

**Joint Appointments
Task Force Report
February 1st, 2021**

Task Force Members

- TC **Thalia Mulvihill**, Professor of Higher Education/Chair of the Task Force
- MCOB **Kesha Coker**, Assistant Professor of Marketing
- COH **Christina Jones**, Assistant Professor of Health Science
- CSH **Deborah Mix**, Professor of English
- CFA **Mike Prater**, Associate Professor of Art Education
- CCIM **Carrie Shue**, Professor of Communication Studies
- UPT **Henry Wang**, Professor of Exercise Science
- UPT **Keisha Warren-Gordon**, Associate Professor of Criminal Justice and Criminology

Introduction

A task force was convened on October 9th, 2020, by the VPAA and the Provost and given the following charge: “To research best practices in joint appointments for tenure-track faculty lines and produce a final report summarizing the findings including a final recommendation to the Provost for future action(s). After an initial meeting to calibrate expectations, members will conduct research on assigned topics related to joint appointments and contribute articles, data, and other materials to a shared Box folder to help guide the creation of a final report. The group will meet as scheduled to provide progress reports on their assigned areas and engage in discussion.” Members of the Task Force developed a collaboratively built task list to help guide their work and met 6 times between October 9th, 2020, and February 1st, 2021. This Final Report summarizes the group’s findings and final recommendations within the context of Ball State University. The report was Collaboratively created by the Task Force and includes a robust set of resources curated and created by the group and housed within the following BOX folder:

<https://ballstate.box.com/s/brgoq2wfjfm49xr4169rz7iw8kw2wl15>

Overall Recommendations:

Ball State University should move forward with creating a Joint Appointments policy. We recommend that this policy should address certain conditions determined by our review to be essential considerations. We have provided a list of items to be addressed in any university policy. Ball State University ought to maintain, yet further clarify, the category known as affiliated faculty. We have provided a list of items to help guide future clarifications.

Essential considerations for future policy:

Clear Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) established at time of hire. This showed up in every university policy reviewed. A clear MOU seems to be central to a successful joint appointment and should meet the following expectations:

- 1) MOUs must clearly define the evaluation procedures for the faculty member in terms of how the involved units participate and their roles, as well as articulate the commitment to and role fulfilled in each of the units, including operationally defining interdisciplinary expectations for research/scholarship, teaching, and service.
- 2) MOUs must be set up before the candidate accepts the position, whether this is a new hire, or a new position created for an existing faculty member.
- 3) MOUs must be drafted cooperatively by the deans/chairs/directors of all involved units, with the input and approval of the faculty member. Many

MOU policies required the dean(s) final approval and dean(s) were charged with ensuring the terms were followed.

- 4) MOUs must be re-evaluated annually with the input of the faculty member.
- 5) MOUs should address employment resources and expectations including, but not limited to, access to lab space or research tools, mailbox location, office space, computer support mentoring and advising requirements.

Designated Home Department. Almost all universities reviewed indicated this was necessary in their policies. The home department was expected to manage the general concerns for any position on campus (office, mail, etc.) and was designated as the PRIMARY unit for the MOU. As the primary unit, the faculty member's P&T and Salary/Merit review process would be expected to be managed by that unit. The secondary unit(s) would participate in a manner spelled out in the MOU.

Clear Interdisciplinary Emphasis. The interdisciplinary nature of the joint appointment ought to be clearly articulated within the position description and emphasized in the MOU. This emphasis should be different from only teaching courses in other units as an affiliated faculty member. When the position is deemed interdisciplinary, it generally refers to the research agenda and/or clinical responsibilities of the faculty member as well as the teaching contributions. When

the position requires a combination of areas of expertise to meet its instructional, research, and service requirements of the position, these expectations are clearly provided in the MOU.

Clear Expectations for Service and Teaching. Expectations should be spelled out in the MOU. Particular attention should be placed on ensuring a fair and equitable set of expectations in relation to other faculty positions not arranged as a joint appointment. It is important that the jointly appointed faculty members' teaching and service expectations are the equivalent of a non-jointly appointed faculty member that operates in a single unit. To this end, the percentage of time/responsibility should be clearly stated in the MOU (such as 60% School of Art /40% School of Business).

Clear Description of the Merit and P&T Review Process. All stakeholders need to be clear about how faculty members will be evaluated, including who will comprise the voting members of the P&T evaluation and the Salary & Merit committees and who if anyone will be an ex-officio. Clear expectations about the forms of scholarship/teaching/service the faculty member will be expected to engage in to achieve tenure or be considered for merit should be included in this process description. To promote consistency across potential future joint BSU

appointments, the university-level BSU joint appointment policy should include expectations for conducting faculty reviews.

Further, the task force recommends that BSU policy be informed by review processes used by other universities. Please see our policy review section for examples. It should be noted that the University P&T Policy located in the *BSU Faculty and Professional Handbook* does not currently allow for multiple-unit P&T reviews for those contributing work across two units. In addition to academic disciplines, gender and race are factors to consider when considering the conditions for success of faculty within joint appointments. Are women disproportionately placed in joint appointments? Are minoritized faculty disproportionately placed in joint appointments? While the literature reviewed does not necessarily provide evidence to answer these questions, the committee felt these were important questions for university leaders to consider.

Glossary of Terms

The Task Force recognizes that nomenclature matters and have provided below a glossary of terms that will be beneficial for policy makers to consider.

Joint Appointments: Joint appointments are when a faculty member holds two or more regular instructional, research, or clinical instructional appointments in two or more units such as schools, colleges, departments/programs or between an academic unit and another unit on campus (e.g., the Museum or Centers). Those

units share the cost of the faculty member's salary and the responsibility for the evaluation of the faculty member's P&T or review for salary and merit.

The specific language used to define these positions varies between institutions, but two definitions stood out to the committee. These are provided below:

“One in which a tenure-eligible or tenured faculty member has a compensated FTE appointment in two or more departments or programs. (Note: Joint appointments do not apply to faculty whose workload may spread across two or more departments or programs but whose salary is compensated by one unit. In this latter situation, the faculty member should seek affiliation with the secondary program or department.)” Such appointments are “commonly split 75%-25% between units” (per the Miami University of Ohio policy).

“For the purposes of this document, a faculty member holds a joint academic appointment if he or she holds two or more regular instructional, research, or clinical instructional appointments, including appointments of 0% effort (sometimes called “dry” appointments). The principles in the policy primarily address joint academic appointments that a faculty member holds

in two or more schools or colleges or other academic units (e.g., research centers)” (per the University of Michigan policy).

An often-cited reason for the creation of joint appointments is when the position is interdisciplinary in terms of the research, scholarship, or clinical responsibilities of the faculty member, and/or when the position requires a combination of expertise to meet its instructional and service requirements of the position.

“Joint appointments are used for individuals whose expertise cuts across existing departments and programs. Such appointments must assist Old Dominion University in providing strong interdisciplinary offerings and in building emerging fields that cross the borders of the traditional disciplines. A joint appointment must reflect the teaching and research expertise of the faculty member” (per the Old Dominion policy).

Joint appointments can either be designed before hiring someone, or an existing faculty member’s appointment can be revised to reflect a newly created joint structure. (See for example: Indiana State University’s policy in document summary, “Initial Appointment” or “Conversions in a pre-existing appointment.”)

Continuing or Fixed Term Joint Appointments: Joint appointments may be Continuing (Tenure Track) or Fixed Term (Contract).

Continuing Joint Appointments. “When an interdisciplinary program is dependent upon faculty with joint appointments for their teaching and governance contributions, new or replacement positions are conceived as continuing joint appointments. An individual in one of these positions may hold a tenured or tenure-eligible position in a primary unit, designated the home unit, with a joint appointment (generally at the same rank) in a secondary unit, designated the host unit. Individuals with continuing joint appointments are committed to sustained involvement with both units” (per the College of William and Mary).

Fixed-term joint appointments are more flexible in nature. These appointments may be initiated by the units to meet interdisciplinary program needs or by individual faculty members to accommodate their interdisciplinary teaching and research interests. These joint appointments may involve faculty who are tenured, tenure-eligible, or with specified term appointments in a home unit with a fixed-term joint appointment (generally at the same rank) in a host unit (per the College of William and Mary).

Affiliated Faculty: Joint appointment positions differ from situations in which a faculty member holds a single instructional appointment but teaches courses in other schools or colleges. Often these faculty are referred to as Affiliated Faculty. Affiliate faculty often teach one course a year, support a *program* and not a *department*, and have a very specialized focus. Affiliate faculty appointments are those in which an individual holds primary appointments in other departments or colleges but by virtue of their expertise, are deemed capable of making a significant contribution to a university program outside of their primary appointment (Gaff, Pruitt-Logan, & Weibl, 2000). Contributions of affiliate faculty to a department or program may involve giving occasional lectures, teaching a course, mentoring students, or providing other means of academic and intellectual support.

Data Sources and Data Analysis

The members of the task force analyzed multiple sources of information and data as a foundation for this report and our recommendations related to Joint Appointments. Members consulted the literature and analyzed the available policies of other universities. Specifically, policies were reviewed from select Indiana institutions, Mid-American Conference (MAC) institutions, an additional 17 institutions similar to Ball State University (public, doctoral university, High Research Activity (R2) Research Doctoral Carnegie designation; comprehensive programs, no med/vet school, high undergrad enrollment) [there's some overlap between a few MAC institutions and this list], and a handful of flagship institutions in other states (e.g., Michigan, Virginia, Missouri, etc.). The task force also conducted interviews with administrators at other universities and three units at Ball State University who already have joint faculty appointments.

Literature Review

Joint Faculty Appointments

The purpose of this targeted review of published empirical studies, case reports, and reflection pieces was to determine the purpose/benefits, challenges, and requirements associated with joint faculty appointments. We searched education, social science, and life science databases along with Google Scholar using the terms *joint faculty appointment*, *joint academic appointment*, *joint*

appointment, affiliate faculty, and interdisciplinary scholarship to obtain broad lists of published manuscripts. Careful review of relevant literature published between the years 2000 and 2020 revealed the following findings.

Joint faculty appointments can occur within one institution (e.g., a faculty appointment shared between two departments) or across two organizations (e.g., a university and medical organization share a faculty member). Literature specific to joint appointments delineates the purpose of, and benefits associated with, joint faculty appointments. First, a joint appointment can bridge a theory-practice gap. There is medical and nursing literature that delineates the ways in which clinical joint appointments offer opportunities for faculty to maintain their practice-related skills, engage in practice-based research studies, and integrate theory with practice while offering students relevant practice engagement opportunities (e.g., Salvoni, 2001; Ogilvie et al., 2004).

Second, there are other general benefits to faculty who hold joint appointments, including access to broader cross-disciplinary information and points of view as well as access to a larger pool of student candidates for course or research initiatives (Lin, 2008). Faculty in joint appointments can experience research topic and funding source flexibility that is not available to those in traditional academic departments. For example, faculty with joint appointments reported more nonprofit, government, or foundation-sponsored research than

single-department faculty colleagues (Glass et al., 2011). The formalization of interdepartmental/interorganizational relationships and collaboration expectations through joint appointments promotes interdisciplinary work instead of relying on chance connections (Lin, 2008). Those in joint appointments can help increase awareness of research collaboration opportunities and facilitate introductions for other researchers interested in interdisciplinary work.

Third, joint faculty appointments can be a means of attracting students to interdisciplinary research and education experiences (Lees, 2017). According to Lin (2008), joint appointments are an established infrastructure that facilitates interdisciplinary scholarship, making it easier for students to work between departments. In addition, by knowing a faculty member holds a joint appointment and engages in interdisciplinary research, interested students know who to seek out for interdisciplinary mentoring. Lin's (2008) survey of joint appointees resulted in mixed findings, however, regarding whether joint appointments themselves are needed in a university structure that already offers collaborative opportunities and a supportive reward structure.

Fourth, joint faculty appointments, at some institutions, are used to help increase the representation of racial minorities. Preliminary analysis presented in Smith and Tian's (2017) working paper revealed that among all professors, African American professors were approximately 2.5 times more likely to hold joint

appointments compared to white professors. Furthermore, African American assistant professors were four times more likely to be in joint appointment positions compared to their white colleagues. Smith and Tian (2017) caution that joint appointments can overexpose faculty members to unique risks that have the potential to affect their career advancement including smaller year-to-year raises as a percentage of their income and lower likelihood of tenure and promotion.

Finally, joint faculty appointments can bridge two academic cultures (Hart & Mars, 2009; Salvoni, 2001) allowing for the investigation of knowledge gaps or the intersections between disciplines (Hart & Mars, 2009). Borrego and Newswander (2011) reviewed job postings advertised in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* over a six-month timeframe in 2007. The goal was to determine the types of joint appointments available to faculty in addition to the listed academic qualifications required of interdisciplinary faculty. Their review of job postings revealed that the Arts/Humanities and Life Sciences had the greatest proportion of interdisciplinary positions followed by the Physical Sciences/Mathematics/Engineering. Social and Behavioral Sciences had far fewer formal interdisciplinary positions.

Further, only six percent of all job postings during Borrego and Newswander's (2011) time frame of interest were formal interdisciplinary positions and most were at baccalaureate institutions (10%; doctoral institutions = 7%, master's institutions = 4%). There were more interdisciplinary faculty

openings at the junior than senior rank. Junior interdisciplinary positions focused on teaching and the potential for collaboration while senior interdisciplinary positions required collaborative research experience and often entailed leadership responsibilities. Interdisciplinary Centers were identified as the site of the interdisciplinary interaction but not the home for the interdisciplinary faculty. Borrego and Newswander demonstrated a lack of consistency regarding how interdisciplinary responsibilities were actually operationalized in the job posting. The job descriptions stated interdisciplinary responsibilities, but most were unclear about what those responsibilities entailed, or the specific candidate skills needed. Borrego and Newswander urged institutions to be clear regarding performance expectations for interdisciplinary hires and to articulate those expectations in job postings. Of additional interest was the finding advanced by Borrego and Newswander (2011) that graduate students entering the workforce expressed high interest in interdisciplinary research (61%), yet fewer felt prepared to engage in interdisciplinary research (25%).

Ambiguity in joint appointment job postings is only one initial challenge. Often prestige and legitimacy come from strong disciplinary ties and reputations within a home field (Hart & Mars, 2009). Joint appointments may be challenging to recruit for, and retain faculty in, if there is disciplinary ambiguity and risk. According to Hart and Mars' (2009) survey of joint appointees, there are

perceptions of a lack of an institutional home, which can negatively impact the faculty member's morale and confidence. This lack of confidence is often reinforced by ambiguous joint appointment policies at the institution and within the norms of academia. The uncertainty some faculty in joint appointments experience can lead to feelings of isolation, lack of support and struggle regarding professional legitimacy. It is important to note that the professional identity tensions joint appointees experience more often occur because of colleagues or mentors and not as a result of self-doubt or lack of personal identification with both disciplines.

And while faculty work in two disciplines, their professional productivity rarely is evenly divided. For example, faculty funding pursuit efforts often focus on one of their two disciplines over the other. Faculty enjoy teaching flexibility across the joint appointment disciplines but often report feeling more confident to teach in one discipline over the other. Finally, publication activities tend to be skewed toward one discipline over the other (Glass et al., 2008).

According to Hart and Mars (2009) tenure and promotion issues are the predominant risk for joint appointed faculty. There are significant questions concerning how committee members and external reviewers will evaluate interdisciplinary work. There may be difficulty finding qualified reviewers of interdisciplinary work when discipline specific faculty serve on tenure and promotion committees. In addition, interdisciplinary scholarship can take more

time to complete (i.e., the need to overcome disciplinary language barriers; time needed to network in two disciplines) prompting some to advocate for a longer tenure clock for interdisciplinary scholars. Finally, joint appointees may have a higher service load given expectations from the two sharing departments/units which can impact candidates' tenure and promotion cases.

Some view joint appointments as good for the institution but difficult for faculty (Lin, 2008). Joint appointments mandate collaboration but cannot guarantee effective cross-disciplinary interactions. Joint appointments can be vulnerable positions during times of organizational change, programmatic shifts, and budget reductions (Ogilvie et al., 2004). Conversely, joint appointments can be a strategy for combining financial resources from two units to support one needed position. For example, Peterson (2003) describes how institutions can propose joint appointments to encourage cross-campus coordination for departments losing faculty because of retirements. While Peterson's staffing approach is intriguing, faculty holding joint appointments created out of financial need in academic environments that are not receptive to collaboration are likely to face significant professional challenges. All these challenges have the potential to suppress the benefits of joint appointments. Institutions should take into consideration policies and practices required to support joint appointments as a means of minimizing negative influences in order to maximize potential benefits.

To this end, the literature identifies specific requirements to support joint appointments. First and foremost, there needs to be a resourceful, supportive and collaborative academic environment. The institution needs clear policies and procedures to support collaborative work in joint appointments and reduce ambiguity (Klien & Falk-Krzesinski, 2017). There needs to be an understanding in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or a Letter of Agreement (LOA), with articulated percentages of time devoted to each unit, to serve as a contract between the sharing departments/organizations defining expectations for research, teaching, and service (Klien & Falk-Krzesinski, 2017). There should be institutional mechanisms that allow joint appointed faculty to network at the institution and at professional interdisciplinary organizations. Joint appointment faculty should have the ability, and be encouraged, to self-advocate during the tenure and promotion process so review committees are informed fully about the nature and significance of the joint appointment work (Hart & Mars, 2009). The sum of this literature demonstrates that, to be successful, joint appointments require careful position design, purposeful candidate recruitment, clear articulation of expectations, and support within an academic environment that values interdisciplinary collaboration.

Affiliated Faculty Positions

Affiliated Faculty Member is a title used to recognize the affiliation of a faculty member or other university employee with an academic unit other than that to which his or her appointment and salary are formally linked. The nature of the affiliation shall be specified in writing, and the appointment shall be made upon the recommendation of the faculty of the department with which the appointee is to be affiliated and with the consent of the primary department faculty. (See for example University of Maryland's policy).

Ball State University currently has a few programs that are supported by affiliate faculty: African American Studies and Women's and Gender Studies; both programs are housed in the College of Science and Humanities. The existing literature on affiliated faculty appointments is sparse at best and as a result this section is framed by information gathered by examining affiliate faculty documents from other universities across the United States.

Affiliate faculty appointments are those in which an individual holds primary appointments in other departments or colleges but by virtue of their expertise, are deemed capable of making a significant contribution to a university program outside of their primary appointment (Gaff, Pruitt-Logan, & Weibl, 2000). Some institutions of higher education offer affiliate faculty appointments available to persons outside the university (e.g., Virginia Commonwealth

University). Affiliate faculty appointments tend to be focused predominantly in the medical and nursing fields (Barchi, & Lowery, 2000) however, there are university documents that outline affiliate faculty appointments in areas of education, social science, and business (e.g., Southern Methodist University; Western Michigan University; University of Kentucky).

Contributions of affiliate faculty to a department or program may involve giving occasional lectures, teaching a course, mentoring students, or providing other means of academic and intellectual support. An examination of universities that currently have affiliate faculty policies publicly available did not specify the extent to which an affiliate faculty member participated in these activities; however, the vast majority of the documents did state that the appointment was for two-year terms with no limitations on renewals after the two-year period.

Affiliate faculty appointments are often recognized as service contributions to those programs. None of the documents mentioned financial compensation for affiliate appointments. All of the appointments began with the program director's approval and then the Dean's office and finally the Provost. All of the universities stipulated that the curriculum vitae serve as the document of evaluation to determine the qualification for meeting affiliate faculty status. All of the documents reviewed provided a ranking system for affiliate faculty such as, Affiliate Professor, Affiliate Associate Professor, Affiliate Assistant Professor, and

Affiliate Instructor.

Review of Joint Appointment Policy Documents of other Universities:

The Task Force identified, collected, and critically reviewed joint appointment policies, and other related documents, to understand the forms and varieties of policies that exist and specifically how they interface with Promotion & Tenure policies and practices as well as Salary & Merit policies and practices. For comparative reasons, these documents were considered in terms of their definitions of Joint Appointment, Home Department, Recruitment and Initial Appointment, Salary and Merit, Promotion and Tenure processes or expectations, and Other Governance Issues. It should be noted that joint appointments are configured in various ways across institutions. For example, they can be arranged between two departments within the same college, or two departments in different colleges, or between a department and another academic unit not housed within a college.

Commonalities across Joint Appointment Policies

Memorandum of Understanding – Almost every policy we reviewed specified the creation of such a document, usually at the hiring stage (or the time of joint appointment). Generally, the parties to this document include the faculty member, unit heads, dean(s), and the provost.

Home Department – Most institutions identify a single academic department as the faculty member’s “home department.” Often this department carries a greater teaching/service/research load for the faculty member. The home department also takes the lead in initiating and coordinating personnel matters like P&T and Salary Reviews and also manages other administrative details (e.g., office space, mailing address, technology requests, etc.).

P&T and Salary Review – There was some variety in how these processes were handled. Some schools require a specially convened committee with equal representation from both academic units or two separate review processes that converge at the dean’s office; in other cases, a representative from the second unit might participate in the home department’s review of the candidate. In the case of external reviews for tenure/promotion, several policies stipulated that external reviewers should be similarly interdisciplinary in focus.

Term of Appointment – Around half of the schools specify a fixed term for the joint appointment (generally 3-5 years) with the possibility for reappointment.

Dean’s Role – Almost all policies identified the dean(s) as the center of negotiation/review of all policies and decisions.

Interviews:

Brief informational interviews were conducted with faculty leaders on other campuses (i.e., Jeff Wanko, Associate Provost, Miami University at Oxford and Ed Martini, Associate Provost, Western Michigan University) possessing relevant experiences with joint appointment policies, as well as department chair stakeholders at Ball State University (BSU), specifically chairpersons for the Department of English (i.e., Pat Collier), the Department of History (i.e., Abel Alves), and the School of Art (i.e., Andy Beane).

All persons interviewed (both external and internal to BSU) were supportive of joint appointments, indicating the importance of supporting interdisciplinary study and taking advantage of resources housed in different units. Consistently it was noted that joint appointments bring new perspectives and opportunities to a unit's curricular offerings. However, all persons interviewed also described challenges they faced and important initial considerations. These are discussed here.

Consistently, it was reported that coordination between units involved in the joint appointment is a challenge. They indicated that a key consideration was making sure the appointment was initially structured not to overburden the faculty member; that the teaching, service, and research requirements were the same as

those used for a standard faculty appointment.

The complexity of the P&T review has been an issue experienced by other institutions. Often there are two rounds of P&T reviews, the first round of review is performed by the P&T committee of the secondary unit. Outcomes of the first round of review are forwarded to the faculty member's home department. The second round of review is performed by the P&T committee of the faculty member's home department (See for example the policy at Western Michigan University).

Though not consistently evident in the literature review of policies from other institutions, in the external interviews it was made apparent that a specific term may be part of a joint appointment. When a specific term is attached to review of joint appointments for renewal or possible termination, this can be at odds with the established promotion and tenure expectations/timelines therefore the inconsistency would need to be addressed at the outset in a MOU.

Increased burden at the administrative level was also reported. It was indicated that both department chairs associated with the joint appointment needed to perform independent evaluations on the faculty member's performance. There was also a need for these chairpersons to meet on a regular basis to discuss issues related to the joint appointment such as the memorandum of understanding, budgets, and the allocation of department resources (e.g. travel money).

How the P&T process is handled was the biggest difference in the interviews conducted with the three BSU departments that currently have joint appointments. All three units used the P&T document of the primary unit. While the English department made no changes to their review process for the jointly appointed faculty member, the History department added members to the review committee from the secondary unit. Different still, the School of Art requires the director of the second unit to sit on the committee as an ex-officio member to represent the secondary unit. The English department indicated they would like to do this as well, but as of yet have not adjusted their process.

The interviews conducted with BSU Department Chairs revealed the following advantages and disadvantages:

Advantages:

1. The joint appointment satisfies a need, filling gaps in the curriculum, and delivering something students want. (History)
2. Joint appointments offer great potential to help multiple units with expertise. (Art)
3. Interdisciplinary work helps refresh the community. (English)
4. Joint appointments promote intellectual diversity. (English)

Disadvantages:

1. There are challenges associated with coordinating joint appointments between units and/or colleges. (History)

2. Joint appointments are challenging because the faculty is split between two supervisors in teaching and other expectations. The joint faculty has to balance teaching and research with the Museum as well.
(Art)
3. It can get complicated when there are two departments involved.
(English)

Current Examples of Affiliate Faculty at Ball State University

The Task Force identified multiple areas at Ball State University that have established affiliate faculty arrangements between units. These established programs and their successful practices should be considered in future policy decisions, due to some similarities between Joint Appointments and Affiliated Faculty positions. Specific examples include:

- * **The African American Studies program and the Women's and Gender Studies program** both housed in the College of Science and Humanities. The African American Studies program is primarily supported by affiliate faculty and the Women's and Gender Studies program is supported by affiliate faculty, contract faculty, and two tenure-track joint appointments.

***The Honors College** currently is supported by twenty-two affiliate faculty teaching one course a semester. The college also has two Ball Brothers Faculty Fellows each year. Faculty fellows receive financial support to enrich their classes with field trips, guest speakers, and other high impact learning experiences. Currently, The Honors College does not have tenured or tenure track faculty housed within their unit. The Honors College does however, have a distinguished professorship with a tenured faculty member, an external candidate hired a couple years ago, who is tenured in the English Department but whose teaching load is all Honors College courses. The previous person in the role shared teaching duties between the Honors College and English.

***The Center for Energy Research/Education/Service (CERES)**

<https://www.bsu.edu/academics/centersandinstitutes/ceres>

***The Center for Medical Education** affiliated with IU/Ball Memorial Hospital

<https://www.bsu.edu/academics/centersandinstitutes/medicaleducation>

***The Fisher Institute of Health and Well-Being** in the College of Health.

<https://www.bsu.edu/academics/centersandinstitutes/wellness/fisher-institute-directory/research-faculty-affiliates>

Task Force responses to additional questions provided in convening memo:

The Task Force was asked to consider the following questions and used the previously provided data to guide responses:

What are the advantages and disadvantages of joint appointments?

Please review the list of advantages and disadvantages as outlined in the Interview section.

Why should BSU continue to encourage Joint Appointments? To promote interdisciplinary study and take advantage of resources contained within separate units.

What cautions should BSU have in relation to Joint Appointments? If not carefully structured, joint appointments create burdens in the form of complexity and procedural ambiguity on both involved units and place the faculty member in a difficult position for reviews and workload.

What data exists on joint appointments and what historical patterns can be traced over time?

Joint appointments have been sporadically studied in the literature and that prohibits a meaningful over time trend analysis.

What assumptions do we bring about joint appointments and are those assumptions supported by the data?

The most dangerous assumption is that joint appointments are like other faculty positions, and the details can be worked out AFTER the hire. Instead, they require

considerable logistical and organizational planning in advance of hiring the faculty member.

Another assumption would be that joint appointments are necessary for faculty to bring their expertise to the offerings of another department. It does not seem absolutely necessary to have joint appointments when a satisfactory affiliate faculty relationship can be created between two units.

How are joint appointments linked to interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary work? Is this the goal of joint appointments? Are there other benefits?

The literature review section of the report addressed many of these questions in some detail and select institutional policies contain policy language reinforcing the value placed on interdisciplinary collaborations and how joint appointments are tangible manifestations of those values.

Is there a clear cause and effect relationship between joint appointments and the ability of institutions to support interdisciplinary work? Are there other equally beneficial ways to support interdisciplinary work? Are there ways in which joint appointments can create challenges for interdisciplinary work?

No direct evidence was ascertained to help answer this subset of questions.

What impact have joint appointments had on the P&T process for those who receive them?

Clearly crafted MOUs between units are a key to success in order to have clear expectations including a clear articulation of who shall serve on evaluative committees (i.e., P&T and Salary/Merit).

Are there recommendations on this topic from professional organizations or accrediting bodies?

While the Task Force did not find any specific guidance from professional organizations, there may be issues to be aware of with college-specific accrediting

bodies who specify minimum qualifications needed to teach certain courses and/or require publications in discipline-specific (rather than interdisciplinary) journals. Any unit considering a joint appointment at Ball State University ought to be up to date with any guidance offered from their accrediting bodies.

How should faculty load be negotiated if there is a joint appointment? How about service expectations? Who evaluates teaching and how are peer evaluations managed?

Faculty load should be carefully thought out and articulated in the approved position descriptions at the time the position is posted. Additional negotiations created at the point-of-hire ought to be clearly articulated in the MOU.

For joint appointments that are arranged for already employed faculty members, versus newly employed faculty members, carefully constructed new conditions of employment would need to be developed, agreed upon by all stakeholders, and documented in a MOU as well as any other relevant documents impacting the expectations and evaluation of the employee.

In both cases critical items that need to be addressed in a MOU include clearly identifying a primary administrative home department as well as the secondary unit and determining the percentage of the job attributed to each unit. Also, it was consistently suggested that a periodic review of the MOU take place by all stakeholders including the faculty member in the joint appointment.

How are clear expectations and criteria for tenure and promotion established? How is this negotiated between departments and/or colleges?

As indicated in the data sources reviewed, it is best to determine these expectations and procedures prior to the joint appointment beginning. These can be established through negotiation and collaboration between the unit heads and dean(s). In the case of an existing faculty member moving into a newly created joint appointment, it is of high importance that the faculty member be allowed to participate in determining these expectations and procedures.

For example, Miami University has a fairly clear statement and guidelines about how this should be formed, describing a collaboration between unit heads that includes the faculty member if possible and the dean(s).

Our current governance documents do not allow for separate committees to be formed for individual faculty members. If the committee decides to make any recommendations concerning joint appointments, what if any modifications to the P&T process would need to be put into place for joint appointments?

From the examination of external documents, external interviews, as well as interviews with BSU stakeholders, three clear options are worthy of consideration:

Option A: Ex-officio members from the secondary department sit on and advise the P&T review committee, providing information as to the jointly appointed faculty member's performance in relation to the expectations in the MOU. This approach requires few modifications to the P&T process but allows for a high level of ambiguity as to the role of the ex-officio member's input.

Option B: The primary department committee is expanded to include one or more voting members from the secondary department. This could mean adjusting the committee's membership to reflect the percentages of load/research associated with the appointment in the MOU. This approach requires few modifications to the P&T process but is cumbersome and more difficult to manage due to the expanded committee and trying to bring two sets of standards together into a single review.

Option C: New policy is added to the handbook to allow for secondary and primary committees for joint appointments. This new policy would potentially have the identified secondary committee make a recommendation to the primary committee, which in turn would make a recommendation to the dean(s). Joint appointments across colleges would need additional consideration for how a recommendation would go forward to the provost. This approach allows each unit to use its own document and review procedures with no adjustments but would require a minimal level of additional coordination between committees. And

potentially additional work for the jointly appointed faculty member if different candidate materials were required by the two units.

References

- Affiliate Faculty. (2017, February 21). Retrieved from <https://wmich.edu/provost/manual/other-appointments/affiliate>
- Barchi, R. L., & Lowery, B. J. (2000). Scholarship in the medical faculty from the university perspective: retaining academic values. *Academic Medicine*, 75 (9), 899 - 905.
- Borrego, M., & Newswander, L. K. (2011). Analysis of interdisciplinary faculty job postings by institutional type, rank, and discipline. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 5(2), 1-34.
- Gaff, J. G., Pruitt-Logan, A. S., & Weibl, R. A. (2000). *Building the faculty we need: Colleges and universities working together*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED438764.pdf>
- Glass, C. R., Doberneck, D. M., & Schweitzer, J. H. (2011). Unpacking faculty engagement: The types of activities faculty members report as publicly engaged scholarship during promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(1), 7-29.
- Hart, J., & Mars, M. M. (2009). Joint appointments and the professoriate: Two houses but no home? *Innovations in Higher Education*, 34, 19-32.
- Klein, J. T., & Falk-Krzesinski, H. J. (2017). Interdisciplinary and collaborative work: Framing promotion and tenure practices and policies. *Research Policy*, 46(6), 1055-1061.
- Lees, D. N. (2017). The roles of chairs and deans in promoting collaboration and interdisciplinary initiatives. *Academic Leader*, 33(1), 5-6.
- Lin, H. (2008). Opportunities and challenges for interdisciplinary research and education. *Journal of National Resources & Life Sciences Education*, 37, 83-91.
- Ogilvie, L., Strange, V., Hayes, P., Raiwet, C., Andruski, L., Heinrich, M., Cullen, K., & Morris, H. (2004). Value and vulnerability: Reflections on joint appointments. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 20(2), 110-117.

Peterson, L. M. (2003) Half-full or half-empty?: How institutional cooperation could turn a wave of faculty retirements into an opportunity. *The Journal of the New England Board of Higher Education*, 17(5), 24-25.

Salvoni, M. (2001). Joint appointments: Another dimension to building bridges. *Nurse Education Today*, 21, 65-70.

Smith, E. B., & Tian, Y. (2017). *Stretched too thin? The paradox of promoting diversity in higher education*. [Unpublished manuscript]. Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University.