



**Appointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Review Considerations for  
Psychologists with Joint Faculty Appointments and Involvement in  
Interdisciplinary/Multidisciplinary Research and Scholarship:  
A Resource Document**

**Board of Scientific Affairs  
American Psychological Association  
May 2014**

*This document is for informational purposes only. It does not constitute  
official policy of the American Psychological Association.*

## Contents

- Preface
- I. Introduction
- II. Principles
- III. Recommended Practices for Joint Faculty Appointments
  - A. Recruiting and Initial Appointments
  - B. Changes in Appointment
  - C. Review Processes
  - D. Possible Review Criteria for I/M Faculty Members
- IV. Special Circumstances
  - A. Early Career Faculty Members
  - B. Established/Senior Faculty Beginning I/M Research
  - C. Special Cases Not Involving Joint Appointments
- V. Summary
- VI. Resources
- VII. Appendices
  - Appendix A: Sample Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a Joint Faculty Appointment
  - Appendix B: Checklist for a Memorandum of Understanding for a Joint Academic Appointment (University of Michigan)
  - Appendix C: Joint Faculty Member Appointment Checklist or Basis of MOU (University of Southern California)
  - Appendix D: Sample Faculty Review Solicitation Letter

## Preface

In November 2012, the Board of Scientific Affairs of the American Psychological Association identified the need for a document to guide psychological scientists and their academic and research institutions in pursuing the opportunities and addressing the challenges involved in interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research and scholarship. The continuing evolution of the scientific enterprise in this direction necessitates a broadened set of considerations for faculty appointments, tenure and promotion decisions, and merit evaluations beyond existing disciplinary-based approaches. This document, prepared in 2013, provides a set of principles and best practices to help psychologists and their university/college administrators, departments, schools, and colleges make faculty appointments and conduct tenure, promotion, and other merit reviews. We drew heavily on sources available in 2013, the references for which are provided. Additional considerations and refinements will undoubtedly be necessary as the 21<sup>st</sup> century university and the scholarship and research of psychology faculty members continue to evolve. The document is intended to aid sound adaption of faculty appointment and review processes to the changing research environment and to promote and reward excellence in faculty scholarship accordingly.

The 2013 Board of Scientific Affairs:

Jalie A. Tucker, PhD, MPH, Chair

Phillip L. Ackerman, PhD

Geraldine Downey, PhD

Kathleen Y. Haaland, PhD

Martin Y. Iguchi, PhD

Leah L. Light, PhD

Saul Shiffman, PhD

Frank C. Worrell, PhD

Sheldon Zedeck, PhD

## I. Introduction

This document is intended to serve as a resource for university and college administrators and faculty members who are involved in interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary (I/M) research, hold joint appointments in more than one unit, or both. The document does NOT address issues such as creating a culture or climate for I/M research or for the training of graduate students pursuing such research and educational endeavors. The latter topics deserve attention in independent documents.

The value of I/M research and scholarship was well stated in the University of California – San Diego document *Best Practices and Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Appointments* (2007):

“Research at the interface between traditional academic disciplines is quickly becoming the norm for scholarly advances and innovation. The research university of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is a horizontally integrated academy where the generation of human and intellectual capital thrives on collaboration and interaction across traditional academic disciplines. To achieve this multidisciplinary culture without academic impediments requires that the campus re-examine how departments, divisions, schools, and campus units approach their traditionally vertical education and research missions. Multidisciplinary education programs exist and are increasing in number, and multidisciplinary research is supported by research centers and institutes (organized research units, multi-campus research units) that are outcome-based and not discipline-based. However, faculty appointments are most often governed by a vertical departmental structure that may not be conducive to recruiting or rewarding excellent faculty whose research focus is at the interface between disciplines and/or in new research areas that do not fit into the traditional departmental structure. There is general agreement that support of multidisciplinary education and research, open to cross-disciplinary collaborations, is a desirable academic model. To enhance such a culture, we need to understand and be

transparent about what our established academic system will support and allow in terms of multidisciplinary appointments, and in what ways our academic personnel processes need to change to facilitate, and not unnecessarily complicate, multidisciplinary joint appointments.” (pp. 3-4)

This document provides a set of principles and best practices to help university/college administrators, departments, schools, and colleges make faculty appointments and tenure, promotion, and other merit reviews conducive to attracting, supporting, rewarding, and retaining faculty members who are engaged in I/M scholarship and education. Typically, this involves faculty who have joint appointments (e.g., split appointments in two departments or in a department and a research center) OR who are involved in I/M research or “team science” with members of the teams based in different departments, schools, or colleges and, on occasion, different universities. One primary reason for the document is that such faculty may be housed in different units that have different standards and expectations regarding faculty hiring and evaluation. As with all faculty appointments, it is critical that faculty members with joint appointments receive an articulation of clear expectations and review criteria.

The goals of the document are to raise issues and provide suggestions regarding the generation of procedures that will:

- Protect jointly appointed faculty members from unreasonable burdens or contradictory expectations not experienced by those with single-unit appointments;
- Clarify the roles of the departments or units participating in the joint appointment;
- Make sure expectations regarding research, teaching, and service are clearly articulated and communicated and agreed upon *in advance*;
- Minimize conflict and promote dialogue between participating departments and units when undertaking administrative procedures related to joint appointments;
- Create both the structure and flexibility necessary to help departments/units and jointly

appointed faculty balance the multiple demands that often accompany joint appointments; and

- Prevent the interests and priorities of interdisciplinary departments and programs from being overlooked in cases where a larger disciplinary-based department or unit is the administrative home of the jointly appointed faculty member.

[Points from: Emory University (2012). *Report of the Special Committee on Jointly Appointed Faculty*]

As stated earlier, this document addresses issues related to faculty who hold joint appointments, who participate in I/M research or team science, or both. Many of the issues pertaining to the hire or evaluation of such faculty are the same, whether the appointment is in two departments or in one department but with the faculty member engaged in research with investigators from other departments or units. Given the similarity of issues, for ease of communication in this document, we will refer to a faculty member in either situation as a “joint faculty member.”

Before proceeding, we want to re-emphasize the need for such a document, which has arisen due to the increasing numbers of research collaborations from different perspectives to address complex problems of common interest. Emphasis on I/M research is becoming widespread among funding agencies and scholarly research communities. We strongly acknowledge that appointments in more than one department can promote I/M research and education and help faculty engage in such efforts.

Joint appointments are commonly split 50%-50%, 75%-25%, or 100%-0% between units; the last arrangement is typically a courtesy or secondary appointment but may still carry performance expectations. Appointments may be between departments within a college, departments from different colleges, or between a department and specialized research unit or program. Other forms of joint appointments are: (1) for a specified period of time subject to renewal; (2) an appointment between an academic unit and an administrative unit; and (3) an

appointment on an adjunct basis with or without pay. Regardless of the form, the issues discussed in this document are generally common to each type of collaboration.

A faculty member with appointments in more than one department, being knowledgeable of both and able to bridge their cultures, can promote collaborations between the departments, thus contributing to the intellectual and cultural diversity of both departments. The collective faculty may benefit from the opportunities created to collaborate with faculty members and teach and advise students in both departments. Success in such research will be based on proper development and nurturing of early career researchers. Incentives and motivators to conduct collaborative research and to involve multiple perspectives should be considered within the research community.

Different science disciplines have different languages, expectations, cultures, standards, and values. The purpose of this document is to raise issues and suggest strategies that pertain to faculty members who do not fit standard disciplinary and departmental criteria; to help administrators to provide a fair process for hiring and review and to assist faculty members who hold joint appointments or are involved in team science to succeed and thrive and to avoid difficulties such as the following:

- Departments may have different policies and expectations on the relative time spent on research, teaching and service; different policies and practices on start-up funds, administrative and technical support, teaching loads; and so on;
- Teaching assignments are more complex;
- Credit for publication and publication type may differ across disciplines/departments, and there may be different norms for author order on publications (e.g., first vs. senior [last] authorship; principal investigator vs. others involved in the research);
- Unless there is very careful coordination among the departments, faculty may end up performing additional service beyond what is expected by either department;

- Faculty may have difficulty being considered an integral part of either of the departments in which they have an appointment;
- Faculty may spend a non-trivial amount of time traveling between departments;
- At the time of tenure, two departments may have to be satisfied, and the norms and requirements of the departments may differ from one another;
- The university may or may not support conditions such that an early career researcher can earn tenure if he/she is engaged in I/M research as opposed to research directly applicable to the discipline of the department;
- Faculty need to know their roles in the team. Joint faculty may face different criteria for assessment of effectiveness/productivity from their two departments or units. Data sharing, processes for data access, and authorship need to be determined, reviewed, and assessed;
- Collaborative research protocol oversight requirements (e.g., Institutional Animal Care and Use [IACUC], Institutional Review Board [IRB]) may differ across institutions and may be further complicated if a foreign institution is involved. Similar discontinuities may occur with respect to grants management and reporting requirements.

## II. Principles

The following principles are designed to help joint faculty members succeed in their academic careers:

1. When a joint appointment is created, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two units is essential. The MOU should be written and signed, and signatories should include the heads of the units involved as well as the faculty member. This will detail how key processes and procedures related to the faculty member's academic career will be carried out (see Appendices A, B, and C for sample MOUs). Details should, at the least, include procedures for academic case review, teaching load, and assignment of campus service. In



addition, the MOU may address issues pertaining to the startup package, space for individual research and for I/M research, compensation (e.g., summer salary), leave practices and policies (e.g., sabbaticals; teaching buy-out policies); “retreat” rights to a single unit under specific circumstances; staff and resources support, including supplies, computers, IT support, professional development, travel, contract and grant support, indirect cost sharing, etc. MOUs also could consider overall goals, work plans and timelines, authorship and credit, contingencies, communication processes, potential conflicts, and how disagreements will be resolved. The ultimate goal should be that the faculty member’s obligations across the two units are not greater than those of others who are full-time in a single unit. The obligations should be delineated as clearly as possible.

2. Units should agree on a single, joint process for preparing academic review cases, especially at times of initial appraisals, tenure review, and promotion cases. This ensures both units have input on the review, streamlines the process so both units are not independently preparing a case, and reduces the risk that a faculty member will receive conflicting feedback from his or her two units.

3. One of the units should agree to act as the administrative home department, and this role should be stated in the MOU. The home department will take the lead on academic reviews.

4. The MOU also should state which unit or organization will handle extramural funds administration (funds may be handled by more than one unit) and address how indirect costs returns will be allocated if not otherwise governed by university policy and procedures.

5. Each unit should take steps to help the joint faculty member become part of the community. This includes appropriate participation in departmental faculty meetings and unit events. The joint faculty member should be included on regular communications, such as email lists, departmental and unit web pages, and the campus directory (which should identify both units for the faculty member).

6. Units should work together to ensure jointly appointed faculty members are not excessively burdened and, in total, have comparable access to resources as faculty with single appointments. These resources include mentors, space, equipment, funding, and access to graduate students.

7. Academic review cases should acknowledge the faculty member's multiple academic commitments and I/M work. This may entail making special effort to evaluate the work that falls outside of the normal purview of a single discipline. Reviewers for tenure and promotion should be selected carefully, with the goal of identifying scholars who are capable of looking beyond disciplinary centers and boundaries. In non-traditional, innovative, and cross-disciplinary research, few people grasp or understand the whole picture of the faculty member's academic agenda. Consequently, the jointly appointed faculty member may be more vulnerable to critique from colleagues across the disciplines in which he or she works. Scholars in a single discipline can be inclined to break down the work into discipline-specific components. Careful choice of reviewers can mitigate these risks.

8. The joint faculty member plays an active role in facilitating the effective collaboration of the two units. If the faculty member becomes aware of conflicting procedures regarding his or her appointment, he or she must bring these to the unit heads' attention in a timely manner. The unit heads will then work together to resolve the conflict and make note of the resolution in the MOU via an addendum.

9. At some academic institutions, an appointment may be at 0% in a particular unit, i.e., a courtesy or secondary appointment. Nevertheless, there may be an expectation that a 0% faculty member will contribute to the unit. Such contributions (teaching, service, participation in faculty meetings) should be clarified in the MOU.

### **III. Recommended Practices for Joint Faculty Appointments**

#### **A. Recruiting and Initial Appointments**

Joint appointments can be established by several means: Two or more units create a

position for a joint appointment, advertise the position, and jointly hire a faculty candidate. Or multiple units commit resources to conduct I/M cluster hiring with search committee members representing the components of the I/M research (Dubrow, Tranby, & Voight, and the Consortium on Fostering Interdisciplinary Inquiry, 2009). When possible, the latter arrangement is optimal for research and scholarly collaboration and reduces the burden on a solo I/M faculty member to create his/her own collaborative connections and infrastructure for unique applications and needs. Regarding the advertisement, much of what might be contained in an MOU should be spelled out to potential applicants such as service requirements; teaching load within each department; need to guest lecture in the “other” department; amount and type of advising undergraduate and graduate students; and so forth. On other occasions, an opportunity to create a joint appointment may arise during faculty recruitment when a unit learns a candidate wants to hold a joint appointment with another department or school. A current faculty member may similarly want to have a joint appointment in another department or school.

In any of these scenarios, a general plan for the appointment should be agreed to by the cognizant deans’ offices. An MOU detailing the appointment should be created and agreed to by all parties before the appointment is finalized; the offer letter might contain the MOU. The following provides suggestions as to what might be included in an MOU (see Appendices A, B, and C), along with commentary that elaborates upon the concerns:

1. Designation of a “home” department. One unit shall be selected by mutual agreement between the joint faculty member and the two unit heads as the administrative home and specified in the MOU. This will help ensure reviews and other administrative tasks are completed in a timely fashion and that nothing falls through the cracks. Any impediments for faculty and students to work together across units should be addressed and accommodated. The home department takes responsibility for notifying the other unit of reviews, preparing/modifying MOUs, and providing opportunities for review and renegotiation of agreements and plans. However, this designation does not release the other unit from its

responsibility for providing clear communication with the faculty member and being responsive to issues as they arise. The home department may be changed subsequently if there is good cause and mutual agreement; the dean or deans of the division(s) or college(s) should be asked to advise in the event of disagreements on this issue. Ideally, the chairs of the two units will meet at least annually to discuss the coordination of the joint appointment.

2. Rank and appointment percentage in each unit needs to be specified, including conditions and processes for changing these designations.

3. Research expectations. Indicate the expected balance to be achieved between disciplinary and I/M research and publication activities; the expected overall level of publication productivity – disciplinary and interdisciplinary; criteria for judging the quality, impact, and acceptability of journals; importance of contributed chapters, conference proceedings and presentations. Clarify and make specific the campus overhead return models and intellectual property issues and how they relate to the joint faculty member and his/her units.

4. Teaching workload. Lay out expectations with regard to the faculty member's teaching. Make sure the overall demands on the faculty member are reasonable and appropriately balanced in terms of the appointment percentages. It may be advisable to devise a teaching plan for an extended but finite period of time, e.g., three years. Teaching assignments should be coordinated between the units. If the appointment is not 50-50, a pro-rated teaching schedule should be considered. Possibilities for cross-listing courses should be explored. The goal should be that the faculty member's obligations across the two units are not greater than those of others who are full-time in their unit. And new courses on the I/M research agenda should be encouraged and rewarded.

5. Service workload. Lay out expectations with regard to the faculty member's service obligations. Make sure the overall demands on the faculty member are reasonable and appropriately balanced in terms of the appointment percentage. Service assignments should be coordinated between the units. The faculty member should be prepared to participate in both

units' faculty meetings and serve on committees as appropriate. The unit heads will take all outside service obligations into account when making assignments. The goal should be that the faculty member's obligations across the two units are not greater than those of others who are full-time in one unit.

6. Advising. It is often expected that the joint faculty member will advise undergraduate majors in each department. One rule of thumb is that the total number of undergraduate students advised will be no greater than those of a faculty member in either of the units of appointment. Given that the joint faculty member is part of two departments, thereby increasing the potential number of graduate student advisees, it is important that the department chairs consider the number of graduate advisees—both as primary advisor and as a committee member—when conducting evaluation of the faculty member or making other assignments.

7. Salary scale. If the joint appointment involves units with different salary scales, the salaries in each unit should be clearly stated. A mutually agreed upon total salary should be established, with each department's portion identified for future salary discussions. One solution is to pro-rate salaries across different salary scales.

8. Access to resources. Discuss and agree on the faculty member's access to resources in each unit (e.g. office space, research space, administrative support, startup funding, mentoring, and graduate student support). New appointments should receive support from both units in accord with normal departmental/unit practices and such support should be proportional to the faculty member's percentage of appointment. One approach to the space issue is that the staff and resources support for the joint faculty member will be administered by the department in which the faculty office or laboratory is housed. Research grants can be administered through the department in which the research space is housed, though it will likely be necessary to acknowledge all departments in the administration's accounting system for grants. Joint faculty members often have an increased need for professional development activity because of their membership in multiple scholarly communities. This may require more

than the “usual” travel and attendance at conferences, in the United States and overseas; administration of travel funds and/or any other professional development funds should be available from all of the units that house the appointment; administration of such funds can be with the home department or the department in which the grant is housed. Who will manage the submission and administration of grants and contracts should be spelled out.

9. Graduate student admission process. Clarify the faculty member’s input into the graduate student admission process in both units. Determine whether a potential graduate student applicant can apply to the interdisciplinary program or must he/she apply to one of the departmental disciplines in which the faculty member is involved.

10. Eligibility for locally-controlled chairs. Clarify the faculty member’s eligibility for department-controlled endowed chairs, should such chairs become available.

11. Allocation of research revenues. If applicable, the units should agree in advance how revenue generated by the faculty member’s research will be distributed.

12. Mentoring. Ideally, the units should coordinate their mentoring programs so the faculty member has one mentor who is experienced with work in the faculty member’s I/M content area and can provide sound advice on how to succeed within the national and international scientific community. Depending on local expertise, this individual may need to be external to the home institution and require compensation. This mentoring need is in addition to local mentoring, preferably by an experienced I/M researcher, on how to achieve tenure and thrive in the multiple units at the home university. Key mentoring issues are:

- Provide adequate mentoring to all early career faculty members, but especially those whose research areas are I/M. In particular, early career faculty should be given clear guidelines about what is expected and valued by a particular department; e.g., they should not be surprised to learn, at their first appraisal, that the department does not recognize some publication venues as valuable for tenure. It may be necessary to provide two (or more) mentors to ensure coverage of the different areas in which the

faculty member works.

- Having at least one mentor who has conducted I/M research is very useful. If a faculty member is heavily involved in a center or institute, it is especially important to provide advice about how to balance work on large team projects with work that establishes a strong individual scientific reputation.
- Encourage and facilitate the opportunity for an early career faculty member to invite speakers who are doing related I/M work to the home department. This should help other faculty, researchers, and students learn how the early career faculty member's research fits into the larger field or to the I/M framework.
- Provide particular guidance in navigating funding. Somewhat paradoxically, while acquiring funding increasingly calls for interdisciplinary collaboration, most funding still comes from agencies that are known within individual disciplines.
- A faculty member hired in an I/M position is more likely to be "first of a kind" in the department. The member may need to establish new research facilities, arrange collaborations with other departments, develop new courses that are possibly cross-listed in several programs, and train teaching assistants for these courses. Such faculty will have a higher overhead while being more isolated than faculty joining an established area and should be provided adequate support and possibly release time to compensate for this overhead; the same applies to any "first of a kind" early career faculty, but more so for those involved in I/M research and teaching. Any release time, from either or both units, should be documented so the amount of release time and the duration are known to both units.
- Assure that the feedback provided in reviews is detailed and specific, and provide it in written form as well as conveying it verbally.
- If possible, involve people from different disciplines in the merit or promotion review of

the I/M faculty member. This will not only provide higher-quality feedback to the individual being reviewed, but will help educate other faculty participating in the review about the norms and values of the other disciplines to which the faculty member contributes. Be sure that the faculty members from outside of the home department as well as in the home unit play a significant role in selecting the external referees who will write letters evaluating the candidate. Also task the faculty member from the home department with helping to make sure that the promotion and tenure committee itself, as well as any faculty members who will vote on the tenure case, understand the values and norms of the other participating disciplines. It may be helpful to write down metrics for judging academic success.

- When a faculty member is involved with a research center or institute, develop mechanisms that include the participation of representatives from the center/institute in the appraisals and tenure reviews.
- The other side of mentoring is expectation that the faculty member may need to mentor his/her laboratory or team members. Here, again, the MOU might address expectations for the faculty member as a mentor, and perhaps consider training needs of the faculty member in his/her new role on a team.

#### B. Changes in Appointment

Faculty members with joint appointments may wish to change them over the course of their academic career. Similarly, faculty without joint appointments may wish to establish a joint appointment over the course of their career at the university. Schools, colleges, departments, and other units (e.g., centers) may also wish to change the terms of the appointment. These changes may arise because of new opportunities, changes in faculty interest and focus, or difficulties in the original joint appointment. Thus, it is important to establish procedures for reviewing and negotiating or renegotiating joint appointments. The following are recommended practices related to changes in joint appointments:



1. Making changes to a budgeted appointment. The deans' offices should agree, in advance if possible, on the procedures by which the faculty member can request to change a budgeted joint appointment or create a budgeted joint appointment. Before undergoing the process to make a change, the department, school, or college should consult with the other department, school, or college. As applicable, the central campus committee or administrative entity responsible for budgets will need to be informed and consulted regarding a change in faculty allocations.

2. Discontinuing an appointment. The deans' offices should clarify the terms under which a faculty member would be allowed to discontinue a joint appointment. For example, if a review shows a faculty member's duties or connections to one of his or her departments has weakened, or the faculty member has not sustained an interest in the domain of one of the units, the joint appointment arrangement should be considered for discontinuance. The same consultations mentioned in (1) above, should be followed.

3. Faculty right of retreat. If a faculty member holds a tenured appointment in two or more units, it should be clear at the time of appointment whether the faculty member has the option of retreating to a 100% appointment in any of the units. When it is not possible for any of the departments, schools, or colleges to offer this option, the faculty member should be fully informed about what options are available.

4. Conflict resolution. The deans' offices should identify the steps the faculty member should follow if he or she experiences concerns about the terms of the appointment and/or the actions of the departments involved. In general, conflicts should be resolved at the departmental level. If the departments' efforts to resolve the issue prove unsatisfactory, then the deans' offices should become involved. If there are concerns about a faculty member's performance or conduct, the administrator most knowledgeable about the concern should handle the issue. Each dean's office has a responsibility to notify the faculty member's other department, school, or college of any disciplinary action taken with joint faculty member.

### C. Review Processes

The following are recommended practices for handling joint faculty member reviews:

1. Preparation of materials by joint faculty member. There may be a need by the joint faculty member to present his/her accomplishments in a somewhat more general way, akin to presenting to a general audience. The faculty member should provide information on the role, amount, and significance of his/her contribution to the research program and the meaning/common practice of authorship order on publications; provide information on the journals' standings and reasons for seeking the journal(s) as a publication venue; and provide an overarching plan or theme for the I/M research and a statement of collaboration strategy.
2. Departmental recommendation. The home department will take the lead on review cases and coordinate with the other units, so that a single, joint recommendation goes forward to the campus administration.
3. Bilateral departmental review committee. Such a committee will be constituted in most cases with balanced representation from each department/unit. This committee will undertake the reviews in the normal fashion, but allow any differences in emphasis between the two departments, valuations of accomplishments in different disciplines, recognition of I/M graduate teaching and co-teaching, acknowledgment of advising of graduate training in two departments/units, etc., to be resolved early in the process. For example, at the time of the final appraisal, the joint committee or department chairs (depending on unit practice) will be able to balance opinions from both disciplines by agreeing upon a group of outside reviewers to represent the different fields. In this manner, a single review file will be constructed that both departments can assess, and a single recommendation will emerge in which both departments can have confidence. In some cases, a bilateral review process or vote is not warranted, but clear input and documentation from the other involved units remain essential.
4. Faculty members conducting the review should adopt an open-minded stance. There may be a need to calibrate the metrics for impact and academic success within another

discipline, even a closely related one. In addition to the need to evaluate the types of research products—books, journal papers, conference papers, and so on—it is also critical to understand the quality of each product. What does authorship order on a publication represent in terms of contribution to a publication? Which conferences are important? Which awards carry the greatest prestige? Which people are the luminaries whose letters of recommendation should be taken most seriously, and which are known to be hypercritical? In tenure cases, there is a great deal of implicit knowledge within a discipline that is taken into account that may be missing in interdisciplinary cases.

5. Letters of recommendation. In requesting letters, use wording that specifically asks the letter-writer to evaluate the candidate on the basis of his or her own area of expertise, while recognizing that the candidate has conducted I/M research. Explicitly state that the university values team science (see Appendix D for a sample letter). In I/M cases, faculty colleagues and administrators often raise an additional set of questions, as summarized by the Council of Environmental Deans and Directors (*Interdisciplinary Hiring, Tenure and Promotion: Guidance for Individuals and Institutions* [Pfirman, Martin, Barry et al., 2011]):

- Why were the letter writers chosen from a different set of institutions than our usual set of peers?
- Why are the letter writers unfamiliar with some aspects of the candidate's scholarship?
- What is the significance of this area of scholarship?
- What is the standing of these journals?
- What was the candidate's contribution to multi-authored publications?
- Why did the reviewers not know everyone on the comparison list? Why is the candidate not on the top of the comparison list?
- Is the level of grant support and professional recognition consistent with other interdisciplinary scholars at a similar career stage?

- The requesting letter might possibly address the above questions and concerns. In addition, the letter writers should be specifically asked to comment on interdisciplinary contributions and impact. This will serve as a reminder to reviewers of the differences and challenges of reviewing an interdisciplinary as compared to a disciplinary candidate.
- The requesting letter could call attention to specifics of the case; perhaps more than the usual number of letter writers for I/M scholars should be solicited in order to account for their broader range. Because some I/M scholarship includes community and non-academic stakeholder interaction, reviews may also be solicited from individuals outside of the academy.

6. Timeline for case preparation. Anticipate that the appraisals and promotions will typically take longer to prepare and evaluate than purely disciplinary cases, and plan accordingly. It will take more time to select the review committee, more time to select the outside reviewers, and more time to evaluate the dossier.

7. Departmental votes. If a departmental vote is required, faculty from both departments may need to vote, depending on university policy and MOU specifications for the faculty member. Both votes will then be reported in the joint departmental letter. If the votes are not in agreement, a detailed explanation of both departmental/unit discussions and votes must be included.

#### D. Possible Review Criteria for I/M Faculty Members

A major challenge in reviewing the scholarly contributions of an I/M faculty member is discerning his/her original, independent, and collaborative contributions from among an I/M research program and resulting scholarly products. This issue may be further compounded by the fact that large I/M projects often take considerable time to complete, and opportunities for scholarly contribution are variable over time depending on project progress and status. The following points, put forward by the National Cancer Institute, *A Template for Integrating Interdisciplinary Research and Team Science into the Tenure Track Offer Letter*, should be

considered when preparing the candidate's review materials and conducting the evaluation:

1. Clearly describe the researcher's role in driving the project(s) forward.
2. What is the major effort that she/he is leading or to which she/he is making significant scientific contributions?
3. Is the contribution essential for the overall success of the project?
4. How did the contribution influence the overall outcome/direction of the project?
5. Was the contribution original rather than a reproduction of the work of others (e.g., was the software developed with novel, original features that will be used by others in the field, or did the scientist merely modify existing software to make it compatible with the workflow of the project)?
6. What accomplishments/achievements can be attributed to the PI in the context of the larger team?
7. For PIs whose research is mainly collaborative, how is the contribution of the individual PI regarded in the PI's field of research? What is the significance of the contributions?
8. What agreements were put in place to decide how authorship, data, and presentations would be shared? What processes were put in place in case of disagreement?
9. Has the candidate made an important intellectual advance?

#### **IV. Special Circumstances**

##### A. Early Career Faculty Members

Special consideration should be taken to ensure early career faculty members with joint appointments are properly mentored and understand the criteria for achieving tenure in both departments.

1. For budgeted joint appointments. In the event that the two departments come to different recommendations on the question of tenure, and tenure is subsequently granted,

complications in carrying out the appointment can be foreseen. It is likely to be the case that all parties will concur with transfer of the faculty member's affiliation to the favoring department.

2. For 100% - 0% joint appointments. In such cases, the department with the 100% assignment may be charged solely with conducting the review with limited documentation from the 0% unit. If a formal evaluation and vote are required by both units, and in the event the department holding the 100% appointment recommends tenure and the 0% appointment department does not, the 0% appointment shall not be renewed. If the department holding the 100% appointment does not recommend tenure, and this recommendation is supported by the administration, then the faculty member will be given a terminal appointment. If, however, the 0% department recommends tenure, then discussion should begin for the faculty member to become 100% in that department.

3. For split appointments (e.g., 50-50) between an academic department or school and a campus research center, there often are additional considerations:

- Review cases involving centers. The home academic department or school will take the lead on all reviews. However, the input and concurrence of the research center director should be included in all academic reviews, including the appointment case. If the director does not concur, he or she would need to write an explanation for the non-concurrence and address it to the appropriate academic campus administrator. If a departmental review committee is involved, it shall include at least one faculty member from the research center.
- Teaching and service. Faculty members appointed in positions allocated to research centers will split their teaching and service duties 50/50 between the research center and the school or department to which they are formally appointed. The research center director and chair or dean of the department/school will consult with one another to coordinate the teaching and service expectations of the research center and school or department; this arrangement should be part of the MOU. The director and chair or dean

will seek to maximize the faculty member's opportunities to teach courses relevant to the area of the research center.

#### B. Established/Senior Faculty Beginning I/M Research

Special consideration should be given to established/senior faculty members who have already attained tenure based on disciplinary research and wish to become involved in I/M research. Embarking on this path may be the motivation for or result of a sabbatical leave or underpin a career development grant application. A mid-to-senior career change in research focus may be associated with the following challenges (Council of Environmental Deans and Directors, *Interdisciplinary Hiring, Tenure and Promotion: Guidance for Individuals and Institutions* [Pfirman, Martin, Barry et al., 2011]):

- High networking time costs and lack of recognition for building and maintaining interdisciplinary research, education and administrative structures and functions;
- Tendency to get drawn into more departmental and program duties such as serving as a program chair, advisor or on review committees beyond those of disciplinary senior scholars;
- Difficulty in receiving awards or salary increases compared to disciplinary scholars;
- Tendency to receive fewer outside offers due to the interdisciplinary nature of work.

One possible means for addressing the issues of senior faculty is to generate an MOU, similar to the ones described at the beginning of this document. The critical point is to recognize that I/M senior scholars should be recognized and receive full credit (e.g., merit pay) for their I/M professional development activities, including intellectual leadership, involvement in multiple grants and multiple author publications, entrepreneurship in seeking non-traditional funding, mentorship of early career interdisciplinary scholars and students, extra departmental service and collaboration expectations, and publications patterns outside the norm.

### C. Special Cases Not Involving Joint Appointments

The primary focus of this document is on cases where I/M work is formally recognized by a joint appointment bridging two units. However, there are cases where some of the same issues apply to standard appointments within a single department. In such cases, the same principles outlined for joint appointments – explicit, transparent, and formal agreement on expectations, and recognition of those agreements in considerations of evaluation, tenure, and promotion – should apply. We note three particular examples here, without addressing them in detail.

1. One case of such intra-departmental split occurs where a department has recognized distinctions among areas or programs within psychology, and a faculty member bridges two areas or is considered a member of both. In such cases, a written MOU should be negotiated with input and agreement from the department chair as well as the heads of the involved departmental programs.

2. Another common case occurs where a faculty member's expertise is in methodology and quantitative psychology (e.g., statistical analysis), rather than in a content-focused area of psychology. In these instances, a divergence of expectations may occur because the expectations for the faculty member's scholarly contributions may include methodological contributions to other faculty members' research programs, as well as development of original methodological contributions. The degree to which collaborative contributions to other faculty's research programs are valued and counted should be explicitly discussed and agreed upon. Also to be considered is the role played by the faculty member on thesis committees, within and outside the department. These expectations should be clearly specified in the MOU, and be carried through in tenure, promotion, and merit evaluations.

3. A third case in which faculty involvement in multidisciplinary research needs special consideration occurs when a faculty member is engaged in "Big Science" projects that may involve many investigators spanning multiple disciplines, some of whom may have different



standards and expectations toward crediting contributions to research. Such Big Science projects are likely to be increasingly important in psychology, but they often raise issues of how to credit individual investigator's contributions for publications, because papers may have many authors, and opportunities for first-authored publications may be scarce, even for those making substantial contributions. Prior discussion of the issues – particularly the faculty member's role in the project and the expected publications and authorship – is called for. Expectations of the faculty member's role in the project and the nature and magnitude of their scientific contributions should be spelled out in an MOU and documented in the review process, perhaps supported by letters from senior collaborators on the project.

### **V. Summary**

This document is intended to be a resource for administrators and faculty in situations where the faculty member is involved in interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary research and where the faculty member consequently has formal and informal roles in more than one department. The document provides principles, practices, suggestions, and comments on issues pertaining to the recruitment, appointment, review, and promotion/merit processes that might be considered applicable to a joint faculty member. The document is not meant to be static, and the Board of Scientific Affairs welcomes suggestions for improvement and modification. Samples of additional documents developed by individual departments and universities to facilitate joint faculty issues may be sent to: Science Directorate, American Psychological Association, Attn: Board of Scientific Affairs, 750 First, N.E., Washington, DC 20002 or by email: [science@apa.org](mailto:science@apa.org) (telephone: 202-336-6000).

## VI. Resources – Joint and Interdisciplinary/Multidisciplinary Faculty Appointments

### Books/Monographs:

Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research, National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine (2004). *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

[http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11153](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11153)

Synopsis of book: Simmons, E. H., & Nelson, M. P. (2011, August 19). Making Interdisciplinarity Possible, *Inside Higher Ed*.

[http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2011/08/19/simmons\\_nelson\\_essay\\_on\\_memoranda\\_of\\_understanding\\_for\\_interdisciplinary\\_faculty\\_jobs](http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2011/08/19/simmons_nelson_essay_on_memoranda_of_understanding_for_interdisciplinary_faculty_jobs)

Dubrow, G., Tranby, E., & Voight, C. (Eds.) and the Consortium on Fostering Interdisciplinary Inquiry (2009). *Fostering Interdisciplinary Inquiry: Proceedings from a Conference*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

[http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/interdisc/cfii\\_conference\\_proceedings.pdf](http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/interdisc/cfii_conference_proceedings.pdf)

Klein, J. T. (2010). *Creating Interdisciplinary Campus Cultures: A Model for Strength and Sustainability*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

<http://www.amazon.com/Creating-Interdisciplinary-Campus-Cultures-Sustainability/dp/0470550899>

Wallace, K. A. (2009). *Joint Appointment Report: Summary of Issues and Practices*. Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 Unported License.

[http://www.kathwallace.com/Wallace\\_Joint\\_Appointment\\_Report.pdf](http://www.kathwallace.com/Wallace_Joint_Appointment_Report.pdf)

### Professional/Academic Groups:

Covan, E. K., Peacock, J. R., & Oscarson, R. (2009, May). *Strategies for success in academia: Navigating the risks and opportunities of interdisciplinary and international appointments*

*for tenure and promotion.* Association for Gerontology in Higher Education Webinar (Powerpoint file).

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=4&ved=0CEEQFjAD&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.aghe.org%2Fclientimages%2F40634%2Fwebinars%2FTenure%2520and%2520promotion.pps&ei=3-8wUZDXLsaB0QHi24DYBQ&usg=AFQjCNFFfNtnfHMBwVwKxEvtMtQgn2yO9w&bvm=bv.43148975,d.dmQ>

Northwestern University Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute. *Science of team science conference series.* <http://www.scienceofteamspace.org/>

Pfirman, S., Martin, P., Barry, L., Fletcher, M., Hempel, M., Southard, R., Hornbach, D., & Morehouse, B. (2011). *Interdisciplinary Hiring, Tenure and Promotion: Guidance for Individuals and Institutions.* Council of Environmental Deans & Directors.

<http://www.uvm.edu/~tri/pdf/NCSE-InterdisciplinaryHiring.pdf>

Pollock, M. E., & Snir, M. (2008, September). *Promotion and tenure of interdisciplinary faculty* (Best practices memo). Computing Research Association.

[http://cra.org/resources/bpiew/best\\_practices\\_memo\\_promotion\\_and\\_tenure\\_of\\_interdisciplinary\\_faculty/](http://cra.org/resources/bpiew/best_practices_memo_promotion_and_tenure_of_interdisciplinary_faculty/)

#### Funding Agency Resources:

National Cancer Institute (2011, February). *A Template for Integrating Interdisciplinary Research and Team Science into the Tenure Track Offer Letter.* Available at

<https://www.teamsciencetoolkit.cancer.gov/public/TSResourceTool.aspx?tid=1&rid=263>

National Cancer Institute. *Team Science Toolkit.* Available at

<https://www.teamsciencetoolkit.cancer.gov/public/home.aspx?js=1>

#### University Statements & Guidelines:

Colgate University

[https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=41&ved=0CC8QFjAAOCg&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.colgate.edu%2Fportaldata%2Fimagegallerywww%2F87419dab-508f-4bc1-b6d1-c4580a90e02a%2FImageGallery%2FSenior%2520Joint%2520Appointment%2520Guidelines%2520and%2520Approval%2520Form-April%25202012.docx&ei=x\\_YwUe\\_fK7KM0QGmnYCoBA&usq=AFQjCNFIlaX3\\_cAhITUcl3i1jRyWdwyl7w](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=41&ved=0CC8QFjAAOCg&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.colgate.edu%2Fportaldata%2Fimagegallerywww%2F87419dab-508f-4bc1-b6d1-c4580a90e02a%2FImageGallery%2FSenior%2520Joint%2520Appointment%2520Guidelines%2520and%2520Approval%2520Form-April%25202012.docx&ei=x_YwUe_fK7KM0QGmnYCoBA&usq=AFQjCNFIlaX3_cAhITUcl3i1jRyWdwyl7w)

College of William & Mary (1998)

[http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/provost/documents/joint\\_appts\\_policy.pdf](http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/provost/documents/joint_appts_policy.pdf)

Columbia University Medical Center

[http://www.cumc.columbia.edu/faculty/sites/faculty/files/Joint\\_%20Interdisciplinary\\_Appointments.pdf](http://www.cumc.columbia.edu/faculty/sites/faculty/files/Joint_%20Interdisciplinary_Appointments.pdf)

Emory University (2012). *Report of the Special Committee on Jointly Appointed Faculty* (Fivush, R., & Goldstein, J. L. Co-Chairs, available from Robyn Fivush, Dept. of Psychology)

Michigan State University

<http://www.lymanbriggs.msu.edu/faculty/MUFJA.cfm>

Northeastern University

<http://www.northeastern.edu/provost/faculty/documents/ReviewofFacultyHoldingJointAppointments.pdf>

Ohio University

<http://www.cas.ohiou.edu/facultystaff/guidelines/interdisciplinaryfacappt.pdf>

Purdue University. *Synergies between Science/Engineering and Liberal Arts/Social Sciences* (white paper)

[http://www.purdue.edu/strategic\\_plan/whitepapers/Synergies.pdf](http://www.purdue.edu/strategic_plan/whitepapers/Synergies.pdf)

Swarthmore College

<http://daily.swarthmore.edu/2012/02/14/observing-the-higher-powers-interdisciplinary-fields-need-more-institutional-support/>

University of California – Berkeley (2009). *Guidelines for Joint Academic Appointments at UC Berkeley*, Office of the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare.

[http://apo.berkeley.edu/Joint\\_Academic\\_Appointments.09.pdf](http://apo.berkeley.edu/Joint_Academic_Appointments.09.pdf)

University of California – San Diego (2007). *Multidisciplinary Research and Education at UC San Diego: Best Practices and Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Appointments*

<http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/files/aps/reports/MJATFReport.pdf>

University of Delaware – College of Engineering

<http://www.engr.udel.edu/resources/faculty/COEJointpolicyFinal.pdf>

University of Iowa

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

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

University of Michigan – Ann Arbor

<https://www.myu.umn.edu/public/Michigan's%20Interdisciplinary%20Statement.pdf>

University of Minnesota

<http://cla.umn.edu/intranet/faculty/JointAppointmentsRegFaculty.php>

University of Nebraska – Lincoln

[http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/documents/best\\_practices\\_required\\_agreements.pdf](http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/documents/best_practices_required_agreements.pdf)

University of Pennsylvania

[http://www.upenn.edu/provost/appointments\\_and\\_promotions](http://www.upenn.edu/provost/appointments_and_promotions)

University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire

Adhoc Taskforce on Interdisciplinary Appointments.

[https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=7&ved=0CFAQFjAG&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.uwec.edu%2Fusenate%2Fdocuments%2F1011Program\\_n\\_SplitApptTaskForceMar15.pdf&ei=3-](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=7&ved=0CFAQFjAG&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.uwec.edu%2Fusenate%2Fdocuments%2F1011Program_n_SplitApptTaskForceMar15.pdf&ei=3-)

[8wUZDXLsaB0QHi24DYBQ&usg=AFQjCNE6wOmtw\\_P0BKcVoW3ZxbhNKxfgw&bvm  
=bv.43148975.d.dmQ](http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/InterdisciplinaryProgramsReport.pdf)

University of Wisconsin – Madison (2003)

<http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/divcomm/InterdisciplinaryProgramsReport.pdf>

Yale University

<http://provost.yale.edu/faculty-handbook>

## APPENDIX A

Sample Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a Joint Faculty Appointment

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE JOINT APPOINTMENT OF

*FIRSTNAME LASTNAME* IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF

DEPARTMENT 1 (50%) AND DEPARTMENT 2 (50%)

(Effective Starting Date)

1. Home Department: Department 1 is designated the administrative home department.

All laboratory and office space will be provided by Department 1. Department 1 will also supply administrative support including contracts and grants administration. Professor *LASTNAME* will participate in selection of graduate students in both departments.

2. Salary: Since Department 1 is on the Department A salary scale, and their portion of the appointment is at 50%, all of Professor *LASTNAME*'s salary will remain on the Department A scale.

3. Teaching: Each department is responsible for funding and providing graduate teaching assistants and/or readers for the courses Prof. *LASTNAME* teaches in that department according to the policies of that department. The departments will coordinate the hiring of the graduate student instructors or teaching assistants. Classes will be scheduled by the respective departments (i.e., DEPARTMENT 1 will schedule DEPARTMENT 1 classes and DEPARTMENT 2 will schedule DEPARTMENT 2 classes). DEPARTMENT 1 will remain the administering department for [name of cross-listed course], and will collect course evaluations.

The normal teaching load in both departments is 30–45 lecture hours per academic year, as defined in the attached documents. Prof. *LASTNAME* will be expected to teach 15–20 lecture hours in each department. For example, a regular teaching schedule of Dept1 100 and Dept1 200 (3.5 units) plus advising 15 Dept1 undergraduate students and three graduate students meet this criterion. Any future teaching assignments will be discussed between Prof.

*LASTNAME* and the cognizant chairs.

4. Leaves such as sabbaticals, special Professorships, etc., will be approved by both departments prior to the start date of the leave.
5. Review of future academic personnel actions: University policy requires that with a joint appointment such as the one proposed for Prof. *LASTNAME*, any future reviews for advancement should be coordinated between all involved departments. Dept1 will take the lead on processing review cases. If a merit or promotion case requires an *ad hoc* committee, there should be balanced representation from both departments. Department 1 will get Department 2's concurrence on every review case and will then forward the case to the applicable Deans. Except in unusual circumstances, merit increases will be considered at the normal time intervals. Every effort will be made to ensure that the departments agree on whether a merit increase is justified and on the size of the increase. However, in the event that they cannot agree then each department will submit a recommendation to the cognizant Dean and he or she will resolve the issue.
6. Service: Prof. *LASTNAME*'s departmental committee assignments will be coordinated annually between the two departments. Service in both departments will be expected to be roughly half that expected for a full department academic appointment. Prof. *LASTNAME* should be prepared to participate in both departments' faculty meetings and serve on confidential committees as appropriate. The department chair(s) will take all outside service obligations into account when making assignments.

We agree to the joint appointment of Professor *LASTNAME* as proposed above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair Department 1

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair Department 2

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean College 1

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean College 2

\_\_\_\_\_  
Campus wide administrator (e.g., Vice Provost or Vice Chancellor)



## **Appendix B**

### Checklist for a Memorandum of Understanding for a Joint Academic Appointment

#### University of Michigan

At the beginning of a joint appointment, the deans' offices and department chairs (if applicable) of the two (or more) schools or colleges should prepare a memorandum of understanding that clarifies how they will engage in key procedures related to the faculty member's appointment and academic career. For new faculty appointments, the memorandum of understanding may be attached to the offer letter or sent separately. For a current faculty member who accepts an additional academic appointment, the two schools and colleges should prepare the memorandum of understanding at the time of the appointment. The key issues that such a memorandum should address are listed below.

#### Rights and Responsibilities

- The key responsibilities of the administrative home
- In which academic unit(s) the tenure line will reside
- Which of the academic units (if any) will extend rights of retreat to the faculty member (if any unit)
- The faculty member's teaching and service responsibilities in each academic unit
- Which unit will serve as the faculty member's administrative home

#### Reviews

- By what criteria the candidate's performance will be assessed
- A brief description of the process and schedule the academic units will follow (jointly or separately) to review the faculty member's performance and progress
- How the units plan to coordinate promotion and tenure reviews

#### Changes in the Appointment

- Whom the faculty member should contact if he or she wants to renegotiate the terms of the joint appointment

- Whom the faculty member should contact if he or she wants to discontinue an appointment
- *(If the faculty candidate is an Assistant Professor)* What constraints will be in place, if any, for the faculty member to discontinue an academic appointment prior to any applicable tenure/promotion review

#### Other Terms/Logistics

- Which of the academic unit(s) will provide office space for the faculty member and whom the faculty member should contact for more information?
- What rights the candidate has to access policies and resources of the units involved
- A process for the faculty member to seek resolution of joint appointment issues (in most cases, approach the associate deans)
- Allocation of research-related revenue

**Appendix C: Joint Faculty Member Appointment Checklist or Basis for MOU**

**Appendix III: Example Joint Appointment Checklist, University of Southern California.**

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
**JOINT APPOINTMENT CHECKLIST**

Optional form, available for use for joint, secondary, and courtesy appointments.

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Title:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(e.g., Associate Professor of Agriculture and Astronomy)

**Term of secondary appointment:**  
 For Assistant or Associate Professors, a fixed term must be specified. For faculty without tenure, the term should not exceed the maximum probationary period, and is subject to non-reappointment. For full Professors only, the term may be "continuous"; no formal renewal is then required and either department or the faculty member can terminate the arrangement at will. Check if continuous and indicate the start date.

**From:** \_\_\_\_\_ **To:** \_\_\_\_\_  
month/day/year month/day/year

Continuous

Normally, start dates should be either September 1 or January 1 and termination dates should be either December 31 or August 31.

	PRIMARY SCHOOL & DEPT./ PROGRAM	SECONDARY SCHOOL & DEPT. /PROGRAM
<b>1. School and Dept.</b>		
<b>2. Teaching Load</b>	Specify teaching load (at least half-time) : <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <input type="text"/> %             <input type="text"/> </div> or	Specify teaching load (up to half-time) : <input type="checkbox"/> Check here if teaching will be renegotiated each <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> course(s)/units per year or
<b>3. Faculty Meetings and Voting</b>	The faculty member attends meetings and votes.	Specify arrangements. Generally the faculty member will neither attend nor vote: Attends: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Votes on non-personnel issues: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Votes on personnel issues: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<b>4. Merit Evaluation and Salary Changes</b>	Merit evaluation is to be conducted by the primary department. Normally, salary increases will be determined within the primary academic unit and by regular procedures followed within that unit.	The secondary department will forward its recommendation for consideration by the primary department. Specify any other arrangements:

<b>5. Tenure and Promotion Reviews</b>	Tenure is held in the primary department, if the individual is tenured. The primary department conducts promotion and tenure reviews.	The secondary appointment is at the rank set in the primary department. Tenure is not held in the secondary department. The secondary department should forward its recommendation for consideration by the primary department at the time of promotion/tenure review and it will be included in the promotion/tenure dossier. If there is non-reappointment in the primary department, the secondary appointment terminates at the same time. Specify any other arrangements:
<b>6. Office Space &amp; Secretarial Support</b>	Provided by the primary department.	Specify arrangements. Any space and secretarial support should reflect the faculty member's participation in the secondary department.
<b>7. Service and Responsibilities</b>	Major service responsibilities	Specify expectations. The total service should not exceed that expected of faculty having single appointments.

Page 1 of 32

	PRIMARY SCHOOL & DEPT./ PROGRAM	SECONDARY SCHOOL & DEPT. /PROGRAM
<b>8. Guidance/ Dissertation Comm.</b>	Faculty member is considered 'internal'.	
<b>9. Renegotiation</b>	This joint appointment is subject to review and possible renewal at the end of the period covered by this agreement, or if continuous can be terminated by either department or the faculty member at will.	
<b>10. Faculty contract and payment</b>	The annual contract will be issued by the primary school as home department, and include the title and any contractual agreements on compensation or duties relating to the secondary appointment.	The secondary school will transfer funds to cover its share of compensation. The secondary school will not issue any separate letter or contract, but will coordinate as needed with the primary department on the wording of the annual contract.

**\*Signatures:** \*Deans' approval is mandatory

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Primary Dept./Program Secondary Dept./Program

Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

***For Deans' Use Only***

	PRIMARY SCHOOL & DEPT./ PROGRAM	SECONDARY SCHOOL & DEPT./PROGRAM
<p><b>1. Budgetary Obligations</b></p> <p>Complete only if appointments are in different schools.</p>	<p>The primary unit is responsible for the faculty member's total compensation at the end of this agreement term, if either the secondary unit or individual decline to renew. If the term is continuous, then the specified allocation will remain in effect until either department or the individual terminates the arrangement.</p>	<p><b>1a.</b> Specify the amount or percentage of salary and fringes covered by the secondary school:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> \$ <input type="text"/> </p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Check here if secondary school's obligation is conditional (and specify conditions in <b>1b</b>)</p>
	<p><b>1b.</b> Revenue from courses taught in the secondary school are credited to secondary school. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>secondary <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>under <b>1a</b>, then <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>(specify).</p>	<p>Credited to <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Split 50%-50%. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Used first to cover school's obligation <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>split 50%-50%. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other arrangement <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>2. Indirect Cost Recovery on Grants</b></p> <p>Complete only if appointments are in different schools.</p>	<p>Indirect cost recovery will be by the school. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Split in proportion to the percentage of salary paid <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Credited to primary school. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other arrangement (specify). <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Unless specified otherwise, primary department will provide the costs of research including lab space, communications, grant management and university indirect changes.</p>		

## APPENDIX D

### Sample Faculty Review Solicitation Letter

Date

Reviewer Name

Address

Dear Dr. Last name:

I write to ask your assistance in evaluating Dr. X, currently an Assistant Professor at the University of XXX, Department of XXX. Dr. X is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor, with tenure, effective July 1, YEAR. The promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is a milestone in the University of XXX system that requires us to solicit outside letters from experts in his/her field of research. We value your candid assessment of Dr. X's research, service, and teaching accomplishments, in the areas in which you have knowledge, as well as his/her future promise. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important role in our evaluation of Dr. X for promotion.

INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH (if applicable): Dr. X is engaged in interdisciplinary research. S/he holds a joint appointment in the departments/units of X and Y. We invite your consideration of the interdisciplinary nature of Dr. X's work, while recognizing you may be best qualified to review only a portion of his/her scholarly work based on your own area of expertise.

Based upon the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of his/her work, we would like your candid evaluation of Dr. X's written and scholarly contributions with a focus on addressing the following points:

- How long and in what capacity do you know Dr. X? (as this would potentially identify you, please give a brief statement below your signature block so it can be redacted)
- What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus, and scholarly impact of the writings?

- Which, if any, of the publications do you consider to be outstanding and why?
- How would you estimate Dr. X's standing in relation to others in his/her peer group who are working in the same field? (Either list cohort or ask reviewer to identify cohort.)
- Would Dr. X receive tenure at your institution?
- How would you evaluate Dr. X's service contributions to the discipline; that is his/her work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, or similar activities?
- How would you evaluate Dr. X's teaching—perhaps based on lectures you have heard him/her give—or on any role s/he has played in the scientific community?

If you are a collaborator with Dr. X, please try to address the following issues in your response:

- Clearly describe the researcher's role in driving the project(s) forward.
- What is the major effort that she/he is leading or to which she/he is making significant scientific contributions?
- Is the contribution essential for the overall success of the project?
- How did the contribution influence the overall outcome/direction of the project?
- What accomplishments/achievements can be attributed to the PI in the context of the larger team?
- How is the contribution of the individual PI regarded in the PI's field of research? What is the significance of the contributions?

I have included a separate page of legal information on the confidentiality of letters at the University of XXX. We request that you return your review to us by DATE. We realize that your schedule is full and this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. If you need further information, please contact NAME at PHONE/EMAIL.

Sincerely,

NAME, Professor and Chair

Department of XXX

Encl: Curriculum Vitae

Review of Research, Teaching and Service/Research Summary

X research articles