

Faculty Senate



Faculty Center
1400 East Mabel
Tucson, Arizona 85721
(602) 621-1342
Fax (602) 621-8844

December 5, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Nathan Buras, Chair, Academic Personnel Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Revisions to Guidelines for Shared Appointments

Enclosed are guidelines for shared appointments. The Provost's office requested we make a few revisions. We have done so. The page that has been modified is attached for your information.

NB/ek
Enclosure

appointment of a tenure track or continuing eligible status member who resides within one unit--with that unit controlling 100% of the budgeted line--to a second (0% budget) appointment in another unit. This allows the member to teach, serve on graduate committees, and otherwise act as a faculty member of the second unit.

With all shared appointments, one unit is designated as the primary unit. Typically, this unit will hold the greater fraction of the appointment. The primary unit initiates the appointment, i.e., it is the unit permitted by the dean(s) to recruit on the line(s) the appointee will occupy. The primary unit also controls the primary budgeted line, i.e., it is the unit in whose budget the primary line is included. The other unit in the appointment is designated as the secondary unit. The secondary unit does not initiate the appointment but it does control its budgeted line until the appointment is made. Following the appointment, the secondary unit may not unilaterally reduce its commitment to this line. When a shared appointment position becomes vacant, the secondary unit will again assume control of its budgeted line. An individual on a shared appointment will hold voting privileges in the primary unit. The secondary unit may choose to extend voting privileges.

With department/department appointments, the department that is the primary unit in the appointment will also be the tenure or continuing status home of the appointee. ~~At this time it is not possible for teaching faculty to hold tenure in an interdisciplinary program. Consequently, with a faculty appointment shared between a program and a disciplinary department, the department, even if it is the secondary unit in the appointment, will be the tenure home and voting location of the appointee. As such shared appointments are being finalized, consideration should be given to a possible future change in status of the interdisciplinary program. The involved administrators and the faculty member should carefully consider the manner in which the shared appointment status would continue under this eventuality.~~

Appointments are shared in a variety of proportional arrangements. Instances of 50/50 appointments are not common and should be approached with caution due to potential problems in clarifying which unit will serve as the primary unit. ~~At some future point, tenured appointments that are 100 percent in interdisciplinary programs may be contemplated. For the time being, however, everything that follows assumes that 100 percent appointments in interdisciplinary programs for tenure track faculty do not exist, and that faculty with shared appointments will continue to hold tenure in departments.~~

While this conception of a shared appointment recognizes that two or more units maintain an interest in an position, it is equally important to emphasize that such an appointment is a single appointment. It involves a single individual whose career should be viewed holistically even though the appointment may stem from joining two fractional positions. The budgetary considerations and the procedures for conducting searches and evaluations outlined below both reflect this understanding of shared appointments as single appointments and assume that departments and programs will cooperate in good faith in sharing the services and evaluations of the individuals involved in such appointments.

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Budgetary Considerations

In any shared appointment, control of the budgeted line must be clearly spelled out. Ideally, one unit should have complete budgetary control over the line. Historical circumstances may dictate that two units share control of a line, but this results in a more complex situation and should be avoided. Because of salary increases or changes in funding sources, the proportionate distribution of salary provided through the respective units sometimes changes. Such changes in salary or appointment proportions must be renegotiated and a new written agreement developed by

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GUIDELINES FOR SHARED APPOINTMENTS

RATIONALE

An essential element to an invigorating university environment is interdisciplinary education through teaching and research. Although this interdisciplinary approach is often informal, frequently faculty and academic professionals are hired to work in two or more units within the university. These units may be disciplinary departments or interdisciplinary programs or research centers. Thus, a shared appointment is an appointment of a faculty member or academic professional whose budgeted line is split between two, or rarely more, units.

Interdisciplinary programs that wish to become involved in faculty recruitment, and faculty members who wish to initiate or continue relationships with interdisciplinary programs, have found themselves operating in gray areas where few policy guidelines exist. Additionally, many faculty appointments have had more than one budgeted line controlled by more than one unit. To avoid confusion and conflicts over evaluations, status and promotion, merit awards, and the like, clear and consistent guidelines must be developed that are broadly publicized, applied uniformly university-wide, and known to the appointees in advance.

When an appointment is shared, it is essential that the individual and the heads of the two units holding the line (department heads for appointments within the same college, deans for appointments between colleges) have a clear understanding of all aspects of their appointment. These aspects include teaching load, research, administration, service responsibilities, merit pay, peer evaluation, status and promotion, etc. A checklist (Appendix A) should be used to record such understandings and should serve as a guide in matters pertaining to the shared appointment.

These guidelines are intended to clarify the relationships and to provide mechanisms that permit departments, programs, and individual faculty members and academic professionals holding shared appointments, to operate in a more orderly way. Underlying these guidelines is the assumption that these relationships benefit both the individual involved and the institution. Consequently, the guidelines described here not only serve the individuals currently holding shared appointments, but also allow for the growth and expansion of interdisciplinary programs which rely on shared appointments. In formalizing these relationships, the guidelines also aim at continuing the standards of teaching, research, and service that already characterize University of Arizona departments and programs, while providing support for individuals whose interests and capabilities cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries. This statement also outlines personnel recruitment and review systems that engage faculty from various units (including various colleges) and that recognize and value the importance of interdisciplinary teaching and research.

These guidelines provide for the needs of faculty who have (or wish to have) appointments shared between disciplinary departments and interdisciplinary programs or between two departments, sometimes in different colleges. While the guidelines also may apply to academic professionals with shared appointments, they do not apply to faculty or academic professionals holding joint appointments.

THE NATURE OF SHARED APPOINTMENTS

A shared appointment is an appointment of a tenure-track faculty member or a continuing-eligible academic professional that is split between, or rarely more, units within or affiliated with the university. A shared appointment may be split either between an

interdisciplinary program and a disciplinary department/school or between two disciplinary departments, sometimes residing in two colleges. In contrast, a joint appointment is an appointment of a tenure-track or continuing-eligible status member who resides within one unit--with that unit controlling 100% of the budgeted line--to a second (0% budget) appointment in another unit. This allows the member to teach, serve on graduate committees, and otherwise act as a faculty member of the second unit.

With all shared appointments, one unit is designated as the primary unit. Typically, this unit will hold the greater fraction of the appointment. The primary unit initiates the appointment, i.e., it is the unit permitted by the dean(s) to recruit on the line(s) the appointee will occupy. The primary unit also controls the primary budgeted line, i.e., it is the unit in whose budget the primary line is included. The other unit in the appointment is designated as the secondary unit. The secondary unit does not initiate the appointment but it does control its budgeted line until the appointment is made. Following the appointment, the secondary unit may not unilaterally reduce its commitment to this line. When a shared appointment position becomes vacant, the secondary unit will again assume control of its budget line. An individual on a shared appointment will hold voting privileges in the primary unit. The secondary unit may choose to extend voting privileges. With department/department appointments, the department that is the primary unit in the appointment will also be the tenure or continuing status home of the appointee.

Appointments are shared in a variety of proportional arrangements. Instances of 50/50 appointments are not common and should be approached with caution due to potential problems in clarifying which unit will serve as the primary unit.

While this conception of a shared appointment recognizes that two or more units maintain an interest in a position, it is equally important to emphasize that such an appointment is a single appointment. It involves a single individual whose career should be viewed holistically even though the appointment may stem from joining two fractional positions. The budgetary considerations and the procedures for conducting searches and evaluations outlined below both reflect this understanding of shared appointments as single appointments and assume that departments and programs will cooperate in good faith in sharing the services and evaluations of the individuals involved in such appointments.

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Budgetary Considerations

In any shared appointment, control of the budgeted line must be clearly spelled out. Ideally, one unit should have complete budgetary control over the line. Historical circumstances may dictate that two units share control of a line, but this results in a more complex situation and should be avoided. Because of salary increases or changes in funding sources, the proportionate distribution of salary provided through the respective units sometimes changes. Such changes in salary or appointment proportions must be renegotiated and a new written agreement developed by the unit heads and the individual. The revised agreement must be approved by the deans and/or directors involved.

When a new hire is planned, a budgeted line may be provided directly to a unit and that unit will control the position and become the primary unit for the appointment. When such a line is vacated, the line normally reverts (with the dean's and provost's approval) to the program or department to which the line was originally allocated.

A shared appointment is possible for a tenure-eligible faculty member or a continuing-eligible academic professional if all the parties to such an appointment clearly spell out their expectations regarding responsibilities and evaluations in a checklist (Appendix A). A shared appointment for a faculty member or academic professional may raise more unique consider-

ations than a single departmental appointment. However, the appointment should be as successful as any other if the two units carefully monitor performance in the appointment and approach it with good will and respect.

Searches

How a search to fill a shared appointment is handled depends on whether the line is controlled by an interdisciplinary program or by a department. Normally, if the line is controlled by the program, the program will initiate the search, seek input from the department, and specify the desired discipline of the person sought. Because tenure will be in the department, the search committee should include at least one department member, and only candidates acceptable to the department should be invited for interviews. No appointment should be made unless the program and the department agree on the choice of the candidate.

On occasion a program may undertake a search without pinpointing a department to share the appointment. For example, a program may wish to search for a director or for a candidate with specific scholarly interests without regard to disciplinary affiliation. In such a case, the program will initiate the search without specific input from a department. However, the program should inform appropriate departments that the search is taking place and should encourage them to nominate possible candidates. Only candidates acceptable to both the program and the department in which tenure is projected will be brought in. Interviews and offers will proceed as above.

If the primary line is controlled by a department that desires affiliation with an interdisciplinary program, the department should define and structure the search, with input from the program via membership on the search committee. Similarly, when the primary line is controlled by a department that wishes the proposed appointee to have a shared appointment with another department, the first department will define and structure the search with input from the second department via membership on the search committee. In both these cases, the candidate offered an appointment must be acceptable to both units involved. Otherwise the appointment will be solely in the initiating department.

Before a search begins, an estimate of search expenses should be prepared by the units involved in the search. Approval must be sought and agreement reached between the appropriate administrators on how recruitment expenses are to be funded.

Evaluations

The policy outlined here for evaluation of shared appointments covers both annual peer (merit) evaluations and promotion and tenure or continuing status evaluations. These evaluations are normally conducted by a single committee composed of representatives of both the primary and secondary units.

Annual peer evaluations ordinarily are initiated by the primary unit. At least one representative of the secondary unit will meet with the peer evaluation committee of the primary unit, and a single joint evaluation will be forwarded to the dean. If merit money is to be awarded, the amount of award will be based on the single joint evaluation. Because a shared appointment has more than one budgeted line, serious inequities in merit pay adjustments can result. To alleviate potential problems and misunderstandings, the individual concerned should discuss and clarify review and merit policies with the department/program heads and/or the dean prior to the time of annual performance evaluation and merit pay allocation. These agreements should be recorded in the checklist provided in Appendix A.

Second-year and fourth-year reviews, promotion and tenure reviews for tenure-eligible

faculty, and promotion and continuing status reviews for continuing-eligible academic professionals are normally initiated by the tenure home or continuing home department. In the case of program/department appointments, reviews will be initiated by the department regardless of whether the department is the primary or secondary unit. At least one representative of the interdisciplinary program will be a member of the departmental committee reviewing the individual in question, with a single review to be forwarded to the dean. In the case of department/department appointments, the tenure home department will initiate the reviews, with at least one representative of the secondary department serving on the review committee. A single review will be forwarded to the dean.

The criteria to be used for evaluation, if different from those in the primary department's document or bylaws describing such criteria, shall be agreed upon in writing by the individual and the units sharing the appointment. This written agreement should be completed no later than three months following the start of employment.

Implementation

Recruitment should follow the guidelines set forth in this document. A new shared appointment is confirmed when all the parties to such an appointment clearly spell out their expectations in the checklist (Appendix A) regarding responsibilities and evaluations. These guidelines also should be implemented for individuals already holding shared appointments.

Renegotiation of the terms of a shared appointment must be initiated, without penalty, by the faculty member if he or she so desires. As with the initial appointment, such renegotiations will be subject to the approval of the dean(s). In the event of reorganization of the units or programs participating in the faculty member's shared appointment, the University may initiate renegotiation of the appointment. However, changes in the terms of the appointment must be agreed to by the faculty member.

Dissemination

This document, with the attached checklist, should be sent to all prospective candidates for shared appointments as well as to all faculty currently holding shared appointments. This information also should be reviewed by all program heads, department heads, and deans to insure uniformity in filling new shared appointments and to help resolve inconsistencies in existing shared appointments.

Approved by Faculty Senate May 1993.
Attachment: Appendix A

APPENDIX A
CHECKLIST FOR SHARED APPOINTMENTS

Date: _____

Name and rank of appointee: _____

Primary department or program: _____

Secondary department or program: _____

1. Teaching Load

Primary unit:

Fall:

Spring:

Secondary unit:

Fall:

Spring:

Percent of Student Credit Hours: ___ Primary ___ Secondary

2. Budgetary Obligations

Primary unit:

responsible for _____ % of line

Secondary unit:

responsible for _____ % of line

3. Faculty Meetings and Voting

Primary unit:

appointee will/will not attend meetings and will/will not vote

Secondary unit:

appointee will/will not attend meetings and will/will not vote

4. Research Responsibilities

Primary unit:

Secondary unit:

Distribution of credit for awards:

Indirect cost recovery on grants:

Primary unit will receive ___ %, secondary unit will receive ___ %.

5. Administrative Load

Primary unit:

Secondary unit:

6. Service Responsibilities

Primary unit will expect:

Secondary unit will expect:

7. **Peer Evaluations**

Committee will be composed of the peer review committee from the primary unit and at least one member of the secondary unit.

Evaluation criteria (teaching, research, service):

Primary unit:

Secondary unit:

8. **Second-Year, Fourth-Year, Tenure/Continuing Status and Promotion Reviews**

Tenure/continuing status is held in the primary discipline department. Review committees will be composed of members of the promotion and tenure committee of the discipline department and at least one member of the interdisciplinary programs/second department. A single recommendation will be forwarded to the dean.

9. **Office Space and Secretarial Support**

Primary/Secondary unit will provide an office.

Primary/Secondary unit will provide secretarial support.

Primary/Secondary unit will provide travel funds. Normally \$_____ will be provided in travel funds. Travel funds typically will be provided for the following purposes:

10. **Other Considerations**

Signatures:

Faculty Member

Representing Primary Unit

Date

Unit Date

Representing Second Unit

Unit Date

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Committee of Eleven
December 5, 1994

Preamble

The Faculty Governance Law (ARS15-1601B) states, in part, "Subject to the powers of the...University Presidents, the faculty members of the universities, through their elected faculty representatives, shall share responsibility for academic and educational activities and matters related to faculty personnel. The faculty members of each university, through their elected faculty representatives, shall participate in the governance of their respective universities...." Governance of a university requires a structure of accountability. In particular, administrators of a university need to be accountable to the scholars of the community, the faculty members, on how well they support the teaching, research and service missions of the university.

Currently, administrators at the level of Department Head and Dean are reviewed at five-year intervals, including a systematic evaluation of their performance, at those times, by the faculty of the unit they oversee. There is also provision for extraordinary reviews of Department Heads and Deans at shorter intervals upon appropriate request. All faculty are evaluated on a yearly schedule, with input from their peers, their students and their unit administrator.

To implement accountability at the level of President, Provost, Vice President and Vice Provost, the faculty of the entire university, to whom they are accountable, must have a mechanism to carry out a periodic review of each such administrator.

Resolution on Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

Each administrator at the level of President, Provost, Vice President and Vice Provost shall be evaluated each three years (with one-third of all such administrators evaluated in each year), by means including a questionnaire distributed to all faculty of the university. This questionnaire shall be constructed by the Committee of Eleven, which is elected campus-wide, and returned to and evaluated by the Committee of Eleven.

The Committee of Eleven shall meet with the President of the University to present, with recommendations, the results of the evaluation of the Provost, Vice Presidents and Vice Provosts.

On the years in which the President is evaluated, the Committee of Eleven shall meet with the President of the Arizona Board of Regents to present, with recommendations, the results of his/her evaluation.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN
ANNUAL REPORT
1993-94

Donald E. Myers (Chair)
Wendy Anderson
Sue Brichler
Dipankar Chakravarti
Henry L. Ewbank
J. D. Garcia
Moirra Geoffrion*

Raphael Gruener
John Law
Sheila Pitt**
Andrew Silverman
Kenneth J. Smith***
Marlys Witte
Charles Zukoski

*Resigned fall 1993; ** Selected by Committee to replace Moira Geoffrion;
***Selected by Committee to replace Lynn Nadel who resigned in the summer
of 1993

Meetings

The Committee met on alternate Friday afternoons throughout the academic year, as well as several times during the summer of 1993, with a number of individuals to discuss issues and exchange points of view, to provide information, and to gain insight into matters pertaining to the University community. Guests included: President Manuel Pacheco; Provost Paul Sypherd; Vice President Michael Cusanovich; Vice President Celestino Fernandez; Vice Provost Martha Gilliland; Marge Koennig, Jan Murphy and Larry Barton, representatives of the Staff Advisory Council; Tilly Warnock and Marvin Diogenes, members of the Intercollegiate Writing Committee and the English Composition Committee; new CORE Director, Ron Peterson; Student Regent Spencer Insolia; Director of Affirmative Action, Janie Nunez; Jay Rochlin and Kent Rollins, representatives from the University of Arizona Alumni Association; Jeanne McCarthy, Co-Chair, University Ombudsperson Committee.

1993-94 Activities

- The Committee met with departments and units campus-wide. These meetings were organized and arranged by a subcommittee consisting of Moira Geoffrion, John Law and Raphael Gruener.
- The Committee was asked to serve as faculty liaison to the CORE program. One member was chosen by the Committee to serve on the Human Resources Team. The Committee has submitted nominations for a number of other CORE teams in response to requests from the administration. CORE liaison is an on-going activity.
- The Committee submitted a number of important issues to the Faculty Senate. These included:
 - . Reorganization of the College of Arts and Sciences
 - . Undergraduate Writing Proficiency
 - . Role and Responsibilities of Faculty-chosen Representatives serving on University committees
 - . Policy on the distribution and allocation of market/equity funds for 1994-95

In addition, the Committee considered a number of other matters: the possible purchase of the IBM facility for a research park and/or a location for the proposed new east campus was discussed with Vice President Cusanovich; the Sequential Degree Program and the proposed new east campus were discussed with Vice President Fernandez; and matters pertaining to possible reorganizations were discussed with both President Pacheco and Provost Sypherd.

- The role of elected faculty governance in the administration and functioning of the University continue to be of central interest to the Committee of Eleven. Although this matter was discussed with various administrators, a satisfactory resolution has not yet been reached. Real implementation of SB 1106 has not yet occurred, although there are encouraging signs such as the pending transfer of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils to faculty governance, the transfer of the Intercollegiate Writing Committee and the proposed transfer of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- During a discussion with Vice Provost Gilliland and Provost Sypherd, it was suggested that an all day retreat for members of the Committee of Eleven, the Senate Executive Committee, and members of the administration could provide an opportunity to discuss issues of interest to both groups. Such a retreat is being planned.

Because the committee is elected campus-wide, it continues to function as a sounding board for the administration as well as for the faculty. It continues to fulfill its historical responsibilities of initiating, provoking and stimulating study and action, and is gladdened by the resolution of situations and problems arising in the University community.