

Department of
Kinesiology & Health Promotion
Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)
Document 2023/24 – 2027/28

APPROVED

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	KHP Mission Statement/Department Values	2
1.2	Definitions and Abbreviations	3
1.3	Review Cycles	5
2	PROCEDURES	6
2.1	Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)	6
2.2	Timetable	8
2.3	Evaluation of Instructional Competence	9
2.4	Evaluation of Professional Productivity	12
2.5	Evaluation Service Contributions	13
2.6	Five-Year Plan	14
2.7	Candidate’s Responsibilities	15
3	CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION	15
3.1	Criteria for Reappointment	16
3.2	Criteria for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor	17
3.3	Criteria for Early Tenure or Early Promotion to Associate Professor	18
3.4	Criteria for Promotion to Professor	19
3.5	Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor	20
4	SUMMARY OF KHP RTP CRITERIA	21
5	APPENDICES	23
5.1	Class Observation Form	23
5.2	Student Activity Evaluation Form	23
5.3	Student Lab Evaluation Form	23
5.4	Student Lecture Evaluation Form	23
5.5	Student Online Evaluation Form	23

1 INTRODUCTION

The reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process is a critically important faculty responsibility. RTP is the mechanism by which the university assures the success of faculty and thereby assures educational quality for its students. While the President makes final decisions on RTP, it is a department's faculty who are in the best position to provide clear performance expectations to the RTP Candidate, create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and render the most informed recommendations to the President. The department RTP criteria document communicates department expectations and RTP procedures to the department faculty, faculty Candidates, dean, College RTP Committee (CRTPC), University RTP Committee, and academic administrators. University policies, including the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and policies 1328 and 1329 of the University Manual, define university procedures and expectations. Department documents must supplement and may not conflict with these policies. In the event of discrepancies, the CBA takes precedence, and university and departmental policies are superseded by the CBA.

The CBA requires that tenure-track faculty members be provided a copy of the department RTP criteria document within two weeks of the start of their first semester at Cal Poly Pomona. It is recommended that department criteria be maintained on the [faculty affairs website](#) so that they are available to Candidates for faculty positions. The primary purpose of the department RTP criteria document is to clearly articulate the department's expectations of its faculty members and what they must achieve to receive a supportive recommendation for reappointment, tenure, and promotion from the department. Department expectations must be stated with clarity and sufficiently for Candidates to be able to plan their activities to meet them.

The department RTP criteria should be consistent with department and College mission, vision, goals, and accreditation standard. We, the Kinesiology and Health Promotion (KHP) department, value curiosity, integrity, collaboration, inclusivity, and innovation. In alignment with these values, the departmental criteria toward RTP are inclusive of all activities that a Candidate may take part in as a faculty member. We recognize that productive activities may vary within the diverse sub-disciplines of KHP. Therefore, we support the creative ways in which our faculty embody the departmental standards of instructional competence, professional productivity, and contribution to service. The department RTP criteria document should be used by the Candidate as a guide that articulates how all of their activities related to their position align with expectations as a faculty member.

RTP is not simply a matter of evaluation. Faculty colleagues, deans, and academic administrators should commit themselves to mentoring and supporting Candidates, providing them the maximum opportunity to be successful. It is important for those making recommendations to be honest, direct, and clear, just as it is important for Candidates to be knowledgeable of and committed to meeting department expectations.

1.1 KHP Mission Statement/Department Values

As part of the College of Science (CoS), the KHP Department is committed to the broader mission of educating, mentoring and inspiring students through scientific inquiry and hands-on learning. In assessing the performance of a KHP faculty member, recognition of the diverse nature of the discipline is essential. The diversity in our discipline is fully supported by the department's strategic object to *investigate ways to advance the art and science of health and human movement*. As a department, we are driven by the shared core values of curiosity, integrity, collaboration, inclusivity, and innovation. These are defined as follows:

- i. **Curiosity:** We encourage and model an open-minded and holistic approach to life-long learning and wellness
- ii. **Integrity:** We exhibit soundness of character and an unwavering moral compass
- iii. **Collaboration:** We combine our strengths in affirming and proactive ways

- iv. **Inclusivity:** We foster diversity appreciation and equity for all individuals and maintain an adaptable curriculum
- v. **Innovation:** We take risks with creative, outside the box thinking and planning to maximize our resources to best serve our students and community

The KHP department also values the teacher-scholar model and, as such, have the expectation that faculty members are actively engaged in advancing their specific discipline within the field and are also committed to blending teaching and scholarship as equally valued and synergistic endeavors.

1.2 Definitions and Abbreviations

1.2.1 Definitions: University Manual, policy 1328, provides a comprehensive overview of RTP and periodic evaluation procedures. Some of the most pertinent definitions are provided here.

- i. A **Candidate** refers to a faculty member who is under consideration for periodic evaluation, reappointment, tenure, or promotion action in the current cycle.
- ii. **DRTPC** is the Department Retention Tenure and Promotion Committee which consists of an uneven number of tenure track faculty members within the department. The members are elected by the tenured and probationary faculty by secret ballot. Members must be full-time tenured faculty members. A faculty member on professional leave (sabbatical or difference-in-pay) for only one semester during a particular RTP cycle may serve if elected and willing and with prior approval by the provost; a faculty member who is on leave for two semesters or more during a particular RTP cycle may not be elected. A tenured faculty member who will be a Candidate for promotion may be elected but may participate on reappointment cases *only*—and may *not* participate in promotion or tenure recommendations. In promotion considerations, RTP committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. (See also policy 1328, sections 1.17 B. 2. and 3.1. G.)
- iii. **Criteria** are the expectations articulated in the department RTP criteria document and in policy 1328, section 2.0. Criteria define what a Candidate must achieve to be positively recommended for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Criteria documents contain procedural information as well; however, it is important to distinguish between criteria and rules/procedures. The department RTP criteria are adopted by a majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty, submitted to the dean and the CRTPC for review and comment, and ultimately approved by the President or their designee.
- iv. **Service Credit** refers to how many years are credited toward promotion and tenure for each Candidate. A **probationary year** of service is defined in terms of the traditional academic year; that is, fall and spring semesters. For faculty members entering the department without service credit, the first probationary year begins with the first fall term of appointment. For faculty members entering the department with service credit, the first probationary year takes years of service credit into account (e.g., a faculty member hired with two years of service credit begins their third probationary year in their first fall term of appointment (See CBA, 13.4

regarding possibility of receiving up to 2 years of service credit at time of initial appointment.) **Probationary faculty** are faculty who have not yet received tenure.

- v. **Tenure Cycle** refers to the period when a faculty member applies for tenure. Faculty members (without initial service credit) **must apply for tenure** at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. An application for tenure prior to the sixth probationary year is an application for **early action**.
- vi. Faculty members entering the department at the Assistant Professor rank are **eligible to apply for the first promotion** at the time they apply for tenure. Once tenured, the faculty member is **eligible for a subsequent promotion** after having served four years in the current rank. Faculty members entering the department at the Associate Professor rank without tenure are eligible to apply for promotion to Full Professor at the time they apply for tenure. Applications for promotion prior to having attained eligibility are applications for **early promotion**.
- vii. **Criteria for early actions** shall place emphasis on teaching ability and accomplishment, and the criteria shall require exceptional performance or extraordinary qualifications regarding professional activities and university service.
- viii. **Student evaluations of courses** is governed by policy 1329 of the University Manual.
- ix. **Peer evaluation of teaching** is the responsibility of the KHP Lecturer Evaluation Committee in collaboration with the DRTPC. Peer evaluation activities include classroom visits and reviews of course syllabi and other teaching materials, as well as written reports of Candidates' teaching performance.
- x. **A Candidate for reappointment must use the department RTP criteria** in effect at the time of the Candidate's initial probationary appointment (see policy 1328, section 7.1) Current procedures and policies apply. "Procedures and policies" mean matters covered by Section 2 of this document, by contrast with criteria which are matters covered by Section 3 of this document.
- xi. **A Candidate applying for tenure or promotion (including early tenure or promotion) may choose between the criteria currently** in effect, or those criteria in effect at the time they were hired (see policy 1328, section 7.2). In any case, *current* procedures and policies apply. A Candidate requesting both tenure and promotion must choose a single set of criteria for both actions.
- xii. **Performance review process** is defined by policy 1328, section 7.3 as an "actionable" evaluation process conducted by the DRTPC, department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), dean, URTPC, and provost that "results in a recommendation for a personnel action such as reappointment, tenure and/or promotion" (see also CBA 15.38). Only through a performance review can a Candidate apply for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
- xiii. **Periodic evaluation** is a non-actionable abbreviated review process defined by policy 1328, section 7.3 as "an intermittent evaluation process

that includes review only by the DRTPC, department chair (if not serving on the DRTPC), and dean,” which “does not result in a formal personnel decision but may be used to support future personnel decisions.”

- xiv. **Review cycle** is defined by Policy 1328, section 7.4 as: “the period of performance under review or evaluation. If a Candidate is applying for reappointment for the first time, the period of review shall be the period since the Candidate’s original appointment. For subsequent reappointment applications and for periodic evaluations the period of review shall be the period since the last performance review. The period of review for application for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure shall be the period since the original appointment. The period of review for application for promotion to Full Professor shall be the period since the previous application for promotion to Associate, or, if the Candidate was hired at the Associate rank, the period since the original appointment.” Reappointment performance reviews are normally based on the Candidate’s performance since their last performance review; promotion performance reviews are based on the period since the previous application for promotion or since original appointment; and tenure performance reviews are based on the period since original appointment to the probationary position. The Candidate may discuss achievements outside of the period of review, but only for the purpose of demonstrating consistency of performance. Thus, this discussion should be brief.

1.2.2 List of Abbreviations

- i. **CAFE-** Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence
- ii. **CBA-** Collective Bargaining Agreement
- iii. **CoS-** College of Science
- iv. **CRTPC-**College Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee
- v. **DRTPC-** Department Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee
- vi. **IRB-** Institutional Review Board
- vii. **KHP-** Kinesiology and Health Promotion
- viii. **PAF-** Personal Action File
- ix. **PY-** Probationary Year
- x. **RTP-** Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion
- xi. **URTPC-** University Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee

1.3 Review Cycles

1.3.1 Pre-RTP

According to Policy 1328, section 7.3, “Probationary faculty will receive an initial appointment of two years. In Year One they will undergo a unique form of periodic evaluation known as “Pre-RTP.” As a periodic evaluation, Pre-RTP is not actionable and will be reviewed only by the DRTPC, department chair if not serving on the DRTPC, and dean.

1.3.2 Review Cycle Schedules

Probationary faculty will typically undergo a full performance review every two years (i.e., they will typically undergo a performance review in their second, fourth and sixth probationary years). In the interim years, probationary faculty will typically undergo periodic evaluation. This cycle schedule may vary for faculty hired with service credit or who apply for early tenure. All probationary faculty must undergo a *minimum* of *three* full performance reviews, except in certain specific cases of application for early tenure (see policy 1328, section 7.3)

1.3.3 Additional Performance Reviews

Review cycle schedules may also vary for Candidates who are required to undergo additional performance reviews. According to policy 1328, section 7.4, “Based on review of the RTP package and evaluation of progress towards tenure and promotion, evaluators at any level of review may recommend that a probationary faculty member undergo another performance review rather than a periodic evaluation in the following year. This recommendation is not subject to appeal although the probationary faculty member can submit a rebuttal.”

2 PROCEDURES

2.1 Department RTP Committee (DRTPC)

2.1.1 Composition

According to university policy, the membership size of the DRTPC shall be three (3) to seven (7) if there are ten (10) or fewer full-time faculty eligible to serve; five (5) to nine (9) if there are eleven (11) to seventeen (17) full-time faculty eligible to serve; seven (7) to fifteen (15) if there are eighteen (18) or more full-time faculty eligible to serve. The DRTPC shall always have an odd number of members (#1328, 3.1A).

2.1.2 Eligibility

All DRTPC members shall be tenured. In promotion considerations, RTP committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. Candidates being considered for promotion are not eligible for service on promotion or tenure considerations. A DRTPC member may not simultaneously serve on the DRTPC and the College RTP Committee or the University RTP Committee during a given cycle. The DRTPC Chair shall be a full-time tenured faculty (#1328,3.1B). Non-tenured department chairs, or chairs who are Candidates for an RTP action, are not eligible to be members of the DRTPC or to write separate recommendations. If eligible, the department chair shall serve as a committee member (#1328, 3.1E).

2.1.3 Term of Service

University regulations require annual elections. Therefore, DRTPC members will serve for one year with the possibility of serving multiple years based on results of the annual elections. Annual elections will be conducted by secret ballot by March 1st of the school year preceding the given RTP cycle, and election shall be by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty members of the department. The DRTPC’s term of service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the DRTPC’s recommendations have been concluded.

2.1.4 Duties of DRTPC

The DRTPC is responsible for (1) clarifying expectations with the Candidate; (2) a careful, thorough, detailed, and timely review of the Candidate's RTP package; (3) making written recommendations for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion based on KHP RTP criteria; (4) keeping deliberations of the DRTPC confidential; (5) voting on requested RTP actions; (6) including a discussion of progress made on recommendations for improvement given to the Candidate in the previous RTP cycle (pursuant to policy #1328, 7.4D); (7) consulting the full Personal Action File (PAF) for additional relevant materials (#1328, 1.5), and (8) ensuring that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted and that a copy of each written evaluation is submitted to the faculty member within two weeks of the class visit (#1328, 3.3C), and (9) notifying each Candidate of its recommendation.

2.1.5 Election of DRTPC Chair

The DRTPC shall elect a DRTPC chair among those members of the DRTPC. The DRTPC members shall also elect an Associate Chair. If the chair relinquishes the position of chair or otherwise cannot fulfill the responsibilities of chair, the DRTPC Associate Chair will assume the position. The DRTPC chair shall be responsible for ensuring that the provisions of the Department RTP Document, Checklist for Review of RTP Criteria Documents from the Office of Faculty Affairs, the policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching in the University Manual, and Articles 14 and 15 of the CBA are carried out within the prescribed deadlines established by the university for completion of review at the department level.

2.1.6 Duties of DRTPC Chair

The chair of the DRTPC shall perform the following duties:

- 2.1.6.1 Within 14 days of the start of instruction for Fall Semester, ensure that the Candidate has been provided with the following: (1) written notice of the action for which the Candidate is eligible or must apply, (2) all appropriate forms related to the RTP process, and (3) a copy of the University RTP calendar for the current academic year.
- 2.1.6.2 Advise Candidates on the types of records and data to keep for preparation of RTP packages.
- 2.1.6.3 Inform Faculty Affairs and the dean of requests for RTP action.
- 2.1.6.4 Ensure that flyers are posted with the RTP action for which Candidates are applying on bulletin boards outside the KHP office, in the hallways adjacent to the KHP Office, outside the Candidate's office door, outside the KHP classrooms, and outside KHP laboratories. Electronic announcements will be posted on the KHP website and emailed to all KHP students, lecturers, and faculty. Included on the announcements will be a solicitation for letters regarding the performance of the Candidate(s) as well as contact information of the DRTPC chair to whom letters are to be submitted. The deadline for the letters will be 10 days prior to the submission deadline of each Candidate.
- 2.1.6.5 Forward the peer observations, and the Candidate's response (if any), to the dean for placement in the Candidate's PAF.

2.1.7 Duties of the DRTPC Associate Chair

- 2.1.7.1 In the event that the DRTPC Chair is unable to fulfill their duties or if they step down as chair, the role will be assumed by the DRTPC Associate Chair.
- 2.1.7.2 Throughout the academic year, ensure that peer evaluations are conducted and a copy of each report is provided to the Candidate within two weeks of the classroom visit.
- 2.1.7.3 At the beginning of Spring Semester, verify that Candidates have had the requisite peer evaluations for the year and, if not, act to remedy the situation.
- 2.1.7.4 In the event the DRTPC chair is going up for action, the DRTPC Associate Chair will assume the role given they hold the rank of a full professor. If the DRTPC Associate Chair does not have full ranking, then the remaining DRTPC member will assume the role as chair given, they hold the rank of full professor. If there are no remaining DRTPC members with full ranking, then a special committee will be created.

2.1.8 External Reviewers

A request for an external review of materials submitted by a faculty unit employee may be initiated at any level of review by any party to the review. Such a request shall document (1) the special circumstances which necessitates an external reviewer, and (2) the nature of the materials needing the evaluation of an external reviewer. The request must be approved by the President with the concurrence of the faculty unit employee (CBA 15.12d).

2.2 Timetable

2.2.1 First-Year Probationary Faculty

Annual evaluations of performance are mandatory for all probationary faculty, including those in their first year of an initial two-year appointment (see Unit 3 CBA Sec. 15). Faculty in their first probationary year must complete and submit a self-evaluation of teaching, scholarly and service activities since being appointed. Additionally, they must submit a plan for satisfying the RTP criteria for reappointment. The self-evaluation and professional plan should be submitted on the Faculty Performance Review form and is due following the calendar provided by Faculty Affairs annually. This evaluation is intended to (1) acquaint new faculty with the RTP process and requirements, (2) facilitate planning of professional activities that will lead to reappointment and, ultimately, tenure and promotion, and (3) provide Candidates with constructive feedback on their performance during their first semester and on their plans for achieving reappointment.

2.2.2 Reappointment to Subsequent Probationary Years

Beginning in their second probationary year, all Candidates must apply for reappointment to the next probationary year. Candidates apply during their second year for reappointment to their third probationary year, during their third year for their fourth probationary year, and so forth. Candidates must complete at least two years of full-time service before being eligible for other RTP actions.

2.2.3 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A probationary faculty member is required to apply for reappointment with tenure at the beginning of the sixth probationary year and is normally considered for promotion to Associate Professor at the same time (CBA 14.2). In some circumstances, a Candidate may, upon application and with a positive recommendation from their department or equivalent unit, be considered for early promotion and/or early tenure. An application for *early tenure and promotion* requires Candidates to meet substantially higher performance standards than those in the case of a normal application for tenure and promotion. Exceptional performance or extraordinary qualification regarding scholarly and creative activities, and service to the university and profession is expected for early actions (#1328, 2.6).

2.2.4 Promotion to Professor

A request for promotion to Professor is never obligatory. Candidates may apply for promotion to Professor after four years at the rank of Associate Professor with promotion becoming effective the following year if granted. Promotion to Professor requires tenure. A probationary associate professor shall meet the same criteria for promotion to tenure to be granted tenure.

2.2.5 Absentee Candidates

Candidates who are away from campus during the academic year in which they may or must apply for action shall observe the same procedures and timelines as Candidates in residence unless they were granted an extension of the probationary period pursuant to section 13.7 of the CBA. Candidates must ensure that they understand department expectations during the time they are away. The DRTPC shall, in light of the special circumstances, commit to writing an interpretation of the departmental criteria and a statement that specifies expectations and outcomes. Candidates in these circumstances are expected to meet with the department chair and the DRTPC chair to complete a memorandum related to RTP criteria prior to their departure. This memorandum of understanding will require the approval of the dean, University RTP Committee, and Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs.

2.2.6 Faculty Affairs Website

Candidates are encouraged to refer to the University Faculty Affairs website for further information on the timeline including the RTP calendar, policies, and forms. <https://www.cpp.edu/faculty-affairs/tenure-line-faculty/evaluation.shtml>

2.3 Evaluation of Instructional Competence

As described in the KHP Department Mission/Values Statement (section 1.1), we value the Teacher-Scholar model and encourage all faculty to bring their own scholarship into the classroom while using innovative pedagogy. The Teacher-Scholar model promotes the KHP department's goal of inclusivity by promoting an adaptive curriculum. We recognize that success as a teacher-scholar is dependent on the faculty's instructional competence in several areas. Therefore, Candidate's instructional competence is assessed through student evaluations, peer evaluation, a Candidate narrative, professional development, and other activities that support a teacher-scholar.

2.3.1 Student Evaluations

2.3.1.1 Instruments for official student evaluation shall be designed by the department following University policies. Separate instruments will be designated for different course type including face-to-face or hybrid

- lecture, synchronous or fully asynchronous online lecture, lab, or activity.
- 2.3.1.2 All courses subject to evaluation, as stipulated in University Policy #1329, must be evaluated by students and results of student evaluations (i.e., instructional assessments) shall be included in the RTP package.
 - 2.3.1.3 Results of student evaluations shall not be provided to faculty until after grades for the class have been submitted.
 - 2.3.1.4 Written comments provided by the students in the official student evaluation instruments cannot be used as part of the RTP review (#1329, 3.2).
 - 2.3.1.5 Administration of student evaluations shall ensure anonymity of the students participating in the evaluation process (#1329, E). Evaluations are distributed, collated, and communicated through central administration.
 - 2.3.1.6 The only professional manner to solicit student opinion on teaching performance for the purpose of peer review is by posting a public announcement, or by publication of such, or by some other means designed to reach students collectively, not individually (#1329, 1.1).
 - 2.3.1.7 Any solicitation by a faculty member on their own behalf, or by a faculty member or administrator on behalf of or against another faculty member is considered unprofessional and is prohibited (#1329, 1.2).
 - 2.3.1.8 A faculty member, department chair, or dean may, in response to an unsolicited oral comment from a student, advise the student that any formal consideration of the comment requires that it be reduced to a written signed statement (#1329, 1.4).
 - 2.3.1.9 At any time, a student may submit a letter expressing their opinion of the teaching performance of a faculty member. Such a letter must be signed and addressed to either the department chair or DRTPC chair. The letter must include the Bronco Identification Number of all student signatures. The department chair/DRTPC chair must provide the faculty member with copies of such letters. The faculty member shall be allowed at least 10 calendar days to provide a rebuttal. (#1329, 2.0).
 - 2.3.1.10 Letters received after an RTP cycle deadline would be taken into consideration in the next evaluation cycle; however, they still need to be given to the faculty member right away and provide the opportunity for rebuttal. Both documents would go to the PAF and considered in the next cycle.

2.3.2 Peer Evaluation

- 2.3.2.1 All Candidates eligible for RTP actions are required to have two peer evaluations each year. To reflect the breadth of courses taught (#1328, 3.3C), it is preferable that peer evaluations be completed for two different courses in different semesters. Peer evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in policies #1328 and #1329 of the University Manual.

- 2.3.2.2 A Candidate may request additional peer evaluations. Such requests are to be directed to the Associate DRTPC Chair. If additional peer evaluations are conducted, the results must be included in the RTP package and used in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
- 2.3.2.3 The peer evaluator shall provide a notice of at least five (5) days that a classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class(es) regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits (CBA 15.14).
- 2.3.2.4 The officially approved peer evaluation template shall be used based on the type of class being evaluated.
- 2.3.2.5 Peers will be assigned for class observations on a rotational basis. Efforts will be made to ensure that evaluators will observe each RTP Candidate at least twice prior to the Candidate applying for tenure and promotion.
- 2.3.2.6 In addition to the class observations, peers will evaluate instructional materials. These materials include, but are not limited to the syllabus, relevancy of assignments, course materials, breadth and depth of course content, currency/relevance of course materials, culturally responsive materials, fairness/effectiveness of grading, and evidence of inclusive instruction.
- 2.3.2.7 The peer evaluator shall provide recommendations for improvement of instructional materials within the officially approved peer evaluation template.
- 2.3.2.8 In subsequent peer evaluations, the peer evaluator will address progression or improvement made from the previous evaluation.

2.3.3 Candidate Narrative

The narrative is required as further evaluation of instructional competence that cannot be captured through student or peer evaluations. The narrative shall include but not limited to the following discussion points: teaching materials, teaching strategies, assessment of student learning, analysis of student/peer evaluations and how they influenced future instruction, teaching philosophy, evidence of inclusive instruction. Add information that the Candidate must address recommendations based on previous evaluations

2.3.4 Professional Development

The University offers many professional development opportunities for Candidates to improve their instructional competence. The Candidate is expected to incorporate the additional training within their teaching. Professional development opportunities may include, but are not limited to, Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence (CAFE) courses, CPP Allyship training, External Organization course (e.g., Association of College and University Educators, Quality Matters, Continued Educational Units). The Candidate needs to demonstrate how the teaching techniques learned in these courses were applied in courses taught within the Candidate's review cycle.

2.3.5 Other related activities

Other related activities are not evaluated for reappointment or regular promotion to Associate or Professor, but it will be a required criterion for early promotion to Associate or Professor. Examples of other activities include, but are not limited to, guest lecturing in another course, developing a new course, earning a distinction on an existing course (e.g., service learning, First Year Experience, Poly X), Teacher-scholar recognition, Wall of COOL recognition, earning an award or recognition from Professional organization in relation to teaching, and research or service.

2.4 Evaluation of Professional Productivity

KHP appreciates the diverse ways each sub-discipline advances the art and science of health and human movement. To foster professional respect, cohesion, and inclusivity of our sub-disciplines, KHP recognizes several ways in which Candidates may perform professional activities. We recognize that professional activities are disseminated in print (scholarly works) or in other visual and oral forms (public dissemination) and require funding. Within each professional productivity criterion, there is a point hierarchy that ranks activities by the effort required of the Candidate. The activities are not ranked based on perceived notoriety as that will discriminate and devalue the activities of our diverse faculty across sub-disciplines.

The list of activities is suggested but are not exhaustive of all possible activities. If the Candidate identifies an activity that is not listed, they may confer with the DRTPC Chair. The final decision to include the activity and the associated point value will be made by the DRTPC. A given activity may only be accounted for once, although it may fulfill several criteria. For example, lead presenter at a regional conference (i.e., public dissemination, two points) where the abstract is published in a peer-reviewed journal (i.e., scholarly works, one point). It is at the Candidate's discretion as to which criterion a given activity will fulfill.

2.4.1 Scholarly Works

Scholarly works represent dissemination of printed material related to the Candidate's professional activities within the field.

2.4.1.1 **Four-point activities:** Authored or co-authored book (more than 50 pages) based on original research

2.4.1.2 **Three-point activities:** Peer-reviewed journal article as first or corresponding author; one book chapter as first or corresponding author; authored or co-authored edited book or textbook

2.4.1.3 **Two-point activities:** Co-authored journal article or book chapter (not first or corresponding); peer-reviewed service documents; authored or co-authored technical reports/white paper; authored or co-authored pedagogical framework/standards/manuals; special issue editor for a peer-reviewed journal; editorial board member for a peer-reviewed journal

2.4.1.4 **One-point activities:** Peer-reviewed book-reviews; journal article or book proposal reviewer; Editorial; Articles or chapters under review; IRB as PI or Co-PI; first or corresponding author of peer-reviewed abstract (only if the associated presentation is not counted in public dissemination)

2.4.2 Public Dissemination

Public dissemination represents all other forms of dissemination of the Candidate's professional activities within the field

2.4.2.1 **Two-point activities:** Lead or co-presenter of state, regional, national, and/or international conference (e.g., poster or oral presentation); Producer/Director of documentary materials

2.4.2.2 **One-point activities:** Listed faculty mentor on student state, regional, national, and/or international conference (e.g., poster or oral presentation); podcasts, media materials, media interviews, or academic blog posts; invited presentation (e.g., related to academic field; invited presentation, public forums, community events, guest lecture); and/or delivery of continued professional development workshop

2.4.2.3 **Half-point (0.5) activities:** Listed faculty mentor on student internal CPP conference (e.g., poster or oral presentation) = 0.5 points

2.4.3 Funding

Funding represents securing resources and funds for the Candidate to conduct original scholarly projects.

2.4.3.1 **Two-point activities:** PI or co-PI on submission of external grant application (additional 0.5 points if grant awarded)

2.4.3.2 **One-point activities:** PI or co-PI on submission of internal grant application (additional 0.5 points if grant awarded); paid contract for research or consultancy services; hosting paid/contracted events on campus; written contract to use or acquire specialty equipment for research, scholarly activity, or consultancy services

2.4.3.3 **Half-point (0.5) activities:** Member of grant team on internal and external grant application (additional 0.5 points if grant awarded)

2.5 Evaluation Service Contributions

KHP strives to be a welcoming and supportive environment for students, faculty and staff. We value service that supports this goal and ultimately supports all the department stakeholders. KHP also strives to be a destination department for innovators, educators and scientists within the field which requires collaboration not only within the department but also within the College, University, community organizations, professional organizations and beyond. To reflect these departmental goals, as well as the University's goal for student learning & success, there are four criteria for service contributions. These include (1) service to students, (2) KHP department, (3) College or University, and (4) external.

Within each service contribution criterion, there is a point hierarchy that ranks activities by the effort required of the Candidate. The activities are not ranked based on perceived notoriety as that will discriminate and devalue the activities of our diverse faculty across sub-disciplines.

The list of activities is suggested but are not exhaustive of all possible activities. If the Candidate identifies an activity that is not listed, they may confer with the DRTPC Chair. The final decision to include the activity and the associated point value will be made by the DRTPC. A given activity may only be accounted for once, although it may fulfill several criteria. For example, chair of the department committee (department, one point) that also

requires committee membership at the college or university level (College or University, one point). It is at the Candidate's discretion as to which criterion a given activity will fulfill.

2.5.1 Students

All evidence contributing to student success is valued at one point. When evidence through workload is not possible, the Candidate must provide evidence through their narrative. Points are allocated per project, NOT necessarily per student.

2.5.1.1 **One-point activities:** Student supervision including, but not limited to, senior project, independent research, project, thesis, or comprehensive exams grading.

2.5.1.2 **Half-point (0.5) activities:** Student mentorship (e.g., continuous career advising).

2.5.2 Department

2.5.2.1 **Four-point activities:** Senior leadership position (e.g., Department Chair)

2.5.2.2 **Three-point activities:** Leadership position (e.g., Associate Department Chair, Graduate Coordinator, Teacher Credential Coordinator: 3-year appointments); Director of Department sponsored center (e.g., Motor Development Clinic)

2.5.2.3 **One-point activities:** Committee Chair (one year appointment)

2.5.2.4 **Half-point (0.5) activities:** Committee membership = 0.5 points

2.5.3 CoS or University

2.5.3.1 **Two-point activities:** CoS/University Committee Chair; non-KHP, CoS or University recognized Fellowship; CoS/University Leadership positions (e.g., FAR); Director of non-KHP, CoS or University-sponsored program or services

2.5.3.2 **One-point activities:** CoS/University Committee membership

2.5.4 External

External service contributions include any contributions outside of the department, college, or university. Additional college and university service can be counted as external if the Candidate meets the reappointment, tenure, or promotion requirements in that area.

2.5.4.1 **Two-point activities:** Professional or community organization leadership position

2.5.4.2 **One-point activities:** Professional or community organization committee member

2.5.4.3 **Half-point (0.5) activities:** Professional or community organization volunteer

2.6 Five-Year Plan

Candidates are required to submit a five-year plan as an additional evaluation measurement. Candidates shall include the five-year plan during the Pre-RTP process during their probationary years. At this point, the plan is aspirational and should describe

the Candidate's plan to accomplish the retention, tenure, and/or promotion requirement. After the conclusion of the two-year probationary period, the Candidate must describe their progress on their plan and whether they intend to make any modifications to the plan. At the time the Candidate is requesting tenure and/or promotion, they shall include another aspirational five-year plan that outline how they continue to commit to instructional competence, professional productivity, and service contributions.

2.7 Candidate's Responsibilities

- i. Candidates will submit a summary of their professional **accomplishments**, the five-year plan, and a self-evaluation of performance in each area of review (i.e., teaching, scholarly and creative activities, service, student advising/mentoring (#1328, 2.1), administrative duties if applicable (#1328, 2.1), academic governance if applicable (#1328, 2.1), activities while on leave from teaching duties if applicable (e.g., sabbaticals, fellowships, etc.; #1328, 2.1). This self-evaluation will be included in the current Faculty Performance Review form used by the university. Relevant evidence demonstrating the value of accomplishments in meeting department RTP criteria in each area of review should be clearly presented, analyzed, explained, and discussed in the self-evaluation and documentation supplied in appendices. In particular, Candidates for reappointment must discuss their progress toward meeting department requirements for tenure. All Candidates must discuss progress made on any recommendations for improvement given in the previous RTP cycle.
- ii. Evaluation of instructional competence shall be based on student evaluation, peer evaluation, professional development activities, signed input from students, additional activities in instructional competence, and the Candidate's self-evaluation. Candidates are required to examine the results of instructional assessments in detail, provide tabular summaries, and comment on them, as well as discuss their relationship to peer evaluations. The nature, value, and outcomes of additional activities in teaching including student advising and/or mentoring should be described and documented.
- iii. Evaluation of performance relative to professional productivity will be based on the point system which accounts for the type of activity, level of participation or leadership, outcomes, and relevance and benefit to the discipline or its integration with teaching. It is the Candidate's responsibility to describe and discuss these activities and their accomplishments in ways that are understandable to a broad audience and to provide documenting materials. If there is an activity that the Candidate deems is related to their professional productivity, but it is not listed in this document, the Candidate is welcome to include it along with a description and their level of participation. In the event additional activities are included, the DRTPC will provide a value for the activity based on the Candidate's description and rating suggestion.
- iv. Evaluation of service contributions shall be based on the point system which considers the type of activity, service level (e.g., Student, Department, College, University, profession, community), level of participation or leadership (e.g., member, Co-Chair, Chair), contributions made, outcomes, and benefits to the organization. It is the Candidate's responsibility to describe, discuss, and document these activities.

3 CRITERIA FOR RTP ACTION

Candidates must meet performance criteria in the areas of instructional competence, professional productivity, and service contributions during the period under review to be recommended for the requested RTP action. Candidates applying for reappointment should clearly address their

progress toward satisfying the criteria for tenure and promotion. Discussion of short-term and long-term goals, which reflect progress towards tenure and promotion, should be included in the self-evaluation portion of the Candidate's RTP packet. There may be activities that meet several criteria, but it is the Candidate's responsibility to indicate which criterion the activities fulfill. A single activity cannot be considered across multiple criteria.

3.1 Criteria for Reappointment

3.1.1 Instructional Competence

- 3.1.1.1 A Candidate for reappointment is expected to exhibit effective instructional competence as indicated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, professional development, signed student and faculty input, and other related activities and the Candidate's narrative.
- 3.1.1.2 **Student Evaluations:** Candidates partially satisfy the requirements for teaching performance by meeting or exceeding the standards for student evaluations described in this section. Standards are based on student responses to all questions on the instructional assessment form, cumulative across all courses taught during the period of review. The general expectation for teaching performance is that student evaluation scores should improve as Candidates gain experience. This expectation is quantified with an initial cumulative standard of 60% or more student responses in the Very Good and Good categories (combined) for faculty applying for reappointment to their third probationary year (PY); 65% for fourth PY, 70% for fifth and final PY, and 75% for application for tenure and promotion.
- 3.1.1.3 **Peer Evaluations:** The Candidate is expected to address concerns and/or suggestions identified by peers from previous peer evaluations of their teaching and instructional material. The number of suggestions and concerns is expected to decrease as the Candidate progresses throughout the probationary period.
- 3.1.1.4 **Candidate Narrative:** It is expected that the Candidate will address the points listed in section 2.3.3
- 3.1.1.5 **Professional Development:** It is expected that the Candidate identifies relevant activities. These activities shall be outlined in the Candidate's five-year plan.

3.1.2 Professional Productivity

- 3.1.2.1 Candidates must have made progress toward establishing a clear line of scholarly and creative activities, as demonstrated by documented evidence of scholarly works, public dissemination, and funding. There are no required minimum points in professional productivity for reappointment, but the Candidate must show progress toward the requirements of tenure and promotion.
- 3.1.2.2 **Scholarly Works:** Although there are no specific requirements for publications for each probationary year, the DRTPC recommends the following schedule of activities to prepare Candidates for tenure and promotion. By the end of the second probationary year, Candidates are expected to provide evidence of beginning work as a primary or corresponding author on a research project. Throughout the

probationary period, Candidates should be engaged in scholarly and creative activities that will make it possible to meet the publication requirements for tenure and promotion.

3.1.2.3 **Public Dissemination:** Although there are no specific requirements for presentations for each probationary year, the DRTPC recommends that Candidates take part in one public dissemination activity, *if possible*, during their probationary years. make a minimum of one presentation each year for any three-year period *if possible*, during their probationary years.

3.1.2.4 **Funding:** Although there are no specific requirements for grant submissions for each probationary year, Candidates are expected to engage in scholarly and creative activities that will make it possible to meet the funding requirement for tenure and promotion.

3.1.3 **Service Contributions**

3.1.3.1 Candidates are expected to be actively involved in governance and academic operations of the department, college, and/or university throughout the probationary period. This includes, but is not limited to, regular participation in department faculty meetings, serving as a committee member or chair, and providing support for intermittent events (e.g., student orientation, faculty retreats, and community outreach events).

3.1.3.2 Although there are no specific requirements for service activities in each probationary year, the DRTPC recommends the following schedule of activities to prepare Candidates for tenure and promotion. During the first two PY, Candidates should be a contributing member to at least one student and one departmental service activity and this level of involvement should continue throughout the probationary period. By the fourth probationary year Candidates should broaden their participation to include service at the college or university level. By the fifth probationary year, Candidates should have developed enough expertise, confidence, and familiarity to serve as chair of a departmental committee and a member of an external committee outside KHP.

3.2 **Criteria for Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor**

It is expected that Candidates applying for tenure and promotion will provide reflection and self-evaluation through the Candidate narrative and the five-year plan for all three areas during the entire review period, and not simply during the year immediately prior to application for early tenure and promotion.

3.2.1 **Instructional Competence**

3.2.1.1 **Student Evaluations:** For all classes evaluated during the review period, at least 75% of responses over all classes must be in the Very Good and Good categories combined.

3.2.1.2 **Peer Evaluation:** It is expected that the Candidate will have addressed concerns and/or suggestions identified by peers on the peer observation form from the review period.

3.2.1.3 **Candidate Narrative:** It is expected that the Candidate will address the points listed in 2.3.3.

3.2.1.4 **Professional Development:** It is expected that the Candidate will complete one professional development course AND demonstrate application through Candidate narrative.

3.2.2 Professional Productivity

3.2.2.1 **Scholarly Works:** Candidates must earn 6 points within this category. Minimum of one 3- or 4-point activities and a maximum of two one-point activities for promotion.

3.2.2.2 **Public Dissemination:** Candidates must earn 6 points within this category. Maximum of four half-point activities for promotion.

3.2.2.3 **Funding:** Candidates must earn 2 points within this category.

3.2.3 Service Contributions

3.2.3.1 **Students:** Candidates must earn 3 points within this category.

3.2.3.2 **Department:** Candidates must earn 2 points within this category. Maximum of two half-point activities for promotion.

3.2.3.3 **College or University:** Candidates must earn 1 point within this category.

3.2.3.4 **External:** Candidates must earn 1 point within this category.

3.3 Criteria for Early Tenure or Early Promotion to Associate Professor

It is expected that Candidates applying for early tenure and promotion will provide reflection and self-evaluation through the Candidate narrative and the five-year plan for all three areas during the entire review period, and not simply during the year immediately prior to application for early tenure and promotion.

3.3.1 Instructional Competence

3.3.1.1 **Student Evaluations:** For all classes evaluated during the review period, at least 85% of responses over all classes must be in the Very Good and Good categories combined.

3.3.1.2 **Peer Evaluation:** It is expected that the Candidate will have addressed concerns and/or suggestions identified by peers on the peer observation form from the review period.

3.3.1.3 **Candidate Narrative:** It is expected that the Candidate will address the points listed in 2.3.3.

3.3.1.4 **Professional Development:** It is expected that the Candidate will complete two professional development course AND demonstrate application through Candidate narrative. One activity must be external to CPP.

3.3.1.5 **Other Activities:** The Candidate must provide evidence of other activities. Examples are provided in section 2.3.5.

3.3.2 Professional Productivity

- 3.3.2.1 **Scholarly Works:** Candidates must earn 10 points within this category. Minimum of two 3-point or one 4-point activities and a maximum of two one-point activities for promotion.
- 3.3.2.2 **Public Dissemination:** Candidates must earn 10 points within this category. Maximum of four half-point activities for promotion.
- 3.3.2.3 **Grants Funding:** Candidates must earn 4 points within this category.
- 3.3.3 **Service Contributions**
 - 3.3.3.1 **Students:** Candidates must earn 5 points within this category.
 - 3.3.3.2 **Department:** Candidates must earn 3 points within this category. Maximum of two half-point activities for promotion.
 - 3.3.3.3 **College or University:** Candidates must earn 2 points within this category.
 - 3.3.3.4 **External:** Candidates must earn 2 points within this category.

3.4 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

It is expected that Candidates applying for promotion to professor will provide reflection and self-evaluation through the Candidate narrative and five-year plan for all three areas during the entire review period, and not simply during the year immediately prior to application for promotion to professor.

3.4.1 Instructional Competence

- 3.4.1.1 **Student Evaluations:** For all classes evaluated during the review period, at least 85% of responses over all classes must be in the “Very Good” and “Good” categories combined.
- 3.4.1.2 **Peer Evaluation:** It is expected that the Candidate will have addressed concerns and/or suggestions identified by peers on the peer observation form from the review period.
- 3.4.1.3 **Candidate Narrative:** It is expected that the Candidate will address the points listed in 2.3.3.
- 3.4.1.4 **Professional Development:** It is expected that the Candidate will complete one professional development course AND demonstrate application through Candidate narrative.

3.4.2 Professional Productivity

- 3.4.2.1 **Scholarly Works:** Candidates must earn 7 points within this category. Minimum of one 3- or 4-point activities and a maximum of two one-point activities for promotion.
- 3.4.2.2 **Public Dissemination:** Candidates must earn 6 points within this category. Maximum of four half-point activities for promotion.
- 3.4.2.3 **Grants Funding:** Candidates must earn 2 points within this category.

3.4.3 Service Contributions

- 3.4.3.1 **Students:** Candidates must earn 3 points within this category.

- 3.4.3.2 **Department:** Candidates must earn 2 points within this category. Maximum of two half-point activities for promotion.
- 3.4.3.3 **College or University:** Candidates must earn 2 points within this category.
- 3.4.3.4 **External:** Candidates must earn 2 points within this category.

3.5 Criteria for Early Promotion to Professor.

It is expected that Candidates applying for promotion to professor will provide reflection and self-evaluation through the Candidate narrative and five-year plan for all three areas during the entire review period, and not simply during the year immediately prior to application for early promotion to professor.

3.5.1 Instructional Competence.

- 3.5.1.1 **Student Evaluations:** For all classes evaluated during the review period, at least 90% of responses over all classes must be in the Very Good and Good categories combined.
- 3.5.1.2 **Peer Evaluation:** It is expected that the Candidate will have addressed concerns and/or suggestions identified by peers on the peer observation form from the review period.
- 3.5.1.3 **Candidate Narrative:** It is expected that the Candidate will address the points listed in I.3.3.
- 3.5.1.4 **Professional Development:** It is expected that the Candidate will complete two professional development courses AND demonstrate application through the Candidate narrative. One activity must be external to CPP.
- 3.5.1.5 **Other Activities:** The Candidate must provide evidence of other activities. Examples are provided in section 2.3.5.

3.5.2 Professional Productivity

- 3.5.2.1 **Scholarly Works:** Candidates must earn 10 points within this category. Minimum of two 3-point or one 4-point activities and a maximum of two one-point activities for promotion.
- 3.5.2.2 **Public Dissemination:** Candidates must earn 10 points within this category.
- 3.5.2.3 **Grants Funding:** Candidates must earn 4 points within this category.

3.5.3 Service Contributions

- 3.5.3.1 **Students:** Candidates must earn 5 points within this category.
- 3.5.3.2 **Department:** Candidates must earn 3 points within this category. Maximum of two half-point activities for promotion.
- 3.5.3.3 **College or University:** Candidates must earn 3 points within this category.
- 3.5.3.4 **External:** Candidates must earn 3 points within this category.

4 SUMMARY OF KHP RTP CRITERIA

Criteria	Measures	Reappointment	Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor	Early Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor	Promotion to Professor	Early Promotion to Professor
Instructional Competence	Student Evaluations	3 rd PY \geq 55% 4 th PY \geq 60% 5 th PY \geq 65% 6 th PY \geq 70%	\geq 75%	\geq 85%	\geq 85%	\geq 90%
	Peer Evaluation	Progressing	Demonstrated improvement via narrative	Demonstrated improvement via narrative	Demonstrated improvement via narrative	Demonstrated improvement via narrative
	Candidate Narrative	Candidate narrative addresses points listed in 2.3.3.	Candidate narrative addresses points listed in 2.3.3.	Candidate narrative addresses points listed in 2.3.3.	Candidate narrative addresses points listed in 2.3.3.	Candidate narrative addresses points listed in 2.3.3.
	Professional Development	Identify relevant opportunities	Complete 1 PD course AND demonstrate application through Candidate narrative	Complete 2 PD courses (1 must be external to CPP) AND demonstrate application through Candidate narrative	Complete 1 PD course AND demonstrate application through Candidate narrative	Complete 2 PD courses (1 must be external to CPP) AND demonstrate application through Candidate narrative
	Other Activities	Not required	Not required	Evidence of other activities required. Examples provided in 2.3.5.	Not required	Evidence of other activities required. Examples provided in 2.3.5.
Professional Productivity	Scholarly Works	Progressing	6 points _†	10 points _‡	7 points _†	10 points _‡

Criteria	Measures	Reappointment	Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor	Early Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor	Promotion to Professor	Early Promotion to Professor
	Public dissemination	Progressing	6 points [§]	10 points [§]	6 points [§]	10 points [§]
	Funding	Progressing	2 points	4 points	2 points	4 points
Service Contributions	Students	Progressing	3 points	5 points	3 points	5 points
	Department	Progressing	2 points*	3 points*	2 points*	3 points*
	CoS/University	Progressing	1 point	2 points	2 points	3 points
	External	Progressing	1 point	2 points	2 points	3 points

A full description of the required criteria are available in Section 3 of this document.

Student Evaluations: Percentages reflect items in the Very Good and Good categories on the Student Evaluation Form.

Progressing: The Candidate is making progress towards meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

+Minimum of one 3- or 4-point activities and a maximum of two one-point activities for promotion.

‡Minimum of two 3-point or one 4-point activities and a maximum of two one-point activities for promotion.

§Maximum of four half-point activities for promotion.

*Maximum of two half-point activities for promotion.

5 APPENDICES

- 5.1 Class Observation Form**
- 5.2 Student Activity Evaluation Form**
- 5.3 Student Lab Evaluation Form**
- 5.4 Student Lecture Evaluation Form**
- 5.5 Student Online Evaluation Form**

5.6 Class Observation Form

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY AND HEALTH PROMOTION Class Observation Form

Faculty Member Being Observed: _____ **Date:** _____
Pre-meeting Date _____
Faculty Member Observing: _____ **Course:** _____
Observation Date _____

1. Provided an effective introduction (e.g. attention getter, warm up, statement of class objectives, demonstration, etc.). Please explain and provide examples.
2. Provided effective instruction (e.g. clear communication skills, active learning techniques, competence in subject matter, open to student feedback, etc.). Please explain and provide examples.
3. Provided appropriate feedback to students (e.g. checking for understanding, asking questions, ensuring safety, etc.).
 - a. For synchronous courses: Provided appropriate feedback to students (e.g. checking for understanding, thorough feedback in gradebook, asking questions, ensuring safety, etc.). Please explain and provide examples.
 - b. For asynchronous courses: Implements mechanisms to provide feedback to students and assess student comprehension of material (e.g. discussion board with feedback, quizzes, virtual review sessions, thorough feedback in gradebook, integrates Packback, etc.). Please explain and provide examples.
4. Provided an effective closure (e.g. a summary, key points, a debrief, revisit class objectives, etc.). Please explain and provide examples.
5. Provided a thorough syllabus that has course objectives and an outline that contains the required components as stated in the KHP Lecturer Handbook. Please explain and provide examples.
6. Summary statement.
7. Recommendations.

Signature of Faculty Member Being Observed: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Faculty Member Observing: _____ Date: _____