

Joint Appointment Report: Summary of Issues and Practices

©K.A. Wallace

You may distribute or quote from this work under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 Unported License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>, <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>). This means that you must attribute to the author, your use must be for non-commercial purposes and you must not use it in order to create your own derivative work.

www.kathwallace.com

email: kathleen{dot}wallace{at}hofstra{dot}edu

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Overview	2
I. Purposes and Types of Joint Appointment	3-5
II. Initiation & Duration	6-7
III. Policies and Memoranda of Agreement	8-10
IV. Departmental Membership	11-13
V. Voting Rights	14-15
VI. Impact on Departments: Workload & Governance	16-17
Appendix I:	
University Policies	
1. University of Missouri	Appendix I, 1-2
2. Five Colleges Consortium	Appendix I, 3
3. University of Maine	Appendix I, 4-5
4. Michigan State University	Appendix I, 6-8
5. Harvard Medical School	Appendix I, 9-11
6. University of North Texas	Appendix I, 12-14
7. Indiana University	Appendix I, 15-16
8. Northern Illinois University	Appendix I, 17-19
9. University of Rochester	Appendix I, 20
10. Duke University	Appendix I, 21-22
11. State University of New York, Stony Brook	Appendix I, 23-24
12. McMaster University	Appendix I, 25-26
13. University of Iowa	Appendix I, 27-31
14. University of Western Ontario	Appendix I, 32-41
Appendix II:	
Comments from Individuals at Different Universities	Appendix II, 1-9

Joint Appointment Report: Summary of Issues and Practices
by ©2009 K.A. Wallace

Overview:

Policies of fourteen academic institutions were reviewed (Appendix I). In addition, comments from individuals who are themselves joint appointees or who have had experience with the administration of joint appointments are also included (Appendix II).

It appears that joint appointments are more likely to be successful:

- when the basis for such an appointment is compelling and recognized as advantageous by all parties involved,
- where the terms of any joint appointment have been carefully spelled out,
- where there has been adequate consultation over a period of time among the units and individuals involved,
- in an institutional environment which is supportive of them, and which is comfortable with and has the resources to support flexible economic, administrative and work arrangements,
- where there is encouragement of departmental and faculty collaboration,
- where the impact on the workload of all those affected is regarded as acceptable and beneficial,
- where there is good will, mutual respect and understanding among the participants.

Areas of concerns raised about joint appointments included:

- evaluation of faculty
- voting rights
- dilution of departmental autonomy
- increase in workload (for the joint appointee, and/ or for Chairs, other faculty members)
- questions about whether they promote interdisciplinarity or collaboration

Given the wide variety in types of joint appointments, it may be desirable for an institutional policy to be framed in such a way as to preserve flexibility, while at the same time, outlining the responsibilities and obligations of units and joint appointees across different arrangements. Joint appointments may be regarded as rare or exceptional, or they may be more regular, for example, in conjunction with an interdisciplinary program.

Particularly helpful material included in the Appendices:

- Summary of "Best Practices for Joint Appointment, Elements That Increase Chances Joint Appointments Will Succeed and Where Problems Can Occur" by University of Missouri (see Appendix I, pp. 1-2);
- Comments from individuals in Appendix II -- a range of views of and experiences with joint appointments -- from joint appointees, department chairs, deans, interdisciplinary program administrators, senior professors

I. Purposes and types of Joint Appointments

A. Basis and purpose

1. **Economic:** Pooling of resources, facilities, grant support, and the like; sharing or splitting of faculty salary support

Many policies identify joint appointments as appointments where the faculty member's salary is split between two units; several explicitly distinguish joint appointments where there is a departmental split between salary support from joint appointments where the salary support is not split.¹

In some institutions, split salary support joint appointments are created when there are insufficient resources in each unit; in joining resources, departments are able to make a new hire.

One factor for an institution to consider is whether a faculty on a joint appointment where there is split salary support could be supported by a single unit were the joint appointment arrangement to become untenable or not be renewed. A number of individuals commented on the particular vulnerability of untenured faculty members in such joint appointments.²

2. Encouragement of **Interdisciplinary Collaboration**³

3. Encouragement or Recognition of **Departmental Collaboration**

(e.g., Five Colleges: "units with established basis for collaboration")

In some cases, joint appointments may facilitate collaboration between departments, where, for example, sharing of resources (such as laboratory facilities) may be appropriate.

4. Recognition of an **exceptional individual case**, e.g., when a faculty member has made a significant contribution to the teaching, research or program of a second department or when a

¹ The latter are sometimes not distinguished in name or they are sometimes variously called "cooperating appointments" (Maine), "secondary appointments" (Duke). One university (see Comment 6, Department Head, Appendix II,) identifies such economically based appointments as "shared appointments" while the term 'joint appointments' refers to "courtesy" appointments.

² See, for example, Comment 4, Department Chair, Appendix II; and Comment 12 (former joint appointee, department chair), Appendix II. A former joint appointee (Comment 12) thought that the pooling of resources was a very poor basis for a joint appointment and recommended against a junior faculty member accepting such an appointment. This appeared to be a concern particularly when the departments are very different and have very different standards for measuring work and performance.

³ In some cases, where joint appointments contribute to the viability of interdisciplinary programs they can be quite successful, although if departments are not cooperative in allowing faculty members to make contributions to such programs, joint appointments can be quite risky for the faculty member (see Comment 13, joint appointee, department chair, Appendix II, for a detailed discussion of successful and problematic cases.) Some individuals expressed skepticism about the extent to which this is realized through joint appointments (e.g., Comment 1, senior professor, Appendix II; Comment 4, department chair, Appendix II); some felt that the departments should be kept separate in the individual faculty member's understanding (e.g., Comment 8, department chair, Appendix II); some felt that joint appointments contributed to the unity of the curriculum (e.g., Comment 7, joint appointee, Appendix II).

faculty member's unique expertise would be clearly advantageous to the overall life or program of a second department

B. Types of Joint Appointments

There is a wide range of types of joint appointments, which fall into roughly three categories:

1. Dual Departmental Joint Appointment

Faculty member is a full member of two departments and has serious obligations in each (e.g., full obligations with regard to attending faculty meetings, voting on personnel matters in each department, and so on).

a. Some of these have an underlying resource commitment from each department (e.g., split salary support), such that the faculty member's employment is literally supported by two distinct units. Others do not have a split salary support (for example, in institutions where salaries are part of a college, rather than a departmental, budget⁴).

b. The faculty member may be evaluated by the two separate departments for tenure and promotion, or the faculty member's evaluations may be conducted by a "home" department. For example, an institution might distinguish between a joint appointment where there is a split salary support in which two separate tenure and promotion evaluations are made and a joint appointment where there is no split salary support in which tenure and promotion evaluations are made by the primary (that is, salary supporting) department, yet in each case, the faculty member may have full voting rights in each department.

2. Joint Appointment between primary department and another department

Faculty member is a full member of one department and has formal status in a regular and serious way in a second department.

a. These can be arranged for a number of reasons, e.g., to facilitate collaboration in a teaching or research interest in a discipline outside the faculty member's department. Usually there is also an institutional basis for such appointments, that is, the second department experiences some benefit from the faculty member's participation -- for example, the faculty member may contribute to programmatic development.

b. There is a range of duties and obligations associated with the appointment to the second department -- in some cases, faculty have full voting rights, in some partial voting rights; in some they are invited to participate in the second department's business, but are not expected to take on the responsibilities of a regular department member. The faculty member's salary may be supported by the primary department which is then either primarily or exclusively responsible for the faculty member's evaluation, tenure and promotion.⁵

3. Affiliated Appointment

Faculty member is a full member of one department and is affiliated in some way with a second department, e.g., teaches some courses or supervises graduate students, but is not a voting

⁴ See, for example, Comment 4, Department Chair, Appendix II.

⁵ A "home" department arrangement may also be the arrangement even in cases of split salary, and is recommended by the University of Missouri, "Best Practices..." (Appendix I, p. 1-2).

member of the second department. These may have a variety of designations ("joint appointment", "affiliated faculty", "secondary appointment").

C. Tenured vs. Untenured Faculty

There was widespread consensus that most of the issues around joint appointments are more difficult for junior (untenured) faculty than for senior (tenured) faculty. For junior faculty, if a joint appointment involves split funding from and/or the expectation of serious work in two different units, then processes of evaluation for tenure and promotion have to be very carefully worked out when the joint appointment is initially set up. Some individuals recommended against joint appointments for junior faculty⁶; others felt that while junior faculty could be very vulnerable, if the processes were carefully spelled out and if the units involved were prepared to be flexible and cooperative, joint appointments could work.⁷

⁶ see Comment 12, former joint appointee and department chair, Appendix II.

⁷ see Comment 13, joint appointee and department chair, Appendix II.

II. Initiation and Duration of Joint Appointments

A. Initiation

1. As a condition of hire

Some of these involve split salary support and serious programmatic commitment to two distinct units. Some involve appointment to a primary department, no split salary and varying degrees of involvement -- from serious programmatic commitment to some teaching and some programmatic involvement -- in a second department. Several individuals commented that positions which had started as joint appointments shifted to single department or unit appointments.⁸ There is considerable variation in the scope of involvement possible:

- a. For example, one joint appointee described the appointee's position in the second department as one in which the appointee contributes to curriculum and graduate thesis supervision, but is not a voting member of the second department. The arrangement was requested by the faculty member at the time of hire and is regarded as permanent.⁹
- b. Another joint appointee described the appointee's position as one which allowed thorough involvement in both departments, although that did involve more work and there was the risk that the joint appointee would become marginal in each.¹⁰

2. Initiated after the faculty member has already been hired and typically, has a department home

--

Typically, these sorts of joint appointments begin with the presumption that the faculty member has a department "home" and the appointment to the second department can range from being merely a courtesy or honorific title to formal status with varying degrees of involvement in and participation in the second department.

- a. For example, at one university, the process is: a joint appointee applies to a second department for an appointment; the second department reviews the request and consults with the first department. If approved, the joint appointee may participate in the second department's faculty meetings, but since the joint appointee's salary, evaluations, promotions, and so on are tied to the first department, joint appointees rarely attend the second department's meetings. These joint appointments are distinguished from "shared appointments" where there is split salary support, and so on.¹¹

B. Duration

The issues in this area are somewhat different for tenured and untenured faculty members.

Some of the institutional policies surveyed indicated that joint appointments were for a specified period of time, although they were extendable (renewable) or amend-able. Others indicated that a joint appointment would be stable and ongoing, unless otherwise specified, often with provision for

⁸ see Comment 9, senior professor and department chair, Appendix II; and Comment 13, joint appointee and department chair, Appendix II.

⁹ see Comment 2, joint appointee, Appendix II.

¹⁰ see Comment 8, joint appointee, Appendix II.

¹¹ see Comment 6, department head, Appendix II.

periodic reevaluation (with the possibility of termination). Some specified that a faculty member may not unilaterally opt out of a joint appointment.

When a joint appointment is a condition of hire, and particularly when it involves split salary support, the expectation is that it is a permanent arrangement from which no participant may *unilaterally* opt out. However, even in these cases, there is sometimes a movement to a single unit appointment eventually.¹²

It appears that some institutions have regarded it as prudent to build into joint appointment agreements either a specific duration or periodic reevaluations with the options of amending or terminating. Relevant considerations might include:

- possible pitfalls of joint appointments,
- change in the justifying conditions (for example, a faculty member's research and pedagogical interests might change),
- the institutional context and experience with cooperating arrangements.

Limited duration joint appointments, even if renewable, seem to be problematic or risky for untenured faculty members and may be less likely to work in cases where there is a split salary support. If joint appointments were of specified duration (even if renewable), the departmental location of the faculty member in the event of non-renewal should be clearly specified in a memorandum of agreement.

¹² see Comment 9, senior professor and department chair, Appendix II; and Comment 13, joint appointee and department chair, Appendix II.

III. Policies and Memoranda of Agreement

A. Framework for Memorandum of Agreement

In cases in which a joint appointment is not just honorific, but has institutional and organizational consequences and involves redistribution of a faculty member's work assignment, all of the institutional policies required explicit agreements. For joint appointments to be successful, it is essential that joint appointees and both departments or units are participants in the process of consultation and clearly understand the terms of the joint appointment for the joint appointee. Where there are different expectations for a joint appointee's workload in a given unit from the expectations for single appointees' workloads in the unit it is helpful if the workload implications for the single appointed faculty members of each unit are also clearly spelled out and understood. University policies should provide clear guidelines for preparing specific joint appointment memoranda of agreement.

B. The types of issues addressed in policies and memoranda of agreement:

1. **Distribution of salary support** (where there is split faculty support between departments)
2. **Workload assignment** (teaching, proportion of time to be spent in each department, etc.)
3. Extent of faculty member's voting rights in each department (see below, **Section V. Voting Rights**)
4. Terms and procedures for **evaluation** of faculty member for tenure and promotion¹³
5. **Expectations and obligations** with regard to attending departmental faculty meetings, and participating in departmental activities
6. Specification of **FTEs** for each department; this may include, although is not limited to:
 - a. how enrollments in courses that are jointly listed are split between departments
 - b. how faculty members are counted for purposes of determining in each department:
 - i. percentage of tenured/untentured faculty
 - ii. ratio of faculty to majors and/or graduate students
 - iii. adjunct ratios (where applicable)
 - iv. distribution of resources when those are based on calculations of the number of full-time and/or part-time faculty members, or on the number of majors, graduate students and the student/faculty ratios
7. Conditions for **replacement** of faculty
 - a. What happens to the line when a joint appointee leaves the university? Does it remain a joint appointment line? If not, how are replacement issues dealt with for each department?
 - b. Or, what happens if a joint appointee moves exclusively into one unit -- how are the replacement issues for the other unit addressed?

¹³ Some of the university policies surveyed (Appendix I) and some of the individual comments (Appendix II) suggest that evaluation of joint appointees may create additional work for Chairs and other faculty members (e.g., Comment 4, department chair, Appendix II), create "political" difficulties (e.g., Comment 3, senior professor, Appendix II). See also below section VI. Impact on Departments.

c. Or, suppose a joint appointee takes an administrative position in the university -- how shall both departments replace the joint appointee? With adjuncts? With independent full-time faculty? With another joint appointee?

8. Eligibility for **Departmental Chairpersonship**.

Some of the issues to be addressed might include:

a. whether joint appointee is eligible for department chairpersonship? (e.g., if yes, then in both departments? in one? under what conditions?)

b. if a joint appointee is a Chair of one department, how shall that affect the joint appointee's participation and faculty status in the second department?

One possible arrangement is that if joint appointee serves as Chair of one department, temporarily transfer the faculty member full-time to the department which she or he is chairing for the duration of the chairpersonship. (see Comment 15, Appendix II, p. 8-9)

c. whether a joint appointee may simultaneously Chair two departments or a department and a program.

(This may also involve clarifying whether there is a distinction to be made between departments and programs. See Comment 13, Appendix II, pp. 6-7)

9. Definition of **governing framework** for areas which agreement does not address

10. **Benefit/No Harm/Scope of Influence:**

Two sorts of concerns here. The first, is that joint appointee be neither expected to double her or his duties, nor be entitled to resources over and above those of single appointed faculty members. The second, is the consideration of whether a joint appointee has more or less influence than other faculty members. Some of the issues that might be addressed are:

a. clarification of joint appointee's entitlement to travel money, internal grant monies, and so on, so that joint appointee is not eligible twice over, that is, through two departmental budgets. (Or, if entitlement to such monies is apportioned on the basis of proportional work in departments and a joint appointee would end up with less benefit than a full member of a single department, then a joint appointee should be eligible through two departmental budgets, with a stipulation that the entitlement not exceed that of a single appointed faculty member.)

b. clarification of eligibility for other benefits distributed on departmental bases (e.g., choice course assignments relative to "service" course assignments in a department); conversely if there are burdens borne on a departmental basis (e.g., advising duties), clarification of what shall be a joint appointee's share. (This sort of provision will depend in part on the specific departments involved and what is understood to be a fair share of benefits & burdens in the units involved.)

c. There may be some cases of voting which might need to be clarified. For example, a faculty personnel case (e.g., another joint appointment) that is subject to review in two departments -- shall a joint appointee vote twice at the departmental level, that is, once in each department?

d. Specification of faculty member's obligations in department personnel committees, in university committees (e.g., may a joint appointee represent two departments simultaneously?)

11. **Duration** of Agreement or specification of periodic evaluation of the arrangement.

B. Key Areas of Concern for Joint Appointees and Departments

1. Evaluation

For the faculty member, there may be a lack of clarity or an increase in expectations, or there may be competing expectations and standards if the faculty member is accountable to two different departments.

2. Workload

From both the joint appointee's and the department's points of view, there may be concerns about distribution of **workload**

3. Departmental autonomy

Department's may have concerns about retention of **departmental autonomy** over personnel issues.

These concerns are addressed in the subsequent sections of this report (**IV. Departmental Membership, V. Voting Rights, VI. Impact on Departments**).

IV. Departmental Membership

Of the institutions surveyed, some identified a faculty member as a member of, accountable to and with serious obligations in two separate departments. A number identified a faculty member as having a primary or "home" department¹⁴.

A. Home Department Structure

On this model, one chairperson/department typically has final responsibility for evaluation and supervisory matters with respect to the joint appointee, with the second department providing input and consultation.¹⁵

The purposes of designating a "home" department included¹⁶,

1. Provide a clear tenure "home" for a faculty member¹⁷.
2. Clarity in lines of Chairperson and Departmental responsibility for evaluation of faculty member for tenure and promotion, recommendations for leave, grants, and so on. Joint appointees have clear guidelines as to the expectations for promotion and tenure.
3. Provide a governing framework for those areas in which a Memorandum of Agreement on Joint Appointment is silent¹⁸
4. Clarity in determining voting rights, and in determining priorities when there may be conflicts of interest.

Risks of a "home" department structure:

The main one seems to be that the joint appointee may not be regarded as fully a member of the second department. Depending on the nature of the joint appointment and the workload expectations, this may or may not be a problem.

¹⁴ Missouri, Michigan State, Harvard Medical School, North Texas, Indiana, Arizona (although Arizona also has joint appointments that grant some formal status to the faculty member). Duke distinguishes between full joint appointments and "secondary" joint appointments; in the latter case, a faculty member has a primary of "home" department. SUNY at Stony Brook distinguishes between "joint appointments" and "affiliated appointments".

¹⁵ e.g., Missouri, Michigan State, Harvard Medical School, University of North Texas, Indiana University. As a number of the individual comments indicate, the area of responsibility for evaluation and clarifying lines of accountability is a particularly sticky issue in joint appointments. Some have a primary department structure for joint appointments, but with detailed policy governing evaluation and how the departments are supposed to work together on joint appointee evaluation. (All these policies are contained in Appendix I.)

¹⁶ The University of Missouri policy in its overview on "Best Practices" and "Elements That Increase Chances Joint Appointments Will Succeed" states that evenly split joint appointments are problematic and suggests that a department "home" (in some sense) is advisable. See Appendix I.

¹⁷ e.g., Northern Illinois University

¹⁸ e.g., Duke

Where there is a "home" department, there needs to be cooperation in recognizing the rules that establish the priority between departments (e.g., the home department having ultimate responsibility for evaluation, assignment of duties, etc.) and a willingness to enter into consultation in the process of evaluation in a reasonable and timely fashion.

B. Dual Department Structure

Where there is no department home, a special peer review committee may be jointly constituted; or the two department Chairs work together to prepare a single administrative evaluation¹⁹, or, two departments or units forward separate evaluations and recommendations²⁰.

Purposes of a dual department structure:

1. that where there is split salary support, each unit is able to evaluate the faculty member in light of the contributions to and standards of that unit.
2. that a joint appointee is as full a member of one department as of the other, usually because the joint appointee's workload is equally substantial in each unit.

Risks of a "dual" department structure:

1. dual lines of accountability and responsibility at the departmental level and lack of clarity in or simply competing expectations for tenure and promotion for the joint appointee
2. faculty member may become a kind of free-floater (bypass normal avenues of departmental accountability and responsibility, or marginalized in one or both departments)
3. duplication of effort (e.g., dual routes of recommendation and evaluation)
4. diminution of departmental autonomy in appointing, tenuring and promoting faculty²¹
 - a. for example, where there are jointly constituted peer review committees, not all members of a department vote on a joint appointee's appointment, tenure and promotion; or
 - b. for example, where a joint appointee's appointment, tenure or promotion requires positive recommendation from two separate departments, one department may block a positive recommendation of another department, or one department's recommendation may be overridden by the other's and the department stuck with someone that it recommended against because of the needs and recommendation of another department
5. creation of additional evaluative processes and increase in workload
 - a. for example, jointly constituted peer review committees and hence an increase in workload;
 - b. for example, another concern appears to be the potential increase in a Chairperson's workload if the Chair is expected to negotiate and work out on a semester by semester basis

¹⁹ e.g., University of Maine

²⁰ e.g., SUNY at Stony Brook; Northern Illinois University

²¹ If an institution wishes to move away from departmental structures to more interdisciplinary institutional governance and resource structures, this could be a positive thing; it would depend on institutional goals and environment.

with another Chair, each with equal authority, the details of a joint appointee's schedule and work assignments

6. lack of clarity in defining possible conflicts of interest

7. possible ineligibility of the joint appointee for departmental level administrative positions (such as department chair)²²

Where there is a "dual" department structure:

there needs to be a willingness on the part of both departments to cooperate in working out the special status of the joint appointee in each department. For the joint appointee, this sort of arrangement involves a delicate balancing act, since the joint appointee cannot fulfill all the duties of a single department appointee in any one department.

²² This may or may not be a good thing; it would depend on whether the joint appointee regards this as unfair in some way to her or his advancement, on how the departments regard the issue of administrative work in the departments, and so on (see, Comment 4, department chair, Appendix II). In some institutions, it appears that a joint appointee is not expected to serve as department chair (see, e.g., Comment 14, joint appointee, Appendix II); in others, a joint appointee may be called on twice over (see, e.g., Comment 13, joint appointee & department chair, Appendix II); in others there is an explicit mechanism for temporarily transferring a joint appointee to one department for the duration of service as Department Chairperson of that unit (see, e.g., see Comment 15, dean, Appendix II).

V. Voting Rights

A. Types of voting rights:

1. Some universities specify that a jointly appointed faculty member shall have full voting rights in each department.²³
2. Others that a faculty member shall have full voting rights in a "home" department, with voting rights in a second department to be determined by the second department or determined through a consultative process between the two departments about the nature and scope of the joint appointment; in joint appointments with "home" department structures, a joint appointee may have full voting rights in a second department, or the voting rights may be more restricted in the second department than in the home department.²⁴
3. One university's policy stated that a faculty member's participation is determined by the proportion of time spent in each department.²⁵
4. The determination of voting rights is up to the departments, but there may be general stipulation that a certain percentage of a faculty member's assignment must be in the department in order for the faculty member to have voting rights or to be eligible for service on certain departmental committees. For example, if a faculty member has only 25% appointment in a department, the faculty member is normally ineligible for service on department recruitment and admissions committees.²⁶
5. Some state more generally that the scope of voting rights shall be negotiated and specified in a Memorandum of Agreement or other document that specifies the terms of a joint appointment.

B. Issues Relevant to Voting Rights

Since joint appointments can be variously structured and can serve a variety of purposes and since institutional environments vary, it may not be possible to provide a general rule on voting rights.

1. A university policy might provide a general framework for the issue of voting rights, but leave the exact determination of voting rights up to the departments involved in each case. It might be recommended that a department have a consistent policy if there are going to be multiple joint appointments.²⁷
2. If there is a "home" department structure, a faculty member may have voting rights in the "home" department, with voting rights in the non-home department determined by the non-home department.

²³ e.g., SUNY at Stony Brook

²⁴ e.g., Indiana, Rochester, Duke

²⁵ University of North Texas

²⁶ See Comment 15, Appendix II.

²⁷ Indiana University, Appendix I, item (f), p. 16.

3. Or, depending on the relationship between the two departments, it may be appropriate that in each specific case there be consultation between the departments in spelling out the voting rights for a joint appointee.

4. Conflict of Interest:

- a. If the purpose of a joint appointment is to enhance or further departmental collaboration, then the extent to which issues from one department "bleed over" into the other department through the dual participation of a jointly appointed faculty member may not be a problem.
- b. If however, a joint appointment is made in recognition of the programmatic services that a faculty member provides to two otherwise separate departments (in other word, the departments themselves are not involved in a collaborative arrangement), then it is possible that departments may have concerns about joint appointee's voting rights.
- c. It may be desirable to identify areas in which there may be conflicts of interest and to make provision in a Memorandum of Agreement for what the voting rights would be in those cases. If there are well-developed conflict of interest policies already in place at the institution, they may be sufficient for addressing conflict of interest in the specific cases of joint appointments.²⁸

²⁸ See Comment 15, Appendix II.

VI. Impact on Departments

A. Workload

1. Chairs and Faculty Peer Evaluation

There appears to be some increase in workload for those involved in evaluation of and administration of joint appointees (Chairs, other faculty members), depending on the nature of the joint appointment, whether there are additional peer review committees, the extent of consultation required to determine a joint appointee's schedule and work assignments on a semester to semester basis. Even when faculty members are tenured, this may still be the case, depending on the extent to which faculty members are evaluated for a variety of purposes (annual evaluations, salary increases, promotion, leave, grant applications) and depending on how much consultation is required on an ongoing basis to determine a joint appointee's work assignments.

2. Departmental Duties

If a joint appointee does not carry a full load of departmental duties (advising, committee work, administrative duties) in any one department, this could impact the workload of other members of the department. The scope of the impact on other faculty members might also depend on the size of the department, how intensive the workload of departmental duties is, and so on.²⁹

3. Multiple Joint Appointments

If a unit were comprised of multiple faculty with joint appointments, where those involve serious obligations for the joint appointees in both units, the unit may have difficulties to the extent that all or a significant proportion of its faculty has duties in other units.³⁰ For example, an interdisciplinary program that is so structured may languish when many or several of its faculty are spread between the program and another department.³¹ Multiple joint appointments may be the only or primary means by which an interdisciplinary unit can survive, although their success may depend on the "congeniality" of the chairs and faculty members of the different units.³²

4. Joint Appointments and Departmental Resources

There may be some issues in the apportioning of resources in the case of joint appointees. For example, if the units in which a faculty member has joint appointments are spatially distant (probably not to be recommended³³), then there may be a demand on departmental office space in each unit for the joint appointee. Or, there may be issues of how to allocate budgetary resources between departments when resources are correlated with the number of full-time faculty in a department; how shall a joint appointee be counted for such purposes.

²⁹ See Comment 15, dean ("on multiple joint appointments"), Appendix II.

³⁰ See, for example, University of Rochester, Appendix I, p. 20.

³¹ See Comment 2, joint appointee, Appendix II.

³² See Comment 15, dean ("on multiple joint appointments"), Appendix II.

³³ University of Missouri ("Best Practices...", Appendix I, pp. 1-2); Comment 2, joint appointee, Appendix II.

5. Possible Solutions:

- a. Simplify and streamline bureaucratic procedures
- b. Specifically spell out in Memorandum of Agreement joint appointee's work assignment, so that on the one hand, a Chair or a department personnel committee chair in one department does not have to engage in frequent negotiation with those in another department on a semester by semester basis to determine a joint appointee's assignment, and, on the other hand, a joint appointee is not subject to the vagaries of the relationships between Chairs and faculty members of different departments.
- c. Discuss and establish agreements about resources with the appropriate administrators and workload issues with other faculty members in a department. It is desirable to make things as clear as possible so that there is no confusion (and hence room for possible future resentment) about whether a faculty member is doing her or his fair share of work, and the allocation of resources is accepted as fair by both units and the joint appointee.

B. Governance

The results of the survey are mixed.

1. Where there are 2 separate lines of evaluation for faculty members or where there are jointly constituted peer review committees for the evaluation of jointly appointed faculty members, there may be concern about a loss of departmental autonomy over tenure and promotion of department members.
2. Some individuals reported varying degrees of skepticism or worry about the extent to which an individual with divided allegiances could undermine one department's interests, inappropriately import the interests of another department, or be insufficiently available to carry out the work of the department. Others felt that this was not a problem.

Governance issues (voting rights, evaluation procedures, and so on) should be carefully thought out and as much as possible spelled out in a Memorandum of Agreement.

It appears that some of this depends on the sustained good will of the individuals and departmental members, as well as the overall climate of the university. Where there is scarcity in or cutting back of resources, a history or climate of distrust between units in the university, or very territorial or firmly defined departmental divisions, joint appointments may contribute to tension between units and they may not be likely to be successful.³⁴ On the other hand, joint appointments could facilitate a loosening of departmental boundaries and structures³⁵, where that is a desirable overall institutional goal.

³⁴ See Comment 1 (senior faculty), Appendix II.

³⁵ See Comment 13 (joint appointee & department chair), Appendix II.

**Appendix I to
Joint Appointment Report**

by
©2009 K.A. Wallace

URLs in this appendix -- active as of 1 March 2009 (except where noted). Permission obtained from each institution to use the information here collected.

University of Missouri

www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/aa/faculty/ifcjoint.shtml

Best Practices for Joint Appointment

Crucial Areas That Should Be Part Of The Agreement Up Front:

1. Funding for position - includes items like general operating funds, grant support, as well as plans on how grant proceeds will be distributed.
2. Clear assignment of work effort in both departments (e.g., how many courses taught, time allocated to each department, variations in workload, etc.).
3. Location of tenure home - needs to have primary home.
4. Clear process for handling tenure or promotion decisions (e.g., joint committee, one department decides with input from other, etc).
5. Procedures for annual evaluation and salary increases outlined in the beginning - where both departments participate (i.e., joint meeting with both chairs present is preferred).
6. Terms related to physical space and use of support and technical staff are outlined.
7. Obligations related to teaching and advising students are clearly articulated.
8. As a general rule, work load follows funding (appropriate proportions).
9. An established procedure to address any conflicts or problems with the goal of "doing no harm" to the person occupying the joint position.
10. Terms of agreement are spelled out in memorandum of agreement with chance to redefine after certain number of years.
11. Expectations for department committee assignments as well as clear expectations for attending division and departmental faculty meetings.

Elements That Increase Chances Joint Appointments Will Succeed:

1. One department holds more than 50% of appointment ... 50/50 appointments can be problematic.
2. Department faculty and chairs need to be flexible in understanding joint appointees' split roles; the departments have a general willingness to work together. Important faculty goals like teaching and research are accomplished through collaboration.
3. A work culture must be promoted that values collaboration and provides real opportunities to cross over to other departments.
4. A flexible approach to interpreting administrative rules (like "how can we make this work as opposed to "this won't work" related to budgets, purchases, course assignments, etc)

5. Economies of scale are key. For example sharing lab equipment and technicians will often allow each department to gain extra support.

6. Individual characteristics of faculty member can be helpful too including being autonomous, effective, patient, willingness to share leadership roles, being flexible and seeing whole as greater than sum of parts, etc.

7. When applying for grants, joint appointments can really be an asset and foster inter-departmental cooperation.

Where Problems Can Occur:

1. Departments that are used to thinking in traditional academic discipline lines. Departments that already draw from various fields are often more comfortable joint appointments (i.e., schools of public health, medicine, professional schools, etc.)

2. One or both departments are inflexible in regard to the journals and where their faculty members publish (i.e., insist on traditional outlets as the only places to publish).

3. Departments who see themselves as separate units make it much harder (i.e., more of a silo effect). If a department has not had experience with joint appointments it may not be used to thinking of collaboration.

4. Two full departmental reviews for promotion and tenure. It is probably best to have a primary department review including consultation with a joint committee that meets to review final department recommendations.

5. Geographical distance can be a problem. Often it is useful for a faculty member to have a presence in both departments to foster connections.

6. When chairs or faculty members insist that joint appointee attending all meetings in both departments.

7. Where chairs are not flexible and willing to give and take ... and to get advantages.

Summary

Joint appointments are often related to the ability to manage the different relationships and resources.

(Five Colles, Inc.: Smith, Hampshire, Mt. Holyoke, Amherst, U Mass Amherst)
http://www.fivecolleges.edu/academic_programs/academprog_appoint.html

Joint Appointments

Five College Joint Faculty Appointments help the institutions maintain or develop the curriculum by sharing appointments. Joint appointees are based at a single campus (the position's home campus), but teach at one or more other campuses on a rotating basis. The procedures of the position's home campus and department govern the review and promotion process, with input from the other campuses sharing in the position. Joint appointments are generally tenure track or continuing.

Requests for joint appointments, which are normally developed over several months and in consultation with a Five College staff member, are reviewed and approved by the Five College Deans. The Deans also establish procedures for searching and hiring in joint appointments and for supporting the work of joint appointees.

Currently, Five Colleges has a multi-year grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation supporting new joint appointments. The grant's special purpose is to help the institutions plan collaboratively to meet curricular needs in the face of faculty retirements, which are likely to reach unprecedented levels in departments across the consortium over the next several years.

The number of appointments varies from year to year, according to the availability of funding. View a list of the current Five College Joint Faculty and visit the resource site for Joint Faculty Appointees for more information.

University of Maine

<http://www.umaine.edu/hr/toolkit/titles.htm>

Cooperating Professor

Cooperating professor (also cooperating assistant professor or cooperating associate professor) is a title used to identify a person holding a professional appointment at UM in a cooperating office or agency or at another campus of the University system. The academic title is granted by a college as a courtesy. Cooperating professors are expected to meet normal academic criteria (usually an earned doctorate) and participate in the normal activities of the department, including research, public service, teaching in the instructional program, advising students, participating in program development, and other appropriate committees, and attending faculty meetings in which they may vote unless the appointing unit decides otherwise.

The cooperating professor may be budgeted solely by the home unit; however, the college in which the person has academic standing will expect him or her to contribute to its programs in a significant way and to be accountable in accordance with its criteria for rank and promotions. Cooperating professors may be reappointed annually. Cooperating professorships do not carry tenure.

Faculty Joint Appointments

A faculty member who has a joint appointment (where the salary is split between two units) should be evaluated by a single peer committee. Joint appointments may be split between two departments or between a department and another unit, such as Quaternary Institute, the Sea Grant Program, or the Cooperative Extension. Please note that a cooperating (unsalaryed) appointment is not a joint appointment. Faculty with cooperating appointments should be evaluated by the primary department; i.e., the department which pays the salary.

The following guidelines should be used for joint appointments except in unusual circumstances where there is an agreement by all parties involved including the dean and vice president:

1. Evaluation criteria will be independently developed and submitted to the appropriate administrative review process by each institute and each department.
2. Faculty with joint appointments will be evaluated using the criteria of both departments or units. The weight given to each unit's criteria will be consistent with the faculty member's allocation of time to each unit.
3. The peer committee for evaluations and personnel recommendations will consist of the peer committees from both units in which the joint appointment is held. If the committees are large in size they may elect to assemble a single committee of three representatives from each of the existing peer committees. This single peer committee will make a single recommendation on personnel actions.
4. Both of the unit chairpersons or directors may sit with the joint peer committee during its deliberations. However, the chairperson or director, or director of one of the units must be present during deliberations.

5. The unit leaders (chairpersons or directors) will prepare a single joint administrative evaluation or recommendation.

Second Department/College

Department or college who contributes to an employee's base salary on a continuing basis. For faculty this would indicate the department in which the individual holds a joint appointment.

Michigan State University

<http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Faculty/Handbooks/Faculty/AcademicPersonnelPolicies/iv-facultystatus>

Faculty Status: Reserved for Appointments in Primary Academic Units of the University / Joint Appointment

IV. ACADEMIC HUMAN RESOURCES POLICIES (Cont.)

FACULTY STATUS: RESERVED FOR APPOINTMENTS IN PRIMARY ACADEMIC UNITS OF THE UNIVERSITY

This policy was issued by the Office of the Provost with an effective date of January 11, 1980.

The academic quality of MSU and the integrity of the tenure system are determined fundamentally by decisions for appointment to faculty ranks. These objectives are served best by limiting appointments to faculty status to the primary academic units of the University, i.e., academic departments, schools and colleges.

The Office of the Provost will endorse appointment recommendations to appoint individuals on a fixed-term basis (with ending date) with the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor only in instances in which the primary recommending unit is an academic department (a department in a college or colleges) and/or a school and/or a college. All appointments in the tenure system, except those subject to the stipulations indicated below, must be recommended by an academic department, or a school in a college, or a residential or other non-departmentally organized college as the primary academic unit, or by such units jointly.

Tenure System Appointments: Primary Academic Units and Other Types Of Units

When a primary academic unit, i.e., a department, school, and/or residential or other non-departmentally organized college, joins with any other type of unit in the University to recommend appointment of an individual in the tenure system, the primary academic unit commits to accept the individual as a regular faculty member. The academic unit should make this commitment only after direct involvement in the recruitment of the individual and specification of the unit's role in evaluations for salary increases, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and leave recommendations. In all cases, except as designated below, responsibility and final decision for salary increases, promotion, reappointment, tenure and leave eligibility rests with the designated primary academic unit.¹ This commitment means that the individual will serve as a regular faculty member in the academic unit if there is a determination at any future date by the Provost after consultation with the appropriate vice president, as applicable, that the best interests of the University will be served by discontinuation of the assignment of the individual in the non-academic unit(s). A faculty member may also initiate a request to return to the academic unit. Notice of one year to the Provost from the faculty member will usually be sufficient time to reassign the individual to the sponsoring primary academic unit, i.e., department, school, or residential or other non-departmentally organized college.

The reassignment of an individual to a department, school, or residential or other non-departmentally organized college will not constitute an addition to the authorized FTE count except as may be necessary during a transition period. Transition periods will be extended only as necessary by the Provost's assessment of the resources available. As soon as the Provost determines that resources are available, the individual will be included in the academic unit's regular FTE count. Thus, before this type of commitment is made, overall department, school, or college priorities must be considered carefully, including both short-term and long-term plans. The number of such commitments should be limited.

Any individual with a multiple appointment of this type holds status in the tenure system as a member of the primary academic unit, i.e., department, school, or residential or other non-departmentally organized college; and the academic unit is obligated to honor this status fully if and when called upon to do so by the Provost or the faculty member. Consequently, departments, schools, and colleges must be centrally involved in the ways specified above in recommendations on appointment, salary increases, reappointment, tenure, promotion and leaves.

Tenure System Appointments: Between Primary Academic Units

The policy stated in the previous paragraphs does not apply to recommendations for joint appointments between primary academic units, i.e., departments, schools, and residential or other non-departmentally organized colleges. Recommendations for joint appointments between primary academic units for new or currently appointed faculty should include the MSU Multiple Appointment Memorandum which identifies the primary unit with responsibility and final decision for salary increases, promotion, reappointment, tenure and leave eligibility.

As specified by the Multiple Appointment Memorandum, all units, including the primary unit, participate in discussions and reach agreement about the initial appointment recommendation and have the opportunity to provide an evaluation of the faculty member concerning salary increases, promotion, reappointment, tenure and leave eligibility, although the primary unit has the final responsibility for such actions. Although, with the agreement of the relevant chairpersons (directors), deans, and the Provost, such assignments may be changed, multiple appointment assignments are viewed as stable and on-going unless made for a specific period as recorded on the academic personnel form at the time the joint appointment is approved. Unlike joint appointments between primary academic units and other types of units, the individual faculty member does not have the option of unilaterally electing to cease performing specified duties in any of the primary academic units party to the original (or amended) joint (multiple) appointment agreement. At the conclusion of joint appointments between primary academic units for specified time periods, the individual faculty member's assignment reverts to the unit(s) specified in the original or amended Multiple Appointment Memorandum.

Footnote to MSU text above:

¹Such understandings, together with the other required information, should be included in or attached to Michigan State University's Multiple Appointment Memorandum. In instances where the other type of unit provides more than 50 percent salary support, any one of these personnel actions may be designated as the responsibility of this unit. However, such arrangements (a)

require the concurrence of the academic unit, (b) should be specified in the Multiple Appointment Memorandum, (c) may be changed at the initiative of the academic unit after consultation with the faculty member, and (d) do not affect the individual's status as a regular faculty member in the academic unit.

Michigan State University (continued)

http://www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Promotion/Faculty/tenure/Faculty_Guide_for_RPT.htm

Recommendation for Reappointment, Promotion or Tenure Action Form

Joint Appointment

Only the primary unit will make a recommendation for reappointment, promotion or tenure for a faculty member with a joint appointment. However, the chairperson/director of the primary unit is obligated to consult with the chairperson/director of all joint units prior to submitting a recommendation.

Harvard University, Medical School
<http://www.hms.harvard.edu/fa/handbook/purplebook/x.html>

X. Policies Regarding Joint Appointments for Voting Members of the Faculty of Medicine

A. Joint Appointments between Departments of Harvard Medical School

1. Joint appointments within the Faculty of Medicine should be made only in exceptional cases and should recognize a significant contribution to the teaching, research, or clinical programs of a second department. Occasional contributions to teaching may be acknowledged by a notice of affiliation appended to the departmental faculty listing. Infrequent contributions need not be recognized.

2. At the outset, a clear decision should be made regarding which department bears the primary responsibility for an individual faculty member's salary, benefits, space, career advancements, and promotions.

3. At the time of initiation of a search for a joint appointee, whether or not at professorial rank, the distribution of support should be negotiated between the departments. With each reappointment below professorial level, there should be a reassessment of the individual's interests and the departments' needs to determine the distribution of support. This re-evaluation is intended to avoid the hazard of one department paying for an individual who spends all her/his time in a second department.

4. In some instances, a faculty member appointed originally in one department may change the direction of her/his academic or clinical work so that a joint appointment is indicated. Under these circumstances, the two department chairpersons should carry on the same negotiations as described in the foregoing two paragraphs.

5. If an appointment below professorial level is under consideration, there should be an agreement at the outset that the appointments will be coterminous and that each department will continue to support in accordance with the original agreement until the expiration of the term (unless by mutual agreement the distribution of support is readjusted).

6. When a junior faculty member is considered for a joint appointment between departments, care must be given to problems of establishing criteria of excellence at the time of promotion. Where will scholarly works be published? Which department will judge, or will both? What opportunities will there be for a permanent position in an interdisciplinary area? How will strength be maintained in the primary discipline?

7. The recommendation of a joint (second) appointment as Professor for a faculty member who already holds an appointment as Professor in another department should include the following:

a. a letter from the Head of the second appointing department proposing the second appointment to the Dean. This letter should contain a description of the candidate, and an explanation of the significant contribution to the teaching, research or clinical programs that would warrant the second appointment

b. a co-signature on this letter or a separate letter from the Head of the primary department, and indication of approval from the Executive Committees of both departments

c. a recent curriculum vitae of the candidate

These materials will be presented to the Subcommittee of Professors for review and recommendation to the Dean. They will then be submitted to the President of Harvard University.

8. To make a joint appointment at the assistant or associate professor level, each department should follow the normal process for making appointments. Both recommendations will then be scheduled for consideration at the same meeting of the Promotions, Reappointments, and Appointments Committee. If an appointment has already been made in one department, the second department should follow the regular process and should include, in the submitted recommendation, documentation that the first department is in agreement with the request for a second appointment.

9. Joint appointments between departments for annual appointees are not encouraged.

B. Joint Appointments between Faculties of Harvard University

1. Joint appointments at faculty rank (assistant professor and above) should be used to recognize a significant commitment to a second faculty. Occasional contributions to teaching should be noted by an annual appointment, such as lecturer, proposed by the involved department. Infrequent contributions (i.e., one or two lectures) need not be recognized.

2. At the outset a clear decision should be made regarding which department in which faculty bears the primary responsibility for the individual faculty member's salary, benefits, space, career advancement, and promotions.

3. At the time of initiation of a search for a joint appointee, whether or not at professorial rank, the distribution of support should be negotiated between the faculties or departments. With each reappointment below professorial level, there should be a reassessment of the individual's interests and the departments' needs to determine the distribution of support. This re-evaluation is intended to avoid the hazard of one department paying for an individual who spends all her/his time in a second faculty.

4. When the search for a professor has been conducted entirely by one faculty, ordinarily the title in a second faculty should be lecturer or member of the faculty. In those instances when the nature of a faculty member's academic work has changed so that the purpose of the work is benefited by a joint appointment at the professorial level, the two deans should carry on the same negotiations as those described in paragraphs 2 and 3.

5. If an appointment below professorial level is under consideration, there should be an agreement at the outset that the appointments will be coterminous and that each department will continue to support in accordance with the original agreement until the expiration of the term (unless by mutual agreement the distribution of support is readjusted).

6. When a junior faculty member is considered for a joint appointment between departments in different faculties, care must be given to problems of establishing criteria of excellence at the time of promotion. Where will scholarly works be published? Which department will judge, or will both? What opportunities will there be for a permanent position in an interdisciplinary area? How will strength be maintained in the primary discipline?

C. Joint Appointments between Medical Schools

1. A faculty member who holds a voting appointment in Harvard Medical School (i.e., an appointment at the level of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor) is not, in general, permitted to hold a voting appointment on the faculty of any other school.

2. Cases may arise where unusual situations warrant an exception to the general policy outlined above. Accordingly, the Dean, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Promotions, Reappointments, and Appointments, or the Subcommittee of the Committee of Professors should have discretion to authorize exceptions to the nondual appointment policy, subject to such conditions as may be appropriate to the circumstances.

Note: The policy concerning joint appointments between medical schools was approved by the Committee of Professors on June 20, 1995.

University of North Texas

http://www.unt.edu/policy/UNT_Policy/volume3/15_1_8.html

SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES FOR JOINT APPOINTMENTS WITHIN OR BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS:

University of North Texas/University of North Texas Health Science Center-Ft. Worth

APPLICABILITY: FACULTY

The University of North Texas and the University of North Texas Health Science Center-Ft. Worth consider that joint appointments between or within the institutions often may be advantageous. Through joint appointments, faculty resources of high quality may be shared, and special skills possessed by a faculty member may be used with maximum effectiveness. Many modern degree programs of a professional or technical nature require the availability of highly competent specialists who often may share their competence in more than one area.

The formal procedures outlined below govern joint appointments for an extended period; but temporary joint appointments may be made, and are not necessarily subject to all of these guidelines. These provisions do not govern the appointments of adjunct staff members, procedures for which are outlined in a separate document.

A joint appointment is one in which an individual's appointment is shared between two institutions or units. The appointee carries out specific program responsibilities in each.

Appointment Procedures:

1. When it seems desirable to consider a person for an extended joint appointment, the candidate must be acceptable to both institutions or units, and should be worthy of appointment in the tenure stream of each.
2. That portion of the salary of a jointly appointed person which is underwritten by each institution or unit should be at a level commensurate with that paid to individuals not so appointed, who have positions of equivalent function and responsibility in the institution or unit.
3. When a jointly-appointed faculty member has an assignment in two institutions or units, and it is appropriate for each to share in the payment, salary may be based on the appointee's assignment and the rate paid for such assignment by each institution or unit (i.e., a person's salary could be a 25% of X plus 75% of Y, where X and Y represent different annual salary rates).
4. A "home" institution or unit, or both, will be established for each new joint appointee. The home institution will normally be the unit which 50% or more of the appointment is made initially, although the percentages of assignment may vary thereafter. The "home" institution is responsible for providing the joint appointee his or her annual written contract and all required notifications regarding terms of employment as required by §51.943 of the Texas Education

Code or institutional policy. Prior to issuing a contract, the “home” institution or unit and the partnering institution or unit must document in writing, the faculty member’s workload expectations and salary agreement for the upcoming fiscal year.

5. The designation of home institution or unit may be transferred under circumstances agreeable to the joint appointee and the administrators of each institution or unit.

6. The home institution or unit will consider providing the joint appointee with a full position and salary (subject to the reappointment and promotional policy of that unit), in the event that appointment to the other institution or unit terminates. Opportunity for full appointment in the home institution is subject to the current availability of faculty positions and level of fiscal appropriations within which the home institution must operate.

7. Appointment and assignment are regarded as separate concepts. In the agreement on the joint appointment, each institution or unit agrees to underwrite a specific proportion of the appointee's duties and compensation. Although appointment at a certain percentage (e.g., 25%) usually implies assignment within that institution or unit at the same level (25%), it may be the case that percentage of appointment and assignment differ, in which case each unit is responsible for its share of the total salary, based on assignment.

Rights of Jointly Appointed Faculty:

1. The joint appointee is eligible to be promoted, to receive salary increases, and to be considered for tenure in the same manner as faculty members not jointly appointed. The home institution/unit is chiefly responsible for initiating and carrying through procedures leading to those changes in status; the institution/unit that is not designated the home institution/unit is likewise expected to give due and regular consideration to the appointee's qualifications for these advancements.

2. Demands on the appointee's time should be roughly equivalent to the percentage of his assignment to the unit.

3. The joint appointee has the right to know the lines of authority governing his activities in each unit to whom he is responsible, and the procedures prevailing in each for addressing any questions as to his duties and privileges.

4. The joint appointee should expect to receive office space, secretarial services, and other support from each department to an extent proportional to his rank and in proportion to his services underwritten by each.

5. The joint appointee should expect that the faculty of each unit in which he serves will regard him as a professional colleague and extend him all the courtesies normally given to other staff members.

Obligations of Jointly Appointed Faculty:

1. The joint appointee should be expected to participate in unit governance committee activities, faculty meeting, etc., of each unit in which he is jointly appointed, to an extent proportional to the amount of time the unit has requested and underwritten.

2. To the extent possible, the joint appointee should attempt to maintain an academic "home" readily available to his students and colleagues in each unit with which he is involved. In those situations he might maintain an office and observe some office hours in each. In any case, he should make himself available as more than one who simply meets classes and then takes his leave.

*Reviewed with name changes only.

Indiana University College of Arts and Sciences

<http://college.indiana.edu/faculty/policy/collegepolicies/jointappointment06282006.shtml>

Policy on the Joint Appointment of College Faculty in Multiple Instructional Units (2002; Reviewed 2006)

The growing interdisciplinarity of research and teaching in the College of Arts and Sciences has created situations where faculty find themselves professionally involved in more than one department or program or even school. This policy seeks to encourage these developments by clarifying the conditions of such appointments.

In practice, joint appointments in the College have been handled in a wide variety of ways. Faculty members with joint appointments variously divide their tenure, FTEs and teaching responsibilities among two or more units, and the extent of their participation in a unit's faculty governance processes also varies. This policy intends to preserve that flexibility and diversity, while at the same time outlining the responsibilities and obligations of units with jointly-appointed faculty. In addition, the policy respects all rules governing academic appointments found in the IUB Academic Guide and the IU Academic Handbook, and offers additional details on issues where those rules are silent. Finally, the policy applies to joint appointments involving units within the College of Arts and Sciences, and serves as a model for joint appointments involving the College and other schools.

The conditions of a joint appointment will be described in a Memorandum of Agreement drawn up by the constituent parties, in consultation with the Dean's office. This Memorandum of Agreement must be approved and signed by the chairs and directors of the involved units, the faculty member, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the Faculties--before a joint appointment takes effect. The Memorandum of Agreement describes the expectations for the faculty member at the time of initial appointment and is binding for the duration of the faculty member's employment at IU; details may be changed with the approval of all parties listed above.

Under review of the Dean of the College, the Memorandum of Agreement for joint appointments will stipulate the percentage of FTE in each unit, and will consider at least the following other issues:

(a) One College department will be identified as the faculty member's home unit for purposes of annual reviews, reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions. These processes will be governed by the written procedures of the home unit. The participation of other units involved in the joint appointment will be clearly described, with the chair or director of the non-home unit preparing a recommendation and summary evaluation of research, teaching and service for inclusion in the faculty member's reappointment, tenure and promotion dossier. Any review must assess the faculty member's research, teaching and service contribution to all units involved in the joint appointment.

(b) The chairs and directors of constituent units must confer at least annually to coordinate teaching and service responsibilities of jointly-appointed faculty. It is important to insure that the overall load of teaching and service obligations does not exceed that of comparable faculty with appointments wholly in one unit.

(c) Faculty members must submit a Faculty Summary Report to the chairs and directors of all units involved in a joint appointment. Each chair or director must provide the Dean's office with summary comments on the Report.

(d) Procedures for setting annual salary increments will be determined by a faculty member's percentage of FTE in each constituent unit. For example, for a faculty member with a 0.5 FTE in two units, each unit will receive 50% of the incremental salary funds that are attributed to her base salary.

(e) Authority to grant requests for various types of leave rests with the Dean of the College and the Dean of the Faculties. For faculty members with joint appointments, chairs and directors of all units involved with the appointment will provide assessments of the requested leave before the deans make a decision.

(f) Jointly-appointed faculty will have full voting rights in their home unit, regardless of the percentage of FTE in that unit. Voting rights of jointly-appointed faculty in units other than the home unit will be decided upon by the departments and programs involved, and these will be clearly stated in each unit's governance documents. All units involved in joint appointments must decide both the criteria for extending voting rights to such faculty, and the substantive issues on which jointly-appointed faculty would be entitled to vote (for example, personnel decisions, curricular decisions, allocations of unit resources, etc.). Units must assign voting rights to all jointly-appointed faculty in a uniform manner.

Northern Illinois University
<http://www.niu.edu/provost/policies/appm/II27.shtml>

Academic Policies and Procedures

Joint Appointment Policy

Section II. Item 27.

Under certain circumstances, it may be both educationally and economically desirable for faculty members, both present faculty and future appointments, to have joint appointments with departments in the same college, with departments in different colleges, or with department and interdisciplinary or research centers in the same or different colleges. Specific conditions for each individual joint appointment must be detailed at the time of initial appointment in a written memorandum of understanding between the appointing units and the candidate.

While the faculty member and the appointing units should have the freedom and flexibility to negotiate individual agreements, certain fundamental guidelines need to be observed in all such appointment statements. Specifically, a memorandum of understanding must be prepared by the appointing units, and endorsed by the dean(s) to whom they report, at the time at which the position is offered. This document must specify the division of the faculty member's time and salary among each of the units, the weighing of factors (teaching, scholarship, and service to the university community and profession) in the faculty member's merit evaluations, all expectations for tenure and/or promotion, and the process by which all evaluations for salary increment, tenure, and promotion will be conducted. The memorandum of understanding will also specify the resources (space, research funds, teaching support, etc.) that each unit will be responsible for providing the appointee. A copy of the memorandum of understanding will be filed in the appointee's personnel file in the provost's office.

1. TENURE AND PROMOTION

General expectations for tenure and promotion must be agreed upon by the appointing units and communicated to the faculty member in the memorandum of understanding at the time of appointment. The ways in which tenure and promotion reviews will be conducted and the role appointing units will play in the evaluation process must also be specified in the memorandum of understanding. The department chair(s) and/or center administrator(s) shall maintain regular communication with each other regarding the faculty member's performance in their units. Each unit will provide a written annual evaluation of the progress toward tenure, with special attention given to the written three-year review of candidates on a seven-year track. (See Article 5 of the Bylaws.) In these cases, the emphasis must be upon the extent of the faculty member's excellence in meeting the expectations for tenure and promotion specified in university and college personnel documents. These expectations must not exceed the overall requirements for faculty members not on joint appointment.

If there is disagreement among appointing units on recommending tenure for a faculty member on joint appointment, the unit(s) recommending tenure may petition the relevant college(s) to fund fully the position as either a tenured position within the recommending

department(s) or as an appointment within a recommending center. Resources permitting, tenure may be awarded in the recommending department. In the event the joint appointment is between an interdisciplinary or research center and a department (or departments), and there is no departmental recommendation for tenure, the interdisciplinary or research center may offer the individual an alternative form of appointment without tenure.

Normally, a faculty member's rank is the same in all departments and titles for appointments in centers should be commensurate with the appropriate academic rank.

2. ANNUAL EVALUATION

The memorandum of understanding accompanying the offering letter shall clearly specify how each unit is to provide the other(s) with an evaluation that will be incorporated into the overall yearly evaluation. There should be a clear and mutually agreeable determination of how and by whom the units' individual evaluations will be combined and how and by whom yearly increment ratings will be determined. In all joint appointments there must be a clear and mutually agreeable prior statement of how a faculty member's professional work will be evaluated, by whom that work will be evaluated, and the extent to which the faculty member's productivity will be evaluated differently from that of others in the department because of the specific nature of the joint appointment. Specifically, two kinds of considerations need to be addressed in this determination: (1) the definition and weighing of professional performance factors (teaching, scholarship, and service to the university community and profession) that will apply to the individual on joint appointment; (2) the manner in which the evaluation of professional achievements will be divided among the appointing units performing the evaluation.

3. RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL OF PERSONNEL DECISIONS

The faculty member may obtain a reconsideration of a personnel decision by the department or center making that decision according to the reconsideration provisions in the university Bylaws. In conformity with the university Bylaws, an appeal of a personnel decision may be taken to the level above the level at which the decision was made.

4. FACULTY GOVERNANCE

The memorandum of understanding shall specify the agreement reached by the appointing units and the faculty member with reference to the location of the faculty member's involvement in the faculty governance structure of the units, the college and the university. A person on joint appointment shall in no way be disenfranchised from the governance system because of the nature of his or her appointment.

5. RECRUITMENT

During the process of recruitment, all units to be involved in the joint appointment shall be represented on the search committee. If the locus of tenure is known at the start of a search by a research or interdisciplinary center, the initial screening committee shall have representation from the departments where the tenure-track appointment would reside. If that is not known, the committee shall have representation of faculty from departments related to the center's areas of activity. As soon as a short list of candidates has been determined, representatives of potential appointing units will be invited to join the screening committee. Only a candidate who is acceptable to all appointing units shall be offered a joint appointment.

6. CHANGES IN APPOINTMENT STATUS BEFORE AND AFTER TENURE

Provided all of the concerned parties agree, the initial statement of agreement on a joint appointment may be amended at any time after the appointment has been made. If any of the

parties wishes to change any of the provisions in the agreement, this must be accomplished through the mutual consent of all parties involved.

Approved by UCPC 4/14/92

Approved by UC 4/29/92

Last Updated: 4/29/93

University of Rochester:
<http://www.rochester.edu/provost/FacultyHandbook/>

Joint Appointment (pp. 23-24, PDF of *Faculty Handbook*, 8 July 2008)

When a joint (secondary) or programmatic appointment is made, a letter from the chair or dean should become a part of the record. It should indicate precisely the conditions of the appointment, and particularly if there is an expectation of teaching or committee work. It is not expected that the letter will spell out details, such as course and committee assignments in any one year, since the letter should be valid for the entire period of the appointment. It should indicate the role of the individual in department meetings and in appointments or promotions within the department. When an appointment spans more than one school, an additional letter signed by all relevant deans should delineate the nature of the salary and research support, the distribution of any externally funded research support, the duration of the agreement, an understanding of how teaching and other responsibilities of the faculty member will be assigned, and how replacement of the faculty member's effort in the home department (if relevant) will be accomplished.

Purely courtesy appointments, with no duties of any kind, are undesirable because they imply to students and others that the professor is part of the department when such is not the case. They will not be approved unless extraordinary reasons can be provided.

Under these guidelines, the joint appointee will be providing a service to the department, and it is expected that the individual will be treated as a faculty member within the school of the department in which he or she has a joint appointment, and will be accorded the usual courtesies, including invitations to faculty meetings and faculty celebrations. Each school may decide whether such joint appointees should have a vote at faculty meetings, but it is recommended that they should. These specifics should be spelled out in the materials supporting the appointment.

Multiple joint appointments are generally undesirable because they dilute the significance of such appointments for all individuals, and if they are multiple, it may be difficult for the individual to be of service to such numerous departments.

Duke University

<http://www.aas.duke.edu/admin/chairshandbook/titles.html>

Secondary and Joint Appointments:

The administrative distinction between secondary and joint appointments is that secondary appointments do not involve any contribution to the faculty salary line; joint appointments do. This matter must be worked out between the chair and the Dean of the Faculty prior to considering a joint appointment. However, even when a unit does not make a financial contribution to a secondary appointment, it may identify some appointments as joint in order to grant voting rights to secondary faculty on special issues, for example, bylaws and personnel matters. The agreement governing the appointment (sample below) should clearly identify any such privilege. Secondary faculty appointed to ad hoc personnel review committees may vote on the committee recommendation, even if they are not entitled by the unit's bylaws to vote in the subsequent general faculty meeting.

Academic units wishing to offer a secondary/joint appointment to a regular-rank faculty member holding a primary appointment in another unit at Duke must obtain the permission of the Provost. The unit reviews the credentials of the candidate, votes on the request in a meeting of the appropriate faculty, and sends a written request to the Dean of the Faculty who, in turn, forwards it to the Provost for a decision. Upon approval by the Provost, the Dean writes an appointment letter to the faculty member consistent with the terms of the request.

The unit's request to the Dean should state its reasons for requesting the appointment, the candidate's current primary title and term, the rank at which the appointment will be made, and the length of term requested. The request sent to the Dean must have appended an agreement (sample below) covering faculty responsibilities and privileges concluded between the chairs of the two units. It is the responsibility of the two units to address all the pertinent questions identified in the sample agreement and any others they deem necessary. Issues not addressed in the agreement will be governed by the rules of the primary unit.

A note on rank: Promotion or change of title in the primary department does not change the secondary/joint rank or title. The secondary/joint department must make a new and specific request to the Dean in order to change the secondary/joint title.

SAMPLE AGREEMENT FOR A SECONDARY/JOINT APPOINTMENT The Department of _____ has voted to offer a secondary appointment to Professor _____ currently ____ Professor of _____. The request is to offer Professor _____ an _____ appointment as _____ Professor of _____ for a __X__ year term beginning _____ and ending _____. We agree that Professor _____'s division of duties and responsibilities will be divided as described here; otherwise, the rules of Professor _____'s primary department will govern his/her activities, responsibilities, and privileges.

Faculty responsibilities:

- Courses taught
- Setting of teaching schedules
- Committee participation
- Undergraduate advising
- Graduate advising and mentoring

Faculty privileges and support:

- Voting rights (if different from those outlined in each unit's bylaws)
- TA assignment
- Equipment support (e.g., computing, copying, laboratory, telephone)
- Administrative support (e.g. typing, scheduling)
- Research support

Personnel evaluation:

- Annual evaluations and salary recommendations to the Dean
- Reappointment and promotion reviews.

Signatures:

- Chair of Primary Program
- Chair of Secondary/Joint Unit

State University of New York at Stony Brook
<http://www.sunysb.edu/provost/policy/affiliatedfaculty.shtml>

GUIDELINES FOR AFFILIATED, JOINT AND NON-SALARIED FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

(a PDF of this and a PDF on procedures is also available at the above website)

AFFILIATED APPOINTMENTS

An Affiliated Appointment is granted by the Academic Vice President (Provost) to an active member of the faculty of Stony Brook University. The affiliated appointment confers limited faculty standing in a second department or school on a member of another department or school. Such an affiliation should not be confused with a Joint Appointment (q.v.), which only the President may make.

The Academic Vice President may grant an affiliated appointment upon the recommendation of the appropriate Vice President, Dean or Director. It will be granted for an indefinite period and may be terminated at any time upon the request of either the designated faculty member, the director or chairs of either the primary or secondary programs/departments or the appropriate Vice President or Dean.

The granting of an affiliated appointment to a faculty member of another department or school entitles that faculty member to indicate his membership in the secondary department or school in all official correspondence in the same manner as is done for his membership in the primary department or school. No distinction between the affiliated appointment and the primary appointment need be indicated. However, since the affiliated appointment confers only limited faculty standing, the extent of the affiliated faculty member's functions and privileges in the affiliated department or school, including whether the affiliated member shall have voting rights in the secondary department should be mutually agreed upon at the outset and specified in the memo to the Dean or Provost requesting the affiliated appointment.

The granting of an affiliated appointment in no way affects or limits the nature of the faculty member's appointment in his primary department or school as governed by the Policies of the Board of Trustees. All personnel actions including promotions and leaves will be initiated by the primary department or school. The primary department should inform the secondary department of the substance of its recommended personnel actions regarding the affiliated faculty member and may invite its endorsement or comment. The termination of the appointment of a faculty member who also holds an affiliated appointment automatically terminates the affiliated appointment as well.

JOINT APPOINTMENT

A Joint Appointment confers full faculty standing upon the appointee equally in both appointed departments or schools. The joint appointee enjoys all the privileges and incurs all the responsibilities in each department or school of a normal faculty member in either. It is normally expected that the workload of the joint appointee will be equally divided between

the two departments or schools.

A Joint Appointment is made by the President upon the recommendation of the Academic Vice President (Provost), who in turn bases his recommendation upon the recommendations of the departments involved and the appropriate Vice President, Dean or Director. In addition, if the proposed Joint Appointment involves a completely new appointment, and if the rules of the appropriate college or center require it, the appointment will also be reviewed by the appropriate faculty committee on personnel policy. As with all academic appointments, a Joint Appointment must conform to the Policies of the Board of Trustees and applicable local campus policies.

In the case of a joint appointee, all personnel actions including tenure review, promotions and leaves must be processed in the normal manner by both departments or schools. A promotion necessarily is effective in both departments or schools.

NON-SALARIED OR COURTESY APPOINTMENTS

A non-salaried appointment is made by the Dean or Provost upon the recommendation of the chair of the department involved and the appropriate Directors, Vice Presidents, Deans, and Provost. As with all appointments, a non-salaried appointment must conform to the Policies of the Board of Trustees and applicable local campus policies.

A non-salaried appointment confers limited, non-salaried faculty standing in a department or school on an appointee who does not otherwise enjoy faculty standing on the campus. Normally, such appointments will be made for a term of up to three years and may be terminated at any time upon the request of either the appointee or the appointed department or school.

A non-salaried appointment may be granted concurrently in more than one department or school but one department must be identified as the primary department. The department or school in which a non-salaried appointment is made may determine the extent of the functions and privileges which the appointee may exercise within the department.

A non-salaried appointee may be promoted upon the recommendation of the department or school to the Dean or Provost without the necessity for review by a faculty personnel policy committee.

(10/12/04)

McMaster University, Canada

<http://www.mcmaster.ca/senate/hrfaculty/joint.htm>

It is in the best interests of the University to encourage appropriate persons to participate in the work of more than one Department. Extensive participation in the work of two Departments should be recognized by a "joint appointment". Appointees who participate less extensively in the work of a second Department should receive an associate membership in that Department. The use of the term "associate member" as it pertains to graduate work has recently been clearly defined (Senate Minutes, Vol. XIV p.125). Since the involvement of faculty in the undergraduate work of Departments other than those in which they hold their primary appointment will range from the occasional guest lecture to responsibility for part or all of a class, it seems futile to attempt to define precisely at what point these contributions should be recognized by formal appointments as associate members or by joint appointments. However, it seems reasonable that *joint appointments should be reserved for those who participate fully in the undergraduate (or undergraduate and graduate) work of two Departments* while those who participate less extensively, but nevertheless on a continuing basis, should receive associate memberships.

Associate Memberships For Undergraduate Involvement

Associate Memberships should be granted only upon the recommendation of the two Departments concerned, with the approval of the appropriate Faculty Dean(s), Academic Vice-President, and, if graduate work is involved, the Dean of Graduate Studies. To insure that the contributions of all associate members will be reviewed from time to time, such appointments will be for up to five-year renewable terms.

Assignment of teaching responsibilities to an associate member must be with the knowledge and approval of the chairman of that individual's major Department and the Faculty Dean(s) involved. Associate membership carries with it the right to participate in those aspects of the business of a minor Department which are directly relevant to the contributions of the associate member. Associate members who participate in the undergraduate teaching programme of a Department can expect to be involved in curriculum and other discussions that affect their contributions. The regulations governing graduate involvement are contained in the Senate Minutes mentioned above.

Joint Appointments

- i. Joint appointments, whether or not they involve financial contributions from two Departments should only be made on the recommendation of the two Departments concerned and with the approval of the Faculty Dean(s), Academic Vice-President, and if graduate work is involved, the Dean of Graduate Studies.
- ii. The teaching responsibilities of joint appointees should be by agreement between the two departmental Chair concerned and with the approval of the Faculty Dean(s). It does, however, seem desirable that one of the departmental Chair should have "first call" on the teaching time of the faculty member. Teaching in another Department can then be negotiated. Alternately,

teaching assignments could be arranged at the time an appointment is made and modified later only by agreement of the Departments concerned.

iii. In the case of many faculty members holding joint appointments, it will be possible to define one of the two Departments as that of "major interest". (For example, a theoretical physicist who does some undergraduate teaching in the Department of Applied Mathematics, but who carries out all his graduate teaching and research in the Department of Physics should have the latter Department as that of his "major interest".) In such cases, the faculty member's title should reflect his major interest. Thus in the example cited above, the appropriate title would be (Assistant/Associate) Professor of Physics.

iv. There may, however, be some joint appointees whose activities (undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching and research) take place equally within both departments. The titles of such faculty members should therefore reflect their full participation in two departments. Thus, for an individual participating fully in the work of both the Department of Biochemistry and the Department of Paediatrics the appropriate title would be (Assistant/Associate) Professor of Biochemistry and Paediatrics.

v. For faculty members on joint appointments, it is the responsibility of both departments to make recommendations concerning tenure and promotion to the appropriate Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee. In those cases where the two departments make differing recommendations, but both report to the same Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee shall make the decision as to whether or not tenure or promotion should be recommended to the Senate Committee on Appointments. In those cases where the two departments involved make recommendations concerning tenure and promotion to different Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committees, a recommendation from each Faculty Committee shall be submitted to the Senate Committee on Appointments. In the event that the recommendations disagree, the Senate Committee on Appointments shall make the final decision.

vi. A faculty member on a joint appointment may not hold two different academic ranks, even if there are different levels of experience and proficiency in terms of his activities in the two departments of which he is a member.

vii. For faculty members on joint appointments, it is the responsibility of both departments annually to make merit assessments for the purposes of salary determination.

a. In those cases where two Faculty budgets and two Deans are involved, there must be joint consideration and agreement by the two Deans on the merit assessment and the dollar amount assigned on the basis of it.

b. In those cases where only one Faculty budget is involved, but the appointment is in two departments in two different Faculties, the two Deans jointly will decide on the merit assessment; the Dean whose budget includes the salary will establish the dollar amount.

c. In those cases where the joint appointment is in two departments of the same Faculty, both chairs will make merit assessments and will forward these to the Dean who will establish the dollar amount.

University of Iowa

http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/deos/admin_manual/faculty_appt/5.shtml

Recruitment of Jointly Appointed Faculty

When the Secondary Unit is Known at the Start of the Search

University of Iowa

If two units agree to search for a jointly appointed faculty member, the allocation letter signed by Dean Maxson is addressed to both DEOs and states that Dean Curto's secretary will call them to arrange a meeting to discuss:

- * The makeup of the search committee.
- * Whether reviews of the position will follow Model A or Model B (see [Joint Appointments](#) for descriptions of models and procedures).
- * The new faculty member's rights and duties in the secondary department, such as voting, student committee membership, service load, and teaching load/assignments.
- * Whether the new faculty member will have office space in the secondary unit (specify the room, if possible).
- * The secondary unit's contribution to moving expenses.
- * The secondary unit's contribution to start-up costs.
- * A model itinerary for the interview process; specifically, how candidates will meet effectively with faculty and students from the secondary unit.

The DEOs of both units must sign the Affirmative Action [Form A](#), which is submitted to Dean Curto. If the secondary unit is in another college, that college's dean must also sign the Form A.

When a candidate is chosen, both DEOs must sign the Affirmative Action [Form D](#) (as well as the appropriate dean if the secondary unit is in another college). The names of both DEOs must appear on the draft offer letter submitted to Dean Curto with the Form D, and both DEOs must sign the actual offer letter. The [model offer letter](#) designed for a joint appointment (listed under "Language for Special Circumstances" on the CLAS website) is used in these cases.

When a Secondary Unit is Identified During the Search

If a search committee recommends a candidate for an interview for whom a secondary appointment seems a reasonable possibility, the likely secondary unit or units must participate in the on-campus interviews.

If that candidate is selected, the DEOs of the primary and secondary units meet with Dean Curto to discuss the terms and details of the joint appointment as described [above](#). The procedures for submitting the Form D and extending the offer are the same as for a joint search.

University of Iowa (continued)

<http://provost.uiowa.edu/faculty/facappt/types/joint.htm>

Joint, Secondary & Tertiary Appointments

Joint Appointments:

A joint appointment is one in which a tenured, tenure-track, or clinical track faculty member has responsibilities to, and review by, more than one department. The percentage time split may range from 90/10% to 50/50%, but the faculty title and rank must be consistent across departments. One department is designated the "home department" and is responsible for the initiation of the HR transactions.

A joint appointment is usually funded by more than one department and requires the cooperation and approval of both departments and colleges concerned in the search, offer and appointment. The offer letter must clearly delineate the expectations of each department and the candidate's rights and responsibilities in the arrangement. Departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences should consult the Executive Associate Dean to negotiate the joint appointment. The appointment form and attachments are routed in workflow through both Departments and Colleges and then to the Office of the Provost for electronic signature.

Required Attachments:

- * Final Offer Letter Signed by Candidate
- * Candidate's CV

Required Offer Letter Elements:

- * Title
- * Start/End Dates
- * Overview of Responsibilities/Expectations
- * Brief Description of Benefits

Sample Offer Letter for a Joint Appointment

Subsequent promotion and tenure reviews are similarly cooperative. The exact process for promotion and tenure reviews can be worked out after the new faculty member arrives on campus but must have the concurrence of all parties involved. (See Joint Appointment Evaluations.)

Secondary and Tertiary Appointments:

Secondary and tertiary appointments, sometimes called "complimentary" or "zero-percent" appointments, are made when the effort split is 100/0%. These type of are intended for tenured, tenure-track or clinical track faculty with a primary appointment in one department but for whom a relationship with another department is appropriate as well. This can involve teaching, advising, committee representation, or any other duty appropriate to the faculty member's areas

of expertise. The primary department usually funds the position. A secondary appointment may be made at the point of initial hire, in which case the statements made above under "Joint appointments" apply, but is more typically made at a later point in time. In the latter case, the appointment form should indicate in the "Remarks" section, "TO RECOGNIZE THE SECONDARY [or tertiary] APPOINTMENT." The appointment form and required attachments are routed electronically from the secondary to primary departments and colleges.

Required Attachments:

- * The agreement (signed by the faculty member), outlining the responsibilities and privileges of the individual, the departments, and colleges including the role of each regarding promotion and tenure decisions, is attached by secondary or tertiary department and routed in workflow to their respective college before routing to the primary department and college. Approval of the form constitutes approval of the agreement.

- * Candidate's CV

Departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences should consult the Executive Associate Dean to negotiate Joint Appointment. If the length of term of the secondary appointment differs from that of the primary appointment, this should be indicated on the appointment form and in the letter of agreement.

Units that can make faculty appointments include all Regental academic units and those programs with an established appointing structure approved by the Office of the Provost. Before making interdisciplinary appointments, units should review all interdisciplinary policies.

University of Iowa (continued)

<http://provost.uiowa.edu/faculty/facappt/evaluation/joint.htm>

Joint Appointment Review

The following is excerpted from the Interdisciplinary Task Force Report to the Provost. A committee will consider these procedures as part of a general review of the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines in the Spring of 2003. At this time, these procedures are recommended but not required. The proposal can be found in its entirety here (see Appendix B).

In order to recognize faculty effort and achievement, all review procedures for joint appointments, both within and across colleges, should be carried out with attention to the following guidelines. This document is supplemental to other University policies regarding review procedures, including the Procedural Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Decision Making.

The core of the joint appointment is the letter of agreement, detailing the expectations, privileges and responsibilities among the appointing units and the faculty member, including the specific details of review procedures. See this sample offer letter.

Promotion and Tenure Reviews:

* The participating units form a joint internal review committee, roughly proportional in its makeup to the percentage of faculty effort in each unit for all annual, reappointment, tenure and promotion reviews (see 1.4 below). Units or the faculty member may seek approval of the Dean(s) for an alternative structure in exceptional circumstances, including cases of marked discrepancy between percentage effort and percentage salary support across the two units. This committee report is submitted in writing to each of the departmental consulting groups.

* The participating units may form a joint consulting group, if mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the units. In such a case, the units may submit either joint or separate votes and reports.

* If a joint consulting group is formed, the executive officers may submit either a joint letter or separate letters reporting the deliberations and making the recommendation(s) for promotion and tenure.

* When standard review procedures differ between units (e.g., delegation of review of teaching, research and service to separate subcommittees vs. using a single internal review committee for all three areas), a joint decision shall be made establishing procedures that are mutually acceptable to the faculty member and the units in advance of deliberations of the review committee[s].

* When a faculty member holds a 0% joint appointment in a unit, that unit may take a subordinate consultative role in the tenure and promotion process, as mutually agreed upon in a letter of agreement (see #3). (See also the sample offer letter.)

Appointments:

* A letter of agreement between the faculty member and the participating units concerning terms of appointment, and approved by the dean(s) shall specify review procedures. The letter shall specify, at a minimum, the faculty member's privileges and responsibilities with respect to the units and the expected activities in each unit in teaching, research, and service. Differences in unit policies and procedures should be recognized and resolved in the letter of agreement.

* For appointments new to the University, an agreement about review procedures shall be made either in the letter of appointment, or as part of a more comprehensive letter further detailing the terms of the appointment within the first year of the appointment. (See the sample offer letter.)

* For appointments from within the University faculty, review procedures shall be included in the letter of agreement concerning terms of appointment.

* The letter of agreement should be reviewed at each reappointment. It may be revised at any time by mutual consent of the faculty member and the participating units, and with the approval of the dean(s) and Office of the Provost.

Annual, Reappointment, and Post-Tenure Reviews:

The same procedures described above shall be followed for annual and third-year reappointment reviews with the one exception that written report(s) from the internal review committee and unit consulting group(s) are optional. Absent a written report from the internal review committee, at least one member of each unit must participate in the oral committee report to each unit consulting group.

Timetable:

No later than the end of the academic year before a promotion and tenure review, an appropriate timeline should be established to enable gathering of information, reasonable committee review, the faculty member's response to the committee report, and consulting group deliberations.

Exception:

In the unusual case in which two units are contemplating a joint but non-interdisciplinary appointment, such that joint review may be inappropriate, the units may petition for an alternative review structure. Such a petition should be presented to the Dean(s) who will seek final approval from the Provost.

University of Western Ontario
<http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/mapp/section4/jointappt.html>

PROCEDURES FOR JOINT APPOINTMENTS WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY

PREAMBLE

In the spring of 1997, the Provost & Vice-President (Academic) announced a Special Faculty Renewal Initiative resulting in the allocation of 20 new academic appointments providing opportunities for research and education straddling two Faculties. While *Conditions of Appointment* provides for joint appointment arrangements and a limited number of such appointments have existed across campus for some time, the references in *Conditions* do not provide sufficient guidance for the administration of these appointments. These new cross-Faculty appointments call for more explicit and elaborate procedures that provide for consistent and well-understood processes of appointment, the handling of procedures for annual performance appraisal and development, promotion and tenure, etc, for joint appointees with responsibilities spanning two or more Faculties. These procedures are consistent with *Conditions of Appointment* and based on the principle that the academic administration of joint appointments should as much as possible be a single joint process rather than parallel but separate processes occurring more or less independently in the two (or more) academic units involved in the appointment.

Appointments Procedure for Joint Appointments

(These detailed appointment procedures are an elaboration of, and consistent with, the appointment procedures contained in Section A - Appointments in Conditions of Appointment.)

1. All open joint academic positions proposed in two or more academic units shall be considered by a Joint Appointments Committee, the composition of which shall be:

(a) the Chair of each Department in which the appointment will be held (or Dean of each Faculty in Faculties without departmental structure) who shall jointly chair the Committee;

(b) at least one full-time tenured member from each Department (Faculty) Committee on Appointments, elected to the Joint Appointments Committee by the members of his/her Department (Faculty) Committee on Appointments; *(See Note 1 below.)*

(c) in addition, if a Department (Faculty) Committee on Appointments so chooses, student members and/or untenured members of the Department (Faculty) Committee on Appointments, elected to the Joint Appointments Committee by the members of the Department (Faculty) Committee on Appointments. *(See Note 1 below.)*

The membership of the Joint Appointments Committee shall be composed of an equal number of members from each academic unit.

Note: 1. *In lieu of 1(b) and (c) above, if a joint appointment includes a clinical Department, the members of the clinical Department's Committee on Appointments and Promotion shall elect at least one member from their Committee to the Joint Department Committee.*

2. *If a joint appointment includes The Centre for Women's Studies, the Director of the Centre shall be deemed to be a Department Chair for the purposes of the appointment procedure and the relevant Dean shall be designated by the Centre's Advisory Committee. The Centre's Advisory Committee shall appoint members of faculty to the Joint Appointments Committee, including at least one full-time tenured member of faculty.*

2. A quorum shall consist of two-thirds of the members (and must include the Chair of each Department, or Dean of each Faculty in Faculties without departmental structure, plus one other member from each unit).

3. The provisions of A.12 to A.17 of Conditions of Appointment relating to an Appointments Committee and Department Chair shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to a Joint Appointments Committee and to the Chairs of the Joint Appointments Committee. The Chairs of the Joint Appointments Committee shall forward a joint recommendation. If they are unable to agree on a recommendation, each shall forward a separate recommendation.

Note: *If a joint appointment includes a School in the Faculty of Health Sciences, written recommendations for appointments, as provided in Alternate Procedures, Faculty of Health Sciences Appointments Committee, shall be made to the Joint Appointments Committee.*

4. If the academic units are in one Faculty, the Dean shall follow the procedures set out in A.16(b).

5. If the academic units are Faculties without departmental structure, the recommendations of the Joint Appointments Committee and the joint recommendation of the Deans (or separate recommendations if the Deans are unable to agree on a recommendation) shall be forwarded as set out in A.17(a) and (b).

6. If the academic units are in two or more Faculties with departmental structure, or if the academic units are in a Faculty/Faculties with departmental structure and a Faculty/Faculties without departmental structure, the recommendations of the Joint Appointments Committee and the Chairs of the Committee shall be sent to the Deans of the Faculties/Dean of the Faculty with departmental structure. The Deans of all of the Faculties involved in the appointment shall forward their joint recommendation (or separate recommendations if the Deans are unable to agree on a recommendation) as set out in A.16(b)(i) and (ii). A Dean of a Faculty without departmental structure who has made a recommendation or a joint recommendations as a Chair of a Joint Appointments Committee shall also forward a joint recommendations with the other Dean(s).

7. The Chairs of the Joint Appointments Committee shall jointly undertake negotiations with the candidate as required under A.18.

8. If the appointment is in one Faculty, the Dean shall inform the prospective faculty member in writing of the terms and conditions of his/her appointment (A.19). If the appointment is across two or more Faculties, the appointment letter will be signed by both/all Deans. Such terms and conditions must also be approved, in writing, by the Provost.

9. The designation of the home academic unit shall be communicated to the prospective faculty member at the time of appointment. Although all substantive aspects will be performed jointly by the academic units involved, for administrative purposes the home academic unit will be responsible for establishing and maintaining a promotion and/or tenure file; ensuring that a Joint Committee on Promotion and Tenure is established when necessary; ensuring that a joint performance evaluation is undertaken when required; processing leave applications, etc. If the home academic unit is a department, that department's Faculty shall be the home Faculty, and shall be so designated at the time of the appointment. The home Faculty shall be responsible for administering at the Faculty level, matters as they pertain to Conditions of Appointment. Such matters shall include the following: contacting external referees as required; ensuring that a Joint Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure is established where required, etc.

10. University listings and other publications will acknowledge both academic units. For example, under Faculty listings in the Academic Calendar, the other academic units in which an appointment is held will be listed after the faculty member's name ("also in Physics").

Faculty Evaluation for Joint Appointments

1. The annual performance evaluation and faculty development is the joint responsibility of the heads of the academic units in which the faculty member holds an appointment. Deans/Chairs involved in joint appointments should establish a joint process of annual evaluation and development that ensures that all aspects of the faculty member's performance are reviewed in one integrated process.

2. As for all members of faculty, the procedure for determining Selective Salary Adjustments for a faculty member holding a joint appointment is determined by agreement arising from negotiations regarding Faculty remuneration between the University and The University of Western Ontario Faculty Association.

Guidelines on Expectations, Rights and Responsibilities of Joint Appointees within the University

Teaching Responsibilities

The teaching responsibilities of joint appointees will be assigned on the basis of agreement between (among) the Department Chairs (Deans in non-departmentalized Faculties) and with the approval of the Faculty Dean(s). Joint decisions as to teaching responsibilities will be made by the Department Chairs (Deans) on a yearly basis.

Research Responsibilities

It is expected that the joint appointee's research may be carried out either in one or in both (all) units. It is the responsibility of all Chairs (Deans) to jointly assess the research requirements of the joint appointee, including the commitment of research facilities, equipment and space. It is expected that such assessment will be done at the time a joint appointment is made, but it may be reviewed by the Department Chairs (Deans) from time to time at the request of the faculty member or at the request of a Department Chair or Dean.

When a joint appointee applies for research funds and the approval or support of the Chair of the Department (Dean of the Faculty) is required, the Chair (Dean) of the Department (Faculty) most closely associated with the research shall take the necessary action.

Other Contributions

A joint appointee is expected to undertake the normal faculty responsibilities commensurate with his/her rank. The joint appointee will be responsible to all Department Chairs (or Deans) in the Departments (Faculties) in which he/she holds a joint appointment, will be provided with office space in all units, and will carry administrative responsibilities in all units in which he/she holds a joint appointment. The division of such responsibilities among the Departments (Faculties) must be approved jointly on a yearly basis by the Chairs (Deans) of the relevant Departments (Faculties).

The joint appointee shall be regarded as a full-time member of the Departments (Faculties) in which he/she holds a joint appointment for the purposes of eligibility to vote in elections at the Department, Faculty and University level, and to stand for election or appointment to committees and bodies at these levels, provided however that such administrative or other responsibilities do not adversely affect the appointee's responsibilities in the other Departments (Faculties).

a) In an election of faculty to the Board of Governors, or any other University-wide election among all faculty, the joint appointee shall have one vote;

b) In an election to select a number of representatives from each Faculty to the Senate or other University-level body, a faculty member with a joint appointment in two or more Faculties may cast one vote in each Faculty in which he/she has an appointment. A faculty member whose departments are within the same Faculty may cast only one vote in such an election.

Promotion and Tenure Procedures for Joint Appointments

(These detailed promotion and tenure procedures are an elaboration of, and consistent with, the procedures contained in Section B - Promotion and Tenure in Conditions of Appointment.)

It is the responsibility of the head of the home academic unit (as designated in the letter of appointment) to establish and maintain a promotion and/or tenure file for a joint appointee who is a candidate for promotion and/or tenure.

Except where specific elaboration is provided here, the provisions relating to Department Committees and Faculty Committees on Promotion and Tenure in Section B of Conditions of Appointment apply to Joint Department Committees and Joint Faculty Committees.

Joint Department Committee

1. If the joint appointee holds a joint appointment in two or more Departments OR in one or more Departments in combination with one or more Faculties without departmental structure, the composition of the Joint Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure is as follows:

(a) the Chairs of the Departments and, if applicable, such person as the Dean of each Faculty without departmental structure may appoint, who shall jointly chair the Committee;

(b) at least one full-time tenured member from each Department (or Faculty without departmental structure) who is a member of the Department (Faculty) Committee on Promotion and Tenure, elected to the Joint Department Committee by the members of his/her Department (Faculty) Committee on Promotion and Tenure; (*See Note 1 below.*)

(c) in addition, if a Department (Faculty) Committee so chooses, student members and/or untenured members of the Department (Faculty) Committee on Promotion and Tenure, elected to the Joint Department Committee by the members of the Department (Faculty) Committee on Promotion and Tenure. (*See Note 1 below.*)

The membership of a Joint Department Committee shall be composed of an equal number of members from each academic unit.

Note: 1. *In lieu of 1(b) and (c) above, if a joint appointment includes a clinical Department, the members of the clinical Department's Committee on Appointments and Promotion shall elect at least one member from their Committee to the Joint Department Committee.*

2. *If a joint appointment includes The Centre for Women's Studies, the Director of the Centre shall be deemed to be a Department Chair for the purposes of the promotion and tenure procedure and the appropriate Dean and Faculty shall be designated by the Centre's Advisory Committee. The Centre's Advisory Committee shall appoint members of faculty to the Joint Department Committee, including at least one full-time tenured member of faculty.*

2. No member of a Joint Department Committee shall consider the case at another level.

3. A quorum of the Joint Department Committee shall consist of two-thirds of the members (and must include two members from each unit).

4. The Joint Department Committee shall be convened by the Chair of the home Department (or the Dean's appointee on the Committee if the home unit is a Faculty without departmental structure).

5. The Chairs of the Joint Department Committee shall forward the recommendation of the Joint Department Committee together with the joint recommendation of the Chairs to the Dean of the home Faculty. If the Chairs cannot agree on the recommendation, a separate recommendation shall be forwarded from each Chair.

6. If the recommendation of one or more of the Chairs or of the Joint Department Committee is positive, the recommendation shall be considered by the Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure (or the Joint Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure if the appointment is across two or more Faculties).

7. If the final recommendations of all of the Chairs and of the Joint Department Committee are negative, an appeal may be made to the Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure (or Joint Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure if the appointment is across two or more Faculties).

Note: *If a joint appointment includes a School in the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Director of the School must submit a written opinion to, and shall appear before, the Joint Department Committee (or Joint Faculty Committee if the appointment is in Faculties without departmental Structure) as provided in Alternate Procedures, Faculty of Health Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee.*

Joint Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure (Faculties without Departmental Structure)

8. If the joint appointee holds an appointment in two or more Faculties without departmental structure, the composition of the Joint Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure is as follows:

(a) the Deans of the Faculties who shall jointly chair the Committee;

(b) at least three tenured members from each Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure, elected to the Joint Committee by the members of their Faculty's Promotion and Tenure Committee, and one of whom shall be a Professor from outside the Faculty;

(c) where a Faculty Committee so chooses, one student member or untenured member of the Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure, elected to the Joint Faculty Committee by the members of the Committee.

The membership of a Joint Faculty Committee shall be composed of an equal number of members from each academic unit.

9. A quorum of the Joint Faculty Committee shall consist of two-thirds of the members (and must include two members from each unit).

10. The Joint Faculty Committee shall be convened by the Dean of the home Faculty.

11. The Deans shall forward the recommendation of the Joint Faculty Committee together with their joint recommendation to the Provost. If the Deans cannot agree on the recommendation, a separate recommendation shall be forwarded from each Dean.

12. If the final recommendation of one or more of the Deans or the Committee is positive, the recommendation shall be considered by the appropriate Senate Committee.

13. If the final recommendations of all Deans and the Joint Faculty Committee are negative, an appeal may be made to the appropriate Senate Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

Joint Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure (Faculties with Departmental Structure or Faculty/Faculties with Departmental Structure Combined with Faculty/Faculties without Departmental Structure)

Note: *If the joint appointee holds an appointment in two or more departments of one Faculty, the regularly constituted Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure as set out in Conditions of Appointment will consider the case.*

14. If the joint appointee holds an appointment in two or more Departments in different Faculties OR if the joint appointee holds an appointment in a Faculty (Faculties) without departmental structure and in one or more Departments, the composition of the Joint Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure is as follows:

(a) the Deans of the Faculties who shall jointly chair the Committee;

(b) at least two tenured members from each Faculty Committee on Promotion and Tenure, elected to serve on the Joint Committee by the members of their Faculty's Promotion and Tenure Committee. (*See Note below.*)

The membership of the Joint Faculty Committee shall be composed of an equal number of members from each academic unit.

Note: *In lieu of (b) above, if a joint appointment includes a clinical Department, the members of the Faculty of Medicine Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall elect at least two members from their Committee to the Joint Faculty Committee.*

15. A quorum of the Joint Faculty Committee shall consist of two-thirds of the members (and must include two members from each unit).

16. The Joint Faculty Committee shall be convened by the Dean of the home Faculty.

17. The Deans shall forward the recommendation of the Joint Faculty Committee together with their joint recommendation to the Provost. If the Deans cannot agree on the recommendation, a separate recommendation shall be forwarded from each Dean.

18. If the final recommendation of one or more of the Deans or the Committee is positive, the recommendation shall be considered by the appropriate Senate Committee.

19. If the final recommendations of all Deans and the Committee are negative, an appeal may be made to the Senate Committee on Appeals.

External Referees

20. Preparation of List: The preparation of a list of potential external referees is the responsibility of the Joint Department Committee (or the Joint Faculty Committee if the appointment is in two (or more) Faculties without departmental structure).

21. Solicitation: The solicitation of the referees will be done by the Dean of the home Faculty.

Grievance Procedures for Joint Appointments

(These grievance procedures are an elaboration of, and consistent with, the procedures contained in Section E - Grievance Procedure in Conditions of Appointment.)

Section E applies in all respects to a member of Faculty holding a joint appointment in two or more academic units, except that if the joint appointment is held across two or more Faculties, a grievance under E.1 relating to a joint decision of the academic units in which the appointment is held shall be submitted to a Joint Faculty Grievance Committee in the first instance.

Except where specific elaboration is provided here, the provisions relating to a grievance to a Faculty Grievance Committee in Section E of Conditions of Appointment apply to a grievance to a Joint Faculty Grievance Committee and the references to "Faculty Grievance Committee" in Section E shall mean "Joint Faculty Grievance Committee" when applicable.

Joint Faculty Grievance Committee

1. Grievances to a Joint Faculty Grievance Committee shall be submitted through the Dean of the home Faculty. The home Faculty will be responsible for providing administrative support for the Joint Faculty Grievance Committee.

2. If the joint appointment is across two Faculties, the Joint Faculty Grievance Committee shall be composed of three faculty members with tenure as provided in E.5. The members shall be selected by lot as provided in E.5(b), except that two members shall be selected from the panel elected by the Faculty Council of the home Faculty and one member shall be selected from the panel elected by the Faculty Council of the other Faculty.

3. If the joint appointment is across more than two Faculties, the Joint Faculty Grievance Committee shall be composed of one faculty member with tenure from each Faculty, selected by lot as provided in E.5(b) from the panel elected by the Faculty Council in each Faculty.

4. The panels referred to in #2 and #3 above are the same panels from which members of a Faculty Grievance Committee are selected.

Procedures for Handling Leaves, Reduced Responsibility and Alternate Workloads for Joint Appointees

Sabbatical Leave

(The following procedure is an elaboration of Section D - Sabbatical Leave in Conditions of Appointment to clarify that recommendations are required from all Chairs and Deans.)

A joint appointee shall apply for sabbatical leave to the head of the home academic unit (Department Chair in Faculties with departmental structure or Dean in Faculties without departmental structure). The recommendations of the heads of both (all) academic units shall be forwarded to each Dean. The Deans shall make a joint recommendation. If jointly approved, the Dean of the home Faculty shall forward the application as required under D.11(a) of Conditions of Appointment. If one Dean does not approve an application for sabbatical leave, the application shall not be forwarded to the Senate Sabbatical Leave Committee. However, the applicant may exercise any rights of appeal provided under D.21(e). Copies of all recommendations of the Senate Sabbatical Leave Committee and the Senate Sabbatical Leave Appeal Committee shall be sent to all Department Chairs and all Deans (where applicable).

Other Leaves and Arrangements

1. Reduced Responsibility, Leaves, Alternative Work Loads - Alternative Career Opportunities, Retention and Development of Faculty, (ACORD) (Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures, Policy 4.2)

Applications shall be made to the home academic unit/home Faculty of the joint appointee. All applications must be approved by the Chairs of all academic units in which the faculty member holds an appointment, and by the relevant Dean (or Deans, if the joint appointment is across two faculties).

a) Conditions relating to a reduced responsibility appointment (see ACORD, Section A, #12 and #13) shall be negotiated through the Chairs of all academic units with the Dean(s) and details of the reduced responsibility arrangements will be confirmed in writing and signed by all Chairs and Deans.

b) Details of the alternative workload arrangement (see ACORD, Section D, #7) will be confirmed in writing and signed by all Chairs and Deans.

3. Pregnancy Leave and Adoption Leave (Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures, Policies 4.7 and 4.8)

An application for pregnancy leave or adoption leave shall be made through all Chairs (or Deans) and each unit will prepare a Work Absence Form and submit it to the Department of Pensions and Benefits.

A joint appointee must provide the Chairs (and/or Dean(s) where applicable) of all academic units with the advanced notice required under these policies and must discuss future plans jointly with the Chairs (and/or Dean(s)).

**Appendix II to
Joint Appointment Report**
by
©2009 K.A. Wallace

Comments from Individuals at different institutions about Joint Appointments¹:

Comment 1 (senior professor)

"The normal procedure is for each faculty member to have a primary appointment. A secondary appt. can be added to this, but it's not vital for continued employment. The problem with belonging to two departments equally is that two sets of likely different and possibly incompatible requirements must be met. Consider tenure: writing enough in two fields to satisfy two different disciplines is very difficult. Salary recommendations are hairy also: how do the two chairs agree on what to offer? Voting makes for problems: in times of internal strife, each department will want to strip the faculty member of the vote in their department.

The problem with primary/secondary appts is that they don't really promote interdisciplinarity. Most of the ones I have seen are congratulatory in nature, celebrating the fact that someone has done work in two fields. But typically one always remains a useless appendage in the second field. It would be good to have truly multiple-department appointments, but the entire structure of universities would have to be revised to make them work."

Comment 2 (joint appointee)

(conducted as a telephone interview)

Prof. X has had three joint appointments at 3 different institutions. In the current joint appointment Prof. X is appointed in the Sociology Dept, with a courtesy appointment in the History Dept.. Salary, resources (e.g., faculty office), voting rights are exclusively in the Sociology Dept.. However, all Prof. X's courses are jointly listed in the Sociology and History departments and the FTEs for Prof. X's courses are evenly split between Sociology and History (e.g., suppose a course enrollment of 100; 50 to Sociology, 50 to History). There is no additional work associated with this joint appointment, except for possibly a slight increase in the number of supervised graduate students. It is a permanent appointment, although Prof. X believes that Prof. X (but not the departments) could initiate a renegotiation if Prof. X so wished. Prof. X reported that both departments seemed perfectly happy with the arrangement; History because it was

¹ Email inquiries were sent to senior faculty, administrators (e.g., Chairpersons) and joint appointees at a variety of different institutions. The responses are in the form of email messages (the text of which has been copied and pasted into this document) except where otherwise noted (e.g., telephone interview). I have anonymized all responses.

getting Prof. X's services for free (not having to pay the salary) and Sociology because Prof. X is a fully participating member of the Sociology Department.

Prof. X's previous joint appointments both involved funding splits between two units -- the salary was split between two units, Prof. X had two bosses, two lines of evaluation for tenure and promotion, and a split workload (separate course load responsibility in each unit, duties in each unit, such as attending department meetings, and the like). These joint appointments were more work for the individual faculty member. Also, when there were times of stress, conflict of interest or tension, an individual faculty member tended to pull back to one of the units (whichever one was more of the "home" unit), leaving the second unit somewhat orphaned. This was particularly problematic when one of the two units was an interdisciplinary unit with less status or structure than a more traditional department structure. Prof. X also felt that this arrangement was a constraint on Prof. X's research program; as a faculty member of two units, Prof. X was locked into an arrangement of meeting programmatic requirements in two units which did not allow Prof. X's research to develop in new directions. Because the salary was funded by two units, there was no possibility of opting out of the arrangement.

Prof. X felt that one thing quite important to the viability of joint appointments is spatial proximity of the units in which a faculty member is jointly appointed. This is important for the sustaining of the informal processes that tend to hold units together, for presence and availability to students in each unit and for minimizing the demands on the faculty member's time (i.e., so that the faculty member is not commuting between two different locations).

Comment 3 (senior professor)

"We've never had such an appointment in our own department, and I haven't had any experience with such appointments elsewhere. One odd thing about my institution's way of handling them is that when an appointment is joint, a "reappointments and promotions committee" is assembled from among the members of the two departments. In a normal appointment, this committee is the entire (tenured) faculty of the department, and since this is the committee that recommends promotions (and tenure) to the college-wide committee, this means that when it comes to a joint appointment, some members of the two departments don't have the same kind of voice they would have if the appointment were entirely within their own department. I imagine that a lot of politicking goes into determining who will be on the joint committee, but I don't have any personal knowledge of it."

Comment 4 (Department Chair with joint appointee on staff)

"Well, I do have a little to say on the topic you've raised. It was "the thing" at my university a few years back to do a lot of these joint appointments, partly because we had a Dean who liked them and partly because they became a way to come up with money for new faculty lines:

The line was partially funded from one pot and partially from another (although I don't know much about the financial considerations involved since, at the department level, we have nothing to do with paying salaries). We have one person (Prof. P) in my dept. on tenure track who is 1/3 in Classics and 2/3's in Philosophy, which means Prof. P does 2 courses a year for them and 4 courses for us. We also have a person who is 20% in the Women's and Gender Studies Program and 80% in Philosophy, although this I really don't understand, since a program is not a department. Once again, I think it's a matter of how the position is funded by the administration.

Some of the complications in these positions with which I'm familiar are the following. The person jointly appointed has split allegiance in terms of service, so expectations have to be adjusted accordingly. One question is whether the person will ever be eligible to be chair in either department and whether a dept. (or the person) is short-changed if the answer is no. The faculty member could also end up doing many different preps to meet the needs of two different departments. There can be scheduling complications, but of course, the department chairs simply have to coordinate to be sure that the faculty member is not scheduled by them at the same time for teaching. (For the person in Women's and Gender Studies, I do the scheduling and simply make sure that one or two of the courses are courses in that program.) Evaluations are also more complicated, since both departments must be involved in them in some way. In the case of our philosophy/classics person, we set up an annual evaluation committee that is 2/3's philosophers and 1/3 classicists. Prof. P will be coming up for tenure in a couple of years, and both departments will meet as a whole when we have to discuss his case, but this is not so difficult for us, since there are only a few other classicists.

Aside from procuring financing that allows a hire that otherwise would not have been, I suppose there are educational and curricular advantages in these sorts of hires, although I'm not such a strong proponent of them. Maybe I'm just in a position now as chair to see the extra work they create. Some argue that the presence of joint appointments brings more unity to the curriculum and that it's a good thing for departments to work together. Maybe so. I'm happy that we got our Classics person, who has been great for the department (although Prof. P being great has nothing to do with Prof. P also being appointed to Classics). But we would not have gotten the position in any other way at the time."

Comment 5 (interdisciplinary program administrator with joint appointees):

"I've had a few experiences with joint appointments and I am currently involved in "creating" such positions because of my work with the an interdisciplinary Institute here at my institution. My quick response is that a key to successful joint appointments is to have the conditions of the appointment and the individual's responsibilities clearly spelled

out in the appointment letter and to make sure that all parties understand and agree to those divisions of labor/expectations up front. I usually make sure that these details are handled by the Dean's office, but work with the Dean and the respective Department Heads to negotiate the contract. If there isn't a contract, it is too easy for folks who hold joint appointments to get caught in the middle. Where I see this as most important is for folks who are not yet tenured and here the issue is often whose scholarship requirements will be employed in a tenure decision (what journals/presses count, what about interdisciplinary research, etc.). I often urge folks in joint appointments to have the tenure/promotion committee constituents (how many from each department) clearly spelled out in the appointment letter."

Comment 6 (Department Head with joint appointees)

(conducted as a telephone interview)

There are two types of appointments: (1) Shared Appointments where the faculty member's salary is split between 2 departments and the faculty member has serious obligations in both departments and (2) Joint Appointments which are courtesy appointment in a second department that may involve teaching in the second dept. or collaboration in the labs, supervision of graduate students and so on. Prof. D does not have shared appointments in Prof. D's department, but does have a number of joint appointments. In joint appointments, the faculty member's home department is responsible for all raises, promotions, and so on. The joint appointee is invited to dept meetings of the second department and may vote on matters in a department meeting, except in personnel cases. Joint appointees rarely attend meetings of the second department. Prof. D said that there is a dept. executive committee that reviews requests for joint appointments to their dept; typically they look for what kinds of contributions some one might make to the department (e.g., intellectually, pedagogically). The second department consults with the faculty member's home department to make sure that a joint appointment would be compatible with the faculty member's obligations in the home department. Joint appointments are presumed to be permanent, but they can be terminated. In other words, there is no term limit or duration specified to a joint appointment, but it can be reevaluated and terminated by the second department.

Comment 7 (joint appointee)

"I have held joint appointments since I began and when chair in [a department at another institution than where I am now] we not only allowed it we encouraged it. I think there are few disadvantages to it for senior people depending upon the politics at your institution. The real complication is in setting a precedent which will make hiring new lines more problematic (will there be joint hires? These can be very difficult) and in tenure and advancement and yearly assessment of junior faculty (when one dept. thinks they are doing well and the other does not). The only other issue may come with FTE distribution and the long term impacts that has on departmental growth, etc. We are experimenting with joint appointments here and all of the above pertains to our struggle with it. I was appointed here as a

university professor (the first) that went well now we have two and are working on two more. Overall it makes a school a more integrated whole with lines of communication that are as open as the joint appointees."

Comment 8 (joint appointee)

"I am one [joint appointee], in a liberal arts college with 3 colleagues in each of my two depts. I was hired as such in 1985: both depts. needed help. I feel strongly that the depts. should be separate -- at least, it suits my sense of things to differentiate their missions -- and accordingly I feel I operate pretty differently on the two sides, although not to the exclusion of a beneficial seepage of topics and methods between them. No one seems to think I have too much power. On the contrary, the danger is of being a relatively peripheral figure in each dept. -- because roughly half of my teaching is in general education humanities courses, I teach so few departmental courses each year (normally at least two in each dept., but sometimes only one in one of them) that I sometimes feel I am making too small a contribution to the majors' experience. And it adds to one's workload if one wants to be a full colleague in both departments, participating in planning, programming etc. But it's richly worth it."

Comment 9 (senior professor and department chair)

"We've had two joint appointments in our dept's history. Both began as joint appointments when the people were hired, but soon shifted to single dept. appointments. So they might not provide a precedent.

One was joint with history, but after [Prof. R] got to know the place, preferred to settle down with us. The other was a new director of Women's Studies Program. After two years, [Prof. W] quit as director and came into our dept fulltime.

I know of a couple other joint appts on campus. They seem to end up with the person being more active in one dept. than the other.

As to the pragmatics, seems to me that you could just make them a voting member in one dept. If the goal is intellectual contribution, that should be just fine. But then that's more like being located in one dept and being adjunct in the other, so why have a joint appt? Maybe adjunct is the logical solution.

Also, be sure to define how much of their coursework will be in which dept (in writing, ahead of time :-)."

Comment 10 (Department Chair)

"I am Chair of the Dept. of Religion and Philosophy at [University]. We have a combined dept. in name. However, the only philosophy taught in our dept. is taught by our theologian who usually cross-lists [theologian's] classes as both religion and philosophy. So, we do not have a true philosophy professor. ...

It seems to me, however, that a possible way to resolve the situation is to house the professor in one dept. and then consider that person to be an adjunct in the other dept. That way, the faculty member is not required to attend two sets of departmental meetings, is not required to serve on departmental committees in two different departments, and issues of tenure, rank, salary, etc. are applicable for only one department. Furthermore, if the person has faculty status in two different departments, then that person answers to two different chairs. That can get complicated. So, I would ask the professor which department they prefer to be housed in. And then consider them as adjunct in the other department."

Comment 11 (senior professor & department chair with joint appointees on staff)

"Our university does use joint appointments, and our department has three members who have joint appointments. They work fairly well, but they depend very much on the good will of the parties involved. The main problem is for pre-tenure faculty members, who have to satisfy two sets of requirements and often feel overwhelmed. I have heard no complaints about the voting rights issue- each faculty member receives a vote in both departments."

Comment 12 (emeritus professor, former joint appointee, former department chair)

"Avoid accepting a joint appointment with another department or school with very different standards for tenure and promotion. The result of joint appointments is that neither department gives the joint appointee its full support or considers them a full-fledged member. In addition, the joint appointee is often expected to perform two full-time jobs. Such appointments are often driven by budget problems and cobbled together out of necessity rather than career development. This is a serious conundrum for cell biologists with joint appointments in basic science and clinical departments, where tenure expectations are often incompatible."

This author referred me to The American Society for Cell Biology (<http://www.ascb.org>) where the following comment on joint appointments can be found: "Avoid accepting a joint appointment with another department or school with very different standards for tenure and promotion. The result of joint appointments is that neither department gives the joint appointee its full support or considers them a full-fledged member. In addition, the joint appointee is often expected to perform two full-time jobs. Such appointments are often driven by budget problems and cobbled together out of necessity rather than career development. This is a serious conundrum for cell biologists with joint appointments in

basic science and clinical departments, where tenure expectations are often incompatible.” <http://www.ascb.org/index.cfm?id=1561&navid=112&tcode=nws3>

Comment 13 (joint appointee from outset, now senior professor, former department chair and interdisciplinary program chair)

(conducted as a telephone interview)

Prof. H reported on Prof. H’s own experience as a joint appointee and Prof. H’s subsequent experience as a faculty member and Chairperson with joint appointments. Prof. H was initially appointed to a Cognitive Science program (the basis for Prof. H’s salary) with a joint appointment in the philosophy department. However, since the cognitive science program had no other faculty members at the time of Prof. H’s initial appointment, Prof. H’s faculty evaluations and tenure review were conducted exclusively by the philosophy department, although Prof. H’s work in the cognitive science program was considered in Prof. H’s evaluations and tenure review. As a condition of Prof. H’s appointment, the Cognitive Science program was to be reviewed after several years and if it was determined that the program would be dissolved, the College would not be obliged to bring Prof. H up for tenure. Before Prof. H’s tenure review, a new Dean voided the condition that made Prof. H’s tenure review conditional upon review of and continuation of the cognitive science program, a condition which had made Prof. H, as a junior faculty member, extremely vulnerable. The Cognitive Science program continues at the institution and Prof. H’s workload is approximately 1/4 in CogSci and 3/4 in Philosophy; CogSci also now has one dedicated full-time faculty member (who moved there from a joint appt. in Biology and CogSci) and several other joint appointees. Prof. H has contributed to and chaired both CogSci Program and the Philosophy Department. Prof. H said that at the institution there is no compensation for department chairs and faculty are not generally eager to serve as chair. Thus, there were no objections to or problems with Prof. H chairing both the philosophy department and the CogSci program.

Prof. H reported on a joint appointment which resulted in the faculty member being denied tenure. There was initial collaboration between the CogSci program and another department. However, the other department conducted the search and hire on its own. There was no clear agreement spelling out the responsibilities, evaluation criteria and processes for the faculty member in the two units, the department and the CogSci program. The CogSci program disagreed with the evaluations of the faculty member made by the other department and filed independent evaluations of the faculty member. The other department did not agree to moving the faculty member entirely into the CogSci program and ultimately, the faculty member was denied tenure by the other department and the institution.

There have been some revisions in the college’s review processes since that case, as well as recognition that joint appointments have to be clearly defined and clear processes for evaluation set up at the outset. One of the reforms requires that every department personnel committee have a member from another department sitting on the committee. This has created more work for the faculty. The College has reformed the processes by which departments and programs collaborate for future hires.

Prof. H said that if all hiring and retention goes on in departments, it is difficult for interdisciplinary programs to flourish.

Comment 14 (joint appointee)

"As you might imagine, I'm far too swamped with my joint duties to respond in detail. But here's some highlights. My evaluations for reappointment, promotion and tenure have been done by joint committees in my two departments, with separate faculty votes in the two departments. That has helped in dealing with the "he's really not one of us but one of them" issues.

Splitting the workload in terms of teaching has been no problem, I can more or less decide on how to allocate my graduate advising, and haven't had too much trouble in keeping the committee work from getting out of hand. I'm also buffered from moving up too high in the hierarchy. In terms of governance, I have a full vote in each department, which isn't fair in a way, but maintains my full identity in each.

The greatest benefits are intellectual, not only for me, but for students because I truly have a foot in both camps and can advise them with some knowledge about opportunities across the interdisciplinary continuum. My salary is 50/50 (actually not exactly, but I have a 50% appointment in each department). I have no idea what would happen if the departments were to disagree. There's probably something in my hiring letter to that effect. As for leaves, the chairs of the two departments get together and decide. I guess the same is technically true of the reappointment, promotion and tenure votes too, because the chair's letter is the official report from the department and the chairs can get together to form a consensus. And finally, I feel confident nobody will make me chair, exactly. I am, however, on the Executive Committee in one department, so I shouldn't get too smug yet."

Comment 15 (Dean), conducted as telephone interview:

on Joint Appointee serving as Chair of one department:

Dean said there have been a few cases of joint appointees serving as department chairpersons of single departments. In those cases, a memorandum of understanding is drawn up temporarily assigning the faculty member who will be Chair full-time to the department ("Department A") in which she or he will be chair. This involves consultation and discussion with Department B (the second department of the joint appointment), the department which would be losing the joint appointee for the duration of the chairpersonship. Department B is compensated for the loss of the joint appointee, for example, with funding to cover the joint appointee's teaching assignments. When the joint appointee's salary is split between the departments, it is reassigned for the temporary period to Department A. The joint appointee is still a faculty member of Department B, but with 0% (or possibly, 25%) appointment for the temporary period. Whether the faculty member retains voting rights in Department B during the chairpersonship of Department A depends on the department. Some departments require that a faculty member have a positive status (i.e., > 0% appointment) for voting rights. During the period of chairpersonship, the faculty member's evaluations are done by the Dean's office, rather than the department(s). Usually, only full professors are appointed as chairs, but if there were to be an Associate Professor appointed as Chair, they would try

to time it such that she or he did not come up for promotion during a chairpersonship. In any case, all evaluations for promotion (and tenure) are done by the evaluation procedure by the department(s), as specified in the memorandum of understanding setting up the original joint appointment between the departments for the joint appointee.

on multiple joint appointments:

Dean reported that up until 1996, no faculty member was allowed to have a joint appointment in more than 2 units (departments or programs). Since 1996, they have allowed triple joint appointments in order to meet one of the university's official targets of encouraging "interdisciplinarity and internationalization." Some of these involve a 50-50-0% split (in which case, the 3rd department is typically a department in which the joint appointee would not have voting rights); others involve a 50-25-25% split (e.g., as measured by teaching load, two courses-1 course-1 course). The success of these has so far largely depended on the congeniality of the three chairs of the respective units. These appointments are tricky with regard to service obligations. Normally, a 25% appointment would be an insufficient basis for eligibility to serve on departmental recruitment or admissions committees. One solution that has been implemented for this kind of service in a 25% appointment department: the joint appointee may serve on such a committee in a 25% appointment department for one year out of two; the service obligation in the 50% department remains the same in either case. There have been some tensions between faculty members with 100% appointments and those with 25% appointments in a department, where the 100% appointee may feel some resentment that someone with only a 25% appointment has a vote that counts equally. So far, however, the arrangements have largely worked, in part because, especially for small departments or programs, the joint appointments are part of their survival. Since all joint appointments and their specific arrangements (specified in memoranda of understanding) must be voted on and approved by the departments, all the faculty have to agree to them and presumably have accepted their rationale.

on conflict of interest:

The Dean reported that the university has well-developed policies (on "Conflict of Interest," "Nepotism," and "Conflict of Commitment") that are sufficient for addressing potential conflicts of interest for joint appointees.

Comment 16 (Dean, former joint appointee)

"With regards to my personal joint appointment back at [another institution], I found it enormously important to my professional development as it helped me to be involved with more graduate students and faculty than I otherwise would have - and I believe it also enhanced both departments.... I am all for these - as long as the parameters are spelled out clearly!"