Faculty of Arts and Science
PTR Cross-Appointment Clarifications

For a cross-appointed faculty member, one cannot simply compare the two departmental scores (in the departments of the cross-appointment) on the assumption that both departments are using the same numerical standard, and say that the scores should be the same in both departments for the same cross-appointed individual; and one cannot compare, either, the PTR dollar amounts and say that they should be the same (pro-rated for % appointment) for the same cross-appointed individual.

Scores
1. Departments may score differently from one another in the numbers they use to represent excellence, very good, etc. — although the faculty members scored will be in the same relationship to one another whatever the numbers used: E.g., "very good" can mean 3 out of 4 in one department and 3.6 out of 4 in another - but all faculty in each department will be scored according to the same numerical scale, and PTR will be distributed in each department according to the rankings of departmental faculty members in relation to one another. A total score of 80 out of 100 in one department might therefore produce the same PTR dollar amount as a total score of 74 out of 100 in another department. I.e., in one department 90 might be the top score, and in another, 82 might be the top score, for the same level of performance; and both departments might award $2500 to the top ranked individual in their pools. A faculty member might be similarly ranked, and receive the same PTR dollars, despite very different scores, in the two departments of his or her cross-appointment.

Pools
2. But also, PTR pools in different departments will always be different from one another: in the performance of individual faculty members in relation to one another, and/or in the number of faculty in the pool (which, along with performance quality, affects the amount of flexibility a department has in allocating PTR dollars). The same individual performance may therefore be ranked, e.g., 5th out of 6 in one department (B) and 2nd out of 4 in another department (A). A department with 6 faculty members may use differing dollar amounts for differing levels of performance than a department with 4 faculty members, because it has more flexibility in allocation. (Departments with pools of the same size may also, of course, use different amounts.) E.g., Department (A) has 2 "very good" faculty members and 2 "good" faculty members; Department (B) has 2 "very good", 1 "good", and 3 "satisfactory" members. At an allocation into the PTR pool of $2000 per faculty member, (A) has 4 times $2000 and (B) has 6 times $2000. (A) might give $2300 = very good, $1700 = good; (B) might give $2500 = very good, $2000 = good, $1666 = satisfactory.

There are further complicating factors.
3. Departments may use different methods of crediting research. E.g., one department may credit a book when it is first accepted, and then credit it again spread over two years, when it is published. Another department may provide credit (over one, two, or three years) for preparation of a book and then credit it again at acceptance. This is a discipline-specific matter. In the long run a good performance will be similarly rewarded in both departments; but in any one year there may not be PTR similarity in scores or dollars allocated to an individual cross-appointee because the 2 different departments may be using different credit systems for a faculty member's performance.

4. Departments may measure leave productivity in very different ways, depending on disciplinary leave research norms. Again, in the long run, good performance will be recognized, but the credits may vary, by department, in the years in which they are given.

5. Departments may have different research cultures. One may privilege book chapters, another may privilege refereed articles, another, refereed conference presentations. Different kinds of services may also be differently valued from one department to another.

In all of 3, 4, and 5, what is important is that a department's crediting methods and performance criteria be known by, and generally agreed to by, the department as a whole.

Consultation between departmental chairs is essential, however, in the case of cross-appointments, to ensure that, for example: 1. each department is aware of the quality of the publishers/journals/conferences involved (which in some cases will be better known in one discipline than in the other); 2. each department is using the same appointment-split evaluation assumptions: e.g., that both are scoring as though the faculty member is 100% in their own department and then prorating the PTR dollars to their percentage of the cross-appointment.

It is important that the faculty member understands how the departments are handling the cross-appointment PTR allocations.