

IV. Recruitment, Evaluation, Tenure, Obligations, Rights and Privileges of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

A. Recruitment, Mentoring, and Development of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Recruitment of New Faculty.

- a. The Department discusses and identifies curricular and programmatic needs, then approaches the Dean of the College for permission to recruit.
- b. From time to time, the Chair files a strategic or five-year plan with the College, outlining the Department's thinking on its staffing needs.
- c. Faculty may be recruited only when the College provides written permission.
- d. When the Department receives such permission, the Chair names the Search Committee.
- e. Membership of the Search Committee:
 - 1) Three or more of the Department's tenured or tenure-track faculty;
 - 2) A post-MA graduate student (non-voting member);
 - 3) One Graduate Faculty member outside the Department.
- f. The Search Process:
 - 1) The Department conducts the search in accordance with all search procedures stipulated by the College, the Provost's Office, and the University's Office of Equal Opportunity.

2. Mentoring

- a. The Chair assigns to all new faculty an official intra-departmental mentor and an extra-departmental mentor, in accordance with University regulations set by the Provost's Office.
- b. Faculty mentors assist the new colleague in learning the culture of the institution and the department, meeting new colleagues, seeking professional development, and advancing appropriately toward third year review and promotion and/or tenure.
- c. Once a new faculty member is hired, every tenured member of the Department, not just official mentors, is responsible for his or her mentorship and development.

3. Faculty Development.

- a. "Faculty development" encourages the use of all opportunities, intra- and extra-institutional, to acquire knowledge and skills that allow faculty to grow professionally and to perform at a higher level of proficiency -- in research, teaching, and service/advising.
- b. All faculty are encouraged to engage in developmental activities appropriate to career stage.
- c. Developmental activities include (but are not limited to):
 - 1) New Faculty Research Grants;
 - 2) Teaching enhancement activities sponsored by the Center for Teaching Excellence, Hall Center, International Programs, and professional organizations;
 - 3) Awards for faculty travel to conferences in the U.S. and abroad;
 - 4) Research grant funding, internal (Hall Center) and external (Fulbright, IREX, ACLS, Guggenheim, NEH, etc.);
 - 5) Sabbatical leave and Keeler intra-university fellowships;
 - 6) KU Vice Chancellors' and ACE Fellows Programs (administrative training);
 - 7) Technology training and workshops;
 - 8) International teaching and research exchanges;
 - 9) Teaching, academic, and administrative workshops;
 - 10) Conferences; special lectures; and any other suitable opportunities for professional development.

B. Annual Merit and Performance Evaluation. All tenured and tenure track faculty in the Department are evaluated annually.

1. Performance Expectations.

- a. Faculty of the Department are expected to:
 - 1) Participate actively in the work of the Department, assuming their share of teaching, advising, and service activities;
 - 2) Work in a collegial and professional manner with other Department colleagues, staff, and students;
 - 3) Teach a normal course load;
 - 4) Work with students at all levels (as advisors, mentors, examiners, etc.);
 - 5) Engage in a continuing and productive program of research at the level appropriate to rank in the field;
 - 6) Render service to the Department, University, and profession appropriate to rank.
- b. Probationary tenure-track faculty seeking promotion and tenure and tenured faculty seeking promotion follow the customary 40%-40%-20% distribution of effort in the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service unless a different allocation of effort was specifically negotiated by job description or contract.
- c. A redistribution of the 40%-40%-20% (teaching/advising-research-service) allocation of effort may be requested by a tenured faculty member and negotiated with the Chair, when consistent with the best interests of the Department and in conformity with College policies and regulations.
- d. Performance expectations in teaching/advising, research, and service are as stipulated in the guidelines and criteria for tenure and promotion in the *Faculty Handbook* ("Guidelines and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure," C.2.c.4.).

2. The Department Merit and Evaluation System.

- a. The base evaluation system is based on a 100 point scale (40 points for teaching/advising + 40 research + 20 service for standard allocation of effort). An overall score of 50 points or greater indicates that the faculty member meets the expectations stated in IV.B.1.a.1)-6:
- b. Any annual evaluation which falls below the mid level of points in any one of the three categories (teaching/advising, research, or service; i.e., below 20-20-10 for a 40-40-20 allocation) will signal to that faculty member a significant weakness in performance in that area.
- c. An overall score of less than 50 points on the annual evaluation will signify an unacceptable level of performance. In this case, the Department Chair and the individual faculty member will work together to develop a specific plan for improving performance in areas of weakness over the next calendar year.
- d. Three consecutive years of evaluation at less than 50 points overall obligates the Department to seek review of the faculty member in question at the College level.

3. The Merit and Evaluation Process.

- a. **Designation of Merit and Evaluation Committee.**
 - 1) At the December Department Meeting, the Chair initiates the merit and evaluation process by distributing the Annual Faculty Self-Evaluation forms and notifying the faculty of the timeline for the process.
 - 2) At that same meeting, the tenured and tenure-track faculty choose the option that determines the structure of the Evaluation Committee for that year.

Original approved 5 December 2006; revision ratified 11 September 2007

- a) Option I: The Evaluation Committee will consist of five tenured or tenure-track faculty members, one of whom is the Department Chair.
 - (1) The makeup of the Committee will reflect proportional representation by rank.
 - (2) That proportion will be defined by the distribution of ranks held by tenured and tenure-track faculty at the December Department Meeting.
 - (3) There shall be a regular, equitable, annual rotation of faculty membership.
 - b) Option II: The Evaluation Committee will consist of all tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department.
 - 3) Role of the Department Chair in the Merit and Evaluation Process:
 - a) Serves as chair of the Merit and Evaluation Committee;
 - b) Submits numerical rankings;
 - c) Is evaluated separately from the Department by the Dean of the College and is thus not a financial stake-holder in the evaluation process.
- b. Preparation of Faculty Self-Evaluation Materials.**
- 1) By **1 February** of each year, all faculty must submit to the Chair a self-evaluation portfolio for the previous calendar year.
 - 2) Each evaluation portfolio includes the following:
 - a) The completed Departmental evaluation form;
 - b) Syllabi for all courses taught that calendar year;
 - c) Appropriate and representative samples of teaching materials;
 - d) Copies of any publications that appeared in that calendar year;
 - e) Student evaluations for courses taught (provided by the Department Secretary);¹
 - f) Two (2) copies of the faculty member's up-to-date CV.
 - 3) Evaluation portfolios *may* include other relevant materials, such as conference programs, notes from students, copies of conference or invited papers presented; letters of thanks or invitation, or other professional supporting materials the submitting faculty member deems relevant.
- c. Review of Evaluation Materials.**
- 1) The Chair will make the self-evaluation portfolios and student evaluations available to the members of that year's Merit and Evaluation Committee.
 - 2) The Committee is charged with taking into consideration the following criteria:
 - a) Quantity of teaching/advising, research, service;
 - b) Quality of teaching/advising, research, service;
 - c) Significance, impact, and effectiveness of teaching/advising, research, service;
 - d) Continuing eligibility for graduate faculty status;
 - e) Impact of achievement in the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service appropriate to rank.
- d. Work of the Merit and Evaluation Committee.**
- 1) Each member of the Merit and Evaluation Committee carefully reads the self-evaluation portfolios prepared by the other members of the faculty.
 - 2) Each member assigns numerical values for teaching/advising (up to 40 points²), research (up to 40 points), and service (up to 20 points) to each portfolio.
 - (a) Maximum score is 100.
 - (b) Members assign rankings differentially, reflecting performance.
 - (c) Evaluators may not award more points than are available, based on allocation of

¹ Advanced classes with three or fewer students may not have evaluations available.

² By departmental custom, faculty automatically receive 20 out of 40 teaching points for meeting their classes.

effort, in any one category.

(d) Exceptions to the above:

(1) Faculty on administrative appointment usually hold split appointments (i.e., part of their appointment is in the department and part in another administrative unit). These faculty members will be evaluated with the understanding that their Departmental performance expectations are rated according to the portion of their appointment in the Department.

(2) In some cases, senior tenured faculty may have negotiated a different allocation of effort for that year, in which case this allocation will be made clear to the Committee. For example, if a faculty member teaches 3 and 3 (instead of the usual 2 and 2) courses per year, the allocation of effort might be 60-20-20 or 60-30-10. In that case, evaluators award teaching points on the basis of 60 possible points for teaching, instead of the traditional 40.

3) Each member submits his or her numerical rankings in confidence to the Chair.

e. Meeting of the Merit and Evaluation Committee.

1) The Merit and Evaluation Committee meets and completes its work on or before **28 February**, usually in a single meeting that lasts as long as necessary for the Committee to complete its work.

2) Members of the Merit and Evaluation Committee negotiate the final values assigned to individual faculty to reflect relative achievement by the faculty in that particular year; thus, the process is norm-referenced.

3) The Committee may vote to award bonus points only in those categories where faculty have achieved the maximum number of points.

4) *The work and discussions of the Committee are strictly confidential.*

f. Awarding of pay raise and merit.

1) When the Chair receives the merit budget allocation from the College, he or she:

a) Subtracts 2% of the regular merit pool;

b) Divides the remaining allocation by the total number of points awarded to all faculty, assigning corresponding merit increases to each faculty member on the basis of those points³;

c) Divides the number of bonuses awarded into the remaining 2% of the dollar amount of the Department's annual merit allocation and assigns those funds to those faculty who received bonuses.

2) The Chair sends forwards those amounts as recommendations to the College for faculty merit allocations when the College calls for them.

g. Completion of Merit and Evaluation Process.

1) Between the Merit Evaluation Committee's final meeting and 15 March, the Chair will send a letter to each faculty member conveying the results of his or her evaluation and summarizing the results of the Committee's deliberations and evaluation.. The work of the Committee will then be complete (provided no appeals are made; see 4., below).

2) Between 15 March and 1 April, the Chair will be available to meet with each faculty member as necessary to discuss the evaluation:

a) If a faculty member does not wish to meet with the Chair, and the Chair concurs, the faculty member will provide the Chair with a brief letter to that effect within ten days of receipt of the evaluation; the letter will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

b) If a faculty member does not wish to meet with the Chair, and the Chair does not

³ Merit allocation is thus tied to points achieved, not to percentages of existing salary.

Original approved 5 December 2006; revision ratified 11 September 2007

concur, a statement explaining the Chair's non-concurrence will be issued to the faculty member and placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

c) If a faculty member meets with the Chair to discuss performance, then the Chair will provide that faculty member with a written summary of their meeting and place the summary in the faculty member's personnel file.

3) By 1 April, all due processes at the Department level will be complete.

4. Appeal of the Merit and Evaluation Process. Faculty may appeal the results of their evaluation.

a. *Step One:* Following receipt of the letter conveying the result of the Merit and Evaluation Committee's deliberations, faculty members who wish to appeal must respond in writing, either declining to meet with the Chair or asking to meet with the Chair (in accordance with IV. B. 3. g. 2) b), above).

b. *Step Two:* Appealing faculty may seek clarification from the Chair informally and terminate the appeal at that point.

c. *Step Three:* Faculty may -- in a letter to the Chair dated not later than 1 April -- request and always be granted a meeting with the full Evaluation Committee.

1) At the meeting the appealing faculty member must introduce new information for consideration and may present his/her views of the evaluation.

2) The meeting is not convened for the purpose of challenging Committee decisions, thus the appealing faculty member may not demand justification of the Committee decisions.

3) The Committee may choose to ask questions of the individual, or not.

d. Following such a meeting, the Committee will compose and the concerned individual will receive a written response indicating the Committee's recommended action following from the meeting.

e. *Step Four:* If, after receiving the Committee's written response, a faculty member still disagrees with the evaluation and with specific suggestions for performance development and improvement, the faculty member may avail himself or herself of the review process specified in Section II.E. of the University Council Document on Faculty Evaluation. In this event, the faculty member will be free to add written comments to the evaluation documentation that will form the official record passed on for higher administrative review.

5. Departmental Review of Evaluation Process.

a. The Department reviews its Faculty Evaluation Plan at least once every three years.

b. At any time, tenured or tenure-track members of the faculty may suggest revisions or amendments; such revisions must be consistent with University policy.

c. Amendments and revisions become Department policy by majority vote of the Department's Graduate Faculty and subsequent approval by University Counsel and the Provost's Office.

C. Department Review and Promotion and Tenure Procedures. All Department procedures regarding review of candidates and promotion and tenuring of candidates are based on the guidelines outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations*. The Department abides by the rules, regulations, and deadlines set by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences and the Office of the Provost.

1. Pre-Tenure Review.

a. In accordance with University regulations, probationary (tenure-track junior) faculty

Original approved 5 December 2006; revision ratified 11 September 2007

undergo an institutionally mandated pre-tenure review in their third year, unless their letter of appointment stipulates otherwise.

b. Criteria for the pre-tenure review: The review is based on the criteria for promotion and tenure (see the *KU Faculty Handbook* (C.2.c.4. and 5.) and the *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations* (Article VI, Sections 1-3).

c. Purpose of the pre-tenure review: The purpose of the review is to provide feedback to the probationary faculty member about his or her progress toward promotion and tenure.

d. Process:

1) At the start of the Fall Semester of the review year, the Department Chair convenes a committee of all available tenured Department faculty; this becomes the Department's Pre-tenure Review Committee.

2) During the Fall Semester, the probationary faculty member and the Department Chair (or the Chair's designated representative, who becomes the Chair of the Review Committee) prepare the third-year form ("Blue Form Lite") in accordance with the instructions provided by the Provost's office.

a) It is the responsibility of the probationary faculty member to:

(1) Provide all materials requested for the dossier;

(2) Complete the portions of the third-year form for which he or she is responsible;

(3) Observe intellectual integrity in the preparation and submission of materials.

b) It is the responsibility of the Review Committee Chair to:

(1) Complete the portions of the form for which he or she is responsible;

(2) Prepare the probationer's file for examination by the Department Review Committee and the CCAPT⁴;

(3) Convene the Review Committee to evaluate the dossier;

(4) Write the letter to CCAPT, conveying the deliberations of the Review Committee and their recommendations;

(5) Submit all materials by deadline.

c) It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to write the Chair's letter to accompany the file to CCAPT.

d) It is the responsibility of each member of the Department's Third-year Review Committee to:

(1) Read the current University guidelines for pre-tenure review;

(2) Carefully read and evaluate the completed review form;

(3) Read all submitted research and teaching materials and evaluate them;

(4) Visit the probationer's classes no fewer than three times for peer evaluation of teaching;⁵

(5) Read all of the probationer's student evaluations;

(6) Submit a separate, confidential letter to the Chair, evaluating the probationer in the area of teaching for inclusion in their file.

4) Early in the Spring Semester, the Review Committee meets to discuss the third-year review materials and, after suitable discussion, votes to:

a) Recommend continuation and reappointment (reflecting very good or exceptional performance); or

b) Recommend a second review in the following year (indicating issues that need to be reexamined); or

⁴College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure.

⁵These visits are part of the Department's general process of peer review of probationary faculty. After appointment of the probationary faculty member to the university, two Departmental faculty are designated to peer review his or her teaching on a regular basis and eventually provide feedback to the Pre-Tenure Review Committee, when such is convened. The record shall show at least three semesters of peer evaluation.

Original approved 5 December 2006; revision ratified 11 September 2007

- c) Recommend non-reappointment (reflecting marginal or poor performance).
- 5) *All discussions and deliberations in this process are strictly confidential.*
- e. If the Department's pre-tenure review process concludes with a recommendation of reappointment, the Chair, in accordance with University regulations, will forward that recommendation to CCAPT. The Chair will immediately inform the probationary faculty member of the Department Review Committee's recommendation. If CCAPT concurs with the recommendation, the Chair will provide the probationary faculty member with both verbal and written feedback, stating expectations and making suggestions for improvement.
- f. If the Department's pre-tenure review process concludes with a recommendation of non-reappointment, the Department Chair, in accordance with University regulations, will forward that recommendation to CCAPT. The Chair will immediately inform the probationary faculty member of the Department Review Committee's recommendation. If CCAPT concurs with the recommendation, they will forward the file to the Provost for action (letter of non-reappointment).
- g. If the pre-tenure review process is inconclusive and concludes with CCAPT mandating a second review in the following year, the Department will repeat the process described above, following all University procedures. At this point, the Department may consider external evaluations.
- h. Appeal: Faculty who have received notice of non-reappointment and believe that the decision was "produced by conditions that constitute an abridgement of academic freedom or a violation of established procedures" (see *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations*, Article VI, Section 4) may appeal to the University Faculty Committee on Tenure and Related Issues.

2. Tenure and Promotion.

a. Department Promotion and Tenure Criteria. The Department follows the general guidelines set forward in the *KU Faculty Handbook* (C.2.c.4. and 5.) and in the *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations* (Article VI, Sections 1-3).

b. Probationary faculty or candidates for promotion must meet specific departmental expectations for teaching/advising, research, and service. These expectations will be precisely stated on their blue forms and should be clearly communicated to probationary faculty members as soon as they begin employment and to candidates for promotion at the time of their tenuring and promotion.

1) Sample statement of research expectations for most faculty in literature and linguistics:

For promotion and tenure, the discipline expects the candidate at a research university, with a normal 40/40/20 allocation of effort, to demonstrate that he or she has developed a substantive and productive program of independent, high quality research beyond the dissertation. This research may be disseminated through a combination of conference papers at regional, national and international conferences; articles in refereed national and international journals; and book-length monographs.

Major publications include books published by reputable academic presses or major national and international presses and articles published in peer-reviewed national and international publications. Article publications typically engage in the national dialogue in first- and second-tier journals, e.g., *Slavic Review*, *Russian Review*, *Slavic and East European Journal*, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, et al., and their European peers.

Minor and *service* publications include book reviews, informational/journalistic writing, encyclopedia entries, notes, and other writing published in non-peer-reviewed journals or non-academic venues. Post-doctoral research should indicate significant movement and growth beyond the dissertation. The candidate should engage in dialogue with peers and leaders in the field, providing strong evidence of potential to make a

Original approved 5 December 2006; revision ratified 11 September 2007

significant, original contribution to the field. Gaining external funding for research beyond the dissertation at some time during the probationary period is a mark of a success, with the understanding that humanities funding is highly competitive.

2) Sample statement of teaching expectations for most faculty: For promotion and tenure, the typical teaching assignment is four to five courses per year, as needed by the department's curriculum, with a balance of undergraduate and graduate teaching.

In addition to classroom teaching, the position requires supervision, as appropriate, of undergraduates in individual research and honors courses and of graduate students in masters and doctoral readings; chairing or serving on graduate examinations, masters committees, oral comprehensive examinations, and doctoral dissertation committees; and supervision of theses and dissertations, as appropriate.

The candidate must maintain regularly scheduled office hours each week and engage in advising periods prior to and during enrollment, including advising periods specified by the Department, School, and University.

3) Sample statement of service expectations for all faculty: For promotion and tenure, the candidate must demonstrate commitment to a share of service duties necessary to facilitate the efficient operation of the Slavic Department. The candidate must also demonstrate participation in a variety of service activities that contribute to the College, the University, and the professional field at national and international levels, with the distribution of these duties appropriate to rank and experience.

b. Department Promotion and Tenure Process.

- 1) The Chair consults with probationary faculty or faculty considering promotion ("candidates") about the appropriate time to become a candidate for promotion and/or tenure.
- 2) In the Spring Semester, the Chair convenes a committee of all Departmental faculty who hold tenured rank superior to the candidate; this becomes the Department P&T Committee.
- 3) The Department Chair, or his or her designated representative, becomes P&T Committee Chair and is responsible for seeing the process through to its conclusion.
- 4) The P&T Committee Chair follows all University and Provost's Office rules, regulations, and deadlines addressing the selection of outside reviewers and preparation of the dossier.
- 5) The candidate and the P&T Committee Chair prepare the P&T Blue Form in accordance with the rules and regulations specified by the Provost's office.
 - a) It is the responsibility of the candidate to:
 - (1) Provide all materials requested by the form and the Department;
 - (2) Complete the portions of the form for which he or she is responsible;
 - (3) Provide the names of six scholars who are appropriate external referees;
 - (a) The candidate may also provide the names of no more than two scholars whom the candidate prefers should not be contacted (no reason needs to be given);
 - (b) The candidate's dissertation committee, members of the candidate's home department, the candidate's personal friends, and former graduate student peers are not appropriate external referees;
 - (c) The external referee must be at least one professional rank higher than the candidate.
 - (4) Observe intellectual integrity in the preparation and submission of materials.
 - b) It is the responsibility of the P&T Committee Chair to:

Original approved 5 December 2006; revision ratified 11 September 2007

- (1) Assist the candidate in preparing the Blue Form;
 - (2) Complete the portions of the form for which the Department is responsible;
 - (3) Select the external reviewers in consultation with the Department P&T Committee and contact them in accordance with university policy and procedures. Note that, while the candidate's nominations will be taken into consideration, the P&T Committee has final discretion over the selection of the external referees. Departmental practice has been to choose from both the candidate's list and from the committee's list;
 - (4) Prepare the candidate's file for examination by the P&T Committee;
 - (5) Chair the meetings of the P&T Committee;
 - (6) Seek input from the elected student representatives to the Department on student views of the candidate and convey these views to the departmental P&T Committee before the conclusion of its deliberations.
 - (6) Write the letter to CCAPT and UCPT, conveying the deliberations of the Department P&T Committee and their recommendations;
 - (7) Submit all materials and meet all set deadlines of the CCAPT and UCPT.
- c. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to write the Chair's letter.
- 6) It is the responsibility of the members of the Department's P&T Committee to:
 - a) Read current University guidelines on promotion and tenure;
 - b) Read and evaluate the completed blue form;
 - c) Read and evaluate all submitted research and teaching materials;
 - d) Visit the candidate's classes for peer review of teaching and convey their evaluation in a letter to the Chair of the P&T Committee;
 - e) Read all of his or her student evaluations;
 - 7) After suitable discussion, the Committee votes to:
 - a) Recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure;
 - b) Recommend against granting tenure and/or promotion.
 - 8) In the event of a split vote, the minority members of the P&T Committee may write a separate letter for the candidate's file, expressing their opinion.
 - 9) *All discussions and deliberations in this process are confidential.*

c. Self-Nomination: Probationary faculty prior to their mandatory year and candidates for promotion, in accordance with the rules, regulations, and deadlines set by the Office of the Provost, have the right to self-nominate for promotion and/or tenure if the Department chooses not to support their candidacy at that time.

d. Appeal: Faculty who have been unsuccessful in their promotion and/or tenure bid and believe that the decision was “produced by conditions that constitute an abridgement of academic freedom or a violation of established procedures” (see *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations*, Article VI, Section 4) may appeal to the University Faculty Committee on Tenure and Related Problems.

D. Faculty Obligations, Responsibilities, and Privileges. All faculty are required to:

1. Meet classes as contracted, or make other arrangements for the instruction of students if they are absent in the case of illness or other professional responsibilities.
 - a. Such arrangements may include (but are not limited to):
 - 1) Guest presentations by other faculty, librarians, or graduate students who have completed the class or are senior to the class and appropriate to the subject;
 - 2) Rescheduling of classes;
 - 3) Assigned field trips;

Original approved 5 December 2006; revision ratified 11 September 2007

- 4) Special assignments or projects.
2. Inform the chair in writing of absences from campus and arrangements made for covering courses.
3. Teach a full course load.
 - a) Faculty are prohibited from "banking courses" or rearranging the standard schedule without explicit permission from the Department Chair and the Dean of the College.⁶
 - b) Faculty who are on administrative appointment may teach a reduced course load to compensate for time given to administrative duties.
4. Prepare conscientiously for classes.
5. Submit a copy of syllabi for courses taught at the start of the semester to the Department Secretary.
6. Attend all Department Committee and *ad hoc* committee meetings.
7. Meet service and advising obligations to the Department, University, and profession appropriate to rank.
8. Meet institutional obligations in research appropriate to rank.
9. Observe University regulations regarding academic conduct, ethics, and behavior as stated in the University's *Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff*, especially in section C.2.e., "The Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct."

⁶ "Banking courses" refers to the practice of concentrating instruction in one semester in order to free up time in another semester. E.g., if a faculty member has a 2/2 teaching load, but chooses to teach 3/1, he or she has "banked" a course. The practice, while feasible in large departments, may distort the curriculum in small departments.