track faculty members are more diverse than the faculty of the comparison group (Table 4). However, NU non-tenure track faculty members are less diverse than the comparison group with respect to these racial/ethnic groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northeastern</th>
<th>Private Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure Track</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Asians/Pacific Islanders, African Americans/Blacks, and Hispanics/Latinos
Appendix A: List of Comparison Universities from the IPEDS Database

Private, non-profit universities classified as having either “high” or “very high” research activity according to the 2010 Carnegie Classification.

University of Southern California
University of Denver
Yale University
American University
George Washington University
Georgetown University
Howard University
University of Miami
Nova Southeastern University
Emory University
University of Chicago
DePaul University
Loyola University Chicago
Northwestern University
University of Notre Dame
Tulane University of Louisiana
Johns Hopkins University
Boston College
Boston University
Harvard University
Tufts University
University of St Thomas
Saint Louis University-Main Campus
Washington University in St Louis
Columbia University
Cornell University
Fordham University
Hofstra University
New York University
Pace University
University of Rochester
St. John's University
Syracuse University
Duke University
University of Dayton
Drexel University
Duquesne University
University of Pennsylvania
Villanova University
Vanderbilt University
Baylor University
Southern Methodist University
Brigham Young University
Marquette University
Stanford University
Appendix B: IPEDS Definition of Student-to-Faculty Ratio

Student-to-Faculty Ratio: Total FTE students not in graduate or professional programs divided by total FTE instructional staff not teaching in graduate or professional programs.

Total FTE students is equal to the number of full-time students plus 1/3 the number of part-time students (Fall enrollment component).

Graduate or first-professional students enrolled in graduate or professional programs such as medicine, law, veterinary, dentistry, social work, or public health, in which faculty teach virtually only graduate-level students (often referred to as "stand-alone" or "independent" programs) are excluded from both full-time and part-time counts.

Total FTE instructional staff is equal to the number of full-time instructional staff to 1/3 the number of part-time instructional staff (Human Resource Component, EAP section).

Instructional staff include employees whose primary function/occupational activity is primarily instruction or instruction/research/public service and are not medical school employees.

Instructional staff teaching in graduate or professional programs such as medicine, law, veterinary, dentistry, social work, or public health, in which faculty teach virtually only graduate-level students (often referred to as "stand-alone" or "independent" programs) are excluded from both full-time and part-time counts.
Appendix C: Faculty Composition of NU Excluding the College of Professional Studies

**Fall 2002**
- Tenured: 57%
- Tenure-track: 16%
- Non-tenure Track: 27%

**Fall 2011**
- Tenured: 50%
- Tenure-track: 17%
- Non-tenure Track: 33%

*Known as University College in 2002*