

California State University, Chico

Department of Kinesiology

RTP Review Procedures

Approved: August 21, 2008

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.

Instruction

KINE faculty will be evaluated on student-centered instruction based on the Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education, currency in the discipline, and the effective use of technology. Ratings based on FPPP descriptors:

- 1 – Inadequate, “evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level”
- 2 – Adequate, “satisfactory level of professionalism”
- 3 – Effective, “substantial professionalism and competence”
- 4 – Superior, “consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator”

	Seven Principles of Effective College Teaching							Other Critical Factors	
Evidence	Student-faculty contact	Cooperation among students	Active learning	Prompt feedback	Time on task	High expectations	Respects diverse talents and ways of learning	Current on Subject Matter Knowledge	Effective use of Technology
Peer evaluations									
Course materials									
Student evaluations									
Self reflection									
Student achievement									

Other items that provide evidence of effective student-centered instruction may include but are not limited to: Instructional Innovations (appropriate CAI, video, distance learning), Community Service, Service Learning, External or university award for teaching, Graduate Thesis or Project Chair or Comprehensive Exam Chair, Graduate Thesis or Project Committee Member, Guest Presentations in Other Classes, and Support Letters & Documentation.

Professional Growth and Achievement

KINE faculty should provide evidence of scholarly contributions to the field. KINE faculty value a holistic vision of scholarly contributions (Boyer, 1990), where scholarly contributions share the characteristics of *originality, peer-review, and formal communication*. The quality of scholarship will be evaluated by the committee based on the products and impact of the candidate's work.

Level 1

- Articles
 - Top-Tier Journals in Faculty Area (e.g. *RQES, MSSE, JTPE*)
 - Peer-Reviewed Journals & Proceedings (e.g. *JSCR, JSS, JHMS*)
 - Peer-Reviewed Professional Journals or Magazines (e.g. *JOPERD, S&CJ*)
- Chapters in Edited Scholarly Books
- Books (textbook, anthology, scholarly book with respected publisher)
- Highly Competitive External Grants Awarded
- Presentations
 - Keynote and Invited (International and National)
 - Reviewed (International and National)

Level 2

- International, National or State Award for Academic Video/CD/Software/Web
- Competitive External and Internal Grants Awarded
- Presentations
 - Keynote and Invited (State and Regional)
 - Reviewed (Regional, State, CELT meetings)
 - Professional Conferences (International, National, Regional, State)
 - Workshops (Regional and State)
- Refereed Proceedings or papers
- Activity Book with Respected Publisher
- Editor of Journal, Scholarly Book, or Professional Website
- Curriculum Scholarship (integration of knowledge and connecting it to professional practice)
- Curriculum Revision at State or Program Level
- Highly competitive external grants not awarded
- Competitive state or regional grants
- Relevant Certifications and Continuing Education
- Editorial Board

Level 3

- Presentations
 - Professional Conferences (local associations and school boards)
 - Workshops (local)
- Non-Reviewed Publications (e.g. professional journal, newsletter, news paper)
- Academic Video/CD/Software/Web

- Grant Proposals Submitted
- Curriculum Revision at Course Level
- Internal grants or research contracts awarded
- Attend professional conference

Other Contributions to the University and Community (Service)

KINE faculty provide evidence of contributions to the department, college, the discipline, profession, and the community beyond the university. Note: Service does not include paid consulting.

Level 1

- Department Committees & Assignments (advising, accreditation, curriculum)
- College Committees & Assignments
- University Committees & Assignments
- External or university award for service/advising
- Office or Significant Participation in Professional Societies
 - International
 - National
 - Regional/State
- Official advisor/sponsor of student organizations or clubs
- Capital campaign

Level 2

- Community committees or boards
- Community service programs
- Student Recruitment
- Fundraising
- Organizing community events such as fun runs, dances, spaghetti feeds, health fairs
- Participation in student organizations or clubs

Contributions to the University and Department Strategic Plans

According to the FPPP 8.5.b.1.d, “the fourth area of evaluation is Contribution to Strategic Plans and Goals of the Department/Unit, College, and University.” The Department of Kinesiology believes that candidate contributions to the university and department strategic plans are relevant to the growth of the department, therefore department personnel reports will include statements describing how well the candidate contributes to the university and department strategic plans.

Ratings

Following the evaluation the committee must select the corresponding ratings (Superior, Effective, Adequate, and Inadequate) for Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Other Contributions to the University and Community (Service) based on the descriptions in the FPPP section 8.5.b.1.c. Key adjectives and phrases from this section of the FPPP for each rating are in quotation marks, with typical examples below:

Superior: “excellence” and an “evidentiary record”

Teaching: “consummate professionalism and exceptional skill as an educator with respect to the materials, activities, and standards”

Consistently some of the highest peer, chair, and SETs evaluations

Scholarship: “significant and highly regarded”

“consummate professionalism and significant, highly regarded scholarly achievement with respect to professional contributions to students, to the discipline, and to the professional community”

Consistent record of multiple and high-quality Level 1 contributions

Service: “high level of involvement” and “key roles on significant university-, college-, or department-level committees”

Consistent leadership in university, college or department committees.

Effective: “competence” and “impressive and valued contribution”

Teaching: “substantial professionalism and competence”

Strong peer, chair, and SET evaluations and course materials.

Scholarship: “substantial significant scholarly achievement”

Multiple level 1 contributions and a few level 2 contributions.

Service: “consistent” and “occasional assumption of key roles”

Service with some leadership on department, college, or university committees

Adequate: “satisfactory and acceptable”

Teaching: “satisfactory level of professionalism”

Average peer, chair, and SET evaluations and course materials

Scholarship: “some scholarly achievement”

Minimal level 1 contributions.

Service: “occasional involvement” and “infrequent assumption of key roles”

Consistent attendance and contributions to committees

Inadequate: “less-than-satisfactory”

Teaching: “evidence does not demonstrate at least an adequate level”

Substantially low peer, chair, and SET evaluations and course materials

Scholarship: “does not demonstrate an adequate level of scholarly achievement”

No evidence of contributions at Level 1.

Service: “does not demonstrate an adequate level of involvement”

Inconsistent on non-participation in department and committee meetings.

Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

In relation to recommendations on tenure and promotion the committee should follow the guidelines of FPPP section 8.5.b.2. To be considered for promotion in KINE, faculty must be rated “Superior” in one and “Effective” in two of the RTP areas. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor the candidate must provide evidence of original, peer-reviewed scholarship that demonstrates the faculty member’s capability to be an independent, contributing scholar in Kinesiology. Candidates must provide evidence and a track record of Level 1 contributions in Professional Growth and Achievement for tenure and promotion. KINE values collaborative scholarship, but candidates for tenure must demonstrate success in independent and original scholarship. For promotion to Professor the candidate must provide evidence of a consistent line of scholarship that has resulted in significant recognition outside (national or international) the university (FPPP 8.5.b.2.e.5) and be rated “Superior” in at least two of the three areas. Extensive

instructional and service responsibilities cannot override a professor's need for scholarly/professional achievement.

The FPPP states that candidates applying for early tenure or promotion must meet a higher standard of "exceptional merit" FPPP 8.5.b.3.c. KINE will consider these cases where there is abundant and unequivocal evidence of exceptional merit. Exceptional merit is defined as performance in all three RTP areas rating "Superior."

Department's Responsibility

All members will work to the best of their ability to assist full-time tenure-track faculty through the retention, tenure and promotion process. New full-time tenure-track faculty may also be assigned a peer mentor. In addition, new faculty will meet twice each academic year with the department chair until they submit their application for tenure and promotion. Meetings should take place near the beginning of the fall semester and near the end of the spring semester. At the fall meetings, the chair will review the FPPP and department guidelines for RTP with the faculty member. The faculty member will establish goals for each area of review and determine a plan of action for the academic year and share that with the department chair and mentor. Each spring, the faculty member will report to the chair the steps taken and/or completed in effort to meet his/her goals.

Candidate's Responsibility

Each candidate has the responsibility of creating a dossier and certain documents for their Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). The dossier and WPAF provide evidence documenting the faculty member's contributions to Instruction, Professional Growth and Achievement, and Service that merit retention, tenure or promotion.

The guidelines in FPPP 8.1.c.1 should be followed in construction of the dossier. Thus the dossier should contain a copy of the department RTP standards, curriculum vitae, narrative, and supporting materials. In particular, the narrative should provide information about the candidate's context and reflective statements on teaching, professional development, and their interrelationship with each other and to one's arc of expertise. The candidate should also address the scope and quality of performance with respect to all areas of evaluation and make the case that this performance has met or exceeded departmental and university expectations. Supporting materials should include, for example, curricular matter and copies of articles and other forms of scholarship. In addition, candidates are encouraged to cite relevant independent sources (e.g. ISI journal impact factors, book reviews, citations) that testify to the quality of their contributions. Letters of recommendation from friends and colleagues of the candidate are not considered independent.

The candidate's dossier and vita should be clearly organized with headings and subheadings consistent with department and university standards so that the nature of all contributions (peer review, audience, etc.) is documented. It is unacceptable to list a variety of different contributions under general headings like "service" or "articles/chapters."

In addition to preparing a dossier the candidate needs to ensure that peer evaluations of their teaching, evidence of professional achievement, and current vitae are available for review. Student and peer evaluations and are located in the WPAF.