

Multidisciplinary Research and Education at UC San Diego

Best Practices and Guidelines for Multidisciplinary Appointments

Report by the
Senate–Administration Task Force on
Multidisciplinary Joint Appointments

April 2007

Contents

1. Joint Senate–Administration Task Force Membership
2. Charge to the Task Force
3. Overview and Executive Summary
4. Enhancing Multidisciplinary Research and Education
5. Guiding Principles and Best Practices for Joint/Split Appointments
6. Joint Appointments with Scripps Institution of Oceanography
7. Joint Appointments with Health Sciences
8. Other Issues

Appendix A - Charge Letter

Appendix B - Ladder-Rank Faculty with Joint Academic Appointments

1. Joint Senate-Administration Task Force Membership

Task Force Membership

Frieder Seible, *Dean, Jacobs School of Engineering, Co-Chair*

David R. Miller, *Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Co-Chair*

Dennis Carson, *Director, UCSD Moores Cancer Center*

Judith Dolan, *Associate Dean, Division of Arts and Humanities*

Sadik Esener, *Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering*

William Hodgkiss, *Professor, Marine Physical Laboratory, Scripps Institution of Oceanography*

David Lake, *Acting Associate Dean, Social Sciences*

M. Brian Maple, *Chair, Physics*

William McGinnis, *Professor, Cell and Developmental Biology*

Ronald Thomas, *Professor, Family and Preventive Medicine/Neurosciences*

Jeffrey Vincent, *Professor, International Relations and Pacific Studies*

Task Force Consultants

Robert Bitmead, *Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel*

Jennefer Collins, *Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel*

Arthur Ellis, *Vice Chancellor, Office of Research Affairs*

Ron Espiritu, *Associate Dean, Business and Fiscal Affairs, Health Sciences*

Debbie McGraw, *Assistant Vice Chancellor, Resource Administration*

Andrew Ries, *Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, School of Medicine*

2. Charge to Task Force

On November 22, 2006, the Senate–Administration Task Force on Multidisciplinary Joint Appointments was charged by Senior Vice Chancellor Marsha Chandler to

"... examine the issues associated with fostering multidisciplinary faculty appointments across UCSD's divisions and schools. In doing so, you are asked to consider how we can remove or reduce the barriers to such initiatives. These barriers may involve, for example, issues related to compensation, space, teaching assignments, the faculty review process, and indirect cost recovery. There may also be programmatic issues for the students involved in these interdisciplinary programs."

A complete copy of the updated charge letter, dated January 25, 2007, is included in Appendix A.

3. Overview and Executive Summary

Research at the interface between traditional academic disciplines is quickly becoming the norm for scholarly advances and innovation. The research university of the 21st century is a horizontally integrated academy where the generation of human and intellectual capital thrives

on collaboration and interaction across traditional academic disciplines. To achieve this multidisciplinary culture without academic impediments requires that the campus re-examine how departments, divisions, schools, and campus units approach their traditionally vertical education and research missions. Multidisciplinary education programs exist and are increasing in number, and multidisciplinary research is supported by research centers and institutes (organized research units, multi-campus research units) that are outcome-based and not discipline-based. However, faculty appointments are most often governed by a vertical departmental structure that may not be conducive to recruiting or rewarding excellent faculty whose research focus is at the interface between disciplines and/or in new research areas that do not fit into the traditional departmental structure. There is general agreement that support of multidisciplinary education and research, open to cross-disciplinary collaborations, is a desirable academic model. To enhance such a culture, we need to understand and be transparent about what our established academic system will support and allow in terms of multidisciplinary appointments, and in what ways our academic personnel processes need to change to facilitate, and not unnecessarily complicate, multidisciplinary joint appointments.

The task force objectives for multidisciplinary joint appointments are threefold:

- (1) to foster an environment in which multidisciplinary research and teaching are encouraged, supported, and advanced;
- (2) to provide transparency and clarification of what is currently possible and what is not possible in terms of joint and split FTE appointments; and
- (3) to establish guidelines to lower the hurdles and simplify the appointment process.

Executive Summary

In the sections below, we first discuss some general concepts and suggestions that we feel would enhance multidisciplinary research and education. We then make specific recommendations for “best practices” to achieve these objectives. The goal is for these best practices and guidelines to provide transparency and to assist faculty, staff, and administrators involved in the academic appointment and review processes to properly acknowledge, evaluate, and reward faculty working at the interface between traditional disciplines. Implementing these best practices should be seen as an important step in the culture change toward a research university without academic walls, and should thereby help lower the barriers to multidisciplinary appointments. It is understood that these guidelines do not constitute policy, but are recommendations that could lead to changes in policy or procedure. Given the nature of multidisciplinary research, there will always be the need to respond to unique opportunities. Therefore, exceptions to and deviations from these recommendations should be expected and welcomed, provided they are conducive to fostering a multidisciplinary research and education culture and enhancing the excellence of UCSD.

To enhance multidisciplinary research and education, our recommendations are as follows:

- Utilize interdisciplinary cluster hiring of faculty and assign multidisciplinary search committees.
- Consider in-house sabbatical programs.
- Utilize individuals with rich experience outside of academia as “Professors of Practice.”
- Constitute campus-wide committees as broadly as possible.
- Reduce any internal impediments for faculty and students to work together across units.
- Enhance organized research units (ORUs) and improve their relationship to departments.
- Invest in core facilities.
- Support grant-writing, review, and project management teams for large, complex multidisciplinary proposals.
- Support the development of knowledge tools that inform and enable the campus to invest strategically in multidisciplinary partnerships.
- Explore with the Academic Senate ways in which interdisciplinary efforts can be better recognized and rewarded at the time of academic review.
- Provide multidisciplinary opportunities with designated fellowship programs.
- Facilitate multidisciplinary team teaching.
- Provide appropriate administrative support structures and resources to encourage multidisciplinary educational programs.

For joint and split FTE appointments (see glossary below), recommended guiding principles and best practices are as follows:

- Identify a home department and associated responsibilities of the home department chair and dean.
- For academic reviews, use single department-level ad hoc review committees that include faculty from both departments, and solicit input from all units in which the faculty member participates.
- Restrict the number and type of split FTE appointments.
- Consider split FTE appointments at the assistant professor level only when necessary for recruitment and when strong mentoring is provided.
- Ensure that teaching and service responsibilities are pro-rated and transparent.
- Make space available in both units whenever possible.
- Make the campus overhead return models and intellectual property issues (especially the ways in which they may affect interdisciplinary research proposals) transparent to faculty.
- Recognize the special challenges for joint appointments in Health Sciences, including the salary compensation plan and lack of ladder-rank FTE positions.
- Consider the possibility of the General Campus “lending” unfunded ladder-rank FTE positions to Health Sciences.
- Recognize that special circumstances warrant joint appointments split between a tenured or tenure-track FTE and a non-tenured title in both SIO and Health Sciences, but that they are not generally recommended on the General Campus.
- Pro-rate salaries across different salary scales.

Glossary

Joint Appointments: Appointments in two (or more) departments, in the same series or in different series. Such appointments cross departmental, divisional, or campus unit boundaries. Joint appointments usually include a salaried appointment in one unit and job series, with an additional non-salaried appointment in another unit and series (e.g., a 100% time appointment as ladder-rank professor in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, with a non-salaried appointment as adjunct professor in the Department of Pharmacology, SOM.)

Split FTE Appointment: An appointment in which the FTE of a tenured/tenure-track (ladder-rank) faculty appointment is divided (split) among two or more departments, divisions, or campus units. An example of a split FTE appointment is 50% time as a ladder-rank professor in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and 50% time as a ladder-rank professor in the Graduate Department at SIO.

Affiliated Faculty: Professors who have informal associations with departments/programs external to their own departments. Since affiliated faculty have no formal responsibilities, they are not subject to academic review in this informal role.

4. Enhancing Multidisciplinary Research and Education

Our campus' capacity for conducting outstanding multidisciplinary research can be enhanced through consideration of the following suggestions:

a) Human Resources

- Bundle faculty FTE positions so that they can be filled through collaborative “cluster hiring” by multidisciplinary search committees. Normally, academic deans should be designated to coordinate this process for the General Campus. The campus should be in a position to respond nimbly to new multidisciplinary research opportunities by drawing upon its cross-disciplinary expertise and networks of contacts to recruit a critical mass of faculty with expertise in emerging fields of scholarship.
- Consider the establishment of incentives that would facilitate the equivalent of an “in-house sabbatical” program. In-house sabbaticals can be appealing for faculty who are unable to relocate. Enabling a faculty member to be associated temporarily with another department or research unit on campus provides an opportunity for cross-fertilization. This process allows the faculty member to export expertise to the host unit/department and import expertise into the home department, thereby seeding multidisciplinary projects. Appropriate funding for such a program could be achieved by permitting the use of “sabbatical-in-residence” teaching or service credit, or by permitting faculty to be partially funded by their research grants. Prior to the recent budget reductions, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (SVCAA) and the Academic Senate partnered in a pilot program that provided funding for just such a purpose. The program was targeted at faculty outside of science and engineering and permitted them to be relieved of their home-department obligations and to initiate

collaborative and interdisciplinary research with colleagues in other departments. This program could be re-evaluated and perhaps re-established as a general program to facilitate multidisciplinary interactions across the campus.

- Utilize individuals who have rich multidisciplinary expertise based on many years of experience outside of academic environments. Their expertise and contacts can be an invaluable resource to the campus in promoting multidisciplinary research and education. The new title of “Professor of the Practice” has been proposed, and once it becomes available, it will make it possible to recruit individuals with “real world” multidisciplinary experience to enrich our campus educational environment.
- Constitute campus-wide committees as broadly as possible. By populating committees so that more disciplines are represented, there are opportunities to bring faculty together that may result in new multidisciplinary research initiatives.
- Continue to recognize the ability of graduate students, postdoctoral students, and researchers to serve as convective agents for multidisciplinary research. Graduate students are often described as the “glue” that enables multidisciplinary projects to succeed. Although having supervisors from multiple disciplines represents a challenge for graduate students (as well as for undergraduates and postdoctoral fellows working on such projects), the benefits to them include exposure to multiple disciplinary cultures, an expanded network of contacts, and knowledge of what is required to undertake such projects successfully. Currently, there do not appear to be any significant policies or practices at UCSD that present a barrier to such interactions, but departments should be encouraged to promote a culture of multidisciplinaryity and to reduce any internal impediments for their faculty and graduate students.

b) Multidisciplinary Structures

- Continue to invest in multidisciplinary centers, institutes, and programs, such as, e.g., organized research units (ORUs). These are traditional campus vehicles for conducting multidisciplinary research. A Joint Senate–Administration Task Force on ORUs is developing guidelines for enhancing the impact of these multidisciplinary structures and for better aligning them with campus goals of improving technology transfer, diversity, mentoring, international connections, and leadership opportunities. The relationship of these entities to the academic departments must be synergistic and complementary, and not competitive; otherwise, significant barriers will arise. The campus can help by ensuring that resource allocations to divisions and departments are not jeopardized by faculty participation in multidisciplinary research units. Nonetheless, ORUs should be thought of as the primary vehicle for promoting multidisciplinary research on campus. ORUs can facilitate the interaction and exchange of ideas that we wish to foster without some of the complications of joint or split FTE appointments.

c) Infrastructure

- Invest in state-of-the-art core facilities that effectively support multidisciplinary research. These core facilities should include support for technical staff needed to facilitate their use by a broad community. Core facilities and instrumentation routinely bring researchers from various disciplines together. The Office of Research Affairs (ORA) is working with the campus to develop sustainable models for core facilities. One suggestion for building our inventory of accessible, affordable, shared cutting-edge instruments is to offer recruited faculty the option of placing their new instrumentation in core facilities in exchange for campus support of maintenance and operation costs.
- Support a grant-writing, review, and project management team for large, complex multidisciplinary proposals. Many funding opportunities in the \$10M to \$100M range and beyond require large, multidisciplinary teams of scholars and the preparation of exceedingly complex proposals, often involving partners from multiple other institutions. By investing in this type of special project support, the campus can lower the barrier for teams of faculty to pursue these high-profile multidisciplinary funding opportunities.
- Support the development of knowledge tools that enable the campus to invest strategically in multidisciplinary partnerships and to help researchers identify extra-disciplinary collaborators. For example, ORA and Calit2 are collaborating in developing tools for “research intelligence.” Knowledge maps enable the campus to identify research strengths, gaps, and potential partners across all disciplines. Web crawlers can allow researchers to “speed date” to identify potential collaborators from other disciplines.

d) Reward Structures

- Create a culture of multidisciplinary research and education. Recognition should be provided in the academic review and advancement process for participation in and development of projects that cross traditional boundaries. Especially important are the often substantial efforts required in service on committees and development of new courses. Our faculty, departments, and the Academic Senate should explore ways and means by which these efforts can be recognized and properly rewarded at the time of the academic review.

e) Interdisciplinary Education, Training, and Team Teaching

- Enhance multidisciplinary training and education by expanding opportunities such as the chancellor’s Multidisciplinary Fellowship Program. Multidisciplinary learning opportunities should be provided even at the undergraduate level.
- Facilitate multidisciplinary team teaching. Processes should be established that make it easy for faculty from different disciplines to jointly teach a multidisciplinary

course. This provides opportunities for exchange of ideas that can lead to multidisciplinary research projects, and it educates students who can make future contributions in such multidisciplinary areas.

- Encourage the development of multidisciplinary education programs by providing the appropriate administrative support structures and incremental program resources.

5. Guiding Principles and Best Practices for Joint/Split Appointments

Multidisciplinary research and education at UC San Diego can best be enhanced by hiring and rewarding the very best faculty who work at the interface between traditional academic disciplines. This goal requires renewed consideration of joint/split appointments.

Joint appointments that involve a 100% salaried appointment in one unit and series and a non-salaried appointment in a different unit and series are common practice. However, when the joint appointment is a split (ladder-rank) FTE appointment, some “barriers” are inevitable and are actually necessary. Given this, we find that an important part of making split FTE appointments is transparency for the faculty and departments involved. Many of our recommendations below deal with this issue. Interdisciplinary research is most often driven by intellectual interests and should not require split FTE appointments, but rather the use of joint non-salaried adjunct professor appointments or informal associations (faculty affiliations) for which the barriers are substantially reduced and the principles and requirements are well defined. We have appended some data (see Appendix B) to indicate the current number of joint/split appointments at UCSD. We have focused primarily on issues related to split FTE appointments.

a) Identification of a Home Department

In all cases, a home department needs to be designated and clearly identified as part of the academic personnel process. For joint appointments, the department in which the salaried appointment is held is designated as the home department. For split FTE ladder-rank appointments, the home department is the one in which the largest percentage of the FTE appointment is held. For FTE appointments split equally, a home department designation (H) is required (50H/50). This designation should be agreed upon by the academic units and faculty involved when the appointment is being proposed.

b) Responsibility of Home Department Chair and Dean

The home department chair is responsible for initiating and coordinating all aspects of the academic personnel review process on behalf of the faculty member. For joint appointments, the home department chair is charged with soliciting input on personnel actions from the other department(s), programs, or research units relevant to the case at the earliest stages of file preparation. The home department’s divisional dean has final authority for delegated personnel actions for faculty with joint and split FTE appointments when such appointments cross two or more divisions.

c) Academic Review

Use of a single department-level ad hoc committee is recommended for all academic reviews of faculty holding split FTE appointments, but in particular for career reviews. The home department chair should incorporate faculty from the other unit to participate in the home department's ad hoc review. In those departments that do not traditionally use ad hoc committees, we urge that they be formed for faculty holding split FTE appointments. We see this as an important change in the academic review process and suggest it be adopted in policy. In addition, if a faculty member has a joint non-salaried adjunct appointment, or is an affiliated faculty member or a member of an ORU or a Multicampus Research Unit (MRU), input from the heads of those units should also be solicited when the review file is first being assembled. In all cases, input on the faculty member's contributions to the other unit should be available to and incorporated into the home department's review. Faculty under review should be specifically asked to include a personal statement describing their contributions to each unit to which they belong. Since interdisciplinary research often results in publications with multiple authors, it is important to campus reviewers that the home department carefully analyzes and documents the unique creative contributions of the faculty member.

d) Number and Type of Split FTE Appointments

Except in unusual circumstances, faculty should not hold more than one split FTE appointment. While the most common ladder-rank FTE appointment split is 50/50, it is recommended that neither component of the split appointment should ever be less than 33%. When making split FTE appointments, the academic-year calendar should be considered to simplify prorating teaching and service load assignments, so that normally only 50/50 or 67/33 appointments would be considered. Both components of the split FTE appointment must be tenured or tenure-track, and each must be permanently funded by the appropriate academic unit.

e) Tenure-Track (Assistant Professor-Level) FTE Appointments

Except when necessary for recruitment, split FTE appointments at the assistant professor level should be carefully considered in light of the burden on the candidate to demonstrate suitability for tenure to faculty in two departments. It should be understood by the candidate that both units will vote independently on recommendations for tenure. Alternatively, joint non-salaried adjunct appointments or affiliated faculty associations should be considered at the assistant professor level, since they may serve the same intellectual purpose without the added complexities in the tenure process. If a split FTE appointment is made at the assistant professor level, then both chairs should meet and agree on how best to provide strong mentoring and support to the junior faculty member, and the situation should be reviewed jointly at each merit review step.

f) Teaching and Service Responsibilities

Teaching and service responsibilities should be prorated according to the percentage of the split FTE appointment, and the nature and extent of these responsibilities should be understood by all parties as explicitly as possible when the appointment is being formulated. The two department chairs should meet jointly with the faculty member to prescribe and document the obligations associated with the prorated commitments, and such a meeting should then be held again at each career review stage. While they must be cognizant of the percentage effort required, individual chairs must retain the same flexibility to make teaching and service assignments as they do for other faculty in their departments. However, department chairs should accommodate and credit faculty who wish to develop new interdisciplinary courses, which could involve shared teaching responsibilities.

g) Space Assignments

Space assignments cannot be simply prorated and must be worked out and documented on a case-by-case basis among the units, deans, and faculty involved. However, there is a strong sense that in order to facilitate interactions among faculty, researchers, and students in multidisciplinary areas, space and co-location play an important role. While space limitations on campus do not always allow office space in each unit for faculty with joint appointments, each faculty member should have designated office space in the home department and, whenever possible, should be assigned at least shared office space in the other department or research unit.

h) Contracts and Grants

When faculty with joint appointments submit contract or grant proposals, they will be expected to guide the determination of which unit will manage the pre- and post-award administrative work based on the research involved. Since there may be pressures to select one unit over the other, the faculty involved should be informed about how campus funding models return overhead to the units involved and how that process may affect matching commitments to the proposal. Once the unit that will manage the contract or grant is identified, normal campus funding models will determine the overhead return to the vice chancellor areas affected. While there is likely room for improvement with regard to how the campus treats credit for and allocation of indirect cost recovery funds, it is currently not apparent, and another work group with budgetary expertise could examine this process further. Similar considerations would pertain to intellectual property and the return of royalty/licensing income to the respective units.

6. Joint Appointments with Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO)

Other than limitations on resources, there seem to be no unusual hurdles or barriers to joint appointments between the General Campus and SIO. Split ladder-rank appointments require the availability of FTEs in both units. Since SIO has some state-funded Research Scientist positions

available, partial ladder-rank FTE appointments in combination with the state-funded Research Scientist appointments are possible.

7. Joint Appointments with Health Sciences

Different salary structures and compensation plans will necessarily continue to represent a barrier to joint appointments. The situation is most complex when appointments include Health Sciences, where faculty with at least 51% appointments (and others by exception) are able to participate in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP); where only the base salary, and no market off-scale component, is normally state funded; and where there are 12-month rather than 9-month appointments. Information about the compensation plan is available at the Web site:

<http://somfiscal.ucsd.edu/policy/HSCompPlan.html>

The salaries in split FTE appointments with Health Sciences must be pro-rated according to the percentages of the appointments, and the details must be transparent to the faculty member involved.

It seems clear that many emerging interdisciplinary areas of interest to faculty will involve the Health Sciences. In addition to the salary issues noted above, Health Sciences has difficulty providing ladder-rank FTE positions for such joint appointments, because the number of Health Sciences FTEs has been limited legislatively and has not been appropriately adjusted for some time. The General Campus receives many budgeted faculty FTEs, but because of the poor workload funding associated with them, there are insufficient funds to fill them. Since in some cases it may be important to a faculty member being recruited to have the ladder-rank position, it is our recommendation that the SVCAA consider “lending” unfilled and unfunded FTEs to Health Sciences when presented with an opportunity to stimulate new interdisciplinary research. It would be the responsibility of Health Sciences to identify a source of the base funding for the FTE, but we would hope that such collaboration would be mutually beneficial.

8. Other Issues

a) Joint/Split Appointment: Professor In Residence and Ladder-Rank Faculty (FTE)

If a joint appointment involves a partial tenured or tenure-track FTE, then the faculty member holds the equivalent of a partial FTE appointment. In accordance with UC policy, an appointment in the ladder-rank professor series is normally for full-time service to the University. This has been adhered to with only a few exceptions on the General Campus. However, there have been two common joint appointment types at UCSD involving a partial FTE component. SIO has some state-funded Research Scientist positions, so that a joint ladder-rank/research position may be permanently funded. Such joint appointments at SIO are common and acceptable. The other case arises in combination with a Professor In Residence (PIR) appointment, which is not a permanently funded, tenured position. Most of these exceptions have occurred in Health Sciences, where there is a lack of ladder-rank FTE positions, as noted above, and where

non-state funding or the compensation plan can often help to maintain funding for the non-tenured PIR component. Because of the serious, long-term consequences both to the faculty involved and to the academic mission of the departments, we do not recommend any change to the current practice for the General Campus. However, we would encourage the SVCAA to consider granting exceptions when it may involve the recruitment of a distinguished senior colleague who will make a unique impact on our research and educational mission. The funding obligations must be clearly understood and agreed to in writing when the appointment is made.

b) Joint Appointments Across Different Salary scales

Other than joint appointments with Health Sciences, discussed above, where the salaries must be pro-rated, the only current differential salary scales on the General Campus and at SIO are the business and engineering (B&E) base salary scale and discipline-based market off-scale salaries that have been established for assistant professor-level faculty appointments in specific departments. The current practice to deal with the B&E scale differential on the General Campus is to use a step function for salary scale at 50%. If a faculty member has at least a 50% appointment in Engineering, then his or her base salary is 100% on the B&E scale; if the appointment is below 50% in Engineering, then the base salary is 100% on the regular faculty salary scale. While the widespread use of market off-scale salaries has diminished the importance of this differential salary scale between units on the General Campus and at SIO, it likely does present a barrier to some interdisciplinary joint appointments. We propose that the step function be removed and that both the base salary and any differential market off-scale salary simply be pro-rated. For example, if a faculty member has a 67% appointment at SIO and a 33% appointment in Engineering, then his or her base salary is pro-rated between the two scales. This change in policy dealing with the B&E scale would require approval by UCOP, but it seems reasonable and more equitable.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

UCSD

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

MARSHA A. CHANDLER
SENIOR VICE CHANCELLOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0001
(858) 534-3130 FAX: (858) 534-5355

January 25, 2007

Dean Frieder Seible (Jacobs School of Engineering), *Co-chair*
Associate VC David R. Miller (Academic Affairs), *Co-chair*
Director Dennis Carson (UCSD Moores Cancer Center)
Associate Dean Judith Dolan (Division of Arts & Humanities)
Professor Sadik Esener (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
Professor William Hodgkiss (Marine Physical Lab, SIO)
Acting Associate Dean David Lake (Social Sciences)
Chair M. Brian Maple (Physics)
Professor William McGinnis (Cell and Developmental Biology)
Professor Ronald G. Thomas (Professor, Family & Preventive Medicine/Neurosciences)
Professor Jeffrey Vincent (IR/PS)

SUBJECT: Senate-Administration Task Force on Multidisciplinary Joint Faculty Appointments

Dear Colleagues:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as members of the Senate-Administration Task Force on Multidisciplinary Joint Faculty Appointments, which has been established at the request of Chancellor Fox.

The task force is charged to examine the issues associated with fostering multidisciplinary faculty appointments across UCSD's divisions and schools. In so doing, you are asked to consider how we can remove or reduce the barriers to such initiatives. These barriers may involve, for example, issues related to compensation, space, teaching assignments, the faculty review process, and indirect cost recovery. There may also be programmatic issues for the students involved in these interdisciplinary programs.

I am grateful that Dean Frieder Seible and Associate Vice Chancellor David Miller have agreed to co-chair the task force and that Jennefer Collins, Assistant Vice Chancellor - Academic Personnel will work with the task force as a staff consultant. I hope that you will have a report of your observations and recommendations by the end of this academic year.

Again, thank you for your willingness to participate in this endeavor.

With kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Marsha", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Marsha A. Chandler
Senior Vice Chancellor

c: Chancellor Fox

LADDER-RANK FACULTY WITH JOINT ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (2006-07)

Overview and Definitions

- Joint Appointment: Multiple appointments in two (or more) departments, in the same series or in different series.
- Split FTE: An appointment in which the FTE of a tenured/tenure-track (ladder-rank) faculty appointment is divided (split) among two or more departments, divisions, or campus units.
- Zero FTE: 0% professorial appointment in a department external to the home department.
- Adjunct appointment: Adjunct (non-salaried) appointment in a department external to the home department.
- Headcount: Number of persons with joint appointments; a person is only counted once if they have multiple types of joint appointments.
The total ladder-rank faculty headcount includes administrators and HHMI faculty; the LSOE series was excluded.

	#	%
<u>Headcount of ladder-rank faculty:</u>	1129	
Headcount and % of faculty with a joint appointment:	122	11%
Headcount and % of joint appointments that are split FTE:	32	3%
Headcount and % of joint appointments that are zero FTE:	34	3%
Headcount and % of joint appointments that are adjunct (non-salaried) appointments:	56	5%

HEADCOUNT OF JOINT APPOINTMENTS

	Split FTE		Zero FTE		Adjunct (non-salaried)		TOTAL	
Campus Total	32	26%	34	28%	56	46%	122	
Division	N	% of Split FTE	N	% of Zero FTE	N	% of Adjuncts	N	% of Joint Appts
Arts & Hum	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Social Sciences	1	0%	2	6%	17	30%	20	16%
JSOE	1	3%	2	6%	11	20%	14	11%
Biological Sciences	1	3%	1	3%	3	5%	5	4%
Physical Sciences	9	28%	3	9%	3	5%	15	12%
IR/PS	0	0%	3	9%	5	9%	8	7%
Rady	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%
School of Pharm	3	9%	2	6%	0	0%	5	4%
SOM	13	41%	21	62%	15	27%	49	40%
SIO	2	6%	0	0%	2	4%	4	3%

Actual headcount does not reflect individuals who have multiple joint appointments.

Joint appointments between SIO divisions are not included.

SIO faculty with joint appointments at SOM, School of Pharmacy, and/or general campus departments are included.