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**Introduction**

Decisions on retention, tenure and promotion of tenure track faculty in the Department of Kinesiology are based on the department mission, as well as the mission and strategic plan of California State University, Chico, the FPPP, and this document.

**Mission Statement:** The mission of the Department of Kinesiology is to communicate and create knowledge about sport, exercise, and physical activity. The department achieves its mission through innovative and engaging instruction, scholarship, and professional service. The uniqueness of our integrative discipline is that we work directly to promote lifelong learning and participation in human movement to enhance quality of life for all.

**The Charge of the Department Personnel Committee**

The Department of Kinesiology (KINE) has the responsibility of evaluating faculty candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion. Faculty elected to serve on the Personnel committee must:

- Maintain confidentiality about candidates, evidence and deliberations.
- Mentor candidates in the presentation of evidence in the dossier and ensuring the WPAF “accurately reflects the full performance record” (FPPP 8.1.a.5).
- Critically evaluate the quality, quantity (FPPP 8.5.a.16.a), and originality of the faculty member’s performance based upon documented evidence.
- Understand and apply specific criteria to the evidence being evaluated.
- Evaluate a candidate based on the formative or developmental feedback reported in the previous department chair’s and department personnel committee performance evaluations (FPPP 8.5.b.1.b).
- Assign specific FPPP summary evaluation ratings (superior, effective, adequate, inadequate) for each of three areas (Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community) of faculty performance.
- Justify evaluation ratings in each of the areas by referencing specific criteria for performance evaluation.
- State whether the candidate has provided evidence of Contribution to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University (FPPP 8.5.b.1.d).
- Submit a minority report when a committee member does not agree with the approved report.

**Evaluation**

The committee evaluation will be based upon the evidence presented in the dossier and WPAF. The evaluation should take into consideration the candidate’s rank, workload, assigned time, and previous developmental feedback. Other factors to be considered are the quality, quantity, originality, leadership, contribution of the faculty member (e.g. authorship, contributor, officer), rigor of external review, and prestige of the documented activities. To this end a hierarchy of levels or ratings and examples has been created to serve as a guideline. The elements in the hierarchy for “professional growth and achievement” and “other contributions to the university and community” are not comparable across areas of evaluation.