CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) POLICY

Effective Date: Fall 2019

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 09-10) 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 he or she submits 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 subdisiciplines.

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 – the traditional research model in which new content knowledge is acquired and disseminated;

b. Scholarship of Integration – the creation of new knowledge by synthesizing and making connections across disciplines or subdisciplines;

c. Scholarship of Application – the integration of theory and practice in ways that promote problem-solving and positive physical, social, psychological, and/or behavioral change among humans; and

d. Scholarship of Pedagogy – the discovery of ways in which students learn and the identification and assessment of methods that foster learning.

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.

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 is 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.

2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice

Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to improve instructional effectiveness, which may result in adopting new teaching methodologies, are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods shall be consistent with course/curriculum goals and accommodate student differences.

To facilitate evaluation of a candidate's instructional philosophy and 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.

2.1.1a Indicators of Effective Teaching

Effective teaching shall be evidenced by faculty in the following ways:

1. Maintaining subject mastery and currency in one's Kinesiology subdiscipline(s);

2. Fostering a caring and respectful learning environment in which the contributions of students and faculty are valued and recognized;

3. Incorporating one's scholarship into teaching;

4. Supervising student research and engaging students in one's own scholarly research when possible (e.g., as participants or collaborators);

5. Demonstrating careful preparation and organization of lessons and pedagogical materials and incorporating improved teaching strategies that were suggested or implied in previous evaluations of one's teaching by students and peers in an effort to enhance student learning;

6. Assessing student learning outcomes that help develop students become successful, ethical, and visionary leaders in a multicultural, highly

technological, and increasingly global world;

7. Experimenting purposefully with one's pedagogy in ways that foster an educational environment characterized by academic freedom, creative expression, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and community engagement;

8. Creating and/or revising courses and curricula in ways that foster a vibrant, intellectual community emphasizing a shared commitment to scholarly inquiry;

9 Mentoring and advising of students that contribute positively to students' cultural, social, and intellectual lives, as well as their professional futures;

10. Demonstrating timeliness and professionalism in meeting classes and evaluating student work; and

11 Demonstrating rigor and transparency in evaluating student work.

2.1.1b Requirements for Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher

1. Faculty shall engage in an ongoing effort to improve their teaching effectiveness, as demonstrated by involvement in at least two of the following professional development activities (a-d). If professional development workshops are attended, documentation of such attendance must be provided.

   a. Regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues regarding pedagogy, such as discussions of pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and consultation regarding course development;

   b. A sustained record of involvement in instruction-related programs offered by the CSULB Faculty Center for Professional Development;

   c. A sustained record of participation in teaching development seminars or conferences sponsored by the Department, College, University or professional organizations; and/or

   d. A sustained record of giving or receiving formal or informal pedagogical coaching and/or other activities that contribute to development of teaching effectiveness.

2. Faculty are required to keep abreast of disciplinary developments through reading professional literature and participation in discipline-specific conferences and continuing education activities.

3. Faculty are required to participate in the development and assessment of graduate students' comprehensive examinations.

4. Faculty are required to mentor graduate students through active participation on committees that supervise graduate student theses and/or projects. (This expectation increases at the Associate and Full Professor ranks).

2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student learning. Instructional practices and course materials shall clearly convey to students expected student outcomes and learning goals. Assessment methods should align with instructional practices.

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.

2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction

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

2.1.3a 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.

Courses taught outside the academic year (winter, summer, and special sessions) should not be submitted and will not be evaluated.

2.1.3b Evaluation by RTP Committee and Peers

Quantitative ratings from student evaluations of instruction must reflect generally positive perceptions among students regarding of 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 compare favorably to those of the Department and College.

1. Candidates for mini-review or reappointment shall provide documentary evidence of the following:

   a) continued improvement in teaching in response to feedback from peers and students; or

   b) a sustained level of effective teaching, as indicated by student and peer evaluation.

2. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall provide documentary evidence of a sustained level of effective teaching.

3. Candidates for promotion to the rank of Full Professor shall provide documentary evidence that a consistent level of teaching effectiveness has been attained.

2.1.3c 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. These additional requirements are listed below in Sections 2.1.4 through 2.1.7.

2.1.4 Peer Evaluations of Teaching

2.1.4a 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 his or her teaching.

2.1.4b 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 and 2.1.2 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).

2.1.5 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.

2.1.5b Evaluation by RTP Committee - All course syllabi shall comply with the requirements of the Academic Senate and Department syllabus policies. Pursuant to these policies, all syllabi must set forth course meeting times and location; the instructor's office location, office hours, and contact information; t relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education; required books and other resources; grading practices, standards, and criteria; an explanation of the instructor's attendance and/or participation policy; an explanation of how the instructor interprets and applies the University's course withdrawal policy; a summary of course requirements that form the basis of the faculty member's assessment of student performance; a statement on academic integrity; and a course outline or schedule.

Additionally, the following are expected:

1. Up-to-date instructional methods that are appropriate for the

courses and topics taught; and

2. Up-to-date assigned materials, appropriate for the topic, and selected to enhance student learning and achievement of expected student learning outcomes.

The absence of the aforementioned content in any course syllabus constitutes evidence that the course, and, therefore the instructor, may fail to meet the standards of excellence this Policy is designed to facilitate.

2.1.6 Samples of Course and Curricular Materials

Candidates are required to submit samples of course and curricular materials (e.g., creative assignments, examinations, cooperative learning exercises, software, special PowerPoint or multimedia presentations, specialized elements on their BeachBoard space) that serve as additional indicators of pedagogical innovation and effectiveness. Samples of submitted materials must include evidence of the following:

a. Innovative approaches to teaching or exemplary ways of fostering student learning in the classroom;

b. Involvement outside the classroom in such areas as academic advising, field trips, practicum/fieldwork experiences, student mentoring, collaborative research projects with students, comprehensive exams, thesis/project supervision, support of student organizations, and/or support of student recruitment and retention activities;

c. Development of new curricula, instructional programs, or instructional materials, such as electronic or multimedia software, or new advising materials or programs; and/or

d. Successful mentoring of students through the completion of comprehensive exams, theses, projects, research presentations at academic conferences, or publications.

Faculty shall indicate how these assignments are related to the student learning outcomes and enhance the quality of the course.

2.1.7 Grade Distributions

2.1.7a Required Documentation - It is the responsibility of candidates to submit their grade distributions in tabular form for all sections of all courses taught during the review period. They must also comment on these distributions, including what the grade distributions indicate about

the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

2.1.7b Evaluation by RTP Committee - Grading distributions help to contextualize a candidate's student evaluations and assist in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The RTP Committee shall evaluate a candidate's grade distributions within the context of how they are explicated by the candidate. For example, while a bell-shaped curve might be expected in large undergraduate classes, the use of mastery-learning techniques might justify a grading distribution of all "A's" and "B's" in an upper-division or graduate seminar. Thus, grade distributions must be effectively articulated in the candidate's narrative so that they can be understood within the context of the candidate's teaching philosophy and pedagogical practices.

2.2 **Research and Scholarly and Creative Activities (RSCA)**

Research and other scholarly and creative activity (RCSA) are a primary and essential academic responsibility of faculty members in the teacher-scholar model. Therefore, Kinesiology faculty are expected to conduct data-based research and other forms of scholarship throughout their academic careers. Data-based research, including both primary and secondary data, and other forms of scholarship, are crucial and beneficial for the following reasons: 1) advances in the discipline of Kinesiology are dependent upon generating new information; 2) research and other scholarly and creative activities enhance teaching effectiveness and enrich the education of students; and 3) RCSA brings prestige and visibility to the Department, College, and University. Such activity increases the likelihood that the Department will attract high quality students, faculty, and financial support (e.g., grants, contracts, and equipment) from the community.

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 required to engage in a sustained (i.e., ongoing over multiple years) program of peer-reviewed, investigative, data-based 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 required to disseminate their RCSA to appropriate audiences through discipline-specific, peer-reviewed publications, and presentations. Faculty may employ quantitative, qualitative, historical, and other subdiscipline-appropriate methodology in conducting their research.

Data-based research published in peer-reviewed scholarly outlets (e.g., journals), which is required of all faculty, is valued more highly than non-data-based and non-peer-viewed scholarship, and thus carries more weight in the RTP evaluative process. Faculty may augment this work with non-data-based and non-refereed scholarly and creative activities that are published in appropriate disciplinary and professional outlets; however, this latter form of scholarship is not sufficient alone for the candidate to be awarded reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

Research and other scholarly and creative activities include articles in scholarly professional journals, books, chapters in books, monographs, scholarly professional presentations, software and electronically published documents, and awarded grants and contracts. Faculty may augment their required research and other scholarly and creative activities with editorial assignments in recognized professional publications, journals, newsletters, magazines, and/or electronic media, appointments to review panels for grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, conference presentations, and other assignments as a referee (e.g., guest reviewer for a journal), and authorship of *published* teaching and curriculum guides and/or laboratory manuals.

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

1. Evaluation Standards – The following standards shall be used for evaluating research and other scholarly and creative activities:

   a. quality of work as judged by one's peers;

   b. scope of recognition (e.g., at local, regional, national, and/or international levels);

   c. *sustained* effort, involvement, and record of accomplishment; and

   d. impact of the activity.

2. 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. Rates of dissemination may vary with specific scholarly goals.

      Future scholarship plans and goals are an important aspect of all faculty reviews, and faculty are expected to continue their scholarly activity throughout their academic careers. Toward these ends:

      1) In the first two years of appointment, probationary faculty are required to formulate and pursue a scholarly research agenda.

      2) Reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires evidence that the candidate's research has been productive, as evidenced by publications in appropriate scholarly venues. Moreover, candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must demonstrate how their research agenda is both ongoing and evolving.

      3) Promotion to the rank of Full Professor requires a sustained pattern of achievement since attaining the rank of Associate Professor, with evidence indicating the maturation of the scholarly/creative/professional record.

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. Thus, completed works must be published in respected peer-reviewed venues consistent with accepted disciplinary standards. This level of accomplishment is required and is the most important criterion for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion within the scholarship domain (see Section 2.2.3 for specific criteria related to the assessment of research and scholarship).

1) RTP Committee members conducting reappointment evaluations shall be mindful of the fact that during the first two probationary years, faculty are likely to be in the early stages of developing a research agenda. New faculty, however, are expected to write and submit manuscripts to refereed journals for editorial consideration during their first two years. Faculty recently receiving doctoral degrees are encouraged to transform their dissertations into peer-reviewed journal articles, but research interests should also evolve beyond their dissertation research.

2) By the time a candidate applies for reappointment at the beginning of the third probationary year, he or she shall have at least one peer-reviewed journal article either in print, in press, or formally accepted for publication during this time period. This is a minimum qualification and should not be viewed as a sufficient threshold, as two or more peer-reviewed journal articles are preferred.

3) After initial reappointment, during the latter half of the probationary period (years 4-6 in a standard six-year timeline), faculty should be publishing regularly in peer-reviewed journals. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall have at least four refereed articles published (or in press) during their probationary period. Quality, however, is more important than quantity. Thus, for example, three peer-reviewed articles that advance disciplinary knowledge and/or theory in significant ways and are published in top-tier journals may warrant granting tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.

4) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are required to maintain consistency in their scholarly activity *over time* and demonstrate their ability to bring significant projects to fruition via publishing them in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank

of Full Professor are required to have produced, on average, at least four scholarly publications since the last promotion. As with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, however, quality is more important than quantity. Thus, multiple publications that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner are not likely to result in a favorable recommendation for promotion. Conversely, three publications in top-tier journals, plus a book (authored or edited with contributions by the candidate), or two scholarly articles, plus two books (authored by the candidate) published by a well-respected scholarly press or leading commercial publishing house may warrant granting promotion to the rank of Professor. In summary, evidence is required of sustained peer-reviewed scholarship and significant contributions to the empirical and/or theoretical body of knowledge since tenure and/or the last promotion.

c. The applicant's entire body of scholarly work through reappointment, tenure, and promotion provides evidence for a pattern of ongoing scholarship. Works completed since one's appointment at CSULB carry greater weight for mini-reviews,[1] reappointment, and tenure, however, unless the candidate was given years of credit for work at other institutions. In such cases, the work at other institutions counts equally with those completed at CSULB. In contrast, works completed after a candidate has received tenure and/or promotion at CSULB carry greater weight for subsequent promotions than those completed prior to tenure and/or initial promotion (e.g., from Associate to Full Professor).

2.2.2b. Additional Evidence of Excellence in Research and Scholarship

1. 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 research 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.

2. Exceptional Scholarship – Publishing exceptionally high-quality scholarship in well-respected venues (e.g., top-tier journals with high impact factors and/or low acceptance rates) shall be given more weight in the RTP evaluative process.

[1] Mini-reviews are conducted by the Department Peer Review Committee; however, the same principles and criteria set forth in this document apply in the evaluative process.

3. Sponsored Research – Although faculty are strongly encouraged to apply for external funds that support scholarly research (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends), application or receipt of sponsored research shall *not* be viewed as a prerequisite for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Securing such sponsored research opportunities, however, is highly valued for its benefits to the University, College, and Department, and the discipline of Kinesiology. Moreover, grants and contracts often bring state of the art equipment and technology to the Department and thereby increase the likelihood that students will be well trained and competitive when seeking employment. Therefore, funded external grants and contracts will be given more weight during the evaluation of an applicant's scholarly activities. The following caveats are in order, however.

   a) The award of sponsored research funding is highly competitive. Preparing applications is a time-consuming process that can detract from the applicant's ability to otherwise pursue scholarly activities that do not require funding. Thus, during the probationary period, applying for sponsored research opportunities is to be commended and supported. Moreover, probationary faculty shall not be penalized if their proposals are not funded, but rather shall be encouraged to continue developing their grant-writing skills. However, the candidate may not use continued grant writing, particularly that which is unfunded, as a reason for not publishing peer-reviewed data-based research.

   b) During the time that faculty members are conducting funded grant-related scholarship, allowances shall be made in the expectations for publishing scholarly data-based journal articles. Evaluators must recognize that managing large-scale grant work is time-consuming, and, therefore publication of the results of such research may be delayed until after an extensive data-collection and analysis process. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide commentary on the time consumption required of grant activities, particularly those that slow down the publication process.

2.2.3 Specific Criteria for the Assessment of Scholarship

2.2.3a Core Disciplinary Scholarship – Faculty shall have a core of data-based disciplinary scholarship disseminated in nationally-recognized *peer-reviewed* professional outlets (e.g., professional journals). Non-refereed published works (e.g., books, chapters in edited volumes, contributions to disciplinary and professional publications such as magazines or newsletters) are valued and may be considered as scholarly and creative activities, but alone do *not* satisfy the scholarship requirements outlined

in this document.

Scholarly presentations at local, regional, national, and international conferences are also valued, with national and international conference speaking engagements carrying the greatest weight in the evaluative process. Refereed presentations carry more weight than non-refereed presentations. Presentations alone, in the absence of published research and other refereed scholarly and creative works, do not fulfill the scholarship requirements for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

It is the candidate's responsibility to report the following indicators of scholarship quality in his/her RTP portfolio:

1. Authorship – First and sole-authored works and those published with student collaborators are evaluated most positively, followed by multiple-authored works that do not include students as co-authors. In the case of multiple authors, the amount and nature of the candidate's contributions must be clearly specified.

2. Refereed Journal Articles – Peer-review process; acceptance/rejection rates for the journal; impact factor, if available; professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of the journal; status of the journal within the discipline/subdiscipline; status of the members of the journal editorial board within the subfield; readership of the journal; inclusion of journal abstracts in relevant disciplinary abstracting services; and citation frequency.

3. Books – The academic standing of the publisher; published reviews; evidence of readership (e.g., size of the press run, sales, course adoptions); and citation frequency.

4. Sponsored Research – The application for and securing of external funds to support scholarly research.

5. Invited Publications and Presentations – The stature of the editor of the special issue or book; the stature of other contributors to the publication; the academic standing of the publisher; the scope of the professional organization extending the invitation (i.e., international, national, regional, or local); and the number of invited colloquia given at the college/university level.

6. Refereed Conference Presentations (e.g., symposia, paper presentations, roundtables, poster sessions) – The peer review process used for the conference; and the scope of the professional organization sponsoring the conference (i.e., international, national, regional, or

local).

7. Editorial/Reviewer Roles – Activities in the capacity of editor-in-chief, associate editor, contributing editor, or assistant editor; guest editor for a special issue of a journal; membership on an editorial board; invitations to serve as an *ad hoc* or guest reviewer on journal submissions; membership on a grant-review panel; and invitations to serve as an *ad hoc* reviewer for grant applications.

8. Professional Consulting Activities – The number and scope of technical reports; and the frequency and range of clients for consulting activities.[2]

9. Internal Support of Scholarly Activities – The number and scope of activities supported by the Scholarly and Creative Activity Committee (SCAC) awards, sabbaticals, and other forms of support for scholarly research funded by CSULB. Receiving money from the Department to support one's research shall not be considered in this category.

2.2.3b Diversity of Impact – Faculty may choose a variety of different outlets for dissemination of scholarship, as appropriate to the targeted audience articulated in their teacher-scholar goals. All types of impact are valued. Some core of disciplinary impact is expected, as is expansion over time into multiple types and levels of impact. Recognized levels of impact include:

1. Disciplinary Impact (i.e., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge) – Disciplinary impact includes the importance of information (e.g., theory, empirical data, methodological innovation, application) for disciplinary progress and typically includes dissemination in peer-reviewed disciplinary journals.

2. Impact on Students – CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should positively impact students. The Department of Kinesiology evaluates impact accordingly in terms of the significance of scholarly work for students' development as junior scholars and professionals (e.g., modeling and mentoring in undergraduate/graduate student research or field work; co-authoring scholarly presentations and publications; discussions of the research process, methodology, and findings in courses). Publications and presentations including student co-authors/presenters are highly valued.

[2] Professional activities as a consultant or practitioner are considered scholarly when they involve the creation of knowledge and impact significantly one's discipline. Examples include original research when consulting for a school, agency, or company, creating national standards for an accrediting organization, and designing curricula for national or regional use. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, written evaluations by peers, organizational professionals, or some other type of formal and rigorous assessment.

3. Community Impact – The Department of Kinesiology recognizes impact on various types of community entities (e.g., professional, organizational, governmental), as well as at different levels of community effort (i.e., local, regional, national, and international).

The impact of scholarship on students and the community may be difficult to demonstrate tangibly; nevertheless, these are valued areas of impact. Indicators of such impact may include, but are not limited to, student co-authorship on presentations or publications; undergraduate research mentee pursuit of graduate training; scholarship used to provide community testimony; use of technical reports or consultation to address issues of public policy; and external evaluation indicating the quality and impact of one's scholarship.

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.

Service to the University is required at three levels: the Department, the College, and the University. The faculty member must be active at each level. *During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty are not required to participate in College and University service; however, they are expected, however, to perform quality service at the Department level*.

For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty are required to make quality service contributions to the Department and the College. Additionally, candidates for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must have made quality service contributions to the community and/or to the profession.

For promotion to the rank of Full Professor, faculty are required to have provided Significant quality service and leadership in the Department, College, and University, as well as a sustained pattern of quality service contributions either in the community or to the profession.

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 Requirements for Reappointment, Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

a. Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall demonstrate a record of committed service to the Department of Kinesiology, as demonstrated by any combination of the following:

1. Participating actively and collegially on Department committees;

2. Advising student organizations or clubs;

3. Authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the Department;

4. Attending and meaningfully participating in faculty meetings and professional development opportunities sponsored by the Department; and

5. Actively participating in student programs (e.g., Commencement, Precommencement Celebration, Graduate Research Colloquium).

b. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor shall have continued making service contributions to the Department of Kinesiology, but also have made service contributions to:

1. The College of Health and Human Services (e.g., serving on College committees and/or authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the College).

They shall also have made service contributions to *one or both* of the following:

2. The Kinesiology profession (advancing one's academic profession through active participation in appropriate professional and scholarly organizations). Examples of this type of service include, but are not limited to, the following:

a) Providing workshops, speeches, performances, displays, and/or media interviews;

b) Authoring non-scholarly documents (e.g., reports and policies) relevant to a professional organization; and

c) Serving in leadership positions or active participation as members of standing or special committees of professional organizations.

3. The community (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of campus, local, national, or international problems), such as:

a) Actively participating in on- or off-campus programs or workshops;

b) Actively participating in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations and/or agencies related to the one's professional expertise; and

c) Acting as a resource person or consultant for educational, government, business, industry, or community organizations.

2.3.2 Requirements for Promotion to Professor

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor shall demonstrate:

a. Consistent service and leadership at the Department, College, and University levels, such as:

1. Serving as a major Department administrator (i.e., Chair or Associate Chair);

2. Chairing major Department committees or programs;

3. Holding elected or appointed leadership positions on College and/or University committees, organizations, or task forces;

4. Authoring policy documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the University, College, or Department; and

5. Developing or significantly revising Department curricula and programs.

They also shall also have made service contributions to *one or both* of the following:

b. A record of professional involvement in professional organizations (e.g., serving on committees; leading workshops; giving speeches or presentations; serving as a media consultant, writing relevant editorials in newspapers, magazines, or newsletters; and/or holding leadership positions).

c. A record of meaningful service in the community (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of campus, local, national, or international problems), such as:

1. Serving in a leadership role in on- or off-campus programs or workshops;

2. Holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations

related to the one's professional expertise;

3. Consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations, government, business, industry, or community service organizations; and

4. Serving on governing boards and/or chairing meetings.

2.3.3 Evaluation of Service

The candidate must provide a documented narrative of his/her 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 organizati0ons 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 he or she 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 by 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.