

## **Report of the Committee on Joint Appointment Policy**

### **Members of the committee:**

Bill Bristow – Chair – Professor of Electrical Engineering, joint appointment in the Geophysical Institute.

Perry Barboza – Professor of Biology and Wildlife, joint appointment in the Institute of Arctic Biology.

Doug Christensen – Professor of Geology and Geophysics, joint appointment with the Geophysical Institute.

Roxie Dinstel – Professor of Extension, Health, Home & Family Development, joint appointment with the Cooperative Extension Service.

Gilberto Fochesatto – Associate Professor of Atmospheric Science, joint appointment in the Geophysical Institute.

Gary Kofinas – Professor of Resource Policy and Management, joint appointment with the Institute of Arctic Biology and SNRAS

Gordon Kruse – President's Professor of Fisheries and Oceanography, joint appointment with Juneau Fisheries

Patrick Marlow – Associate Professor of Linguistics, joint appointment with the School of Education

The committee was formed at the end of the 2012-2013 academic year and held an initial meeting in May 2013. At that meeting Cecile Lardon described the task as suggesting policy to cover tenure and promotion evaluation of faculty with joint appointments. New policies will be incorporated into a revision of the "Blue Book", which has been underway for some time by existing Faculty Senate committees. More formally stated the charge of the committee was:

### **Charge:**

1. Recommend formal policies and procedures for hiring and evaluation of tenure-track and research faculty with joint appointments
2. Write new sections on these policies and procedures for the UAF Blue Book
3. Advise the Faculty Senate on other issues related to joint appointments that the committee wishes to raise.

The committee did not meet over the summer, but began work by querying the Deans and Directors and received comments from a few of them. The following paragraphs summarize the comments:

By far CNSM has the most faculty members with joint appointments (87), and Dean Paul Layer provided rather lengthy and substantial comments. In addition we received comments from Dean Doug Goering, Interim Dean Steven Sparrow, Dean Michael Castellini, and Fisheries Director Keith Criddle.

**CNSM:**

Dean Layer is highly in favor of joint appointments, believing that the benefit to the college and students is great. The T-P process is well established and involves input from the institutes at the Dean/Director level. The unit peer committees are typically composed of faculty from the academic department of the candidate. Institute participation at the peer level comes only if there are other department faculty members from the candidate's institute. Director and Dean both sign workloads and annual evaluations.

Excerpts from Dean Layer's comments:

*"For tenure and promotion review, all unit peer committees (department based) have membership of joint and non-institute faculty. Each faculty member gets one vote, regardless of the proportion of their appointment. After the peer review, the file goes to the director for review and written comment, and then to the dean. This way both supervisors have equal input in the T-P process. Faculty members standing for review are encouraged to discuss the nature of their appointment in the context of their workload. I think that most CNSM faculty recognize that different appointment proportions mean different teaching and research expectations."*

*"Tenure is a commitment by the University of Alaska Fairbanks to ensure academic freedom for the faculty. In the past, both I and the institute directors have had to defend faculty rights of freedom of expression to outside entities who might not like the views of the faculty member. This is a difficult issue as these entities might also control funding to the institute. As constituted at UAF, tenure resides in the academic unit. However as noted above, institutes have an equal voice in tenure and promotion decisions at the department and dean/director level."*

*"I interpret CNSM's "responsibility" to a faculty member is the salary appropriate to the proportion of the appointment. If that is "quarter-time" in the college, CNSM is obligated for only 2.25 months of salary, not 51% of 9 months."*

**CEM:**

CEM has the second most (7) faculty members with joint appointments. Dean Goering is supportive of joint appointments, though not as whole-heartedly as Dean Layer. Dean Goering's reservations come because CEM has had to absorb several faculty members who for one reason or another lost their institute appointments. Like CNSM, institute input to the T&P process comes at the Dean/Director level, and at the peer level only if institute members are part of the academic department of the candidate. Director and Dean both sign workloads and annual evaluations.

Excerpts from Dean Goering's comments:

*"\*Current CBA policies require at least a 51% academic appointment of 9 months for tenure-track faculty. Existing contracts are grandfathered in at existing percentages."*

*"For faculty members with any fraction of joint appointment in an academic department in CEM these evaluations are carried out using the published University and CEM Unit Criteria for Promotion and Evaluation. The CEM peer review committee consists of a core committee including one senior faculty member from each of the six academic departments in the college. The core committee is then augmented for each candidate by adding the tenured faculty members from each candidate's department to the core committee."*

*"The main concern is who is "on the hook" for faculty salaries when faculty starting in a joint appointment do not live up to their research funding expectations."*

*"As a result of these past failures and related budgetary impacts, CEM has begun offering joint appointments with a 51% tenure commitment, meaning that academic department is obligated to fund no more than 51% of the 9-month contract regardless of what may happen with the associated 49% research appointment. This is specifically stated in position offer letters and contract letters."*

*"Hence that type of analysis by the faculty member's Director is valuable to the unit Dean and Peer Review Committee. However, it is important for the Director to reference his/her evaluation to the CEM Unit Criteria as those are the controlling guidelines for tenure and promotion evaluations for faculty with any fraction of an appointment in a CEM department."*

*"Some faculty have asked that the CEM Unit Peer committee be supplemented by adding faculty from outside the academic department or college (such as by adding additional institute faculty, without any CEM appointment, to the committee). This has been resisted, and in our view is inappropriate since tenure is held in the academic department, not the institute, and thus the departmental/college based faculty are the appropriate peer group."*

### **SNRAS/AFES**

Interim Dean Steven Sparrow's comments were simply a summary of the status of their existing faculty joint appointments.

Excerpts from Dean Sparrow's comments:

*"Milan Shipka hold a 51% appointment with CES and 49% with SNRAS/AFES. He is tenured in CES. Evaluation of him for tenure/promotion has been a mess in the past, as it has always been unclear what role SRNAS should play."*

*"Joshua Greenberg holds a 25% appointment in School of Management and is tenured in SRNAS. If I remember correctly, we ask a faculty member from the SOM P/T*

*committee to participate when he is evaluated for promotion or has his post-tenure reviews."*

### **SFOS/IMS**

*"Carolyn Bergstrom, Dave Tallmon, Mike Stekoll, Sherry Tamone, and soon Heidi Pearson are joint between UAF/Fisheries and UAS/Biology ... we agree to pay a small portion of their workload for serving on or directing graduate committees in Fisheries. We don't evaluate them and the workload is indirectly approved as we approve committees they serve on."*

*"Shannon Atkinson is joint between UAF/Fisheries and UAS/biology, but without a workload component at UAS and with all evaluation and workload assignment through UAF/Fisheries."*

*"Andres Lopez holds a tenure-track appointment in Fisheries and a workload assignment in the Museum. We handle his annual evaluation and workload without input from the Museum (I tried to involve the Museum director but never got the time of day). We wrote a special section into our Unit Criteria to allow inclusion of an evaluative letter from peer curators to be included in Andres' P&T review files but we do not have an explicit evaluation process involving the museum because it is not an academic unit."*

### **Work of the committee:**

The committee began its work by obtaining the draft revised University Policies and Procedures at the end of August 2013 and held its first working meeting September 4, at which the discussion centered on where the document needed modification. As a whole, the committee felt that the document needed only minor modification, as is reflected in the final document proposed by the committee. It was felt that for the most part the current procedures for appointment and evaluation of Joint Appointment Faculty worked well, however there were certainly cases in which this was not the case. The committee set the goal of proposing modifications that would not significantly change the current procedures but would help to clarify where responsibilities for supervision of the various parts of an appointment resided, which seemed to be where most problems arose. In addition, the committee recognized the importance of producing a result that the Deans and Directors would find acceptable.

Following that first working meeting, suggested additions and changes to the policies were drafted and circulated among the group. After a brief email discussion, the committee met once in October, and once again in November. Those two meetings were devoted to discussion of the draft and modifying it to address areas where the suggestions fell short. The most significant of which was ensuring that the composition of a unit peer committee was appropriate to review a candidate for promotion or tenure.

The committee held its last meeting November 8 at which a final draft was accepted by all present. After a brief email discussion to finalize editorial comments, the draft was forwarded to Cecile Lardon on November 21.

### **Suggested additions and modifications:**

Three new definitions were added:

20. "Tenure-track joint-appointment position." A tenure track position in which the faculty member has responsibilities in more than one academic unit. The units may include a college and a research institute (college-institute appointment), more than one college (inter-college appointment), or more than one MAU (inter-MAU appointment).
21. "Primary academic affiliation." The college within which the locus of tenure will reside for faculty holding joint appointments. In the case of college-institute appointments, the primary academic affiliation will be the college. In the case of inter-college appointments, the primary academic affiliation will be considered to be the college holding the majority appointment.
22. "Supervisor responsibilities" will include but are not limited to: signing of time sheets, travel authorizations, provision of office space, approval of workload agreements, approval of annual activities reports, periodic evaluations, tenure and promotion coordination.

A new appointment category was added to Chapter II section A.

#### 6. Tenure Track Joint Appointments

Faculty appointed to tenure-track joint-appointment positions either hold tenure or may become eligible for consideration for appointment to tenure within the college of their primary academic affiliation subject to the requirements for tenure-track appointments discussed in Definition 18 and Section 1a of this chapter.

A tenure-track college-institute joint appointment requires a minimum of 25% appointment in an academic college with the remainder of the appointment in a research institute.

A tenure-track inter-college joint appointment requires a minimum of 25% appointment in a college of majority appointment. The locus of tenure shall be the college of majority appointment.

Text was added to Chapter II section C. Following the Selection Process:

... In the case of joint appointments, a primary supervisor and division of supervisor responsibilities will be determined by the agreement of the unit supervisors (Dean and Director in the case of college-institute appointments;

Dean and Dean in the case of inter-college appointments). In addition, the locus of tenure and conditions for tenure, including applicable unit criteria, will be determined.

A paragraph was added to Chapter II section D. Letter of appointment:

...  
Letters of appointment for Tenure-Track Joint-Appointment Faculty will state the percentage of effort dedicated to each unit supporting the appointment as well as the division of supervisor responsibilities and the applicable conditions for tenure.

In Chapter III section B Types of Evaluation for Different Faculty, a paragraph was deleted and replaced as follows:

...  
~~In the case of a faculty member having a joint appointment, the dean will coordinate the review and recommendation with the director as appropriate.~~

In the case of college-institute Tenure-Track Joint-Appointment Faculty, the dean of the college in which the appointment is held will coordinate the review in consultation with the institute director and/or other relevant supervisor(s?).

In the case of inter-college Tenure-Track Joint-Appointment Faculty, the dean of the college in which the majority appointment is held will coordinate the review in consultation with dean of the college in which the minority appointment is held.

The supervisors will evaluate the conditions of a member's appointment and determine if changes are required to the division of supervisor responsibilities. If changes are required, the reappointment letter will state the changes.

In section B 2. The term "cognizant dean" was replaced by "designated supervisor" and the word "dean" was replaced with "supervisor".

In Chapter III Section B. 5. Evaluation Process for Retention, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review, section I on Unit Peer Review, the following paragraphs were added:

When candidates with inter-college joint appointments are under review, the peer review committee shall have representation from all of the colleges in which he or she has some appointment. Such representation shall be proportional to the candidates established workload for each college.

When candidates with college-institute joint appointments are under review, the peer review committee may have representation from all of

the units in which he or she has some appointment. The request must be submitted as part of the candidates file. When such a request is made, the Dean of the college with locus of tenure will determine the number of additional faculty required to adequately evaluate the candidate's file and will request the supervisors of the additional units to nominate qualified tenured faculty to serve on the committee.

And under section m. Levels of review, Dean/Director Level, the following paragraph was added:

In the case of an inter-college joint appointment, the dean of minority appointment will provide an independent evaluation of the file at each level (tenure and/or promotion, 4<sup>th</sup> year comprehensive and diagnostic review, post-tenure review).