

**Guidelines for Joint Academic Appointments at UC Berkeley**  
Office of the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare  
August 2009

Contents

- I. Introduction
  - II. Principles
  - III. Recommended Practices for Joint Faculty Appointments
  - IV. Special Circumstances
    - A. Junior Faculty
    - B. New Initiative Centers (NICs) Appointments
    - C. Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative (BDRI) Appointments
- Appendix A: Sample Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for a Joint Faculty Appointment

**I. Introduction**

---

Joint appointments in more than one department can promote multi/interdisciplinary research and education and help faculty interested in such efforts. Joint appointments are commonly split 50%-50%, 75%-25%, or 100%-0% between units. Appointments may be between departments within a college, departments from different colleges, or between a department and research initiative such as one of the NICs or BDRI. A faculty member with appointments in more than one department, being knowledgeable of both and able to bridge their cultures, can promote collaborations between the departments, thus contributing to the cultural diversity of both departments. The faculty may benefit from the ability to better collaborate with faculty in both departments, and teach and advise students in both departments.

This document provides a set of principles and guidelines to help the administration, departments, schools and colleges to make processes related to joint faculty appointments as clear and direct as those for faculty with appointments in a single unit. We are focused on the need to appoint, review, promote, retain, and, in some cases, terminate any tenure-track or tenured faculty member who holds a joint academic appointment. The purpose of these guidelines is to assist in helping faculty members who hold joint appointments to succeed and thrive at Berkeley and to avoid difficulties such as the following:

- Departments may have different policies and expectations on the relative time spent on research, teaching and service; and different policies and practices on start-up funds, administrative and technical support, teaching loads, and so on;
- Teaching assignments are more complex;
- Unless there is very careful coordination among the departments, faculty may end up performing additional service beyond what is expected by either department;
- Faculty may have difficulty being considered an integral part of either of the departments in which they have an appointment;
- Faculty may spend a non-trivial amount of time traveling between departments; and perhaps most significantly:
- At the time of tenure, two departments may have to be satisfied, and the norms and requirements of the departments may differ from one another.

## II. Principles

---

The following principles are designed to help faculty members with joint appointments succeed in their academic careers at UC Berkeley:

- A. When a joint appointment is created, an MOU between the two units should be written and signed; signatories should include the heads of the units involved as well as the faculty member. This will detail how key procedures related to the faculty member's academic career will be carried out (see Appendix A for a sample MOU). Details should include procedures for academic case review, teaching load, and assignment of campus service. In addition, the MOU may address issues pertaining to the "startup package," space, compensation (e.g., summer ninths), leave practices and policies (e.g., sabbaticals; teaching buy-out policies); and retreat rights. The goal should be that the faculty member's obligations across the two units are not greater than those of others who are full-time in their unit.
- B. Units should agree on a single, joint process for preparing academic review cases, especially at times of mid-career appraisals, tenure, promotion, and barrier step (Full Professor Step VI and Above Scale) cases. This ensures both units have input on the review, streamlines the process so both units are not independently preparing a case, and reduces the risk of a faculty member getting conflicting feedback from his or her two units.
- C. One of the units should agree to act as the administrative home department and have this stated in the MOU. The home department will take the lead on academic review cases.
- D. The MOU should also state which unit or organization (such as ERSO or RES, if applicable) will handle extramural funds administration (funds may be handled by more than one unit).
- E. Each unit should take steps to help the faculty member become part of the community. This includes full participation in departmental faculty meetings and unit events. The faculty member should be included on regular communications, such as email lists, departmental and unit web pages, and the campus directory (which should identify both units for the faculty member).
- F. Units should work together to ensure jointly appointed faculty members are not excessively burdened and, in total, have comparable access to resources as faculty with single appointments. These resources include mentors, space, equipment, funding, and access to graduate students.
- G. Academic review cases should acknowledge the faculty member's multiple academic commitments and interdisciplinary work. This may entail making special effort to evaluate the work that falls outside of the normal purview of a single discipline. Reviewers for tenure and promotion should be selected carefully, with the goal of identifying scholars who are capable of looking beyond disciplinary "centers." In non-traditional, innovative, and cross-disciplinary research, few people grasp or understand the whole picture of the faculty member's academic agenda. Consequently, the jointly appointed faculty member may be more vulnerable to

critique from colleagues across the disciplines in which he or she works. Scholars in a single discipline can be inclined to break down the work into discipline-specific components. Careful choice of reviewers can mitigate these risks.

- H. The jointly appointed faculty member plays an active role in facilitating the effective collaboration of the two units. If the faculty member becomes aware of conflicting procedures regarding his or her appointment, he or she must bring these to the unit heads' attention in a timely manner. The unit heads will then work together to resolve the conflict and make note of the resolution in the MOU via an addendum.
- I. Although an appointment may be at 0%, it is not at 0% effort. It is considered an "above the line" appointment and conveys full voting rights in the department or school. Therefore, there is a campus expectation that a 0% faculty member will contribute to the unit. Such contributions (teaching, service, participation in faculty meetings) should be clarified in the MOU.

### **III. Recommended Practices for Joint Faculty Appointments**

---

#### **A. Recruiting and initial appointment**

Joint appointments can be established by the following means:

- Two or more units create a joint appointment, advertise the position, and jointly hire a faculty candidate;
- Two or more units create a joint appointment for a specific faculty candidate through a targeted recruitment and an off-cycle FTE request;
- During a faculty recruitment, a unit learns a faculty candidate wants to hold a joint appointment with another department or school; or
- A current faculty member wants to have part of an appointment in another department or school.

In any of these scenarios, a general plan for the appointment should be agreed to by the cognizant deans' offices. If the joint appointment comes about after a search for a single appointment, the units need to consult with the VP-AAFW and the BC to get approval of the FTE allocations. An MOU detailing the appointment should be created and agreed to by all parties before the appointment is finalized. The MOU should include:

1. Designation of a home department. One unit shall be selected by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the two unit heads as the administrative home in the MOU. This will help ensure reviews and other administrative tasks are completed in a timely fashion and that nothing falls through the cracks. The home department takes responsibility for notifying the other unit of reviews, preparing/modifying MOUs, and providing opportunities for review and renegotiation of agreements and plans. However, this designation does not release the other unit from its responsibility for providing clear communication with the faculty member and being responsive to issues as they arise. The home department may be changed subsequently if there is good cause and mutual agreement; the dean or deans of the division(s) or college(s)

should be asked to advise in the event of disagreements on this issue. Ideally, the chairs of the two units will meet at least annually to discuss the coordination of the joint appointment.

2. Rank and appointment percentage in each unit.
3. Workload. Lay out expectations with regards to the faculty member's teaching and service. Make sure the overall demands on the faculty member are reasonable and appropriately balanced in terms of the appointment percentage. Teaching and service assignments should be coordinated between the units. Possibilities for cross-listing courses should be explored. The faculty member should be prepared to participate in both units' faculty meetings and serve on confidential *ad hoc* committees as appropriate. The unit heads will take all outside service obligations into account when making assignments. The goal should be that the faculty member's obligations across the two units are not greater than those of others who are full-time in their unit.
4. Salary scale. If the joint appointment involves different salary scales, the salaries in each unit should be clearly stated. However, if at least 50% of the joint appointment is in a department on the Business/Economics/Engineering faculty salary scale, the faculty member's entire salary will be on the higher scale.
5. Access to resources. Discuss and agree on the faculty member's access to resources in each unit (e.g. office space, administrative support, startup funding, mentoring, and graduate student support). New appointments should receive support from both units in accord with normal departmental/unit practices and such support should be proportional to the faculty member's percentage of appointment.
6. Graduate student admission process. Clarify the faculty member's input into the graduate student admission process in both units.
7. Eligibility for locally-controlled chairs. Clarify the faculty member's eligibility for locally-controlled endowed chairs, should such chairs become available.
8. Allocation of research revenues. If applicable, the units should agree in advance how revenue generated by the faculty member's research will be distributed. Such an agreement should be described in the MOU.
9. Mentoring. Ideally, the units should coordinate their mentoring programs so the faculty member has one mentor who is familiar with interdisciplinary work and can provide sound advice on how to achieve tenure and thrive in two units. Key mentoring issues are:
  - Provide adequate mentoring to all junior faculty, but especially those whose research areas are interdisciplinary. In particular, junior faculty should be given clear guidelines about what is expected and valued by a particular department; for example, they should not be surprised to learn, at their mid-career appraisal, that the department does not recognize some publication venues as valuable for tenure. It may be necessary to provide two (or more) mentors to ensure coverage of the different areas in which the faculty member works. Having a mentor who has conducted interdisciplinary research can also be very useful. If a faculty member is heavily involved in a center or institute, it is especially important to provide advice about how to

balance work on large team projects with work that establishes a strong individual scientific reputation.

- Provide particular guidance in navigating funding: somewhat paradoxically, while acquiring funding increasingly calls for interdisciplinary collaboration, most funding still comes from agencies that are known within individual disciplines.
- A faculty member hired in an interdisciplinary position is more likely to be “first of a kind” in the department. The member may need to establish new research facilities, arrange collaborations with other departments, develop new courses that are possibly cross-listed in several programs, and train teaching assistants for these courses. Such faculty will have a higher overhead while being more isolated than faculty joining an established area and should be provided adequate support and possibly release time to compensate for this overhead; the same applies to any “first of a kind” junior faculty, but more so for those involved in interdisciplinary research and teaching. Any release time, from either or both units, should be documented so the amount of release time and the duration are known to both units.
- Assure that the feedback provided in reviews is detailed and specific, and provide it in written form as well as conveying it verbally.
- If possible, involve people from different disciplines in the merit review of an interdisciplinary faculty member. This will not only provide higher-quality feedback to the individual being reviewed, but will help educate other senior faculty participating in the review about the norms and values of the other disciplines to which the faculty member contributes. Be sure that the faculty member from outside of the home department plays a significant role in selecting the referees who will write letters evaluating the candidate. Also task that member with helping to make sure that the promotion and tenure committee itself, as well any faculty who will vote on the tenure case, understand the values and norms of those other participating disciplines. It may be helpful to write down metrics for judging academic success.
- When a faculty member is involved with a center or institute, develop mechanisms that include the participation of representatives from the center/institute in the mid-career appraisals and tenure reviews.

10. Faculty leave without salary: Salary savings, if any, will be split according to the percentage of appointment within each unit; e.g., an appointment in a NIC will result in a 50/50 split between the budget of the NIC unit and the cognizant unit dean.

#### B. Changes in appointment

Faculty members with joint appointments may wish to change them over the course of their academic career at UC Berkeley. Similarly, faculty without joint appointments may wish to establish a joint appointment over the course of their UC

Berkeley career. Schools/colleges and/or departments/units may also wish to change the terms of the appointment. These changes may arise because of new opportunities, changes in faculty interest and focus, or difficulties in the original joint appointment. Thus, it is important to establish procedures for reviewing and negotiating or renegotiating joint appointments.

The following are recommended practices related to changes in joint appointments:

1. Making changes to a budgeted appointment. The deans' offices should agree, in advance if possible, on the procedures by which the faculty member can request to change a budgeted joint appointment or create a budgeted joint appointment. Before undergoing the process to make a change, the school or college should consult with the other school or college. The campus' Budget Committee will need to be consulted regarding a change in FTE allocations.
2. Discontinuing an appointment. The deans' offices should clarify the terms under which a faculty member would be allowed to discontinue a joint appointment. For example, if a review shows a faculty member's duties or connections to one of his or her departments have weakened, or the faculty member has no sustained interest in the domain of one of the units, the joint appointment arrangement should be considered for discontinuance. The same consultations mentioned in (a) above, should be followed.
3. Faculty right of retreat. If a faculty member holds a tenured appointment in two or more units, it should be clear at the time of appointment if the faculty member has the option of retreating to a 100% appointment in any of the units. When it is not possible for any of the schools or colleges to offer this option, the faculty member should be fully informed about what options are available.
4. Conflict resolution. The deans' offices should identify the steps the faculty member should follow if he or she experiences concerns about the terms of the appointment and/or the actions of the departments involved. In general, conflicts should be resolved at the departmental level. If the departments' efforts to resolve the issue prove unsatisfactory, then the deans' offices should become involved. If a dean's office is directly involved in the conflict, the VPAAFW will assist in resolving the issues. If there are concerns about a faculty member's performance or conduct, the administrator most knowledgeable about the concern should handle the issue. Each dean's office has a responsibility to notify the faculty member's other school or college of disciplinary action toward the jointly appointed faculty member.

#### C. Review Processes

The following are recommended practices for handling joint appointment faculty reviews:

1. Departmental recommendation. The home department will take the lead on review cases and coordinate with the other units, so a single, joint recommendation goes forward to the campus administration.
2. For cases involving a unit *ad hoc* committee, a bilateral departmental review committee will be constituted with balanced representation from each department/unit. This committee will undertake the reviews in the normal

- fashion, but allow any differences in emphasis between the two departments, valuations of accomplishments in different disciplines, etc., to be resolved early in the process. For example, at the time of the final appraisal and tenure review, the joint committee or department chairs (depending on unit practice) will be able to balance opinions from both disciplines by agreeing upon a group of outside reviewers to represent the different fields. In this manner, a single review file will be constructed that both departments can assess, and a single *ad hoc* committee recommendation will emerge in which both departments can have confidence.
3. Faculty members conducting the review should adopt an open-minded stance. They may need to calibrate the metrics for impact and academic success within another discipline, even a closely related one. In addition to the need to evaluate the types of research products – books, journal papers, conference papers, artifacts, and so on – it is also critical to understand the quality of each product. Which conferences are important? Which awards carry the greatest prestige? Which people are the luminaries whose letters of recommendation should be taken most seriously, and which are known to be hypercritical? In tenure cases, there is a great deal of implicit knowledge within a discipline that is taken into account that may be missing in interdisciplinary cases.
  4. In requesting letters of recommendation, use including wording that specifically asks the letter-writer to evaluate the candidate on the basis of his or her own area of expertise, while recognizing that the candidate has conducted interdisciplinary research (see Appendix B for a sample letter).
  5. Timeline for case preparation. Anticipate that the promotions will take longer to prepare and evaluate than purely disciplinary cases, and plan accordingly. It will take more time to select the *ad hoc* committee, more time to select the outside reviewers, and more time to evaluate the dossier.
  6. Departmental votes. If a departmental vote is required (e.g. for promotion or advancement to Above Scale), faculty from both departments need to vote. Both votes will then be reported in the joint departmental letter. If the votes are not in agreement, a detailed explanation of both departmental/unit discussions and votes must be included.

#### **IV. Special Circumstances**

---

- A. Junior faculty. Special consideration should be taken to ensure junior faculty with joint appointments are properly mentored and understand the criteria for achieving tenure in both departments.
  1. For budgeted joint appointments: in the event that the two departments come to different recommendations on the question of tenure, and tenure is subsequently granted, complications in carrying out the appointment can be foreseen. It is likely to be the case that all parties will concur with transfer of the faculty member's affiliation to the favoring department. However, in order that the issue of FTE allocation should not influence the respective deliberations of each department, the candidate's appointment and FTE should continue to be shared between the two departments if tenure is granted. This default action can be altered subsequently, according to existing policies for changing the departmental affiliation of a faculty member.

2. For 100%/0% joint appointments: in the event the department holding the 100% appointment recommends tenure and the 0% appointment department does not, the 0% appointment shall not be renewed. If the department holding the 100% appointment does not recommend tenure, and this recommendation is supported by the administration (after consultation with the Budget Committee), then the faculty member will be given a terminal appointment.
- B. NIC Appointments. All NIC appointments are a 50/50 split between an academic department or school and a NIC (see the attached Appendix C on NIC governance).
1. Review cases. The academic department or school will take the lead on all reviews. However, the concurrence of the NIC Director must be included in all academic reviews, including the appointment case. If the Director does not concur, he or she would need to write an explanation for the non-concurrence and address it to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare. If a departmental *ad hoc* committee is involved, it shall include at least one NIC faculty member. Once the input of the NIC Director is received, the case will follow the normal path of review.
  2. Teaching and service. Faculty members appointed in positions allocated to NICs will split their teaching and service duties 50/50 between the NIC and the school or department to which they are formally appointed. The NIC Director and Chair or Dean will consult with one another to coordinate the teaching and service expectations of the NIC and school or department; this arrangement should be part of the MOU. The Director and Chair or Dean will seek to maximize the faculty member's opportunities to teach courses relevant to the area of the NIC.
- C. BDRI Appointments. All BDRI appointments can be 100% within an academic department, or split appointments between departments (see the attached Appendix D on BDRI governance).
1. Review cases. The academic department or school will take the lead on all academic reviews. If the appointment is split between two or more academic departments, one will be designated as the home department through mutual agreement with the faculty member and the cognizant chairs or deans. However, the concurrence of the Chair of the cluster coordinating committee must be included in all academic reviews, including the appointment case. If the Chair does not concur, he or she would need to write an explanation for the non-concurrence and address it to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare. If a departmental *ad hoc* committee is involved, it shall include at least one BDRI cluster faculty member. Once the input of the Chair of the cluster coordinating committee is received, the case will follow the normal path of review.
  2. Teaching and service. Faculty members appointed through the BDRI shall work with his or her department chair and/or dean to maximize teaching and service opportunities that address BDRI goals.

## APPENDIX A: Sample MOU

This sample document shows how relevant points can be addressed.

### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE JOINT APPOINTMENT OF **FIRSTNAME LASTNAME** IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF **DEPARTMENT 1 (50%)** AND **DEPARTMENT 2 (50%)** (Effective **January 1, 2010**)

1. Home Department: **Department 1** is designated the administrative home department. All laboratory and office space will be provided by **Department 1**. **Department 1** will also supply administrative support including contracts and grants administration. Professor **LASTNAME** will participate in selection of graduate students in both departments.
2. Salary: Since Department 1 is on the Business/Engineering salary scale, and their appointment is at 50%, all of Professor **LASTNAME's** salary will remain on the Business/Engineering scale.
3. Teaching: Each department is responsible for funding and providing GSIs and/or readers for the courses Prof. **LASTNAME** teaches in that department according to the policies of that department. The departments will coordinate the hiring of the GSIs. Classes will be scheduled by the respective departments (i.e., **DEPARTMENT 1** will schedule **DEPARTMENT 1** classes and **DEPARTMENT 2** will schedule **DEPARTMENT 2** classes). **DEPARTMENT 1** will remain the administering department for [name of cross-listed course], and will collect course evaluations.

The normal teaching load in both departments is 30–45 lecture hours per academic year, as defined in the attached documents. Prof. **LASTNAME** will be expected to teach 15–20 lecture hours in each department. A regular teaching schedule of **Dept1 100** and **Dept1 200** (3.5 units) plus advising 15 **Dept1** undergraduate students and three graduate students meet this criterion.

Any future teaching assignments will be discussed between Prof. **LASTNAME** and the cognizant chairs.

4. Leaves such as sabbaticals, Miller Professorships, etc, will be approved by both departments prior to the start date of the leave.
5. Review of future academic personnel actions: University policy requires that with a joint appointment such as the one proposed for Prof. **LASTNAME**, any future reviews for advancement should be coordinated between all involved departments. **Dept1** will take the lead on processing review cases. If a merit or promotion case requires an *ad hoc* committee, there should be balanced representation from both departments. Department 1 will get Department 2's concurrence on every review case and will then forward the case to the applicable Deans.

Except in unusual circumstances, merit increases will be considered at the normal time intervals. Every effort will be made to ensure that the departments agree on whether a merit increase is justified and on the size of the increase. However, in the event that they cannot agree then each department will submit a recommendation to the cognizant Dean and he or she will resolve the issue.

6. Service: Prof. **LASTNAME's** departmental committee assignments will be coordinated annually between the two departments. Service in both departments will be expected to be roughly half that expected for a full FTE. Prof. **LASTNAME** should be prepared to participate in both departments' faculty meetings and serve on confidential *ad hoc* committees as appropriate. The department chair(s) will take all outside service obligations into account when making assignments.

We agree to the joint appointment of Professor **LASTNAME** as proposed above.

---

**Associate Professor First Last**

---

**First Last**  
Chair  
Department 1

---

**First Last**  
Chair  
Department 2

---

**First Last**  
Dean  
College 1

---

**First Last**  
Dean  
College 2

---

**First Last**  
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare

**September 1, 2009**

## APPENDIX B: Sample Solicitation Letter

September 9, 2009

name  
address 1  
address 2  
address 3  
address 4  
address 5

Dear Dr. **last name**:

I write to ask your assistance in evaluating **Dr. X**, currently an **Assistant Professor** at the University of California at Berkeley, Department of **XXX**. **Dr. X** is being considered for promotion to Associate Professor, with tenure, effective July 1, **2010**. The promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is a milestone in the University of California system that requires us to solicit outside letters from experts in **his/her** field of research. We value your candid assessment of **Dr. X's** research, service, and teaching accomplishments, in the areas in which you have knowledge, as well as **his/her** future promise. Your scholarly and professional judgments will play an important role in our evaluation of **Dr. X** for promotion.

**TENURE CLOCK (if applicable)**: **Dr. X** has received an extension of **his/her** tenure clock per University policy. This policy states that the criteria for promotion and tenure are no different than the criteria for faculty who do not have an extension of the tenure clock. We therefore request that this extension not be a factor in your letter of evaluation.

**INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH (if applicable)**: **Dr. X** is engaged in interdisciplinary research. **S/he** holds a joint appointment in the departments/units of **X** and **Y**. We invite your consideration of the interdisciplinary nature of **Dr. X's** work, while recognizing you may be best qualified to review only a portion of **his/her** scholarly work based on your own area of expertise.

Based upon the enclosed materials and any other knowledge you have of **his/her** work, we would like your candid evaluation of **Dr. X's** written and scholarly contributions with a focus on addressing the following points:

- How long and in what capacity do you know **Dr. X**? (as this would potentially identify you, please give a brief statement below your signature block so it can be redacted)
- What are your impressions about the quality, quantity, focus, and scholarly impact of the writings?
- Which, if any, of the publications do you consider to be outstanding and why?
- How would you estimate **Dr. X's** standing in relation to others in **his/her** peer group who are working in the same field? (Either list cohort or ask reviewer to identify cohort.)
- Would **Dr. X** receive tenure at your institution?
- How would you evaluate **Dr. X's** service contributions to the discipline; that is **his/her** work on professional committees, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, or similar activities?
- How would you evaluate **Dr. X's** teaching – perhaps based on lectures you have heard **him/her** give – or on any role **s/he** has played in the scientific community?

I have included a separate page of legal information on the confidentiality of letters at UCB. There is one important point to note. At UCB, we are required by policy to make the full text of all letters (without the letterhead or signature block) available to the candidate upon request, so please refrain from making any statement within your formal letter that identifies you.

We request that you return your review to us by **DATE**. We realize that your schedule is full and this may be a time-consuming task; however, we will be most grateful for your assistance. We have selected you because of your expertise in this area. If you need further information, please contact **NAME** at **PHONE/EMAIL**.

Sincerely,

**NAME, Professor and Chair**  
**Department of XXX**

Encl: *Curriculum Vitae*  
**Review of Research, Teaching and Service/Research Summary**  
**X** research articles

Under University of California policy, the identity of authors of letters of evaluation which are included in the personnel review files will be held in confidence. A candidate may, upon request and at certain prescribed stages of the academic personnel review process, be provided access to such letters in redacted form. Redaction is defined as the removal of identifying information (including name, title, institutional affiliation, and relationship to the candidate) contained either at the top of the letterhead or within and below the signature block of the letter of evaluation.

The full text of the body of your letter will therefore be provided to the candidate if so requested. Thus, if you provide any information that tends to identify you in the body of the letter, that information may become available to the candidate. **If you wish, you may provide a brief factual statement regarding your relationship to the candidate at the end of your letter but below the signature block.** This brief statement will be subject to redaction and will not be made available to the candidate.

Although we cannot guarantee that at some future time a court or governmental agency will not require the disclosure of the source of confidential evaluations in University of California personnel files, we can assure you that the University will endeavor to protect the identity of authors of letters of evaluation to the fullest extent allowable under the law.

## APPENDIX C: NIC Governance

### Governance of Initiative-Based Interdisciplinary Centers

## The Organization of New Initiative Centers (NICs)

### Preamble

This template has been prepared as guidance to participants in the centers as well as to campus administrators and faculty members interested in the success of these efforts. It is unlikely that a single structure will be appropriate for all centers. This template is meant to be a point of departure for the development of a governance plan for each center. The template outlines themes common to all centers that must be addressed in the governance plan, although the details of their implementation may vary.

### I. OVERALL GOALS FOR CENTERS

The primary goal of the new centers is to develop research and instructional programs in promising areas that lie between or among traditional disciplines. Specifically, the new centers are expected to:

- A. Foster and facilitate development of interdisciplinary research and academic activities in the center's area of interest.
- B. Foster and co-ordinate the development of graduate and possibly undergraduate programs of instruction in the interdisciplinary area, including graduate groups and designated emphases. Any academic information--majors, course enrollments, allocated student FTE--associated with these centers will be handled as they are with other non-department academic units, e.g., the Helen Wills Neuroscience Institute. The majors, course enrollments and student credit hours will be attributed to the unit awarding the degrees or offering the courses. The allocated student FTE will be attributed back to the pay department(s) of the instructors.
- C. Play a coordinating and oversight role in the allocation of faculty FTE designated for the area as part of the campus initiative process. The center will designate the academic focus in which a search for the FTE will be conducted, and in collaboration with one or more departments, conduct the search. The actual appointments will be in existing departments.
- D. Provide leadership and infrastructure for the initiation of interdisciplinary research efforts involving government, foundation, and industry funding sources. Provide the necessary infrastructure to coordinate these research efforts. If these efforts require unique research facilities, the center will mobilize campus and external funding for the improvement of existing space and, if appropriate, the addition of new space.

## **II. GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP**

### **A. Center Leadership**

Each center will be led by a director, or co-directors, at least one of whom who will be a faculty member. The director oversees all activities of the center and supervises the center staff. The director will report directly to the Vice Provost-Academic Planning & Facilities, with an auxiliary reporting responsibility to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. In many respects, the director's duties and responsibilities resemble those of the director of an ORU; however, it is not the intent that these new centers develop contracts, grants, and management staff, since these functions are to be secured from existing ORUs or colleges. That is, it is not the intent for these centers to spawn their own new ORUs.

The director is advised by an executive committee. The committee is composed of the deans of the directly relevant schools, colleges, and/or divisions, and an equal number of faculty members drawn from appropriate departments. The term of service is two or three years, with three years being the maximum. The EVCP appoints the NIC director, at the recommendation of the VP-APF; the VP-APF appoints the Executive Committee.

### **B. Center Administrative Structure**

Each center will be located under the Vice Provost-Academic Planning and Facilities (VP-APF) as a separate entity. In addition, a range of chart string numbers will be established in the partnering ORU or interdisciplinary center to facilitate the tracking of center resources. Current staff in the VP-APF immediate office will provide general oversight for the NICs.

Each center will establish a client relationship with an already-existing, closely aligned ORU or interdisciplinary center. A center will be a client of the ORU just as PIs are clients of the ORU. The ORU will provide normal business services – budget, accounting, payroll and HR. Business aspects of the research conducted by faculty associated with the NIC may be supported by this ORU or another ORU with which a PI has an existing relationship. However, each NIC will be expected to establish its own structure for outreach, publicity, grant writing, student programs, and curriculum design.

It is envisioned that all day-to-day administrative services will be provided at least initially by existing staff in the partnering ORU, augmented as needed for the first three years by start-up funds from the EVCP (see below). Either the ORU or NIC may hire additional staff, if it is necessary, who can be situated in either location. As a NIC grows, its staffing infrastructure will increase commensurately and, at some point, it may leave the ORU. The specific nature of the NIC/ORU relationship should be set forth in a formal Memorandum of Understanding.

## **III. FACULTY AFFILIATION WITH A CENTER**

The director and executive committee will determine the process and criteria for faculty affiliation and de-affiliation with the center, and categories of affiliation. These procedures and criteria will receive broad review before implementation and then dissemination to the relevant units after approval by the campus administration and the Academic Senate.

#### **IV. BUDGET**

The success of these centers requires temporary financial support. The budget allocation will be determined by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost following consultation with the appropriate senior administrators having responsibility for the research and teaching missions of the university. The budget for a center will depend upon the justification provided by the director, the current budgetary constraints of the campus, and the level of contributions provided by the relevant deans. As a general policy, the budget for each center will be shared equally between the relevant deans and the EVCP. That is, the EVCP will match dollar-for-dollar the contributions of the deans of the schools/colleges/divisions who wish to affiliate with the center, as well as outside sources of funds. This match will extend for three years and be limited to a maximum of \$125K a year. Beyond three years, EVCP funding will be determined on a year-to-year basis.

For administrative support, the EVCP will pay each partnering ORU 7.5% of the annual allocation as a temporary allocation of 19900 funds. If the funds are used for staff salaries, benefits will be covered automatically by the campus. Partnering ORUs will also receive 7.5% on all research funds managed in support of a center through the standard campus practice for such distributions. All funding, whether in the form of extramural grants or EVCP start-up funds, will be recorded as received in the NICs, but administered on a day-to-day basis by the partnering ORU. Grants will be the fiscal responsibility of the PIs, as is currently the case, but each NIC will be fiscally responsible for start-up funds from the EVCP and gifts.

#### **V. SPACE**

Each center will need to be allocated administrative space and will need access to space for lectures, meetings, etc. Since no new space is available on the campus to house such activities, this space will have to be provided by the relevant academic units in a configuration to be developed by the director in collaboration with the deans. The five NICs may be located adjacent to academically related units rather than their partnering ORU.

At least initially, the research of the center faculty will have to be carried out in currently occupied space provided by their home department or other source. An important role for the center will be to plan for and advocate optimal facilities for furthering their programs. This advocacy would include developing resources, campus support, and external support for creating optimal space and facilities for their programs, including a new building if that is appropriate.

#### **VI. RECRUITMENT, AND PROMOTION OF INITIATIVE-DESIGNATED FTE**

A center that receives an allocation of faculty FTE will not itself hold the faculty FTE. These FTE will be housed in appropriate existing departments. The center will, however, play a central role in the selection of the new faculty's research focus, the departments of new faculty, the formulation of search committees, the selection of new faculty, and faculty promotion.

The FTE of New Initiatives appointees will float above the targets of their host colleges and departments. For FTE management purposes, they will fall under the target for the New Initiative. In the event of separation, normal campus policies will be applied, and the centers

will be responsible for coordinating requests for new authorizations. In particular, if a junior (non-tenured) faculty is separated without receiving tenure, the FTE returns to the center for recruiting. In the case of a senior faculty member separation, the FTE will be returned to the EVCP. The center, not the home department, will be eligible to request the return of this FTE from the EVCP.

#### **A. Allocation of FTE**

The director, in consultation with the executive committee, will request authorization to recruit from the EVCP based on the FTE allocated for the center. These requests will receive Budget Committee review in the usual way. The request will include a search plan and the usual programmatic justification. These requests would be made in the usual cycle for such FTE requests, although off-cycle requests are possible in the startup year. The call for faculty recruitment plans is normally issued in October. The NIC requests to recruit should be accompanied by letters of support from the dean(s) who will make space available, and otherwise follow normal submission procedures. Once received, they will be simultaneously reviewed by the administration and the Budget Committee, as is always the case. The EVCP typically authorizes recruitment in May.

#### **B. The Search Committee**

The director, in consultation with the Executive Committee, will appoint the search committee. Provisions will be made for liaison between this committee and searches going on in the related departments that year. Once a NIC receives authorization to recruit, the director will submit a search plan to the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs & Faculty Welfare. The plan will also be reviewed by the Faculty Equity office. After the search plan is approved, the search will be conducted as specified below.

Search costs for filling positions allocated to NICs will not be covered from the budget of the cognizant unit dean, but will be covered by the NIC itself.

#### **C. Ad Formulation and Approval**

The director, in consultation with the search committee and executive committee, will formulate the advertisement and request its approval in the usual way – through the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs & Faculty Welfare and the Faculty Equity office.

#### **D. Articulation with Potential Home Departments**

Since the appointments will be made in a specific department, articulation of the search with departments is critical. Campus interviews with finalists will be coordinated with the appropriate home departments of the finalists.

#### **E. Development of Appointment Case**

The appointment case will be developed by the search committee chair working in collaboration with the home department chair.

## **F. Start-Up Funds**

The NIC director will discuss possible NIC searches with the potential cognizant dean. The cognizant unit dean should request start-up funds in his/her budget request, and should then allocate start-up funds in the normal way in partnership with the central administration. Because the eventual department is not always known at the beginning of an interdisciplinary search, more than one dean may request start-up funds in anticipation of a search. The NIC director should indicate when more than one dean may anticipate a NIC hire.

Unanticipated costs associated with an appointment, for example, helping an appointee secure a visa, should be split between the cognizant dean and the central administration.

Office space for the faculty member is provided by the cognizant unit. Renovation costs should be included in the deans' start-up requests.

## **G. Faculty Service**

Recruited faculty are expected to fully participate in the teaching mission of the university at the undergraduate and graduate level. The identification of faculty with one or more home departments is necessary to carry out this teaching mission. The selection of a home department will need to consider the teaching obligations and opportunities afforded by that department to the new faculty member. Teaching expectations should be agreed upon during the recruitment period and may include a specific understanding with the home department(s) for up to 50% teaching outside of the department (but within the interdisciplinary area).

## **H. Teaching and Service Expectations**

Faculty members appointed in positions allocated to any of the New Initiative Centers (NICs) will split their teaching and service duties between the NIC and the school or department(s) to which they are formally appointed (their units). The faculty members are not expected to devote more than 50% of their time to their units. Their service and teaching will be arranged in the normal way by consultation between the faculty member and the director of the NIC, and between the faculty member and the chair or dean of his/her unit.

The director and the chair or dean will consult with one another to coordinate the teaching and service expectations of the NIC and the unit. The director and the chair or dean will ensure that the faculty member's total teaching and service loads are not greater than those of others who are full-time in their unit. The director and the chair or dean will seek ways to maximize the faculty member's opportunities to teach courses relevant to his/her research interests.

Salary savings will be split between the budgets of the NIC and of the cognizant dean according to the percentage of time the faculty member spends in each place.

Costs of any GSIs, readers, or technical support staff assigned to NIC courses will not be supplied from the budgets of the cognizant unit dean, nor will any other instructional costs for NIC courses.

Replacement costs for NIC teaching will not be provided from the budget of the cognizant dean.

### **I. Faculty Advancement**

Units are responsible for preparing cases for merit increases, promotions, and other academic personnel actions. Unit ad hoc committees will include one NIC faculty member. In actions requiring a vote within a unit, the faculty members of the NIC will also take and report a separate vote. The NIC director and unit chair or dean will each prepare a letter assessing the candidate's record, but the unit chair or dean will take the lead in preparing the case. Cases sent forward by the unit chair or dean will follow the normal path of review.

In the preparation of advancement cases, the department chair will consult with the NIC director regarding the center's view of the contributions of the faculty member. The candidate should include in his/her own report the ways in which he/she has served both the department and the center. It is useful to have the executive committee of the NIC vote on the faculty member as well. The NIC director letter and report on the executive committee vote should be included in the case materials reviewed by the departmental faculty prior to the department's vote on the case.

### **VII. SUNSET REVIEW**

These centers are expected to seed the formation of new disciplines and transform the campus as a result. The pace of this transformation is uncertain; it is also possible that the transformation may never take place. To account for these possibilities, the centers will be subject to sunset reviews every 5 years using an internal and external review process to be initiated jointly by the Vice Chancellor-Research and the Vice Provost-Academic Planning and Facilities. If the center has an affiliated Graduate Group, that group should also be reviewed as part of the sunset review process. Academic Senate involvement in the review process is expected. The sunset review will be started five years after the last FTE position joins the campus, unless circumstances suggest otherwise. The case for continuation will rest on the vitality of the academic enterprise, as measured by growth in enrollment of graduate and undergraduate students, and on the size and breadth of the research program and support.

## THE BERKELEY DIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVE

### Charter of 2008

#### Preamble

This document has been prepared as guidance to participants in the BDRI as well as to campus administrators and faculty members interested in the success of these research efforts. It is likely that each BDRI diversity cluster will be unique in its circumstance and organization, but this document establishes the arrangement under which all BDRI clusters will function.

#### I. Overall Goals

The BDRI was created to promote and facilitate research into racial and ethnic diversity, specifically interdisciplinary research into the nature of multi-cultural societies and the ways in which such societies flourish. One major goal is to generate a deep understanding of the similarities and differences among multi-cultural societies, and of the factors that contribute to their success. Another equally important goal is to build on this research to develop prescriptions for changes in policy and practice that are likely to reduce ethnic/racial disparities that are of concern to the State of California and the nation.

The process for meeting the goals is through the support of BDRI diversity clusters made up of faculty members from academic units across campus. The clusters will concentrate on promising areas of diversity research in which new faculty FTE will work together with current faculty from a variety of departments. The Chancellor has promised new faculty FTE for this purpose. The faculty will collaborate to develop research themes that will grow, flourish, and eventually mature into research and instructional programs. This goal may be reached through the establishment of interdisciplinary graduate groups, or participation in existing research centers, or the creation of new research centers.

#### II. Organizational Structure

- A. The activities of the BDRI will be facilitated by an Advisory Board whose duties include the following:
1. Define and oversee a process to implement any newly authorized opportunities for a proposal process for additional faculty FTE.
  2. Appoint and provide oversight to the BDRI Director, and advise the Director on strategic directions.
  3. Nominate an Operations Committee which works more closely and intensively with the Director on operational concerns and development opportunities.

The Advisory Board will meet as needed, and be composed of the following:

- 1) Faculty Co-Chairs appointed by the EVCP

- 2) a member from each of the BDRI clusters (chosen by each cluster, currently 3). If a cluster member is a co-chair, the cluster does not get another representative.
- 3) a member from each of the relevant major campus centers or ORUs directly associated with diversity research (selected by each unit). [These now include the Center for Race and Gender, the Warren Institute, and the Institute for the Study of Social Change]. If a Center member is on the Board in another position, the Center does not get another member.
- 4) 3 other faculty members engaged in diversity research (2 appointed by the VCEI and one by COMS, who reports back to the Academic Senate)
- 5) Appropriate Multi-disciplinary Chair-holders (as determined by the VCEI)
- 6) A graduate/professional student from one of the clusters (chosen by the Board)
- 7) A staff member associated with research or student activities important to the BDRI (chosen by the Board)
- 8) Representatives of the VPAPF and VCEI (1 each)
- 9) A member of BIR (ex officio, and only when searches are contemplated or ongoing)

Board membership is one-year renewable; the Co-Chairs are two-year renewable (with staggered terms).

The Operations Committee will be composed by the Board of committed and effective individuals who have the time and energy to more closely oversee the BDRI, take initiative, and report to the Board on operational concerns, possible new initiatives, and development activities. It will contain at least 4 Board members (including at least 1 Chair), but may also have membership not on the Board. The Director will act as Secretary to the Operations Committee. The purview of action of this Committee will be set by the Board.

## B. Activities and Functions of the BDRI

The BDRI will serve as a “hub” to all the “spokes” of diversity research on the Berkeley campus. These spokes include BDRI clusters, other centers and ORUs, and groups or individuals doing diversity research as defined in the preamble. The primary purpose of the hub is to help promote interaction between the spokes, but it should also seek resources to provide targeted services that enhance the effectiveness of spokes when they are not able to provide them on their own. What follows is a list of possible activities or characteristics of the hub; they vary greatly in the resources required. The Board has to set priorities among them, and help set up processes to generate the required resources.

1. Promoting Research Synergies and Community Building
  - a) Seminar series on selected inter-disciplinary and cross-spoke topics. This could take the form of a series of talks, a faculty/student seminar (like those in the Townshend Center), among others.
  - b) Workshops or Conferences, organized by the hub and involving at least several spokes (sometimes co-sponsored by one or more spokes)

- c) BDRI Speaker series (sometimes helps expose new faculty candidates)
  - c) Community meetings (town halls, forums, and the like)
  - d) Retreats involving varying numbers of spokes
  - e) Database of all ongoing efforts and investigators
2. Dissemination of Results and Public Relations
    - a) BDRI website (collecting the integrated effort in one place)
    - b) Searchable databases and bibliographies
    - c) Publication support (as resources are available)
    - d) Production of white papers and policy recommendations
    - e) Media relations (press releases, opinion pieces)
  3. Teaching, Research, and Curriculum Support
    - a) Support of new multi-disciplinary courses (development and implementation)
    - b) Involvement of students in BDRI research (graduate, professional, and undergraduate). Making finding opportunities easier, and supporting inter-spoke or cluster research if resources are available.
    - c) Promoting networking and mentoring vertically and horizontally
    - d) Providing seed funds for pilot projects
  4. Seeking New Resources
    - a) Support of grant-writing activities
    - b) Support of development opportunities through connections to fund-raising entities on campus (including current campaign); additional fundraising capacity as resources allow
    - c) Collaboration with units having existing resources; realizing “efficiencies of scale” and reducing duplication of effort
    - d) Making effective arguments for campus resources
  5. Administrative Needs
    - a) full-time Director (in addition to the faculty Board Co-chairs)
    - b) administrative staff or collaborative arrangement with a unit that can supply administrative functions (at least: funds management, events organization, HR management)
    - c) communications capacity (website, dissemination activities above as funded)
    - d) teaching relief for highly involved faculty members (if possible)

### III. Cluster Leadership

Coordinating committee leader(s) will engage members of the diversity cluster in planning all research activities and faculty hiring. The leaders will report to the VP-APF.

The term of service is two or three years, with three years being the maximum. Leaders will be appointed by the EVCP.

### IV. Allocation, Recruitment and Promotion of BDRI-Designated FTE

The leader(s) of each coordinating committee will request authorization to recruit faculty FTE from the EVCP during the regular annual faculty recruitment process, except during the start-up phase, when an off-cycle request will be entertained. The call for faculty recruitment plans is normally issued in October. The requests to recruit should be accompanied by letters of support from the VP-APF and the dean(s) and chairs who will make space and start-up resources available, and otherwise follow normal submission procedures. Once received, they will be simultaneously reviewed by the administration and the Budget Committee, as is always the case. The EVCP typically authorizes recruitment in May. Once a diversity cluster receives authorization to recruit, the leader will submit a search plan to the Vice Provost-Academic Affairs & Faculty Welfare. The plan will also be reviewed by the Office of Faculty Equity (OFE).

A diversity cluster that receives an allocation of faculty FTE will not itself hold the faculty FTE; these FTE will be housed in appropriate existing departments. The cluster will, however, play a central role in the selection of the intellectual thrust of the new faculty, the department to house the new faculty, the formulation of search committees, the selection of the new faculty, and the faculty promotion.

- A. **Allocation of FTE associated with a diversity cluster.** The leader(s) of the coordinating committee will request authorization to recruit from the EVCP, through the VP-APF, based on the FTE allocated for the diversity cluster. These requests will receive Budget Committee review in the usual way. The request will include the usual programmatic justification. These requests will be made in the usual cycle for such FTE requests, although off-cycle requests are possible in the startup year.
- B. **Formation of search committee.** The coordinating committees will recommend to the VP-APF the membership and leadership of each multidepartmental search committee. Provision must be made for liaison between each search committee and searches going on in the related departments that year. Each search committee will develop the search plan and request its approval in the usual way.
- C. **Ad formulation and approval.** Each search committee will formulate the advertisement and request its approval in the usual way.
- D. **Coordination with potential home departments.** Since the appointments will be made in one or two departments, coordination of the search with potential home departments is critical. Campus interviews with finalists will be coordinated with the appropriate home departments of the finalists.

- E. **Candidates.** Will be expected to give a job talk attended by members of the departments they consider their likely units of appointment. Interested faculty from other departments and members of the search committees are expected to attend as well.
- F. **Development of appointment case.** Once the search committee identifies candidates who are acceptable to relevant departments, it will rank these candidates and propose to the relevant dean(s) that the top-ranked candidate be offered the position. The appointment case will be developed by the appointing department(s) working with the search committee chair and sent to the cognizant dean(s). As with any faculty appointment, the home departments (s) will be required to conduct a meeting to discuss the candidate and submit the faculty vote on the candidate as part of the package.
- G. **Start-up costs.** Will be shared between the EVCP and relevant dean(s) on a 50-50 basis.
- H. **Service expectations.** BDRI faculty members will have the same service expectations as any other faculty member.
- I. **Advancement cases.** In their preparation, the department chair will consult with the coordinating committee regarding the research, teaching, and service contributions of the faculty member. In advancement cases that require or entail a departmental ad hoc committee, the department chair will include one outside member associated with the diversity cluster on the committee for preparation of the promotion case, and the case will include a letter from the coordinating committee leader(s) evaluating the contributions of the faculty member. This letter will be included in the case materials reviewed by the faculty prior to the departmental vote on the case. In normal merit cases, the department chair will solicit input from one or more members of the cluster coordinating committee.
- J. **The FTE of BDRI appointees** will float above the targets of their host colleges and departments. For FTE management purposes, they will fall under the target for the diversity cluster. In the event of separation, normal campus policies will be applied, and the diversity clusters will be responsible for coordinating requests for new authorizations. In particular, if a junior (non-tenured) faculty is separated without receiving tenure, the FTE returns to the diversity cluster for recruiting. In the case of a senior faculty member separation, the FTE will be returned to the EVCP; the diversity cluster, not the home department, will be eligible to request the return of this FTE from the EVCP.

## V. Budget

The success of these diversity clusters will require some financial support. The budget allocation will be determined by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost following consultation with the appropriate senior administrators having responsibility for the research and teaching missions of the university. The budget for a diversity cluster will depend upon the justification provided

by the leader(s), the current budgetary constraints of the campus, and the level of contributions provided by the relevant deans.

## **VI. Space**

Since no new space is available on the campus, space for BDRI faculty members will have to be provided by the relevant academic units in a configuration to be developed by the diversity cluster leaders in collaboration with the deans and department chairs. At least initially, BDRI faculty research will have to be carried out in space provided by home departments or other sources.

## **VII. Cluster Review**

These diversity clusters are expected to generate research that draws upon a broad range of disciplines on the UC Berkeley campus, ultimately transforming the campus as a result. Each cluster will be asked to work with the EVCP/VP-APF to develop goals and metrics against which they will be evaluated coincident with the normal budget cycle. In addition to its own goals and metrics, each cluster is expected to support the general BDRI goals articulated in Section I. Each cluster will be asked to submit an annual report on progress to the VP-APF, which will be reviewed by the BDRI Executive Committee.

As this transformation will take time, the diversity clusters will be subject to full reviews on a five-year basis. The first review will be started five years after the cluster's second FTE position joins the campus, but no later than eight years after the FTE award in 2006.

An internal and external review process will be initiated jointly by the Vice Provost-Academic Planning & Facilities and Vice Chancellor-Research. If a diversity cluster has created an affiliated graduate group, that group should also be reviewed as part of the review process. Academic Senate involvement in the review process is expected. The case for continuation will rest on the vitality of the research enterprise, as measured by the size and breadth of the research program and support.