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ABSTRACT

INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND JOINT FACULTY EXPERIENCE: A MULTI-CASE STUDY OF THREE SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Marcia A. Thomas
J. Matthew Hartley

The past few decades have witnessed a rise in the popularity of interdisciplinary efforts in colleges and universities around the world. In U.S. schools of public health, interdisciplinary work has taken on a variety of forms, from individual courses to interdisciplinary research centers and institutes. Some schools have approached interdisciplinarity by going beyond collaborative activities to the development of formal, jointly appointed faculty positions, in which faculty hold an appointment between the school of public health and at least one other school or department within the same university. However, joint appointments tend to fall outside of the traditional institutional infrastructure, which may make faculty who hold such appointments vulnerable to a variety of professional and environmental challenges.

The purpose of this qualitative study was to better understand how institutional infrastructures influence the experience of faculty holding joint appointments by exploring this phenomenon in three U.S. schools of public health. The data for this research were collected through interviews with joint faculty as well as key administrators at each of the three sites. Observations from site visits as well as
institutional documents were also used as part of the case study design. Institutional documents included accreditation self-study reports, institutional bylaws and policies, websites, and strategic plans.

Analysis of the case studies suggests that it is not a specific administrative infrastructure per se that prevents problems associated with joint appointments and/or promotes faculty satisfaction; rather, what matters is how the infrastructure aligns with organizational culture. In addition to looking inward to institutional culture, the study also suggests that schools should: 1) foster strong faculty mentoring for joint faculty, 2) prioritize institutional transparency around joint appointment decision-making, 3) value and appreciate the unique arrangements and contributions of joint faculty, and 4) recognize that place in career may influence joint faculty experience.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Institutions serious about interdisciplinary scholarship need to move beyond making joint hires and simply hoping they will work out.”
(Pfirman, et al., 2005a, para. 19)

Across many areas in higher education, interdisciplinary work has been on the rise (Amey & Brown, 2004; James Jacob, 2015) and generally supported as a worthwhile institutional goal (Teodorescu & Kushner, 2003). Leading health and science organizations have recognized the strengths of interdisciplinary efforts and have identified interdisciplinarity as a key priority area over the past several years (Institute of Medicine, 2003a; National Institute of Health; National Science Foundation). Noted benefits of interdisciplinary efforts include the ability to address problems not confined to one discipline, the synergistic potential of multiple perspectives, the capacity for innovation, an ability to adapt to changing workforce environments, and the increased likelihood that approaches to problems will be sustained (Aldrich, 2014; Klein, 1990; Lattuca, 2001; National Academies, 2004; Spanner, 2001; Stehr & Weingart, 2000). The field of public health draws heavily on interdisciplinary efforts to tackle some of the world’s most challenging health-related issues. Today’s global health problems require the integration of knowledge and skills across a variety of fields – from medicine to engineering – in order to improve and sustain the health of populations. For example, the recent Ebola outbreak demonstrates the need to integrate knowledge and practice across multiple specialties to develop practical solutions to a multifaceted problem – epidemiology, transportation, policy, medicine, communication, and law enforcement to name just a few. Encouraging academic institutions to provide the necessary
infrastructures and incentives for interdisciplinary activities, the Institute of Medicine (2003b) recommends that schools of public health, specifically, should collaborate with other academic units and serve as a foundation for interdisciplinary research to improve the public’s health.

Schools of public health utilize a variety of methods to encourage interdisciplinary efforts. One common strategy is through the hiring of faculty jointly appointed in the school of public health and at least one other school or department within the university. A school dean or department chair might also be limited by the approved allocation of faculty lines or resources in a given fiscal or academic year and can negotiate a shared appointment with another unit. Faculty themselves might be drawn to the opportunity to be part of multiple disciplinary departments; take for example, a public health engineer. This individual may seek the public health faculty and professional community, while also drawing upon the engineering school’s resources, laboratories, and research potential. Despite the existence of joint faculty appointments in colleges and universities, the literature suggests that in reality, such appointments fail to reach their potential as a result of a variety of institutional practices (or lack thereof) (Bozeman & Boardman, 2004; Caruso & Rhoten, 2001; Rhoten, 2004).

For example, the typical organizational structure of universities is discipline-based, (Amey & Brown, 2004; Becher, 1994; Lattuca, 2001), while interdisciplinarity does not sit cleanly within organizational charts. Thus, faculty involved in interdisciplinary work are often left to feel out of place, devalued, and even vulnerable as compared to their discipline-specific colleagues (Bell, Carss, & Marzano, 2005; Hart & Mars, 2009; Pfirman & Martin, 2010; Spanner, 2001). Joint faculty are also susceptible
to tensions across disciplines when it comes to “allegiances.” Consider, for example, that each grant submission by a joint faculty member may involve a negotiation as to which unit/department the grant is submitted and administered. If the grant is awarded, negotiations must take place regarding which unit will receive credit for the grant (which is important for rankings), which unit will be able to count the research dollars in its financial reporting, which unit will receive the indirect cost or overhead that is returned to the university, and in some cases, which unit will receive recognition if and when a publication results from the research (Lingard, Schryer, Spafford, & Campbell, 2007; Porter, Roessner, Cohen, & Perreault, 2006). Promotion and tenure processes can be complicated for interdisciplinary faculty, and is identified as the top impediment to interdisciplinary research by the National Academies (2004). At a minimum, tenure and promotion standards vary widely across disciplines (Hart & Mars, 2009) and tenure committees often maintain a discipline-focused mentality (Austin, 2003). As a result, joint faculty may be evaluated by two separate groups of faculty, often with separate disciplinary norms and expectations.

A 2009 report by the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) states that “although institutions are influenced by the widespread rhetoric regarding the significance of interdisciplinarity and frequently commit to such an ideal in their strategic plans and organizational mission, the institutional structure in higher education is unable to adequately support interdisciplinary work” (Holley, 2009b, p. 8). Over the past few years, however, organizations and scholars of interdisciplinarity have begun to establish recommendations to improve institutional infrastructures in support of faculty participating in interdisciplinary efforts (Aldrich, 2014; Association of American
Universities, 2005; Casey, 2010; Holley, 2009b; National Academies, 2004; Pfirman et al., 2011; Stehr & Weingart, 2000), recommending that universities not only initiate interdisciplinary work but remain committed to successful implementation (Pfirman & Martin, 2010). However, the degree to which institutions are applying those recommendations in practice, and how they ultimately influence faculty, remains unclear.

The literature suggests that there is a need – in theory – for colleges and universities to establish intentionality in their institutional infrastructures in order to support faculty engaged in interdisciplinary work. However, to do so responsibly, research is needed to better understand the role and experience of faculty who are formally engaged in those efforts. In particular, additional research is needed to explore the ways in which institutional systems relate to interdisciplinary joint appointments, and how those relationships manifest within schools of public health specifically.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to better understand how institutional infrastructures influence the experience of faculty holding joint appointments in U.S. schools of public health. Using a qualitative multiple case study approach, I explored in depth how three U.S. schools of public health navigate interdisciplinary efforts through joint appointments. Each school prioritized interdisciplinarity and faculty joint appointments. The significance of the study is three-fold. First, the results of this study help fill some of the gap in our understanding of one aspect of the execution of interdisciplinarity: faculty joint appointments. In particular, it sheds light on some of the factors that promote or impede the effectiveness of interdisciplinary appointments. Second, schools and programs that appoint joint faculty will be able to use results of the study to inform their
own systems to support, promote, and deliver excellence in interdisciplinary efforts.

Finally, this study provides insights to faculty holding joint appointments about how they might navigate a complex, but valuable career.
Institutions of higher education understand that the challenges facing our world today cannot be addressed through singular approaches, and are looking toward ways to integrate disciplines across their campuses. Disciplinary approaches provide a particular lens on challenging problems, but complex problems may require understanding from a variety of perspectives. In U.S. schools of public health, interdisciplinary work has taken on a variety of forms, from coursework drawing on multiple fields of study to large-scale interdisciplinary research centers and institutes. Some schools have approached interdisciplinarity by going beyond collaborative activities to develop formal, jointly appointed faculty positions, in which faculty hold an appointment between the school of public health and at least one other school within the same university. As disciplines within an institution may have different norms and values, faculty who hold appointments in two separate disciplines may face challenges in trying to bridge those differences.

Interdisciplinarity

To better understand the potential complexities of bridging disciplines, it is important to understand what is meant by “interdisciplinarity.” Although the practice of interdisciplinarity has been around for some time, the term itself did not really emerge until the twentieth century (Klein, 1990; Kockelmans, 2003). In 1923, the Social Science Research Council was created to promote integration across disciplines and original issues addressed included racial relations, human migration, and prohibition (Social Science Research Council). During the 1930s and 1940s, government and organizations
began to realize that many problems facing the nation— including war, propaganda, and social services — could not be approached by any one specific discipline but needed integrative collaboration among scientists, economist, and policy experts (Klein, 1990). The 1950s gave rise to interdisciplinary materials research through the Department of Defense, and the 1970s brought a surge of interdisciplinary research around technology development. In 1972, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) identified the interdisciplinarity of science as a priority in the book *Interdisciplinarity: Problems of Teaching and Research in Universities*. Since the 1970s, the focus on interdisciplinarity has gained increasing momentum within higher education and spans across curriculum, faculty appointments, research, and institutional partnerships. For example, there has been an almost six-fold increase in interdisciplinary studies\(^1\) baccalaureate degrees awarded since 1970, and a 54% increase in just the past ten years (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Today, a simple Internet search for “interdisciplinary” generates over 37 million responses.

Despite the interest in interdisciplinarity, there is no single accepted definition for it; rather, a wide variety exists in the literature (Aboelela et al., 2007; Frodeman, Klein, & Mitcham, 2010; Klein, 1990; Lattuca, 2003; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 1972). The one used in the remainder of this paper is grounded in the definition developed by the OECD:

> An adjective describing the interaction among two or more different disciplines. This interaction may range from simple communication of ideas to the mutual integration of organizing concepts, methodology, procedures, epistemology, terminology, 

\(^1\) Defined by the National Center for Education Statistics as “instructional programs that derive from two or more distinct programs to provide a cross-cutting focus on a subject concentration that is not subsumed under a single discipline or occupational field”.

data and organization of research and education in a fairly large field. An interdisciplinary group consists of persons trained in different field of knowledge (disciplines) with different concepts, methods, and data and terms organized into a common effort on a common problem with continuous intercommunication among participants from the different disciplines. (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 1972, pp. 25-26)

Although definitions of interdisciplinarity vary in the literature, the common thread among them all is the concept of “integration” with other characteristics including interactions, linkages, and blending (Klein, 2010). Terms used frequently when discussing interdisciplinarity include borrowing, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinarity and should be defined and distinguished. They represent concepts across the continuum of collaboration.

Borrowing is a term used to describe situations in which knowledge and/or methodologies from one discipline are applied to another discipline (Klein, 2000, 2010). In borrowing, the cross-fertilization of disciplines is typically isolated and transitory. An example of borrowing is the use of mass marketing techniques from the corporate industry toward messaging a public health prevention campaign.

Multidisciplinary is often used interchangeably with interdisciplinarity, however there are important distinctions between the two concepts. Per Klein (1990), “Multidisciplinarity signifies the juxtaposition of disciplines. It is essentially additive, not integrative” (p. 56). In multidisciplinary engagement in higher education setting, individuals who represent various specialties contribute separate disciplinary perspective, however the work is coordinative rather than integrative and thus the disciplines themselves are not enriched or changed as a result (Klein, 2010; Lattuca, 2001; The National Academies, 2004). For example, individuals with diverse training may be
placed on a research team studying the effects of a diabetes prevention program in the community. When the research project is complete, the team separates and individual members engage in other projects.

*Transdisciplinary*, on the other hand, is used when action “transcends” disciplinary worldviews and *systematically* integrates knowledge, thus transforming disciplines and creating new conceptual and theoretical frameworks (Klein, 2010). New theoretical paradigms are created and “problem solutions emerge in context of application, and transdisciplinary knowledge has its own theoretical knowledge structures and research methods” (Weingart, 2000, p. 43). In application, transdisciplinary approaches are not connected with disciplines per se, but with problems and solutions. Transdisciplinary team members learn the language, methods and perspectives of their colleagues so that in reality, disciplines no longer exist (Rosenfield, 1992).

**Interdisciplinarity in Public Health**

Few fields epitomize interdisciplinarity as well as public health. As defined by the World Health Organization, public health refers to:

All organized measures (whether public or private) to prevent disease, promote health, and prolong life among the population as a whole. Its activities aim to provide conditions in which people can be healthy and focus on entire populations, not on individual patients or diseases. Thus, public health is concerned with the total system and not only the eradication of a particular disease (World Health Organization).

Today’s global health challenges demand that scholars and practitioners from numerous fields integrate knowledge and practice to improve and sustain the health of populations around the world. As such, the field of public health must draw from a variety of disciplines, including but not limited to economics, public policy, medicine,
nursing, sociology, education, law, and engineering. It has been argued that for complex issues (such as those impacting the public’s health), disciplinary boundaries can actually impede problem-solving processes (Spanner, 2001).

Among institutions of higher education, interdisciplinary approaches are becoming fundamental aspects of scholarly research in the health sciences, and generally supported as worthwhile institutional goals (Teodorescu & Kushner, 2003). One survey found that the majority of researchers in higher education report having engaged in at least some interdisciplinary work (Evaluation Associates, 1999). The National Academy of Sciences (2004) credits this rise of interdisciplinarity in research to four primary “drivers”: the inherent complexity of society, the desire to address problems that are not confined to a single discipline, the need to solve societal problems, and the emergence of new technologies. Interdisciplinarity is often seen as synonymous with innovation; a cutting edge approach where through the integration of ideas, creativity and breakthroughs can occur.

Recognizing the significance of interdisciplinary work, the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), the accrediting agency for schools and programs in public health, has specifically highlighted interdisciplinarity in its accreditation criteria. To maintain accreditation, schools must provide a “description of the manner in which interdisciplinary coordination, cooperation and collaboration occur and support public health learning, research and service” (Council on Education for Public Health, 2011, p. 7).

Other leading health and science organizations have also acknowledged the strengths of interdisciplinary efforts and have identified interdisciplinarity as a key
priority area over the past several years, as “important research ideas often transcend the scope of a single discipline or program…the integration of research and education through interdisciplinary training prepares a workforce that undertakes scientific challenges in innovative ways” (National Science Foundation).

Recognizing that students of academic public health programs must graduate with a broad range of skills and information to meet the needs of today’s workforce, the Institute of Medicine (2003a) report, *The Future of the Public’s Health in the 21st Century*, calls for an increase not only in multidisciplinary education, but in “integrated, interdisciplinary learning opportunities for students in public health” (p. 16). The IOM also encourages academic institutions to provide the necessary funding, infrastructures, and faculty reward systems to incentivize interdisciplinary activities. Furthermore, the IOM (2003b) also recommends that schools of public health should “collaborate with other academic units (e.g., medicine, nursing, education, and urban planning) to provide transdisciplinary approaches to active community involvement to improve population health” (p. 16) and “serve as a focal point for multi-school transdisciplinary research as well as traditional public health research to improve the health of the public” (p. 108).

The IOM has also partnered with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, with financial support from the W.M. Keck Foundation, to offer the National Academies Keck Futures Initiative (NAKFI). NAFKI’s goal is to facilitate interdisciplinary research and scholarship through a variety of mechanisms, including cash prizes, grants, and conferences (National Academy of Sciences).

In terms of major research funding organizations, the National Institute of Health
(NIH) emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary research not only in specific funding opportunities, but also in altering the traditional academic culture. In its 2003 launch of its Roadmap, the NIH sought to advance knowledge through innovative funding opportunities and training programs to encourage interdisciplinary research and promote interdisciplinary scholars (National Institute of Health). The NIH Roadmap served as a stimulus for incorporating interdisciplinary funding and training programs in their portfolio today. The NIH also acknowledges the collaborative potential of research by allowing multiple principle investigators (PIs) on grants, something that was only allowed on exceptional basis prior to the Roadmap.

Through both solicited and unsolicited mechanisms, the National Science Foundation (NSF) supports a growing body of interdisciplinary research across a wide variety of areas, including public health topics such as water sustainability and climate change (National Science Foundation). The NSF also supports training of students and scholars engaging in interdisciplinary work, as well as ongoing workshops and seminars. Data from the NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates found that from 2001-2008, 28.4% of doctoral graduates reported dissertation research with an interdisciplinary focus and/or approach (Millar & Dillman, 2012).

**Interdisciplinary Faculty and Joint Appointments**

The role of interdisciplinarity in the career of a faculty member in schools of public health can take on a variety of approaches. Some disciplinary faculty may be hired into interdisciplinary departments while others are interdisciplinary faculty hired into disciplinary departments. Still others may not fall into either category, but engage in interdisciplinary work none-the-less.
One common approach to interdisciplinarity taken by schools of public health is through the hiring of faculty jointly appointed in the school of public health and at least one other school or department within the university. Such appointments are made for a variety of reasons. First, joint appointments can be used strategically to attract a faculty member to an institution who might otherwise not be recruitable, particularly when compensation is a factor. In this case, schools can share costs and pull resources including those for housing and research space. Second, a school may be limited by the number of approved faculty lines in any given year, therefore joint hires allow a dean or department chair to spread those lines out further, which is particularly important when faculty headcount is needed to meet institutional and professional standards. Third, faculty members themselves might have expertise that crosses one discipline or department, and therefore specifically seeks opportunities in which an appointment can be made in multiple units. Finally, research indicates that joint appointment models suggest an institution’s openness and commitment to interdisciplinary (Lattuca, 2001). Given the attention being given to interdisciplinarity, departments and schools are using joint appointments to market that perception.

Despite the growing interest and benefits of jointly appointed faculty, there is cause to examine the challenges that faculty in those positions may face. For example, one recent study found that all but one joint faculty interviewed would not consider a joint appointment in the future, and that mentors and colleagues advised against it for a variety of reasons, including a lack of professional identity and reduced legitimacy (Hart & Mars, 2009). While few argue the benefits of interdisciplinary activities in general, the success of interdisciplinarity in practice remains in question (Caruso & Rhoten, 2001).
The review of literature will examine challenges facing interdisciplinary faculty across five areas: culture and identity, research, promotion and tenure, and resources.

**Culture and Identity**

Edgar Schein defines culture of a group as a:

Pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relations to those problems (Schein, 2010, p. 18).

Applying this definition, one might argue that the very organizational structure of universities supports a discipline-oriented culture, through the existence of schools and departments within those schools (Becher, 1994; Lattuca, 2001). The proliferation of disciplines – the professionalization of knowledge – in institutions of higher education in the nineteenth century was accompanied by the administrative infrastructures to support them (Amey & Brown, 2004; Kockelmans, 2003). Autonomous departments became the organizational entity to facilitate disciplinary work, often with unique governance and fiduciary responsibility. This departmental structure gives rise to particular norms and values. Academic departments themselves hold prominence and prestige in U.S. colleges and universities (Eckel, 1998), and chairs of those departments often have control over faculty appointments, hiring, and tenure decisions. Such prestige is closely linked to an accumulation of social capital and the disciplinary department serves as a social community for faculty (Burris, 2004; Frodeman et al., 2010). Traditionally, the departmental structure legitimizes academic work and creates an organizational – and disciplinary – home for faculty (Eckel, 1998; Klein, 1990; Lattuca, 2001; Sá, 2008). The nature of the departmental organization ultimately establishes a competitive environment
not only for reputation but also for the allocation of resources. Becher (1989) described academic departments as “tribes” seeking to “defend their own patches of intellectual ground by employing a variety of devices geared to the exclusion of illegal immigrants” (p 24).

Interdisciplinarity, on the other hand, “exists in the white space of organizational charts” (Klein, 2000, p. 8). Despite an interest in innovation and interdisciplinary measures in higher education, the cultural norm of the discipline-centric academy creates a centrifugal force pulling faculty away from the potential for formal interdisciplinary work. Indeed, as scholars move toward interdisciplinary environments, they report not “fitting in” as well as they did in their single disciplinary home and those with formal joint appointments feel a lack of support and an overall reduction in morale and confidence (Lattuca, 2001, 2003). Interdisciplinary faculty have reported being judged by peers as engaging in less rigorous scholarship as compared to their discipline-specific colleagues (Bell et al., 2005; Hart & Mars, 2009; Klein, 1990; Marzano, Carss, & Bell, 2006).

Interdisciplinary faculty also experience difficulty in adapting to new cultures and frames of reference across disciplines; this sense of multiple identities ultimately creates tension, insecurity and a sense of vulnerability (Bell et al., 2005; Brewer, 1999; Bromme, 2000; Lau & Pasquini, 2004; Lingard et al., 2007; Pfirman & Martin, 2010; Spanner, 2001). For many, the discipline serves as the unit of academic knowledge and is expressed in practical application through the peer review process. Thus, one’s disciplinary peers become the community in which scholars identify and establish
credibility (Aldrich, 2014; Holbrook, 2010). For joint faculty, the “shared basic assumptions” that establish professional culture are blurred.

A disconnected culture can lead to potential power differentials, where one academic department may dominate the other in decision-making, administration, or authority (Lattuca, 2001; Marzano et al., 2006). In some cases, joint faculty expressed confusion regarding which department had authority over their hiring, promotion, and expectations for productivity (Hart & Mars, 2009). Several studies indicate a particular challenge in communication among faculty engaged in interdisciplinary research, specifically in the struggle to fully understand the “language” spoken across disciplines (Bell et al., 2005; Chamberlin, 2006; Domino, Smith, & Johnson, 2007; Marzano et al., 2006).

**Research**

Another challenge facing joint faculty lies in research productivity and administration. Many faculty are drawn to interdisciplinary work due to its collaborative and synergistic research potential. By breaking down disciplinary boundaries, faculty are free to explore new methodologies and interventions which may result in more meaningful and sustainable change. However, while interdisciplinary research may be an attraction for faculty, it can also be a deterrent. As Marzano (2006) explains, “this multiplicity of identities means that our combined ‘interdisciplarity’ is exponential, creating the conditions for both creativity and conflict” (p. 505-506).

On the pre-award side, interdisciplinarity is complicated by conflicting allegiances. For example, a faculty jointly appointed between a school of public health and a school of medicine must navigate between two powerful entities to determine under
which school the grant proposal is submitted. The decision may have serious consequences in terms of overall grant funding reporting by school and subsequently school rankings, not to mention the personal and professional pressure that it places on the faculty member. Once the administering department is identified, there is the issue of principle investigator status and a faculty member’s individual contribution (Porter et al., 2006). Depending on the disciplines, the professional protocols and implications of investigator status can vary greatly. Thus, an increased level of negotiation is required as compared to more traditional disciplinary approaches. In addition, scholars do not always share the same definition or understanding of interdisciplinarity and researchers may disagree on the level of collaboration required. On one end of the spectrum, faculty may be part of an interdisciplinary team but have minimal or any contribution. In fact, researches who cross disciplines have expressed having been “written in” to interdisciplinary grants due to their area of expertise or interdisciplinarity, but are not involved in the actual study design (Campbell, 2005). On the other end of that spectrum, researchers may be expected to collaborate fully, sometimes needing to drop other projects in order to do so. Due to the nature of these collaborations, interdisciplinary scholars have potential to deviate from their planned research agenda, risking progress toward personal professional pursuits (Spanner, 2001).

Another challenge interdisciplinary faculty face in the early stages of a research project lies in the difficulty of identifying the appropriate community for the peer review process (Aldrich, 2014; Holbrook, 2010). While funding agencies are increasingly open to interdisciplinary projects, the selection of those projects often falls under a discipline-centric review process, in which those who render judgment are “peers” within that
subject area. Per NIH protocol, “the first level of review is carried out by a Scientific Review Group (SRG) composed primarily of non-federal scientists who have expertise in relevant scientific disciplines and current research areas” (National Institute of Health). Interdisciplinary research projects, however, complicate how one defines “peer.” As disciplines adhere to different, and sometimes conflicting, standards of quality in research design, the current process may be questioned for the impartiality and fairness of review (Holbrook, 2010; Huutoniemi, 2010).

Once research funding is secured, joint faculty must be flexible in the ways in which they think and the ways in which they work (Marzano et al., 2006). They are expected to understand or even master multiple approaches and methodologies and negotiate decisions across and within research groups (Lau & Pasquini, 2004). The increased amount of time and energy spent on interdisciplinary projects can often be a challenge and communication requirements increase in complexity and volume (Marzano et al., 2006). Such challenges can ultimately affect publication time and process which can be particularly problematic to junior faculty (Domino et al., 2007). In fact, studies indicate that faculty who engage in collaborative research publish less than those who specialize (Leahey, 2006, 2007).

Finally, faculty engaged in interdisciplinary work have experienced setbacks in publishing in top-tier journals, reportedly due to a lack of appreciation and/or perceived value in interdisciplinary research (Huutoniemi, 2010; Lau & Pasquini, 2004). Interdisciplinary scholars are vulnerable to bias when it comes to publishing in “non-traditional” journals or journals outside one’s discipline, and for some disciplines, finding top tier journals that will publish interdisciplinary research is a challenge (Campbell,
Furthermore, negotiations over authorship can influence the dynamics of the interdisciplinary collaboration (Lingard et al., 2007). Although there may be multiple principle investigators, there can only be one first author and first author rules often vary by discipline though not all junior faculty are aware (Campbell, 2005).

**Promotion and Tenure**

A main concern among interdisciplinary faculty, and in particular joint faculty, is in the promotion and tenure process (Austin, 2003; Hart & Mars, 2009). The National Academies identifies “promotion criteria” as the top impediment to the future of interdisciplinary research (National Academies, 2004). One study found that only three out of nineteen institutions engaged in interdisciplinary activities with faculty had processes in place for interdisciplinary hires and promotion (Pfirman, Collins, Lowes, & Michaels, 2005b). A recent University of Maryland (UMD) survey indicated that only 54% of faculty agreed that their unit supports interdisciplinary scholarship, although the perceptions varied significantly across UMD schools (Lanford & Scholnick, 2013). A study at Virginia Tech found that junior faculty were counseled by senior faculty to concentrate on disciplinary work so that the activities will count toward tenure: interdisciplinary research should wait until after tenure (Boden & Borrego, 2011).

As mentioned, challenges are plenty in interdisciplinary research, and these challenges can ultimately have a negative impact when it comes to faculty evaluation. In higher education institutions, faculty are evaluated on a number of areas, and in public health a large emphasis is placed on scholarly productivity measured in research dollars and publications. Under these traditional standards, faculty in interdisciplinary positions
are at risk of a reduced level of productivity; collaborative interdisciplinary work frequently takes longer and research credit is often shared. Participation in large-scale collaborative projects and/or team teaching makes it difficult to define individual contributions (Boden & Borrego, 2011; Choucri, de Weck, & Moavenzadeh, 2006). The evaluation process is further compromised when joint faculty exhibit a lack of awareness of what a joint appointment entails; they may not be prepared for the experience and the expectations (Bell et al., 2005).

Faculty holding joint appointments are in a particularly precarious situation when it comes to the process of evaluation. Are the departments sharing the appointment equally responsible for evaluating the faculty member? What if the evaluations differ? Which department administers the evaluation? Again, these questions are of particular concern for junior faculty going up for tenure. As it is with variation in research cultures across disciplines, tenure and promotion standards vary widely as well (Hart & Mars, 2009; Pfirman & Martin, 2010). What may exceed expectations in one discipline or department may not be adequate in another, and a discipline-focused mentality of tenure committees can prove problematic (Austin, 2003). Furthermore, faculty appointed across multiple units have found that they are expected to do “double duty” when it comes to publishing, teaching, and service (Lanford & Scholnick, 2013). In joint appointments in which salary is allocated across schools or departments, compensation must also be negotiated, even when considering annual merit increases. During the review process, using external reviewers can also be problematic, if the external reviewers are not familiar with the interdisciplinarity of the candidate (Pfirman & Martin, 2010).
Resources

Allocation of resources is yet another aspect to consider when evaluating joint faculty appointments. Available resources to support faculty work are tenuous in the most straightforward of organizational environments; it is even more so when it comes to joint faculty positions. For one, department chairs and/or deans must determine where faculty members will be physically located. If joint faculty are assigned an office in one unit only, that faculty may be at a disadvantage both practically and socially in the unit for which an office is not assigned. If offices are assigned in both units, the office may very likely be “subpar” as compared to their full-time colleagues. As a result of moving between two units, joint faculty often share administrative support staff; since they are not full time in either unit such support may be overlooked (Pfirman & Martin, 2010). Regardless, they will need to navigate cultural and geographical challenges of having a “home” in two (or more) places (Boden & Borrego, 2011; Hart & Mars, 2009).

Depending on an institution’s policies and protocols for the recovery of indirect costs (overhead) on research grants, joint faculty may find themselves in the middle of a complex negotiation of the flow of those funds across departments, and those negotiations can impede grant submissions (Boden & Borrego, 2011). In public health research, indirect cost revenue may be upwards of 70% of the total direct costs, thus the political and financial stakes are high for schools and/or departments to retain those funds. For the joint faculty member, these indirect cost recovery challenges may influence where and how grants are submitted.

Equally problematic is the bureaucratic nature of budget development across multiple units. With increasing departmental autonomy often comes greater budgetary
control and potential unwillingness to allocate funding to faculty who are shared with other units, perhaps assuming that resources are met elsewhere or because there is reluctance to contribute resources for activities not seen as advantageous to the department (Boden & Borrego, 2011). Tightened allocation of funding is problematic for interdisciplinary faculty who may require additional funding and time for travel to multiple professional and research conferences. Tight departmental budgets can result in unrealistic expectations of joint faculty to cover teaching, advising and committee work (Lanford & Scholnick, 2013).

**Institutional Infrastructure**

Despite potential challenges, the literature suggests that there is no lack of interest among faculty to engage in interdisciplinary efforts, but rather a lack of faith in the systematic and institutional “measures” to facilitate that work (Bozeman & Boardman, 2004; Rhoten, 2004). Spanner (2001) found that interdisciplinary scholars perceived themselves operating in a more complex organizational environment as compared to their disciplinary peers. One study of joint faculty reported that the lack of structural and organizational clarity caused participants to become skeptical about the collegiality of peers on either disciplinary side (Hart & Mars, 2009). Over the past few years, institutions around the country have begun to recognize the need to develop new procedures for handling interdisciplinary scholars, however the degree to which they are do so remains unclear (Bunton & Mallon, 2007; Casey, 2010). As one report states, “institutions serious about interdisciplinary scholarship need to move beyond making joint hires and simply hoping they will work out” (Pfirman, Collins, Lowes, & Michaels, 2005a, para. 19).
Several organizations and scholars of interdisciplinarity have put forward recommendations to improve institutional infrastructure in support of faculty engaging in interdisciplinary work (Aldrich, 2014; Association of American Universities, 2005; Brewer, 1999; Casey, 2010; Holley, 2009a; Marzano et al., 2006; National Academies, 2004; Pfirman et al., 2007; Pfirman et al., 2011; Sá, 2008; Stehr & Weingart, 2000). For example, given the growing importance of interdisciplinary activities in universities, the Association of American Universities (2005) created a task force to identify actions university administrators can take to promote interdisciplinary activities. They stressed that successful interdisciplinary work requires both faculty engagement and administrative commitment and urged administrators “to incorporate interdisciplinary activities into the institution’s programmatic structure in ways that encourage collaboration over competition and advance the mission of the university” (p. 1). It is also recommended that institutions show commitment not only to initiation of interdisciplinarity, but also implementation (Pfirman & Martin, 2010). Although the majority of the recommendations in the literature are for interdisciplinary scholars in general and not specific to joint faculty, the rationale for the recommendations are applicable across a variety of appointment types.

Pfirman (2005b) argues that the process for promotion and tenure of an interdisciplinary faculty member should begin before the hire takes place. Ideally, the search committee should replicate the committee structure and procedures to be used for promotion and tenure, and those committees should include faculty knowledgeable of interdisciplinary work (Lanford & Scholnick, 2013). The offer letter itself should clearly detail expectations around research, advising, teaching, and administrative support as
well as criteria for evaluation; deans, chairs, and administrators should be bound to those expectations. For joint faculty, it is also critical for the potential success of the faculty member that early consultation and planning between hiring departments takes place. Formal memoranda of understanding (MOU) should be created between the appointing units, and the MOU should subsequently be referred to during times of faculty evaluation (Aldrich, 2014; Casey, 2010; Lanford & Scholnick, 2013). Discussions between the units should discuss agreements regarding space and support staff allocation, guidelines for authorship and principal investigator status, committee service expectations, and teaching loads. These formal institutional arrangements should hopefully reduce the likelihood of competition and foster collaboration (Association of American Universities, 2005). For some institutions, policies regarding tenure and faculty incentives may need to be reviewed and revised to account for non-traditional appointments – before senior administrators can even begin to negotiate the hiring (Bozeman & Boardman, 2004).

It is also recommended that career development skills for interdisciplinary scholars are needed, with a specific lens toward success in interdisciplinary work (Domino et al., 2007). Joint faculty may be particularly vulnerable to a lack of professional development and mentoring as their time and loyalties are divided across university and professional entities (Pfirman & Martin, 2010).

In terms of research infrastructure, recent literature suggests that universities appreciate the episodic and nuanced funding environment for interdisciplinary research (Association of American Universities, 2005). As a result, it is recommended that institutions ensure that grant offices are familiar with the funding environment for interdisciplinary awards. It is then critical that departments partner with those offices,
and work with faculty so that they have the necessary tools to navigate that funding system (Association of American Universities, 2005; Lanford & Scholnick, 2013; National Academies, 2004).

**Conclusion**

Interdisciplinary efforts in higher education – including public health programs – are on the rise and gaining in popularity across academic institutions. Although the potential benefits of interdisciplinary efforts are well documented, the success of interdisciplinarity in practice remains in question. Faculty engaging in interdisciplinary work, particularly those holding formal joint appointments, find themselves in environments more conducive to traditional discipline-centered models. In order to create and sustain successful interdisciplinary activities and adequately support faculty who engage in them, the literature speaks to a need for colleges and universities to establish intentionality in their institutional infrastructures. Without a supportive culture and systematic organizational model, faculty holding interdisciplinary appointments (especially junior faculty) may be at risk for failing to thrive at their institutions and their interdisciplinarity may be an impediment to their success.

This informal “call to action,” coupled with the pervasive presence of interdisciplinarity in today’s colleges and universities, strongly supports the need for more research to better understand the role and experience of faculty who are formally engaged in those efforts. In particular, additional research would shed light onto how institutional systems impede or support joint appointments, and how those effects manifest within schools of public health specifically. Examining how joint public health faculty experience their appointments when it comes to institutional culture, research,
promotion and tenure, and resource allocation will fill a gap in our understanding of interdisciplinarity, ultimately assisting schools and programs in establishing the necessary systems to support, promote, and deliver excellence in interdisciplinary efforts.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

The purpose of this study is to better understand how institutional infrastructures influence the experience of faculty holding joint appointments in U.S. schools of public health. Literature on interdisciplinarity alludes to a growing interest in joint appointments as one method for supporting interdisciplinary efforts, particularly among health related programs. However, much of the literature on interdisciplinary faculty focuses on research specifically, rather than across multiple domains of faculty members’ positions. There is also a lack of literature on how institutional systems particularly impact joint appointments, and how that impact manifests within schools of public health specifically. This study will help address this gap by exploring institutional infrastructures and joint faculty experience at three U.S. schools of public health.

Site Selection Rationale

The three sites were chosen for several reasons. First, all three schools are currently ranked among the top twenty schools of public health by *U.S. News and World Report* (2015) and are institutions that other public health programs tend to benchmark themselves against when looking to establish best practices. Second, I wanted to select a mix of public and private in order to explore potential differences across institutional sectors. Finally, it was important that each of the schools selected for my analysis have a fairly large number of jointly appointed faculty; each of the three sites have made interdisciplinarity a priority and have at least ten percent of their faculty holding joint appointments. Thus, the assumption is that these three institutions would have made progress towards addressing structural challenges effecting joint faculty.
As part of the selection process, deans of the eligible schools of public health were approached for their interest and willingness to participate. Initially, five schools of public health were asked to participate. One dean declined participation and another felt they did not meet the above criteria in terms of the percentage of joint faculty. The deans of the three schools used in this study agreed to participate, provided full support of my visits to campus, and provided complete access to faculty and administrators. The study preserved anonymity by assigning pseudonyms for institutions, generic titles for individuals, and general titles for institution-specific departments, programs and documents.

**Case Study Design**

Since I was looking to engage in an exploratory analysis of how institutional infrastructures influence joint faculty experience, I decided to approach my research question using a qualitative multiple case study method. This approach allowed me to hear from individual faculty members holding joint appointments, speak to administrators involved in their respective institutions infrastructures, and review a variety of documents and archival resources pertaining to such infrastructures. Ultimately, I was able to use the information gathered collectively to better understand the institutional factors contributing to faculty experience.

The concept map found in Figure 3.1 shaped the design of the study. In terms of institutional infrastructure, I was interested in exploring elements such as university-level bylaws, school or department-level policies and procedures, faculty recruitment protocols, memoranda of understanding, and organizational design. On the faculty side, I was concerned with levels of satisfaction as well as attitudes, beliefs, and values as they
relate to their joint appointment and their institution. I then wanted to understanding how these elements converge across several overarching domains, each with its own set of elements: research, academic reward systems, resources, and culture.

**Figure 3.1: Concept Map**

Given the exploratory nature of the research design, I chose to use a qualitative, case study approach (Creswell, 2012). A multi-case study design was selected in order to assess potential themes across cases, as well as to identify similarities and differences between cases. I chose a case study approach in order to present an in-depth understanding of the institutional infrastructures influencing joint faculty experiences at each of the three schools selected. A pilot study was conducted between February and April 2015 in order to better refine and improve upon the design. The pilot allowed for
testing and refinement of the interview protocols as well as a review of institutional artifacts and documentation related to faculty joint appointments.

At each of the three selected sites I interviewed a mixture of faculty and administrators. To be eligible for the study, faculty must have held full-time faculty appointments (tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track) at the time of the interview. They also needed to hold an appointment in one department within the school of public health and at least one additional faculty appointment in another department or another school within the same university. To be included in the study, administrators were required to hold a position within the school of public health and be engaged in some aspect of the infrastructure related to joint faculty. I constructed a purposeful sampling strategy while also allowing for some snowball sampling, as I wanted to deliberately select those individuals that are typical (i.e. those who, by nature of his/her job description, are close to the issue) as well as critical (i.e. those who may have particular insight, even if not formally documented) to the phenomenon (Maxwell, 2012). I wanted to speak to joint faculty to better understand their personal experiences while also speaking to department and school administrators engaged in a variety of aspects potentially associated with joint appointments. I was interested in understanding not only what institutional infrastructures may exist but also how they are perceived and implemented (or not). Although there are similarities in regards to such characteristics as rankings and percent of joint faculty, preliminary analysis revealed that the infrastructures within the schools are unique enough to warrant a theoretical replication across the three sites (Yin, 2013).
Interviews with administrators focused on systems within his/her area that specifically address or are related to joint faculty appointments. Questions focused on better understanding what infrastructures exist, how they are working, and how they are communicated and disseminated. In addition to better understanding the institutional structures, the interviews sought to expound upon processes which are/are not working well. Appendix A provides a summary of the administrator interview protocol. Faculty were interviewed to better understand their personal experience as a joint faculty member within their respective institution. Faculty were asked to describe practical aspects of their recruitment and appointment, promotion, and institutional and professional expectations. The interviews sought to explore attitudes, beliefs and values of the faculty member as they relate to their current joint appointment. Appendix B provides a summary of the faculty interview protocol.

Several of the documents I reviewed were available on the schools’ websites (such as university policies, procedures and bylaws, accreditation reports, and faculty handbooks). Upon request, schools provided additional internal documents. In the document review, I was looking particularly for examples of how the institution defines, articulates, and communicates various aspects related specifically to joint faculty appointments. Appendix C provides a list of institutional documents reviewed.

Data Collection

Given the qualitative approach to the study, I collected data using interviews, on-site campus observations, and document review. Site visits to each campus were conducted in Fall 2015. Participants were identified through a combination of methods,
including a review of website profiles, initial recommendations by school deans, and through snowball sampling.

Once identified, individuals were emailed to request an interview; the email included a one-page summary of the study (see Appendix D and E). If there was no response after one week, a follow-up email was sent. All respondents were asked to consent to their participation in the study by signing a consent form, provided in advance of the scheduled interview (see Appendix F).

Interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview protocol. Interviews were conducted on-campus and in-person whenever possible; telephone interviews were conducted with a few participants who were important to the study but unavailable during the site visit. All respondents were asked to consent to their participation in the study by signing a consent form, provided in advance of the scheduled interview (see Appendix F). As I was asking faculty to respond to questions about personal experiences and potentially about job-related satisfaction, confidentiality was granted to all faculty respondents. Given that anonymity was granted to the three institutions, the design of the study – and the presentation of the results – were prepared to account for anonymity without compromising the findings and conclusions. All interviews were recorded, with permission, using a digital voice recorder and transcribed using the professional transcription service, Rev.com. All participants received their transcript by email and asked to make any necessary corrections within one week.

In total, 42 interviews were conducted, 37 in person and five by telephone. Table 3.1 provides additional detail of those interviewed by site. Documents for review will be
provided by the schools’ websites, my primary contact at each school, or requested at the
time of the interview.

Table 3.1: Respondents Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perth</th>
<th>Fort William</th>
<th>Kirkwall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Joint Faculty Interviews</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Interviews</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interviews In-Person</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interviews by Phone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis

Using the multi-case design, I conducted both within-cases and cross-case
analysis, identifying potential themes as well as similarities and differences between
cases. To do so, I established a coding mechanism influenced by my concept map. The
final set of codes (see Appendix G) was established through an iterative process, using a
combination of the literature and the interviews. All transcripts were uploaded into the
qualitative software NVivo 10.2.2, which was used to aid in the analysis. To frame my
analysis, I drew from Birnbaum’s (1988) organizational models, structuring the analysis
across the following institutional types: collegial, bureaucratic, political, and anarchical.
Given the complexity of the design in using three sites as well as the variation of
institutional design across sites, I felt the use of the Birnbaum’s models would provide a
helpful organization and allow for a practical application of the findings. For assessing
issues of organizational culture, I applied Schein’s (2010) three levels of culture
/artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions)/. Given the
exploratory nature of the study, I used a pattern matching technique, identifying patterns that may be related to faculty experience and institutional infrastructure (Yin, 2013).

**Study Trustworthiness**

Several steps were taken to increase the validity of the study. I used multiple sources of evidence – faculty interviews, administrator interviews, documentation, and campus visits – in order to approach the phenomenon from multiple perspectives. This triangulation of data was used to check results against one another, thus arriving at a more reliable set of conclusions (Maxwell, 2012; Yin, 2013). I selected sites in which I have no direct relationship thus supporting an objective perspective. I have never been employed at these sites, have not personally attended these universities, nor have I spent any substantial time at them. By allowing respondents the opportunity to review their transcripts before analysis, I increased the likelihood of capturing accurate information from the interviews. The use of open-ended scripts helped to minimize potential research bias; I allowed respondents to answer openly without leading the respondent into preconceived answers. In order to encourage candidness of responses, I granted confidentiality to the institutions, including all faculty and administrators interviewed. Finally, prior to collecting data at my three sites, I pilot tested my interview protocol with joint faculty and administrators at another school of public health.

**Study Limitations**

The selection of respondents at each site was likely influenced in some way by the point of entry to the specific site, including the dean of the school. Despite making telephone interviews available, I missed faculty members and administrators who were on vacation, traveling, or otherwise unavailable. Finally, although I gave great thought
during site selection, the research studied only three schools of public health out of a total of 52 accredited schools. As an exploratory study, the conclusions cannot be generalized across all schools of public health, but can serve as a foundation for further discussion and inquiry.
CHAPTER 4: PERTH UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

The Perth University School of Public Health prides itself on its interdisciplinary efforts and in particular, the large number of joint appointments as highlighted in its self-study report to the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), the accrediting body for schools of public health. Perth tells the story of interdisciplinary faculty navigating through a traditional academic hierarchy and a clear departmental organizational structure, with an emphasis on research productivity, faculty promotion and institutional prestige.

Perth University

Established over 100 years ago, Perth University is an independent, private, four-year research university whose mission statement emphasizes its dedication to scholarship, research, and diversity and who has a long history of interdisciplinary pursuits. The University is decentralized, with 21 schools and colleges, including the School of Public Health. In the fall of 2014, student enrollment was just over 27,000 (39% White, 18% Asian/Pacific Islander, 13% Latino and 7% Black). Eighty-two percent of the undergraduate population was 24 years or younger. Fulltime faculty headcount during that same time totaled just fewer than 6,000. Perth University has a strong financial portfolio with an endowment of over $8 billion. The average net price of tuition in 2013-2014 was approximately $20,000 (National Center for Education Statistics).

2 Pseudonym. Actual name of the University is withheld.
Located in an urban setting on the east coast, Perth’s campus is physically split between two locations – the main campus and the health sciences campus, which includes the university’s medical center, as well as the dental, medical, nursing and public health schools. The campuses are in proximity to one another and easily accessible by public transportation as well as university shuttles.

Perth University’s School of Public Health

Overview

The School of Public Health at Perth University is ranked by *U.S. News and World Report* to be among the top 20 Schools of Public Health (*U.S. News and World Report*, 2015). Established over 40 years ago, the school currently employs over 500 faculty and instructors (both full-time and part-time) and enrolls just over 1400 students in its master and doctoral programs. In terms of its physical footprint, the school of public health occupies approximately 165,000 square feet of space. Although school personnel do reside in multiple building locations, the main school operations, including the academic departments, administration, and student services is under one roof. It’s unrestricted operating budget in 2014 exceeded $50 million (Association of Schools and Programs in Public Health). Per the school’s website, over one-third of its faculty hold joint or interdisciplinary appointments.

The school is led by an executive team consisting of its Dean and a core set of vice and associate deans responsible for such areas as academic affairs, research, student affairs and finance and administration. The school is organized around six departments, each led by a department chair who reports directly to the dean. Policies and procedures that govern school administration fall under the auspices of a school advisory committee.
consisting of the dean, vice dean, and department chairs. The School of Public Health’s full-time faculty play an integral role in school-related policy through monthly faculty meetings (with voting privileges), a faculty steering committee, standing committees (admissions, curriculum, appointments and promotion, doctoral programs, and academic standards) and ad hoc committees.

The school operates under a decentralized model at the department level. According to a senior school administrator:

> We have a budget system that decentralizes the revenue and essentially it’s their money to run as long as the dean is in agreement with the strategy, et cetera. They make the decisions with the money (PA9).

A substantial number of school-related issues and operations reside or are initiated at the department level, including budgeting, hiring, faculty appointments and promotion, and faculty expectations (i.e. teaching loads). Across the school, however, most full-time faculty members are expected to teach at least one course per academic year.

**Joint Appointments**

Per the school’s faculty directory, faculty hold joint appointments with over 20 schools or departments including, but not limited to, medicine, nursing, history, dentistry, public affairs, social work and law. At Perth, an appointment is defined as joint when “the individual is qualified in the disciplines of two (or more) Faculties/departments and fulfills significant functions and responsibilities in each.” An internal document on joint appointments defines terminology used around joint appointments:

*Home and host departments.* At the time of the appointment, that Faculty/department which best represents the individual’s principal discipline as determined by training and academic interests, is designated the home Faculty/department. The other is the host.
Administrative department. The Faculties/departments, Institutes, Centers, or Programs involved agree that one Faculty/department, Institute, or Center will assume the continuous responsibility for processing the required appointment and payroll documents. That Faculty/department is the Administrative Faculty/department.

Primary Department. The Faculty/department in which the appointee shall be counted for the purpose of representation on the respective Faculty Council/Assembly.

Faculty and administrators used this terminology interchangeably and without consistency. As explained by the Associate Dean for Human Resources, “the administrative department is the one that basically manages the employee” (PA8), whereas the school’s senior faculty affairs officer described the primary appointment as the place “where everything, the grants, the appointments, all of the bureaucracy functions through” (PA10). Finally, the lead administrative officer spoke of the home department as the entity “responsible for the tenure guarantee, providing space, integrating that faculty member into the teaching programs” (PA9). Potentially the identifiers could reside within the same department, or be applied across different departments based on the role served.

Given the large size of the school, the complexity of arrangements across departments, as well as an inconsistency in how joint appointments are defined, faculty holding multiple appointments at Perth face a range of issues throughout their careers which are likely to influence their experience.

Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

The ways in which faculty are appointed and subsequently promoted can certainly influence their institutional experience. For those holding joint appointments across multiple units, such policies and practices can carry even more weight, as seen at Perth.
Appointment Process

At the Perth School of Public Health, nominations for all assistant professor faculty appointments, including joint appointments, originate within the departments. Per the Faculty Handbook, the departmental Appointment and Promotion Committee (APC) reviews the candidate and makes advisory recommendations to the department chair. The APC is made up of seven members having the rank of full professor (tenured and untenured positions) who are appointed by the Dean. If the appointment is a joint appointment, approval is obtained from the other department(s) and a Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) between departments is drafted, finalized and signed. The MOU should include specific details identify the home/host/administrative departments, titles, salary and funding allocations, duties, space, and voting privileges. There is no set standard for how the joint arrangements are determined; rather, the specifics of the joint appointment is negotiated on a case-by-case basis between department chairs and the faculty member. This might include everything from teaching expectations to voting privileges. As explained by a senior school official, “the department might give the faculty member who’s got the home elsewhere and the appointment here, they might have voting rights here also so the chair can decide if that faculty member also has voting rights” (PA9). There is some uncertainty, however, about what privileges are actually bestowed upon faculty via their joint appointment. When explaining whether or not he has voting rights in his secondary appointment, one faculty replied, “No. Well I might, but they’ve never asked me to exercise them if I do. You know, I have the appointment, I may very well” (PF5). Other faculty use voting privileges sporadically, when there is an issue of importance to them.
Once all approvals are obtained, the hiring/promotion process is managed by the “home” department and the final candidate is forwarded to the school Faculty Affairs office for final approval. New faculty members meet with the Academic/Faculty Affairs dean, ideally within first month of their arrival.

Faculty appointments above the rank of assistant professor are subject to additional review procedures. In addition to the departmental steps outlined above, candidates must be reviewed and approved by the APC. All appointments and promotions above the level of assistant professor are voted on by the APC.

Joint appointments at Perth’s School of Public Health can occur at the time of recruitment or after the individual has been hired at Perth. However, there is some discrepancy regarding the typical time of appointment to a joint position, with one administrator stating: “they hardly ever get recruited on a joint” (PA8) and another, “in many cases, it’s during recruitment” (PA9). The rationale for the appointment varies substantially across faculty, without established criteria for when or why a faculty might be given a joint appointment. Examples included the ability to teach courses in a department, maintaining a connection to a specific discipline (such as history), prestige (for the faculty member and/or the department), access to resources, and departmental headcount. Once faculty member was given a joint appointment to increase the likelihood of receiving a grant award: “so we put in the grant, and because they wanted it to appear to come out of the School of Social Work, they gave me an appointment to be a faculty member there” (PF5). In some cases, the joint appointment may be more about the needs of the department or chair of that department then about the individual faculty member’s interests, as explained by a department chair:
When I first arrived, I have a junior faculty member who is a star, and another department wanted to get him a joint appointment and thought this is a great honor and so on. He didn’t want it and so this is interesting. He didn’t want it, and he was nervous because he is in a tenure track position and he didn’t know what was going to exactly be expected of him, and that other department assured me, oh, they want him because of his stature in someone and he was hesitant to commit. As a chair, I played the bad guy almost, went to our faculty and said that we didn’t really think that this was in his best interest, but it was really the faculty member that didn’t want it ...so that was a little tricky thing, and unfortunately I see the chair as a job to protect the faculty too (PA11).

Once the joint faculty member has been hired or appointed, the responsibility for that faculty member resides with the primary department. Appointment letters follow a standard template for all new faculty members, and are not specific to faculty holding joint appointments. Joint appointments can also be easily terminated, as explained by the a human resources administrator:

Most of the time, if things are not working out or if someone is saying, “I really don’t have time to agree to all this stuff.’ It was well intended when we first started, but it’s six months [to] a year into it and it’s not working out for me. I’m not getting the benefit and you’re not getting the benefit, so let’s just call it ... Let’s just end it.” They resign from that particular department, and done deal. (PA8)

Although documentation regarding joint appointment policies and procedures exist, there is incongruity between written policies for faculty appointments and actual implementation of those policies. For example, although policies are in place for formalizing the joint appointments through approvals and MOUs, such steps are not necessarily occurring in practice. According to a department chair:

I don’t even know her. I know the person she’s working for had emailed me and so on, and there’s really no financial cost to the department. It was just very easy and done by email and so on. Another time, I just supported the joint appointment with somebody in my department who is going to have 25% of his
effort paid for by sociology, and he’s going to teach a class down there that involved a couple of different meetings between myself and the chair, and then the faculty meeting with the chair (PA11).

There is also inconsistency in regards to the use of established MOUs between joint appointment departments. In fact, senior administrators disagreed amongst themselves as to how they are used. What follows are three different descriptions of the use of MOUs for joint faculty among three different school administrators. The human resource officer explained that at the school:

We make sure that there is a memorandum of understanding in place, that we look at the credentials for the person that they have by training ... again, by training, education, or experience sort of the level (PA8).

Whereas the lead administration and finance officer provided the following description:

When we have situations where there are specific collaborations, we will frequently create a memorandum of understanding between the departments that would speak to who’s got the responsibility for the salary, who’s offering the space, where in which location or locations do they have voting rights, and then what’s the nature of the indirect cost sharing that goes on. Sometimes it’s formally crafted and sometimes it’s just informal. All the person has is an appointment in the department that they teach a course, they’ll attend faculty meetings, et cetera...Once it gets to the research involved is where it’s most likely to have a written MOU (PA9).

Finally, the associate dean for faculty affairs explained the process from her perspective:

Well, when there’s financial implications, I think there definitely is [an MOU] mainly because of the financial model here where we pay for space. Who’s space is the person sitting in has a big impact on those agreements (PA10).
Promotion and Tenure

When faculty holding joint appointments go up for promotion and/or tenure at Perth, they must do so separately with both departments or schools to which they are appointed, thus preparing separate promotion and tenure packets for separate review by both promotion and tenure committees. Both units involved in the appointment must vote, with the primary department typically voting first. The two entities do confer on one set of referee letters to obtain. The steps for the promotion and tenure process are outlined in internal department faculty handbooks, with special notes for joint faculty clearly highlighted. Such documents emphasize the additional steps required for joint faculty as well as the additional time needed for such procedures. For example, it is written in the faculty handbook on promotion and tenure:

Can take a year or longer. Joint/interdisciplinary promotions take longest, given the need for 1) two or more chairs to agree on nomination, MOA, and referee list, 2) two or more departmental [APC] to schedule and approve, and 3) two or more school level [APC] to schedule and approve.

Although the procedural steps for promotion and tenure are documented for joint appointments, there does not appear to be a mechanism in place for communicating those expectations at the time the joint appointment is made, nor do faculty fully understand those expectations. Both school administrators as well as faculty alluded to this notion. As mentioned by a department chair, “it’s not always clear what the expectations are now. After they’re here for a year, then this is what ... the expectations will begin to be spelled out” (PA8).

Because the School of Public Health can have joint appointments across many departments and schools at the University, criteria for promotion can vary widely across
disciplines. How that is handled varies by department and also by discipline, often residing between chairs on a case-by-case basis. Both faculty and administrators expressed concern regarding unclear and poorly defined infrastructures to support joint faculty during the promotion and tenure process. As a result, faculty may in fact simply drop the joint appointment during tenure and add it back once tenure is awarded. A department chair explained:

The faculty that I just mentioned to you was getting that appointment in sociology. He’s in a tenure track. He has a couple of years before he comes up for tenure, but he’s on a very fast track. I discussed that with the chair and I said, you know, I was concerned that he might not meet the requirements for sociology, for example, when he comes up for tenure. And the chair, he said, “Oh well, you know …” Because I was thinking of what they expect, which is basically they expect a book or two, and he’s writing articles and not writing books, and they said, no, but we wouldn’t hold him to that, the same bar as somebody in sociology. And where we left it at is we’ll reassess when he comes up for tenure. What happened in this department, as I mentioned that historian who has his appointment here, he actually had the appointment, dropped the appointment when he went up for tenure, and then got the appointment back again. That was interesting. (PA11)

Faculty mentioned barriers to engaging in interdisciplinary research in general at a research-focused university such as Perth. At the School of Public Health, tenure guidelines stipulate a required number of first-authored publications, and there is no exceptions noted for interdisciplinary appointments or projects. An academic affairs officer explained, “I try and stress to faculty that interdisciplinary research is wonderful, but when you carve out such a project, you need to make sure that there’s some piece of it that you’re going to take the lead on, you’re going to be known for” (PA10).
**Research**

Prior research argues that the ways in which research is conceptualized and operationalized plays a substantial role in the experience of interdisciplinary faculty (Aldrich, 2014; Campbell, 2005; Marzano et al., 2006; Porter et al., 2006), and Perth School of Public Health is no exception. Perth University’s School of Public Health prides itself as being one of the premier research entities among its public health peers, with over $150 million in federal research dollars reported in 2014 (40% of those dollars from NIH funding) (Association of Schools and Programs in Public Health). At Perth, there is a strong emphasis placed on research and is considered a leading priority for the school; at each faculty meeting, the Dean reports were the school stands in terms of grants against peer schools.

**Research Infrastructure**

There is no set standard for how research is administered for joint faculty, though by default, it tends to fall within the purview of the primary department. Issues such as research administration support and the flow of indirect cost revenue (ICR) from research grants are often captured in joint appointment MOUs, when MOUs are used. More recently, the School of Public Health developed “an informal, unofficial, evolved standard of sharing indirect cost revenue” (PA9) which is used particularly with joint appointments with the medical center. A percentage of the net ICR (after the university receives its portion) is allocated to the entity providing the salary (25%), the entity providing the space (50%), and the entity administering the grant (25%). However, as this is an unofficial standard, it is often negotiated on a case-by-case basis. As the Perth indirect rate can be as high as 60% of direct costs for federal research grants, the details
of these arrangements are taken quite seriously. Not all faculty are aware of this informal standard for ICR allocation: “That’s not black and white. That part [flow of research monies] I don’t know about” (PF1). The senior finance officer explained his view of who is or is not aware: “I would say the ones who are involved are, the ones who don’t do this are probably not because there’s no formal written, agreed upon document” (PA9).

Research Culture

Faculty and administrators presented slightly different perspectives in terms of the level of support provided by the school for interdisciplinary research. School administrators emphasized a culture of interdisciplinary research at all levels of the school, starting with the Dean and spoke about formal systems in place to support that culture, including pilot research funds, workshops, etc. For example, one senior school administrator described a school research office that is:

…constantly looking for opportunities on research projects and send it out to our faculty mailing list, to see whether people are interested and begin to collaborate and work together, so that maybe … It is encouraged very much from the top down, from the dean, from the departments, and at every sort of meeting, and even off meetings, where there are opportunities. The dean has in the past created some … some prize money but the idea was for seed money to start something [interdisciplinary], and you'll get $25,000 (PA11).

Faculty, on the other hand, were quick to mention that the “Dean is big on interdisciplinary,” but were less able to articulate how interdisciplinary research is supported in practice. For example, one faculty member mentioned “our current dean is really a proponent for getting a crosstalk across departments” but when asked to provide examples of how she implements that crosstalk he replied, “well, she says it at every faculty meeting” (PF2). Furthermore, although faculty feel there is talk about
interdisciplinary pursuits and even great potential for research collaboration at Perth, the reality of the funding pressures creates barriers to actualizing those collaborations, as explained by a faculty member:

It’s challenging, but it’s maybe one of those things, it looks good on the face of it. What could be wrong with getting more perspectives? That’s what a university is! People having an open mind and seeing things in a different way, but practically, especially in this funding environment, I think people would rather not ... My chairman would certainly rather I didn’t give away half the indirect costs to some other school and department unless that was critical to getting the grant, but if there’s any way we could work around it, if there’s any way we could get a consultant at another place we’re only giving 20,000 and that’s fine (PF5).

Several faculty expressed concern and at times even resentment when it came to the school’s priorities of research over other intellectual pursuits, particular the focus on research funding amounts: “That's all that matters... How much money you bring in. No matter how much they talked about anything else, it’s all that really ultimately flips it” (PF5). Another faculty member mentioned that there is talk within the school that the dean’s office will be generating a report to be shared revealing who does and does not support themselves on grants. One faculty member shared his perspective:

Because the culture of a place, you know, we have the faculty meeting. I’m just coming from it and everybody’s talking about the grants. I thought like intellectual agendas, it’s like who is getting the grants, which is kind of a distortion of what a university is supposed to be about. And for somebody coming from the liberal arts and social sciences and from hard money institutions where you are hired because of what you’re writing and what you were thinking and what you’re doing and what you’re teaching (PF4).

There is also concern among the faculty about where their own research best “fits.” As described by one faculty member:
Doing interdisciplinary research made me seem like a logical choice for a joint appointment, but it also makes it very difficult to figure out where to put me in to begin with. Putting together joint appointment is tricky because you have to get more moving parts in sync, as you know (PF6).

**Finance and Other Resources**

Issues of resources – both in terms of allocation as well as expectations – surfaced as a major theme at Perth, particularly as an area of contention among faculty.

**Budget and Finance**

As mentioned previously, most budgetary and financial decisions are made at the level of the departments within the School of Public Health. For joint faculty, financial decisions in terms of salary, research support, administration, etc. are managed by the chairs of the primary department, but when necessary, are negotiated with chairs of the joint department. The identification of the primary/home department is of particular importance for the school, as explained by a senior finance official:

> We have to be really clear on tenure guarantee. You want to make sure that you’re not getting stuck with somebody else’s tenure guarantee. We want to make sure that the department that’s going to own that faculty, owns all their commitments, so the housing commitment, any educational support, any spousal or recruitment support. Any recruitment support for that individual then … You want to make sure that you’re not on the hook for that (PA9).

At Perth University, revenue from tuition follows the school in which the student is matriculated. Administrators and faculty mentioned that this particular tuition model effects departmental investment in faculty teaching outside their primary department. One chair expressed reluctance to use her own departmental budget to support a faculty member in another department, even for teaching. The opposite case may also be true, per a department chair:
We have that one faculty who has a joint appointment and he feels very committed to that department as well, goes to all their faculty meetings, participates, but that department doesn’t pay any of his salary. And he was teaching a class down there. I said to him, great, you’re teaching there, but I’m not counting that as part of … you’re still going to teach your two or three classes here and whatever (PA11).

Faculty voiced frustration with the business-oriented model of the school and repeatedly commented on the money-focused mentality of both the University and School leadership. Furthermore, they expressed disappointment that the focus often rests with the prestige of the departments themselves not with the support of the faculty who comprise that department, or for the collaborative efforts of joint appointments. Some faculty saw it not necessarily as a direct neglect of the joint faculty, but rather about self-preservation during difficult financial environments, where departments are “most concerned about meeting their own obligations, financial situations” (PF3). A faculty member explained:

These things are so ingrained in their culture of doing it in a business sense, but they don’t understand the importance of transparency that is essential to making people happy, feeling that they have voice and seeing that their words will actually translate into some kind of impact on how the world they work in functions. That wasn’t the case here at all. It’s not the case at Perth. It’s not the case at a lot of other institutions. You don’t get anything from them unless you threaten them, threaten that I’m going to walk and take all my money away, even at 9-month positions on main campuses (PF5).

Another faculty member with a joint appointment between the School of Public Health and Arts and Sciences on the main campus described his perspective:

…so that’s the drawback. So I end up thinking about that kind of monetary crap and then taking it as an insult that the school doesn’t pay this department for my course [on the main campus] because it’s…I keep saying this is a university, we’re all part of the same educational process. So now I’m teaching, I teach a section [on the
main campus] for our students here with the School of Public Health number right? But I force them to come [to the main campus] so they don’t get funded for even that number and for even that course (PF4).

Additional Resources

Most joint faculty occupy just one office, although they might have research space that spans multiple locations. In general, faculty feel the allocation of office space works well, as does having one administrative department for support: “that’s helpful too, because it’s really complicated to go through two different institutions” (PF2). In general, faculty did not feel there were particular resource advantages to having the joint appointment, and suggested that most of the resource decisions were ultimately negotiated separately between department or division chairs.

One faculty resource that was mentioned quite frequently was mentoring. There is a growing faculty mentoring and development program for faculty within the School of Public Health. Each new faculty member is assigned a mentor who serves as a professional resource as well as someone to help navigate the various systems at Perth. Mentoring contracts are developed that outline individual goals in consultation with mentors and department chairs, and mentor and mentee are expected to take the mentoring relationship seriously. In the case of faculty holding joint appointments, however, only one faculty member is assigned through the primary department, and that faculty mentor may or may not have ties to the secondary appointing department. Faculty mention that the mentoring they receive is more aligned with the needs of the department and their success within that department, rather than success as a joint faculty member across multiple departments. Faculty do not feel that the two (or more) departments coordinate when it comes to providing the faculty affairs resources
necessary to succeed in both departments, which can be a challenge when preparing for successful promotion and tenure. Several faculty emphasized the importance of having a strong mentor who understands the complexities of a joint appointment. As summarized by a faculty member holding a joint appointment with the School of Public Health and Psychiatry:

When I was a junior person, like I said, we have this director, so usually he’s making sure that some of my time would be protected. If I run into issues, he’s open to hear about the issues. I think that’s very helpful. He basically mentored me through the collaboration process in my earlier years. I think that’s a main help. I can survive in this environment. Otherwise I would think it’s very tough for a new person, especially. Working with the senior people is especially hard. Senior clinicians in psychiatry, they are not ... Don’t have a very good reputation. They are very anxious and they just want to get business done. Sometimes they view statisticians as a service providers. Some of them don’t have that respect, so for everybody to earn that respect. As a junior person it’s especially hard. For those projects I’m lucky to work with the director together on some tough projects. On some other projects if it gets too difficult, after one or two grants, we just stop collaboration (PF1).

Culture

The faculty’s perceptions of the culture at Perth provides meaningful insight into the ways in which joint faculty experience their appointments. Words frequently used by faculty when discussing their experience at Perth’s School of Public Health were chaotic, political, business-minded, negotiations, and image. When asked about the culture of collaboration, one faculty dismissed the notion by saying: “I mean, they’re too busy trying to do their own thing as well and stay afloat in the soft money environment. That’s what everybody is too busy doing” (PF6). There is a general sense among faculty interviewed that there is a lot of lip-service around collaboration but little action in supporting it or engaging in it:
...they claim to want to break down barriers. Which is the mantra everywhere it seems – interdisciplinary work with your colleague, blah, blah, blah, blah. When it comes right down to it, they don’t give a crap unless it’s a dollar assigned to it. (PF4)

Another faculty member explained:

...they certainly want cross-campus, cross-school collaboration. I think within the schools, there’s a little less now especially, but I think it’s always been this way. But especially now with the funding environment. People aren’t that eager to give away a large portion of the monies and indirect costs to another school, and I think if you could do it within your own school and the expertise here, they would probably prefer. Although they might not say that because it’d sort of want to be politically correct. But I think they would prefer that you try to do it, you know, within the school. Again, there our own school doesn’t incentivize. It incentivizes cross-departmental stuff. They would like to see that, but not really incentivizing us to go outside the school at this point (PF5).

Faculty described a political culture at the University as well as within the school, aligning with Bolman and Deal’s (2013) description of politics as “the realistic process of making decisions and allocating resources in a context of scarcity and divergent interests” (p. 183). There is an overarching philosophy of self-preservation (at both the department level as well as the faculty level) as described by a faculty member:

The thing about it is, people have been talking about it [interdisciplinary collaboration] for many, many, many years, 40 years easily. They want to encourage it, but there’s no blueprint for making it happen more efficiently, because there is this legacy of self-preservation that occurs (PF4).

Faculty described political tensions between schools and/or disciplines at the University, between departments within the School of Public Health, between administration and faculty, and between faculty and the negative impact such tensions can have on faculty engaged in interdisciplinary work, particularly jointly appointed faculty. The tensions seem to originate from a combination of historically opposing
interests (for example between the liberal arts and the professional schools), demands on funding expectations, and pressure to maintain School ranking. Some faculty at Perth seem to thrive in such an environment, while others do not. Faculty described the need for a high level of self-confidence and ambition to succeed at Perth.

With the alleged culture of self-preservation comes the feeling among faculty that they are not supported in their joint appointment, and that the interdisciplinary contributions they are trying to make are not valued; in fact, they perceive some resentment. A faculty member describes his experience during promotion:

I was promoted to associate professor also with that, and that happened a year and a half ago. I can tell you that there were certain resentments that cropped up about my role and function that caused people not to sign as quickly as they should have, as you would think they would in a collegial environment. Technically I shouldn’t have known about this, but everything moves down (PF6).

Faculty also emphasized a feeling of being taken for granted, or even used for the prestige of the school or the department. A faculty member with a joint appointment between Medicine and Public Health mentioned that he could step away at any time, and his contributions often go unnoticed: “I do it because I love it. I really do. Every once in a while, I pass the vice president and we chat, and I remind him that I’m still teaching. He says ‘Thank you. We appreciate that.’ That’s all I get for that” (PF2). Another faculty member discussed his opinion on the matter:

…because of that, there’s no communication. Could be there? Yeah. Would be there? Probably not, to be perfectly blunt, because everybody is too busy. It’s not worth the time. And a lot of the time with these joint appointments is, it’s sort of ceremonial perhaps to somebody. Somebody gets the lion’s share of everything, which in this case is indirect research dollars and administrative work and teaching. The other ones just get to say,
“Well this person is affiliated there.” They ballooned their numbers. They put you on their website (PF6).

One faculty described the lack of coordination between the departments where he held his appointments.

I came thinking I was a total joint appointment with total privileges everywhere and equally welcomed everywhere, and I know the historians were happy to have me. And the School of Public Health was recruiting me and they were happy. The reality is that the two places functioned almost independently of one another (PF4).

Interestingly, administrators holding leadership roles at the School of Public Health themselves disagreed about the value or importance of joint appointments. The School’s associate dean for faculty affairs described her own view on joint appointments:

From my perspective, I guess it’s maybe a biased viewpoint, but I don’t particularly encourage people who are just getting here to start dealing with joint appointments. You got a lot of stuff to do up front. I tell them the dean expects you to … go to our faculty meetings] once a month. Your chair is going to expect you to go to your monthly faculty meetings. There’s a gazillion seminars. You can spend every day almost all day long at the medical center at campus, going to seminars all day long. You really need to have a strong, good reason why you want this joint appointment. My own bias is, what it’s going to get you personally? I think the risks outweigh the benefits in terms of joint appointment. You could be interdisciplinary. We encourage interdisciplinary, but you don’t need a joint appointment to function interdisciplinarily (PA10).

Whereas the school’s lead financial officer didn’t seem to think about joint appointments much at all:

I mean, I don’t think it’s a big deal. I don’t see it as a problem or a big issue. It doesn’t happen often. I mean, the minor ones happen more frequently, but there are no financial consequences. In the scheme of everything on my radar, that’s not even on there. It’s just not an issue (PA9).

A department chair within the School felt otherwise:
I’m very supportive of it. I think it’s good on an intellectual one, on an academic basis, in terms of, I think it’s, again, very satisfying. I think it’s a tool, almost a retention tool, because it keeps that faculty member, that they feel that they are working in public health, but they have that tie to their disciplinary home. As a chair, I really see my job is to support the faculty and to help them to be able to achieve what they want to achieve and to retain the faculty and recruit the faculty, so I see joint appointments as a positive thing (PA11).

In fact, the majority of faculty interviewed spoke out about the lack of coordination and systems to adequately support joint faculty. For example, faculty mentioned that they were not aware of whether or not they were invited to faculty meetings at the secondary department, but even if they were they would likely not attend on a regular basis. “When there are important issues or tenure cases, I go and I listen and I vote” (PF2). Faculty as well as some administrators also emphasized the culture of negotiation and “deals” within the School, even when policies and procedures have been established. As described by an administrator, “Perth is notorious for everything being vague and things for a reason. There’s no set rule…it’s all negotiated” (PA11). Furthermore, faculty feel left out of those conversations, even when it involves their own appointments: “You don’t know what’s going on. They don’t inform you, they don’t tell you” (PF5). Negotiated arrangements can be further complicated by the faculty’s impression that after the deals there is “no coordination [between departments]; none at all” (PF4). The lack of consistency within the infrastructure combined with a culture of “poor communication” cause some faculty to feel quite angry:

… they didn’t talk about any of it because they’re not very forthcoming and they’re not very good about it. Perth is without a doubt…Its administration is atrocious. It’s byzantine, it’s completely convoluted, it’s highly inefficient much more so than any of the other four institutions I’ve been around (PF6).
CHAPTER 5: FORT WILLIAM UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

The Fort William School of Public Health tells the story of loosely coupled infrastructure and entrepreneurial spirit. Like Perth, it takes research and institutional prestige seriously, while granting great autonomy to its faculty holding joint appointments. Interdisciplinarity, including joint appointments, is valued at the highest levels of the University and in particular within the School of Public Health. One of the goals of the school is to “sustain a thriving academic community and environment that embraces diversity in expertise and interests.”

Fort William University

Located in an urban area on the east coast of the U.S., Fort William is a private, not-for-profit four-year research university with an intentional focus on working across disciplines. Fort William includes ten schools and institutes and operates on a Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM) model that grants decision-making authority to the various schools on matters pertaining to faculty governance, curricula, admissions, budgetary operations, and resource allocation. Deans are accountable for all school matters. As described by one faculty member at the School of Public Health, “this school [is] related to the university in a way Kosovo is to Serbia – not that much” (FF24).

With a history spanning more than 100 years, the University currently enrolls over 21,000 students (45% White, 20% Asian, 12% Latino and 6% Black) and employs approximately 4,000 full-time faculty. Ninety-two percent of its undergraduate population is 24 years or younger (National Center for Education Statistics). Fort
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William’s endowment at the beginning of the 2013-2014 academic year exceeded $2 billion. The average net tuition price in that same year was approximately $25,000.

As a leader in federal research and development funding, Fort William has a reputation as being a premier site for research and innovation across many disciplines and is highlighted in their mission today. With over $1 billion in reported federal grants and contracts, Fort William’s focus on research is substantial.

Fort William’s city location is spread across four campuses. The health corridor is one of the campuses and includes the Schools of Nursing, Medicine and Public Health. There is a campus shuttle to facilitate transportation between campus locations.

**Fort William University’s School of Public Health**

**Overview**

The School of Public Health at Fort William, whose history goes back over 50 years, is currently ranked among the top 15 Schools of Public Health by *U.S. News and World Report* (2015). The School is quite large, with close to 2,000 full and part-time students and 600 full-time faculty (Association of Schools and Programs in Public Health). Over 100 of the School’s faculty hold joint appointments with a department or school outside the School of Public Health. Another 300 faculty from across the Fort William hold joint appointments with the School of Public Health. Its current total budget is over $500 million ($100 million in unrestricted operating funds).

Offering undergraduate and graduate programs, the school is organized around 10 departments and houses over 60 centers and institutes. Following a decentralized governance structure, the school is led by a dean and a core group of associate deans responsible for such areas as academic affairs, student affairs, finance and administration,
research and communication. The Dean reports to the President of the University through the Provost. Per the school’s administration and finance officer, “our School treats the academic departments more as entrepreneurs. The general fund is managed at the department level” (FA27). The School’s Advisory Board, which is chaired by the University’s president or provost, reviews and votes on all new policies, degree programs and faculty appointments and promotions.

**Joint Appointments**

On its website and in other school documents such as the most recent accreditation self-study for the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), the School emphasizes the importance of joint appointments as a means to cultivate diversity and collaboration. The School’s Faculty Handbook states that:

> Joint appointments with other divisions of the University and other departments of the School are encouraged. Such arrangements are common and can enrich the academic programs of each and stimulate research collaboration.

One of the ways in which it seeks to foster interdisciplinary collaboration is to set targets on the number of joint appointments held in a given academic year. Per the School’s Faculty Handbook, joint appointments are defined as “secondary appointments reserved for faculty with primary appointments in other divisions of the University or departments of the School.” The School also participates in a University-wide interdisciplinary initiative that uses external funding support to recruit senior faculty into joint appointments across two or more schools at the University. At the current time, the School of Public Health participates in seven of these joint professorships.

**Appointment, Promotion and Tenure**

The appointment, promotion and tenure processes at Fort William have been
thoughtfully and intentionally designed to address joint faculty appointments. The ways in which these policies are practiced and perceived play a meaningful role in how faculty experience their appointment.

**Appointment Process**

The School of Public Health establishes policies and procedures for all faculty appointments and promotions. The School’s Appointments and Promotions Committee (APC) is comprised of full professors from the School and processes all faculty appointments and promotions. The School’s Advisory Board, which is chaired by the University’s president or provost, votes on all appointments and promotions of primary and affiliated faculty. The University’s Board of Trustees also votes on tenure recommendations.

This past year, the Dean’s office issued a policy memorandum regarding updated policies and procedures regarding faculty appointments and promotion. The memo included specific language regarding jointly appointed faculty. In the memo the dean’s office encourages such appointments “whenever it is believed that such appointments would enrich the programs of the divisions or department involved and/or when it appears to be professionally advantageous to a faculty member” and that “joint appointments should be made only when there is a tangible contribution by the faculty member to the departmental program.” Both the memo and administrators mentioned that the idea of “courtesy” appointments should be avoided; however it appears that such appointments do occur in practice.

In terms of the formal process for appointing joint faculty, the School policies indicate that recommendations are proposed by the chair of the secondary department
after obtaining consent from the chair of the faculty member’s primary department. The School’s Advisory Board approves all proposed joint appointments, “but should be considered primarily as informational, subject to discussion only under unusual circumstances.”

In practice, faculty and administrators spoke of a very similar, but less formal approach. For example, appointments often originate with another faculty member who, by letter of recommendation to their chair, requests that a particular faculty member be given a joint appointment to formalize a particular collaboration. Or at times, such appointments begin with the individual faculty member seeking the appointment. That individual may find a particular faculty member or department within the University with a different perspective who feels that engaging in collaboration may be helpful to their own work. The faculty member self identifies and approaches the department chair for an appointment.

Although joint appointments at Fort William are typically used for the benefits and professional interests of individual faculty members, there are instances in which the rationale for the appointment has more to do with the desires of the department. For example, one faculty member spoke openly of the culture of “favors” between chairs:

I think the way it worked actually, is that the person in my department, the head of my division who was going to ask the department head over here if I could have a joint appointment, felt comfortable doing it because that department chair had recently come to her to ask if one of her people could have a joint appointment. There’s this … It’s like a trading. It’s a little favor thing (FF15).

Joint appointments can add to the prestige of the department, as explained by department chair at the School of Public Health:
The department can sometimes benefit from listing some very highly placed person in their department, whether they’re active or not. This gets back to the training grants, and this is probably where it’s most important here in the school, because those are reviewed by outside folks. You include a Nobel Prize when you’re on your list, that certainly looks like you have a stronger faculty base for your students than you might actually have (FA28).

Regardless of who initiates the request or the rationale for doing so, it often occurs after a faculty member has been recruited to the University; that is, once faculty become better acquainted with other faculty and research with collaborative potential. Although it can and has been used as a recruitment tool, such appointments are less frequent.

Once requests are made, the chair of the secondary department reviews the suggestion to ensure that there is collaboration with current faculty. The chairs put together a packet that goes to the Deans office for review. The packet includes the CV and a letter from the secondary department chair that includes a short description of the person’s background and how they will engage with the department. All joint appointment proposals across the school are collected and presented at the next monthly executive board meeting (deans and department chairs). According to an academic affairs administrator at the School, there is supposed to be coordination between chairs at each department, but no formal approval is needed from the primary department chair in order to proceed with the appointment: “With the joint appointments, they pretty much just vote as a block” (FA26). Finally, a letter is generated by the Dean to the faculty member acknowledging their joint appointment. One faculty member described the process as “really minimal. I couldn't tell you the specifics of ... I can’t even remember whether there was any paperwork I filled out. I think I just indicated that I would like to have that affiliation and it was done” (FF22).
When joint appointments are made, they are done so without designation of rank in the department of the secondary departments. Rather, the faculty rank of the primary department is honored. There are a small number of appointments in which tenure resides in two places. For those appointments, there is a deeper level of discussion and agreements. In such a case a formal memorandum of understanding (MOU) is developed and each dean involved signs off. An MOU template was developed across schools for consistency. First, however, a spreadsheet is used to identify expectations in terms of funding, time and effort, space, teaching, etc., which is then discussed in detail across schools or divisions. There is a high level of communication to ensure a smooth and transparent process for all involved, as described by the School of Public Health’s lead finance officer:

We’ve managed all of these by updating the spreadsheet and making sure everyone is provided the spreadsheet. There are calls every other week to review each [joint faculty appointment] and the funding. We can raise questions and concerns on those calls and updates, e.g. regarding recruitment, a new proposal for a [joint faculty appointment], who is primary or secondary on a specific [joint faculty appointment] finances. It’s made a big difference, because from a program side, they get up and running and they never talk about the money. Really, the [department administrators] are the ones that are pushing it and managing the whole process based on the spreadsheet. I received a call last week regarding 2 that popped up from [School of Medicine]. I was asked to sign off on the spreadsheets, which would have committed our School to 30% support for one and a smaller amount for the other. I wrote the dean and asked if he knew about the expected commitment, because I did not. He said he had, but had been told that our money was not needed. The spreadsheet provided the continuity among the business officers and the program faculty to make sure information and expectations are not misaligned (FA27).

Non-tenured joint appointments have a one-year term limit that can be renewed indefinitely. Each year, the Office of Academic Affairs sends a list to the chairs
identifying their jointly appointed faculty and the chair votes “yes or no” to renew. No additional paperwork or CV is required for renewal. An annual letter confirming the joint appointment is sent from the chair of the secondary department to the faculty member.

Promotion and Tenure

Promotion and tenure decisions at Fort William rest solely with the primary department level. The joint appointment will “automatically get the same rank. We always honor the rank that the person has in their primary” (FA26). No formal evaluation is done within the secondary department. The exception to this policy is for those few faculty at the University who hold primary appointments at two or more schools, such as those participating in the University-wide interdisciplinary initiative. However, to date all individuals in those appointments are recruited as senior faculty with tenure. Post-tenure reviews would be coordinated between two schools.

Many faculty, however, feel that the joint appointment has been (or will be) beneficial to their own promotion process. For example, having multiple chairs and/or faculties supporting their work is advantageous and “the more people who have your back, I think the more that you have the advocacy needed to advance through the ranks (FF22). There is a feeling that the joint appointment could be beneficial in showing that they have taken the effort to create a broader network for themselves. A faculty member explained:

I felt, again, the fact that I had two chairs on my side and both were equally supportive of both my decision to remain non tenure-track, and both desired in their view of merit, of meritorious consideration for going forward as associate. Both of them are eager to see me move on up (FF21).
Some of the junior faculty expressed uncertainty regarding the specifics of their joint appointment when it comes to promotion and tenure. When one junior faculty was asked how promotion works for them as a faculty member with a primary appointment with the School of Medicine and a secondary appointment in the School of Public Health, he replied:

I don’t know. I think… certainly to the extent that it increases my national presence through the collaborations that I have with people that I work with, yes, and that’s a good question. I probably should look. We have a [faculty affairs] book that all faculty members get. It lays out exactly what you need. I haven’t really looked at it because I’m pretty early (FF18).

However, faculty in general did not express concern about the appointment and promotion process as a joint faculty member. There was a general feeling that priority attention must remain with their primary department or school and the expectations brought by that department. Any additional arrangements are openly communicated and clear to departments and to faculty. An associate professor with a joint appointment between two departments at the School of Public Health described his arrangement:

Some of it goes to kind of administrative forms that get processed, that have, I presume, in a sense a legal standing. I would say that whatever the form of that communication is, whether it’s a letter from the administrator or the chair or whomever, it’s perfectly clear what’s up. I’ve never felt that somehow somebody’s saying, “Well, gee, we expected you to do this,” and I would say, “No, I didn’t expect that at all. I have a different understanding.” In that sense, I think it’s been, in my case, very transparent (FF21).

**Meaning: A Sense of Cachet**

Overall, faculty understood the meaning of the joint appointment, both in terms of what it did – and did not – provide. For faculty, there is a perception that not much is expected of them personally and professionally in terms of their time or expectations (in
regards to teaching, research or service) to the secondary department. Nor do they feel there is much they need to give. Faculty and administrators alike suggest that the joint appointment is significant only to the extent that it means something to the faculty member individually (or at times, the secondary department). The meaning of the joint appointment varies across faculty, including such features as validation of a disciplinary background, a formal “nod” to a collaboration, and research potential. As one faculty member stated, “Are there any expectations? I don’t know if there are formal expectations for a joint appointment on this level. There’s always been an understanding that it gives the department the opportunity to draw upon the resources that appointees have” (FF12). Faculty also mentioned that in such a large, decentralized institution, the expectations of the joint appointment can vary substantially across schools and even departments within the same school:

The meaning of a joint appointment, the expectations of a joint appointment vary from one department to the next. I can have four because nobody expects me to do much of anything, at least the way I see it…It’s just a line on my CV and on my biosketch (FF17).

However, regardless of the level of commitment in the joint appointment the theme cutting across almost all explanations was a sense of professional cachet. The symbolic recognition and prestige of the appointment – in both internal and external professional circles – was important to faculty, as described by a department chair:

I think it’s more the cachet, because the fact is that just myself and other faculty in the department collaborate widely across the university, and nobody feels they have to have a joint appointment to do that. I don’t think those departmental boundaries keep people from working together. They go out and find the person they need, and that person’s able to work with them without any kind of appointment. I do think it does give them some cachet
with whatever other stakeholders or organizations they like to be affiliated with (FA28).

A junior, tenure-track faculty member with a joint appointment presented his own perspective:

I think part of it is strategic, that there's a good reason to promote myself as having a presence in the Department of Mental Health since I’m a mental health services researcher. For purposes of applying for grants, I can say I have that secondary appointment. Perhaps in some way as I progress toward promotion and tenure in a fairly small, but every little bit helps kind of way. It could be beneficial in showing that I’ve taken the effort to create a broader network for myself here at the school of public health (FF22).

School administrators suggested this idea as well. A department chair in the School of Public Health suggested, “most people in this school have joint appointments because they want to send a message externally” (FA28). Some faculty even alluded to the notion that having a joint appointment is critical to your professional image:

They recommended that I get this joint appointment because it would look good in a lot of ways. It would also look good when I wrote grant proposals to see a joint appointment. If you don’t have one, people told me, people who were more knowledgeable than me, it looks like there’s something wrong with you (FF17).

Research

Research Infrastructure

Given the importance placed upon research productivity, it is not surprising that both research infrastructure and culture will play a part in how faculty experience their appointment at Fort William. Almost all grants are submitted, at least by default, through the joint faculty’s primary department. Similar to other school administrative mechanisms, research administration (both pre- and post-award administration) is
decentralized to the department. The School’s central research administration office oversees the application and reporting process for all sponsored research and will review applications before they are submitted to funding agencies. Once a grant is awarded, the principal investigator (PI) works with the corresponding department administrators to manage the grants. If the research itself is a collaborative project, a template is completed, reviewed, and approved across participating entities, and the faculty investigators involved in the process. The “contract” of sorts indicates the type of grant, time and effort, and funding amounts.

For a jointly appointed faculty, it is assumed that the primary department will manage the money associated with the appointment and thus indirect cost revenues (ICR) flow to the joint faculty primary department. In all cases, however, there is a review to determine if salary and non-personnel funds are shared and if so, proper allocation accounts are established. There are some exceptions, particularly if the secondary school or department has particular resources or expertise in managing a grant or is providing space or personnel.

Another exception is for those faculty participating in the University-wide interdisciplinary initiative who hold primary appointments in two schools. In such cases department chairs and their respective department administrators will discuss the appropriate arrangements and expectation. According to school administrators this ICR model is accepted across schools and departments, and there are “no (issues), because if they’re going to do the work here then it’s expected that it comes over here, because they could lose their space, because we need that F&A to take care of the space charges” (FA25).
In discussing research administration for joint appointments, the School of Public Health’s lead finance and administration officer highlighted the decentralized approach: “From that standpoint, it’s really pretty self-directed, either by department administrator over there or over here. That’s our unwritten policy” (FA27). A chair in the Nursing School (whose department has several joint appointments with the School of Public Health) recognized the flow of ICR can sometimes be an issue, but emphasized the steps that have been taken to minimize problems and empower faculty at the same time: “The indirects are always an issue. Luckily, we have a very strong [research center] that provides guidance to faculty members in terms of that process of working on grants and how to do their subcontracts” (FF23).

Research Culture

Regardless of the type of joint appointment, faculty feel there is a positive research culture at Fort William and in particular, at the School of Public Health. There is no doubt that faculty understand that research is a priority for the school, but they also enthusiastically emphasized the collegial and collaborative culture of the School to support the research goals.

We are working with people in a variety of departments, including medicine and with basic scientists, the lab people, all of that. Because the research is what drives the mission, research is also what drives collaboration. The glue that brings people together is collaborating on research. That is what holds people together. Teaching courses, yes. I mean, somewhat. That shifts. Who you actually work with in terms of your research is much more durable (FF14).

There is also general agreement that joint appointments, although not required for collaboration, help to facilitate it. A faculty member who is primary in the School of
Medicine with a secondary appointment in the School of Public Health spoke about the collaborative potential of the joint appointment:

Certainly in pediatrics and in general and adolescent medicine specifically, there is a lot of public health-focused research in our department, and so there is a lot of collaboration between us and the School of Public Health. There is actually a lot of collaboration. People are on each other’s grants, people are on each others papers, and we have a lot of Ph.D.’s who are faculty members here who are public health students there. There’s a lot of those relationships that exist because they are primary here, but have those relationships there. I think that allows for that collaboration (FF18).

Faculty also spoke about the benefits of the joint appointment when it comes to the audience for their research, which was mentioned positively as a means of increasing funding and publication opportunities. Not only does it create additional opportunities to be heard, but also in a difficult funding environment, it has the potential to open up additional funding streams outside of one’s traditional home. A faculty member explains:

If you’re talking to a larger audience, if I’m conveying our research findings or so forth, and you have a mixed audience, then maybe in those settings I would think that you have more, establish some common background and so forth. So maybe feeling like a member of two communities that I think my work is relevant to both. So I think that’s probably the biggest benefit (FF19).

**Finance and Other Resources**

The entrepreneurial spirit of Fort William plays out within issues of finance and resource allocation as well. In general, faculty feel there is adequate institutional and administrative support for their interdisciplinary efforts, however with that support comes a high level of responsibility among those in academic positions.
Budget and Finance

The School of Public Health has an annual total budget of approximately $500 million, with grants and contracts accounting for 80% of total revenue. Direct cost revenue from grants and contracts goes directly to investigators to support their research and professional activities. On average, 60% of faculty salary support comes from grants and contracts. The other 40% is provided by schools/departments for teaching and other administrative services.

General school funds (from tuition, grants and contracts, etc.) are distributed to departments based on an allocation formula. The formula takes into consideration a department’s contribution to teaching, research, and mentoring and advisement. ICR is not returned to faculty directly, but to the respective department that then establishes its own methodology on how its funds are allocated. For joint appointed faculty who are teaching across departments, the allocation formula can become a bit unwieldy, although it is transparent, as described by the senior finance officer:

There are buckets and there’s probably about 15 buckets. If you’re primary, you’re teaching the class, you get so many points. If you’re advising, you get so many points. If you are a lab-based department, so many points are provided. If it’s special studies, I mean seriously, we’ve talked about going back to mainly a flat tax. Right now, it’s very transparent, but essentially in most cases, the primary department gets some portion of that tuition back based on this allocation. If you’re an adviser in a different department, your department will get credit for you advising that student (FA27).

According to school administrators, however, there are few situations of shared salary support for joint faculty. There may be some salary allocation for teaching and mentoring students, however, it was emphasized that teaching within the School is not a highly compensated endeavor. A faculty member with a primary
appointment in the social sciences and a secondary appointment with the School of Public Health explained:

You have to understand that teaching in the School of Public Health is not a remunerative thing to do. It’s mostly not something that people initiate. It would be something you would be asked to do because you would get very, very little in salary support to do it. There’s no motivation to do it (FF12).

There is some faculty frustration with this teaching model and the perceived lack of value placed on teaching due to the low remuneration for it. This concern was most pronounced among junior faculty, who have not yet established a full research portfolio in which to support their salary. A tenure-track faculty member with a primary appointment in medicine and a secondary appointment in public health provided his opinion:

I think definitely the expectation and desire for us to teach over there and the amount of reimbursement we get for that, that’s a challenge, particularly when you’re not fully funded, which a lot of junior people are not fully funded. Teaching a course is not just the 3 hours you spend, it’s 10-15% of your time during, and then there’s time before then too. It would be much easier to justify doing that if some level of our percent effort were actually covered out of just this flat fee (FF18).

School administrators acknowledged this frustration among faculty, and shared in it to some extent. When asked about teaching compensation for joint faculty, one administrator explained:

It’s tricky, I think. As with everything, when money is plentiful, nobody cares about these things. When money’s tight, then everybody’s trying to work the formula and try to make the most out of it (FA27).
Additional Resources and Privileges

Faculty and administrators alike spoke of the numerous resources available to faculty at Fort William, which can ultimately be expanded by joint appointments. A department chair discusses the plethora of resources available at Fort William:

We’ve worked real hard from the get-go with new faculty to explain to them when you come to [Fort William], and you begin to realize what resources are out there, it's like being let loose in a candy store, and you really have to choose carefully and wisely. I think the mentorship process has really helped to reduce that lost feeling with all the opportunities that there are (FF23).

At the School of Public Health, most of the resources afforded to the faculty are provided by the primary appointment, and can vary substantially by department. However, faculty recognized additional resources resulting specifically from their joint appointment. For example, all joint faculty with the School of Public Health receive a faculty page on the School website and have access to School intranet resources for faculty. Website space was seen as beneficial to faculty, in that it expanded their professional presence, allowing students as well as fellow colleagues to find them. Access to students in multiple disciplines was highlighted as a major benefit of the joint appointment. At Fort William, faculty are unable to mentor doctoral students unless the faculty member holds a formal appointment in the student’s school. Access to doctoral students is an asset to faculty and serves as a means of enhancing intellectual capital and research opportunities. A faculty member with a joint appointment in medicine and public health explains:

In terms of having the students that would be really interested in the type of stuff that I was interested in, is much more likely to happen in the School of Public Health than in the School of Medicine. As I said, there’s much more opportunity to develop a mentoring relationship with them and even bring them on board in terms of research assistant jobs and coordinator position jobs (FF18).
For some faculty, it is simply a matter of practical need. One faculty member mentioned a lack of available sociology students to serve as teaching assistants in her sociology class, so she was able to draw from public health students to fill that role: “Since this course is a public health course and the students here are fabulous and I … I take advantage of that. It allows us to free up some resources over there” (FF12).

Many joint faculty indicated that they are invited to faculty meetings at the secondary appointment, but few actually attend. A lack of time was given as the major reason faculty do not attend two sets of faculty meetings, as one faculty member describes:

I have on occasion attended a department meeting, but it’s not something I do on a regular basis…The department chair for the department that I reside in over in the School of Public Health … I’ve invited him over to mine and he’s invited me over to his. We recognize that neither one of us has the time to do it. Yes, and every once in a while, we try and get together and we catch up (FF23).

Some faculty were unsure if they were allowed to attend faculty meetings or not. Several were unsure if they had voting privileges in the secondary appointment, though they assumed they did not. Those who do attend faculty meetings mentioned networking opportunities as a benefit: “Usually I’m going because I want them to get to know me and I’m going to get to know them, and it’s a re-acclimation a little bit” (FF13).

An Entrepreneurial Culture

“This is really an entrepreneurial place. It’s the ultimate entrepreneurial place, and that’s its greatest strength and greatest weakness” (FF24). This statement by a joint faculty member captures a major theme that evolved from the interviews with both
administrators and faculty; a strong entrepreneurial environment at Fort William. This sentiment was felt throughout administrative infrastructures, programming, interdisciplinary collaborations, and faculty autonomy. Guiding that entrepreneurial spirit is a perceived, embedded trust throughout the School of Public Health administration and faculty.

There is a high level of autonomy afforded to faculty in their positions, and that autonomy comes with the belief that faculty are accountable first and foremost to themselves. In general, they do not feel a pull across their joint appointments, because there is no formal expectation of them on either side. Since the majority of faculty fund themselves through their research, they are given more latitude, and that works for them. One faculty member said:

I think the last time I looked at it, the university kick-in to me was the legal minimum which is 5%. I’m very adverse to people telling me what to do because they are only paying me 5% of my salary. I kind of feel like, back off. That’s also why I’ve stayed in academia. You know what I mean? There is true intellectual freedom here. That is rare (FF14).

It was acknowledged that the entrepreneurial environment puts more responsibility on the faculty member, as one senior faculty member mentioned: “I think a lot of what happens here at Fort William doesn’t fall in your lap, you have to go out and get it and ask for it” (FF17). Yet faculty expressed an understanding and even appreciation for this type of environment; they thrive on it. A faculty member with a joint appointment between the business school and public health stated: “I’ve looked at university life as an opportunity to engage people, to exchange ideas, and I’ve been able to do that. I know that there are places where you don’t step until we say step so. This is not one of those places ” He later explained:
Yeah, it’s very entrepreneurial. I’m much more entrepreneurial, okay? Being entrepreneurial, the vibe works, right? It is ideas. It is knowledge and so, I like to think, and I may not be correct, I chose the institution as much as them choosing me. Yeah, it worked out. I had a couple of other choices. I visited other places but, I didn’t feel that I could ... Some of it’s luck. Since I’ve been here, like I said, I have the run of the place in some ways. I think, as a faculty, that’s the best position I could have (FF15).

When asked about the high level of autonomy and responsibility, another faculty member responded,

This is what I signed up for. Nobody forced me to do it, and I’m getting properly compensated…I guess I trust my own judgment and people trust that in me to not feel like I’m sort of playing one or the other. Yeah, there are sometimes just overlapping commitments – two committees meeting at the same time. I’ve got to say sometimes, “Nope, I got to go to [this department] one because that’s more important today” or “Nope, I got to go to the [other department] one because that’s more important.” We’re allowed a lot of latitude here. I think that’s what’s both the strength of the school as well as, in some respects, it’s a challenge as a faculty. It’s pretty entrepreneurial. As long as you get your work done, you get to make a lot of decisions on your own. The department chairs are happy as long as you’re paying your salary and teaching the courses and advising the students and not sort of just falling down (FF21).

The autonomy and flexibility, in turn, cultivates a setting in which faculty feel respected and valued for the work that they do. When asked if there are expectations tied to the joint appointment, one faculty member explained:

No, that’s the nice part. It’s not tied to workload effort. It’s really tied to the contribution that you’re making to whatever is the focus. It’s usually within the department, so with my focus being on substance use and the work that I’m doing with the different grants that I’m on… It’s more the expectation that what you’re doing dovetails with what they’re working on. (FF23).

The entrepreneurial culture was also recognized through Fort William’s solution-oriented approach. Faculty and administrators underscored the school’s ability to
develop innovative solutions to complex challenges, often thinking “outside the box” to resolve issues. Frequently those examples involved cooperation with multiple stakeholders, including peers across the University as well as students. There are certainly potential challenges, such as resource allocation, research administration for joint faculty, or even the logistics of getting across campus to teach a course. However, faculty and administrators work collaboratively to resolve issues and work out solutions. Challenges are often approached more as opportunities, as described by a department chair:

> What I think has worked for me is that I have kind of taken advantage of an overlap between the two departments that’s not contested territory, right? Yes, occasionally, something comes up ... “Oh, we should be teaching a mortality course.” “No, that’s our turf.” Hey, I’m in the perfect position to help if those things arise, if it’s not related to me, but something else. To say, “Actually, I think I know how to help resolve this.” It doesn't mean it resolves happily and satisfactorily for all concerned, but at least process it without feeling like you’re kind of going into unknown territory (FF21).

**Intellectual Rewards**

Another theme that emerged with faculty at the Fort William School of Public Health was the intellectual rewards that result from the joint appointments. Regardless of where they were in their careers or which departments to which they were appointed, faculty at Fort William’s School of Public Health recurrently referred to the academic benefits of their arrangement. A faculty member with a joint appointment in public health and sociology explains:

> Part of the reason we have joint appointments is so that you can have an intellectual home in a place where you share research interests and ideas with people. A lot of that leads to collaborative research. I also am involved in a research institute that has a foot
in arts and sciences and also in public health and also in medicine and nursing. (FF12).

The knowledge synergies are not just felt between faculty colleagues, but result from student interactions as well. Faculty feel the contributions of the diverse student body are valuable to their professional development. Access to students from multiple disciplines is seen as a positive outcome of a joint appointment. A faculty member with a joint appointment in history and public health spoke of this benefit:

Well it certainly helps in terms of my scholarship because, as I said, it always keeps me sort of grounded in what’s going on now. And in terms of my students, I benefit from listening to how people talk about problems. I mean, for me, every time I walk in the door it’s like an ethnographic experience. I just try to soak up how people are talking, what they’re doing, how they think about health programs and problems. You know, it’s not like it directly shaped what I do, but it certainly informs my thinking (FF20).

As mentioned by the above faculty member, the collaborative potential of Fort William, as well as of the specific joint appointment, is essential to faculty. Collaboration is highly valued among the faculty, and to some extent is seen as the primary purpose of the joint appointments. A faculty member with a joint appointment between the humanities and public health shared his thoughts:

I feel like within my division here, there’s a great culture of collaboration, and there as well. In general, people aren’t stealing each other’s ideas. It’s like open door, talk about new ideas. Yeah, it’s great. So that’s one of the reasons I feel like it’s a great reason to stay. It’s like, you know, among the top. It’s just the intellectual atmosphere is really good (FF20).

There is a high regard for a community of people working in the same areas or interested in similar issues. The culture of collaboration as its relationship to joint appointments was articulated by the department chair of nursing, who also has a joint appointment with the School of Medicine:
I think that the key at Fort William, which I learned when I began my position here, is that collaboration is a very strong culture at Fort William. I think the fact that the joint appointments are encouraged is a demonstration of this culture of collaboration. Rather than the collaboration being a culture within the joint appointment, the joint appointment’s more an expression of the university culture of collaboration (FF22).

On more than one occasion, faculty expressed a feeling of satisfaction in “bridging” disciplines through their joint appointment. They expressed a sense of accomplishment and/or purpose in their facilitating role in bringing people and ideas together that may have otherwise not have occurred. In describing an interdisciplinary research group, a School of Medicine faculty member with a joint appointment in the School of Public Health described her public health peers: “I think they see the benefit of participation in that group because they get to see outside of the School of Public Health. That’s something I facilitate for them” (FF13). Another Medicine and Public Health joint faculty member explains.

… like everyone here has that same setup, has that connection that creates bridges between School of Medicine and School of Public Health, both in terms of pushing research agendas for it. And I have collaborators in the School of Public Health that have been my collaborators for awhile and so that continues those connections (FF18).

Another faculty member interviewed had the following perspective:

I know a hell of a lot more about pediatrics than almost anybody here in the School of Public Health. That’s really valuable here, because the research I do is at the intersection of healthcare and human services. Having that appointment is an important thing for me because it says, “Hey, I still have my hand in. I’ve got a lot of years of experience and it’s still important for me to wear this hat.” (FF17)

Faculty mentoring is very strong at Fort William and is regarded as a facilitator of intellectual capacity. Both administrators and faculty spoke of the importance of
mentoring (as both mentors and mentees) throughout one’s career and the value placed on it throughout the School of Public Health. A faculty member also mentioned that her “department is encouraging people to be mentored by people who are not part of their research collaborations” (FF14), underscoring the significance of interdisciplinary perspectives. Faculty mentoring can take the form of formal mentors, as is the case for junior faculty, or informal mentors as described by a faculty member:

I have a peer-to-peer mentoring group, which is, there’s four of us. Three are from the School of Medicine including myself primarily, and one is from the School of Public Health. That’s just like an informal thing that we ... Actually that was my meeting before this. We meet every month, just the four of us, to sort of generate ideas, talk about grant ideas, talk about papers (FF19).

Faculty mentoring is thought of not only as a means of supporting faculty through the ranks, but also to encourage intellectual stimulation through collaborative relationships, which faculty mentioned could be challenging to navigate at Fort William, given its large size and complexity. As described by a faculty member with a joint appointment between Nursing and Public Health:

Oh, I think that the strongest thing that we have at school level, which is across our two departments, is the whole commitment to mentorship. So that when you’re a junior faculty coming on board, it can be pretty overwhelming to navigate a huge Level 1 research institution to figure how to, you know, get going ... especially since the expectation is you will get going. We have a very strong mentorship program. That really relies on across-school mentorship, so that if I have a new faculty that’s come on board, and I’m talking with them and they’re interested in a particular area, that for nine times out of ten crosses over into the School of Medicine/School of Public Health, then they’re encouraged to get a expert mentor outside the School of Nursing ...... and one inside the School of Nursing. That gives them that beginning of looking at that collaborative process from the very beginning (FF23).
Kirkwall School of Public Health, which values interdisciplinary efforts among its faculty and its scholarly work, is characterized by collegiality and collaboration. It is a belief felt across the school. As one faculty member described her experience:

That’s how the university was successful in recruiting me and was creating a place where there is an opportunity to make that happen. To do more training and capacity building. To do more research than I could do individually by working collectively with colleagues. They’re very strongly committed to working not only across departments but across the schools at the university. There was quite a concerted effort during my recruitment to talk broadly within the school and across the other schools in the university. It was structured from the beginning to be multidisciplinary and collaborative (KF32).

Such beliefs shape the ways in which the institutional systems impact the joint faculty experience.

Kirkwall University

Founded over 100 years ago, Kirkwall is a large, four-year public research university located in an urban setting on the west coast of the U.S. In 2014, student enrollment reached just over 44,000 (43% White, 23% Asian, 7% Latino and 3% Black) across its sixteen schools. Ninety percent of undergraduates were 24 years of age or younger. The University employs approximately 6,000 full-time faculty. At the beginning of the 2013-2014 academic year, Kirkwall’s endowment topped $2 billion and the average net price for in-state students in the same year was approximately $10,000 (National Center for Education Statistics). Research funding from all sources exceeded $1.3 billion (university annual report).

---

4 Pseudonym. Actual name of the University is withheld.
Kirkwall University operates on a decentralized organizational model, with each dean responsible for his/her school’s academic portfolio, budget planning and allocation, faculty and administrative personnel, space allocation, and strategic planning. State funding dedicated to academic programs is allocated at the discretion of the Provost.

**Kirkwall University’s School of Public Health**

**Overview**

With a history going back more than 30 years, the School of Public Health is one of the sixteen schools and colleges at Kirkwall, and one of six professional schools that make up the Health Sciences campus. The dean of the School of Public Health reports to the president through the provost on all matters concerning the School. The president, in turn, reports to the Board of Regents, which governs the University.

This past year, the School enrolled approximately 1500 students in its undergraduate and graduate programs offered across five academic departments. Of those students, 61% were in-state residents. The School houses over 50 research centers and institutes and is ranked within the top 15 in the *US News and World Report* survey of schools of public health (*U.S. News and World Report*, 2015). The School’s reported annual budget is $214 million, of which 81% comes from grants and contracts.

The physical footprint of the school is just under 300,000 assignable square feet, and is spread out across multiple university locations throughout its urban setting. A free university shuttle is available to transport the university community between locations.

The five department chairs report to the dean, who leads a senior administrative team responsible for such areas as academic affairs, research, administration and finance and communication. Faculty also play an important role in school governance. Each
department elects a member to the School’s Faculty Council. The Faculty Council advises the dean on all proposed faculty promotions, as well as new appointments at the levels of associate and full professor. The Faculty Council also advises on academic affairs policies, including priorities, resources and salary allocation.

**Joint Appointments**

The School of Public Health employs almost 1,000 full-time and part-time faculty, including 100 full-time faculty who hold joint appointments with the School. The School’s Faculty Handbook defines such a joint appointment as “one that recognizes a regular or research faculty member's long term commitment to (and participation in) two or more Kirkwall departments.” For all joint appointments, there is only one designated primary department and any subsequent appointment is considered secondary. Joint appointment designations can be changed or terminated only when the faculty member and the corresponding departments agree and approve. Once a faculty member receives a joint appointment, they are considered full faculty in both units and are afforded all rights and responsibilities of faculty in that department. At Kirkwall, faculty can also be given an adjunct appointment in another school or department, but such an affiliation does not come with full-faculty privileges, such as voting rights.

How joint faculty navigate their career at Kirkwall both influences, and is influenced by, a multitude of institutional practices, including promotion, research administration, and resource allocation. Furthermore, the organizational culture at Kirkwall plays a critical role in shaping the faculty experience.
Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

Appointment Process

The School of Public Health follows University policy regarding faculty recruitment, appointment and promotion. All specifics of the appointment, such as compensation, benefits, and promotion guidelines, are determined by the primary appointment, although the secondary department may provide recommendations. All arrangements of the faculty appointment, however, must have agreement across all departments (both primary and secondary). Once the chair of the respective departments approve of the terms, the joint appointment must receive approval of the representative deans as well as the Provost.

Joint appointments are included in the hiring plan that all departments submit to the Provost annually. The academic affairs office at the School of Public Health manages this process. At times there may be differences in faculty affairs policies between the appointing units. If so, the academic affairs office ensures that the appropriate language is included in the letter of appointment. Joint appointments are considered one-year appointments that can be renewed indefinitely. Faculty vote annually to renew the joint appointments.

Given that the details of the appointment are negotiated on a case-by-case basis, appointing units often develop a memorandum of understanding (MOU). Departments with a substantial number of joint appointments have developed an overarching MOU, as described by a school administrator:

MOUs are very important to have because they basically have to get attached. You know you’ve got, essentially, the appointment letter itself and the contract, and so the MOU that comes later can
sort of be attached to that. It’s almost like a rider to a contract (KA4).

If faculty are recruited to Kirkwall directly into a joint appointment, the recruitment involves two separate processes that may or may not be coordinated. The procedural steps for recruitment into a joint appointment with the School of Public Health are clearly documented in the school’s Faculty Handbook. The documentation includes specific processes for advertising the position, search committee membership and participation, interviewing candidates, voting and offer letters. The School requires that at least one School of Public Health faculty member serve on the search committee and that the School fully participates in the search process, including recruitment talks and seminars. According to the Faculty Handbook:

The proposed SPH department will be expected to participate in the search, including departmental seminars by the candidates (or if acceptable by the Department Chair, timely notification of the department of the seminars at the external institution) and interviews of the candidates by SPH faculty.

Faculty expressed some concern that the process can be onerous and disorganized. One faculty member who was recruited to Kirkwall into a joint appointment stated, “Gosh, I think I had about fourteen interviews, because you do everything twice” (KF34).

The reasons joint appointments are awarded vary by department and also by faculty. However, many of the reasons given have to do with the synergistic benefits to the work itself. The issue-focused objective of the joint appointment – as compared to a personal gain – was repeated again and again when describing the purpose of the appointment. Faculty suggested that the collaborative reputation at the University and within the school itself helps to address complex public health issues, and that was very
important to them, as explained by a faculty member: “I was attracted to Kirkwall partly because they have these centers where it’s supposed to be much more collegial and interdisciplinary and not just one person’s lab” (KF36).

Because all joint appointments go through a formal review and approval process, and because all appointments factor into promotion decisions, the faculty at the School of Public Health take the joint appointments quite seriously. Thus, the reason for the appointments must be meaningful and bear weight to the research and scholarship. Faculty feel that they are fully and legitimately part of the community within each appointing unit, and that the leadership and their fellow colleagues feel the same. A faculty member explains:

I think where it helps is like both departments feel they own me, and so I never get a feeling like I’m an outsider in either department. And so in terms of collaboration and spirit of support and things like that, I actually feel like I belong in both which is nice (KF34).

Promotion and Tenure

Each department within the School of Public Health has its own policy regarding the awarding of tenure. According to school reports and confirmed by faculty and administrators, the School of Public Health holds a limited number of tenure positions that are allocated across departments. The majority of public health faculty are appointed without a tenure commitment. All full-time faculty, regardless of tenure commitment have equal voting rights. The only difference between faculty with and without tenure is a guarantee of salary support. Faculty without tenure can only have their employment with the University terminated for reasons of misconduct or loss of funding (as described as less than 50% over one year). For those in a tenure-track position, promotion and
tenure processes are decoupled. Although tenure can occur at the time of promotion to associate professor, tenure is most commonly awarded to a seated, senior member of the faculty who has clearly demonstrated exemplary scholarship and research and a true commitment to the University. Awarding of tenure requires that departments and school demonstrate adequate and sustainable resources to support the tenured faculty member. When tenure proposals are put forward by a department, the Faculty Council is involved only to ensure that each department is following their own rules, and that those rules are applied equitably. The variance in tenure policies and allocation across departments at the University can create challenges for some joint faculty, as recognized by a faculty member who was originally appointed into two categories:

I think there were some things that none of us anticipated, so one was ... I think the biggest thing was that the vote went through in my Nursing department as with tenure or tenure track positions, but [the public health department] does not have tenure. And so the letter that I got originally was like 50% tenure track and 50% non-tenure track or something like that, but then administratively, they actually can’t do that. There is just no system that allows that to happen currently, and so they said because [public health] was the one that initiated the hire and my primary is in [public health], and so they said your tenure line ... Whether you’re tenure or not tenure actually follows your primary department and can’t be really split. So I had to then turn over the whole tenure to a [without tenure] position and then ... There was sort of this kind of handshake, goodwill thing, like later on, if you want to switch your primary to Nursing, they understand that you want to go through the tenure position. But I think that was something that the chairs didn’t even know, and so when they were making this position, they had to kind of go back and say, “I'm so sorry, but we just didn’t realize there’s not actually any way to make that happen.” (KF34)

Regardless of the tenure commitment, faculty holding joint appointments with the School of Public Health and other departments or schools at the University must fulfill the promotion criteria for both entities. They are also required to go through the
promotion process separately within both departments. The Faculty Handbook, which outlines the promotion process in detail, mentions that “alternative ways of meeting certain SPH promotion criteria may apply, e.g., consideration of clinical teaching for partial fulfillment of criteria for teaching.”

Administrators and faculty described various ways in which the promotion process may unfold, which is highly dependent upon the departments and/or schools involved. At times the process is managed by the primary department, which processes all of the original paperwork. At the point when the promotion packet is prepared, it goes over to the secondary department to advance through its procedures. One senior administrator suggested, “typically the secondary department will, you know, take into account what the primary department has done” (KA40). There are instances, however, where the cultures between appointing departments are sufficiently different that a faculty may receive a stronger letter of promotion from one of the departments than from the other.

In other cases, the promotion processes of the two entities are completely separate and even occur at different times. As described by a faculty member holding an appointment in the School of Medicine and the School of Public Health:

I had to do all the paper work for both ... were completely independent. They very recently tried to make the annual review paperwork similar, but it’s not quite the same, and it is still actually different. You do need to feel out both separate ... separate paperwork for everything. I had to separate paperwork for the whole application process. The promotion requirements are different in both departments, and so all the paperwork is duplicated with some differences. Not always ... not the same time (KF30).

A School of Public Health administrator confirmed the administrative challenges in coordinating promotion across joint appointments:
You know, I think that the most difficult time is around the time of promotion. So, kind of trying to synchronize that when it’s cross-institution used to lead to a lot of difficulty, and some things have changed a bit to try and get the cross-institution promotions to be closer aligned. The way we do things here is we have, you know, it’s very bureaucratic. So, you know, the Assistants go up in the fall, the Associates go up in the winter, and, in both cases, they’re not effective until the following July 1. Whereas at some of our sister institutions, if somebody can be promoted at any time of the year, and once the process is complete and the recommendation is made and it’s signed off, then you’re promoted. So, you know, you can potentially be promoted nine months, let’s say, before you’re promoted here (KA42).

Faculty indicated that the expectations for promotion and tenure vary widely across disciplines and departments. One faculty member spoke of the conversations that occurred during his recruitment to Kirkwall as a joint faculty with appointments in Medicine and Public Health. He was being recruited with tenure, and there was debate over faculty rank and identification of the primary appointment between the two schools, as the School of Public Health will expect many more published peer-reviewed papers as compared to the School of Medicine. Another faculty member explained his perspective:

Yeah, I think if you want to think about risk, in my perception there is more risk in the School of Dentistry side, mainly because the faculty peer reviews are clinicians. You have to be a good communicator in terms of explaining why you’re worthy of promotion or meritorious for promotion to somebody who doesn’t do the work you do, who basically, you’re doing clinical biological practice and research. There’s a communication challenge there (KF38).

Regardless of any challenges associated with promotion and tenure, faculty indicate that the expectations as well as the process itself is very clearly communicated and understood, even for joint faculty. According to faculty, the high level of transparency and the well-articulated processes are well received and appreciated. Subsequently, the administrative operations for the joint appointments in general run smoothly, albeit
tedious. As described by one faculty member holding appointments with Medicine and Public Health:

The School of Public Health has an excellent ... it’s very clear in the written materials about what’s required for promotion, and it is also clear for the Department of Medicine, but there is more malleability between the requirements. Teaching, for example, in the School of Public Health is very clear. You have to teach so many credits. In the School of Medicine, you can either teach a course or you can teach while you are attending. So it’s a little less specific. The requirement is still there, but there is more than one way to reach that requirement (WF30).

Research

Kirkwall is a Research I University and ranks among the top institutions in the country in terms of total federal research funding, making research a key issue for faculty. Within the University, only the School of Medicine exceeds the School of Public Health in the amount of total federal research dollars. As a highly ranked School of Public Health, research is a high priority for the school and is emphasized in its mission statement as well as in it most recent strategic plan (2012-2020). In this past fiscal year, faculty within the School were awarded over $85 million in research funding from NIH and other federal agencies.

Research Infrastructure

Research policies and procedures related to joint appointments are outlined in the school’s Faculty Handbook, as are research expectations at each level of promotion. Joint faculty may submit grants through their primary or secondary department. How the administering department of the grant is determined as well as the where indirect cost revenue flows is determined on a case-by-case basis and varies by school and department. Described by a school administrator as “a dance,” it is generally understood that both
department chairs must agree if the grant is to be submitted by the non-primary department. Then, it is outlined in writing how the indirect revenue will be allocated accordingly. An electronic routing system has been created to ensure that department chairs formally approve the transactions. According to administrators, an effort has been made to create a formula for indirect revenue that takes into account the primary home school of faculty member, the administering department, and the physical location of grant.

Both faculty and administrators agree there is a very collegial and practical approach to grant administration, grounded in the philosophy that first and foremost, decisions should be made for the benefit of the research. It was suggested that proposals are submitted “in whichever department makes sense and then we find there’s administrative people who do cost sharing stuff” (KF32). For example, if a school or department has particular expertise in managing a certain type of grant, or has the necessary human or physical resources to do so, then the grant would be administered there – even if it is the secondary department of the joint faculty. This was heard repeatedly for grants involving international activities. Given the complexities of navigating global research, multiple faculty and department chairs agree that research taking place outside the U.S. should be administered by schools and departments with the knowledge and expertise to handle issues such as visas, international labor laws, and foreign sub-contracts. As recognized by one faculty member:

I guess what I really love is having a department where I can have the grants go through and be administered in a way that the money gets out to my international colleagues pretty efficiently. I would say that really is a great benefit, because [Medicine] was struggling to get that done (KF37).
Another faculty member shared his personal experience:

Running my grants through the school of public health, I work in an environment where there are people who know about in-country registration and how to get a lawyer in-country. Send money. Run these grants through general medicine, but I can tell you I’m tracking every wire transfer. I’m getting the bank information from somebody in Uganda. Here, I have people who know how to do that, the systems with the university, and we can advance money. There’s clear infrastructure benefit (KF31).

Many of these decisions are made by negotiation, but the negotiation is often based on the topic and the needs of the research, not the needs of the departments themselves. Any negotiated decisions are clearly documented, sometimes in faculty offer letters. Even when indirect revenue is lost, some department chairs maintain this collegial attitude. A faculty member described the response of his primary chair when thanked for allowing a major grant to go through the secondary department: “He just said, ‘No problem. You’re a good citizen, and that’s the right place for [the indirects] to go.’ They don’t make it a hassle” (KF31).

Not all faculty felt as positively, however; satisfaction with grant administration as a joint faculty member can depend on decisions made by specific departments and chairs involved. A few faculty expressed frustration with trying to navigate pre- and post-award administration across multiple affiliations:

Even within the [School of Public Health] they have a total different structure and system, and so that grant is like 20% of my time. Then I have this R01 that’s 25% of my time and that’s in another center in [Public Health]. And so that has a different support structure, and then 20% of that is somehow supposed to come from Nursing. And so I think the challenge is, I’m getting to a point where I am whittling everything down to percent of a percent, and so there’s not one person who is like, “Hey, I’m going to take care of that for you.” I’ve kind of hit that wall, I think, in the last three months where it was like, it was all great and fun and everyone was supportive, and then I was like, “I can’t actually get
someone to help here.” It is administratively really challenging just to really find who your support person is supposed to be… It took me, like, three months to get people hired because I couldn’t get the right administrative support. It’s just these little logistic things right that are causing me a lot of stress and making things happen more slowly than they would be if I just had like one person I went to for these things. (KF34).

A faculty member who is primary in the School of Medicine and joint with Public Health shared similar frustrations:

I think one challenge administratively is for a long time I have had my grants at the pre-award part of…helping to get the grant out the door by global health folks. Then just last year I was told, “because you are primary in medicine not in global ... you can’t use our people any more. You have to go to the medicine people.” They know nothing about a global health grant. That thing might be an exaggeration, but some things fell through the cracks. Maybe I haven’t always been in on that, as on top of it, because I’d always had an administrator who really knew what it meant to do a grant with an institution in another part of the world… the pre-award admin is through medicine. The first couple of grants ... biggest growing pains and I am still... There’s still some pains around that, but it just means I have to do a lot more. I have to double check and be much more on top of it. Which, at this time, when we are having to put so many grants in (KF39).

An additional issue surrounds inconsistent policies across schools, departments, and even centers within the same department regarding how indirect cost revenue is allocated. For example, centers within the same department may have different agreements with the department chair; some centers get half of the indirect revenue that comes back to the department, whereas other centers have negotiated to receive all if it. The lack of consistency in policies has created some tension across research groups and faculty. One administrator admitted “that's been a bit of a problem for us, in that we haven’t been consistent, documented who gets what, and that’s one of the things the new chair is really adamant about, and I’m very, very happy about that” (KA40).
Faculty and administrators are open and honest about these challenges when they occur. The school’s strategic planning process, which involved input from numerous faculty, staff, administrators, students, and community partners, addressed some of the concerns that were raised. The current strategic plan calls for the school to develop and strengthen robust research support, develop mechanisms to assist junior faculty, develop systems to facilitate cross-disciplinary research, and establish equitable and transparent mechanisms surrounding indirect costs.

**Research Culture**

Despite whether or not one feels that research administration works well for joint appointments at Kirkwall’s School of Public Health, there is resounding sentiment for the positive culture of research collaboration, which drives a lot of the activities. A faculty member further explains:

> Well, I think that general interest in cross-departmental collaboration is quite good. Two weeks ago I was at a meeting with the leadership of the department of surgery and the leadership of [international health] at Kirkwall, because they’re trying to figure out what are the opportunities for integration. The department [in international health] says, “We think we’re the best in the country and because we’re not just a little infectious disease department that’s really all about malaria and HIV.” No, actually and there’s a lot happening right now in global surgery. They’re looking for collaborative opportunities. I think that’s quite easy to do here because the environment is based on collegiality and professionalism – both of those are core values here (KF29).

Both faculty and administrators recognized the collaborative and synergistic opportunities of joint appointments. Administrators spoke frequently of the practical aspects of the collaborations, including access to additional research resources such as space. It was also suggested by a faculty member that “it’s better to be diversified because you never really know when funding is going to dry up in one area and become
more popular in another area. It’s just good to have some diversity” (KF38). One administrator discussed the practical aspects of the collaborations, in terms of additional research resources:

Well, potentially you have easier access to colleagues in the different places, whether it’s different departments or different schools or different institutions. And I think that’s fairly similar. So, for all of those levels, for cross-institution, for joint appointments that are common, in this institution with a couple of others, the availability of research space, so space for project coordinators and interviewers and so on, is greater in the other institution, in almost all cases, than here. And so, that’s a clear benefit because you’re then getting the strength of the university on the one hand, and then you’re getting the research kind of unique focus, really, on the other institution (K42).

Support for collaborative and interdisciplinary research goes beyond the School of Public Health and other schools within the health sciences campus; it reaches to the highest levels of the University. A faculty member with a joint appointment across two departments at the School of Public Health described the collaborative research emphasis as “really embedded in the university… there’s this real effort of working across your departments, across schools, and building collaboration” (KF32). One of the university central offices solicits applications for small amounts of money to support interdisciplinary research collaborations aimed at building relationships across the University. Faculty appreciated the funding programs provided by the University as it acknowledged the value of their interdisciplinary work while providing funds to help launch larger projects.

**Finance and Other Resources**

**Budget and Finance**

As mentioned previously, the school operates on a decentralized budgeting
system through its departments. The dean consults with the department chairs and the Faculty Council when developing the overall school budget, which is submitted to the Provost every two years. The University recently adopted an activity-based budgeting model of allocating revenues to schools. Faculty suggested that at times, there can be confusion and perhaps even tension when determining just who is responsible for the actual activity, and thus who is responsible for the associated budget when it comes to joint appointments. One faculty member further explained:

Here, I think we have, unfortunately there’s a bit of a blurring... Sometimes the advantages, sometimes that gets complicated. It’s not 100% straightforward. Sometimes on the floor, printers – who’s printer? What are we using? Which department is the one that several of us are using? I don't know how they’re actually managing that. There's a lot of black box stuff to me in terms of who actually pays for the printer cartridges and the printer that I use. I don't know. I have no idea (KF33).

**Additional Resources and Privileges**

Because joint faculty are considered fully part of the School of Public Health, they benefit from access to additional resources and privileges. Faculty are invited to faculty meetings of their secondary appointment and according to faculty, most attend and participate. Some departments require participation as part of the promotion and evaluation process. Voting privileges in the secondary department can be arranged, and most faculty mentioned that they did have voting rights in both appointments, and exercised those rights. At the School of Public Health, joint faculty are eligible to serve on the school’s Faculty Council. Although managing one’s time was expressed as a challenge, faculty also saw the value and opportunity in being part of the “citizenship” of both appointing departments. A faculty member shared her perspective:
I think being joint is maybe even more important. That way you just get to know people from a collaborations standpoint. If you are interested in the university and how things work and education at the university level, it’s good to be in ... if what you’re really interested in is just your own world little world and doing your research and cannot breathe more on that silo, that might not be bad to create. Then you would probably just be a burden to me (KF39).

Culture

Several words dominated the conversation when both administrators and faculty were asked to speak about the culture at Kirkwall University, and more specifically at the School of Public Health: collegial, professional, collaborative, cooperative, supportive and value-driven. Not one person spoke of anything but a positive environment, even taking into considerations some of the administrative and structural challenges that result from the joint appointments.

Collegiality

Across the board, there is a strong sense of cooperation and respect for others, whether those relationships are between administrators and faculty, across departments or schools, or research groups. This feeling was expressed repeatedly, regardless of the individual and their role or position at the school. As described by one senior faculty member, but reiterated by many others:

I would just say, this is a uniquely collegial place. That would be my sense. I have friends at [two large west coast institutions]. I don’t get the same … It’s just not the same for them. The appointments, the review, and all that is much more a pain in the neck. I think having it be low maintenance really helps, but the general, I would just say there’s been for a long time a lot of collegiality. I’ve watched it for over 30 years now (KF31).

The collegial environment was expressed through the ways in which the departments focus on the academic and research priorities, rather than individual
or departmental gain. When asked why she thought administrative systems surrounding joint appointments ran so smoothly at the School of Public Health, a department administrator answered with:

I think the reason there haven’t been challenges is part of both chairs, my former chair and my current chair, is interdisciplinary relationships are just their number one priority. We do have joint faculty who use our space. They have whole entire programs in our space. Their grants go through our org code and we look more at what’s going to make a stronger department rather than being so turf oriented. I have heard things, like other administrators will say, “Oh, he’s joint and he’s trying to use our conference room.” That’s just not our culture at all. We look more at what’s going to make a stronger department rather than being so turf oriented” (KA40).

Interestingly, a joint faculty member who relocated from an east coast institution expressed his opinion that the cooperation and collegial nature of Kirkwall is attributable at least in part to its location on the west coast. He explains:

I think there is huge geographic variation. When I did research at Memorial Sloan Kettering, nobody talked to each other. It was a very closed environment; everybody seemed super paranoid, sort of like, if you told them what you were working on they might steal it. The [area of the west coast], it’s one of the things that drew me here. It’s just not like that. It was so refreshing to come here. I meet all these people and they all tell me what they were doing and I tell them. The question was never who, how can … it’s, “Gosh I wonder if I have enough time that I could play in the sandbox with what you’re doing. That sounds like fun.” (KF29)

Although several people spoke about the professional and respectful environment at the University overall, there was particular attention paid to the School of Public Health. Administrators suggested that not all of their peers at the University had similar positive experiences in terms of working relationships. At the School of Public Health, however, there is a notable lack of contentious relationships. It was suggested that openness and transparency helps in part to foster a collegial atmosphere at the School of Public Health.
Faculty and administrators both indicated a high level of communication across departments as well as between School administration and the faculty.

Collaboration

As mentioned previously, the School of Public Health places great value on collaboration, which is listed among the School’s core values: “to nurture creative, team-based, and interdisciplinary approaches to advancing scientific research and knowledge and improving population health.” The core values can be seen on posters and documents throughout the main buildings of the school. The School of Public Health encourages (rather expects) collaborations between faculty, departments, schools and community partners.

Faculty frequently cited the collaborative environment of the School of Public Health and of their joint appointment itself as something of very high regard. The ability to work with a variety of different scholars across multiple disciplines was a major strength and enhanced their intellectual capacity, as described by a faculty member: “The benefits are you’re always learning and you’re never bored, and sometimes there’s real magic in people coming together who don’t work together all the time and sharing ideas” (KF36). Faculty were excited about shared opportunities, networking and building personal and intellectual relationships. One faculty member stated:

I’ve never really met someone who isn’t enthusiastic. I have met people who say, “Well, I haven’t really done global health, so I don’t really know what I should do.” But, they tend to be either willing to mentor or willing to introduce me to someone who may have experience and more time to collaborate. I would say, yes, very collaborative, and that’s fun as well (KF37).

Faculty felt strongly that the culture of collaboration is deeply embedded in the school and supported and even facilitated by school leadership and administration. It is
not simply something one speaks or writes about in annual reports, but something that is lived and breathed through a wide range of activities across the school, from actualizing partnerships, supporting interdisciplinary faculty appointments, and encouraging cross-fertilization of students in the classroom and in research labs. One faculty member felt very enthusiastic about the positive collaborative setting:

This is not just me. This is true across a wide range of issues. There is very strong collaboration from the dean level on down. The deans talk with each other, they have very strong working relationships, so they set the culture that you work across schools and you work across the schools and also the colleges at the university, so you see it at all levels. I have students who contact us, really, truly at all levels. I have students that contact me for different colleges saying, can I take your course? Of course you can. I’ve had students from different schools ask if I can be part of their mentoring community, which I’m very happy to do. You see it from the students, you see it from the deans, you see it with the faculty, that it’s a very strong collaborative environment in which to work (KF32).

The collaborative culture is so ingrained in the day to operations of the school that faculty sometimes take it for granted. Individuals make an effort to build relationships, and those relationships last for a long time, cultivating not only positive working environments, but also encouraging innovative and sustainable research groups and projects which result in outcomes that are more than the sum of their parts.

Value and Respect

Although not explicitly stated, an underlying theme that emerged from the interviews was an impression that joint faculty felt valued and respected by the University, their respective schools, and the administration in them. This idea was conveyed when faculty mentioned the fundamental support for the collaborative work that the faculty do, and the contributions they are making to the field. Faculty spoke of
chairs foregoing indirect revenue to ensure a project was properly managed, policies that have been established to process joint appointments effectively, and strong mentoring at both the primary and secondary department as examples of ways in which they feel they are truly regarded as a contribution, not a burden. A faculty member provided an example of his division head foregoing indirect revenue for the good of a project:

I was talking to my division head the other day, and I said, “I really appreciate the fact that you guys have never made that an issue.” This has been a really nice part of Kirkwall. I know some people would make a big issue, but they let me do this here, and let the indirects go. They realize that administering these grants is a complicated matter. It’s the right place for them to go through, and it’s the right place for the indirects to come back to (KF31).

Administrators frequently spoke of the value of the joint appointments, indicating an alignment between administration’s goals and faculty interest. One administrator mentioned: “I think the culture has been acceptance of that’s how we do things around here and that it’s useful that each institution actually can benefit from the kind of cross-fertilization of ideas from the other (KA42). Several faculty meet throughout the year with the chairs of both departments, and those chairs are invested in the work and opinions of the joint faculty in the same manner as the primary faculty.
CHAPTER 7: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The cases presented in this study represent highly ranked Schools of Public Health within large, not-for-profit Research I universities. Each school prides itself on its interdisciplinary efforts and utilizes joint appointments as one way to achieve that interdisciplinarity. The cases presented are not unlike those discussed in the literature on interdisciplinary faculty. All three schools of public health – Perth, Fort William and Kirkwall – encountered infrastructure and cultural challenges related to joint appointments. However, each of the cases presents very different stories with different outcomes in terms of their respective institutional infrastructures and faculty experience. This chapter seeks to find meaning in those stories in order to fill a gap in our understanding of interdisciplinary approaches in academia.

Organizational Culture Matters

Literature on interdisciplinary efforts and on joint appointments speaks to multiple challenges associated with institutional infrastructure, including research administration (Boden & Borrego, 2011; Porter et al., 2006), promotion and tenure procedures (Austin, 2003; Hart & Mars, 2009), and allocation of resources (Boden & Borrego, 2011; Pfirman & Martin, 2010). Analysis of the three cases suggests, however, that how those challenges manifest is to at least some extent dependent on the organizational culture of the school, and how that culture is perceived by the faculty. To date, literature on joint appointments and interdisciplinary faculty focuses on culture primarily in terms of the departmental-centric organization of academic institutions (Becher, 1994; Eckel, 1998; Klein, 1990, 2010; Lattuca, 2001). This study suggests that
the influence of organizational culture on joint faculty experience goes beyond department-specific issues and structures.

**Understanding Organizational Culture**

Each of the cases in this study represents dynamic, complex organizations in which joint faculty must navigate for success in their careers. The culture within each of the schools of public health plays an important factor in better understanding the dynamics of joint appointments and how they manifest within the institution. In *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2010), Schein lays out three cultural layers, with layers representing “the degree to which the cultural phenomenon is visible to the observer” (p. 23). Each layer is useful in understanding how culture within an organization can influence outcomes, such as faculty attitude, beliefs, and values.

At the most must basic layer are artifacts, which include those cultural occurrences that can be seen, felt, or easily heard. They are readily observable to someone who is new to the environment. The next layer includes espoused beliefs, which involve articulated ideologies, such as departmental goals and values of a department chair that faculty might learn during their tenure. At the deepest level are basic underlying assumptions, which are beliefs and values that are so ingrained they are taken for granted; they are unconscious and implicit beliefs that guide behavior. Schein states “the essence of a culture lies in the pattern of basic underlying assumptions, and after you understand those, you can easily understand the other more surface levels and deal appropriately with them” (p. 32).
Birnbaum’s four models of organizational functioning (1988) can also serve as a conceptual framework when analyzing the cases in this study. Birnbaum himself argues that:

No model of a complex system such as a college of university can be a perfect representation of that system, but some models appear to reflect what usually happens in some parts of some institutions and therefore suggest useful courses of action (1988, p. 83).

Likewise, Perth, Fort William and Kirkwall are each complex systems; applying Birnbaum’s models (collegial, bureaucratic, political, and anarchical) allows for a deeper analysis of the institutional culture in order to better understand what influences joint faculty experience.

**Comparison of Cultures Across Cases**

Applying Schein’s definition of group culture, we can learn a great deal in considering the cultures across the three cases:

[A] pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relations to those problems (Schein, 2010, p. 18).

That is, the culture within each school of public health is so ingrained that it drives how faculty and administration perceive and approach issues related to joint appointments.

*Perth School of Public Health*

The Perth School of Public Health aligns closely with Birnbaum’s Political model, in that key drivers at Perth are power and competition for resources. Viewing politics as the “realistic process of making decisions and allocating resources in a context of scarcity and divergent interests” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 183), Perth is guided by
power and conflict as well as competing (and often conflicting) agendas both within the school and as a member of the larger university. One could argue, in fact, that competition is a basic underlying assumption at Perth University. It is assumed that one must fight for what they have, as well as fight to keep it. This message was received at the level of the dean, the department chairs, and of faculty themselves. School leadership emphasizes rankings and research funding, and compares departments to one another. The competitive environment causes department chairs to focus on their respective departments achievements, both in notoriety as well as resources. The need to prove oneself was a dominant theme across virtually all conversations. Although a certain degree of competition can be healthy, the extent to which that level of competition is bound by healthy or harmful behavior can be examined through other cultural layers. Although to some extent values varied by department, there is an underlying belief among faculty that it is important to make one’s department look good. For faculty holding appointments in multiple departments, the ability to do right by one’s department can become quite difficult.

At the Perth School of Public Health, decisions are often a result of bargaining and negotiations, at times without the stakeholders (i.e. joint faculty), involved in those discussions. The details of each joint appointment, including allocation of resources (revenues and expenses) are determined on a case-by-case basis between department chairs. Although there are informal models in place for allocating revenues, decisions are often negotiated against those models. In an environment where funding is critical, those discussions can, at times, be contentious. Department chairs of the secondary appointment decide whether or not joint faculty can vote in their department; voting
rights vary from faculty to faculty and are based solely on department chair choice. Furthermore, the level of documentation regarding arrangements varies; sometimes there are MOU’s developed whereas other times arrangements are informally determined between parties with no documentation. Policies and procedures (even when documented) are often overlooked or negotiated based on the needs/desires of departments and/or faculty. Thus, policies and procedures are applied inconsistently creating frustration and perceived inequities among faculty. Faculty holding joint appointments get caught in the middle of these conflicts or at times even become the source of the conflict when associated financial resources are at play. A faculty member describes the chairs of the departments sharing his appointment:

Neither one is that keen on the integration. It’s just really – they could do a lot more. They’re not really trying to sabotage it, but each is most concerned about meeting their own obligations, financial situations (PF3).

Although espoused beliefs at Perth can vary to some extent by department, all departments placed great value in money and resources – and lots of it. Faculty spoke repeatedly about the pressure from administration to bring in more research money, to teach larger courses for additional tuition revenue, and to keep existing revenues within department. Yet again, for jointly appointed faculty the pressure to contribute adequately to multiple departments can be a strain on overall professional satisfaction, as was witnessed in the case of Perth. In fact, there is a sense that the school places greater value on the financial rewards as compared to the actual contributions to the field. Along the lines of the prestige that comes with high levels of grant funding, here is also great importance given to promotion and tenure. Much of the advice given around joint
appointments centers on what one needs to get tenure; the value of the work and interdisciplinary contributions can come later.

The political culture could be seen through organizational artifacts at Perth. Several faculty spoke with an angry tone, at times gritting teeth and raising their voice. One faculty member pounded his fist on his desk when talking about his frustrations. The School has a high level of security at the entrance and several points thereafter, however there is a lack of reception once arriving at a department. Upon coming off the elevators to the proper location, one simply needed to find their way to a faculty member’s office. Departments themselves are separated and siloed, differentiated by varying design as well as by the quality of furniture and office space. One could easily notice a variation in resources across departments. A final example is that several school-specific documents were not made public, such as accreditation self-studies. Although given upon request, it was not information the school willingly made available to the masses. Many of these examples allude to a culture of mistrust and hostility, embodied in a competitive environment.

The political culture of Perth can also be seen in what Birnbaum describes as “dualism of control” (1988, p. 135) – the often waxing and waning of power exerted by faculty and administration. Perth follows a more vertical governance approach, with greater control exerted by School leadership and department chairs; however this approach is not well-received by faculty who also vie for power. Faculty criticized the administration’s level of control at each level – the University leadership’s control over Deans, Deans’ control over department chairs, and department chairs over faculty. Thus, power struggles have evolved creating tension and dissatisfaction among the faculty.
Not only do faculty feel there is too much of a top-down approach, but there is a general feeling that those at the top do not value or support interdisciplinary work through joint appointment structures; school administrators and faculty differ in their perceived value of the joint appointments. In general, faculty believe the joint appointments serve in part as a means of enhancing scholarship and research collaborations, and they are willing to navigate complex infrastructures to do so. Senior school officials on the other hand – some in the Dean’s office – suggested that joint appointments weren’t providing additional value and discouraged them. Several faculty felt as though they were taken advantage of by the institution, that they were exploited as joint faculty to showcase the interdisciplinary work that they are doing. Yet in reality, they did not feel supported for their interdisciplinary efforts:

[I]t’s completely on me until they need some kind of creds [on the main campus], until they need to be able to go to the dean’s office or the provost office and say we are interdisciplinary then they drag me out. And I’m dragged out…it’s like a joint appointment…This is our model, right? And it’s their model as long as it helps them. And the moment that there wasn’t any kind of university support for this model, they would vanish (PF4).

Similarly, faculty expressed frustration with a perceived discrepancy between what the school communicates in terms of its interdisciplinary goals and what actually occurs operationally in practice. Examples that were given include the lack of coordination between the health campus and the main campus, the mechanisms in which tuition revenue flows for courses taught outside one’s primary department, a lack of communication between department chairs, inconsistent documentation of expectations, and an uncoordinated promotion and tenure process. The net effects of these organizational characteristics are a faculty who are discouraged and at times, angry.
The basic underlying assumptions driving the culture at Fort William are grounded in entrepreneurship, autonomy, and respect, aligning with Birnbaum’s Collegial system (1988). The Collegial System, while it may present as informal organization, is based on mutual respect and shared values; it represents a community of scholars. At Fort William, both faculty and administration’s expertise are valued and such mutual respect encourages an action-oriented approach. These characterizes are simply what is expected of all who work within the School of Public Health. It is taken for granted that departments and faculty will be given great latitude and flexibility and in turn, departments and the faculty within them will be productive and even pioneering. There are few boundaries, which facilitates interdisciplinary partnerships and scholarship. It is understood and accepted that policies and procedures exist, but serve more as a basic framework rather than rule. Documented policies are established to guide operations, but department chairs and faculty are given substantial latitude in interpreting and applying those policies. In short, the feeling is: if it produces positive results, go for it. Fort William’s approach to decision-making is much more lateral in design; control of decision-making and problem-solving is often disseminated to the faculty who work both individually and collectively to approach their work and meet expectations. When necessary, the department chairs and administration are available to facilitate and assist.

That entrepreneurial assumption is woven into the school’s beliefs and values. There is a strong belief that research is the priority and that faculty “eat what they kill.” That is, faculty will get back exactly what they put into their appointment. Because there is a general belief that faculty are inherently competent, they are afforded a high level of
independence and respect, which fosters an entrepreneurial spirit. Fort William is also pragmatic and believes that solutions should be generated for problems, even if those solutions involve creativity and compromise. The autonomy exerted to faculty allowed them to form innovative collaborations without the need to seek formal approvals at every step. They also do not need to account for their time between appointing units, which allows them to remain nimble.

At Fort William, the joint appointment itself serves as a symbol of interdisciplinarity at the University. As there are few shared resources, the joint appointment represents a formal recognition of the collaborative work taking place at the School of Public Health. It sends a signal to peers and to external agencies that the faculty member is truly committed to working across disciplines. As a result, faculty are satisfied with how the infrastructure at Fort William aligns with the interdisciplinary goals; they believe that their institutions do not just endorse rhetoric around interdisciplinary work, but reinforce the concept with tangible action.

At Fort William, there is a feeling of empowerment among the faculty. Faculty feel trusted in the autonomy given to them, and in turn express respect for the administration. Administration and faculty share a reciprocal appreciation of the joint appointment and the value it brings. They are also in agreement about what it does and does not mean. A faculty member explained, when asked if he felt there were any particular challenges he experiences as a result of the joint appointment:

No I don’t. I really don’t think so. I think that most departments are very respectful of the time and of the limitations of what joint appointments can do. I’ve never seen any attempt to take advantage of the people (FF12).
Although not perfect, faculty in general share a positive attitude about their environment and the work that they are doing.

Fort William is certainly not free from conflict or political tensions. However, those tensions do not seem to dominate the conversation and the culture. For the most part, joint appointments do not involve shared resources, which minimizes and potential disagreements about the allocation of those resources. For the majority of joint faculty, promotion and tenure decisions are also not shared, but rather follow the recommendations of the primary appointment. In the case where tenure is shared, the joint appointment is only made for senior faculty who have already secured tenure, again minimizing the potential for disagreement. Administrators across the schools have developed informal “agreements” between one another that they will be committed to transparency and open communication when issues of resources arise. The school also maintains a practical approach when it comes to resource allocation, such as indirect cost revenues from research. For example, there is a basic understanding among administration and faculty that money flows to where the work is being done. Certainly it is not a perfect system without conflict, but this philosophy helps to minimize those conflicts while focusing on solutions to interdisciplinary challenges. Furthermore, the collegial environment at Fort William facilitates interdisciplinary approaches, which is recognized by faculty:

There is a great emphasis on collegiality, which is absolutely essential if you’re going to have anything across departments. What I found here is, for example, that when you reach out to faculty in other departments is something like that your emails are answered. That’s ... There is a culture of doing that. That is part of the way they do things here and that's part of the way that this university is so successful (FF16).
The collegial nature of Fort William could be seen and felt by observers as well. Faculty were generally enthusiastic and smiled during conversations. Upon entering the main building, there is a security check point and badges are given out, but then visitors are free to use the facilities at will, including the cafeterias and lounge spaces. All departments shared a similar layout and design, with one look and feel for the furniture and equipment across all departments and offices. Per the lead administrative officer, the design was intentional to create equity across departments regardless of their size or level of resources. Bulletin boards throughout the halls showcased faculty research and activities, including those of an interdisciplinary nature.

*Kirkwall School of Public Health*

Like Fort William, Kirkwall is also organized around the underlying assumption that the School of Public Health will be a collaborative and collegial place. Yet unlike Fort William, it is an institution that places gives regard to established policies and procedures. Thus, Kirkwall shows characteristics of a mixture of Birnbaum’s Collegial and Bureaucratic institutional models. Although there is a great deal of mutual respect and governance by consensus, there is also a regard for hierarchy and protocol.

The collaborative culture is what attracts people to the school and what keeps them there. Some faculty had a difficult time describing examples of the collaborative culture, as it was so ingrained in everyday life it often goes unrecognized. A faculty member with a joint appointment between the School of Medicine and the School of Public Health spoke at length about the collaborative and collegial assumptions:

The code of the hill says you’re a nice person, that you’re respectful to your staff, you’re respectful to your nurses. It’s just what you do and it wouldn’t matter who you are. It wouldn’t matter if you were god’s gift to surgery. If you threw things in the
OR, which did used to happen way back in the 70s and 80s and before. You’d be called on the carpet and invited to take a course in proper behavior or “bye now.” It’s just it’s a very positive environment for collaboration. People are always looking for … it extends to the department of surgery. I started out doing research there and I never felt anything but support from the other surgeons, most of whom had absolutely nothing to do with anything that I was doing. Could they have said, could they have been critical and well, “How come he’s not doing what we call… or some blah blah? I think that there is an environmental, it’s really nice here. It’s kind of like people don’t have time for that stuff. It’s too nice – go outside (KF29).

Those basic assumptions were evident in institutional beliefs and values, to which faculty and administrators spoke. They believe that school employees (faculty and staff) should be friendly and cooperative, even in the face of challenges. They also believe that you should enjoy what you do, and support one another in accomplishing that goal. Both faculty and administrators value authority and rules, and believe that in general, those rules exist to provide the infrastructure needed to succeed in one’s job. Kirkwall has well-documented and clearly communicated policies and procedures that are applied in practice. Established policies are intended to be followed, and employees (both administrators and faculty) are aware of those rules and follow them fairly consistently. It is understood that any deviation from policy requires discussion, agreement, and documentation.

Kirkwall applies both vertical and lateral approaches to decision-making fairly equally. Aligning with Birnbaum’s Bureaucratic lens, school leadership establishes policies and procedures which faculty are expected to follow; however, policies and procedures are developed using a collaborative and participatory approach. The school also utilizes a variety of task forces, meetings, and networks to continually assess the guiding framework and make recommendations and changes as needed to run the
While policies and procedures are paramount, they were developed in a way that recognizes the value as well as the complexity of interdisciplinary work and of joint appointments specifically.

Thus, although there is more bureaucracy involved with interdisciplinary work, it is applied in a positive and productive way to support collaborative work. The transparency of those “rules” allows all entities participating in the joint appointment to fully understand the expectations and the arrangements, as well as the consequences if there is lack of adherence to them. Kirkwall School of Public Health exerts more control over faculty through adherence to established guidelines and procedures, yet it does so while simultaneously empowering faculty. The policies were not established unintentionally, but were created purposefully and with the participation of faculty. Because the governance process at the School of Public Health is inclusive and transparent, faculty feel valued and appreciated which in turn promotes positive feelings and encourages the creation and maintenance of collaborative relationships. The support that faculty perceive helps to foster a positive attitude toward the joint appointment opportunities. A faculty member explains:

> I think it’s very open and supportive. I haven’t really experienced any downsides from having a joint appointment other than being really busy and having to make decisions about how many admission committees am I going to sit on. I think it is generally supportive. I think it is quite supportive. I haven’t encountered anything to suggest otherwise (KF30).

The Kirkwall School of Public Health is grounded in its established core values. The core values can be seen on the website, in documents and on posters throughout the school’s physical space. The core values, which include collaboration, drive the priorities of the school and serve as a symbol for all those employed by the school.
Administrators and faculty were able to articulate the spirit of collaboration, which was clearly present in descriptions of the culture of the school. Those values undergird research, teaching, service, and relationships. Furthermore, collaboration is not something one is forced to do at Kirkwall; it is seen as a true value and is sought after by faculty holding joint appointments, as described:

I think the joint appointment also opens up my sphere of collaboration. By going to the faculty meetings, which we have every month, there was a great desire to reach out to the entire university and pull in collaborators. I think that was pretty effective. Now, at our faculty meetings, we’ll often have an inter, multidisciplinary, cross-disciplinary group. That was a way for me to hear new languages of other disciplines (KF37).

Understanding the basic assumptions as well as beliefs and values provides meaning to the artifacts identified at Kirkwall. Faculty spoke with enthusiasm and energy; they were truly excited to be part of the school. Although the physical layout and design varied across the school, the offices and departmental spaces were of similar quality. Core values could be seen on posters and materials throughout the halls of the school. Finally, there is no security upon entering the school, throughout the buildings, the offices, or the labs. Visitors are free to come and go and walk around the school at will.

**Translating Culture into Practice: The Importance of Framing**

There is no “right” infrastructure for joint appointments, nor is there no one “right” culture for schools of public health. However, the ways in which an institution is organized and operationalized can have an impact on the organization’s success and on the satisfaction of the individuals within it. Most importantly, this study demonstrates that how the infrastructure and the culture align can affect the experience of joint faculty.
For example, Perth and Fort William both rely heavily on negotiation between
departments to establish joint appointment arrangements such as the allocation of
resources. At Perth, however, faculties describe the school as chaotic and political and
perceive many actions of the school as competitive. Thus, negotiations are often
perceived in a negative light. At Fort William on the other hand, faculty describe the
school as collegial and entrepreneurial; the same type of negotiations are seen as
opportunities and perceived in a positive way. Thus, the institutional culture frames the
faculty experience.

Fort William is symbolized by innovation and entrepreneurship. Like Perth,
research funding is prioritized and faculty, though with great autonomy, are held
responsible for much of those resources. Both Perth and Fort William faculty speak
frequently about the importance of securing grant funding. Yet there are notable
differences in how the faculty at both schools describe those expectations. At Perth, there
is a negative connotation to the requirement to bring in grant funding, as if school
leadership see the faculty as dollar sighs rather than scholars. At Fort William, on the
other hand, the enthusiasm for the academic benefits supersedes the financial pressures
placed upon them. The very same expectations are presented as intellectual
opportunities. As described by another Fort William faculty member:

I think there’s a lot of cultural differences, and a lot of them have
to do with money and how one earns money and what one has to
do in order to make money, and the sense that time is money to a
much greater degree in professional schools and arts and science.
But it’s interesting that that can make it difficult for faculty in
medicine and public health, for example, to engage in
interdisciplinary activities like seminars and colloquiums ... But
it’s amazing, once you get them interested in it, once they’ve done
it, that they somehow find time to do it. And people have told me
that it actually enriches their understanding and that actually feeds
back positively into what they do, even though it’s not directly relevant to their going out and getting a grant for X, Y, and Z (KF20).

Here again, the structures (i.e. grant funding expectations) are the same, yet how they are experienced varies based on the institutional culture.

As like Perth and Fort William, Kirkwall faces its own challenges regarding joint appointments including the allocation of resources; at times negotiation is required. Whereas Perth approaches such challenges through power and political means and Fort William through faculty and chair autonomy, Kirkwall has tried to minimize political tensions by developing and enforcing specific rules and protocols, such as strict adherence to MOUs. There is also an expectation that a high level of transparency will follow those decisions, and the School supports a participatory governance model. Deviation from policy is not done on a whim; intentionality and justification is applied and it is exercised consistently across departments within the school. Like Fort William, the high level of collegiality at Kirkwall facilitates conflict-free decision-making around joint appointments. Although faculty feel that at times joint appointment procedures can be tedious and inefficient (i.e. promotion and tenure procedures across two entities), they are handled professionally and typically without political strife.

In short, this study suggests that it is not a specific administrative infrastructure per se that prevents problems associated with joint appointments and/or promotes faculty satisfaction. Similarly, no one culture fits across all organizations; how that culture influences the experience of the employees – in this case the joint faculty – is important. Most importantly, how infrastructure aligns with the respective culture of the school of public health in practice is critical. Studies have shown that when perceived
organizational cultural does not align with employees’ expectations, job satisfaction as well as performance suffers (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988; Goodman & Svyantek, 1999; Joyce, Slocum, & Von Glinow, 1982; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Although the cultural assumptions guiding beliefs and values are different between Fort William and Kirkwall, joint faculty attitudes were very positive at both places, suggesting that there exists a cultural “fit,” so to speak. Perth faculty, on the other hand, conveyed a negative attitude toward their experience as joint faculty, displaying frustration with the School’s organizational culture. The bureaucratic model of Kirkwall would not work at Fort William – yet faculty at both institutions are, in general, satisfied and encouraged by their school’s support of joint faculty.

Crosscutting Themes

Although it is helpful to analyze the cases by comparing their differences, there is also much to learn from what they have in common. Perth, Fort William, and Kirkwall are each dynamic places with varying goals and objectives, as well as approaches to achieving those goals. Yet several important takeaways regarding joint appointments emerged from their stories.

The Importance of Mentoring

Faculty in each of the three cases underscored the importance of mentoring for faculty holding joint appointments. The format of mentoring varied across schools – sometimes faculty members were assigned and other times faculty sought out their own mentors. Regardless of the format, mentoring was highly regarded as a factor for success, irrespective of where one is in their career. Mentors serve valuable purposes for joint faculty including advice during the time of recruitment and appointment, guidance
during promotion and tenure processes, advocacy when encountering administrative challenges, introductions to new and expanding professional networks, and overall guidance across disparate disciplines. A joint faculty member at Perth reiterated the importance of her mentor in helping her to focus her research when navigating collaborations across the university:

…so usually he’s making sure that some of my time would be protected. If I run into issues, he’s open to hear about the issues. I think that’s very helpful. He basically mentored me through the collaboration process in my earlier years. I think that’s a main help. I can survive in this environment. Otherwise I would think it’s very tough for a new person, especially (PF1).

At Fort William, mentoring is helpful in navigating the open, entrepreneurial environment, as explained by a joint faculty member, “…and you really have to choose carefully and wisely. I think the mentorship process has really helped to reduce that lost feeling with all the opportunities that there are” (FF23). At Kirkwall, faculty emphasized the importance of strong mentorship during the time of appointment, which at Kirkwall is a formal process across the participating departments:

My mentors always said, make sure you ask about this, and then they also were more nice enough people that they made it part of, at least part of the interview process too, but really making sure that I understood the ... Kind of what I was getting into (KF34).

Faculty at each site also discussed the value of being mentored, as well as serving as the mentor. Whether it was senior faculty mentoring junior faculty, or faculty mentoring doctoral students and/or post-docs, there was a high regard for advising others, regardless of the institution.
Emphasis was placed on the usefulness of mentors holding joint appointments themselves; such experience was invaluable for more junior faculty going up through the ranks at a particular institution. As mentioned by a Kirkwall faculty member in discussing promotion and her mentors, “they also have joint appointments, so they are very well versed in using both requirements” (KF30).

**The Importance of Transparency**

Another theme that emerged across all three cases was the importance of transparency. Joint appointments frequently require an increased amount of communication, due to the need for arrangements across multiple academic units. Those arrangements can often be complex and involve issues of titles, rank and tenure, compensation and research resources. Faculty at the three schools understand and respect the complexity, but they also expect a certain level of openness in how those arrangements are made.

Kirkwall serves as a model for a heightened degree of transparency. Policies and procedures are well documented and communicated to faculty; deviation from those policies requires discussion and written approvals. Faculty are very much a part of governance, including the appointing and reappointing of faculty. Although Fort William has a very loose structure in terms of organizational oversight, the faculty fully understand those expectations. There is a high level of communication across appointing departments. Perth, on the other hand, lacks coordination between participating departments and when arrangements are made, they are often done without faculty involvement or understanding and without documentation. Faculty in joint appointments felt that having a more transparent model for establishing expectations (of the faculty
member as well as the participating departments) would be valuable in promoting a more positive experience.

**Feeling Valued Matters**

Feeling valued as faculty members was a central theme that emerged across all three cases. It was important that faculty felt appreciated at each of the appointing departments separately, as well as for the interdisciplinary work that they do as a whole. How faculty perceived their value varied within and across Schools, but the concept resonated across almost all faculty – whether or not they felt valued. For some faculty, it was the support – or lack thereof – received by their respective school’s administration to participate in interdisciplinary research and to recognize collaborative achievements. Others mentioned the administrative creativity and flexibility their university and/or school allowed in order for their joint appointment and the work associated with it to succeed. Several faculty discussed encouragement received from department chairs who were truly invested in their interdisciplinary efforts. Not feeling valued was an impediment to their overall experience as a joint faculty member.

Interestingly, faculty at each of the three Schools mentioned teaching as an area in which their joint appointment is not valued in its fullest. The majority of Perth, Fort William and Kirkwall faculty enjoyed teaching and saw it as an intellectual reward and a way to both stimulate their own learning, as well as share interdisciplinary perspectives to students across the university. However teaching across disciplines proved challenging in each setting, due to factors such as a lack of adequate compensation models, poor return on investment (departments do not receive tuition revenue for their faculty member’s time), and logistical challenges in geography and scheduling.
Place in Career Matters

Where one is in their faculty career factors into their perceptions, attitudes, and experience. Junior faculty at each of the schools expressed more concern about meeting expectations for promotion as a joint faculty when compared to more senior faculty. They also were less sure of the institutional culture and policies. Senior faculty expressed a bit more confidence in their own personal situations. However, although senior faculty at each of the three sites valued their own joint appointments, the majority recommended that those without tenure consider refraining from a joint appointment until later in one’s career. A Fort William faculty member went so far as to say of joint appointments for junior faculty, “to be honest I think they’re really dangerous” (FF12).

A Perth faculty with tenure mentioned:

I think it’s really hard for junior people, so if they had multiple offers, I’d probably say, “Go work in the single appointment place. When you make your second move and you’re more established and finding out what you want to do, then, at that time, probably a joint appointment makes much more sense.” Especially for biostatistic doctoral students; I think it’s really, really hard if they don’t have a good mentor, a good person to shepherd them through the process. It’s impossible basically. I’ve seen my friends and colleagues struggle sometimes, especially with the tenure-track appointments. It can be really difficult. I wouldn’t encourage them to look for joint appointments when they’re starting. Maybe when they are more developed, if they find this place fits them better, maybe that’s a better place. That’s just my opinion (PF1).

The same sentiment was heard by Kirkwall faculty, as described by this particular senior faculty member:

Don’t do it. Based on your take in terms of how hard it is to get promoted in both places. But I think especially if you’re being hired in a new university, you hadn’t been there, you don’t have a very good feel for what that’s going to be like. Even if people say it’s going to be easy, I wouldn’t believe them. Because you never know what it’s really going to be like five years down. It may be
easy right now, but things change over five to six years, and it’s just a lot less stressful to know that you are going to have to be reviewed at one place (KF38).
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to better understand how institutional infrastructure influences the experience of faculty holding joint appointments in U.S. schools of public health. The study revealed that although the nuances of institutional infrastructure at each of the sites is important, the influence on faculty experience is relevant only insofar as the infrastructure aligns with organizational culture. It is not enough to simply implement a specific set of policies and procedures, as prior research suggests. For some institutions, like Fort William, strict guidelines and rules concerning joint appointments would likely not result in positive faculty outcomes. The loosely coupled design and “laissez-faire” administrative systems works well with Forth William’s entrepreneurial culture. Faculty appreciate the flexibility and note it as one factor promoting their success.

Recommendations

The results of this study shed light on possible steps that schools and/or joint faculty individually can take when considering the success of joint appointments. First, it is critical that the institutional culture be given substantial consideration when designing joint appointments and the infrastructure to support them. For school leadership, this might involve assessing both the historical culture as well as the vision for the school’s future. An important take-away from this study is that schools must look inward to their own culture, rather than simply looking to how other schools of public health design the joint appointment infrastructure. The school’s core values and beliefs are likely to frame the perspective of faculty, so school administration will likely benefit
from an understanding an appreciation for those values. Faculty considering a joint appointment at a new institution should make every effort to learn about the culture of that institution in deciding whether or not to accept the appointment or in negotiating the details of the offer.

Second, schools of public health that appoint joint faculty should establish strong faculty mentorship programs. Ideally, mentors would themselves be joint faculty or at a minimum, have a solid understanding of the nature and expectations of such an appointment. The mentoring should cross departmental units, engaging in collaborative relationships with open lines of communication. Faculty would benefit from mentors who not only provide professional guidance, but who also serve as an advocate to the joint faculty member as they navigate potential institutional complexities throughout the progression of their career.

Third, both schools and faculty should consider where one is in their career when offering or considering a joint appointment. The results of this study do not suggest that junior faculty will not thrive in a joint appointment; however, it does suggest that one’s experience may in part be shaped by it. What one needs to be successful in a joint appointment may vary based on their place in their career, and both administrators and faculty should be sensitive to this idea and be prepared to discuss the implications and establish appropriate mechanisms of support.

Finally, those engaged in joint appointments – either as faculty or as administrators – should be open in communication about institutional expectations. Navigating an academic career can be challenging under the most traditional of circumstances; for faculty holding joint appointments that career can be even more
complex. This study suggests that joint faculty are not naïve about that complexity; rather, they expect it. However, it is important to faculty that school administrators are transparent in their expectations and also in how arrangements across units are made.

**Implications for Future Research**

Ideally, schools and programs that appoint joint faculty will be able to use results of the study to better support and promote interdisciplinary efforts through faculty joint appointments. The study also sheds light on additional areas of research needed to further explore the joint faculty experience.

1. Two of the sites used in this study were located on the east coast, while the third was located on the west coast. Faculty alluded to potential geographical influence on organizational culture, and additional research would help to assess the extent to which geographical location plays a role in how place influences culture, and in turn, the experience of joint faculty.

2. Although the current study used a mixture of public and private institutions, the type of institution was not a focus of the analysis. Research comparing public and private institutions across a variety of factors, including culture, on joint faculty experience would further add to the body of knowledge.

3. The current study was intended to be exploratory in nature. However, results suggest that quantitative research would complement the existing qualitative data currently available. For example, measuring faculty satisfaction across a variety of areas and then correlating satisfaction to institutional characteristics could provide additional evidence to guide administrative decision-making around joint appointments.
4. This study suggests that how faculty experience their appointment depends heavily on institutional culture. Part of that culture is driven by leadership styles, at both the level of the university and of the school. Thus, research on the role of leadership style on faculty experience is warranted.
APPENDIX A: ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. What is your role/the role of your Xxxx office, in regards to faculty holding joint appointments?

2. Within your area of Xxxx, can you briefly describe what systems are in place that specifically addresses joint faculty?
   a. When were those systems developed (if known)?
   b. How were they developed? Through what process (if known)?
   c. Are those systems documented? Where?
   d. Are faculty aware of those systems? How are they communicated to faculty?
   e. Are other administrators aware of those systems? How are they communicated?

3. Are there any gaps within your Xxxx area in terms of support for joint faculty?
   a. If so, what are they?
   b. Has any effort been made to address those gaps?

4. Among infrastructures that do exist, what is working particularly well?

5. Do you have any particular recommendations for improvements or changes to the infrastructures that effect faculty in joint appointments?

6. Do you have any other comments or thoughts related to institutional infrastructures supporting joint faculty?
APPENDIX B: FACULTY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. How long have you held a joint appointment at Xxxx? What other school/department to you hold an appointment?

2. Tell me a bit about how you came to hold a joint appointment at Xxxx.
   a. Were you recruited into the joint appointment, or did that appointment take place after you were hired at Xxxx?
   b. How was the appointment described to you?
   c. Did your offer letter describe any specifics about how your appointment would be handled across the two (or more) units?
   d. What were some of the reasons you decided to accept a joint appointment at Xxxx?
   e. Have you ever held a joint appointment prior to this one?

3. Please describe your overall experience as a joint faculty:
   a. Promotion and tenure
   b. Research
   c. Resources
   d. Culture

4. What do you feel Xxxx does well to support faculty holding joint appointments?

5. What do you feel Xxxx could improve upon in terms of support for joint faculty?

6. What do you feel are the greatest benefits to your joint appointment?

7. What do you feel are the greatest challenges?

8. How would you describe the role of your joint appointment status in terms of your own productivity? Is it enhanced? Challenged?

9. On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being highly satisfied, how satisfied would you say you are in terms of Xxxx’s institutional infrastructure supporting joint faculty? Why?

10. If given the option, would you accept a joint appointment in the future?

11. Please provide any additional information regarding your experience as a joint faculty member at Xxxx.
### APPENDIX C: INSTITUTIONAL DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perth</th>
<th>Fort William</th>
<th>Kirkwall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Bylaws</td>
<td>University Bylaws</td>
<td>University Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Tenure Guidelines</td>
<td>Promotion and Tenure Guidelines</td>
<td>Promotion and Tenure Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and University Website</td>
<td>School and University Website</td>
<td>School and University Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation Self-Study Report</td>
<td>Accreditation Self-Study Report</td>
<td>Accreditation Self-Study Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Faculty MOU Template</td>
<td>Joint Faculty Appointment Worksheet</td>
<td>School of Public Health Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Organizational Chart</td>
<td>School Organizational Chart</td>
<td>School Organizational Chart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greetings,

Dean XXX may have mentioned that I would be reaching out. I am a doctoral student in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. My dissertation focuses on institutional infrastructures and the experience of joint faculty in U.S. schools of public health. I was hoping to speak with you about your own experience at XXX. The commitment involves a 45-60 minute (maximum) individual interview with me this fall at your campus or by telephone if you are unavailable in person. I will be on your campus [insert dates] for interviews.

If you are willing to be interviewed, please let know at your earliest convenience by emailing me at thmarcia@gse.upenn.edu. I am also happy to answer any questions that you may have about the interview and the study. Your reply regarding participation will be kept confidential. I look forward to hearing from you and thanks for your consideration.

Regards,

Marcia Thomas, MPH, MS
Ed.D. Candidate in Higher Education Management
University of Pennsylvania
thmarcia@gse.upenn.edu
Institutional Infrastructure and the Experience of Joint Faculty in U.S. Schools of Public Health

A research study by Marcia Thomas, Ed.D. candidate in Higher Education Management at the University of Pennsylvania

Study Overview
Interdisciplinary efforts in higher education are on the rise and gaining in popularity across academic institutions. Literature on interdisciplinarity alludes to a growing interest in joint appointments as one method for supporting interdisciplinary efforts, particularly among health related programs. Although the potential benefits of interdisciplinary efforts are well documented, the success of interdisciplinarity in practice remains in question. The pervasive presence of interdisciplinarity in today’s colleges and universities strongly supports the need for additional research to better understand the role and experience of faculty who are formally engaged in those efforts, including those holding joint appointments.

To that end, I will be conducting three case studies of U.S. schools of public health in order to explore how institutional systems support and/or impede joint appointments and how those effects manifest within schools of public health specifically. I hope that the results of the study will fill a gap in our understanding of interdisciplinarity, ultimately assisting schools and programs in establishing the necessary systems to support, promote, and deliver excellence in interdisciplinary efforts.

Interviews
I am hoping to conduct one-hour interviews with administrators and faculty between September and November of this year (2015). Ideally, I would like to interview approximately 10 tenured or tenure-track faculty members holding joint appointments within the school of public health and another school at the university, or across departments within the school of public health.

I would also like to interview key administrators within the school who are engaged in the infrastructure supporting joint faculty. Those individuals might include a combination of the following: the dean of the school of public health, associate deans (finance and administration, academic/faculty affairs, and/or research), department chairs,
department administrators, and individuals holding senior central positions in offices of sponsored programs, human resources and faculty affairs at the University. Ideally, interviews will be conducted on-campus; however, phone interviews will be possible as well.

**Additional Information**

I have obtained IRB approval by the University of Pennsylvania to conduct this study. Interview participants will not be identified unless they explicitly give permission. If your school prefers, I will honor confidentiality of the school name as well.
APPENDIX F: CONSENT FORM

Institutional Infrastructure and the Experience of Joint Faculty at Three U.S. Schools of Public Health

CONSENT FORM

FOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY, CONTACT:

Marcia Thomas, Graduate School of Education
917-232-6276
thmarcia@gse.upenn.edu

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study on institutional infrastructures and the experience of joint faculty in schools of public health. You will be asked to participate in an interview that will focus on your experiences as a joint faculty member or administrator at your university. Interviews will be tape recorded and transcribed, and the audiotapes and transcriptions will be kept in a secure location. All publications and presentations will ensure your confidentiality unless you provide explicit permission to be identified. This research is being conducted as part of the requirement for the Executive Doctoral Program at the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no anticipated risks associated with this study. As a participant in this study, you may request to receive a copy of the summary findings upon completion of this project. Upon your consent, this interview will be audio taped. The audiotape will later be transcribed for research purposes, but will never be played for any audience other than the researchers directly involved in the project. Upon completion of the project audiotapes will be erased.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation in this experiment will take approximately sixty minutes. You will be invited to review the interview transcript and make corrections.

PAYMENTS: Although your assistance is greatly appreciated, there will be no payment for your participation.

SUBJECT’S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study. If you have questions about your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any
aspect of this study, you may contact – anonymously, if you wish – the Office of Regulatory Affairs with any question, concerns or complaints at the University of Pennsylvania by calling (215) 898-2614.

I give consent to be audio taped during this study; please initial: __ Yes __ No

The extra copy of this consent form is for you to keep.

SIGNATURE _____________________________ DATE ___________
Printed Name ______________________________


## APPENDIX G: CODING SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Descriptions of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domains</td>
<td><strong>Research</strong> ICR, Rankings, Credit, Publications, Grant administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Academic rewards</strong> Promotion and tenure, evaluation, compensation, recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resources</strong> Facilities, staff, support, salary, resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Culture</strong> Identity, community, norms, values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong> Benefits, challenges (positive, negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes, Beliefs and Values</strong> Attitudes, Beliefs and Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schein</td>
<td><strong>Artifacts</strong> Visual depictions of structure and processes (MOUs, etc.); public; obvious to most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Espoused beliefs and values</strong> Strategies, goals, philosophies; obvious to the initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Basic underlying assumptions</strong> Unconscious, taken for granted beliefs, thoughts and perceptions; unseen by most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birnbaum</td>
<td><strong>Collegial</strong> Consensus, values-oriented, collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bureaucratic</strong> Process, policies, hierarchy, boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Political</strong> Competition, personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Anarchical</strong> Autonomy, loose coupling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td><strong>Reasons</strong> Reasons for having the joint appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong> Recommendations for improving joint appointments; for faculty considering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong> Positive aspects of joint appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong> Negative aspects of joint appointments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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