

## **Politically Mainstreaming Interdisciplinary Programs: A Structure for Success**

by Michael T. Marsden, Dean

*College of Arts and Sciences  
Northern Michigan University*

**WHEN I FIRST ASSUMED MY DUTIES** as Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs in the College of Arts and Sciences at Bowling Green State University in the summer of 1985, one of my major responsibilities under the direction of the Dean, Kendall Baker (currently the President of the University of North Dakota), was the coordination of a variety of interdisciplinary programs within the College, each of which was at a different level of development and maturity. Within the first year we had evolved a detailed plan for providing those programs with necessary support and for requiring appropriate accountability in order to ensure their viability as academic entities within a suspicious but generally tolerant University environment. In October of 1986 Kendall Baker and I co-authored a paper entitled, "Structuring for Success: A Progress Report on Administering the Political, Economic and Pedagogical Realities of Interdisciplinary Programs," which I presented at the National Conference on Interdisciplinary Baccalaureate Education at the University of South Carolina that same fall. The present paper is a full account of that and subsequent interdisciplinary efforts to provide a growing number of interdisciplinary programs with maximum opportunities for success in the College of Arts and Sciences at Bowling Green State University from its beginning in 1985 through 1992, and then more recently here at Northern Michigan University.

Prior to the considerable focus interdisciplinary programs began to receive in the College of Arts and Sciences in the mid 1980s, the attention they had received could best be described as pleasant inattention. While faculty and students were certainly allowed to pursue their interdisciplinary interests as long as they met their erstwhile disciplinary obligations, interdisciplinary programs were given either modest or no budgets of their own and had to exist without a formal structure. The programs survived because of the strong will of the faculty and students involved. Common concerns shared by interdisciplinary programs were seldom addressed. Yet one of Bowling Green State University's distinctive characteristics was its deep commitment to holistic thought and cross-disciplinary, as well as interdisciplinary teaching and research. The problem interdisciplinary programs most directly faced was that politics at the University were disciplinary based.

Working from the assumption that interdisciplinary education is not only an important option in a College of Arts and Sciences, but an essential component of a liberal arts education, the College Office took a series of definite steps to provide support and accountability for the interdisciplinary programs offered under its auspices. It was decided that the initial focus was to be on the ten interdisciplinary programs offering undergraduate or graduate degrees which existed outside of conventional departmental structures.

Back in 1983 Dean Baker had established an *ad hoc* committee to examine the structure and current condition of the existing programs, and committee members were asked to make recommendations about the steps to be taken to achieve greater integration of the interdisciplinary programs into the College of Arts and Sciences as a whole. The committee

proceeded to collect materials from around the state of Ohio about interdisciplinary programs, particularly about the ways in which interdisciplinary education was approached at other public universities, and from the program directors in the College of Arts and Sciences about the nature and condition of their individual programs. While the committee did collect a good deal of information, it never completed its report. But the results of the effort provided a useful inventory of realities and concerns that the directors of interdisciplinary programs on campus faced. One of those realities was the "disenfranchisement" which occurs for interdisciplinary programs because of their lack of representation in governance structures within the College and the University. Other significant realities included the minimal number of faculty members willing and able to teach in interdisciplinary programs, merit evaluations for those who do, and resource allocations, including equipment, for the programs. In short, the interdisciplinary program directors complained that they and the faculty members who participated in their programs were unappreciated, unsupported and unrewarded.

The survey of interdisciplinary efforts at other public institutions in Ohio revealed similar concerns. But it also revealed that only one other university was making a systematic effort to coordinate and develop interdisciplinary education. The general impression provided by responses to the survey was of a variety of interdisciplinary programs in place with few students and little support, despite apparent intellectual commitment to, in the words of one dean, "exciting ideas developed by an exciting faculty."

After a careful review of all of these external and internal materials, Dean Baker in conjunction with associates in the College Office developed a proposal to promote interdisciplinary education across the College of Arts and Sciences. The proposal (Appendix A) was then discussed with the directors of the interdisciplinary programs and received their strong support. The essence of the proposal resided in its two-pronged approach to the support of and accountability for interdisciplinary programs. It was decided that the new Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs to be appointed would assume responsibility for the administration and evaluation of the interdisciplinary programs as part of the overall responsibilities of the position. More specifically, responsibility for coordinating and stimulating the growth of the interdisciplinary programs in the College and for the maintenance of communications with directors of the programs was to reside with the new Assistant Dean.

The ten interdisciplinary programs which became the focus of these new efforts were:

- American Culture Ph.D. Program
- American Studies
- Asian Studies
- Classical Studies
- Environmental Studies
- Film Studies
- International Studies
- Latin American Studies
- Russian Studies
- Women's Studies

The directors of these programs were invited to join a new Council of Interdisciplinary Programs which was created as a parallel body to the long-established Council of Chairs in the College of Arts and Sciences. Over the next seven years it was to meet regularly with the Dean's representative and to formulate a series of policies and procedures for more effectively addressing the needs of interdisciplinary programs in the College of Arts and Sciences. A considerable agenda was developed for this Council over a seven-year period.

In this formative stage, minimum budgets of \$500 were established for each of the programs if they did not already have a continuing budget. In addition, modest supplemental payments were made to the home departments of the program directors to cover any expenses the departments might incur because of their faculty members' involvement in interdisciplinary program administration. While these payments were small, they became a positive, concrete recognition of the value the College Office placed upon the contributions of the program directors. Additionally, "buy-back" funds were made available to replace cooperating faculty members in their home departments should they wish to teach in the core courses of one of the interdisciplinary programs, such as the "Introduction to Women's Studies" course in the Women's Studies Program. Collectively, these financial commitments required a sizeable dollar investment by the College Office, but the investment was well received by faculty members and program administrators alike who appreciated the College Office's strong commitment to interdisciplinary education.

Cooperative publicity efforts from advertisements in the student newspaper to a combined display at the two Preview Days the University sponsored for prospective students each year were developed. There were also several collective efforts to have undecided students consider an interdisciplinary major. Funding was provided by the College Office to print a special brochure for interdisciplinary studies which paralleled those available for the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences, thus establishing a fourth major division within the College of Arts and Sciences. These combined efforts were continued throughout the seven years and culminated in the development of an attractive folder with individual sheets for each of the programs, which can be easily updated, as well as an overview statement on the importance of interdisciplinary studies.

One of the first initiatives to help establish credibility for the programs and their directors was to require an annual evaluation of the program directors, which again paralleled the evaluation process utilized for department chairs. The annual evaluations were conducted by the Advisory Committees of the respective programs and submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, who in turn discussed the reviews with the directors. A more rigorous, three-year review process was later established to coincide with the regularized three-year terms of the program directors (Appendix B). Again, the purpose was to provide accountability, and thus political viability, for these programs which existed outside of departments.

A number of important curricular developments occurred in these interdisciplinary programs over the seven years. Some of the earliest curricular developments included the creation of introductory and senior level courses for a number of the programs under their own designations. Prior to this, the College of Arts and Sciences had loaned its generic Arts and Sciences course numbers to fledgling programs. But with a program's maturity came the development of its own, distinctive core curriculum.

Not every program had an internship course number. So an interdisciplinary internship course number was established in Arts and Sciences for use by several programs. Eventually, the programs developed their own internship course numbers as needed. Collectively the interdisciplinary program directors favored the experience of an internship.

The College Office established a special equipment fund allocation system for interdisciplinary programs which paralleled the one in place for departments and schools. The result was that several programs received essential equipment in support of their instructional mission which they otherwise would not have been able to receive through the normal equipment allocation process which was department-centered.

An early victory was the revision of the College of Arts and Sciences' "Guidelines of the Promotion and Review Committee" specifically to include contributions to interdisciplinary programs. This process required the approval of several College committees and was

continually refined in subsequent years as the guidelines themselves were regularly refined and updated due to the leadership of Dean Andrew Kerek, who followed Dean Baker, and the diligent work of Diane Regan, Executive Assistant to the Dean. But the important point was made, to new faculty in particular, that interdisciplinary efforts were rewarded in the College of Arts and Sciences.

The issue of merit determination for interdisciplinary program directors was not as readily addressed because not all of the interdisciplinary program directors were on split contracts. For those who were, the percentage of their merit related to the administration of their interdisciplinary programs was held in the College Office and combined with a small number of other merit funds to form a special pool. But this process never really proved to be a satisfactory one.

A major accomplishment was the establishment of guidelines for joint appointments between departments/schools and interdisciplinary programs for current faculty members as well as for new, incoming faculty members. The guidelines themselves took several years to develop and had to be approved through the various channels. But the effort was an important one for it led to the establishment of several key joint appointments which in turn provided the program directors with commitments to their programs they could use to plan future course offerings. New faculty appointments were considered permanent; joint appointments for existing faculty members were established for three-year terms with the option of renewal (Appendix C).

It became clear that the Council of Interdisciplinary Programs would need to find a voice on key committees and councils in the College of Arts and Sciences. Two key councils/committees were identified: the College of Arts and Sciences Council, which was the main advisory committee to the Dean, and the Budget Committee. Both efforts took several years but were successful, and the Council of Interdisciplinary programs placed a voting member on each body. Achieving a representative voice was essential in ensuring that the needs and concerns of small, interdisciplinary programs were heard, and as often as possible, heeded.

The concept of summer institutes for several of the interdisciplinary programs was proposed and endorsed by all concerned. During the summer of 1986 the College of Arts and Sciences sponsored two, three-week institutes, one for a new program in "Great Ideas" and one for the Women's Studies Program. Both were very successful and engaged both faculty members and graduate students in curriculum development activities. In following summers, the institutes for the Great Ideas Program and Women's Studies were repeated, and new ones were developed for the emerging Canadian Studies program and the university-wide Cultural Diversity general education requirement. Faculty participants in the summer institutes were expected to make a commitment to teach in the interdisciplinary program in exchange for a modest stipend for participating in the summer institute. A long-range plan included the establishment of a permanent interdisciplinary summer institute which was to have served the faculty of a number of colleges and universities in the region.

For several years the College Office hosted half-day retreats for the directors of interdisciplinary programs. These were opportunities for the directors and the College Office to discuss and evaluate common concerns of the interdisciplinary program directors and to plan the agenda for the academic year ahead. The topics ranged from resource and budget issues to more effective ways of recruiting students and faculty. The retreats also established a camaraderie among the program directors and provided an opportunity which paralleled the one provided annually to department chairs. Eventually the retreats were compressed into an extended, agenda-setting meeting at the beginning of each academic year.

During the seven years covered by this report there were several program changes. The American Culture Ph.D. Program and the American Studies Program, which offered undergraduate and Master's degrees, joined together to become American Culture Studies. Latin

American Studies was absorbed within the structure of International Studies while yet retaining its separate degree program status. Russian Studies was modified twice—first to Soviet Studies, and then to East and Central European Studies, The Canadian Studies program as well as the Great Ideas Program were subsequently added to the Council. These changes mark natural processes in curriculum and program development as the needs and interests of the faculty and students changed.

After some controversy, the Council of Interdisciplinary Programs achieved approval for a generic graduate level seminar number under the Arts and Sciences heading which could be used for special seminars offered by interdisciplinary programs which did not have their own graduate program. This was a major victory for the viability of interdisciplinary studies at the advanced level and a recognition of their significant academic contributions.

The tough academic love which characterized the administration of these interdisciplinary programs during the seven years of this report allowed the programs to weather some serious political storms, including a decision by one of the colleges in the University to eliminate all interdisciplinary courses from the general education core they would allow for their students. The careful procedures developed for establishing and evaluating joint appointments served the programs well and led to the creation of joint appointments between Environmental Studies and the Department of Geography, between Women's Studies and the Department of Ethnic Studies, between Women's Studies and the School of Art, between Women's Studies and the Department of Romance Languages, between Women's Studies and the Department of English and between Canadian Studies and the Department of Economics.

In August of 1992 I left Bowling Green State University to assume my new duties as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Northern Michigan University. As would be expected, I carried with me my convictions about the viability and desirability of joint faculty appointments.

In my first year as Dean, the Glenn T. Seaborg Center for Teaching and Learning Science and Mathematics was moved into the College of Arts and Sciences and provided with departmental status. A national search for a new Director was initiated, and we were fortunate to secure Dr. Peggy House for the position. Our discussions about joint appointments with selected faculty members had preceded her arrival on campus, but they became quite focused once she began to serve as the Director. During the 1994-95 academic year, the Seaborg Center established joint appointments for one faculty member in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science and one in the Department of Biology to work on specific grant-funded projects. During the 1995-96 academic year a third joint appointment was established with another member of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science. A number of other such joint appointments are being planned for future years. While each of these joint appointments is for one year and needs to be renewed annually with the mutual agreement of all parties, joint appointments of up to three years are envisioned. After considerable discussion of the details to be included in such an agreement, Peggy House developed a simplified agreement form to be signed by all appropriate parties which has proven effective (Appendix D). With the success of the joint appointments between the Seaborg Center and departments, we are hopeful that the process will be utilized between other academic units on campus as well.

Whatever successes these interdisciplinary programs have enjoyed in the College of Arts and Sciences at Bowling Green State University and in the College of Arts and Sciences at Northern Michigan University can be attributed to the hard work and dedication of the faculty and of the administration, as well as to the dual commitment of the parties to resource sharing and accountability. The difficult financial times ahead pose serious problems for interdisciplinary programs in particular. But it is hoped that the two-pronged approach which gave these programs strength will serve them well in future, difficult times.

**APPENDIX A**  
**INTERDISCIPLINARY AND PLANNED PROGRAMS:**  
**STRUCTURE, SUPPORT AND RESOURCES**

**I. Purpose of Proposal**

- A. Secure academic and organizational legitimacy for the programs.
- B. Improve communication and interaction with the college.
- C. Improve visibility, quality and diversity of the educational options available to students.

**II. Structure**

- A. Create the position of "Coordinator of Interdisciplinary and Planned Programs" to be filled by an Assistant/Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences. The principal responsibilities of this position will be:
  - 1. coordination and stimulation of interdisciplinary education in the college
  - 2. maintenance of on-going communication with the directors of the programs
  - 3. administration and allocation of resources
  - 4. program evaluation
- B. Appointment of directors for each of the programs on the basis of recommendations of the advisory committees and the Coordinator of Interdisciplinary and Planned Programs (3 year terms).
- C. Creation of Advisory Committees for each of the programs. Membership will be appointed by the dean on the basis of recommendations from the director and the Coordinator. Term of members will be fixed.

**III. Financial Resources**

- A. Creation of a fund of \$15,000, initially, to support the release of faculty to participate in the development of innovative course/curricular opportunities. This money would be used to compensate departments/schools—in the form of a part-time instructor—for releasing the faculty member from a course obligation to work on the developmental project or to teach a course which is a part of an interdisciplinary program but not part of the regular offerings of a faculty member's department/school. The source of the funds would be soft monies in the college.
- B. Creation of a minimum operating budget of \$500 (where none currently exists) for each of the interdisciplinary programs. This budget could be used by the director in whatever ways he/she thinks appropriate. This budget will be allocated by the Coordinator and this individual will be expected to demonstrate to the dean and college budget committee that the funds are contributing to the development and maintenance of a quality program.
- C. Provide each department/school to which the director of an interdisciplinary program is assigned with a \$200 supplement to its operating budget during the time period in which the faculty member serves as director of the program. This supplement is provided to the department/school as compensation for releasing the faculty member from other department/school service obligations so that he/she can devote time and energy to the development of the program.

**IV. Other Support**

- A. Encourage departments/schools to provide merit awards for faculty participating in interdisciplinary programs.
- B. Explore the development of faculty positions which would be joint appointments between departments/schools and interdisciplinary programs.
- C. List faculty participating in interdisciplinary programs in A & S News annually.

- D. Feature interdisciplinary programs in A & S Alumni Newsletter.
- E. Explore the possibility of changing tenure and promotion criteria to insure that credit for participation in interdisciplinary programs is provided in the personnel evaluation process.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **GUIDELINES FOR THREE-YEAR REVIEW OF INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS**

Following University and College of Arts and Sciences policy, each interdisciplinary program is to be reviewed once every three years. This triennial review is timed to coincide with the end of the program director's three-year term and precludes the annual review of the director's performance.

The review committee is to include three internal and three external members. Internal members are to be current members of the program's advisory committee (other than the director). External members will include a faculty member not on the advisory committee, a student and a representative of the Dean. The review committee is expected to seek input from the current director, faculty members who have been associated with the program, and current as well as former students.

Each review is to be limited to 10 pages and should address the following questions but not necessarily be limited to them:

#### **GENERAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT**

What have been the program's goals for the past three years and what is the assessment of the results?

What internal and external evidence is there of the program's quality?

Have there been any noteworthy innovations in the program since the last assessment?

#### **CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT**

How well is the curriculum meeting the goals of the program and the needs of the students?

How current is the curriculum? When was it last reviewed?

What are the curricular matters which need to be addressed in the next three years?

#### **STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND MATRICULATION**

How strong is student interest in the program?

How effective is student advising?

How effective is student placement out of the program?

### **INTER-UNIT SUPPORT FOR THE PROGRAM**

How many faculty (and from which departments) are actively involved in the program?

Do any joint appointments exist? If so, how successful have they been?

Do the cooperating departments favor continuance? Is expansion of the program a viable option?

### **ASSESSMENT OF THE DIRECTOR'S LEADERSHIP**

Has the director been effective in providing leadership and management of the program? In what specific ways?

How effectively have any support staff been professionally supervised?

Have available resources been effectively and efficiently used for the maintenance of the program? Please provide examples.

Has the program been effectively represented to internal and external constituencies? Please provide examples.

### **SUMMARY ASSESSMENT**

What are the program's major strengths and major weaknesses?

What are the major concerns to be addressed in the next three years?

Overall recommendation about the future of the program.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING AND EVALUATING JOINT APPOINTMENTS IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS/SCHOOLS AND INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS**

#### **Establishment of Joint Appointments**

1. A "joint appointment" is understood to refer here to the sharing of a faculty member's services between a department or school ("unit of appointment"] and an interdisciplinary program ("unit of assignment").
2. Demonstration of a need for a joint appointment and an interdisciplinary curricular commitment by both units must accompany any joint appointment request.



- 3, Two types of joint appointments may be made. Regular joint appointments are made when a faculty member will be rendering distinct and substantial service to each unit on a permanent basis. Term joint appointments are made when a faculty member will be rendering distinct and substantial service to each unit for a specific period of time. Term appointments are renewable.
4. The percentage of service to be rendered to each academic unit and the duration of the appointment will be specified on all initial statements of joint appointments and will be signed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the director of the appropriate interdisciplinary program and the chair/director of the department/school within which the faculty appointment resides. The annual contracts will specify the percentage of the assignments.

### **Evaluation or Joint Appointments**

Section B-1.4.D of the *Academic Charter* states:

"When a faculty member holds an interunit assignment, an appropriate evaluation by the unit in which the assignment is held should be submitted to the academic unit in which the faculty member holds an appointment."

The *Academic Charter* makes it clear that faculty on interunit or joint appointments are to be evaluated by appropriate groups within each unit. In accordance with the *Charter*, the following guidelines are established for determining reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit.

At each stage of the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, the department of appointment must consider formal evaluative information prepared by the appropriate advisory committee of the interdisciplinary program. Evaluative information must be weighed proportionally to the percentage of commitment the faculty member has to each academic unit at the time the evaluation takes place.

When a portion of a tenure-track appointment has been assigned to an interdisciplinary program, the program's advisory committee will assume the functions of a departmental personnel committee for:

- 1. The Annual Review For Reappointment.** In accordance with collegiate policy, the probationer is responsible for providing a current vita and other pertinent material for faculty review. The program director, or if the appointment under review is the program director, the chair of the advisory committee or his/her designate, will prepare a written assessment of the probationer's strengths and weaknesses in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The assessment will be based on accumulated materials and may be developed in a manner at the discretion of the interdisciplinary committee

The assessment prepared by the advisory committee will be forwarded to the Chair/Director of the unit of appointment. The department/school will then apply the reappointment policy it has in place with the addition that it will use the assessment presented by the interdisciplinary advisory committee as part of the accumulated record to be presented to the tenured faculty in the department. The tenured faculty of

the department/school will vote on the reappointment of the probationer. The Chair/Director will prepare a letter for the probationer summarizing the strengths and weaknesses as identified by faculty in both groups and will specify the vote of the tenured faculty in the department. The probationer will be invited to discuss the evaluation with the department/school Chair/Director. A copy of the final evaluation will be forwarded to the interdisciplinary advisory committee, which will in turn discuss the reappointment recommendation with the probationer.

2. **Annual Progress Toward Tenure Reviews.** At the conclusion of each academic year, the Chair/Director of the tenuring unit will submit an assessment of the probationer's progress toward tenure. The University-prescribed review of teaching, service, and research will be followed. The final evaluation will be completed following consultation with the program director (if appropriate) and/or the Program Advisory Committee. The probationer will sign the review acknowledging receipt of the joint appointment evaluation. The final statement will be communicated in writing to the probationer, Advisory Committee, Dean and VPAA
3. **Annual Evaluation of Merit.** All faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences are expected to complete an annual faculty update record. In the case where faculty members hold joint appointments, the department/school will determine the merit award based on the percentage of merit dollars allocated to the unit for the joint appointee. Merit for the portion of the joint appointment dedicated to the interdisciplinary program will be determined by the program director (if appropriate) and/or advisory committee and submitted to the College Office. The portion of the merit money generated by the percentage of the appointee's contract assigned to the interdisciplinary program will be held in the College Office.
4. **Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure.** Tenure on the faculty of BGSU may be attained by faculty members on a probationary appointment [*Charter* (B.1.3.B.2)]. The probationary period is provided as a trial-employment period to permit members of an academic unit to determine whether an appointment leading to tenure should continue. Thus, careful evaluation of the performance of each probationary faculty member on a joint appointment is of fundamental importance in order both to protect the rights of the probationer and to maintain or enhance the quality of the University and its interdisciplinary programs.

The candidate for tenure who has adhered to professional standards of ethics, is to be granted or denied tenure solely on the basis of exactly the same criteria as applied to all probationary faculty and specified in section B-I.4 of the *Charter* and Section 6.9 of the A&S Chair/Director Handbook. These criteria include teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative work, service to the University, and attainment of the terminal degree or its professional equivalent. Academic units or colleges may develop more precise statements of what is expected under each criterion, but may not add other criteria. All such statements of criteria or statements of equivalencies must be approved by the appropriate tenured faculties, must be made available to the probationary faculty members affected, and must be kept on file in the appropriate administrative offices. The responsibility for establishing evaluation procedures and for conducting the annual evaluations of probationary faculty members lies with the tenured faculty of the academic units to which the joint appointee is assigned and the Chair and Director

involved in each case. Participation by tenured faculty members in both groups is essential in order that the probationer develop a sense of the evaluative judgments of colleagues as well as those of the Chair and Director.

A probationer in the next to last year of probationary appointment shall be evaluated by the tenured faculty of the academic unit of appointment for the purpose of determining whether a recommendation for tenure will be made. In the case where a probationer is a joint appointee, the Dean of the College will broaden the assessment by appointing, in consultation with tenured members of the unit's faculty [*Charter*: B-I. 4C] and of the Advisory Committee of the unit of assignment, up to two tenured faculty members from the Advisory Committee of the interdisciplinary program to which the probationer is assigned. In all cases, appointments shall be made so as to maintain, as much as possible, discipline integrity.

An affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all tenured faculty of the broadened base shall be required to recommend that tenure be granted. Faculty from outside the department who are appointed by the Dean to broaden the assessment base shall be included in the vote.

Tenured faculty have the responsibility to vote in tenure decisions; an abstention or failure to vote has the same effect as a negative vote. A recommendation that tenure be granted shall be forwarded by the Chair or Director to the Dean, who shall approve or disapprove after viewing the recommendation of the appropriate faculty Advisory Committees. If the recommendation is approved at the college level, it shall be forwarded to the VPAA. Responsibility for recommending tenure to the President and Board of Trustees lies with the VPAA.

In the event that a probationary joint appointment is not renewed prior to acquisition of tenure, the University shall give written notice of its intention not to reemploy the affected faculty member in accord with the policies specified in the *Charter*. A probationer who wishes to appeal an adverse decision on the basis of alleged violation of academic freedom, discrimination, inadequate or inequitable consideration of professional competence, or failure to observe due process in decisions at the department, school, program, college or higher administrative level (including failure to meet *Charter* provisions for evaluation of probationary faculty or other failure to meet formal professional commitments), will be accorded a review employing the Grievance Arbitration Procedure as set forth in the *Charter*.

- 5. Evaluation for Promotion.** Evaluation of a joint appointee for possible promotion shall consist of a complete review of the faculty member's instructional, research, and service activity. The review and recommendation shall be carried out by the faculty of the department/school and its Chair or Director. Up to two members of the program's advisory committee, with the consent of the faculty of the academic unit of appointment and its Chair/Director, will serve as voting members of the personnel committee of that unit. This is to ensure that adequate and equitable consideration is given to the professional competence of the joint appointee as mandated by the *Charter*.

Joint appointments may require that alternate criteria be established as the basis for promotion. This is allowable if the faculty of the department/school, Interdisciplinary

Advisory Committee, Dean, and VPAA approve such an alternative. Whatever criteria are established must be equitable and appropriate and must not conflict with *Charter*-prescribed or collegiate-mandated criteria for academic ranks. Copies of all statements of evaluation procedures, criteria, and equivalencies must be maintained in appropriate administrative offices and made available to the joint appointee.

**Notes:**

1. The procedures outlined above are consistent with the *Charter* (B-1-4.D), which states that the formulation of procedures for evaluation related to merit, promotion, and tenure of faculty on joint appointments is the responsibility of the appropriate academic units, their Chairs and Directors, and the Dean. The execution of these procedures is the joint responsibility of the appropriate *faculties*, Chairs and Directors, Dean, and the VPAA.
2. Differences in the evaluation recommendations of the two academic units involved in joint appointments will be addressed by the Dean. A meeting of appropriate groups from the two units will be held in an attempt to reach a consensus.
3. Conditions of appointment and performance expectations of a joint appointee are to be established with the initiation of the appointment.
4. The policy does not preclude or address courtesy titles/appointments which are customarily made by the Dean.

**APPENDIX D**

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING  
THE ESTABLISHMENT AND EVALUATION  
OF A JOINT APPOINTMENT  
between  
THE DEPARTMENT OF \_\_\_\_\_  
AND THE SEABORG CENTER  
for  
\_\_\_\_\_**

It is hereby agreed that for the \_\_\_ - \_\_\_ of the academic year, \_\_\_\_\_ of the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ will hold a *joint appointment* between the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ and the Seaborg Center. The faculty member will devote \_\_\_\_\_ percent of his/her time to his responsibilities in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ percent of his/her time to new duties\* in the Seaborg Center, under the direction of' Peggy A. House, Director. The Department of \_\_\_\_\_ will be compensated up to \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for the cost of adjunct faculty needed to cover unstaffed instruction created by \_\_\_\_\_ 's released time.

At the end of the period of this *joint appointment*, a Personnel Sub-Committee of the Seaborg Center's Faculty Advisory Committee will initiate a formal evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_'s duties in the Seaborg Center in consultation with the Director of the Seaborg Center, the Head of the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ and the Evaluation Committee of the Department of \_\_\_\_\_. This evaluation will become part of \_\_\_\_\_'s permanent personnel file and will be used in future annual evaluations of \_\_\_\_\_ by the Department of \_\_\_\_\_.

It will be the responsibility of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to ensure that the evaluation process is followed through by all parties.

This agreement is renewable at the end of the \_\_ - \_\_ academic year upon mutual consent of the key parties.

**\*AS DESCRIBED IN THE ATTACHED SHEET.**

_____ Faculty Member	_____ Date
_____ Head, Department of	_____ Date
_____ Director of the Seaborg Center	_____ Date
_____ Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences	_____ Date
_____ Vice President for Academic Affairs	_____ Date