

School of Criminal Justice Faculty Variable Workload Assignment Policy
[approved January 25, 2019]

§1. Preamble

The mission of the School of Criminal Justice is to advance interdisciplinary research that addresses the challenges posed by crimes and emerging risks, translate knowledge into innovations that advance equity, efficiency, and effectiveness in justice systems, and prepare students to utilize evidence-based practices and to serve as future leaders committed to engaged scholarship that informs policy and practice.

Tenure system faculty members in the School of Criminal Justice engage in three principal areas of performance:

- Research/scholarship in their academic discipline,
- Teaching/advising of students,
- Service and outreach to the university, public, and profession.

The distribution of a tenure system faculty member's effort can vary among these areas but the overriding principle in workload assignments is that in all cases they should result in a full-time effort. **This Variable Workload Assignment Policy is intended to govern cases in which tenured faculty¹ with at least a partial appointment² in the School of Criminal Justice have cause to adjust their workload in order to ensure productivity and fair evaluation of their annual performance.** This policy explicitly acknowledges that concentrated effort in one of the three areas may require a faculty member to redistribute their assigned percentages of effort. Without workload adjustment, these faculty members are at risk for consistently failing to meet expectations which can lead to below average merit raises, trigger a post-tenure review, or reduce the percentage of appointment overall.

§2. Guiding Principles

This policy is guided by the following principles and values: All three areas—teaching/advising, research/scholarship, and service/outreach—are part of the regular responsibility of tenure-system faculty. Tenured faculty have both the right and the responsibility to determine, in concert with the Director, priorities for carrying out their responsibilities in light of their own professional capabilities, priorities, and opportunities as well as the missions of the school, college, and university. Thus, at different stages of career, or in response to different opportunities, a faculty member's workload may merit adjustment.

Although these workload adjustments are recognized as appropriate elements of faculty careers, it is important to take into consideration their potential to impact promotion opportunities. In its policy on Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, the Office of the Provost notes that the achievement and performance levels required for promotion to a higher rank is based upon several years of sustained, outstanding achievements in education and scholarship across the mission, consistent with performance levels expected at peer universities. Therefore, tenured associate professors who shift their workload to reduce their efforts (especially in research/scholarship) will be reducing their likelihood of successful promotion to full professor. Associate professors who intend to seek promotion to full professor are discouraged from reducing effort in the area of research/scholarship below 40%.

¹ Changes in workload for assistant professors or non-tenure track faculty are not governed by this policy.

² In cases where faculty hold joint appointments, percentages of effort in each area must be agreed to by the director/chair of each unit in which faculty are appointed. MOUs for these faculty must be approved by all appropriate unit leaders.

§3. Policy Trigger

The standard distribution of effort for tenured faculty in an academic year is as follows:

40% (teaching/advising), 40% (research/scholarship), 20% (service/outreach).

Each faculty member is expected to make demonstrable contributions in each of the three areas each year as discussed in the Guidelines and Procedures for Faculty Merit/Salary Increases (Appendix B) of the School of Criminal Justice Bylaws. **Any tenured professor who fails to meet performance expectations in any area evaluated as part of the School's annual review process for three consecutive years will be asked to reduce their distribution of effort in this area and to increase their distribution of effort in other areas where they are meeting or exceeding performance expectations.** Tenured faculty who do not reduce the percentages of workload allocation in areas where they are not meeting performance expectations may be subject to post-tenure review or may have their percentage of appointment reduced.

Example arrangements for standard cases include the following:

- A 20% redistribution from research/scholarship to teaching/advising for a 60-20-20 assignment might require that the faculty member teach 3 courses per semester (or 6 per academic year) in order to meet expectations in that area while reducing the expected annual output required to meet expectations in scholarship/research below that normally required and leaving the minimum required to meet expectations in performance in service/outreach unchanged.
- A 20% redistribution from research/scholarship to service/outreach for a 40-20-40 assignment might require the faculty member to increase the expected annual performance level in service/outreach to a level that would ordinarily exceed expectations, while reducing the expected annual output required to meet expectations in scholarship/research below that normally required and leaving the minimum required to meet expectations in performance in teaching/advising unchanged.
- A 20% redistribution from teaching/advising to research/scholarship for a 20-60-20 assignment might permit the faculty member to meet expectations by teaching 1 class per semester (or 2 per academic year) while increasing the expected annual output required to meet expectations in research/scholarship to a level that would ordinarily exceed expectations and leaving the minimum required to meet expectations in performance in service/outreach unchanged.

§4. Memorandum of Understanding

Upon triggering this policy, the faculty member and the Director will meet to discuss the potential for redistribution in light of the needs and priorities of the faculty member and the unit generally. The decision to approve or deny the redistribution is that of the Director who may, at his or her discretion, seek feedback from appropriate School committees: Faculty Advisory Committee or the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee. If approved, the Director and faculty member will prepare and agree upon a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU must be completed and approved by the faculty member and all relevant unit heads before any workload redistribution may take effect. Workload may only be increased in areas for which the faculty member has, at a minimum, met expectations in annual reviews of performance for the previous three consecutive annual review periods, or exceeded expectations in two of the last three consecutive annual review periods. Differential workloads must be negotiated in a timely manner in order to facilitate programmatic scheduling. Most MOUs should be complete within the same semester that this policy was triggered, and none should take more than one academic year to prepare.

Required elements of the Memorandum include: (a) The length of time for which the workload redistribution is to be in effect. No individual MOU will be in effect for a period of more than 3 years. (b) Detail how the reassignment will affect the evaluation of the faculty member's annual review performance and, by extension, merit pay. This most notably includes specification of the performance and outputs required to achieve "meeting expectations" in the adjusted annual review category or categories. Performance and output levels required to achieve "meeting expectations" on the unadjusted categories and those required for "exceeding expectations" on all categories will be unchanged.

In order to match the typical SCJ annual review cycle, any modifications in workload assignment due to the establishment of an MOU or modification of existing MOU will typically be implemented January 1 of the subsequent year. MOUs that are in force for a given calendar year will be reviewed during the annual review of faculty members by the Director and the SCJ Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC). In the event of unforeseen changes in circumstance that challenge the faculty member's potential to meet the performance or output requirements discussed in the MOU, the sufficiency of modifications will fall to the discretion of the Director as advised by the Faculty Advisory Committee (in this situation, faculty are strongly advised to work closely with the Director to ensure the sufficiency of alternate approaches and present this information to FAC as part of the faculty member's materials). Tenured faculty who fail to meet the adjusted performance expectations for three years may be subject to post-tenure review or may have their percentage of appointment reduced.

§5. Other Redistribution Scenarios

In addition to triggering this policy in response to a tenured faculty member's failure to meet expectations, tenured faculty members or the Director may request a redistribution of effort from the standard 40% (teaching/advising), 40% (research/scholarship), 20% (service/outreach) assignment as a result scenarios that include the following. Redistributions as a result of these scenarios must adhere to §2 and §4 of this policy.

- A contractual administrative responsibility,
- A sabbatical agreement,
- Receipt of a grant, fellowship, or award that "buys out" some portion of a teaching assignment,
- Leaves of absence (paid or unpaid).
- In addition to the above four conditions, an agreement for the redistribution of effort may be reached between the Director and the faculty member as a long-term plan to respond to changing circumstances in the faculty member's professional work. The maximum redistribution permitted in this scenario is 20%.

§6. Sunset Provision

This policy will sunset five years after the approval of this document. Prior to that time (but no sooner than three years after implementation), FAC will be responsible for compiling and presenting de-identified data regarding the implementation of this policy (to the extent possible without identifying individual faculty members), and eliciting comments on the policy as implemented. A new vote will be required to reinstate this policy or implement an amended version. If no such policy is approved, the current policy will remain in effect until re-approved or replaced but for no longer than three additional years.