



Recommendations to Dean Shapiro Part II: Joint Appointments to Reinforce/Build Interdisciplinarity

**Submitted by the Interdisciplinary
& Emerging Programs Sub-Committee:**

Faculty: Jocelyn Ahlers, Martha Stoddard Holmes,
Sheryl Lutjens, Karen Glover,
Elizabeth Matthews, and Linda Shaw;

Dean's Office: Theresa Aitchison and Dawn Formo

Interdisciplinary and Emerging Programs Committee

Proposal: Joint Appointments to Reinforce/Build Interdisciplinarity

March 2013

The Interdisciplinary Programs (IP) Subcommittee recommends that CHABSS prioritize the hiring of joint appointments within the CHABSS and, as opportunities arise, across colleges.

Definition

By joint appointment, the Subcommittee understands instructional or research appointments between two or more departments/units, within or across colleges, with varying percentages of responsibility to each (e.g., 50%/50%; 40%/60%).¹ Joint appointments may be new hires and/or reassignment of existing faculty, and they may be short or long-term appointments. The position can be advertised, hired, and evaluated with the cooperation of two or more departments/units. It may also be created by reassigning a portion of the instructional or research effort of an existing line to another department(s)/unit(s).²

Rationale

Joint appointments will serve the CHABSS mission, Strategic Plan, and three-year plan in various ways that include:

- * Joint appointments can further interdisciplinarity in the College, reflecting the commitment to creativity in the faculty positions we create, the recognition of the complex nature of knowledge in the 21st century, and the innovative pedagogical strategies that joint hires can facilitate.
- * Joint appointments can promote the CHABSS commitment to diversity in curricular content and faculty composition by allowing new resources to be devoted to the small programs that contribute significantly to diversity course delivery while remaining understaffed in terms of tenure-track faculty.

¹ According to the University of Michigan Guidelines, a joint appointment with a 0%/100% division of effort is a "dry" appointment. "The University supports dry (0% effort) faculty appointments with an expectation that such appointments convey rights and responsibilities within the relevant schools/colleges making the appointment," (9).

² Another possibility is "co-hiring," where there is cooperation between departments/units in funding a position/line but the line is not divided at all. An example might be the participation of Extended Learning in funding a position for a specific period of time, at which point the entire financial responsibility is assumed by the home department/unit.

- * Joint appointments can help promote the exciting spaces created by existing, as well as still-to-be-discovered, problem-based initiatives in knowledge creation.
- * In implementing joint appointments, organizational structures and self-conceptions will be challenged in ways that promote institutional transformation.
- * In times of budget crisis, joint appointments can mitigate the ongoing tenure-track faculty deficit by satisfying the needs of two or more departments.

For all of these reasons, joint hires are an extremely positive option for CHABSS, now and into the future.

The literature on joint hires reveals the benefits noted above as well as challenges and problems associated with such appointments (see works consulted and cited). The proposed guidelines that follow acknowledge these challenges and suggest best practices that can prevent and respond to them.

Recommended Guidelines for Implementing the Commitment to Joint Hires

Memorandum of Understanding

A fundamental best practice related to joint appointments is the creation of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) from the very beginning of the process of defining, advertising, and hiring a joint position. The MOU should include provisions for the supervision of the faculty member, including annual, periodic, and tenure/promotion evaluations. These evaluations should take into consideration the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) standards used by each department/unit that will be party to the joint appointment. All relevant parties should participate in creating the MOU. Here they are understood as the faculty member, department/unit chairs/directors/heads, the CHABSS Dean, and the Provost. As noted in the literature related to joint appointments:

A well-crafted MOU should specify the resources each unit will provide to the faculty member, the faculty member's responsibilities within each unit, and the standards by which the faculty member's performance will be evaluated. Resources might include items such as salary, office space, start-up funds, teaching or research assistantships, or conference travel support. A list of responsibilities might cover average teaching loads, specific courses or course sequences, curriculum development, advising duties, supervision of graduate students, committee work, and general expectations for levels of scholarly productivity. (Simmons and Nelson, 2011)

Based on these best practices, the areas to be addressed by the MOU should also address:

1. Searches

Clear articulation about how the hiring units will divide the labor in the search process and how the position will be defined and advertised. The participating departments/units should be named.

2. Hiring

Clear expectations regarding office location, salary, how start-up costs will be distributed, teaching load, and service load, etc.

3. Supervision

Clear articulation about whether the faculty member will have two “chairs” or one, and which chair or chairs will be responsible for signing “forms.”

Mentoring: We recommend a formal system of mentoring for new jointly hired faculty, with mentors from both departments. This is important to establish formally to counter the common complaint that joint hires may experience “two houses but no home.”

4. Personnel Processes (Annual/Periodic Evaluations and Tenure and Promotion Processes)

Three options for structuring the evaluation processes for joint appointments stand out: the single home/department model, the two-home model, and a “synthetic” model:

- Single Department – Evaluation processes are handled in the home department (primary) with input from the secondary department.
- Two-Department – Evaluation is a separate process in each department. For example, both Peer Review Committee (PRC) chairs write letters.
- Synthetic – Evaluation is collaborative between the primary and secondary departments. For example, a PRC of three and two faculty from each department or two and two from each department plus a designated interdisciplinary faculty from outside of both primary and secondary departments. The PRC chair of the primary department writes the letter.

Timing is also another way to distinguish among models: separate and sequential reviews; separate and parallel reviews; and joint review.³

Clear specification of personnel processes is key to the success of a joint appointment. While each of these models has positive and negative aspects, a well-developed MOU, evaluation measures, processes, and expectations, based on departmental/unit RTP documents, must be clear for any one of them to succeed. The MOU should always be explicitly taken into consideration in evaluation processes.

5. **Modification of Joint Appointment**

The MOU should be considered a living document that permits needed transitions and modifications during the faculty member's career (Simmons and Nelson, 2011). This means that modification of joint hire appointments may be made if they are agreed to by signatories to the MOU. It is expected that all parties will participate in the reassignment process.

See Appendix A for sample MOUs.

³ Guidelines for Joint Academic Appointments at the University of Michigan, 2004.

Works Consulted or Cited

- Beitz, Janice M. and Marjorie M. Heinzer. "Practice in Joint Appointments: Implications for Nursing Staff Development." *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing* 31.5 (2000): 232-37. Print.
- Center for Women's Studies and Gender Research, University of Florida. *Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*. N.p.: n.p., 15 Nov. 2005. Print.
- College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Northern Arizona University. *Proposed Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.
- Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research, National Academy of Sciences. "Toward New Interdisciplinary Structures." *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research*. N.p.: National Academies, 2004. 171-187. Print.
- Hart, Jeni, and Matthew M. Mars. "Joint Appointments and the Professoriate: Two Houses but No Home?" *Innovative Higher Education* 34.1 (2009): 19-32. Print.
- Holling, Michelle A., and Roe Bubar. "Dis/Jointed Appointments: Solidarity Amidst Inequity, Tokenism, and Marginalization." *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Ed. Mary C. Fu. Boulder: University of Colorado, 2012. 250-65. Print.
- "Joint Faculty Appointments." Message to WMST Listserv. 26-27 May 2012. E-mail.
- Kennesaw State University. *Interdisciplinary Studies Department Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty Performance*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.
- McCaughey, Martha, ed. *Women's Studies Program Administrators Handbook*. N.p.: NWSA, 2006. Web.
<<http://082511c.membershipsoftware.org/files/WSHandbook2006.pdf>>.

Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. "Guidelines for Joint Academic Appointments at the University of Michigan." *U-M Office of the Provost*. University of Michigan, n.d. Web. 26 Apr. 2013.

Pfirman, Stephanie L., James P. Collins, Susan Lowes, and Anthony Michaels. "What Works: A Resource--To Thrive and Prosper: Hiring, Supporting, and Tenuring Interdisciplinary Scholars." *Project Kaleidoscope*. N.p., n.d. Web. 2005.
<<http://www.pkal.org/search.cfm?cx=002533105468931288696%3Azvpym1jebv8&cof=FORID%3A9&q=what+works%3A+To+thrive+and+prosper&sa=Go&siteurl=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.pkal.org%2Fdocuments%2F>>.

Simmons, Elizabeth H., and Michael P. Nelson. "Making Interdisciplinarity Possible." *Inside Higher Education*. N.p., 19 Aug. 2011. Web.
<http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2011/08/19/simmons_nelson_essay_on_memorandums_of_understanding_for_interdisciplinary_faculty_jobs>.

Print on departmental letterhead

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Joint-Appointment Agreement for *insert faculty name*

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

***insert home department* and**

insert sharing unit

Prior to the development of the joint appointment, a Memorandum of Understanding between the sharing unit and the home department must be developed which addresses the specific critical elements listed below. The Memorandum of Understanding must identify or state:

a. Units involved in the joint appointment.

Department of *insert home department* (Home Department) and *insert sharing unit* (Sharing Unit)

b. Home department of the jointly appointed individual. The home department will have the lead responsibility in the management of personnel issues and coordination of annual performance evaluations, merit decisions, tenure, and promotions in rank reviews as may be applicable for the particular individual. For tenure-track or tenured faculty, the commitment of tenure and rank will be within the academic department. Often but not always, the home department will be the department with the higher workload fraction. As a general guide, the designated home department should also be the department that is most relevant to the individual's discipline/expertise area, inclusive of the area of intellectual / creative pursuits, and that which the individual feels the closest identity.

c. Terms of the appointment, e.g., academic year, twelve months, etc.

Academic year

d. Tenure status of the appointment, e.g., tenured, tenure track or non-tenure track.

Insert tenure status

e. Rank or title of the applicant for the appointment.

Insert rank

f. Workload distribution between the two units and whether this is for the duration of the joint appointment or up for review at designated times; if the latter, state the times.

50% home department, 50% sharing unit.

The 50% sharing unit workload will be made up of teaching, scholarship and service. The basic teaching load will be three courses per semester during the academic year (3/3), [insert #] for home department and [insert #] for sharing unit.

Reassignments may be negotiated with the department Chair, unit Head or Dean. The primary service requirement for the position will be in the sharing unit with a rough distribution of 1/3 to the home department and 2/3 to the sharing unit. This priority may be modified in the Faculty Performance Agreement, in consultation with the home department Chair and the sharing unit Head, as service needs of the home department or sharing unit change. The faculty member's scholarship will be in line with college and departmental guidelines and may be either disciplinary or interdisciplinary, or both. This workload description should be reflected in the annual Faculty Performance Agreement, in consultation with the Chair of the home department and the sharing unit Head.

g. Eligibility criteria and expectations regarding membership on unit level committees.

The joint appointee is eligible for membership on committees in either units; service on sharing unit committees should take priority in line with the workload guidelines outlined above.

h. Joint appointee's office location, access to instructional support materials, secretarial support, and research support.

Understanding that office assignment falls under the purview of the Office of the CHSS Dean, the joint appointee's office should be located in an appropriate location that allows convenience to support services. Support services can come from either unit, consistent with the work being done. For example, support for teaching in the home department should come from the home department's support service;

likewise, teaching for the sharing unit should be supported by the sharing unit's support services.

i. Method in which the home department will modify their evaluation and review processes for annual review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review as applicable to be inclusive of the sharing unit's input on performance.

The home department Chair will consult with the Head of the sharing unit in completing the faculty member's annual review and other reviews* (e.g., for merit pay increases). The faculty member's scholarship will be in line with college and departmental guidelines and may be either disciplinary or interdisciplinary, or both. The faculty member's Annual Review Documents (ARDs) will include separate assessments by the Chair of the home department and the Head of the sharing unit. Also, as part of the normal review process, the Head of the sharing unit and the Chair of the home department will both provide an independent assessment of the faculty member's performance in their respective areas for third-year, tenure, and promotion reviews. For third-year, tenure, and promotion reviews, the review committee will include three members from the home department, and two members from the sharing unit, or any other approved College of Humanities and Social Sciences' procedures for establishing such committee.**

When reviewing joint-appointees, review committee members will follow departmental tenure and promotion guidelines from both departments. In case of significantly diverging guidelines, the home department tenure and promotion guidelines will have precedence and that precedence will be noted in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA).

The faculty member agrees that the home department Chair will copy and share with the sharing unit Head all documents pertaining to annual, third-year, tenure & promotion, and/or post-tenure reviews, including student evaluations.

* Subject to review by the Dean.

** Unless otherwise defined in the departmental governance document, Joint T&P Committee members are elected from members serving on the Home Department and Sharing Unit T&P Committees.

j. Mechanisms by which applicable revenues are managed if generated by a joint appointee with an externally funded grant.

Appendix A: MOU Sample 1: Department to Program

Any indirects that accrue as a result of an externally funded grant will be shared by the home department and sharing unit on a 50/50 basis.

k. Process for modifying or terminating the joint appointment.

Any modification or termination of the joint appointment must be approved by the Chair of the department and sharing unit Head in consultation with the faculty member, and approved by the Dean and the Provost.

_____	_____
Faculty Member	Date
_____	_____
Department Chair (Home Department)	Date
_____	_____
Department Chair (Sharing unit)	Date
_____	_____
Dean	Date
_____	_____
Provost	Date

* These guidelines were modified from two sources: The University of Michigan's, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's policies and procedures for joint faculty appointments.

Print on departmental letterhead

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Joint-Appointment Agreement for **insert faculty name
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
insert home department and
insert sharing department**

Prior to the development of the joint appointment, a Memorandum of Understanding between the sharing department and the home department must be developed which addresses the specific critical elements listed below. The Memorandum of Understanding must identify or state:

Departments involved in the joint appointment.

Department of **insert home department** (Home Department) and **insert sharing department** (Sharing Department)

l. Home department of the jointly appointed individual. The home department will have the lead responsibility in the management of personnel issues and coordination of annual performance evaluations, merit decisions, tenure, and promotions in rank reviews as may be applicable for the particular individual. For tenure-track or tenured faculty, the commitment of tenure and rank will be within the academic department. Often but not always, the home department will be the department with the higher workload fraction. As a general guide, the designated home department should also be the department that is most relevant to the individual's discipline/expertise area, inclusive of the area of intellectual / creative pursuits, and that which the individual feels the closest identity.

m. Terms of the appointment, e.g., academic year, twelve months, etc.

Academic year

- n. Tenure status of the appointment, e.g., tenured, tenure track or non-tenure track.**

Insert tenure status

- o. Rank or title of the applicant for the appointment.**

Insert rank

- p. Workload distribution between the two departments and whether this is for the duration of the joint appointment or up for review at designated times; if the latter, state the times.**

50% home department, 50% sharing department.

The 50% sharing department workload will be made up of teaching, scholarship and service. The basic teaching load will be three courses per semester during the academic year (3/3), [insert #] for home department and [insert #] for sharing department.

Reassignments may be negotiated with either department Chairs or Dean. The primary service requirement for the position will be in the sharing department with a rough distribution of 1/3 to the home department and 2/3 to the sharing department. This priority may be modified in the Faculty Performance Agreement, in consultation with home and sharing department Chairs, as service needs of the departments change. The faculty member's scholarship will be in line with college and departmental guidelines and may be either disciplinary or interdisciplinary, or both. This workload description should be reflected in the annual Faculty Performance Agreement, in consultation with the Chairs of the home and sharing departments.

- q. Eligibility criteria and expectations regarding membership on department level committees.**

The joint appointee is eligible for membership on committees in either department; service on the sharing department committees should take priority in line with the workload guidelines outlined above.

- r. Joint appointee's office location, access to instructional support materials, secretarial support, and research support.**

Understanding that office assignment falls under the purview of the Office of the CHSS Dean, the joint appointee's office should be located in an appropriate location that allows convenience to support services. Support services can come from either department,

Appendix A: MOU Sample 2: Department to Department

consistent with the work being done. For example, support for teaching in the home department should come from the home department's support service; likewise, teaching for the sharing department should be supported by the sharing department's support services.

- s. Method in which the home department will modify their evaluation and review processes for annual review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review as applicable to be inclusive of the sharing department's input on performance.**

The home department Chair will consult with the Chair of the sharing department in completing the faculty member's annual review and other reviews* (e.g., for merit pay increases). The faculty member's scholarship will be in line with college and departmental guidelines and may be either disciplinary or interdisciplinary, or both. The faculty member's Annual Review Documents (ARDs) will include separate assessments by the Chair of the home department and the Chair of the sharing department. Also, as part of the normal review process, the Chairs of the sharing department and of the home department will both provide an independent assessment of the faculty member's performance in their respective areas for third-year, tenure, and promotion reviews. For third-year, tenure, and promotion reviews, the review committee will include three members from the home department, and two members from the sharing department, or any other approved College of Humanities and Social Sciences' procedures for establishing such committee.**

When reviewing joint-appointees, review committee members will follow departmental tenure and promotion guidelines from both departments. In case of significantly diverging guidelines, the home department tenure and promotion guidelines will have precedence and that precedence will be noted in the Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA).

The faculty member agrees that the home department Chair will copy and share with the sharing department Chair all documents pertaining to annual, third-year, tenure & promotion, and/or post-tenure reviews, including student evaluations. The faculty member further agrees that home department Chair or sharing department Chair will share this information with Program Coordinator/Director overseeing the program with which the faculty member is actively involved.

* Subject to review by the Dean.

** Unless otherwise defined in the departmental governance document, Joint T&P Committee members are elected from members serving on the Home Department and Sharing Department T&P Committees.

Appendix A: MOU Sample 2: Department to Department

t. Mechanisms by which applicable revenues are managed if generated by a joint appointee with an externally funded grant.

Any indirects that accrue as a result of an externally funded grant will be shared by the home and sharing departments on a 50/50 basis.

u. Process for modifying or terminating the joint appointment.

Any modification or termination of the joint appointment must be approved by the Chairs of both departments in consultation with the faculty member, and approved by the Dean and the Provost.

Faculty Member

Date

Department Chair (Home Department)

Date

Department Chair (Sharing Department)

Date

Dean

Date

Provost

Date

* These guidelines were modified from two sources: The University of Michigan's, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's policies and procedures for joint faculty appointments.

