

Unit Criteria Committee Meeting

Wednesday Oct 21, 2015

Minutes

An audio recording was made of today's discussion regarding Joint Appointments. Present were Deans Paul Layer and Doug Goering, and members of the Unit Criteria Committee including Jennifer Tilbury, Chris Hartman, Sarah Hardy, Bob Bolton, and Sunny Rice (via Zoom).

No chair was present at the meeting since Mara was out of town. Deans Paul Layer and Doug Goering were asked to attend this meeting to weigh in on the joint primacy issue.

Dean Layer reports that CNSM has 110 faculty holding joint appointments. Two thirds have an appointment with an external research institute such as IARC or the museum. Dean Layer says that tenure resides in the college, not in the research institute. He emphasized that the promise of tenure is important for recruiting. Institute faculty have a voice in writing unit criteria. Dean Layer stressed that faculty shouldn't have two sets of criteria; currently this criteria derives from the locus of tenure. There is a lack of clarity, however, about the expectation of external funding brought in by faculty members for their research institute. For faculty salary, what is committed by the college and what is committed by the institute? This situation is often handled in different ways. When faculty are evaluated, the dean and director both evaluate based on the criteria.

Dean Goering reports that he also has many faculty with joint appointments, but has less than Dean Layer. There is sometimes tension regarding workloads. Dean Goering urges that appointments should have clear structures and workloads that are established upon hire. Deans and directors should qualify external funds: i.e. Where does it come from? How much is expected? What is an acceptable level of grant support for the research institute? They should also clarify publication expectations. Currently, department and academic unit criteria don't address funding at all, so if faculty become tenured, the relationship with the research institute could get "shaky."

Dean Goering and Dean Layer favor joint appointments where 50% of the appointment is tenure track (4 ½ months salary is covered by the college and 4 ½ months is covered by external funds), but these aren't always as attractive to faculty.

Dean Goering also mentioned that sometimes the appointment agreement "trades" as the faculty member evolves (some begin to teach more, others conduct research more). Dean Goering stressed that the ideal unit criteria for 50/50 appointments should include language about funding, including any expectations of successful grants and contracts. This should be built into the unit criteria for tenure and promotion.

Concerns arise about what happens in any unit when a faculty member ceases being productive? A suggestion to address this is to strengthen the post-tenure review process.

Dean Goering discussed the evaluation process for 50/50 appointments: directors and deans each write an evaluation and then both meet with the untenured faculty member together. Deans and directors send one message of unified expectations. We don't want two sets of criteria for one faculty member. The deans stressed that the unit criteria need to reflect the ideas, and process, that are already in place. An issue, however, is discerning which unit peer committee to go through. There is a need for research unit peer review.

Group Discussion: It appears this committee's task is to revise the blue book and ensure that unit criteria address joint appointments. It seems most faculty understand their roles, but there are some holes to clarify. Sunny wondered if the research directors felt that they had enough say regarding joint appointment expectations. We decided it would be helpful to hear from some directors. We also would like clarification on how many total faculty members hold joint appointments.

Adjourned