

14 December 2010

To: Thomas M. Hinckley, Interim Director

From: Elected Faculty Advisory Council (Darlene Zabowski (Chair), Frank Greulich (vice-Chair), Rob Harrison, Kern Ewing, Sarah Reichard, Stanley Asah)

Re: Joint Appointments

In October you requested that we consider and provide advice on Joint Appointments. Specifically, you asked for information on the following questions:

1. Broadly stated, how should faculty and the School embrace joint appointments?
2. What do you anticipate as the positives of joint appointments?
3. What do you anticipate as the negatives?
4. What precautions does SFR need to have in place before pursuing joint appointments (e.g., voting, financial, space and other implications)?
5. How does SFR prioritize a joint appointment versus traditional unit appointments?

To address this issue, we followed your recommendation of contacting Gordon Bradley, John Perez-Garcia, and Beverly Anderson. We have attached their responses to our request for information. We also examined UW documents concerning joint appointments. Our comments are based on information received from these sources and general faculty perspectives. As we are a faculty council, we have addressed this issue largely from a faculty perspective.

Joint appointments can be either new faculty hires or internal UW joint appointments. We see each type of appointments as different, with unique advantages and disadvantages, thus we will separately consider each at times. We will also address each of your 5 points separately. For simplicity we will refer to all potential joint appointment being between departments rather than specifying among schools, colleges or departments.

1. Broadly stated, how should faculty and the School embrace joint appointments?

In general, we think these appointments (both new hires and internal reappointments) should be approached with great caution, but especially new hires. New junior faculty will face many additional challenges with a joint appointment and, being inexperienced they are not likely to be aware of the many issues they will confront simply because it is a joint appointment. With an internal joint appointment, faculty are likely to be more aware of the issues and if there are no additional costs, and problems are fully considered, these appointments may be of benefit. Overall, our sense of how well previous joint appointments have worked within SFR is mixed but generally seen as not having worked well in the long term.

2. What do you anticipate as the positives of joint appointments?

Benefits of joint appointments are similar for new hires or internal reappointments, so they will not be considered separately. A potential benefit of a joint appointment is that it could increase interdisciplinarity within the faculty and provide new, different perspectives and contributions. If the funds are not available for a full appointment in an area of study that would enhance the faculty, this may be a way to broaden our program when it would otherwise not be possible. We also see having a diverse faculty with other skills and knowledge as a way to enhance student recruitment and retention. This said, an adjunct appointment could provide many of these benefits. There are also possible benefits from teaching additional courses of interest to our students and with regard to the ensuing ABB model. We also have potential additional benefits of research money, if the appointment obligates the appointee to request commensurate (with percentage of appointment) research funds to our school.

3. What do you anticipate as the negatives?

There are a variety of potential negatives for individual faculty. First, the additional demands of having two ‘masters’ each with their own expectations will create an additional burden on a joint appointee potentially leading to a workload that is not manageable. This may be especially troublesome for a new junior faculty appointment. Additionally, PMT issues can be a problem. Exactly how PMT will be managed may be clearly stated in advance (e.g., the home department is in charge of PMT with a representative from the alternate department serving on that committee for that evaluation), it would need to be very clearly defined as to what the expectations for that faculty member are in terms of promotion. Publications, service, teaching etc. are not all valued the same in every department and the potential for disagreement on the productivity of a joint appointment is much higher. There should be concurrence on criteria for promotion clearly laid out in writing and agreed to by both departments.

Second, although joint appointments typically do (and should) indicate a home department, this may operationally change over time as the person develops working relationships and closer ties to one department or the other. This may not always be the home department, and one department or the other typically has less involvement with a joint appointment over time. This has been evident in some of the past joint appointments in SFR. This can also become an issue in terms of voting. Voting rights are typically given only in the home department. However, in some cases ties may be closer to the secondary department—this could lead to a joint appointment not being able to vote on issues closely related to them, or voting on issues that they are not very familiar with.

There is also the issue of SCH and how they are counted. From past statistical evaluations, it is clear that individual faculty SCH’s are not credited to their home department if they are teaching

a course outside of their department. We have seen examples of this with CQS. This can be a serious issue in terms of crediting faculty efforts to a department. Joint appointments could have many of the SCH's they generate going to the secondary department instead of to their home department. This could become a burden to the other faculty within the home department as their average SCH are diminished by having the count of a faculty member who is contributing more teaching effort elsewhere.

Joint appointments often change over time, and in some cases the initial terms of the joint appointment may no longer be appropriate or binding. One department may feel that they are not benefiting equivalent to their costs. This has a potential to affect evaluations of the appointee even if they are outstanding in the other department. We also see a potential issue with joint appointments where funds are contributed from one department for a limited period of time. For the benefit of both the appointee and departments, it should be clearly stated what will happen if there is an end to the joint agreement. For example, if an appointment is a 50% joint appointment for 3 years, then one department decides to no longer support their 50% contribution, does that mean that the joint appointee will have a 50% appointment in the remaining department? Would the other department be forced to provide the other 50%? Or could one department's decision result in terminating the appointment completely? Again, clear agreement on contingency issues prior to the appointment could make this fair for the appointee and the department which may be expected to find additional resources to fund a joint appointment.

4. What precautions does SFR need to have in place before pursuing joint appointments (e.g., voting, financial, space and other implications)?

First, who will be in charge of PMT and whether, or how much of a role the secondary department plays in PMT should be decided in advance of any appointment. In addition, the expectations for promotion, merit and tenure should be agreed upon prior to the appointment, in writing. This would also mean establishing clear teaching expectations as well. Concurrence on these critical issues ahead of time could save much time and difficulty for both the appointee and the PMT committee.

Voting rights are typically assigned to the home department, but this may become a problem over time. It isn't clear if it is possible to have a faculty member transfer their voting rights to their secondary department if their efforts are more directed there rather than their home department, but this might be considered.

Space allocation is another issue that should be clearly agreed to before an appointment. Is there one office or two? Where will the lab space be? Are there special research or student office space needs? Who provides startup funds? Likewise, we see issues with where research dollars

that are generated by the appointee are credited and where indirect costs will be assigned. Will all proposal submissions be joint? If so, this seems like much additional paperwork. Which finance office processes awarded funds? And how will all of this be counted when ABB is in place? We see clear consensus and decisions on some of these issues as critical to whether a joint appointment should be considered or not. Obviously there are potential drawbacks that could be averted by extremely clear agreements put in place by the two departments prior to any appointment.

5. How does SFR prioritize a joint appointment versus traditional unit appointments?

We recommend that new junior faculty appointments be single appointments. Many of the potential pitfalls of a joint appointment are not likely to be clear to a junior faculty member and we feel that they should be spared this so that they can concentrate on meeting clearer expectations for promotion and tenure. In many cases an adjunct appointment would appear to offer most of the benefits of a joint appointment at lower risk to the faculty member or the appointing units.

In terms of joint appointments with faculty that are more senior or already at the UW, we think that these should be assessed on an individual basis. Such faculty are much more likely to be aware of the problems with serving two departments, and may not be as concerned about PMT issues. In this case, financial issues would clearly need to be the consideration for whether SFR would consider such an appointment. In these times of budget cuts, there would need to be a clear assessment of the costs and benefits of such an appointment in terms of salary, space, ICR, SCH allocations, etc. not just for the immediate future, but for the long term. If salary support ends at any point, the mechanism for dealing with the lost salary should be clearly determined prior to any agreement. With any such appointment it should be clearly demonstrated to the SFR faculty that the benefits to SFR would be greater than the costs.

Re: Joint appointments

From: John M Perez-Garcia <perjohm@u.washington.edu>
To: Darlene Zabowski <zabow@u.washington.edu>
Cc: Beverly Anderson <bja@u.washington.edu>, Tom Hinckley <hinckley@u.washington.edu>
Date: Fri, 3 Dec 2010 10:33:36 -0800 (PST)
OFFER LETTER sample REDACTED.pdf ([View](#) | [Download](#)),
Attachments: MOU sample REDACTED.pdf ([View](#) | [Download](#)),
JointApptHiresMay10.doc ([View](#) | [Download](#))

Dear Darlene,

Bev Anderson and I had a couple of meetings regarding joint appointments at the end of last spring quarter. We also did some background research on how joint appointments work in other units on campus and in other institutions. Here are some web sites from places that seem to have thought about the issue quite thoroughly:

http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/appointment_guidelines/additional_appointments.html
<http://www.tcnj.edu/~academic/policy/jointappointments.html>
<http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/aa/faculty/best.shtml>
<http://www.provost.iastate.edu/faculty/handbook/current/section3.html>

Our committee to look into joint appointments and hires requested by Interim Director Hinckley (see attached Charge letter) included Michael Dorn-Robinson, Josh Tewksbury, Bev and me. We met once with Josh Tewksbury, but never were able to get a full committee meeting afterwards. Subsequently, Bev and I developed a strategy based on conversations with other people on campus and web research to develop a boilerplate MOU for joint appointments. Bev followed through on this by using it when a new hire joint with engineering and the school was under discussion last summer. A redacted version of this is attached.

What we learned from that experience was that each appointment is really best handled case by case. We were heading in a direction that would have developed a check list of some kind that would include all possible issues of concern so that they could be considered in each case and included in the MOU or rejected as irrelevant. We noted a need to be specific about teaching duties, research duties, service and merit reviews that would likely vary case-by-case, but at the very least these duties should be included in the MOU. We also felt that negotiations on specifics such as ICR be held at the time of the hire and included in the MOU when research programs were being discussed. If you read the UW Handbook section on joint appointments you'll likely find it very general; too general to answer specific issues arising from teaching and research duties of the appointee and the costs and benefits to the two units. Again all of these vary case by case, and there really is no magic template that fits all cases.

It is important to note that joint appointments are not the only means by which to document collaboration with another department. Adjunct appointments recognize the contributions of a member of the faculty to a secondary department. However, they do not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure in the secondary department. We've had a number of long-standing joint appointments that really have functioned more like adjunct appointments in that there aren't shared resources associated with them and we don't believe they have voting privileges for the most part. See the SFR faculty directory for notations of joint appointments:

<http://www.cfr.washington.edu/SFRPublic/People/facultyTeachingResearch.aspx>.

There seems to be a notion currently that joint appointments are "the answer" to something, and sometimes they are. However, there are complexities associated with them, if there are shared resources, as suggested by the topics in the MOU. The majority of faculty should probably be traditional unit appointments with the joint appointments being relatively few. In addition to ensuring very clear terms for the joint appointment, it should be very clear what the advantages to the unit are before searching for or accepting a joint appointment. Demand on staff time is also not a trivial issue with regard to joint appointments.

Beverly Anderson
Administrator, UW Forest Resources
107E Anderson Hall, Box 352100
voice (206) 685-2047; fax 206.685.0790

and

John Perez-Garcia
Professor in Forest Economics
123C Anderson Hall
206 685 2315

RE: Joint appointments

From: Gordon Bradley <gbradley@u.washington.edu>

To: Darlene Zabowski <zabow@u.washington.edu>, Gordon Bradley <gbradley@uw.edu>

Darlene Zabowski <zabow@u.washington.edu>, Francis Greulich <greulich@u.washington.edu>, Kern
Cc: Ewing <KERN@u.washington.edu>, Robert B. Harrison <robh@u.washington.edu>, Sarah E. Reichard
<reichard@u.washington.edu>, Stanley Asah <stasah@uw.edu>

Date: Thu, 2 Dec 2010 22:54:42 +0000

Darlene,

One should not necessarily depend on the outcome of past examples to determine future direction, but the two examples of joint appointments that I am aware of did not result in much more that can be achieved through adjunct appointments. One of the individuals was Jens Jorgensen (engineering) who I believe Frank may have worked with and the other was Barney Dowdle (economics) which obviously goes way back. In both cases, before long the individuals were pretty much operating exclusively in their respective "home" departments. Jens in Engineering and Barney in Forest Resources. So I would add to your list of precautions below..... "long term commitment."

Beyond that, I am not sure why a new, or even senior faculty would want a joint appointment given the added complexity it may add to the faculty member's efforts. If the individual is to be truly joint, it is two of pretty much everything including, administrators, PMT reviewers, offices, and to make sure his/her peers in each department recognize their contributions they really have to be contributing more than 50% to each unit.

Also as we move into ABB, while it is not clear the precise nature of its implementation implications; accounting and accountability will be paramount. With a joint appointment, there are lots of opportunities to lose beans when the bean-counting is done. This includes to whom the SCH's, research dollars, ICR and other measures accrue. We have over the years lost many beans, and unfortunately, there does not appear to be any mechanisms in place, in spite of the movement toward ABB to insure accurate accounting mechanisms in the future.

So with regard to prioritization of joint vs. traditional unit appointments I would clearly fall in favor of traditional. Having said that, I would like to be clear that preferring traditional over joint does not in any way imply that, all that a joint appointment may suggest..... like collaboration, interdisciplinary, and innovation, are not important to me. On the contrary, I think all of those things are important and I think are clearly reflected in my record here at the University. It is just that I think they can all be accomplished without the headaches that complex and unwieldy administrative appointments, and inefficient institutional arrangements provide.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Regards,

Gordon



UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

School of Forest Resources

October 11, 2010

To: Elected Faculty Advisory Council

Subject: Joint Appointments

From: Thomas M. Hinckley, Interim Director



As a result of the School's effort to hire jointly with Chemical Engineering a faculty member in Bioresources Science and Engineering, I asked Ms. Beverley Anderson and Professor John Perez-Garcia to explore the administrative and procedures protocols that the School should have in place with regard to a joint hire.

Because this position has been on the School's high priority list for some time, involving a broader set of faculty in framing these protocols seemed unnecessary. However, because of record in interdisciplinary, natural resource management and stewardship, we are getting numerous requests to participate in joint hires (e.g., 33% SFR, 67% Department of Atmospheric Sciences) or joint faculty assignments (e.g., Professors Michael Dorn-Robinson, Law School; Josh Tewksbury, Biology; Martha Groom, Biology, UW-S, and interdisciplinary studies, UW-B; and Stevan Harrell, Department of Anthropology). As a result, I am requesting EFAC to provide to the faculty of SFR and the Director the following advise:

1. Broadly stated, how should faculty and the School embrace joint appointments?
2. What do you anticipate as the positives of joint appointments?
3. What do you anticipate as the negatives?
4. What precautions does SFR need to have in place before pursuing joint appointments?
5. How does SFR prioritize a joint appointment versus traditional unit appointments?

I would strongly recommend that the EFAC interview Ms. Anderson and Professor Perez-Garcia, then Professor Gordon Bradley as Chair of the Planning Committee, and finally Dean Lisa Graumlich before making your recommendations (you certain may alter this order).

Thank you for taking on this critical assignment. Please provide a response by the November 30 faculty meeting.

Also let me know when a lunch, a coffee or a beer/wine and associated discussion with me would assist in the completion of your work.