

MINUTES
Faculty of Arts & Sciences Meeting
October 6, 2020, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
Via Zoom teleconference

Dean Maria Donoghue Velleca welcomed faculty to the monthly meeting which was called to order at 3:30 p.m. with 123 participants (and which later reached 131 participants). She asked that faculty wishing to comment or ask a question put their name and department in the Zoom chat function. She indicated that she would be using Robert's Rules of Order's provision for unanimous consent for some items.

I. Approval of minutes from meeting of faculty on September 1, 2020

Dean Donoghue-Velleca asked whether there were any objections to approving the minutes of the September meeting. Seeing no objections, the minutes were approved.

II. Report from the Dean (Maria Donoghue Velleca)

Dean Donoghue Velleca noted that faculty had just been sent an email that Athletics Director Samantha Huge had stepped down and that President Rowe's Chief of Staff Jeremy Martin would be acting as Interim Athletics Director. She noted that she had been struck by how much faculty care about the athletics program and their willingness to participate broadly in the workings of the university.

The dean said that William & Mary will be issuing bonds, as described at the Board of Visitors meeting in September, to update facilities and cover the budget shortfall. She noted that the current fiscal year budget had not yet been set, but that she was working with chairs and program directors on budgeting. She said that while higher education had not been cut much by Virginia's General Assembly, there was an expectation that there will be less funding in the coming fiscal year.

Dean Donoghue Velleca noted W&M was doing well in terms of its COVID-19 case numbers and that the current dashboard showed only five active student cases. Employee numbers have increased slightly; she encouraged anyone who was feeling unwell to stay home.

The Dean said that she had put out a call for departments and programs to make requests for new faculty hiring next year, though she indicated that it was unlikely that A&S would have many (or even any) of its requests granted. She noted that Non Tenure Eligible (NTE) faculty would be eligible for promotion to senior lecturer this year and that she had been trying to advocate for Arts & Sciences in this regard.

Dean Donoghue Velleca emphasized the stress that the COVID-19 epidemic had placed on staff, who are doing more than they have ever done in ways they have never done it. She said that she was seeking to use the Mission Critical Exemption to hire a coordinator for all the departmental administrators and would ask Council of Chairs and Program Directors (CCPD) on Thursday where their departments could use more help.

Dean Donoghue Velleca noted that students reported mixed experiences with classes this fall but the overall experience was good. She said that graduate students were worried about going on a depressed job market and were concerned about the expiration of their funding. She said that the President's Cabinet had spent a lot of time discussing what the upcoming Presidential election felt like as well as the issue of graffiti on campus.

Dean Donoghue Velleca said that the Chief Human Resources Officer, Christopher Lee had announced options for staff to take time off to deal with the stress of the pandemic, and for a “strategic pause” in departments and programs in December and January, though there is some discussion about how that will apply to Arts & Sciences.

III. Report from the Faculty Assembly (David Armstrong)

David Armstrong (Physics), the chair of the Faculty Assembly, reported that the FA had formed an ad hoc working group on the Scheduled Semester Research Leave (SSRL) policy and was seeking to look more broadly at the definition of “research active” in different programs and schools and to define how to improve research activity. This working group will involve all of the deans of the academic teams, the dean of the libraries to representatives from FA, the Vice President for Research, the Senior Associate Provost for planning, etc., with the Provost as chair. The FA has suggested people to serve on this committee, including Suzanne Raitt (English) from Arts & Sciences and Tracy Cross from the School of Education. Prof. Armstrong noted that a group of faculty were gathering information about research leave policies at peer institutions.

Likewise, he noted that the FA had also formed a working group on NTE faculty divisions, which was gathering information on NTE policy across W&M’s faculties. He added that the FA had also designated a working group on the President’s pilot plan on diversity hiring to look at the reports from individual programs on their reaction to that policy, and that this group was meeting with Chief Diversity Officer Chon Glover. He noted that the hiring policy was designed to improve hiring practices over the next three years. Prof. Armstrong also noted that there was a subgroup working on revisions to W&M’s Title IX policy as well as continuing revisions to the Faculty Handbook.

Finally, regarding the issues with the W&M Athletics Department, he noted that President Rowe had tasked FA with coming up with a core group of faculty who would be working closely with the Athletics Director during the newly announced listening period regarding the seven cancelled athletics teams that would take place over the next five or six weeks. He indicated that he expected that FA would be working to provide faculty input on the reconsideration of the decisions on the seven varsity sports.

II.a. and III.a. Questions for the Dean and Faculty Assembly Chair

At this point Dean Donoghue Velleca realized that she had not taken questions after her earlier report and asked for questions on the reports. Christy Porter (Psychological Sciences) asked whether NTE promotions would be paused across all ranks and schools and whether there would be a parallel pause for tenured faculty as well. Dean Donoghue Velleca indicated that there will be no pause in NTE promotions and the only way that she would support such a pause would be if it occurred across W&M.

Pieter Peers (Computer Science) asked Prof. Armstrong for an update on the FA’s progress on the Consensual Amorous Relations policy as it applies to graduate students. Prof. Armstrong replied that he had not heard from the committee that was revising that policy, but that it was on the agenda.

Suzanne Hagedorn (English) asked the Dean about the status of Phi Beta Kappa Memorial Hall renovation project, since she had heard that the current structure had been sitting outside so long that the exposed steel girders might be deteriorating and the project might require more money than currently budgeted. Dean Donoghue Velleca replied that the supplemental budget

for this project was \$16 million which was approved by the General Assembly and the money for both that project and the music building renovation were a done deal.

Regarding the athletics issues, Prof. Hagedorn indicated that she was happy that the motions that she had pre-circulated to A&S faculty regarding the vote of no confidence in former Athletics Director Samantha Huge and the recommendation that the President and Board of Visitors dismiss or accept her resignation were no longer relevant, but that since there was no indication that the administration would create a formal task force to review athletics as a whole or would reinstate cancelled teams during a comprehensive review of all programs, she still hoped to bring the third and fourth motions that she had pre-circulated the day before at the end of the meeting during New Business since there were deadlines for athletes to commit to teams in early November, before the next A&S meeting. She noted that it was particularly hard on the athletes that the decision to cut the teams had been announced in early September, after they had already paid tuition and room and board; if the decision had been announced in August, before classes started, they could have decided to take a gap year. Dean Donoghue Velleca noted that this item was not currently on the agenda. Prof. Hagedorn noted that she would not be making a motion to put the pre-circulated motions ahead of current business on the agenda but wished to bring the motions during New Business at the end of the meeting.

John “Rio” Riofrio (Modern Languages, Hispanic Studies) noted that for the last 19 weeks there had been student protests for the Black Lives Matter movement and that there were issues about liberalism and white supremacy that had been raised in graffiti on campus. He noted that those issues were also intertwined with issues of equity in athletics. Prof. Riofrio pointed out that the Center for Liberal Arts had been holding conversations about these issues several times per month, but that he had not heard anything reflective of that in the Faculty Assembly Report. Prof. Armstrong noted that the hiring initiative did relate to diversity, and that he had not heard about the graffiti on campus. He said he would welcome input from faculty on issues that Faculty Assembly should be taking up.

Mike Jabbur (Art & Art History) asked the dean to clarify her earlier statement about the call for new hires. Dean Donoghue Velleca indicated that she had asked chairs and program directors to re-evaluate the positions that they had requested last spring in light of mission critical criteria. She indicated that she did not think it likely that A&S would receive many positions, but hoped there would be some.

IV. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee (Josh Burk)

Josh Burk (Psychological Sciences) indicated that there had been issues with limited accessibility to the Watson Lab for testing accommodation. He said that Peter McHenry (Economics) was undertaking a survey of Tenure-Eligible faculty hiring related to diversity. He noted that that the FAC had oversight of the elected and appointed A&S committees.

V. Report from the Council of Chairs and Program Directors (Josh Gert & Rob Hinkle)

Rob Hinkle (Chemistry) noted that the CCPD was not an elected body, but that it was composed of appointed chairs and program directors who met regularly with the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the contact deans to offer input on future plans. He said that the CCPD had provided a response to the President’s memo on diversity in hiring. He added that co-chairs of the committee were elected on a calendar year rotation and the next election would take place in November to select new co-chairs. Prof. Hinkle stated that the athletics issue had been a late

addition to CCPD's recent agenda and that they had also been discussing student wellness as the semester moves forward without a Fall Break.

VI. Nominations and Elections (Rani Mullen & Thomas Payne)

The committee announced the newly-elected members of the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CDEI): Area 1: Leisa Meyer; Area 2: Iyabo Obasanjo; Area 3: Gene Tracy; NTE: Dana Lashley. The following people will also be serving on the committee: Undergrad student rep: Malik Obeidallah; Graduate student rep: Ravynn Stringfield; Staff member: Jabria Craft.

VII. Report from RPT (Jeff Nelson)

On behalf of the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, Jeff Nelson (Physics) thanked the members of the committee from the past year. He noted that the committee had not considered any retention cases during the past year. They had considered ten tenure cases and had forwarded nine unanimous (6-0) positive recommendations and one split-vote (4-2) positive recommendation to the Dean. The Dean and Provost made similar positive recommendations in all cases. All ten candidates received endorsement from the Board of Visitors and were granted tenure.

For the fall of 2019 and spring of 2020, Prof. Nelson reported that the committee reviewed three cases for tenure of advanced hires. The RPT forwarded three unanimous positive recommendations to the Dean and Provost, and all three were granted tenure.

Prof. Nelson reported that in the fall of 2019 and spring of 2020, the committee reviewed eight cases for promotion of Associate Professors to the rank of Professor. The RPT forwarded eight unanimous positive recommendations to the Dean. Both the Dean and Provost made similar positive recommendations in all cases. All nine candidates received endorsement from the Board of Visitors and were promoted to the rank of Professor. He also noted that the committee had endorsed eight departmental recommendations for Emeritus status.

Prof. Nelson said that in 2019-20, the RPT Committee, based on prior agreement from Dean Conley and Provost Halleran, moved away from a "does not meet"/"meets"/"exceeds" concluding assessment for each category of evaluation (scholarship/teaching/service) and moved to "meets"/"does not meet" as the RPT assessment rubric. He said that while 2019-20 was marked by some improvements in the quality and thoroughness of dossiers assembled and electronically submitted to the RPT Blackboard site for review, in the majority of cases RPT still received incomplete or disorganized dossiers.

He said that in 11 of 20 cases, RPT had to ask for required information that was missing from the dossiers. He noted the various problems with dossiers, which are detailed in the committee's annual report and said that the RPT had produced an annotated copy of the Dean's Memo on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure that outlined and frequent issues in dossiers, which was initially presented during the 2020 A&S Pre-Tenure Forum. Prof. Nelson noted that the three guiding documents for the preparation of a dossier continue to be the departmental/program personnel policies, the Dean's memo on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, and the Faculty Handbook. On behalf of the RPT Committee, he urged each Department Chair, Program Director, and candidate to read thoroughly each of these documents before assembling dossiers and selecting external reviewers for the 2020-2021 academic year. He asked for questions.

Rowan Lockwood (Geology) pointed out that the instructions are twelve pages long and very detail-oriented; she suggested a coversheet with checkboxes so that those submitting dossiers could easily check on completeness.

VIII. Two motions from Educational Policy Committee (Josh Erlich & Mike Deschenes):

The Educational Policy Committee represented by Josh Erlich (Physics) made the following two motions to the Faculty of Arts & Sciences on behalf of the Department of Kinesiology & Health Sciences:

Motion #1:

The Bachelor's of Arts degree in the Department of Kinesiology & Health Sciences will be eliminated. There will be a sunset period during which current Kinesiology & Health Sciences majors eligible to receive the B.A. degree will be grandfathered in the program. Beginning Fall 2020 no new students will be admitted as majors in the Kinesiology & Health Sciences B.A. programs.

Motion #2:

The Bachelor of Science degree in Health Sciences will be renamed the "Bachelor of Science in Human Health."

In explaining the motions, the committee said that the department was getting rid of the B.A. program as part of its long-term change from the Department of Kinesiology to the Department of Kinesiology and Health Sciences and its transition to becoming a STEM-focused department. The committee asked for questions to the motions.

Tom Payne (Music) asked whether the department planned to remain in Area II or would be going to Area III instead. Mike Deschenes (Kiniseology & Health Sciences) said that the department was divided between natural scientists and social sciences, but would probably remain where it is at present. Suzanne Hagedorn (English) asked whether these changes had to be approved by the State Council on Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV) and whether the name change for the department had been approved already. Prof. Deschenes indicated that he had been working with Susan Bosworth on the name change for the department and major, which had been approved by W&M a few years back but had not been approved by SCHEV yet; the name change and these curricular changes would be going to SCHEV once A&S had approved them.

There was no debate on the motions, which both passed as a block with no nays.

IX. Presentation of a motion from FAC for an updated JAMOU policy (Jennifer Bickham-Mendez and Fred Corney)

The committee members explained that it had been formed because the last policy on Joint Appointment Memos of Understanding had been passed in 2001. They gave an overview of the new policy (which is presented in the appendix to the minutes) and asked for questions. Leisa Meyer (History) asked about whether programs could be potential tenure homes. Prof. Corney (History) and Bickham-Mendez (Sociology) replied that the working group had discussed it but that was a change that needed to be approved by SCHEV. John Swaddle (Biology) asked about whether JAMOUs between A&S and other units had been considered.

The committee members replied that they had only addressed JAMOU's within A&S in the document. Various faculty members asked questions and expressed concerns about the status of JAMOU's and whether faculty who were hired under them could terminate these agreements. After some discussion, the committee moved to adopt the policy, which passed with a clear majority vote.

X. New business and XI. Adjourn

Since the meeting was now beyond its stated time, Dean Donoghue Velleca asked for a motion to adjourn. Prof. Hagedorn made a motion to extend the meeting by fifteen minutes to discuss the motion on the athletics task force and reinstatement of teams as New Business; the motion died for lack of a second. Another faculty member made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded and passed with a majority of yes votes and one no vote. The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne Hagedorn, Secretary to the Faculty of Arts & Sciences.

Attachment (JAMOU Policy)

(See the attached file with the policy adopted at the October 6th meeting)

Appendix with Proposed Motions on Athletics

These four motions were pre-circulated to members of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences by Suzanne Hagedorn (English) prior to the meeting and were intended to come before the meeting as New Business; Motions #1 and #2 became moot due to the announcement of Athletics Director Samatha Huge's departure prior to the meeting: Motions #2 and #3 were not introduced at the October 6 meeting due to time constraints, but became moot because of the Faculty Assembly's consideration of similar motions at their meetings of October 13th and 20th and their decision to create a Faculty Athletics Task Force.

Whereas, on Friday, September 18, William & Mary Athletics Director Samantha Huge publicly admitted that she had copied language from Stanford University in announcing cuts to W&M's Athletics teams without any acknowledgement of these borrowings, an act that, if committed by a student, would result in charges of violating the W&M Honor Code on grounds of plagiarism,

and

whereas, Ms. Huge created a strategic plan for W&M Athletics that laid the groundwork for a "strategic realignment" to focus on football and basketball without consulting widely among W&M faculty, in violation of the norms of shared governance at this institution,

Be it resolved that

We, the members of Faculty of Arts & Sciences at the College of William & Mary in Virginia here assembled in this body express our lack of confidence in Ms. Huge's continued leadership of W&M Athletics.

Motion #2:

Be It Further Resolved That:

We call upon W&M President Katherine Rowe and the W&M Board of Visitors to dismiss or accept the resignation of Ms. Huge as soon as possible and replace her with a new Athletics Director.

Motion #3

Be It Further Resolved That

We call upon W&M President Katherine Rowe and the W&M Board of Visitors to appoint a new Athletics Task Force with significant representation of W&M faculty, staff, and students to create a new strategic plan for W&M Athletics.

Motion #4

Be It Further Resolved That

We recommend that while this Athletics Task Force undertakes its work, the action of September 3 be reversed and the teams that were cut be reinstated, pending further review and consideration by the Task Force.



Faculty of Arts & Sciences **Joint Appointment Policy**

- I. BACKGROUND
- II. JAMOU
 - 2.1 Definition of Home and Host Units
 - 2.2 Existing JAMOU Arrangements
- III. MOU
- IV. GUIDING PRINCIPLES
- V. PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTING JAMOUS
 - 5.1 Templates for Joint Appointments
 - 5.1.1. Equally Shared Joint Appointments
 - 5.1.2. Program-Based Joint Appointments
 - 5.1.3. Department-based Joint Appointments
 - 5.2. The Letter of Intent and the JAMOU
 - 5.3. Evaluation of Joint Appointees
 - 5.3.1. Clarification of Home Unit Responsibility
 - 5.3.2. Holistic evaluation
 - 5.4. Provisions for Revising the JAMOU
- VI. ROLE OF THE DEAN

I. BACKGROUND

Arts & Sciences (henceforth A&S) has had an explicit policy on joint appointments of faculty and joint arrangements of resources among schools, departments, and programs since 2000, revised in 2001. In the two decades since, the number and types of Joint Appointment Memoranda of Understanding (JAMOU) and Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) respectively have increased substantially in both number and complexity.

This document supplants the 2001 policy and covers JAMOU and MOUs in so far as the latter are salient to the implementation of the former. Given the myriad JAMOU and MOUs in place, A&S must ensure that policies and procedures be tailored to the many inter-unit arrangements while respecting all relevant A&S guidelines regarding the evaluation of merit, tenure, promotion, and retention.

II. JAMOU

2.1 Definition of Home and Host Units

Academic units are designated as either home units or host units when faculty and teaching resources are shared. The definitions and arrangements are as follows.

Home units are departments or schools in which a tenure-eligible faculty member's tenure resides. Faculty members with joint appointments will have full rights and privileges consistent with their tenure status and rank in the home unit unless otherwise specified in the JAMOU.

Host units are departments, programs, or schools in which a faculty member holds an appointment in addition to the home unit named in the JAMOU. Host units, tenuring or non-tenuring, rely on JAMOU for sharing faculty resources between programs and departments that are tied to an individual faculty member, hereinafter the joint appointee.

JAMOU holders may have a continuing appointment if they are tenured or tenure-eligible (TTE) faculty. Joint appointees may have a fixed-term, renewable appointment if they are non-tenure eligible (NTE) faculty, or in rare cases, TE faculty. The various arrangements for sharing tenure lines, teaching power, and service become germane when it comes to evaluating joint appointees. Although much of what follows below applies to inter-school arrangements, we will focus exclusively on inter-unit arrangements within A&S.

2.2 Existing JAMOU Arrangements

1. **Equally Shared JAMOU:** The tenure line is allocated *equally* to the home unit and the host unit. Both units conduct the search jointly for the joint appointee. All faculty-specific evaluations with regard to merit, retention, tenure, and promotion reside jointly with, and are equally shared by, both units.
2. **Program-based JAMOU:** The tenure line is allocated *to the host unit*, and the host unit conducts the search for the joint appointee. Potential home units are involved at some point in the search process with a view to their participation in the joint appointment. For all faculty-specific evaluations with regard to merit, retention, tenure, and promotion, the host unit provides input, and the home unit renders a decision. As programs cannot grant tenure, this arrangement involves asymmetries of power. Departments bear certain costs (the labor involved in tenure and promotion review, often providing office space, and travel funds) and benefits (extra courses in the Department, some service duties, enrichment of interdisciplinary and intellectual depth, and often the diversity of their unit) from the joint appointee. Programs do not have the power to grant or deny tenure or promotion, but they benefit from the teaching and service of the joint appointee. This can generate confusion and conflict between the units.
3. **Department-based JAMOU:** The tenure line *already resides in a home unit* and a faculty member pledges, with home-unit consent, a portion of their workload to another department or program for an indefinite or agreed-upon period of time.

III. MOU

MOUs are complex agreements between programs and departments or between departments. These agreements may variously stipulate the creation of faculty lines, or the promise of courses by a department to a program's curriculum, or a combination of both. Existing MOU agreements generally take one of the following three forms:

1. A new tenure line is *allocated to the host unit* but resides with the home unit, and the division of faculty resources is course-specific. Home units agree to

offer a specified number and type of courses in exchange for the tenure line. All faculty-specific evaluations thereby reside in the Department.

2. A new tenure line is *allocated to the home unit*, but with specific course obligations to the host unit.
3. A tenure line is not involved, but two departments or a department and a program agree to ensure adequate courses for both sets of majors.

IV. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following guiding principles inform A&S joint appointment policy.

The first four principles address the need to recognize the multiplicity of joint appointments and craft nuanced arrangements for implementation:

1. Home and host units must agree on the distribution and evaluation of research, teaching, and service obligations of the joint appointee. Formalized procedures for implementation, appropriately detailed and contextualized, and clearly formulated, must be included in the JAMOU and any addendum. These aforementioned procedures for the implementation of the conditions of the JAMOU must be specified in the JAMOU.
2. Where a JAMOU involves a joint line between a Department and Program (***Shared JAMOU***), the JAMOU must be agreed upon by all parties and appended as an addendum to the Letter of Intent (LOI) by the start date of the joint appointee.
3. Where a JAMOU involves a line allocated to a Program and housed in a Department for the purposes of retention, tenure, and promotion (***Program-based JAMOU***), the JAMOU must be agreed upon by all parties and appended as an addendum to the LOI by the start date of the joint appointee.
4. Where a JAMOU involves the allocation of single or multiple courses or service to a Program (***Department-based JAMOU***) by an established faculty member in a Department, the JAMOU must be signed by all parties at the time of agreement.

The next two principles ensure transparent and fair implementation of the JAMOU:

5. The home unit, by current SCHEV policy, takes the lead in the overall judgment for retention, tenure, and promotion since it has leadership of the tenure decision even where the tenure line itself is not allocated to it.
6. The JAMOU shall be reviewed every three years. If there are serious disagreements between a host unit and a home unit, or between the joint appointee and either unit, these must be arbitrated by an external peer body or the Dean. (see Section VI for details).

The next two principles deal with the need for an equitable allocation of teaching power and related resources:

7. Travel and research funds should come from both units, but the total should not exceed those provided by Departments for singly-appointed faculty. Decisions about office space and/or research space must be agreed upon by both units.
8. The service and teaching power of jointly appointed faculty are in many cases essential for Programs' sustainability and day-to-day operations. To fulfill their mission, many programs rely heavily on these joint appointees for their service and teaching power. Programs must therefore be made aware in advance of joint appointees' leave schedules. Teaching releases offered as compensation for service as chairs or program directors must be negotiated with the input of all stakeholders.

The final two principles underscore the need to harmonize faculty-related policies within FAS and across the College:

9. There shall be no inconsistencies between the joint appointment policies specified herein and any other relevant policies or procedures emanating from departments, programs, the Dean's Office, and the Faculty Handbook. Interdisciplinary programs must have approved policies and procedures with appropriately specified criteria for granting the status of affiliate faculty who enjoy voting rights on personnel matters pertaining to jointly appointed faculty.

10. All communication from the Dean pertaining to merit, retention, tenure and promotion of a joint appointee shall be distributed to all relevant Chairs and Directors.

V. PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTING JAMOUS

5.1 *Elements of Joint Appointments*

5.1.1 Equally Shared Joint Appointments

In the case of a Shared joint appointment, agreement will be sought at the time of authorization as to which units must approve the selection of a continuing joint appointee. Under no circumstances can a negative vote by the home unit against offering a Shared joint appointee a position in that unit be overridden. The same is true of an offer of a continuing joint appointment in the host unit. Shared Joint Appointments will be reviewed by all parties regularly, at intervals specified in the JAMOU.

5.1.2 Program-Based Joint Appointments

For program-based joint appointments, the home unit may be unknown at the time of authorization. This arrangement may include a number of potential departments. Such positions will be advertised with a list of possible disciplines corresponding to possible home (tenuring) units. Since the home unit is not specified at the time of authorization, it is imperative for all potential stakeholders to agree upon the broad terms of the joint appointment before candidates are interviewed. The expectations accompanying the joint appointment, as they pertain to both participating units, will be clearly conveyed to all candidates. Whenever possible, the search committee should include voting members of the host unit and all possible home units. Under no circumstances can a negative vote in the host unit or a home unit on offering a Program-based joint position be overridden. Program-based Joint Appointments will be reviewed by all parties regularly, at intervals specified in the JAMOU.

5.1.3 Department-based Joint Appointments

For Department-based Joint Appointments, the home unit may be approached by another Department Chair or a Program Director with a view to a Department faculty member becoming a Joint Appointee in that host unit. The precise expectations of the joint appointment, as they pertain to both participating units, will be clearly laid out in the JAMOU. Department-based Joint Appointments will be reviewed by all parties regularly, at intervals specified in the JAMOU.

5.2. *The Letter of Intent and the JAMOU*

For a newly hired joint appointee, the Letter of Intent will be issued by the Dean's Office, together with a draft JAMOU drawn up on the basis of a JAMOU checklist (see Appendix I), after consultation with the Chairs and Directors of all pertinent home and host units. The draft JAMOU, which will accompany the Letter of Intent, must be reviewed carefully by the faculty member, relevant department chairs, program directors, and deans for each continuing or fixed-term joint appointment. This initial JAMOU shall, at the minimum, stipulate 1) major expectations for appointees in the areas of teaching, research, and service, 2) any agreements on the allocation of resources (including office space, operating support, start-up funds, indirect costs, etc.), 3) the schedule for regular review of the JAMOU, 4) expectations for the replacement of courses during leaves (SSRL and mid-probationary), 5) the terms and mechanisms whereby a JAMOU may be renegotiated, and 6) that total service expectations will not exceed the expectations for non-jointly appointed faculty. A finalized JAMOU will be signed on or before the newly hired faculty member's start date.

5.3. *Evaluation of Joint Appointees*

The following provide clear and specific guidelines for collaborative evaluation of joint appointees by home units and host units for merit, retention, tenure, and promotion. As a principle, singly appointed faculty and jointly appointed faculty should be evaluated on comparable standards for retention, tenure, and promotion as much as possible.

The chair of the home department in A&S and the dean, chair, or director of all host units will consult regularly about the status and well-being of their joint appointees and will carefully review the effectiveness of communications and procedures relative to workloads, assignments of teaching and service responsibility, and other actions that affect joint appointees. It is particularly important that those in supervisory relationships to joint appointees keep in mind the impact of decisions they make on other units. Chairs and directors should not, as a matter of routine, make unilateral decisions that have substantive impacts on the workload, schedule, or expectations of jointly appointed faculty without consultation with their counterparts in the units affected. Examples might include approval of leaves, external work for pay, or administrative reassignments.

5.3.1. Clarification of Home Unit Responsibility

The Dean's Office will notify the home unit and the host unit simultaneously of any impending personnel actions. The responsibility of the home unit in A&S refers to its primary responsibility for overseeing the process of evaluation of the joint appointee for merit, retention, tenure, and promotion. For RPT, the home unit is responsible for submitting the dossier containing all the required documents to the Dean's Office in a timely manner. The home unit will work collaboratively with the host unit and will

include the host unit in establishing time-lines for the completion of each stage of the review process. If the host unit feels that the home unit has not taken its input adequately into account, the host unit may appeal to the Dean.

Both units shall observe the agreed-upon terms and implementational procedures in the JAMOU and its addendum. It is essential that joint appointees be evaluated in the context of and in a manner consistent with the programmatic, educational, and scholarly expectations defined in both the Letter of Intent and the JAMOU. Where interdisciplinary activity is explicitly involved, any interdisciplinary standards to be applied must be specified in the JAMOU or its implementational procedures

5.3.2. Holistic evaluation

All evaluations of jointly appointed faculty for merit and for retention, tenure, and promotion shall be made in a spirit of good faith such that the performance of the joint appointee is evaluated holistically in the broad context of his/her various roles. The emphasis by the Faculty Assembly on collaborative evaluation strongly implies a broad view as well as on-going communication between home and host units. Evaluators should see the work of a jointly appointed faculty member as contributing to the strength and diversity of home and host units and of the College, as well as enhancing the educational depth and breadth of our students.

5.4 Provisions for Revising the JAMOU

JAMOUS will be reviewed by all parties every three years or at intervals specified in the JAMOU.

In the case of Shared JAMOUS, if substantive issues arise that necessitate the revision or renegotiation of the JAMOU, this must be done in ways that do not disadvantage either of the sharing units. If any jointly appointed faculty decides, for compelling reasons, to separate from the host unit, this would require a renegotiation of the JAMOU which must involve careful consideration of the needs of both units, and carries with it the possibility of reassignment of the joint appointee, termination of the employment contract, and adequate compensation for the losing host unit.

In the case of Program-Based JAMOUS, if substantive issues arise that necessitate the revision or renegotiation of the JAMOU, this must be done in ways that do not disadvantage the program in which the original line originated. The home department has no claim to the host unit line if the JAMOU ceases to apply.

In the case of Department-based JAMOUS, there is no implied permanent commitment to the Program, unless explicitly stipulated in the JAMOU. A faculty member's decision to return to their home (tenuring) department carries no pledge by the Department of teaching restitution for courses lost by the Program.

VI. ROLE OF THE DEAN

Clearly, joint appointments require an active posture by the Dean since the joint appointee's status involves multiple units that do not report in a simple hierarchical manner. In the event of disagreements with any or all parties to a JAMOU, or in the event of refusal by the joint appointee to honor the terms of the JAMOU, the Dean will act as a mediator and will make decisions in consultation with all concerned parties to the joint appointment.

The creation of a JAMOU is the responsibility of the Dean of Faculty. The JAMOU will be created based on the completed JAMOU Checklist submitted to the Dean's Office.

Approved by vote of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences, May 2, 2000.

Minor revisions approved by A&S Faculty Affairs Committee, April 10, 2001.

Major revisions approved by vote of the Faculty of Arts & Sciences, xx, 2020.