## **Joint Appointments**

# **Draft MOU Guidelines between Departments for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

This MOU should be understood as clarifying expectations rather than as a formal document. The content can be incorporated into department handbooks, but should also be shared and discussed with tenured colleagues, with the department chairs of the jointly appointed faculty member, and with the faculty member.

## **Department Attendance Expectations**

Attending all department and program meetings and events is expected unless otherwise agreed to with the faculty member.

# **Service Expectations**

Department and program chairs should work to avoid the faculty member (tenured or tenure track) having more than half the average number of advisees, thesis students, and similar forms of service in each department. Because tenure-track faculty rarely decline requests or might feel compelled to volunteer for service work, chairs should not just defer to the faculty member as a way to gauge a proper workload. Chairs should check in with the faculty member at least once per semester to assess how heavy a workload the faculty member is carrying, especially since the faculty member is giving time to both sets of department meetings and events.

## **Publishing Expectations**

It is helpful to jointly appointed faculty members when publishing expectations for tenure are consistent between their departments. When possible, when searching for a joint position, departments should discuss publishing expectations before a hire is made. (Department tenure expectation documents provide guidance on this front.) It is important for departments to find ways to reconcile expectations that are wildly inconsistent (e.g., one department expecting a book and the other expecting articles) so that the faculty member can develop a clear pathway toward tenure. Publishing norms for tenure within the faculty member's discipline or subfield can be the guiding framework to reconcile different expectations. If departments cannot come to a consistent framework, they should consult with the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty. Expectations should be communicated to the faculty member.

## **Teaching Expectations**

Under standard conditions, jointly appointed faculty members should teach the same percentage of courses for a department as matches the percentage of their affiliation with that department (e.g., two courses per department in the case of a 50-50 split). It is expected that some courses would be cross-listed across departments, but it can useful to designate which courses are originating in which departments so that the faculty member and departments know that both departments are being fully served. Such a designation also will help determine which department observes which of the faculty member's classes, so that the faculty member does not end up with each department observing each class. Department chairs should consult with the faculty member about how many new preps are expected in each department and should not expect the individual to create more new preps in total than what is normal in their department. Attention should be paid to allow jointly appointed faculty members to teach as

many courses in their specialty as typical in the department, given that teaching introductory or required courses in two departments can otherwise take up an individual's teaching opportunities.

#### **Annual Conversations**

It is important for chairs to discuss their respective departments' approach to teaching and service assessment. It helps support the faculty member when chairs agree on these matters, so chairs should communicate their expectations to one another and, as much as possible, convey a consistent message to the faculty member. Chairs should check in before their respective annual conversations so as to appreciate what the faculty member has contributed to each department, in case extraordinary service or teaching commitment for one department, for instance, becomes relevant in their own evaluations. Mentors of the faculty member in each department should similarly communicate their respective expectations. Respecting the fact that evaluations are not shared across departments, chairs should connect with one another if they notice any particular concerns.

## **Chairing**

The rotation of chairing in a department should take into account jointly appointed faculty members' chairing of their other department as part of their past chairing service. Departments should try to give faculty members their standard amount of reprieve between stints chairing, while balancing the chairing timelines of other tenured department members.

## **Programs**

The above guidelines on teaching and service apply to faculty who substantially serve programs. Program chairs should keep in mind that faculty members' primary teaching and service responsibilities are to their departments. If it seems unavoidable to place heavy service or teaching expectations for a brief time by the program or department onto a faculty member, chairs should communicate and do their best to alleviate expectations from the other major, without overburdening members of that major. Under these circumstances, chairs should seek a long-term strategy to balance the teaching and service expectations.