

**Department of English**

**College of Letters, Arts and Sciences  
University of Colorado Colorado Springs**

**Criteria, Standards and Evidence for Reappointment,  
Promotion and Tenure**

**July 1, 2020**

## CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE Department of English

These criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion and tenure in the Department of English at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. Each candidate's case is reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances.

The department is committed to quality teaching, strong scholarly/creative work, faculty mentoring, and effective service to the university, the profession, and the community. The criteria herein have been developed according to the standards as outlined in the Rules of the Regents. When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the work performed in teaching, research, and service during the years granted toward tenure will be considered along with the work performed at UCCS.

The department recognizes the *risk* which can be involved in the pursuit of creative and innovative teaching and research efforts. The "risk factor" of the teaching and research efforts of the candidate is considered in the evaluation of the "success" and quality of the venture. Examples of appropriate criteria for faculty evaluation in the Department of English and items to consider for inclusion in the candidate's dossier are provided at the end of this document. This is a list of suggestions and is *neither* all-inclusive *nor* a list of requirements.

The department recognizes that scholarly and/or creative work can take many forms. Our department recognizes digital scholarship and/or projects as well as the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, creative work, administration, and teaching and learning. We value peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed publications as consistent with value standards in our discipline. Article-length contributions to peer-reviewed and/or refereed, edited books are evaluated in the same fashion as peer-reviewed and/or refereed journal articles. Edited research works, co-authored and/or collaborative work, textbooks, and other publications are recognized as valuable scholarship; in cases of co-authorship or collaboration, scope of work must be indicated. In general, we place greater value on peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed publications. When evaluating scholarship that has not been peer-reviewed, the department considers the venue of publication, the collaborators, the context, the audience, and the funding behind the project. We may also recognize the particular contribution of some non-refereed publications to the field or discipline, but these typically make a lesser contribution to tenure and promotion as consistent with scholarly standards in our field. Peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed publications in the scholarship of pedagogy are recognized. Peer-reviewed and/or edited digital projects, are recognized; in cases of collaboration and/or co-authorship, scope of work must be indicated. In all cases, it is the scholarly/creative quality and contributions to the discipline, not merely its quantity, that guide the evaluation of the faculty member's work. In every case where quantitative volume is not high, it is understood the standards may be adjusted to reflect ongoing work of exceptional quality and contribution to the field.

Our department recognizes that scholarly work may be categorized in different ways. Accomplishments may fall along the spectrum of research, teaching, and service; faculty may choose a categorization, but may not double-count.

We do not use a Faculty Responsibility Statement in evaluating faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure. As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of English have voted **not** to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. Per APS 1022, if the chair of the department does not serve on the PUC, the chair must write a separate letter of evaluation.

## **INITIAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW**

### Teaching:

The candidate's teaching will be evaluated by multiple means, which include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation (see Appendix for examples). In evaluating teaching, size, content, level, student population, and delivery method (e.g. online, hybrid) are considered in interpreting student evaluations. Candidates must show promise as successful and effective teachers. Emphasis is placed on the teaching contribution of the individual. Candidates will demonstrate that their courses are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field. Furthermore, candidates are expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which are good interaction with students, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department are taken into consideration.

### Scholarly/Creative Work:

The department recognizes that scholarly and/or creative work can take many forms. Our department recognizes digital scholarship and/or projects as well as the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, creative work, administration, and teaching and learning. In most cases, peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed scholarly/creative work and publication is valued more highly than non-refereed contributions. When evaluating scholarship that has not been peer-reviewed or refereed, the department considers the venue of publication, the collaborators, the context, the audience, and the funding behind the project. Candidates will present evidence of scholarly/creative work potential and progress toward publication or implementation. This might include copies of drafts or work in progress or submitted for publication or implementation and evidence of performances and readings. Co- authors and/or collaborators must indicate scope of work.

### Leadership and Service:

Candidates will begin a process of identifying appropriate service contributions. Each candidate must have met his or her service obligations in the Department of English, such as department meetings and activities. The candidate will be beginning service contributions within the college, the university, the community, and/or the profession.

## COMPREHENSIVE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. The candidate's record of teaching, research, and service are evaluated separately, indicating whether the candidate is "on track for tenure" and meritorious or excellent in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service; "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections"; or, "not on track for tenure". Each evaluator/committee also separately makes a recommendation regarding reappointment. The program requirements of the primary unit will be considered only at the time of appointment and reappointment. Examples of appropriate criteria for faculty evaluation in the Department of English and items to consider for inclusion in the candidate's dossier are provided at the end of this document. This is a list of suggestions and is *neither* all-inclusive *nor* a list of requirements.

The Comprehensive Reappointment Review is Pre-Tenure.

### Teaching:

Candidates must demonstrate teaching merit as determined by multiple means, beyond that required for Initial Reappointment Review. The candidate will demonstrate strong and effective teaching via (1) student evaluations and (2) two other measures of teaching effectiveness from the examples provided in the appendix to this document. This includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In cases in which this standard is not met, the candidate must provide an explanation for the failure and an appropriate remedial plan. In evaluating teaching, size, content, level, student population, and delivery method (e.g. online, hybrid) are considered in interpreting student evaluations. Progress is expected toward the identification and development of each candidate's niche in the department. Candidates will demonstrate that their courses are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field. Furthermore, candidates will demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which are good interaction with students, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department are taken into consideration. A rating of "on track for tenure" and meritorious in teaching requires evidence of effective teaching as detailed above. A rating of "on track for tenure" and excellence in teaching requires evidence of outstanding achievement, measured qualitatively or quantitatively, in more than one of the measures listed under meritorious above.

### Scholarly/Creative Work:

Candidates must demonstrate scholarly/creative merit as determined by multiple means, beyond that required for Initial Reappointment Review. The department recognizes that scholarly and/or creative work can take many forms. Our department recognizes digital scholarship and/or projects as well as the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, creative work, administration, and teaching and learning. Article-length contributions to peer-reviewed and/or refereed, edited books are evaluated in the same fashion as peer-reviewed and/or refereed journal articles. Edited research works, co-authored and/or collaborative work, textbooks, and other publications are recognized as valuable scholarship; in cases of co-authorship or collaboration, scope of work must be indicated. In most cases, peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed scholarly/creative works and publications are valued more highly than non-refereed contributions. When evaluating scholarship that has not been peer-reviewed or refereed, the department considers the venue of publication, the collaborators, the context, the

audience, and the funding behind the project. Peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed publications in the scholarship of pedagogy are recognized. Peer-reviewed and/or edited digital projects are recognized; in cases of collaboration and/or co-authorship, scope of work must be indicated. A rating of “on track for tenure” and meritorious in scholarly/creative work requires evidence of scholarly/creative merit as described above. A rating of “on track for tenure” and excellent in scholarly/creative work requires evidence of outstanding achievement, measured qualitatively or quantitatively, in more than one of the measures listed under meritorious above. In all cases, it is the scholarly/creative quality and contributions to the discipline, not merely its quantity, that guide the evaluation of the faculty member's work. In every case where quantitative volume is not high, it is understood the standards may be adjusted to reflect ongoing work of exceptional quality and contribution to the field.

#### Leadership and Service:

The department recognizes service to the campus, community, and to our profession. A rating of “on track for tenure” and meritorious in service requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions are be considered. A rating of “on track for tenure” and excellence in service requires meeting service responsibilities within the department as well as multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, and/or profession.

### **TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

The candidate’s record in teaching, research, and service are each evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must be rated as, at least, meritorious in all three areas and must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or research. Examples of appropriate criteria for faculty evaluation in the Department of English and items to consider for inclusion in the candidate’s dossier are provided at the end of this document. This is a list of suggestions and is *neither* all-inclusive *nor* a list of requirements.

In this review, we require the minimum number of external letters required by the Regents, though more may be included. It is essential that a majority of the reviewers have neither collaborated with nor mentored the candidates.

Per Regents Rules, tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership/service, *and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or scholarly/creative work.*

#### Teaching:

Candidates must demonstrate teaching merit as determined by multiple means, beyond that required for the comprehensive reappointment review. The candidate is expected to demonstrate strong and effective teaching via (1) student evaluations and (2) two other measures of teaching effectiveness from the examples provided in the appendix to this document. This includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. In evaluating teaching, course size, level, student population, and delivery method (e.g. online, hybrid) are considered in interpreting student evaluations. A

rating of meritorious requires evidence of effective teaching. Candidates will demonstrate that their courses are coherently organized, thoughtfully presented, and that they deal with significant areas in the field. Furthermore, candidates will demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which are good interaction with students, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department are taken into consideration. A rating of excellent requires evidence of outstanding achievement, measured qualitatively or quantitatively, in more than one of the measures listed under meritorious above.

### **Required by the Regents of CU: Impact of Teaching Beyond the Immediate Instructional Setting.**

A rating of excellent is determined in totality. One component is that there must be evidence of some achievement beyond the “immediate instructional setting.” Per Regents Rules, the department of English identifies the immediate instructional setting as the place where regular assigned teaching occurs. Thus, any teaching impact at the departmental, campus, or community level demonstrates the impact of teaching and learning beyond the candidate’s immediate instructional setting.

### Scholarly/Creative Work:

Candidates will present evidence of substantive scholarly and/or creative work. The department recognizes that scholarly and/or creative work can take many forms. Our department recognizes digital scholarship and/or projects as well as the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, creative work, administration, and teaching and learning. Article-length contributions to peer-reviewed and/or refereed, edited books are evaluated in the same fashion as peer-reviewed and/or refereed journal articles. Edited research works, co-authored and/or collaborative work, textbooks, and other publications are recognized as valuable scholarship; in cases of co-authorship or collaboration, scope of work must be indicated. In most cases, peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed scholarly/creative works and publications are valued more highly than non-refereed contributions. When evaluating scholarship that has not been peer-reviewed or refereed, the department considers the venue of publication, the collaborators, the context, the audience, and the funding behind the project. Peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed publications in the scholarship of pedagogy are recognized. Peer-reviewed and/or edited digital projects are recognized; in cases of collaboration and/or co-authorship, scope of work must be indicated. In all cases, it is the scholarly/creative quality and contributions to the discipline, not merely its quantity, that guide the evaluation of the faculty member’s work. In every case where quantitative volume is not high, it is understood the standards may be adjusted to reflect ongoing work of exceptional quality and contribution to the field.

To receive a rating of meritorious, candidates must demonstrate that they have met various criteria listed in the appendix under “Scholarly/Creative Work.” A rating of excellent requires evidence of outstanding achievement, measured qualitatively or quantitatively, in more than one of the measures listed under meritorious above.

### Leadership and Service:

The department recognizes service to the campus, community, and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and service to the college, campus, community, and/or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus,

community, and/or profession. In evaluating service, both the quality and quantity of service contributions are considered.

## **PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service are evaluated as a whole as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. Promotion requires "a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service." Examples of appropriate criteria for faculty evaluation in the Department of English and items to consider for inclusion in the candidate's dossier are provided at the end of this document. This is a list of suggestions and is *neither* all-inclusive *nor* a list of requirements.

In this review, we require the minimum number of external letters required by the Regents, though more may be included. It is essential that a majority of the reviewers have neither collaborated with nor mentored the candidates.

### Teaching:

The candidate will demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which includes, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities will be considered here. In evaluating teaching, size, level, content, student population, and delivery method (e.g. online, hybrid) are considered in interpreting student evaluations. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be demonstrated through meeting various criteria as listed in the appendix under "Teaching."

### Scholarly/Creative Work:

The department recognizes that scholarly and/or creative work can take many forms. Our department recognizes digital scholarship and/or projects as well as the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, creative work, administration, and teaching and learning. Article-length contributions to peer-reviewed and/or refereed, edited books are evaluated in the same fashion as peer-reviewed and/or refereed journal articles. Edited research works, co-authored and/or collaborative work, textbooks, and other publications are recognized as valuable scholarship; in cases of co-authorship or collaboration, scope of work must be indicated. In most cases, peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed scholarly/creative works and publications are valued more highly than non-refereed contributions. When evaluating scholarship that has not been peer-reviewed or refereed, the department considers the venue of publication, the collaborators, the context, the audience, and the funding behind the project. Peer-reviewed, edited, and/or refereed publications in the scholarship of pedagogy are recognized. Peer-reviewed and/or edited digital projects are recognized; in cases of collaboration and/or co-authorship, scope of work must be indicated. In all cases, it is the scholarly/creative quality and contributions to the discipline, not merely its quantity, that guide

the evaluation of the faculty member's work. In every case where quantitative volume is not high, it is understood the standards may be adjusted to reflect ongoing work of exceptional quality and contribution to the field.

Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure must be demonstrated through areas of research as seen in the appendix under "Scholarly/Creative Work," including scholarly/creative publication. Substantive scholarship may be evaluated quantitatively and/or qualitatively.

#### Leadership and Service:

The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions are considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in service since tenure must be demonstrated through a discussion of service progress in the department, college, campus, university, community and in our profession. We recognize that different faculty at this level fulfill this requirement very differently. The appendix lists some examples that may be considered.

### **POST-TENURE REVIEW**

Recognizing the many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define "meeting expectations" for purposes of post-tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met: 1) having achieved a rating of "meeting expectations" or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review, 2) having addressed the faculty member's previous professional plan, and 3) having submitted a new and acceptable professional plan that indicates an ability to achieve "meeting expectations" or higher ratings in the future. If a faculty member diverges from the current professional plan, the committee will consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the divergence such that a rating of "meeting expectations" is still appropriate. Ratings of "exceeding expectations" or "outstanding" are awarded for exceeding these standards.

The following criteria are to be considered guidelines for evaluation of candidates for post-tenure review in the Department of English at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case is reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching and scholarship, and effective service to the university, the profession, and/or the community. The evaluation process assumes conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

The Department recognizes that annual merit reviews alone may not account for factors it wishes to take into consideration when determining the criteria for a rating of meeting expectations or higher in a post-tenure review.

Teaching: Faculty will not have a consistent pattern of substantiated negative behavior regarding teaching. Such behavior may include, but is not limited to, consistent disrespectful behavior toward students (e.g., inaccessibility, excessive missing of classes, mistreatment of students,



harassment of students) or poor teaching (e.g., lack of substance in teaching, extreme tardiness in grading, capricious standards for classroom performance, ill-defined curriculum or course planning).

Research: Faculty will not have substantiated negative behavior regarding research. Such behavior may include, but is not limited to, plagiarism, falsification of data or results, unethical treatment of research participants, or mismanagement of research funds.

Service: Faculty will not have substantiated negative behavior regarding service. Such behavior may include, but is not limited to, disrespect toward or harassment of other faculty and staff; flagrant disregard for department, campus, or system policies; disengagement from service activities (e.g., repeated arbitrary or unexcused instances of not attending faculty meetings or other committee meetings), misrepresentation of self in the community, misuse of university resources.

## **EXAMPLES OF APPROPRIATE CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION AND MATERIAL FOR INCLUSION IN DOSSIERS, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**

This is a list of suggestions and is *neither* all-inclusive *nor* a list of requirements. Items are not ranked or grouped in any order of importance. There is no expectation by the Department of English that these are the only things that might be used or that all of these items must be used.

### **A. TEACHING**

1. Student Evaluation of Teaching
2. Teaching Awards and Other Outstanding Accomplishments in Instruction
3. Peer Evaluation of Teaching
4. Alumni Evaluation
5. Doctoral Dissertation and Master's Thesis Supervision and Graduate Committee Contributions
6. Advising and Mentoring of Students
7. Educating Teachers About Pedagogy at Any Educational Level Within or Beyond UCCS
8. Creativity and Innovation in Teaching
9. Participation in Teaching-Related Subject Activities
10. Effectiveness of Students in Succeeding Courses and/or in the Pursuit of Graduate Education and/or in Careers
11. Student Supervision in Professional Experience Activities, Internships, Research, Scholarships, and/or Independent Studies
12. Assessment of Students in English Degree Plans
13. Preparation of Course Material
14. Student Development/Encouragement (Centers of Excellence, Library Knowledge, Learning Disability Recognition, Encouragement of Students)
15. Course Organization
16. New Course Development, Including Development of Courses in Different Modes, such as Online, Hybrid, and/or Other Future Formats.
17. Participating in Teaching Improvement Activity (Workshops, Conferences)
18. Teaching Contribution at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado Colorado Springs
19. Risk Factor Involved in the Teaching Venture
20. Contributions of Teaching to Diversity
21. Pedagogical Community Outreach, e.g. Workshops and Activities Conducted for Teachers at Any Level Outside of UCCS
22. Creation of Teaching Related Documents
23. Letters of Recommendation Written for Students
24. Letters from Former Students
25. Observing, Writing Letters of Support, and/or Mentoring of Teachers at any level Within or Beyond UCCS

26. Development of New Academic Programs
27. Authoring or Co-Authoring Textbooks Adopted by Other Educational Institutions
28. Scholarly Research and Presentation or Publication on Teaching and Learning
29. Pedagogical Development Grants
30. Publications on Pedagogical Methods

## **B. SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE WORK**

1. Peer Judged Articles and Book Chapters
2. Peer Judged/ Refereed Single-authored Books
3. Peer Judged/ Refereed Co-Authored Books
4. Edited Volumes from Refereed Presses
5. Edited Journal Special Issues
6. Peer Judged and/or Edited Digital Projects and Research, e.g. Programs, Artifacts, Archives, Web-Based “Living” Texts, and so on.
7. Edited Research Works
8. Textbooks
9. Non-Reviewed Digital Projects and Research, e.g. Programs, Artifacts, Archives, Web-Based “Living” Texts, and so on.
10. Managerial and/or Curatorial Work Related to Research
11. Papers Submitted for Presentation at Professional Conferences and/or Workshops
12. Papers Accepted for Presentation at Professional Conferences and/or Workshops
13. Papers Presented at Professional Conferences and/or Workshops
14. Public Presentations of Research
15. Proposing and Organizing a Conference Panel
16. Chairing a Conference Panel by invitation
17. Chairing a Conference Panel
18. Grant Applications Awarded
19. Grant Application Submissions (awarded or not)
20. Recognition by other Scholars of Research and Publications
21. Creative Work (indicate quality of publication venue/ peer judged/refereed/edited or other measure)
22. New Media Composing (indicate quality of publication venue/ peer judged/refereed/edited or other measure)
23. Performances (indicate quality of venue/ peer judged/refereed or other measure)
24. Readings (indicate quality of venue/ peer judged/refereed or other measure)
25. Unsponsored Research
26. Professional Reputation (Both Inside and Outside University)
27. Evidence of Capacity for Future Achievements (for the purpose of the annual merit reviews)
28. Participation in Development Workshops
29. Participation in Career Development Activity (Workshops, Conference, Summer Schools, etc)
30. Long-Term Research Projects
31. Expert and Technical Consultation on Research Projects
32. Role Modeling and Mentoring of Research on Any Educational Level
33. Risk Factor Involved in the Research Venture
34. Peer Reviewed publications in Conference Proceedings

35. Reviewing Books in Scholarly Journals
36. Contributions to Diversity
37. Exhibits in Scholarly Venues
38. Inclusion of Undergraduates in Research
39. Non-Refereed Publications

### **C. LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE**

1. University Committees
2. Administrative Service
3. Service to the Profession and Discipline (Local, State, National, International Level)
4. Consultation and Public Service
5. Letters of Recommendation or Support for Colleagues
6. Nominating Students or Colleagues for Fellowships, Awards, etc.
7. Non-Reviewed Digital Public Humanities Projects
8. Non-Reviewed Digital Humanities Projects Prepared for Professional Organizations
9. Digital Humanities Projects Prepared for the Public/Community
10. Mentoring on Any Educational Level
11. Reviewing Research Proposals
12. Reviewing Grant Proposals
13. Refereeing Book Manuscripts, Article Manuscripts, and/or Conference Paper Proposals
14. Attending Commencement Ceremonies
15. Participation at Professional Conferences, Specifically Organizational Activities (Organizational Activities, Local Planning Committees, Site Visit Details, Activities Involved in Local, Regional and National Meetings, etc.)
16. Membership In and/or Office-holding in Professional Associations
17. Service Contribution to Education at Any Level and at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado
18. Contributions in Faculty Governance
19. Contributions of Service to Diversity
20. Managerial and/or Curatorial Work as Service

College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences  
Department of English RPT Criteria  
Version History

*Version 1: Initial Version*

Approved by the English tenured/tenure track faculty, 4/15/2020

Approved by Interim Dean Rex Welshon, 4/18/2020

Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 6/26/2020

Effective date, 7/1/2020

---