

TENURED / TENURE-TRACK FACULTY PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
EDWARDS COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND FINE ARTS
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

The Scope of Professional Life:

Performance expectations for the tenured/tenure-track faculty of the Department of English at Coastal Carolina University are based on a definition of professional life that encompasses teaching and learning; research, scholarship, and creative activity; and service to the profession, the institution, and the community.

Expectations:

A statement of expectations for each performance area constitutes the standards by which the tenured / tenure-track faculty of the Department will be evaluated for the purposes of annual performance evaluation, third-year review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. Productivity in each performance area is required for a satisfactory review at each major level of evaluation. The faculty of the Department recognizes that excellence of achievement in the arts and humanities involves evaluation of quality as well as quantity, in the context of institutional mission. As members of a self-governing profession, the faculty of the Department endorses the concept of peer evaluation, both internal (by peer committees and academic administrators at Coastal Carolina University) and external (by peers within the discipline). Because we as a Department encompass diverse and multiple academic specializations, we call on individual faculty at each major level of evaluation (i.e., third-year review, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review) to use the space of the application letter to accurately contextualize their pedagogical approach and practice, their scholarship, and their disciplinary service so that the relevant peer-review committees and administrators can fully assess the level of accomplishments and write well-informed letters of evaluation. The following lists of performance indicators and tiers indicate a spectrum of the relative quality of various activities in the performance areas of (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activities, and (3) professional, university, and community service. Faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion or post-tenure review should articulate clearly how their teaching activities, scholarly and creative activities, as well as professional, university, and community service activities correspond to the categories listed under performance indicators or tiers enumerated below (i.e., Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3). All materials referred to and contextualized in the application narrative must be included in the accompanying *curriculum vitae*. Since English is a diverse and dynamic discipline, the lists of tiers undergo regular review by the Department. The Department recognizes that the categories under each tier are not exhaustive, but are representative of typical professional activities undertaken by faculty. In the event that particular items listed in the faculty's *curriculum vitae* and supporting documents do not fit discretely into any one of the itemized categories, it is the responsibility of the applicant to use portions of their application letter to explain how and why these contributions to the areas of teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities, and/or professional, university, and community service are significant indicators of their productivity and contribute positive evidence of their performance as a member of the Department, College, and/or University. Similarly, in the event that a particular item included by a faculty member in their application materials and supporting documents crosses over the performance areas of teaching, scholarly or creative activities, and service, the candidate must assign the item to the performance area that they consider of primary relevance.

In the area of scholarship, the department has assigned point values to specific activities within each tier. In the areas of teaching and service, the department follows the college standards and indicators as they are outlined in the Edwards College **Expectations for Tenure and Promotion and Post-Tenure Review**.

I. TEACHING

Statement of Expectations:

The successful teacher-scholar in the Department of English will maintain content currency in all courses; employ pedagogical diversity to improve student learning; maintain high performance standards for students; uphold a high standard of professionalism in the preparation of teaching materials and in the mentoring of students; observe institutional regulations regarding class meetings and final examinations; exhibit civility, approachability, and fairness in interactions with students. The Department of English believes that scholarly or creative production is integral to sustaining currency and pedagogical diversity in teaching across all course levels. The relation between teaching and scholarly or creative publications should be symbiotic, and excellence in scholarly or creative publications and activities provides a base for excellence in teaching.

Performance indicators are of two kinds: 1) those that denote modes of activity relevant to a performance area and 2) those that provide documentary support of the quantity and quality of activity in a performance area. Neither the number of activities nor the number of supporting documents necessarily indicates a high (or low) quality of performance; instead, faculty should consider a combination of quantitative and qualitative elements when evaluating performance. Currency in all levels of teaching should be made clear in the candidate's file through the listed documentation. The lists outline activities and supporting documents that demonstrate excellence in teaching. We value the inclusion of at least some activities from tier 1.

Edwards College Expectations for Sustained and Outstanding Performance in Teaching:

In teaching, *sustained* activity is determined by submitted evidence that the faculty member is a reflective teacher who regularly reviews classroom practices in the light of student learning outcomes. This may be documented in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, accounts of peer visitations, explanations of new teaching methods and learning assessments, summaries of student evaluations, descriptions of independent study courses/internships, and records of effective advising. Of major importance in this area is that the faculty member's activities typically show a clear impact on student learning, which may involve participation in the assessment processes of the department and/or the mentoring of students in the successful completion of grant proposals, graduate and professional school applications, auditions or presentations, and/or publications.

Outstanding teaching can be demonstrated by student evaluations, reports of peer visitations, development of new courses and curricula, mentoring student-centered activities and research, mentoring faculty, and/or a faculty member's activity as a peer reviewer of teaching for the department and college. It is expected that an outstanding teaching record would include annual reports that contain citations of performance in teaching that is superior to typical levels of achievement as established by departmental or disciplinary norms.

List of Activities: Tier 1:

- Curriculum design and development
- Course design and development
- Mentoring of student research or creative project
- Directing graduate thesis, senior thesis, or honors thesis
- Organizing pedagogical seminars and workshops
- Collaborative, team, and interdisciplinary teaching
- Classroom or online teaching

Tier 2:

- Serving as reader on graduate thesis
- Supervising independent study
- Teaching in the honors program
- Participating in pedagogical seminars and workshops
- Student advising

Sample List of Supporting Documents:

- Teaching awards, commendations, and grants
- Sample syllabi, assignments, examinations, and other course materials
- Evidence of pedagogical innovation
- Evidence of effective use of emerging technology in pedagogical practice
- Student evaluations that, on average, meet or exceed college averages
- Teaching observation and evaluation by chair, associate chair, dean, CeTeal, or peer
- Evidence of student learning (e.g. student presentation or publication beyond the classroom; graduate school acceptances; career and public service accomplishments of graduates)

II. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES**Statement of Expectations:**

The successful teacher-scholar in the Department of English will develop, continuously refine, and diligently pursue a scholarly or creative agenda; submit work in progress for peer review¹; incorporate scholarly or creative learning into pedagogical content and practice; and bring scholarly or creative projects to successful conclusion as demonstrated by presentation and publication. As a Department, we acknowledge the challenges of balancing the requirement to maintain significant scholarly or creative activities with a substantial teaching load, limited support for faculty research commitments, and no reassignment leave for untenured faculty members. With regard to speeches and presentations, faculty will consider the level of the conference or venue in terms of organizers and participants as either prominent or respected. With regard to publications, faculty should consider the following items in determining whether a venue (e.g., press, series, collection, journal, magazine) is prominent or respected, while also accounting for nuances across academic specializations and fields (e.g., composition and rhetoric, creative writing, cultural studies, literature or literary studies, linguistics, new media studies, and/or professional and technical writing):

- level of the editorial board/masthead and referees
- level of other authors or contributors
- general profile in the field covered
- rigor in editorial process
- peer review policy

¹ For the purposes of tenure and promotion in the areas of composition and rhetoric, cultural studies, literature or literary studies, linguistics, new media studies, and/or professional and technical writing, peer review entails original scholarly work or research accepted for publication by an editorial board, external referee(s), or solicited by an editor(s) for a prominent or respected journal or press. In the area of creative writing, peer review entails original creative or scholarly work accepted for publication by an editor, editorial board, or external referee(s). This applies to the scholarship and creative work listed in candidates' *curriculum vitae* as well as other materials submitted for tenure and promotion evaluation.

Not all of these items will be applicable in every case; if any item is not appropriate for evaluating a given publication venue, it is the responsibility of the candidate to explain why this item is not pertinent in a particular case. The determination of whether a venue is prominent or respected is best made within each academic specialization; documentation of a venue's status in individual cases is the responsibility of candidates. For the purposes of tenure and promotion, faculty publications, except for interviews and book reviews, should successfully have undergone a peer review process according to relevant academic specializations (see note 1); in the event that a publication has not undergone a form of peer review according to relevant academic specializations, the applicant must explain clearly in their application letter why the particular publication should count for the purposes of tenure and promotion evaluation. As the current scholarly and creative publishing environment undergoes changes, much significant work is being done in evolving fields and venues, such as online arenas; in the current atmosphere, the influence of such work can reach beyond the domains of more traditional venues. Given this, for candidates whose scholarly or creative work engages with emerging publication practices, it is their responsibility to articulate the materials' relevance to their professional development by illustrating how these align with either prominent or respected venues. The Department therefore follows the Modern Language Association (MLA) guidelines on evaluating work in digital humanities and digital media: <https://www.mla.org/About-Us/Governance/Committees/Committee-Listings/Professional-Issues/Committee-on-Information-Technology/Guidelines-for-Evaluating-Work-in-Digital-Humanities-and-Digital-Media>

The Department of English also recognizes the value of coauthored works. This is especially important in academic specializations of composition and rhetoric, linguistics, and new media studies, where empirical data and research are crucial, and multiple authors are increasingly normative, but this trend has growing importance in other academic specializations as well. In publications having two or three authors, every author should be treated like a full author. In works having four or more authors, distribution of credit may be differential; in these cases, it is the candidate's responsibility to explain the particularly important roles of the first author and the corresponding author.

A. Elaboration of Tiers and Point Values for Publications in Academic Specializations of Composition and Rhetoric, Cultural Studies, Literature or Literary Studies, Linguistics, New Media Studies, and/or Professional and Technical Writing:

Tier 1:

- Scholarly monograph or multigraph published by a prominent press **(12 points)**
- Edited collection published by a prominent press **(12 points)**
- Scholarly edition published by a prominent press **(12 points)**
- Editing special issue of a prominent journal **(12 points)**
- Editing prominent scholarly or creative journal **(12 points)**
- Textbook published by a prominent press **(12 points)**
- Scholarly article or book chapter published in a prominent journal or edited collection **(6 points)**
- External grant, fellowship, scholarship, and other awards from a prominent venue (Guggenheim, NEH) **(6 points)**

Tier 2:

- Scholarly monograph or multigraph published by a respected press **(9 points)**
- Edited collection published by a respected press **(9 points)**
- Scholarly edition published by a respected press **(9 points)**
- Editing special issue of a respected journal **(9 points)**
- Editing respected scholarly or creative journal **(9 points)**
- Textbook published by a respected press **(9 points)**

- Scholarly article or book chapter published in a respected journal or edited collection **(3 points)**
- External grant, fellowship, scholarship, and other awards from a respected venue **(3 points)**

Tier 3:

- Interview in a prominent or respected journal or magazine **(1 point)**
- Book review in a prominent or respected journal or magazine **(1 point)**
- Conference organizer / member organizing committee for a prominent or respected conference or other venue **(1 point)**
- Invited speaker or presenter at a prominent or respected conference/venue **(1 point)**
- External grant, fellowship, scholarship, and other awards from a respected venue **(1 point)**

Supporting Activities:

- Presentation at a prominent or respected conference or other venue
- Seminar or workshop attendance
- Academic commentary
- Item/article in reference work

B. Elaboration of Tiers and Point Values for Publications in Academic Specializations of Creative Writing:

Tier 1:

- Book-length creative work published by a prominent press (e.g., poetry volume, novel, memoir, narrative nonfiction, collection of short stories, collection of creative nonfiction essays) **(12 points)**
- Edited collection of creative work published by a prominent press **(12 points)**
- Creative writing textbook or craft-book published by a prominent press **(12 points)**
- External grant, fellowship, scholarship, and other awards from a prominent venue (Guggenheim, Pulitzer Prize, National Book Award, NEA) **(6 points)**
- Chapbook of poems, stories, or essays published by a prominent press **(6 points)**
- Creative work published in a prominent journal, edited collection, magazine, or anthology (e.g. first publication of a single story, essay, or poem or small submission of poems) **(3 points)**
- Craft essay or article published in a prominent journal, edited collection, magazine, or anthology **(3 points)**

Tier 2:

- Book-length creative work published by a respected press (e.g., poetry volume, novel, memoir, narrative nonfiction, collection of short stories, collection of creative nonfiction essays) **(9 points)**
- Edited collection of creative work published by a respected press **(9 points)**
- Creative writing textbook or craft-book published by a respected press **(9 points)**
- Chapbook of poems, stories, or essays published by a respected press **(4 points)**
- External grant, fellowship, scholarship, and other awards from a prominent venue (Pushcart Prize, anthologized in “Best American” series, etc.) **(3 points)**
- Creative work published in a respected journal, edited collection, magazine, or anthology (e.g. single story, essay, or poem or small submission of poems) **(2 points)**
- Craft essay or article published in a published in a respected journal, edited collection, magazine, or anthology **(2 points)**
- Creative work reprinted in a prominent journal, edited collection, magazine, or anthology (e.g. second publication of a single story, essay, or poem or small submission of poems). **[*Note:**

When a previously published creative work subsequently appears in a book-length collection of poems, stories, or essays written by that author, it is not considered a reprint.] **(2 points)**

Tier 3

- Creative work reprinted in a respected journal, edited collection, magazine, or anthology (e.g. second publication of a single story, essay, or poem or small submission of poems. [***Note:** When a previously published creative work subsequently appears in a book-length collection of poems, stories, or essays written by that author, it is not considered a reprint.] **(1 point)**)
- Reviewing another author’s creative work(s) in a prominent or respected journal or magazine [***Note:** A book review so thorough and sweeping that it reads like an essay could rise to the level of a Tier 1 or 2 publication.] **(1 point)**
- Conference organizer / member organizing committee for a prominent or respected conference or other venue **(1 point)**
- Invited reader, speaker, or presenter at a prominent or respected conference/venue **(1 point)**
- External grant, fellowship, scholarship, and other awards from a respected venue **(1 point)**

Supporting Activities:

- Reading or presentation at a prominent or respected conference or other venue
- Seminar or workshop attendance
- Academic commentary
- Item/article in reference work

C. Points Required for Tenure and Promotion and for Post-Tenure Review

PLEASE NOTE: The point totals enumerated below represent the minimum standard of eligibility for each review category. Earning the necessary point total does not guarantee promotion, tenure, or the appropriate post-promotion rating. Likewise, this point system is not meant to preclude the evaluation of the candidate’s file at the college, Dean, and University levels. Instead these totals should be read as an articulation of the quality and quantity of scholarship/creative activity that the department values and deems necessary—but not automatically sufficient—for promotion and post-promotion review.

For promotion from untenured Assistant Professor to the rank of tenured Associate Professor, a candidate must earn *12 points total, with at least 9 points coming from Tier 1 and/or Tier 2.*

For post-tenure review, to earn a “meets expectations” rating in scholarship, an Associate Professor of English must earn *6 points total*, starting from the point of their promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or last post-tenure review. To earn an “exceeds expectations” rating in scholarship, an Associate Professor of English must earn *9 points total, with at least 6 points coming from Tier 1 or Tier 2.*

For promotion from Associate Professor to the rank of Professor of English, starting from the point of their promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must earn *12 points total, with at least 9 points coming from Tier 1 and/or Tier 2.*

For post-promotion review, to earn a “meets expectations” rating in scholarship, a Professor of English must earn *6 points total*, starting from the point of their promotion to Professor or last post-tenure review. To earn an “exceeds expectations” rating in scholarship, a Professor of English must earn *12 points total, with at least 6 points coming from Tier 1 or Tier 2.*

III. PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY, AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Statement of Expectations:

The successful teacher-scholar in the Department of English fulfills basic responsibilities of professional and university citizenship and collegiality; participates regularly in the professional activities of their discipline; responds to professional and institutional needs as they arise; accepts service work on professional, institutional, and/or community levels, including at least some activities at Tier 2 level or above; seeks opportunities to use their expertise and knowledge for the benefit of the profession, the institution, and the wider community; and pursues other opportunities for ongoing professional growth and renewal.

Edwards College Expectations for Sustained and Outstanding Performance in Service:

In service, *sustained* activity is demonstrated by annual participation in department, college and university committees, organs of faculty governance, and/or in disciplinary or academic societies and organizations. Coastal Carolina University also recognizes participation in discipline-related extracurricular community and/or institutional activities as having the potential to help fulfill a faculty service commitment.

Outstanding service can be demonstrated through leadership. Chairing committees, holding offices, building new programs, and/or successfully collaborating with peers to launch or organize new initiatives are but a few examples of actions that can help the candidate differentiate *outstanding* service from “caretaker” roles and lower-impact participation. It must be demonstrated in the letters of evaluation of the department peer-review committee and the candidate’s chair that the service activities of the faculty member made a substantial positive difference in the outcome, function, or operation of the department, college, university, discipline and/or community.

List of Service Activities

Tier 1:

- Member, disciplinary board
- Officer, professional organization
- Professional referee (manuscripts, proposals, grants)
- Editor, scholarly or creative journal (service-based)
- Editor, undergraduate journal (service-based)
- Editorial board or masthead
- Chair, Department
- Program Coordinator, Department, College, or University level
- Chair, University committee
- Chair, College committee
- Chair, Department committee
- Chair, University, College, or Department search committee

Tier 2:

- Elected or invited committee member, professional organization
- Member, Faculty Senate
- Member, University committee
- Member, College committee

- Member, Department committee
- Adviser, student publication
- Organizer, Department series
- Judge, scholarly or creative contest
- Recruitment and retention activities
- Community outreach programming

Tier 3:

- Adviser, student club
- University professional development presentation

REVISED BY DEPARTMENT: February 18, 2019

APPROVED BY DEAN: March 11, 2019

Addendum. The following statement shall be added to the Department of English Performance Expectations Documents. This addendum was approved by a unanimous vote of the department faculty on Friday, February 12, 2021.

Addendum to performance expectations for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers.

1. For any single academic year in which the University has declared a financial crisis or exigent circumstance as defined in Faculty Manual §5.2.10.:

- a. On the chair's annual rating of the faculty member's performance, student evaluations and comments will carry reduced weight. Faculty may demonstrate teaching effectiveness in a variety of ways, including pedagogical innovation, engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning, successful course revision/design /development, obtaining peer and/or supervisor observations of teaching, performing such observations, participating in additional trainings beyond those already required, and undertaking other forms of professional development as may arise.

Justification: For faculty at all ranks, the department recognizes that measuring teaching effectiveness is especially challenging when the means and modalities of teaching are changing rapidly and under highly challenging conditions. In such a context, the known shortcomings of instruments such as student evaluations are exacerbated.

- b. Other than required trainings, workshops, and department meetings, no further professional development, service responsibilities, or creative/scholarly activities are expected from Lecturers and Senior Lecturers.

Justification: As stated in the Faculty Manual, §5.2.10, "Each department and college shall review how to reduce activities not directly tied to instruction."

2. During promotion or post-promotion review, when the University has declared a financial crisis or exigent circumstance (as defined in Faculty Manual §5.2.10) during one or more years of the review period:

- a. A "meets departmental expectations for teaching" rating by the chair on a faculty member's annual evaluation will constitute the highest necessary level of success needed to earn "excellent" or "sustained and outstanding" for the year(s) in which the University was in financial crisis or exigency.

Justification: As stated in the Faculty Manual, §5.2.10, "For [L]ecturers, [Senior [L]ecturers, and [Senior [I]nstructors, evaluations of teaching deemed 'satisfactory' or 'favorable' will constitute the highest necessary level of success in order to earn 'excellent' or 'sustained and outstanding' for the promotion and review process for each year of the review period in which the university was in financial crisis or exigency."

II. Addendum to performance expectations for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors

1. For any year in which the University has declared a financial crisis or exigent circumstance as defined in Faculty Manual §5.2.10.:

Teaching

- a. On the chair's annual rating of the faculty member's teaching performance, student evaluations and comments will carry reduced weight. Faculty may demonstrate teaching effectiveness in a variety of ways, including pedagogical innovation, engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning, successful course revision/design /development, obtaining peer and/or supervisor observations of teaching, performing such observations, participating in additional trainings beyond those already required, and undertaking other forms of professional development as may arise.

Justification: For faculty at all ranks, the department recognizes that measuring teaching effectiveness is especially challenging when the means and modalities of teaching are changing rapidly and under highly challenging conditions. In such a context, the known shortcomings of instruments such as student evaluations are exacerbated.

- b. No other adjustments will be made to teaching performance expectations.

Justification: As stated in the Faculty Manual, §5.2.10, "During a financial crisis, the faculty are expected to prioritize teaching over other activities, in order to maintain student academic continuity."

Scholarly and Creative Activities

- a. Although faculty members may choose to engage in scholarly and creative activities during an exigency year, they are not expected to do so. Therefore, on their annual evaluations for scholarship, all faculty members will earn, at minimum, a rating from the chair of "meets departmental expectations for scholarship and creative activity" during years when the university is in financial crisis or exigency. Furthermore, due to the workings of the publication timetable, the department recognizes that faculty members who are forced to suspend scholarly and creative activity may see a reduction in productivity during the academic year *following* the exigency year. Therefore, "meets departmental expectations for scholarship and creative activity" will also be the minimum rating the chair can assign in annual evaluations conducted the year immediately subsequent to an exigency year or years. The chair will acknowledge in the narrative component of their annual evaluations of scholarship each pertinent item

of the faculty's creative and/or scholarly activity completed (successfully) during times of financial crisis or exigency.

Justification: As stated in the Faculty Manual, §5.2.10, "If a non-administrative faculty member's normal duties include scholarship and/or service, the scholarship and/or service expectations shall be suspended until an academic year that is not affected by financial crisis." Creative and/or scholarly activity must be acknowledged in the narrative portion of the chair's annual evaluation because such evaluations are used for post-tenure review (sometimes including external review) and promotion to Professor rank (always including external review).

Service

- a. During exigency years, faculty members are not expected to engage in service beyond what is deemed necessary for the governance and operation of the department, college, and University. Professional and community service activities are not expected during years when the university is in financial crisis or exigency. Therefore, on their annual evaluations for service, all faculty members, will earn, at minimum, a rating from the chair of "meets departmental expectations for service" during years when the University is in financial crisis or exigency.

Justification: As stated in the Faculty Manual, §5.2.10, "If a non-administrative faculty member's normal duties include scholarship and/or service, the scholarship and/or service expectations shall be suspended until an academic year that is not affected by financial crisis."

2. During promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review, when the University has declared a financial crisis or exigent circumstance (as defined in Faculty Manual §5.2.10) during one or more years of the review period.

Teaching

- a. During the evaluation of a faculty member's Promotion and Tenure dossier, when assessing the teaching from a year when the university was in financial crisis or exigency, the chair and peer review committee should give less weight to student evaluations and more weight to other indicators the faculty member may have included to establish teaching effectiveness.

Justification: For faculty at all ranks, the department recognizes that measuring teaching effectiveness is especially challenging when the means and modalities of teaching are changing rapidly and under highly challenging conditions. In such a context, the known shortcomings of instruments such as student evaluations are exacerbated.

- b. No additional adjustments to teaching performance expectations should be made.

Justification: As stated in the Faculty Manual, §5.2.10, “During a financial crisis, the faculty are expected to prioritize teaching over other activities, in order to maintain student academic continuity.”

Scholarly and Creative Activities

- a. The minimum point total required for a given promotion level (e.g. tenure, promotion to associate professor, promotion to professor, post-tenure review) as listed in the departmental PED will be reduced by 20% for each year in the review period that the university was in financial crisis or exigency.

After accounting for the 20% per exigency year reduction, the total required will be rounded up or down, as appropriate. For example: if there was one exigency year during a review period and the original point minimum required for promotion was 12, then the adjusted point minimum is 10 ($12 \text{ points} \times .80 = 9.6$, rounded up to 10). If the original point minimum was 9, then the adjusted point minimum is 7. ($9 \text{ points} \times .80 = 7.2$, rounded down to 7). If there were two exigency years during a review period, 12 points becomes 7 ($12 \times .6 = 7.2$, rounded down to 7) and 9 points becomes 5 ($9 \times .6 = 5.4$, rounded down to 5).

Individual faculty are responsible for articulating in their tenure/promotion/post-tenure review materials the specifics of their productivity and responsibilities in the context of the department's, college's, and university's reduced expectations.

NOTE: As is stated in the PED, the point totals enumerated above represent the minimum standard of eligibility for each review category. Earning the necessary point total does not guarantee promotion, tenure, or the appropriate post-tenure rating.

Justification. As stated in the Faculty Manual, §5.2.10, “If a non-administrative faculty member's normal duties include scholarship and/or service, the scholarship and/or service expectations shall be suspended until an academic year that is not affected by financial crisis.” The policy also notes that “all promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review expectations regarding scholarship and service shall be adjusted down by a factor dictated by the faculty's department and college during a financial crisis or exigent circumstance.”

Service

- a. The expectation for service work (departmental, college University, professional, and community) conducted by the faculty member should be reduced by a total of 20% for each year in the review period that the university was in financial crisis or exigency (i.e. one year of exigency during the review period means a 20% reduction in service expectations; two exigency years means a 40% reduction).

Justification. As stated in the Faculty Manual, §5.2.10, “If a non-administrative faculty member’s normal duties include scholarship and/or service, the scholarship and/or service expectations shall be suspended until an academic year that is not affected by financial crisis.” The policy also notes that “all promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review expectations regarding scholarship and service shall be adjusted down by a factor dictated by the faculty’s department and college during a financial crisis or exigent circumstance.”