

Revisions to the Faculty Manual Relating to Joint Appointments**RPC 0405-2**

Date: 2/23/05

To: St. Olaf College Faculty

From: Bob Hanson, Chair, RPC

Re: Revision to the Faculty Manual Relating to Joint Appointments

At the March 2005 Faculty Meeting RPC will move the approval of the following revisions to the Faculty Manual. Proposed revisions are of two types: substantive changes and minor wording changes. Substantive changes involve new content specific to joint appointments or the deletion of content relating specifically to joint appointments. These are described in detail in the accompanying rationale. The minor changes all relate to references to a single department or chair and simply amount to allowing for the possibility of faculty being a member of more than one department. Minor changes are presented in tabular format. The entire proposed Faculty Manual, as revised, may be inspected at <http://www.stolaf.edu/people/hansonr/rpc/fm/0405-2.htm>

MINOR WORDING CHANGES

FM 4.VIII.D	second sentence	change <i>chair</i> to <i>chair(s)</i>
FM 4.IX.1	initial paragraph	change <i>department</i> to <i>department(s)</i>
FM 4.IX.7.b		change <i>candidate's department</i> to <i>candidate's department(s)</i> change <i>Department's Staffing Plan</i> to <i>staffing plan(s) of the department(s)</i>
FM 4.XI.2	first paragraph	change <i>department's members</i> to <i>members of the candidate's department(s)</i>
FM 4.XI.2	second paragraph	change <i>department's tenured members</i> to <i>tenured members of the candidate's department(s)</i>
FM 4.XI.4.d		change <i>department</i> to <i>department(s)</i> four places
FM 4.XI.4.e		change <i>department</i> to <i>department(s)</i>
FM 4.XI.4.f		change <i>department</i> to <i>department(s)</i>
FM 4.XI.4.i		delete <i>three</i> in first sentence; change <i>department</i> to <i>department(s)</i> two places
FM 4.XI.4.j		change <i>department</i> to <i>department(s)</i> two places
FM 4.XI.4.m		change <i>department</i> to <i>department(s)</i>
FM 4.XI.4.o		change to read: <i>The statement(s) on Significant Professional Activities of the candidate's department(s).</i>
FM 4.XI.7.b		change <i>Department Staffing Plan</i> to <i>staffing plan(s) of the department(s)</i>

SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES

FM 4.VI.D Joint Appointments [replace entire section]

For the purposes of this Manual, “joint appointment” refers to an appointment for which responsibility for appointment, reappointment, salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations shall be shared by more than one department. Assignment to teach courses in other departments or programs does not in and of itself confer joint appointment status.

1. In the case of appointments, the chairs of the appropriate departments, in consultation with the Associate Deans of the relevant Faculties, shall be responsible for:
 - (a) negotiating an agreement on the nature of the joint appointment;
 - (b) determining the procedures for recruitment and interviewing the candidates; and
 - (c) preparing a joint statement of expectations for teaching, professional activity, and service. This statement will be revised in the first year of appointment by the relevant chairs in consultation with the faculty member holding the appointment. This document will be made available to all members of the relevant departments.
2. Faculty members holding joint appointments shall be considered full members of each department to which they are appointed.
3. Except where a written agreement approved by the Dean of the College specifies other arrangements, the FTE of joint appointments are assigned in equal proportions to the relevant departments.

FM 4.VIII. Reappointments and Renewals

- C. [add sentence at end of this paragraph] In the case of a joint appointment, each chair shall submit an evaluation based on the candidate’s work in the chair’s department.
- D. 3. [add sentence at end of this paragraph] In the case of a joint appointment, each department shall solicit student evaluations.

FM 4.XI. Procedures for Granting Tenure and Promotion

1. [replace this subsection; first two sentences are unchanged] Recommendation for tenure and promotion shall usually be initiated by the department chair. The candidate’s Associate Dean or the Dean of the College may also initiate the candidacy. If the candidate is a department chair, recommendation for tenure or promotion shall be initiated by the individual’s Associate Dean, the Dean of the College, or a full professor appointed by the Dean. If the candidate holds a joint appointment, recommendation shall usually be initiated by the relevant department chairs jointly. [DELETED: In all cases, the initiator shall carry out the responsibilities normally assumed by the chair.]
4. The dossier shall contain only the documents described below...
 - c) [add sentence at end of this paragraph] In the case of a joint appointment, votes of the different departments involved will be tallied separately.
 - i) [add sentence after first sentence] In the case of a joint appointment, in reference to (2), above, the candidate may choose one peer reviewer per department. Similarly, in reference to (3), each department involved may select a tenured member from their department to review the candidate’s teaching in that department.
 - j) [add sentence at end of this paragraph] In the case of tenure in a joint appointment, these individuals will also be given the portion of the joint statement germane to professional activity described in section 4.VI.D.1.c.

- m) [add sentence at end of this paragraph] In the case of a joint appointment, the initiators shall write their letters independently.
- p) [add new subsection] In the case of tenure in a joint appointment, the joint statement of expectations for teaching, professional activity, and service described in section 4.VI.D.1.c.
- q) [add new subsection] In the case of tenure in a joint appointment, a letter from each of the chairs of the relevant departments specifically addressing the joint statement of expectations for teaching, professional activity, and service described in section 4.VI.D.1.c in relation to his or her department.

12. Each candidate's dossier shall be treated with strict confidentiality by those authorized to review it.

- a) The initiator of the candidacy, the candidate's Associate Dean(s), the members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Dean of the College, and the President shall have access to the dossier for evaluation of the candidate, except as noted in Section 4.XI.12.c, below.
- b) [unchanged] The candidate may request at any time a discussion with the initiator of the candidacy, Associate Dean(s), the Dean of the College, or the President regarding the general contents of the dossier. In such discussions, the participants shall strive to keep the names of individuals who have contributed to the dossier confidential.
- c) The letters referred to in Sections 4.XI.4.m and 4.XI.4.n will only be made available to the candidate's Associate Dean(s), the Dean of the College, the President, and the members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- d) In the event of an appeal by the candidate, and with the consent of the candidate, the Faculty Review Committee shall have access to the entire dossier if so requested.

Rationale for Revisions to the Faculty Manual Relating to Joint Appointments

Although the Faculty Manual has language that deals directly with joint appointments, it is insufficient in several ways. The areas of particular concern with regard to joint appointments include:

- the Faculty Manual lacks a clear definition of “joint appointment”;
- the language in current FM 4.VI.D.2, relating to disagreements among relevant departments is no longer applicable;
- in the case of joint appointments, there is a need for specific documentation regarding expectations for teaching, professional activity, and service in terms of how the individual’s work will be divided among two or more departments;
- the procedures for tenure (and promotion) do not adequately address the case of a joint appointment; and
- the procedures for the comprehensive review at the end of the second and fourth years suffer from the same problems as the procedures for tenure.

Definition of “Joint Appointment”

FM 4.VI.D is rewritten entirely. In this section we define “joint appointment” as an appointment for which “responsibility for appointment, reappointment, salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations shall be shared by more than one academic unit of the College.” Former subsection FM 4.VI.D.3 is folded into the first paragraph of the proposed section FM 4.VI.D. New sections FM 4.VI.D.2 and FM 4.VI.D.3 address specify that joint appointees be considered full members of their multiple departments and that the FTE distribution between or among those departments be clear from the beginning and throughout the appointment.

Disagreements

In the opinion of RPC, the section of the Faculty Manual relating to disagreements between departments in relation to joint appointments and recommendations for appointment, salary, tenure, or promotion (FM 4.VI.D.2) is no longer necessary or is dealt with better already in other parts of the Manual.

Documentation

In FM 4.VI.D.1, changes clarify the process by which a joint appointment is created. The most significant change is the addition of the requirement that, at the time of appointment, the departments agree on a “joint statement of teaching, professional activity, and service,” and that this statement be reviewed and possibly revised during the individual’s first year of service. It is our belief that this will provide documentation that will be helpful as individuals move through their pre-tenure years. This document will also play a role in the candidate’s tenure dossier. (See below.) We believe this document is an acceptable alternative to requiring every department seeking a joint appointment to rewrite its Statement of Significant Professional Activity. This statement will be made available at least to all members of all relevant departments so that all involved are aware of any special considerations that might be involved in the joint appointment.

Reappointment

There are additional changes to FM 4.VIII.C and FM 4.VIII.D.3 pertaining to the procedures for reappointment. In this case, the currently described procedures for the comprehensive review at the end of the second and fourth years suffer from the same problems as the procedures for tenure. We believe the simplest solution is to (a) allow each relevant department to conduct its own review and (b) require each chair to submit his or her own recommendation.

Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

The procedures for tenure (and promotion) defined in FM 4.XI currently do not address joint appointments. The first recommended change, in FM 4.XI.1 is to specify that the initiation of the candidacy normally should be a joint effort of the relevant department chairs. This adds some access issues that are addressed below.

A second change, in FM 4.XI.4.c, specifies that in the case of tenure, the votes by tenured members of the departments relevant to a joint appointment be tallied separately so that in the dossier there is a record of how members each individual department voted.

A third change, in FM 4.XI.4.i, specifies that each department may identify an additional tenured member of their departments to review the candidate’s teaching. We don’t believe that this should be a requirement since, in many cases, the reviewers selected by the candidate and the relevant departments will suffice.

A fourth recommended change involves the inclusion of the document specified in FM 4.VI.D.1 (described above) in two places in the tenure dossier. In a revision to FM 4.XI.4.j, the outside evaluators will have access to the part of this document relating to the candidate’s professional activity. In two new sections, FM 4.XI.4.p and 4.XI.4.q, this entire document is now to be included in the dossier, along with letters from the relevant chairs that relate this document to the general expectations for teaching, professional activity, and service within their respective departments. In this section *tenure* (as opposed to *promotion*) is specified because we felt that this document would probably not be of importance in promotion to Associate Professor or Professor.

Finally, it was pointed out in committee that the current practice of chairs not having access to the letter written by the Associate Dean is not supported by the current Faculty Manual text. To remedy this, and to make clear that the letters from one department chair in the case of joint appointments should not be accessible to other department chairs, we propose adding FM 4.XI.12.c and relabeling the current FM 4.XI.12.c as FM 4.XI.12.d. We add the word “entire” in that section to make it clear that the Faculty Review Committee will have access the entire dossier.