

## **Report of the Special Committee on Jointly Appointed Faculty**

Submitted January 2012

The landscape of a liberal arts education is shifting in ways that make more compelling the role of scholarship that stretches *across* traditional departmental and programmatic boundaries. We at Emory seek to find the best structural supports for such interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research and teaching, as part of supporting innovative approaches to the understanding of critical issues faced by individuals and societies. Emory College of Arts and Sciences has a strong tradition of supporting such scholarship through its multiple interdisciplinary departments, programs and centers. As Emory has moved forward in supporting this type of cutting edge scholarship, however, issues have emerged regarding relations between traditional departments and interdisciplinary initiatives, issues that must be explicitly addressed in order to advance our institutional commitment to an excellent and diverse faculty. One of the critical challenges facing interdisciplinary initiatives is the appointment of joint faculty between two or more departments and/or programs of the college. In order to address this challenge, the Dean of Emory College of Arts and Sciences established a special committee to make recommendations regarding ECAS's approach to joint appointments. The report of the committee, presented here, affirms the value of joint appointments for the College, makes specific recommendations regarding procedures for the hiring and evaluation of jointly appointed faculty, and identifies ways in which a more significant culture of interdisciplinary and cross-unit scholarship might be fostered at Emory.

### **THE VALUE OF JOINT APPOINTMENTS**

Given a history in which some departments/programs have had great success with joint appointments, but others have had difficulties, the committee took a step back to discuss the desirability of joint appointments at Emory.

The committee unanimously agreed that interdisciplinarity is at the forefront of current scholarship across the humanities, social sciences and sciences, and if Emory is to remain a scholarly force, we must facilitate interdisciplinarity and other types of scholarship that depend on cross-unit interchange through joint appointments. Importantly, the committee noted that joint appointments are only part of facilitating interdisciplinary and cross-unit scholarship at Emory, albeit a critical one.

More specifically, the committee found that joint appointments facilitate a diverse and excellent faculty in the following ways:

- They facilitate scholarship that emerges at the junctures of critical questions that traditional disciplines may have difficulty addressing within their own developed paradigms. Thus, jointly appointed scholars bring new ideas, new opportunities, and new methods to traditional disciplines.
- Joint appointments create opportunities for collaboration between faculty of different units and the building of areas of strength in the college and university that rely on talents and resources spread across different administrative divisions. In this way, joint appointments serve as a catalyst for the creation of synergies that bring together existing strengths in research, scholarship and teaching and help forge them into more than the sum of their parts. In doing so,

these appointments are crucial to Emory's goal of developing areas of excellence that enhance its national reputation.

- Often, joint appointments emerge in areas of scholarly study that address important societal problems and needs. Examples include areas such as Women's Studies and African American Studies, which have emerged out of and advance the crucial social movements they examine; Cognitive Neuroscience, which integrates brain and behavioral approaches to understanding the mind; and Global Health, which bridges multiple scientific and behavioral disciplines to focus on human health processes and behaviors. Thus, joint appointments are critical for an ethically engaged university that integrates inquiry and outreach.
- Because joint appointments often create opportunities for scholars to address critical contemporary questions that cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries, these fields attract not only an unusual diversity of scholars, but also those who among the best and brightest in their fields.

In addition to facilitating state of the art scholarship, joint appointments are critical in providing an innovative undergraduate curriculum in the following ways:

- Joint appointments are a major avenue through which cross-listed courses are developed and taught. Cross-listed courses are critical in helping students understand that multiple disciplines approach the same critical question from different perspectives, and help students understand the need for multiple points of view.
- Joint appointments help departments and programs develop major areas of study that break traditional boundaries and create exciting new scholarly trajectories. Emory has a long standing history of offering interdisciplinary undergraduate majors, including Women's Studies, African American Studies, IDS, and NBB, which attract some of the best and brightest students. These offerings can be expanded at the undergraduate level and joint appointments can similarly enhance and enliven Emory's approach to graduate training.
- Joint appointments that bridge departments, units, and schools can bring ECAS into greater and more meaningful conversation and cooperation with other divisions of the University.

For these reasons, the committee concluded not only that joint appointments are critical to maintaining a healthy academic environment at Emory, but also that they should be vigorously pursued by the College. Despite the demands placed on jointly appointed faculty at the junior rank, many of the best young scholars are engaged in interdisciplinary research and Emory would be disadvantaged in attracting these bright young scholars if there was not an environment that valued and facilitated joint appointments. Although there have been challenges faced by some joint appointments in the past, the committee does not want the past to rule the future, but instead to serve as a guide in formulating better procedures and policies, that promise to enhance the work and lives of current and future jointly appointed faculty and their respective programs/departments.

## THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to help create better administrative mechanisms that will support interdisciplinarity and cross-unit scholarship through joint appointments, the committee is attaching to this report specific recommendations in the form of two documents, as follows:

1. Guidelines for authorizing and conducting searches for a jointly appointed faculty member;
2. A template memorandum of understanding that shall be completed by the chairs of the participating units and the faculty candidate, in consultation with the dean, at time of hire. The MOU includes guidelines for annual evaluation and for tenure and promotion evaluation for junior jointly appointed faculty members;

All of these documents were drafted with the aims of standardizing procedures in ways that will:

\*Protect jointly appointed faculty from unreasonable burdens or contradictory expectations not experienced by faculty with single-unit appointments.

\*Clarify the roles of the departments or units participating in the joint appointment.

\*Make sure expectations regarding research, teaching, service, are communicated and agreed upon *in advance* and periodically reviewed' by the participating units and the jointly appointed faculty member.

\*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.

\*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.

## CREATING AN INTERDISCIPLINARY CULTURE

Although the committee believes that the administrative mechanisms recommended above will greatly improve the system of joint appointments at Emory, we also wish to emphasize that additional change is needed to create an intellectual culture in which interdisciplinarity and cross-unit scholarship will continue to expand and thrive. Thus, we highly recommend that the college continue these important conversations about joint appointments more specifically, and fostering interdisciplinarity more generally, as we move forward.

In helping to frame this conversation, the committee would like to point to several larger principles embodied in its recommendations that might profitably be employed in seeking further change:

1. Administrative procedures such as statistical reporting and collection of data have to be more sensitive to interdisciplinary and cross-unit initiatives. ECAS must improve existing tools such as OFARS to better document and understand how its faculty engage in interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship, so that these strengths can be supported and expanded.
2. The ECAS needs to make funding available in ways that push beyond conventional administrative boundaries, support interdisciplinary and cross-unit initiatives, and recognize the unusual burdens of jointly appointed faculty. If interdisciplinary programs were able to offer professional development funds that supplement department-based funding, scholars with multiple disciplinary or programmatic homes would be better supported in pursuing their multifaceted scholarly agendas.
3. Searches for joint appointments need to be prioritized over single-unit searches as a means of making the best use of ECAS resources and encouraging a greater climate of interdisciplinarity and cross-unit scholarship.
4. Departmental and other barriers that separate units need to be bridged more commonly in searches, evaluations, and other procedures, as well as in scholarship and teaching more broadly. The model we have suggested for faculties of different departments or units meeting jointly for hiring and tenure procedures can serve as a model for many other endeavors.

In terms of more specific action items for the future, the committee members recommend that the college continues to work on policies and procedures that will:

1. Develop clear guidelines for interdisciplinary and cross-listed courses that include allocation of teaching credits. We see this as critical in facilitating equity in teaching, and also for creating more innovative curriculum.
2. Establish flexible policies (such as course buy-outs or term appointments) that allow faculty to move into and out of interdisciplinary or cross-unit scholarship and teaching throughout their careers.
3. Redefine existing structures to allow for rethinking the allocation of resources to promote interdisciplinary work. This may include:
  - a. Developing priority areas such that multiple interdisciplinary appointments are made to create synergy within specific themes.
  - b. Developing mentoring programs for faculty working in interdisciplinary areas
4. Develop clear policies regarding the allocation of resources, and especially merit raises, to jointly appointed faculty.

We also note that our discussions and our recommendations have focused on the jointly appointed faculty member. Obviously faculty live within existing structures, and to fully realize a vision of

interdisciplinarity and cross-unit scholarship at Emory, we will need to continue conversations about the ways in which current departmental structures both facilitate and hinder interdisciplinary and joint appointments. Toward this goal, and beyond what we have suggested above, we further recommend that the College expand the current discussion to include specific ways in which structural barriers to jointly appointed faculty can be overcome, and even more importantly, to develop policies and procedures that will advantage departments that facilitate interdisciplinary scholarship and a general academic culture of interdisciplinarity.

We would welcome a more extended conversation with the administration about how interdisciplinary and cross-unit programs can best be supported to reach their full potential, both by the adjustment of administrative procedures and reporting, but also through an increased willingness to support creative new programs and initiatives that are designed to think outside conventional boxes, bring existing resources together in new ways, and to realize Emory's goal of articulating its distinctive contributions to higher education.

Respectfully submitted by the committee,

Robyn Fivush (Psychology), co-chair  
Eric L. Goldstein (Jewish Studies and History), co-chair

Arri Eisen (ILA and Biology)  
Carla Freeman (Anthropology and Women's Gender and Sexuality Studies)  
Pamela Hall (Religion)  
Leslie Harris (African-American Studies and History)  
James Taylor (Biology and Math & Computer Science)

Michael Elliott, ex-officio

## **APPENDIX 1.**

### **Template for Memorandum of Understanding**

#### **Preamble**

Jointly appointed faculty play a critical role in the intellectual life of Emory College and Emory University. Such appointments create opportunities for Emory to recruit scholars whose work bridges more than one department, and who will have a broad impact across the College. These appointments enrich the units that house them, and play a central role in contributing to an intellectual climate that fosters intellectual innovation. Joint appointments also represent an opportunity for a faculty member to have an appointment that reflects the full range of his or her scholarly interests and skills.

As with all faculty appointments, it is important that jointly appointed faculty receive an articulation of clear expectations. This Memorandum of Understanding provides an important initial opportunity to articulate those expectations for assistant level tenure-track faculty and should be adapted for other types of appointments. The MOU should be supplemented by clear communication from all of those involved in evaluation of jointly appointed faculty, usually the relevant department chairs and/or program directors.

This Memorandum exists within the framework dictated by the other documents governing faculty appointments: the University's *Statement of Principles Governing Faculty Relationships*; the *Principles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure in Emory College*; and the *Appointment and Review of Lecture-Track Faculty*.

#### **1. Structure of appointment:**

This memorandum template presumes an appointment divided equally between two units, usually two departments or programs of the College.

#### **2. Office and Laboratory space:**

Office space will be provided by YY department. Laboratory space will be in YY department.

Generally, the staff and resources support for the research of a member of the faculty will be administered by the department in which the office or laboratory is housed. This includes the administration of travel funds and/or any other professional development funds. Faculty with joint appointments often have an increased need for professional development activity because of their membership in multiple scholarly communities. Therefore, funds should be available through all of the units that house the appointment.

Research grants will be administered through the department in which the research space is housed. However, the College administration will make efforts to record the grant activity of jointly appointed faculty in both of the departments/programs when creating records for planning purposes.

### **3. Teaching**

The total teaching load for this faculty member is 4 courses per year.

The units participating in this appointment will devise a teaching plan, covering a period of approximately 3 years, for the faculty member. This teaching plan should cover undergraduate and graduate teaching, and it should be devised by the chairs of the units in consultation with the faculty member. It is important for the faculty member and the units that expectations of the kind of teaching and the timing of course offerings are made as explicit as possible. In cases where both units provide graduate teaching, the faculty member should be able to teach graduate courses for students from both programs.

### **4. Service and governance**

The combination of the faculty member's service/governance obligations should be no greater than those appropriate for other faculty members of similar rank. If the service obligations become excessive, there will be some form of compensation, such as a corresponding reduction in teaching load or additional research resources, to be negotiated.

As a member of both YY and YY departments, the faculty member will be a voting member of the faculty of both units, and eligible to participate in all of the faculty governance procedures appropriate to rank. The faculty member should therefore expect to attend the faculty meetings of both units. This increased time commitment shall be considered in annual evaluations and in assigning additional service and governance responsibilities.

As with teaching, the chairs of both units shall devise a service plan to cover approximately 3 years, detailing what kind of service each unit expects from the candidate. This may include participation on department committees, as well as leadership roles that are appropriate to the position.

### **5. Advising**

All faculty are assigned pre-major, undergraduate advisees through the PACE program. During the pre-tenure period, PACE advisees will be assigned through XX department.

It is expected that the faculty member will advise undergraduate majors in each department, and that the total number of undergraduate students advised will be no greater than those of faculty in either of the units of appointment.

Graduate advising and mentoring will also be a crucial part of the faculty member's activity. It is important that the department chairs consider the number of graduate advisees— both as primary advisor and as a committee member —when conducting the annual evaluation.

## **6. Evaluation**

### **Annual Evaluations of Untenured Faculty**

As part of annual evaluations for untenured faculty members who hold joint appointments, the discussion of the research, teaching, and service materials by the faculty members of each unit will be followed by a meeting of a Joint Evaluation Committee composed of four individuals: the chairs of the two units and one faculty member from each unit. The faculty members on the committee will be chosen by the respective chairs in consultation with the holder of the joint appointment. They may have some mentoring relationship with the jointly appointed faculty member or some connection to his or her area of study, but the main criteria in the selection is that they should be individuals who can aid in the evaluation by providing a bridge between the two disciplinary or topical specialties, in making sure policies and procedures are applied fairly, and in facilitating communication between the two units. If at all possible, there should be some continuity of the Joint Evaluation Committee across the pre-tenure years. The Joint Evaluation Committee will share the perspectives of the two units and create a composite evaluation based on their own discussion of the file. The two chairs will draft a single joint review letter which will be shared with the faculties of both units for comments, corrections, and suggestions before it is submitted.

### **Evaluation for Pre-tenure review and Change of Rank (Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Full Professor, promotion to Senior Lecturer, etc.)**

For a review that may result in a change of rank, two initial lists of possible external evaluators will be created, one by the faculty members of each unit. A Joint Evaluation Committee similar in composition to the one constituted for regular annual evaluations will then be formed for the purpose of creating a third and final list of external evaluators who represent a blend of the jointly appointed faculty member's disciplinary and topical areas of specialization. After the review letters are submitted by the external reviewers and the faculty members of each unit have had a chance to examine the materials, the faculties of the two units will meet in joint session for discussion. Following the joint meeting, the faculties of each department will meet separately for further discussion and to vote. The chairs of each unit will write separate letters of evaluation, but they shall share drafts and consult with one another before submitting the letters.

### **Annual Salary Evaluation**

When evaluating jointly appointed faculty, tenured or untenured, for the purpose of setting annual salaries, the chairs of the two units should meet to share their impressions of the faculty member's contributions in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The meeting should result in a single composite evaluation that will allow the faculty member's salary to be set in a way that takes into account his or her contributions to both units. The College shall facilitate the access of each department to the OFARS data of the jointly appointed faculty member in advance of the meeting.



## **APPENDIX 2:**

### **Search processes for Joint Appointments**

#### Authorizing a search

When crafted effectively, joint appointments serve a particularly critical role for the college and university because they not only enhance the strategic goals of each participating unit, but they also forge the strengths of those units into more than the sum of their parts. This creates synergies between existing units that allow Emory to highlight and advance important areas of excellence. Therefore we describe the ideal search process whereby two units together propose a search for a faculty member who will create these types of synergies between them.

We note that some joint appointment searches are initiated by one department or program with the second department or unit left "open" depending on the applicant pool. In some cases, searches authorized in this way may be necessary to meet the needs of particular units or to address particular strategic goals of the college or university. But because these types of appointments may not be as effective in creating interdisciplinary culture as appointments jointly proposed at the "grass roots" level, and because they may add layers of complexity to the search process, they should be considered on case-by-case basis but should not be authorized routinely.

#### The search process

1. Convening a search committee. Participating units shall have equal representation on the search committee.
2. Administrative load. The chairs of the participating units shall decide a priori which unit will provide the administrative resources for the search. As a default model, the unit providing the administrative resources will appoint the chair of the search committee. In cases where the search originates because of an endowed position that has been provided to one of the units, that unit shall provide the chair of the search committee.

#### Outreach

Advertisements for the position shall be placed in the appropriate venues for all participating units. Similarly, for areas where preliminary interviews are conducted at professional meetings, all efforts shall be made to interview at professional meetings relevant to the scholarly focus of all participating units.

NOTE: The additional costs of advertising in multiple venues and interviewing at multiple professional meetings will require additional monetary resources for a joint appointment search than are usually provided for a unitary appointment search.

#### Campus visits

The chairs and faculty members of all participating units shall have equal time to meet with the candidates.

### Decision making

The search committee will rank the candidates and then present their report to *a joint meeting of the faculties of the participating units*. Full discussion shall occur during this joint meeting. Each participating unit will then, separately, vote on a ranking of the candidates. In cases of disagreement between the rankings of the participating units, the process will continue until there is consensus. In cases where one of the units considers a candidate to be unacceptable, no further discussion of this candidate as a joint appointment between these units will ensue.

### Hiring process

One chair—typically the one representing the unit where the new hire will be given office and/or laboratory space—will take the lead on contacting and negotiating with the selected candidate, in full consultation with the other chair. The MOU for jointly appointed faculty will be completed as part of the negotiation and hiring process and the terms will be approved by both chairs.