



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

Effective Date: Fall 2025

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) aspires to be a national exemplar in public higher education. Toward this end, the University makes an effort to recruit and retain faculty who are both excellent teachers and scholars. The Department of Kinesiology (KIN) is committed to fostering the development of teacher-scholars so that they may: 1) provide excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service, and 2) develop and/or implement programs that are responsive to the needs of students, the community, and the Kinesiology profession.

This Policy sets forth the requirements for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) of faculty in the Department of Kinesiology and is intended to guide faculty and the Department RTP Committee during the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process. The discipline of Kinesiology is comprised of multiple subdisciplines. Hence, these requirements take into account the diversity of academic expertise and training among the faculty.

Portions of the University and College RTP Policies that are critical for emphasis and clarity are presented in italics in this document.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Department Mission and Vision

In accordance with the CSULB Mission, faculty members in the Department of Kinesiology *shall provide highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), and service for the people of California and the world.* Moreover, their actions shall be in accord with the mission of the Department of Kinesiology, which is to facilitate change in the individual through the study and application of human movement principles across the lifespan and through the management of and participation in physical activity, exercise, and sport.

1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

1.2.1 *A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, research and other scholarly and creative activities (RSCA), and service is essential to accomplishing the articulated mission and vision of the University, the College, and the Department of Kinesiology. Kinesiology faculty shall be effective teachers and integrate the results of their RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning. Moreover, faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing service contributions to the Department, College, and University, as well as the profession and/or community.*

1.2.2 *Decisions regarding RTP are among the most important made by the university community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review. Faculty achievements*

may differ from those of colleagues, yet still meet the standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure that excellence is rewarded and that faculty members who meet department, college, and university standards and expectations have an opportunity for advancement.

1.2.3 Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the University, and in the profession and/or community. All faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of all three areas.

1.2.4 This policy should not be construed as preventing innovation or adjustment in workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise and accomplishment, department and college needs, and university mission.

1.2.5 All faculty members are expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect favorably on the individual, the academic unit, the college, and the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and ethical behavior.

1.3 Governing Documents

1.3.1 Adoption

The Department adopts this RTP Policy pursuant to the mandates of Section 3.5 of both the University RTP Policy (Policy Statement 23-24) and the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) RTP Policy, and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the CBA, the University, or the CHHS RTP Policies, the conflicting provision shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered inoperable.

1.3.2 Specific Role of this Department Policy

This Department Policy serves to interpret, synthesize, and apply the policies and procedures set forth in these other governing documents specified in Section 1.3.1 in a manner that provides comprehensive and specific guidance to faculty in the Department of Kinesiology within their discipline-specific framework.

1.4 Obligations

All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in the University, College, and Department RTP Policies. To be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an RTP file.

1.4.1 Obligation of the Candidate to Initiate the RTP Process

The candidate shall be responsible for initiating the Department RTP process by complying with all published time frames for the handling of documents to be reviewed. Thus, in order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, a candidate must submit an RTP file.

1.4.2 Obligation of the Candidate to Provide Documentation of Accomplishments

It is the candidate's responsibility to provide a complete and appropriately documented RTP file. All accomplishments claimed in a candidate's RTP file must be supported with appropriate documentation. Candidates must, therefore, furnish all necessary and relevant documentation for evaluation.

1.4.3 Obligations of the Department RTP Committee

The reputation, success, and future credibility of the Department of Kinesiology are directly related to the quality of the candidates and the diligence with which the Department RTP Committee discharges its responsibilities in evaluating and presenting the evidence to support its recommendations.

1.5 **Department Standards**

The Department RTP Committee (and Department Chair, [if they submit an evaluation]) shall evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and weaknesses associated with each of the established standards. Evaluation(s) shall include an analysis of the candidate's roles, performance, and achievements within the Department and the discipline. *Evaluation(s) of a candidate's record shall be guided by the principle that the higher the academic rank, the greater the expectation for demonstrated excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.* Evaluation shall also be guided by the following expectations that apply to all Department faculty members at all ranks:

1.5.1 Currency in the Discipline

Faculty members shall keep abreast of the literature and developments in their Kinesiology subdiscipline(s), particularly those that are applicable to their teaching responsibilities and research interest(s).

1.5.2 Involvement in the Profession

Faculty members shall attend and participate in meetings of professional organizations related to the discipline of Kinesiology and/or its subdisciplines.

1.5.3 Scholarly Research and Publishing

Faculty members shall actively pursue an investigative, data-based research and publishing agenda relevant to one or more of the following types of scholarship, all of which are equally valued:

- a. *Scholarship of Discovery – Advancing knowledge through original research, scholarship, and creative activities. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to peer reviewed publications, juried presentations, performances or exhibitions in notable venues, or patents.*
- b. *Scholarship of Integration – RSCA that seeks to build or expand connections from existing knowledge within or across disciplines, to shape more critical, coherent, and/or integrated use of knowledge. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, published literature reviews, textbooks, or meta-analyses.*
- c. *Scholarship of Application or Engagement – RSCA involving the application of disciplinary expertise to practical problems within or outside the university. The Scholarship of Engagement includes: a reciprocal relationship with communities that yields innovations with disciplinary expertise, can be replicated, documented, is professionally and/or peer reviewed, and has evidence of impact. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to technical reports, program evaluations, grant proposals, or mentorship of students in RSCA activities.*
- d. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning – RSCA advancing teaching and learning knowledge through systematic study. Evidence of this form of RSCA could include, but is not limited to, educational research disseminated via professional journals or conferences, publishing a new instructional method, or grant proposals supporting instructional materials.*

1.5.4 High-Quality Instruction

Faculty members shall deliver high-quality instruction and encourage active learning among students in the following ways:

- a. By socializing students into a culture of intellectual discovery and professional communication via both group and one-on-one interactions (e.g., in class and extracurricular activities, in research projects, in advising sessions, and at professional conferences);
- b. By assigning meaningful work in the discipline and by interacting with students both inside and outside of class in a manner that fosters the development of broadly applicable intellectual habits necessary for lifelong learning and productive citizenship (e.g., critical thinking and problem-solving).
- c. By participating in unique disciplinary interactions with students (e.g., via directed studies and independent research projects);

- d. By engaging students in the research enterprise (e.g., as participants, collaborators and co-authors);
- e. By engaging students in service-learning projects where appropriate; and
- f. By demonstrating commitment and service to the Department of Kinesiology, the College of Health and Human Services, the University, professional organizations, and the community at large.

1.5.5 Meaningful and Collegial Service

Faculty shall serve the Department, the College, the University, their profession, and the community in meaningful and collegial ways. That is, they shall contribute to the orderly and effective functioning of the academy and their academic discipline area and act in a civil, constructive and respectful manner in interactions with all members of the campus community. Faculty contributions to service are expected to increase concomitantly with the institution's commitment to the individual, i.e., they are required to accept more significant service responsibilities with each passing year during the probationary period and as they advance in academic rank.

1.6 **Profiles of Academic Ranks**

RTP candidates shall be evaluated by applying specific criteria established by the University, the College of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Kinesiology. Sections 5.0 – 5.5.2 of the University and College RTP Policies profile the standards applicable to each academic rank. This Department Policy applies these standards using discipline-specific criteria.

1.7 **Narrative**

In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional context, candidates are required to submit a written narrative describing their work in each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements.

CSULB recognizes that cultural and identity taxation has the potential to create inequities within all faculty evaluation areas. This policy and all college and department RTP policies should be structured and interpreted in ways that minimize these inequities. Within the narrative, candidates who feel that their work in any of the areas of evaluation has been impacted or influenced by cultural taxation are encouraged to submit a maximum of one page to put their work within that context.

2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION

Candidates shall be evaluated in three areas: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) research, and other scholarly and creative activities; and 3) service. All candidates for

reappointment, tenure, and promotion must comply with the provision of Sections 2.1-2.3 of this document.

2.1 Instruction and Instructionally Related Activities

Teaching is a primary and essential academic responsibility of faculty members in an institution that subscribes to the teacher-scholar model. Therefore, Kinesiology faculty are expected to demonstrate that they are effective teachers. To be considered effective teachers, faculty must develop and implement quality teaching practices responsive to the needs of CSULB's diverse student body and the University's educational mission and assess the impact of these practices on student learning. *They also are expected to foster learning inside and outside of the traditional classroom. Instructionally related activities include, but are not limited to: curriculum development; academic and Department advising, supervision of student research, fieldwork, and laboratory work; supervision of students in clinical settings; direction of student performances and exhibitions; mentoring of students on campus and studying abroad, and supervising students in the production of theses, projects, and other capstone experiences.*

CSULB recognizes that effective instruction is as much a process as an outcome, and available strategies may be affected by mode, level, and type of instruction. CSULB also recognizes the additional faculty time and effort required to provide expansive learning opportunities for students such as High Impact Practices.

Excellent teaching involves a commitment to three principles that candidates are expected to address in their narratives:

- continuous professional learning,*
- thoughtful reflection on and subsequent adaptation of instruction (formative assessment), and*
- the use of instructional practices that foster student learning and the achievement of course goals (summative assessment).*

To facilitate evaluation of a candidate's practice and teaching effectiveness, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall submit five types of indicators of teaching effectiveness: 1) student evaluations, 2) peer evaluations, 3) course syllabi, 4) samples of other course materials, and 5) grade distributions. All of these materials shall be evaluated by the Departmental RTP Committee for evidence of teaching effectiveness using the criteria specified in this Policy. Additionally, candidates may (but are not required to) submit additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher. Candidates should also disclose and describe in their narratives any instructional activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

2.1.1. Continuous Professional Learning

Effective instructors remain up to date not only with their course content, but also pedagogical

practices designed to help all students achieve course learning goals. Effective instruction requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with educating a diverse student population.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) what they have invested in their own learning and growth as instructors.

*Within their supporting documentation, candidates should provide evidence documenting this professional learning. Evidence supporting the narrative could include, but is not limited to, participation in on or off campus professional development activities, conferences, and lessons learned observing or discussing the instruction of peers. The narrative should address at least one example **per year** of how candidates incorporated what they took from their professional learning, how they incorporated that into their teaching, and why they chose that activity.*

2.1.2 Reflection & Instructional Adaptation: Formative Assessment

Effective instruction requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and the impact of those practices on student learning. Effective teaching is thoughtful teaching. Deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness are expected of all faculty members. Effective instructors are aware of their instructional goals, formatively assess students, reflect upon the information gathered, and change their instructional practices if the assessment results indicate the need to do so.

Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and the committees should consider) their formative assessment practices, including: (1) discussion of one or more course goals, aims, or practices the candidate decided to change, (2) the evidence alerting the candidate something needed to change, and (3) how the candidate ultimately decided the course(s) would change. Candidates should highlight continued efforts in diversifying course materials to 1) represent a broader range of perspectives and identities, 2) include more inclusive assessment methods, and 3) actively engage students in discussions on diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility. We encourage faculty to use multiple types of feedback (e.g., check for understanding, midterm check-ins).

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to evidence that prompted the changes, and documents such as syllabi, assignments, or other materials that show what the course was like before or after changes. For example, if changes were made based on DEIA workshops.

2.1.3 Instructional Practices that Foster Learning: Summative Assessment

Effective instruction engages and helps students learn the desired course outcomes. Instructional methods should be consistent with course/curriculum goals and should accommodate student differences. Within their narratives, candidates should discuss (and committees should consider) effective instructional strategies for student learning.

Evidence supporting the narrative could include but is not limited to student work samples (including multiple iterations of the same assignment with instructor feedback), assessments, syllabi, peer observations, a short video clip of the candidate's teaching together with a narrative description, observations by trained observers, support letters, qualitative or quantitative student perception data, and other supporting documentation.

2.1.4 Student Learning Outcomes

Instructional practices and course materials shall clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices. Where candidates have made improvements to outcomes, goals, and/or assessments, these should be discussed in the narrative by the candidate with corresponding evidence.

To this end, faculty shall:

- a. Clearly convey to students in measurable, behavioral terms the expected student learning outcomes for each course taught.
- b. Clearly convey to students the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education goals.
- c. Prepare lessons and course materials that enhance student learning associated with the student learning outcomes for a course.

2.1.5 Syllabi

Course syllabi shall be included in the candidate's RTP file and align with academic unit RTP Policy. Syllabi for all courses taught during the review period shall be included in the candidate's file, along with narrative discussion and corresponding evidence where improvements have been made to syllabi.

2.1.5a Required Documentation

Candidates shall submit syllabi for all courses taught during the review period. Generally, only one syllabus per discrete course shall be submitted, not multiple copies of identical syllabi used in different sections of the same course. An exception to this rule, however, is when a candidate has made substantial changes to a syllabus in response to suggestions from students or peers. In such an event, the candidate must submit "before" and "after" copies as evidence of his/her efforts to improve a course(s). In addition, candidates must explain the evolution of their syllabi in the narrative part of their application.

2.1.6 Grade Distributions

Grade distributions of courses taught during the review period should be included in the candidate's RTP file along with narrative discussion of grading in accordance with academic unit expectations. Grade distributions alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness and, as such, candidates should specify why and how teaching strategies inform their grade distributions.

Candidates should provide a rationale for how their grade distributions are reflected by their approach to teaching (e.g., a mastery approach). Grade distributions should be submitted in tabular form for all courses taught during the review period.

2.1.7 Student Response to Instruction

Student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction.

2.1.7a Required Documentation

Candidates shall submit copies of their quantitative student evaluations as follows (provision of qualitative student comments is optional). All candidates, regardless of rank, must submit the evaluation summary sheets for all the courses in which university administered SPOT evaluations were given.

2.1.7b Evaluation by RTP Committee and Peers

Quantitative ratings from student evaluations of instruction must reflect generally positive perceptions among students regarding the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and overall teaching effectiveness. Moreover, a faculty member's mean scores on item #1.5 in particular (i.e., overall teaching effectiveness) shall be evaluated relative to context, including but not limited to:

- a. Class characteristics: course level, course type (e.g., required, elective, writing intensive, online/asynchronous, for majors only or GE, etc.), number of enrolled students, whether this was a new course preparation, and course meeting time.
- b. Candidate's teaching assignment: number of new course preparations during the semester of evaluation, total number of different course preparations, alignment of Standard Course Outline (SCO) with the candidate's area of expertise/training.
- c. Candidate's experimentation with methodologies in attempting to improve teaching effectiveness, trends over time, keeping in mind that it is impossible to remove or account for all bias in student evaluations.

2.1.7c Caveat on the Use of Student Ratings

Student course evaluations alone do not provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the University standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not provide sufficient evidence of effective instructional philosophy and practices. Hence, the Department of Kinesiology requires additional evidence of teaching effectiveness that helps the Department RTP Committee to contextualize student ratings.

2.1.8 Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations of the candidate's instruction shall be included in the candidate's RTP file, and candidates should reflect on and incorporate peer feedback, including providing evidence of instructional improvements where appropriate.

2.1.8a Required Documentation

Candidates for reappointment shall submit *at least* one (1) peer evaluation each semester prior to a request for reappointment (a minimum of four as the RTP portfolio is submitted in the Fall semester of the third year when the standard six-year timeline is in effect). After reappointment, candidates shall submit one (1) peer evaluation per year through tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. For promotion to Full Professor, candidates shall submit one (1) peer evaluation at least every other year (minimum of two). These evaluations, regardless of a candidate's rank or position in the RTP process (i.e., probationary or tenured) must be conducted by a *variety of* colleagues (at least half must be tenured). The evaluations must be in more than one course. It is the candidate's responsibility to request colleagues to conduct peer reviews of their teaching.

2.1.8b Evaluation by RTP Committee and Peers

Peer evaluations shall be based on observation of teaching in which pedagogical approaches and methods are described and evaluated for quality. Peer evaluations must document whether: instructional methods are appropriate to the course(s) being taught; content is up-to-date and appropriate to the topic; and the overall effectiveness of ways in which information is communicated to students in the classroom. To the maximum extent possible, peer evaluators should endeavor to learn as much as possible so that they may comment from an informed perspective about the indicators of teaching effectiveness listed in Section 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3 of this document. Peer evaluators should also examine and comment on the clarity, rigor, and currency of syllabi, assignments, and other course materials. (Peer evaluators shall use the Department Peer Evaluation form).

2.2 Research and Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)

Research and other scholarly and creative activity (RSCA) are a primary and essential academic responsibility of faculty members in the teacher-scholar model. Therefore, Kinesiology faculty are expected to conduct research and other forms of scholarship throughout their academic careers. In addition, candidates must disclose and describe any scholarly or creative activities for which they receive reassigned time or additional compensation.

2.2.1 Variability Across the Discipline

2.2.1a Variability in the Nature of Scholarship

Kinesiology is a field that has many subdisciplines, methodologies, and data collection methods. Qualified Kinesiology faculty may be trained in the social sciences (e.g., psychology, sociology, history), the natural sciences (e.g., exercise physiology, biomechanics, neuroscience), the professions (e.g., pedagogy, sport medicine, sport management, kinesiotherapy, health-fitness management), and/or in interdisciplinary programs (e.g., sport studies). These varied subdisciplines use a diverse array of research methodologies and data-collection methods that are equally valued. Thus, individual differences in scholarly agendas and goals shall be respected by those conducting RTP evaluations and taken into consideration when applying standards.

2.2.1b Variations Due to Service Roles

There may be a period when the required level of scholarly activity is reduced somewhat due to serving as the Department Chair, or in a position of leadership with high-level College- or University-wide or professional significance. In such cases, a modest reduction in scholarship shall *not* be counted against the candidate; however, there must be evidence that the candidate's scholarly activity has been maintained and holds promise for full resumption when the other academic activities return to normal levels.

2.2.2 General Requirements for Research and Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA)

To be reappointed, tenured and/or promoted, faculty members are encouraged to engage in a sustained (i.e., ongoing over multiple years) program of peer-reviewed, investigative research that demonstrates their intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement of the subdisciplines of Kinesiology. They are also encouraged to disseminate their RSCA to appropriate audiences. Faculty may employ quantitative, qualitative, historical, and other subdiscipline-appropriate methodology in conducting their research.

2.2.2a Evaluation Standards for the Production of Research and Other Scholarly and Creative Activities

Required evidence of scholarly activity – Although scholarly activities take many forms, faculty are required to develop and sustain a scholarly research agenda and a record of scholarly publication that flows from the pursuit of their research agendas.

- a. Scholarly Research Agenda – Faculty are required to establish and maintain a *sustained* program of scholarship that is marked by continual research activity and dissemination. Faculty may concentrate on one type of research (e.g., basic, applied, pedagogical) or may distribute their scholarship across different methodological types.
- b. Evidence of Research and Scholarship Excellence – The quality of work is defined by its significance in one's field of inquiry and requires peer-review to validate the work's significance. Candidates should explain the significance of their work and the peer review process for each RSCA contribution.

2.2.2b The following are the RSCA requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion:

- a. In order to achieve reappointment, the candidate should have a minimum of one peer-reviewed manuscript published for the period under review or a **justification for equivalent**.
- b. In order to achieve tenure, the candidate should have a minimum of three peer-reviewed manuscripts (including the first one for reappointment) **or a justification for equivalent publications**.
- c. In order to achieve promotion to associate professor, the candidate should have a minimum of three peer-reviewed manuscripts published for the period under review **or a justification for equivalent publications**. Faculty also need at minimum one additional equivalent RSCA contribution. See section 2.2.2c for a list of suggestions. Four peer-reviewed manuscripts and one additional RSCA contribution is considered exceptional.
- d. In order to achieve promotion to full professor, the candidate should have a minimum of four peer-reviewed manuscripts published for the period under review **or a justification for equivalent publications**. Faculty also need at minimum one additional equivalent RSCA contribution. See section 2.2.2c for a list of suggestions. Five published manuscripts and two additional equivalent RSCA contributions is considered exceptional.

2.2.2c Equivalent RSCA contributions may include but are not limited to:

- One peer-reviewed published manuscript
- One published book
- Two book chapters published in an edited book (revised versions of previous chapters are not considered)
- Serving as Principal Investigator or Co-Investigator on a funded external grant

- Submission of an external grant as Principal Investigator on an external grant that was not funded
- Presenting or co-presenting a national or international conference presentation (e.g., lecture or poster)
- Presenting or co-presenting two regional conference presentations (e.g., lecture or poster)

2.2.2d Additional Requirements of Excellence in Research and Scholarship

Scholarly Engagement of Students – In keeping with the mission of the University and the College of Health and Human Services, the Department of Kinesiology values RSCA that involves students beyond participation as subjects of study. Scholarly activities that achieve this end shall be considered additional evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement. The involvements of students in the aforementioned RSCA requirements (see section 2.2.2b above), is defined as having a minimum of one of the RSCA contributions list at least one CSULB student as a co-author. The requirements are as follows:

- a. For reappointment, student involvement is encouraged.
- b. For tenure and promotion to associate professor, one CSULB student should be listed as a co-author.
- c. For promotion to full professor, one CSULB student should be listed as a co-author on a RSCA contribution after the promotion to associate professor.

2.3 **Service**

Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the quality of programs and activities at the University, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty are required to participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the processes of faculty governance, as well as in professional organizations and/or discipline-appropriate community service activities throughout their academic careers.

Within their narratives, candidates must disclose and describe whenever activities include reassigned time or compensation, including details about the expectations or goals of the service activity. In general, candidates should discuss service activities by outlining the activity's objectives or actions (for instance, what a committee does and how often it meets), articulate their own contributions to the work accomplished (for instance, officer/leadership roles and concrete contributions such as drafts of memos or policies), and then describe outcomes or impact of the work.

The quality of service is fundamental to meeting the service criterion. Moreover, service shall be related to academic expertise and rank of the faculty member.

2.3.1 Service Contributions

- a. Candidates for reappointment should participate in a minimum of one departmental committee per year beginning in their second year of appointment **or provide a justification for equivalent service contributions.**
- b. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should serve on a minimum of one departmental committee per year after reappointment and should provide additional service contributions at a minimum of two of the three levels: campus, community, or professional, **or provide a justification for equivalent service contributions.** Holding leadership roles at the departmental level and one other level is considered exceptional.
- c. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should serve on a minimum of one department committee per year, provide service contributions at all additional levels: campus, community, and professional, and hold leadership roles at the department and one other level, **or provide a justification for equivalent service contributions.** Multiple service contributions and leadership roles at all levels is considered exceptional.

Suggested service contributions can include, but are not limited to:

- *Campus Service: Service and leadership on department, college, university, CSU systemwide committees and task forces; oversight and maintenance of departmental labs, facilities, and supervision of student workers; service to student organizations; service to CFA.*
- *Community Service: Board memberships; consulting with agencies in areas relevant to academic expertise, supervising student contributions to the community (e.g., practicums, internships, or service learning); facilitating partnerships with community organizations, non-profit organizations and schools.*
- *Service to the Profession: External grant reviewer; peer-reviewer for scholarly publications; leadership for professional organizations; mentoring, coaching, and advising of colleagues and students in the discipline.*

Leadership roles can include, but are not limited to:

- Holding elected or appointed positions on committees (e.g., committee chair), serving as Department Chair, elected or appointed positions in professional or community organizations, or director of an academic program, lab, or center.

2.3.3 Evaluation of Service

The candidate must provide a documented narrative of their service contributions. It is incumbent on the candidate to describe in detail the aforementioned evaluative criteria in his/her narrative. Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council work and to other processes of faculty governance in addition to documenting their attendance and participation. They shall also provide official correspondence from community organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the candidates' participation and/or leadership roles in such organizations.

The evaluation of service shall be based on the quality and significance of the service activity. Relevant factors include, but are not limited to, the nature of the service commitment; the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the University, College, and/or Department; the depth/extent of the candidate's involvement and contribution to the service activity; and the degree of the candidate's leadership in the service activity.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the Department, the RTP Committee, the Chair of the Department of Kinesiology, the College of Health and Human Services RTP Committee, the College Dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external reviewers participating in the process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the "Open Period."

Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the Department RTP Committee, the Dean, the Provost, the Associate Vice-President for Academic Personnel, and the President. External reviewers, if any, shall have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.

3.1 Candidate

A candidate for RTP shall make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the Department Chair, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. The candidate has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of his or her accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all information and supporting materials specified in all applicable RTP documents. The candidate must clearly reference and explain all supporting materials.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes his or her goals and accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service. It is recommended that the narrative shall not exceed 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including summary sheets from student evaluations and

an index of all supplementary materials. *The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.*

3.2 Department RTP Policy

The content of this Policy specifies the criteria and standards to be applied in evaluating teaching performance, scholarship, and service. The Department standards are consistent with those of the College and University and support the missions of the College and University.

3.3 Department RTP Committee

The Department RTP Committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's work and making the initial recommendation to the College RTP Committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP Committee members are responsible for analyzing critically the candidate's performance by applying the criteria outlined in this document.

3.3.1 Committee Selection

The RTP Committee of the Department of Kinesiology is composed of a least three (3) tenured, full-time faculty members and one alternate elected by majority vote of the full-time tenured and probationary faculty. Faculty serving in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may also serve on the RTP Committee, if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members and approved by the President. Faculty may *not* participate in the evaluation of candidates at more than one level of review (i.e., serving on both Department and College RTP Committees).

- a. Election – Members shall be elected each academic year, as needed. Membership on this Committee shall reflect, at a minimum, all requirements specified in the University and College RTP documents.
- b. Single vs. Multiple Committees - Subject to the exception provided in subsection 3.3.6 governing joint appointments, all recommendations for advancement (promotion) to a given rank, for tenure, or for reappointment shall be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might consider all candidates within the Department who are eligible for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor. A second committee comprised of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

3.3.2 Committee Composition

The following provisions shall govern the composition of the Department RTP Committee:

- a. Membership Rank – Members of the Department RTP Committees who participate in promotion recommendations shall be tenured and have a higher rank than the candidate(s) being evaluated. In addition, they may not be current candidates for promotion.
- b. Department Chair – The Chair of the Department of Kinesiology generally does not serve as a member of the Department RTP Committee so that they may write an independent evaluation of the candidate pursuant to the provisions of Section 3.4.2 of this document. However, in the event that there is an insufficient number of faculty member qualified to serve on the Department RTP Committee (or other unusual circumstances that so warrant), the Department Chair may serve as a member of the Department RTP Committee, if elected. If elected to such service, however, the Chair may not make a separate Department Chair recommendation pursuant to Section 3.4 of this document.
- c. Persons on Leave - Persons on leave or sabbatical for any part of the academic year may serve on the Department of Kinesiology RTP Committee if they are in active status during the semester in which the review takes place. Faculty members participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may serve on the RTP committees of academic units if requested by the majority vote of tenured and probationary faculty members of the academic units and approved by the President. Under no circumstances, however, may the Department of Kinesiology RTP Committee be comprised solely of faculty participating in the FERP.
- d. Term of Membership – The term of membership shall be two-years; the term of the alternate shall be for one year; however, individuals may be re-elected to an unlimited number of terms.
- e. Service Limitations – A faculty member who is serving on the College RTP Committee may not serve concurrently on the Department RTP Committee. He or she may serve, however, on the Peer Review Committee while concurrently serving as a member of the College RTP Committee as the mini-reviews are submitted only to the College Dean for evaluation rather than the College RTP Committee and the Dean.
- f. Vacancies --In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of the Department RTP Committee, either a meeting of the Department faculty shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall be solicited by the Department Chair. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the nominee who receives the most votes shall serve the longest term,

the nominee receiving the second most votes shall serve the next longest term, and so on until all vacancies are filled.

g. Chair of RTP Committee

The RTP Committee Chair shall be elected from among the members of the RTP Committee. The Chair has primary responsibility for ensuring that the RTP evaluation process is completed according to University standards and timelines. The Chair is also responsible for providing the following information to the RTP candidates: deadlines, procedures, the Open Period (a period of time that allows for comments from the campus community about the candidate), and other pertinent matters.

3.3.3 Burdens of Responsibility and Accountability

The Department RTP Committee shall be held accountable for its recommendations by: 1) providing the College RTP Committee with substantive evidence to support its recommendations, and 2) submitting the candidate's RTP portfolio and supporting documents on time and in accordance with establishment deadlines and requirements. Submissions must include the "HHS College RTP Evaluation Recommendation Form" for each candidate.

3.3.4 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review

No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review

3.3.5 Ad Hoc Committees

If fewer than the required number of members, as specified in the academic unit RTP policy or this document, are eligible from the academic unit, then additional members from outside the academic unit shall be selected in accordance with the following procedure:

- a. *Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided that they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of expertise.*
- b. *After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election to an ad hoc RTP Committee, the academic unit shall submit the names of all candidates for election to the unit's RTP committee and then conduct an election.*

3.3.6 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments shall be evaluated by a committee composed of members of each academic unit served by the person being evaluated. The joint-appointment RTP Committee shall be composed of members currently elected to each academic unit's RTP Committee. This committee shall use the existing criteria of each academic unit to evaluate the individual holding joint appointment pursuant to item VI, Academic Senate Policy Statement 94-11.

3.4 **Department Chair**

The Department Chair is responsible for communicating the Department, College, and University policies to candidates. The Chair also provides ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with Department expectations. The Chair, in collaboration with College and/or Department mentors, is responsible for consulting with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

3.4.1 Meeting with the Committee

The Chair shall meet with the Department RTP Committee prior to the beginning of the Department evaluation process to review the Department, College, and University processes and procedures.

3.4.2 Optional Independent Evaluation

The Department Chair may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates unless the Chair is elected to the Department of Kinesiology RTP Committee. In promotion considerations, however, the Department Chair must have a higher rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute a review or participate on a review committee. In no case, may the Department Chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of review.

3.4.3 Candidate Rights

Candidates may request a meeting to review recommendations with the Department Chair and/or the Department RTP Committee. Candidates have the contractual right to respond in writing to these recommendations before they are forwarded from the Department to the College RTP Committee and/or the Dean.

4.0. TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS

All tenured and probationary faculty members undergo performance review and evaluation, according to timelines established by the University. Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when a candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, he/she shall undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five years.

The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor with no service credit; however, actual timelines may vary according to level of appointment and service credit.

4.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment

4.1.1 Periodic Review (mini-review)

Mini-reviews do not result in any job actions (i.e., reappointment, tenure, or promotion); however, these reviews shall be provided to probationary faculty in writing and must provide guidance for professional development.

4.1.2. Reappointment Review

In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years. If reappointed for three years, probationary faculty shall continue to be evaluated annually using the periodic review process. If, however, candidates are reappointed for a shorter period of time, they shall be evaluated using the periodic review process until such time as they undergo another formal reappointment review.

4.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion

Candidates shall undergo comprehensive RTP evaluation in the sixth year of continuous service. The evaluation takes the form of a tenure review, which may also be a review for promotion. A probationary faculty member may request consideration for early tenure and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth-year review.

4.2.1 Consideration for Early Tenure and/or Promotion

Candidates for early tenure and/or early promotion shall receive initial guidance from the Department Chair and Dean regarding the criteria and expectations for early tenure and/or promotion. These actions are granted only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons. Assistant Professors may apply for early promotion, early tenure, or both. A candidate applying for early tenure must meet all criteria for early promotion to Associate Professor. Tenured Associate Professors may apply for early promotion to Full Professor. Non-tenured Associate Professors may not apply for early promotion to Full Professor without also seeking early tenure.

To be considered for early tenure, which is granted only in exceptional and rare cases, a candidate must demonstrate a record of distinction in all three evaluative areas and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure in the standard six-year timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and must inspire confidence that this pattern of exemplary

overall performance will continue. In addition, candidates for early tenure are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process, according to the Academic Senate Policy on External Evaluation.

To receive a favorable recommendation for early promotion to Associate or Full Professor, a candidate must have achieved a record of distinction in all three areas of evaluation that clearly exceeds in substantial ways the requirements established in the Department and College RTP policies. In addition, candidates for early promotion are encouraged to participate in the external evaluation process, according to the Academic Senate Policy on External Evaluation.

4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (ETF)

Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated every five years by the Department Peer Review Committee and the Dean of the College.

5.0 AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT RTP POLICY

Amendments to this RTP Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent (15%) of the full-time tenured and probationary faculty of the Department of Kinesiology. This petition shall be submitted to the Department Chair. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Chair shall communicate the proposed amendment(s) to the Department faculty at least two weeks (i.e., 14 calendar days) prior to voting.

5.1. Voting on Amendments

Voting on amendments shall be by secret ballot and shall comply with the policy as identified in the CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement.

5.2 Majority Approval Required

To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the ballots cast by eligible voters and approved by the Dean and Provost. If an amendment is approved, the change will go into effect at the beginning of the academic year following its passage, provided it is approved at all upper-administrative levels.

5.3 Voting Rights

Tenured and tenure-track faculty in the CHHS, including those on leave and those participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) during a semester of active service, are eligible to vote on RTP policy matters.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS

Department RTP Policy Document Approval

Effective Date: **Fall 2025**

Department of Presidency

Approved by the College Faculty
Council (Enter date below):

4/25/25

Faculty Council Chair
Name & Signature:

Nathan Gerard
[Signature]

Date:

6/30/25

Approved by the College Dean
(Enter date below):

7-8-2025

College Dean
Name & Signature:

Grace Reynolds - Fisher
Grace Reynolds
[Signature]

Date

7-8-2025

Final Review by Faculty Affairs
(Enter date below):

5/29/25

Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs
Name & Signature:

Patricia Perez

Date:

7/10/2025

Provost Signature:

[Signature]

Date:

07/11/25