

**The Time Management Matrix Re-Tooled: An Instrument for
Academics Navigating the Tenure Process**

Mark DeBeliso

Southern Utah University, Utah, USA

Howard Gauthier

Idaho State University, Idaho, USA

Trish Sevene

California State University Monterey Bay, California, USA

Kent J. Adams

California State University Monterey Bay, California, USA

Marcus M. Lawrence

Southern Utah University, Utah, USA

Mike Climstein

South Cross University, Queensland, Australia

Joseph Berning

New Mexico State University, New Mexico, USA

Chad Harris

Metropolitan State University of Denver, Colorado, USA

James W. Navalta

University of Nevada Las Vegas, Nevada, USA

Abstract

The crown of a successful academic career is often considered an achievement of tenure. The path to tenure may vary based on the type of Carnegie University at which one is employed. Carnegie Doctoral granting R1 Universities place a high priority on conducting research, grant writing and publishing while other Carnegie classified Universities place more emphasis on teaching. Regardless of a University's Carnegie classification the path to tenure requires sound time management skills if an academic is to achieve tenure. To

that end, the authors have decided to revisit Covey's Time Management Matrix (CTMM). The authors provide an ethnographic perspective with respect to the Quadrants of the CTMM for the purpose of providing a priority driven time self-management instrument to assist academics navigating towards tenure. Priority driven effective time self-management is key to successfully achieving tenure and we forward our academic interpretation of the CTMM as a potential guide for academics and their administrators. Further, the authors suggest that a priority driven effective time self-management strategy is portable across disciplines and national/cultural borders.

Keywords: Time efficiency, productivity, prioritization, Covey

For faculty members who have been hired on a tenure-track appointment, receiving tenure is a highly valued goal. Typically, gaining academic tenure is a five to six year process. Frequently, two potential problems arise for junior faculty members seeking tenure. First, on many college campuses the steps to achieving tenure may not have clear metrics and therefore the targets are a bit ambiguous. Second, a faculty member in their new tenure-track position may become overwhelmed with trying to learn and navigate the inner workings of the department, college, university, and academic campus life in general. As time is spent navigating these university-related waters, it also begins to slip away as the tenure clock continues to tick. Therefore, the new faculty member needs to clearly understand the tenure targets and minimum standards and focus almost immediately on meeting tenure achieving activities in teaching, research, and service. For example, the tenure requirements at a research oriented institution such as the University of Las Vegas Nevada (UNLV, n.d.) are rather different from those at a teaching focused institution such as Southern Utah University (SUU, n.d.).

Ultimately, the responsibility of understanding the scholarship targets that need to be met for tenure falls upon the new tenure-track faculty member. It is important that junior faculty members read and thoroughly understand the college and university policies and procedures that pertain to achieving tenure. This will assist them as they begin to create short-term, intermediate, and long-term goals for teaching, research, and service activities. New faculty members should seek out an on-campus mentor, preferably a senior academic with both sound familiarity and success in the tenure process who can

help clarify the goals that need to be achieved. It is also important that the new faculty members seek to build positive and supportive relationships with their department chair and other faculty members within their college. It is our collective opinion that these relationships will greatly aid the junior faculty members as they navigate the tenure waters.

The next step is to be critically aware that the tenure clock has begun and that time can easily slip away. Therefore, it is imperative that new faculty members begin to implement a time management plan for achieving the goals and objectives of tenure. This time management plan should include measurable short-term, intermediate, and long-term goals, along with timelines to achieve these goals. In writing and implementing the time management plan, the faculty member needs to understand which activities are deemed urgent, which are important, and which activities are unimportant (Covey, 2013). For each goal, action steps should be established where an overall plan is developed (i.e., macro plan) and then the plan is broken down into several short-term goals or action steps (micro plans within the macro plan). For example, how many publications and external grants does the new faculty member plan on attaining prior to application for tenure? Regarding teaching, what metric scores are they aiming for (e.g., an overall rating of > 4 out of 5) or what requirements must be met (e.g., peer evaluations, self-reflections, and student evaluations). Service is also highly valued with regard to tenure and includes commitments such as department, college and university committee work, and membership and contributions to professional associations. Furthermore, many institutions are now requiring extension and outreach whereby faculty are expected to contribute their expertise to the public sector within their community and state. All of these obligations lead to an exceptional amount of time and rarely do faculty ever work less than 50-60 hour work weeks. In fact, many faculty, as they pursue tenure, often spend well over 60 hours a week balancing all the obligations required by their contractual and annual evaluation agreements (Ziker, 2014).

Assuming a faculty member is engaged in the aforementioned taxing workload, it would be tough to assume that a lack of effort is responsible for a failed tenure applicant. Perlmutter (2008) states: “one of the main reasons people fail to get tenure is that they are fighting the wrong war on the wrong battlefield”. As such, we

collectively view a lack of appropriate prioritization as a root cause of a non-successful tenure applicant.

Given the aforementioned, the authors have decided to reach back in time and re-examine the priority driven time self-management tool presented by Covey (2013). Covey’s classic work *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* presents a balanced, priority driven, self-time management matrix which we refer to as CTMM (see Figure 1). As such, the purpose of the current examination was to retrofit the CTMM as specific to the academic environment to serve as an instrument to assist faculty in successfully navigating the tenure journey.

Figure 1
Time Management Matrix with Quadrants I-IV

	Urgent	Not Urgent
Important	I <i>Activities:</i> Crises Pressing problems Deadline-driven projects	II <i>Activities:</i> Prevention, PC activities Relationship building Recognizing new opportunities Planning, recreation
Not Important	III <i>Activities:</i> Interruptions, some calls Some mail, some reports Some meetings Proximate, pressing matters Popular activities	IV <i>Activities:</i> Trivia, busywork Some mail Some phone calls Time wasters Pleasant activities

Note. Covey’s Time Management Matrix with Quadrants I-IV (Covey, 2013) with permission of Franklin Covey Co.

The CTMM and the Authors

The CTMM is illustrated in Figure 1. Specific to the CTMM are the Quadrants of relative priority; urgent, not urgent, important, and not important. Each Quadrant in the CTMM has a list of activities that fit within the cross section of relative priorities. The authors have examined each Quadrant from an ethnographic academic

interpretation of the various activities listed in the Quadrants. Ethnographies are characterized by observers being completely immersed in a particular environment (Thomas et al., 2015). The authors of the current manuscript have been collectively immersed in the academic environment for over 150 years. They have been tenured and promoted at both teaching and research institutions; served on numerous tenure and promotion evaluation committees at department, college, and university levels; and been involved with tenure and promotion policy development at a variety of institutions. The results of the aforementioned interpretations are provided in the applications sections. Examples are not meant to be exhaustive but rather to demonstrate the usefulness of the CTMM in academic environments. With that said, the authors forward that the CTMM retrofitted for the academic environment would be portable and serve useful for academics pursuing tenure/promotion transcending disciplines and national/cultural borders (see International Application).

Applications to Junior Faculty

The CTMM presents four Quadrants that might appear to contain activities that are unique to each Quadrant. However, the transition from one Quadrant to another is not necessarily discreet in nature. Specifically, some activities may appear in more than one Quadrant but differ in the context of a given scenario. Likewise, for the purpose of this manuscript, we have stretched the boundaries of Quadrant II in order to provide a more comprehensive scope of important activities that a tenure track faculty member may need to engage.

Quadrant I: Important and Urgent

Important priority activities take place to address high priority goals (Covey, 2013). Urgent priority activities attempt to resolve an issue that requires immediate attention (Covey, 2013). Issues that require immediate attention are often thrust upon a faculty member and hence require an urgent response. Such issues are unavoidable and to a certain degree are part of the typical work day/week. Conversely, some issues that require immediate attention are the result of poor proactive planning by the faculty member or some layer of bureaucracy on campus. The cross section of the priorities of important and urgent make up the activities that occupy Quadrant I.

As a general paradigm we propose that Quadrant I activities will arise to address issues originating from 3 sources: external, internal, and typical academic deadlines.

- As of the writing of this manuscript the COVID-19 pandemic has been impacting every aspect of life including higher education. As such, faculty may have had to alter their methods of communication, physical student interaction, modality of course delivery, and scheduling. Further, with the mental health issues rising on campuses, one must be prepared to respond with appropriate support and referral to mental health professionals when a crisis occurs (Sevene, Adams, Climstein, et al., 2020).

This scenario is what we would refer to as a “crisis” that is both urgent and important; driven by a source external to the university environment.

- Donors or potential donors (or other constituents) that you have met in the community may drop in randomly since they were on campus for another engagement. These types of interruptions have to be met with tact and cordiality as they could set the stage for meaningful relationship building and fundraising (more on this point in upcoming section Quadrant II).
- Other sources of “crisis” that are both urgent and important but are driven internal to the University may be the result of an administrative mishap. For example, an administrator knows that a college level seven-year review is due to an accrediting body and does not temporally plan to have the report completed with a cushion for internal peer review. The faculty under the particular administrator will likely now be thrown into “crisis” mode. Or conversely, consider a high ranking campus administrator unnecessarily creating compressed timelines to complete campus wide efforts, the outcome, a “crisis” that the faculty will have to respond to.
- Typical academic ongoing deadlines that are both important and urgent include:
 - ✓ Tenure and annual evaluation deadlines
 - ✓ Curricular change(s) deadlines

- ✓ Program review deadlines
- ✓ Required HR training (e.g., Title 9)
- ✓ Grading
- Scholarship opportunities such as grants often have deadlines that become urgent due to the nature of the process (e.g., routing signature sheets, budgets, etc.) and the involvement of different collaborators and divisions across campus. While we urge diligence in Quadrant II, one must be prepared for urgency when it arises.
- Mismanaging editorial work (e.g., peer reviews) can lead to urgency in meeting timelines and harm the quality of your work (including other areas of scholarship).
- At times one is asked to pick up a new course to teach or switch courses at the last minute, in a sense creating deadline driven teaching until one can carve out some time to get ahead of the curve.
- Faculty members should seek sound proactive planning in order to minimize Quadrant I activities that could be attended to in a non-urgent fashion (Quadrant II).
- Finally, all faculty members have challenging days. Sometimes recognizing this as an urgent situation, dropping what they are doing, and taking a mental health break leads to enhanced capacity and productivity and improve one's morale.

Quadrant II: Important and Not Urgent

Covey (2013) regards the activities that inhabit Quadrant II as those that are prioritized and habitually engaged in by successful professionals. The authors of the current manuscript agree with Covey's (2013) postulate. With that said, the authors of the current manuscript have expanded Quadrant II to include additional important activities that if not managed in a prioritized temporal manner could easily shift to Quadrant I activities (i.e., crises).

- Covey (2013) discusses the need to be balanced with respect to productivity and capacity to be further productive. As such, faculty need to identify their priority goals and values first, then strategically plan and deliberately engage the associated activities in temporal fashion to avoid them becoming Quadrant I activities.

Covey (2013) recommends planning in one week blocks to facilitate the effectiveness of this strategy.

- In order to achieve tenure a faculty member will need to demonstrate a long term pattern of successful teaching effectiveness that is developmental in nature. The activities associated with the developmental aspect of becoming an effective educator (e.g., facilitating learning through innovative instruction, developing assessment strategies, curriculum and program development, mentoring student research, etc.) require a significant and ongoing time commitment. The aforementioned developmental activities should be considered as a Quadrant II must.
- Covey (2013) identified relationship building as Quadrant II activity. The authors of the current study agree that positive relationship building is of particular importance for a faculty member aspiring to achieve tenure. Establishing trust with colleagues, staff, administrators, students, and community members is the foundation for a productive career. Graduate students represent mentoring opportunities with a potential high return on investment, in both the short and long term. Developing positive relationships is typically accompanied by trust. Investing time to develop positive relationships should be considered as an absolute must for all faculty regardless of tenure status as it lends itself to a productive and collegial work atmosphere best suited to serve the needs of the students and the university.
- Relationship building with your donors, potential donors, and community constituents is also crucial and demands time and attention. Again, the investment has payoff both professionally and personally.
- A natural outcome of relationship building provides a segue to another Quadrant II activity; “recognizing new opportunities” (Covey, 2013). New opportunities could take the form of faculty involvement in various learning communities. For example, some learning communities are dedicated to the development of a faculty member’s skill set with regards to pedagogy. Yet another new opportunity might be the development of a community

service contact or a research team (or inclusion into an existing team). These new relationships are integral to attaining metrics towards tenure, particularly with regard to research teams which facilitates publications. Junior faculty should use care however and differentiate new opportunities with a high chance for tenure related outcomes.

- The benchmarks regarding the amount and type of scholarship at a given University vary depending on designation (R-1, regional teaching, etc.). As such, it is recommended that faculty stay current in their discipline by engaging in academic writing (including publications, grants, presentations, etc.). Think of a pipeline approach where you always have research projects in all phases of action (e.g., in-press, in-review, in data collection, in planning, etc.). This strategy ensures continued academic productivity.
- Taking time to purposefully think about your research (i.e., planning, reviewing the literature, creating, innovating, etc.) will allow the conducting of research (planning, calibration, data collection, etc.) to be as productive as possible.
- The manner in which academic writing is disseminated is also worth considering. Ideally the high impact factor journals in a discipline are considered the crown jewels. Some of these journals have lengthy review periods (12-18 months) and excessive article processing charges. Therefore, faculty should be strategic with regards to the journal they are submitting their manuscripts to, as the ultimate metric is the published dissemination of the research results.
- Editorial work (e.g., peer review) that is planned, targeted, and appropriately managed can help develop your reputation, inform your research, and lead to editorial board invitations.
- Covey (2013) discusses the need to be balanced with respect to productivity and capacity to be further productive. Taking time to exercise and recreate is considered a Quadrant II activity as it is considered a mechanism to revitalize the faculty member, or what

Covey refers to as productive capacity building (or sharpening the saw) (Covey, 2013). The academic work environment is ideally suited to allow for this type of activity due to the flexibility of an academic's typical work day/week. The cognitive, physical, emotional and social wellbeing of an individual are all positively benefited by regular physical activity and exercise (World Health Organization, 2020; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018; Elmagd, 2016). The authors of the current paper contend that if a faculty member is serious-minded about attaining tenure, then regular exercise following well-established guidelines should be considered a must (World Health Organization, 2020; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018).

- Faculty should consider the use of technology as an integral aspect of teaching effectiveness and conducting research (Saad, & Sankaran, 2020). Staying current with regards to communication devices/platforms, research instrumentation, and software should be considered as a “lifelong learning process”. However, we are not suggesting that every new bell and whistle technological gadget be employed, rather the faculty member be aware of and adopt new technology when it improves teaching and learning and/or scholarly effectiveness. As of writing this manuscript, the planet is immersed in the COVID-19 pandemic. Those faculty who have stayed current with regards to technology and communication have likely had a far less difficult time maintaining their teaching effectiveness as instruction modalities moved to online delivery.
- Service related activities such as committee assignments can be time consuming and vary in emphasis on different campuses. Typically, your tenure portfolio will be evaluated primarily on your teaching effectiveness and scholarly productivity. Committing your time to service related activities should be strategic and kept to the minimum. Be careful of what you volunteer for. If you find yourself getting inundated with committee ‘busy work’, it is highly recommended to say ‘no’ justifying your response with all the items you already are obligated

to complete. This is also where advice from your Chair or mentor may be key, especially if you have built a relationship of understanding with them.

Quadrant III: Not Important and Urgent

Non important activities are those that do not translate into achievement of goals towards attaining tenure. However, a portion of established academic responsibilities requires faculty to engage in urgent yet not important activities. Below are some examples of activities found in Quadrant III. Recognizing and minimizing engagement in these not important activities is essential for a priority driven time self-management strategy.

- While in your office you will likely find yourself dealing with many urgent yet unimportant activities/tasks. For example, a student shows up at your door outside of your scheduled office hours. The perceived need by the student becomes urgent for you because they will not leave without your immediate attention. Likewise, any colleague, staff member or administrator will command your immediate attention to address their concerns if they show up at your door. A certain amount of these tasks is part of the responsibilities of weekly operations. However, there are some tactics to help mitigate the urgency aspect of the aforementioned activities. For example, if a student shows up at your door outside of your scheduled office hours and requires immediate engagement, politely let them know that you only have a set amount of time now (no more than 5 minutes) but would be happy to talk more at length during your next scheduled office hours. You may consider a simple “Do Not Disturb” sign on your door. This is usually enough to dissuade most individuals. Incoming phone calls during office hours are often Quadrant III activities. The incoming phone call only becomes urgent if you answer the phone. If you are not prepared to take the phone call, it may be a good practice to let the caller leave a voice mail. Then the faculty member can respond in a less urgent fashion and in a prepared fashion.

- Many meetings require your urgent presence but often times are not of importance to your achievement of goals towards attaining tenure. Volunteering to attend meetings that do not directly move a faculty member towards tenure should be avoided (see comments in Quadrant II regarding relationship building). The same can be said for impromptu committees that will not be recognized as service.
- Some emails are urgent in nature and require immediate action on the faculty member's part and yet are of little importance. When students send emails to their professors they expect an immediate response regardless of the nature of the email or the time of day (weekday or weekend). Creating a personal policy regarding email responses and including it on course syllabi can decrease such interruptions. Timely responses to professionally related email are a sound practice; however, one must be purposeful when determining whether a response is necessary.

Quadrant IV: Not Important and Not Urgent

Reducing Quadrant IV activities is the best way to make time available for more priority Quadrants I and II (Covey, 2013). Below are some examples of activities found in Quadrant IV. Recognizing and avoiding (and/or minimizing) engagement in these time consuming activities is essential for a priority driven time self-management strategy.

- You will likely encounter individuals who confuse communication with productivity. These individuals can take up much of your time. To avoid this, consider signage on your office door (e.g., Dr. Doe is in and available or Dr. Doe is in however not available).
- While email is clearly a necessity to communicate, it can also be a temporal drain. There is an abundance of University emails making announcements/FYIs which affect very few people. It's highly recommended not to spend much if any time reading these sorts of emails. Cal Newport (2016) in his book *Deep Work* suggests deleting any email that could be resolved by the sender in doing a

5-minute Google search. Newport also suggests deleting any email where the sender says “thoughts” in place of some well thought out question(s). However, if your Chair, Dean or Provost are asking for your thoughts, it is not advisable to delete the request. Rather ask for specifics as to what they need and when it is needed by.

- Be prepared to stick with your personal priorities when facing emergency tasks delivered in an untimely fashion by others. Many of these may go unnoticed when your tenure evaluation occurs. If the task cannot be avoided request a communication outlining what you accomplished so it may be added to your tenure portfolio (i.e., letter from Chair or Dean). Keep in mind, when you apply for tenure, you may have a different Chair, Dean and/or Provost. As such, the aforementioned documentation is a must. The author’s collective experience suggests that a faculty member should not assume that a new administrator’s tenure perspective will be aligned with the spirit and specifics of the tenure criteria in place at the time of the faculty member’s date of appointment.
- In contrast to the planning recommended as related to Quadrant II activities, too often faculty “plan to plan” rather than working to achieve a desired outcome. Avoid spending too much time thinking about or discussing a plan and neglecting actual action.
- Beware of spending time on a “pet project.” Such activities are better postponed until tenure is achieved. We realize every once in a while someone strikes gold, but in most cases these types of projects are unrelated to the individual’s scholarship areas and have no relevance to achieving tenure.

Application to Leaders

It is clear that the academic tenure process is tedious, time consuming, and that guidance is needed in order for the junior faculty member to gain successful promotion and tenure. That is where the role of the leader comes in. The leader within the tenure process may be the department’s Chairperson, the college Dean, a senior tenured

faculty member (mentor), or even the Provost in some institutions. The role of this leader is to inspire, encourage and support the tenure-seeking faculty member, and to help guide them through the tenure process. Using the CTMM as viewed through an academic lens, may help both the leader in their mentoring and the junior faculty member in developing and acting on their strategic plan to successfully achieve tenure.

Academic leaders need to take a proactive role so that junior faculty members are not left to fend for themselves in the years leading up to tenure. Responsible and effective leaders create a climate that supports the faculty members and provides them with guidance about the process. This supportive environment needs to include the building of trusting relationships through proper and effective communication. More than just providing proper guidelines, timelines, and information on the tenure format, the leader will want to create a psychologically safe environment for the faculty members through verbal and non-verbal actions known as belonging cues. Belonging cues are behaviors and actions the leader communicates to the faculty member signaling they are safe in the organization, and that the leader welcomes questions and input from the faculty member (Coyle, 2018).

It is recommended that each junior faculty member have a mentor who can share what targets need to be met and at what time period within the tenure process. A mentor can also help the faculty member identify synergies and connections between the scholarship areas (e.g., how can your research inform your teaching and service), thereby helping to create an efficient and successful plan. Further, Smith (2020) states: “research and teaching are linked; deep content knowledge gained through research can positively impact student success” (p. 182); suggesting that time committed to research can be done so in a synergistic fashion to enhance teaching and student learning. Such synergies can be thought of as examples of intentional congruence.

In some cases, finding or being assigned a faculty mentor who is not in the department can provide for an unbiased view on how to be successful. However, when being matched with a mentor, it is important that the individual has worked in a similar environment as the faculty (e.g., if research is expected, match with a successful research faculty; or if assessment will be primarily on teaching, then a

match with someone who has had most of their workload allocation in teaching should be chosen).

By following these guidelines of building a positive and supportive climate, by building strong relationships with the junior faculty members, and by effectively communicating the process, the academic leader is providing the support and tools necessary for the junior faculty member to effectively advance toward academic tenure.

International Application

The proposed CTMM also has wide international application, albeit with subtle differences. For example, in South America (Brazil) even though Federal university professors are considered public servants who acquire tenure automatically after three years, there are five hierarchal classes (each has four levels). Progression across the levels and classes is accompanied by predetermined salary increases. As such, the CTTM applies similarly in that a priority driven effective time self-management strategy would prove useful in order to successfully navigate the aforementioned progressions.

Whilst in Australia and other Asia Pacific and European settings academic institutions do not offer tenure per se, the equivalent of tenure is referred to as the probationary period. The probation period is the specified period of time, generally three years for new academic staff, where the new faculty member's academic performance (and conduct) is subject to a yearly and final formal assessment at the end of their probationary period by their supervisor, Department Head and Dean of the Faculty.

The expectations with regard to teaching, research and service are not specific to the classification of the University, rather, the type of academic appointment. The majority of academic appointments in Australia for example, are teaching and research, where the faculty member has 60 percent of their workload allocated to teaching, 30 percent allocation to research and 10 percent allocated to service (institutional, community and key industry stakeholders). Other academic appointments include teaching scholars (i.e., exclusively teaching) and lastly research focused (i.e., exclusively research). Regardless of the academic appointment, the CTMM provides a strategy for new faculty members independent of International boundaries to effectively manage time with a focus on efficient and consistent production.

Furthermore, once an applicant has successfully completed their probation period, the proposed CTMM also has direct application with regard to the promotion process where teaching, research and service accomplishments are again evaluated, however by a more rigorous process which includes review by a committee of senior faculty (departmental and non-departmental) and the Vice Chancellor. Once again, junior faculty members are strongly advised to seek guidance from senior academics who have recently navigated the promotion process successfully for insight into developing the application. If the faculty member is invited to an interview with the promotions committee, they should again seek insight and guidance from senior faculty members who have recently completed this process successively. New faculty members should seek the advice and guidance from faculty both at the level at which they are applying and those who were successful at higher academic levels (i.e., Senior Lectures, Associate Professors). In the end, one's production in all areas of scholarship will be formally assessed per the specific standards of one's institution; and production, self-driven by efficient time management processes is key to a successful review.

Final Thoughts

It is also advisable that the junior faculty member seek recent, successful tenure applications as a template in development of their own application. Additionally, the junior faculty member should seek peer review and feedback on their application. This should include colleagues who were successful in attaining tenure and senior academics (i.e., supervisor, department Chair and Dean). Applications have strict guidelines which need to be observed to ensure the application reaches the consideration stage by the committee. Late applications are never accepted, so be aware of critical deadlines. Not strictly adhering to word limits or neglecting to clearly address tenure standards and criteria is a recipe for disaster and disappointment, including having to seek a new job.

Additionally, use metrics whenever available to support your academic accomplishments. For example, aside from the number of publications, include the impact factors for the journals published in. You may also consider including citations, h-index, i10-index or Altmetric scores. With regard to teaching, include your mean scores from teaching and learning evaluations. Where appropriate compare with your departments and universities mean score. If you have any

outstanding comments by students, those can also help support you as an outstanding teacher worthy of tenure. In some institutions where teaching metrics are no longer allowed, both favorable and less than favorable comments should be provided. Everyone provides their favorable comments, but if you provide some less than favorable comments, you can demonstrate how you are addressing those comments to help improve your overall rating and teaching effectiveness. No one gets perfect comments and by showing you admit this and are willing to improve demonstrates acknowledgment for continued growth and development in the academy. Asking for letters to document significant service is also a sound practice and required as evidence at many institutions. Reflecting on prior reviews may also be relevant as this shows reviewers you are listening, reflecting, and responding (and in some cases is required in the tenure and promotion process). Further, when compiling the tenure portfolio be diligent with keeping the end-user(s) in mind. Arrange the tenure portfolio in a fashion such that reviewers can readily locate the most critical documentation with supporting evidence archived in appendices (or available upon request).

We acknowledge that we did not delve into the differences between tenure requirements for research R-1 and regional teaching universities. The faculty at R-1 universities will find the scholarly productivity requirements (grants, publications, presentations, etc.) formidable and others have proposed models for success in such scenarios (Lindsey & de Castro Brás, 2017). Faculty at teaching focused universities should not neglect their scholarly development. While teaching focused universities may have rather relaxed scholarly benchmarks with regard to research productivity in order to achieve tenure, it is more than likely that a faculty member will have multiple positions (with multiple universities) during the course of their career. Search committees will rapidly bypass applications where the faculty member has not stayed current with an active scholarly agenda. It is recommended that faculty maintain an active scholarly agenda that will demonstrate to future employers that the faculty member is current and engaged in their discipline.

Finally, we propose that effective time management is crucial to academic success. Regardless of location, the academic culture is complex and difficult to navigate, and these time management principles and activities (quadrants) are malleable to multiple

disciplines and are portable across academic disciplines as well as national/cultural borders.

This manuscript focused on a priority driven time self-management strategy for faculty pursuing tenure: knowing that time is fixed. Mission creep is an accepted phenomena occurring in higher education (Goldstein et al., 2013) which continues to erode the time allotted for faculty to successfully navigate the tenure waters. Future research should focus at an institution level to identify areas referred to by Newport (2016) as those areas associated with black hole metrics and/or areas of mission creep. Identifying and eliminating wasteful/redundant tasks that don't serve the mission of the University may ultimately minimize the erosion of time available for tenure seeking faculty.

Conclusion

The process of achieving tenure is extremely challenging yet highly rewarding. Priority driven time self-management would appear to be a requisite skill in order to achieve tenure. This manuscript provides an instrument based on the CTMM that is crafted specifically to aid faculty in implementing a prioritized time management strategy for attaining tenure. The author's collective ethnographic rendition of the CTMM may provide valuable insight as to how to pursue tenure from a balanced and prioritized time self-management perspective. We hope the audience will digest this strategy through a lens of applicability to their unique tenure-environment across disciplines and national/cultural borders.

References

- Covey, S.R. (2013). *The 7 habits of highly effective people (25th Anniversary Ed)*. Simon & Schuster. New York, NY
- Coyle, D. (2018). *The Culture Code*. Random House: London, UK.
- Elmagd, M.A. (2016). Benefits, need and importance of daily exercise. *International Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Health*, 3(5): 22-27.
- Goldstein, H., Bergman, E. M., & Maier, G. (2013). University mission creep? Comparing EU and US faculty views of university involvement in regional economic development and commercialization. *The Annals of Regional Science*, 50(2), 453-477.

- Lindsey, M.L., & de Castro Brás, L.E. (2017). The physics of an academic career. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 41, 493-497. DOI:10.1152/advan.00105.2017
- Miller, T.N., & Thurston, L. (2009). Mentoring junior professors: History and evaluation of a nine-year model. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 23(2), 35-40.
- Newport, C. (2016). *Deep work: Rules for focused success in a distracted world*. Hachette UK.
- Perlmutter, D.D. (2008). You didn't get tenure: What now? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(50).
- Saad, N., & Sankaran, S. (2020). Technology Proficiency in Teaching and Facilitating. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Retrieved 17 Jan. 2022, from <https://oxfordre.com/education/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-591>.
- Sevene, T., Adams, K.J., Climstein, M., Berning, J.M., Carson, C., Harris, C., Walsh, J., & DeBeliso, M. (2020). COVID-19: Sedentary isolation – a bad combination. *International Journal of Sports Science*, 10(3), 57-61. DOI:10.5923/j.sports.20201003.01
- Smith, E. (2020). The intersection of faculty success and student success. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Higher Education*, 5(1), 180-183.
- Southern Utah University. (n.d.). *POLICY #6.1: Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure*. <https://www.suu.edu/policies/06/01.html>
- Thomas, J.R., Nelson, J. K., & Silverman, S.J. (7th Ed.) (2015). *Research methods in physical activity*. Human Kinetics.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2018). *Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans (2nd Ed.)*. https://health.gov/sites/default/files/2019-09/Physical_Activity_Guidelines_2nd_edition.pdf
- University of Nevada Las Vegas. (n.d.). *Tenure and Promotion*. <https://www.unlv.edu/ofa/processes/tenure-promotion>
- World Health Organization. (2020). *WHO Guidelines on Physical Activity and Sedentary Behavior*. <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/336656/9789240015128-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Ziker, J. (2014). The long, lonely job of homo academicus, *The Blue Review*, 31, 3-14. <https://wayback.archive->

Author Bio

DR. MARK DEBELISO, FACSM is a Professor and Graduate Program Director at Southern Utah University. His research interests include: orthopaedic biomechanics, mechanics and metabolics of sport movements and work tasks, strength training for all walks of life, and masters.

Email: athletes.markdebeliso@suu.edu

DR. HOWARD GAUTHIER, is a Professor of Sports Science at Idaho State University where he teaches graduate level courses in sports leadership and sports management. His research interests include: career development in sports, positive leadership, and positive organizational culture.

Email: gauthowa@isu.edu

DR. TRISH SEVENE, CPT is a Professor of Kinesiology at California State University Monterey Bay. Her research interests include: evolutionary biology, the biological basis of human performance and aging, work-related lifting tasks, and masters athletes.

Email: tsevene@csumb.edu

DR. KENT J. ADAMS, FACSM CSCS is a Professor and Department Chair of Kinesiology at California State University Monterey Bay. His research interests include: strength and power training across the lifespan, human performance, work-related lifting tasks, and masters athletes.

Email: kadams@csumb.edu

DR. MARCUS M. LAWRENCE, CSCS is an Assistant Professor at Southern Utah University where he teaches undergraduate and graduate level courses in exercise science and strength and conditioning. His research interests involve utilizing nutritional, exercise, or pharmaceutical interventions to enhance or maintain skeletal muscle health in a variety of populations, with an emphasis in the elderly.

Email: marcuslawrence@suu.edu

DR. MIKE CLIMSTEIN, FACSM FASMF FAAESS is an Associate Professor and Course Coordinator for the Masters in Clinical Exercise Physiology at Southern Cross University (Australia) and an adjunct Faculty member of the Physical Activity, Lifestyle, Ageing and Wellbeing Faculty Research Group at the University of Sydney (Australia). His research interests include: water-based research, skin cancer, world masters games/veteran athletes and DXA (segmental body composition as relates to health).

Email: Michael.climstein@scu.edu.au

DR. JOSEPH M. BERNING, CSCS, FACSM was a Professor of Kinesiology and Department Head at New Mexico State University where he instructed both Graduate and Undergraduate courses in Exercise and Strength Physiology. His research interests focus on strength performance, junk yard training and training for extreme sports.

Email: jberning207@gmail.com

DR. CHAD HARRIS, FACSM CSCS is a Professor and Chair of the Department of Human Performance and Sport at Metropolitan State University of Denver. His research interests include training effects on power production, weightlifting biomechanics, resistance training responses in the older adult and metabolic responses to power training.

Email: charr112@msudenver.edu

DR. JAMES W. NAVALTA, FACSM is a faculty in the Kinesiology and Nutrition Sciences Department at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. His research focuses on the immune response to exercise (lymphocyte apoptotic and migratory responses), physiological responses to outdoor exercise (hiking and trail running), and the validity of wearable technology.

Email: james.navalta@unlv.edu