



Academic Affairs
Faculty Senate

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN BERNARDINO

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY

GUIDELINES FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION AND TENURE

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Procedures for Performance Review and Periodic Evaluation	4
I. Preamble	4
II. General Requirements	4
Chapter 2. Department Criteria for Review, Retention, Promotion and Tenure	6
I. Preamble	6
a. Faculty Activity Report	
b. Contents of FAR	6
i. Teaching Effectiveness	6
ii. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities	7
iii. Service Activities	7
II. Summary	7
Chapter 3. Teaching Effectiveness	8
I. Preamble	8
II. Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness	8
a. Purpose	8
b. Methods of Evaluation	8
c. Factors to Consider	8
d. CSUSB Categories of Evaluation	9
i. Above Expectations	9
ii. Meets Expectations	9
iii. Below Expectations	9
iv. Well Below Expectations	9
III. Classifications of Teaching Effectiveness	9
a. Above Expectations	10
b. Meets Expectations	11
c. Below Expectations	12
d. Well Below Expectations	13

IV. Summary	14
Chapter 4. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities	15
I. Preamble	15
II. Evaluating Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities	15
a. Types of Activities	15
b. Kinesiology Faculty Responsibilities	16
c. Providing Evidence	16
III. Classifications of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities	16
a. Above Expectations	16
b. Meets Expectations	17
c. Below Expectations	18
d. Well Below Expectations	19
IV. Summary	20
Chapter 5. Service	21
I. Preamble	21
II. Evaluating Service Activities	21
a. Service Expectations	21
b. Providing Evidence	21
III. Classification of Service Activities	22
a. Above Expectations	22
b. Meets Expectations	23
c. Below Expectations	25
d. Well Below Expectations	26
IV. Summary	27
Appendix A. Examples of Acceptable Journals in Kinesiology	28

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY

GUIDELINES FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Chapter 1

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND PERIODIC EVALUATION

I. PREAMBLE

In all matters related to retention, promotion and tenure (RPT), the Department of Kinesiology will carefully follow and adhere to the CSUSB Faculty Administrative Manual (FAM 652.4 (FAM 300)). The procedures and criteria contained in this Department of Kinesiology document are in addition to those presented in FAM 652.4 (FAM 300). The material that follows provides specific information on procedures that will be followed, and on the criteria for retention, promotion and for tenure in the Department of Kinesiology approved by a majority of the department faculty members in a secret ballot that insures anonymity. Issues not addressed in this document are answered in FAM 652.4 (FAM 300). A candidate's qualifications will be judged against the criteria set out in FAM 652.4 (FAM 300) and the discipline-specific criteria described herein. Evidence to support the qualifications of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure may be solicited and submitted from many sources. All such evidence shall be submitted in written form and approved by the candidate. RPT shall not be influenced by the person's race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic or national origin, religion, age, disability, or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era

II. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

New faculty members should obtain an electronic Faculty Activities Report (*FAR*) template from the Faculty Senate Office as a guide in organizing the FAR. The Department of Kinesiology of adheres to the policies and descriptions included this document.

The process of RPT begins with the hiring of a faculty member when expectations are made clear and reinforced annually until the university makes its final determination. Thus, the criteria specified below are intended to serve as a guide for:

- A. An annual pre-tenure review of faculty at the rank of Assistant, Associate or Professor.
- B. Determination of the candidate's qualifications in her/his application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and/or Professor.

These guidelines are not intended to modify the University's Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure, but to further delineate the criteria to be used. The Department of Kinesiology is the "unit" for tenure and promotion. Faculty eligible to vote on appointments, third-year reviews, promotions and tenure are stipulated in the FAM 315. The committee is referred to as the Department Evaluation Committee (DEC).

Chapter 2

Department Criteria for Review, Retention, Promotion and Tenure

I. PREAMBLE

Procedures in the FAM 652.4 (FAM 300) and 315 will be carefully followed for the search and appointment of new full-time faculty. At the time of appointment, a new faculty member will receive a copy of the FAM 652.4 (FAM 300) and the Department of Kinesiology Guidelines for Review, Retention, Promotion and Tenure, and will be advised about CSUSB's expectations for promotion and tenure.

A. Faculty Activities Report (FAR)

The Department of Kinesiology faculty members will prepare a FAR according to CSUSB sponsored workshops and seek counsel from the department chair and/or chair of the DEC. Each faculty member should maintain records of her/his professional activities and accomplishments and keep copies of relevant documents associated with teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service. The actual documentation of activities reported in the FAR are contained in a section labeled "Attachments", separate from the FAR. The attachments should include an index and be presented with the FAR when submitted to Academic Personnel in the Office of Academic Affairs.

B. Contents of the FAR

Included in the FAR is information summarizing the quality of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, substantive research, scholarly and creative activities, and professional service activities to the university and the community.

1. Teaching Effectiveness. Information regarding teaching effectiveness will include, but not be limited to: summaries and interpretations of student and peer evaluations, explanation of activities related to student advising and/or mentoring, curriculum development, response to recommendations from the previous year (if appropriate), explanation as to how each of the teaching criteria were met for the requested RPT action, and discussion of short- and long-term teaching goals from the previous year and for the following year. Teaching General Education or Professional Preparation activity classes should have high *Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness* (SOTE) scores with commensurate student comments. Conversely, teaching courses in the core portion of the Kinesiology major or highly specialized technically driven science classes presents unique challenges and warrants proper consideration by evaluation committees.

2. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities. Information describing a Department of Kinesiology faculty member's research and scholarly activities will include, but not be limited to: a description of her/his scholarly activities, complete references for peer reviewed and invited publications, presentations and/or attendance at professional meetings, an explanation of work in progress and ongoing research and other scholarly activities, a response to recommendations from the previous year (if appropriate), an explanation as to how each of the research, scholarly and creative activities criteria were met for the requested RPT action, and a brief discussion of short- and long-term research goals.
3. Service Activities. Information describing a Department of Kinesiology faculty member's service activities will include, but not be limited to: specific university, community and professional committee memberships including roles, duties and outcomes, and assistance in a professional capacity to any group, response to recommendations from the previous year (if appropriate), an explanation as to how each of the service criteria were met, and a brief discussion of short- and long-term service goals.

II. Summary

All data with the exception of University-sponsored student evaluations are to be compiled and presented by the individual faculty member. University-sponsored student evaluations will be made available to reviewing bodies when the FAR is submitted according to published dates.

Chapter 3

Teaching Effectiveness

I. PREAMBLE

University excellence is based on a balance of effective teaching, active and substantive research, scholarly or creative contributions, and professional service to the university and/or community. These criteria shall be applied to all persons seeking retention, tenure, and/or promotion as members of the tenure track faculty, and to all faculty members subject to periodic evaluation.

II. EVALUATING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

A. Purpose

The primary function of the Department of Kinesiology is the provision of rigorous, high-quality, effective teaching. Evidence of teaching effectiveness is crucial to the overall evaluation process, with the recognition that teaching is a partnership between faculty and students.

B. Methods of Evaluation

Teaching effectiveness shall be evaluated by the quality of performance of the faculty member in varied aspects of instruction. These may include, but are not limited to, classroom instruction to include SOTEs compared to Department and/or College average/median for similar classes; department expectation for the faculty member to teach undergraduate classes, theory/activity classes, and currency in content for teaching areas, laboratory instruction; supervision of individual projects; supervision of fieldwork, curriculum development, response to recommendations from the previous year (if appropriate); explanation as to how each of the teaching criteria were met for the requested RPT action; and discussion of short- and long-term teaching goals from the previous year and for the following year.

C. Factors to Consider

Teaching general education activity classes, professional preparation activity classes, and small discussion group classes (n=10 or more students) are expected to have higher SOTE scores with commensurate student comments than teaching lecture courses in the core portion of the Department of Kinesiology major. Smaller lecture classes will normally have higher SOTE scores than large lecture classes. Introductory courses in the major often have lower SOTE scores than more advanced major classes. Classes that are supervised fieldwork or independent project classes are not subjected to SOTEs.

Members of evaluation committees shall recognize the existence of differences in teaching styles and student evaluation standards. While no single style or manner of teaching can be established as best for all instructors or for all students, faculty members are expected to work efficiently and effectively with students individually and in groups.

D. CSUSB Categories of Evaluation

CSUSB faculty members are evaluated according to the following criteria. The criteria are: Above Expectations (AE), Meets Expectations (ME), Below Expectations (BE) and Well Below Expectations (WBE). Listed below are general recommended guidelines associated with the aforementioned criteria for tenure at Assistant or Associate Professor and promotion to Associate Professor or Professor:

1. Above Expectations (AE) – A faculty member’s effectiveness is evaluated by his/her consistency over a sustained period of time resulting from a preponderance of the data commensurate with an outstanding faculty member as defined by criteria stated in Teaching.
2. Meets Expectations (ME) - A faculty member’s effectiveness is evaluated by his/her consistency over a sustained period of time resulting from a preponderance of the data commensurate with an average performance of a faculty member as defined by criteria stated in Teaching.
3. Below Expectations (BE) - A faculty member’s effectiveness is evaluated by his/her consistency over a sustained period of time resulting from a preponderance of the data commensurate with a below average performance of a faculty member as defined by criteria stated in Teaching.
4. Well Below Expectations (WBE) - A faculty member’s effectiveness is evaluated by his/her consistency over a sustained period of time resulting from a preponderance of the data commensurate with a well below average performance of a faculty member as defined by criteria stated in Teaching.

III. Classifications of Teaching Effectiveness

Evaluation of teaching shall be based upon the particular methods used by the instructor, and whether or not they are likely to produce the desired results. The prioritized list concerning the quality of instruction for the Department of Kinesiology is as follows. Data in AE are more valued than data in ME which are more valued than data in BE and WBE. When a preponderance of the data appears in AE, ME, BE, or WBE, that category will serve as the evaluative marker for a faculty member.

A. Above Expectations

1. A faculty member receives College, University or professional award for teaching excellence.
2. Syllabi have goals and student learning outcomes that are observable, measureable, and identifiable. The goals and objectives are consistent with those of the American Kinesiology Association or other appropriate professional organization such as the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, American College of Sports Medicine, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, International Society of Sports Nutrition, or the National Strength and Conditioning Association, etc. Anticipated dates when goals and objectives are realized are evident on syllabi.
3. Measures to assess student learning are defined on the syllabi and easily understood.
4. Courses reflect a reasonable allocation of time and resources along with appropriate use of instructional materials, including any effective use of technology.
5. Courses indicate that faculty regularly review and modify course content to meet changing curricular needs either in the discipline or profession. Course content is relevant, timely, with salient discipline issues clearly identified.
6. Fair and thorough assessment of student achievement is represented by traditional examinations, homework assignments, term papers, laboratory reports; seminar presentations and the like appear challenging for students. Assessment strategies are clear; standards to measure performance are proper, and appropriate to the level of the course and sufficient to make meaningful distinctions among different levels of student achievement.
7. Classroom visitation reports, with appended materials gathered during the pre- and post-visit conferences, indicant significant success in mastery of course content and teaching of students commensurate with an *AE* evaluation.
8. Active leadership in curriculum modification and updating to meet state and national standards is evident in the file.
9. Annually mentoring 3 or more CSUSB students (e.g., senior and special projects).
10. SOTE scores comparable to department averages for various courses (eg., upper division courses in the major to service courses in General Education) offered within the department are expected. In the evaluation report the DEC and department chair will list the range of scores typically achieved by faculty members considered as AE in teaching effectiveness for comparable types of courses. SOTE scores should be commensurate with student comments for a faculty member who demonstrates a preponderance of the attributes in the aforementioned list in this category.
11. Qualitative student comments should be commensurate with a faculty member who achieves a preponderance of the attributes in the

12. SOTE scores, student comments and comments from peer visitations are taken collectively to evaluate an overall pattern of teaching effectiveness.

B. Meets Expectations

1. No professional awards for teaching were indicated.
2. Syllabi have goals and student learning outcomes that are observable, measureable, and identifiable. The goals and student learning objectives are consistent with those of the American Kinesiology Association or other appropriate professional organization such as the American College of Sports Medicine, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, International Society of Sports Nutrition, or the National Strength and Conditioning Association, etc. Anticipated dates when goals and objectives are to be addressed appear on the syllabi.
3. Measures to assess student learning appear on syllabi. The means to assess student learning is understandable but not as clear, concise, or professional in nature as in *AE*.
4. Courses reflect a seemingly appropriate allocation of time and resources along with acceptable use of the usual instructional materials, including technology.
5. Courses indicate that faculty occasionally review and modify course content to meet changing curricular needs. Course content seems relevant, timely, and addresses salient discipline issues that are clearly identified.
6. Fair and thorough assessment of student achievement is represented by usual traditional examinations, homework assignments are routine, term papers are typical topics associated with the discipline, laboratory reports meet essential expectations, seminar presentations are not provocative and the like. Assessment strategies are clear; standards to measure performance seem appropriate, and fitting to the level of the course and sufficient to make meaningful distinctions among different levels of student achievement.
7. Classroom visitation reports, with appended materials gathered during the pre- and post-visit conferences, indicates average success in mastery of course content and teaching of students commensurate with an *ME* evaluation.
8. Curriculum development and currency is apparent in the syllabi and consistent with the concentrations in the major.
9. Annually mentoring 2 CSUSB students (e.g., senior and special projects).
10. SOTE scores comparable to department averages for various courses (eg., upper division courses in the major to service courses in General Education) offered within the department are expected. In the evaluation report the DEC and department chair will list the range of scores typically achieved by faculty members considered as *ME* in teaching effectiveness for comparable types of courses. SOTE scores should be commensurate with student comments for a faculty member who demonstrates a preponderance of the attributes in the

- aforementioned list in this category.
11. Qualitative student comments should be commensurate with a faculty member who achieves a preponderance of the attributes in the aforementioned list in this category.
 12. SOTE scores, student comments and comments from peer visitations are taken collectively to evaluate an overall pattern of teaching effectiveness.

C. Below Expectations

1. No professional awards for teaching were indicated.
2. Syllabi have goals and student learning outcomes that are observable, measureable, and identifiable. The goals and student learning objectives appear but are not aligned to any national standards. Specific dates when goals and objectives are addressed do not appear on the syllabi. Measures to assess student learning are not clear and appear ambiguous. Anticipated dates when goals and objectives are due do not appear on syllabi.
3. Measures to assess student learning appear on syllabi. The means to assess student learning is apparent but not as clear, concise, or professional in nature as in *ME*.
4. Courses do not reflect a seemingly appropriate allocation of time and time allocation is not clear. Similarly, resources along with acceptable use of the usual instructional materials, including technology are mentioned but not easily identifiable. No innovative technology is used in the class.
5. Course content seems dated and salient issues are not apparent. Courses indicate that the faculty member seems to occasionally review and modify course content to meet changing curricular needs, but significant change is not apparent and reasons for maintaining the status quo are not offered.
6. Fair and thorough assessment of student achievement is not quite represented by usual traditional examinations, homework assignments are routine, term papers are traditional topics associated with the discipline but are not challenging, laboratory reports meet minimal expectations, and seminar presentations are stagnant or not challenging. Assessment strategies are not distinct; standards to measure performance seem appropriate, and fitting to the level of the course and sufficient to make meaningful distinctions among different levels of student achievement and avoid capricious grading.
7. Classroom visitation reports, with appended materials gathered during the pre- and post-visit conferences, show a source of concern about teaching effectiveness as expressed by peer review, and are commensurate with a *BE* evaluation.
8. Evidence of engagement with students is not apparent or very minimal.
9. SOTE scores comparable to department averages for various courses (eg., upper division courses in the major to service courses in General Education) offered within the department are expected. In the evaluation report the DEC and department chair will list the range of scores typically achieved by faculty members considered as *BE* in teaching effectiveness for comparable types of

- courses. SOTE scores should be commensurate with student comments for a faculty member who demonstrates a preponderance of the attributes in the aforementioned list in this category.
10. Qualitative student comments should be commensurate with a faculty member who achieves a preponderance of the attributes in the aforementioned list in this category.
 11. SOTE scores, student comments and comments from peer visitations are taken collectively to evaluate an overall pattern of teaching effectiveness.

D. Well Below Expectations

1. No professional awards for teaching were indicated.
2. Syllabi are not given to students within the first three weeks of classes or not at all. The goals and student learning objectives appear but are not aligned to any national standards. Anticipated dates when goals and objectives are addressed do not appear on the syllabi or are consistently not met. Measures to assess student learning are not clear and appear ambiguous.
3. Measures to assess student learning do not appear on syllabi. The means to assess student learning are not as clear, concise, nor professional in nature as in *BE*. In addition, evaluation of assignments and/or examinations is not performed in a timely manner.
4. Courses do not reflect a seemingly appropriate allocation of time and time allocation is not clear. No acceptable use of the usual instructional materials, including technology is not mentioned and not easily identifiable. No effective technology is used in the class.
5. Course content seems dated and salient issues are not clear. Courses indicate that the faculty member seems to not review and modify course content to meet changing curricular needs and reasons for maintain the status quo are not offered.
6. Fair and thorough assessment of student achievement is not represented by usual traditional examinations, homework assignments are routine, term papers are typical topics associated with the discipline, laboratory reports meet minimal expectations, and seminar presentations are stagnant or not provocative. Assessment strategies are not distinct; standards to measure performance seem inappropriate, and do not fit to the level of the course and lack sufficiency to make meaningful distinctions among different levels of student achievement and avoid capricious grading.
7. Classroom visitation reports, with appended materials gathered during the pre- and post-visit conferences show a source of concern about teaching effectiveness as expressed by peer review and are commensurate with a *WBE* evaluation.
8. Engagement with students is extremely minimal.
9. SOTE scores comparable to department averages for various courses (eg., upper division courses in the major to service courses in General Education) offered within the department are expected. In the evaluation report the DEC

- and department chair will list the range of scores typically achieved by faculty members considered as WB`E in teaching effectiveness for comparable types of courses. SOTE scores should be commensurate with student comments for a faculty member who demonstrates a preponderance of the attributes in the aforementioned list in this category.
10. Qualitative student comments should be commensurate with a faculty member who achieves a preponderance of the attributes in the aforementioned list in this category.
 11. SOTE scores, student comments and comments from peer visitations are taken collectively to evaluate an overall pattern of teaching effectiveness.

IV. Summary

Faculty members may include a teaching portfolio. Items appended to classroom visitations or included from other courses may include, but are not limited to, course syllabi, lab schedules, examinations and quizzes, hand-out materials, online/hybrid courses, and other appropriately demonstrative materials. Quality of instruction shall be evaluated in the following areas as defined in the Procedures and Criteria for Performance Review and Periodic Evaluation for instructional faculty: Command of Subject Matter; Course Design/Preparation; Instructional Material and Organization; Effectiveness in Instruction; and, Academic Assessment of Students. Listed below are general recommended guidelines associated with the aforementioned criteria for tenure at Assistant or Associate Professor and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor:

1. Above Expectations – A faculty member’s teaching effectiveness is evaluated by their consistency of their performance over a sustained period of time resulting from teaching effectiveness with a preponderance of the data identified as AE.
2. Meets Expectations - A faculty member’s teaching effectiveness is evaluated by their consistency of their performance over a sustained period of time resulting from teaching effectiveness with a preponderance of the data identified as ME.
3. Below Expectations - A faculty member’s teaching effectiveness is evaluated by their consistency of their performance over a sustained period of time resulting from teaching effectiveness with a preponderance of the data identified as BE.
4. Well Below Expectations - A faculty member’s teaching effectiveness is evaluated by their consistency of their performance over a sustained period of time resulting from teaching effectiveness with a preponderance of the data identified as BE.

Chapter 4

Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

I. PREAMBLE

Consistent with institutional expectations, Kinesiology faculty members are expected to produce research and other scholarly work that enhances their ability to make long-term contributions to the discipline as well as enhancing the reputation of the department and CSUSB. To accomplish these goals, scholarly work should be of high quality, and the evaluation of faculty research performance must consider both its quantity and quality.

Consideration for reappointment and/or promotion and tenure will anticipate Kinesiology faculty members to engage in a sustained (i.e., ongoing over time) line of research of peer-reviewed, investigative, research that demonstrates their intellectual and professional growth in the discipline and that contributes to the advancement of a particular subfield (viz., adapted physical activity, biomechanics, exercise physiology, motor behavior, nutrition, sport psychology, sport sociology, etc.) in Kinesiology as compared to a series of unrelated publications or presentations. A Kinesiology faculty member is expected to disseminate her/his scholarship to professional audiences through discipline-specific, peer-reviewed publications, and invited and/or peer-reviewed presentations. Faculty may augment this work with non-refereed scholarly and creative activities that are published in appropriate disciplinary and professional outlets. That notwithstanding, the latter form of scholarship is not sufficient in itself for a candidate to receive reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

II. EVALUATING RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. Types of Activities

Research and other scholarly and creative activities include manuscripts in scholarly professional publications, books, chapters in books, monographs, scholarly professional presentations, software and electronically published documents, awarded grants, grants submitted but not funded, and contracts. Faculty may augment their required research and other scholarly and creative activities with editorial assignments in nationally recognized professional publications, appointments to review panels for grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, conference presentations, and other assignments as a referee (e.g., guest reviewer for a journal). Another option for Kinesiology faculty members includes authorship of professional publications of teaching and curriculum guides, and/or laboratory/field manuals.

B. Kinesiology Faculty Responsibilities

It shall be the sole responsibility of the faculty member to provide documented evidence of research, scholarly or creative contributions referenced in the *FAR*. Examples of items which may be used are books and articles, or evidence indicating their acceptance or under review for publication, proposals, contracts, grants or programs; letters of invitation; reviews of creative activity written by professionally recognized people; continuing education, retraining, development of new skills relevant to one's current or potential assignment, and other appropriate professionally generated materials pertinent to this area of evaluation. Examples of documented quality may include, but not be limited to, journal acceptance rate, citation rate, impact factor, etc. This evidence shall be submitted as part of the *FAR*.

C. Providing Evidence

The faculty member must provide documentation for each item. Documentation should address the significance of the contribution and the quality of the form in which it is presented, i.e., a publication, a paper or presentation, a work in progress, etc. In addition, if the contribution consists of professional activity such as a consultancy, participation in a professional organization, or grant and award, the faculty member must address its significance and clarify the relevance of the format.

III. Classifications of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities are difficult to quantify but Kinesiology faculty have prioritized their expectations as follows. Activities in Above Expectations category are more valued than data in Meets Expectations category which are more valued than data in Below Expectations category and so on. Peer-reviewed work in Kinesiology is most significant. The individual contribution to collaborative activities must be clearly stated on a Joint Activity Report (JAR) form. Faculty members will receive an evaluation in classification area (listed below) based on the preponderance of activities associated with the following categories:

A. Above Expectations (AE): To achieve an AE in Kinesiology numerous factors are considered, including but not limited to the quality and quantity of publications, research productivity in terms of originality, quality, consistency and the importance of the scholarly contribution to the discipline. This category represents a noteworthy amount of scholarly activities in a preponderance of the categories listed below.

1. Recipient of an on-campus award such as Outstanding Professor.
 2. Recipient of an award for scholarly activities from an internationally or nationally recognized society or professional association.
 3. Principle Investigator or co-Investigator on successful external funding. The funding should (eventually) result in a peer reviewed publication.
 4. Authorship or co-authorship of
 - a. Research papers published in appropriate discipline-specific, widely circulated, blind peer-reviewed journals, published by recognized professional societies or publishing companies.
 - b. Monographs or Special Papers, blind peer-reviewed and professionally edited and published by nationally or internationally recognized professional societies or publishing companies.
 - c. Review articles in blind peer-reviewed series that summarize the state of knowledge in the faculty member's discipline.
 - d. A peer-reviewed textbook or textbooks in the faculty member's field published by nationally/internationally recognized publishing company/companies.
 5. Authorship or co-authorship of blind peer-reviewed conference publications.
 6. Presentations: Invited keynote speaker for a national or international professional conference. Or one or more first authored peer-reviewed presentation (poster or oral) per year at regional or national professional conferences (assuming funding is available for travel).
 7. Continuing Education: Evidence of continuing education, retraining, and the development of new skills relevant to one's current or potential assignment. Evidence of these activities may be taking of courses, earning advanced degrees, or participating in professional conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, certifications, or special programs which lead to systematic updating of knowledge.
 8. Manuscript Review: More than one manuscript review for professional journals, book chapters for professional texts, grant reviews, or abstracts for professional society meetings per year.
 9. Consultantships: Participation as a consultant, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature on an international, national level or regional level that may significantly impact the profession.
- A. Meets Expectations (ME). To achieve a ME numerous factors are considered, including but not limited to the quality and quantity of publications, research productivity in terms of originality, quality, consistency and the importance of the scholarly contribution to the discipline. This category represents an average amount of scholarly activities in a preponderance of the categories listed below.

1. Awards/Grants: Recipient of an on-campus award (viz., College of Natural Science award for excellence in research and scholarly activities), on-campus grant, contract, award, prize, or other index of professional recognition for research and scholarly activities.
 2. Recipient of an award for scholarly activities from a regional professionally recognized society or professional organization.
 3. Authorship or co-authorship of:
 - a. Research papers published in appropriate discipline-specific, widely circulated, blind peer-reviewed journals, published by recognized professional societies or publishing companies.
 - b. Monographs or Special Papers, blind peer-reviewed and professionally edited and published by nationally or internationally recognized professional societies or publishing companies.
 - c. Review articles in blind peer-reviewed series that summarize the state of knowledge in the faculty member's discipline.
 - d. A peer-reviewed textbook(s) in the faculty member's field published by nationally/internationally recognized publishing company/companies.
 4. Authorship or co-authorship of a blind peer reviewed paper or papers in a regional or statewide journal published by recognized professional societies or publishing companies.
 5. Authorship or co-authorship of a conference publication in non-peer reviewed work carries more weight than those that are not so reviewed.
 6. Presentations: Invited keynote speaker for a state/regional professional conference. Or one or more first or second authored peer-reviewed presentation (poster or oral) per year at regional or national professional conferences (assuming funding is available for travel).
 7. Continuing Education: Some evidence of continuing education, retraining, and the development of new skills relevant to one's current or potential assignment. Evidence of these activities may be taking of courses, earning advanced degrees, or participating in professional conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, certifications, or special programs which lead to systematic updating of knowledge.
 8. Manuscript Review: At least one manuscript review for professional journals, book chapters for professional texts, grant reviews, or abstracts for professional society meetings per year.
 9. Consultantship: Participation as a consultant on a state level, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature that may significantly impact the profession within the profession.
- B. Below Expectations (BE) To achieve a BE numerous factors are considered, including but not limited to the quality and quantity of publications, research productivity in terms of originality, quality, consistency and the importance of the scholarly contribution to the discipline. This category represents a below average amount of scholarly activities in the categories listed below.

1. Awards/Grants: Minimal to no awards or grants received for professional research.
 2. Authorship or co-authorship of:
 - a. Research articles published in appropriate discipline-specific, widely circulated, blind peer-reviewed journals, published by recognized professional societies or publishing companies.
 - b. Monographs or Special Papers, blind peer-reviewed and professionally edited and published by nationally or internationally recognized professional societies or publishing companies.
 - c. Review articles in blind peer-reviewed series that summarize the state of knowledge in the faculty member's discipline.
 - d. A peer-reviewed textbook(s) in the faculty member's field published by nationally/internationally recognized publishing company/companies.
 3. Presentations: A few presentations at local meetings, but minimal activity at recognized professional organizations. Or some peer-reviewed presentation (poster or oral) at regional, national or local professional conferences (assuming funding is available for travel).
 4. Authorship or co-authorship of a non-peer reviewed paper or papers in a regional or statewide journal published by recognized professional societies or publishing companies.
 5. Authorship or co-authorship of a conference publication in non-peer reviewed work carries more weight than those that are not so reviewed.
 6. Presentations: Invited keynote speaker for a state/regional professional conference. Or one or more first or second authored non-peer-reviewed presentation at state, regional or national professional conferences (assuming funding is available for travel).
 7. Continuing Education: Keeps up to date on current activities, but no pursuit of continuing education to advance career.
 8. Manuscript Review: Occasional manuscript reviews for professional journals, book chapters for professional texts, grant reviews, or abstracts for professional society meetings.
 9. Consultantship: Minimal to no consultantship.
- C. Well Below Expectations (WBE) To achieve a WBE numerous factors are considered, including but not limited to the quality and quantity of publications, research productivity in terms of originality, quality, consistency and the importance of the scholarly contribution to the discipline. This category represents a well below average amount of scholarly activities in the categories listed below.
1. Awards/Grants: Minimal to no awards or grants received for profession research.
 2. Publications: No publications in the peer-reviewed literature. Minimal activity in the non-peer-reviewed literature.
 3. Presentations: Minimal to no activity in professional presentations at

- recognized professional organizations.
4. No peer-reviewed presentation (poster or oral) at regional or national conferences (assuming funding is available for travel).
 4. Continuing Education: No significant effort to enhance continuing education to advance career.
 5. Manuscript Review: No manuscript reviews for professional journals, book chapters for professional texts, grant reviews, or abstracts for professional society meetings.
 6. Consultantship: Minimal to no consultantship.

Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions effectiveness is evaluated according to university criteria. The criteria are: Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations and Well Below Expectations. Faculty members will receive an evaluation in classification area (listed below) based on the preponderance of activities associated with the following categories.

IV. Summary

Listed below are general recommended guidelines associated with the aforementioned criteria for tenure at Assistant or Associate Professor and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor:

1. Above Expectations – A faculty member’s effectiveness is evaluated by their consistency developing a line of inquiry over a sustained period of time resulting from Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions with a preponderance of the data identified as AE.
2. Meets Expectations - A faculty member’s effectiveness is evaluated by their consistency over a sustained period of time resulting from Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions with a preponderance of the data identified as mostly ME.
3. Below Expectations - A faculty member’s effectiveness is evaluated by their consistency over a sustained period of time resulting from Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions with a preponderance of the data identified as some ME and mostly BE.
4. Well Below Expectations - A faculty member’s effectiveness is evaluated by their consistency over a sustained period of time resulting from Research, Scholarly or Creative Contributions with a preponderance of the data identified as mostly BE.

Chapter 5

Service

I. PREAMBLE

Kinesiology faculty must demonstrate evidence of contributions to the department, college, discipline, profession, and community beyond the university. In the self-evaluation of service section, candidates must demonstrate growth and progress and satisfy service performance standards described below in order to receive a favorable recommendation for the requested RPT action. As faculty members progress through their careers, it is expected that they play an increasingly significant role in professional activities such as serving on professional committees, assuming leadership positions, serving as a program planner, conducting seminars and workshops, and serving as a professional consultant, on editorial boards, and/or as a reviewer of scholarly/professional materials.

II. Evaluating Service Activities

Kinesiology faculty members are expected to participate in scheduled department meetings and address issues that require additional and/or immediate faculty service/time. As a faculty member of the Department of Kinesiology, each person is expected to actively assist in developing and supporting department goals and objectives associated with program enhancement, development, implementation and evaluation. Service and active participation on department committees are indispensable to supporting academic affairs on campus and in the community.

A. Service Expectations

Faculty members must participate in professionally related service to the University and/or community. All probationary and tenured faculty members must participate in institutional governance, evaluating the teaching of their colleagues, and advising students. Community service related to the mission of the University should be consistent with the teaching abilities, expertise, and leadership qualities of the faculty member, and should foster an intellectual relationship with the off-campus community. The term "community" may refer to local, regional, state, national, or international entities.

B. Providing Evidence

Each faculty member shall describe and provide documentation of University and/or community service. Evidence may include, but shall not be limited to, letters of invitation, memoranda documenting the extent and quality of service,

programs, membership lists, and other appropriate items that address the quality of the faculty member's contribution. This evidence shall be attached to the FAR.

III. Classification of Service Activities

The prioritized list of service contributions for the Department of Kinesiology is as follows: activities in Above Expectations are more valued than activities in Meets Expectations, which are more valued than activities in Below Expectations or Well Below Expectations. Additionally, items listed below are considered general expectations of categories of service for Kinesiology faculty members. However, other work not listed in the areas (below) also may be an appropriate consideration of service activities. Any such work that is not listed below and is an appropriate consideration for service shall be included in the FAR. It is not sufficient to simply list contributions to service without a brief statement of the quality of the contribution. Items listed without a brief statement of contribution shall not be considered as valid documentation of service.

A. Above Expectations

1. Awards: A faculty member receives a college, university or professional award identifying excellence in Service.
2. Report Writing: Writing documents such as college or department self-study reports or comprehensive reports required and accepted by accrediting/approval organizations appropriate for the university (viz., WASC etc.), college (WASC, NCATE, CCTC, etc.), Department of Kinesiology (WASC, NCATE, CCTC, department self-study, etc.)
3. Editorial Roles: Activities in the capacity of editor-in-chief or associate editor. Serving as a guest editor for a special issue of a peer-reviewed academic journal is highly valued. A guest editor is not viewed synonymously as if a candidate served as an editor-in-chief.
4. University Service: Documented leadership in service to and/or governance of university programs (viz., Chair of Faculty Senate, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, Chair of Educational Programs and Resources Committee, Chair of University Curriculum Committee, Chair of General Education Committee etc.), college (Chair of College Curriculum Committee, Chair of Dean Review Committee, etc.), department (Chair), and/or the University System (viz., Statewide Academic Senator). If a faculty member is given reassigned time to perform such service or governance, this shall not be considered in evaluating the quality of such work. However, having received reassigned time may be considered when evaluating the quantity and quality of academic service.
5. Department Service: Chair of the Review Committee responsible for completion of classroom visitation reports for faculty members in the college and/or department.
6. Academic Advisement: Academic and/or career advisement of an extra number

of students exceeding typically assigned number of students by at least 75%. After faculty members advise students they will give the academic files and names of students they advise to the staff in the Kinesiology department. The academic files will include an advisement worksheet, schedule of classes for a specific quarter and roadmap for graduation.

7. Community Service:
 - a. Leadership (viz., President, Chair or other reasonable facsimile) associated with several community service activities per year.
 - b. Examples of such leadership service includes, but are not limited to, leading international professional events (viz., conferences or meetings), serving as a lead consultant to federal government activities (Department of Education, National Institute of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, National Science Foundation, etc.).
 8. Professional Organization Service:
 - a. Leadership in professional organizations associated with Kinesiology (viz., Board Member of the American Kinesiology Association (AKA), President of Society for Health and Physical Education (SHAPE) or American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) etc. and/or one of its sub-fields (viz., Pedagogy, Exercise Science, or Allied Health Professions).
 - b. Consultantships to international or national groups (viz., SHAPE, ACSM, etc.).
 - c. Candidates are expected to demonstrate leadership and participate in professional association activities by attending meetings, participating on international, national and/or regional committees, by holding office, and being involved in similar professional activities.
 9. Student Collaboration:
 - a. Collaborating with students on projects above and beyond what is expected in the classroom (i.e., research projects, interns in a laboratory, etc.).
 - b. In addition to writing letters of recommendations for students, faculty members utilize professional resources to actively refer students to career or educational opportunities.
- B. Meets Expectations
1. Awards: A faculty member receives a college, university or professional award identifying excellence in Service.
 2. Report Writing:
 - a. Writing documents such as college or department self-study reports or comprehensive reports required and accepted by accrediting/approval organizations appropriate for the Department of Kinesiology (WASC, NCATE, CCTC, department self-study, etc.).
 - b. Authorship of documents, reports, or other materials pertinent to the University's mission or operation.
 3. Editorial Roles: Editorial board member on a peer-reviewed academic journal for a sustained period of time.

4. University:
 - a. Documented leadership in service to and/or governance of department programs (viz., Chair of Department Review Committee, Chair of Academic Advising, Coordinator of Adapted Physical Education Credential program, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Coordinator of Exercise Science, Pedagogy or Allied Health Professions Concentration, etc.). If a faculty member is given reassigned time to perform such service or governance, this shall not be considered in evaluating the quality of such work. However, having received reassigned time may be considered when evaluating the quantity and quality of academic service.
 - b. Active documented participation in service to and/or governance to the University System, CSUSB (viz., Member of: Faculty Senate, University Curriculum Committee College Curriculum Committee, Budget Committee, etc.), and department committees. If a faculty member is given reassigned time to perform such service or governance, this shall not be considered in evaluating the quality of academic service. However, having received reassigned time may be considered when evaluating the quantity and quality of such academic service.
 - c. Documented attendance and active participation at university, college, and department meetings as well as any professional meetings.
 - d. Active participation on committees at all levels of the University and the University System, with emphasis on the departmental and the college levels.
5. Department:
 - a. Maintaining or developing teaching space (viz., a laboratory, computer workstations, etc.).
 - b. Completion of classroom visitation reports.
6. Advisement:
 - a. Advisor or sponsor to student groups on campus and in the department.
 - b. Academic and/or career advisement of students as assigned by the Department Chair.
7. Community:
 - a. Participation in at least one community service activity per year. Examples of community service include, but are not limited to, service at international, national, regional, state or local government levels. For example, a faculty member may serve on a local city group like Redlands Bicycle Classic, jogging events in local communities, service to the southwest district of a professional organization, etc.
 - b. Consultantships to community service groups, judge at science fairs, activity programs, fitness events, etc. demonstrating a sustained level of involvement and commitment to a particular organization.
8. Professional Organization:
 - a. Consultantships to international or national groups (SHAPE, ACSM, etc.).
 - b. Candidates are expected to demonstrate leadership and participate in professional association activities by attending meetings, participating on

- international, national and/or regional committees, by holding office, and being involved in similar professional activities throughout their career.
- c. Membership on a grant-review panel; and, invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer for grant applications
9. Student Collaboration:
- a. Collaborating with students on projects beyond the usual expectations associated with teaching and learning (i.e. research projects, internships in a laboratory, etc.).
 - b. Writing letters of recommendations for students associated with professional employment or postgraduate education compatible with their career goals.
- C. Below Expectations
1. Awards: No services awards received.
 2. Report Writing: No evidence of writing documents such as college or department self-study reports or comprehensive reports required and accepted by accrediting/approval organizations appropriate for the university (viz., WASC etc.), college (WASC, NCATE, CCTC, etc.) Department of Kinesiology (WASC, NCATE, CCTC, department self-study, etc.).
 3. Editorial Roles: No or a minimal role serving a peer reviewed academic journal.
 4. University: Minimal participation on committees at all levels of the University and the University System, with emphasis on the departmental and the college levels.
 5. Department: Minimal completion of classroom visitation reports.
 6. Advisement:
 - a. Advisement or sponsorship to student groups on campus and some academic and/or career advisement of students.
 - b. Basic academic and/or career advisement of students as assigned by the Department Chair.
 7. Community:
 - a. Minimal community service activity. Examples of community service include, but are not limited to, service at the international, national, regional or state levels.
 - b. Minimal consultancies to community service groups (viz., activity programs, fitness events, etc.).
 8. Professional Organization: Minimal participation in professional association activities by attending meetings, participating on international, national and/or regional committees, by holding office, and being involved in similar professional activities.
 9. Student Collaboration:
 - a. Minimal collaboration with students on projects above what is expected in the classroom (i.e. research projects, interns in labs, etc.).
 - b. Minimal evidence of writing letters of recommendations for students associated with professional employment or post graduate education compatible with their career goals.

D. Well Below Expectations

1. Awards: No service awards
2. Report Writing: Authorship of documents, reports, or other materials pertinent to the University's mission or operation is nonexistent.
3. Editorial Roles: No editorial roles
4. University:
 - a. No participation in service to and/or governance of programs, departments, colleges, the campus, and/or the University System.
 - b. No documented evidence participation in service to and/or governance to the University System, CSUSB (Member of: Faculty Senate, University Curriculum Committee College Curriculum Committee, Budget Committee, etc.) and department committees.
 - c. Active participation on committees at any level of the University and the University System, with emphasis on the departmental and the college levels is not apparent, misrepresented, or lacking.
5. Department:
 - a. No documented evidence of leadership in service to and/or governance of department programs (viz., Chair of Department Review Committee, Chair of Academic Advising, Coordinator of Adapted Physical Education Credential program, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Coordinator of Exercise Science, Pedagogy or Allied Health Professions Concentration, etc.).
 - b. Documented attendance and active participation at university, college, and department meetings is nonexistent.
 - c. Completion of classroom visitation reports is not evident.
6. Advisement:
 - a. Advisor or sponsor to student groups on campus and in the department.
 - b. Academic and/or career advisement of students as assigned by the Department Chair is shown as lacking, unprofessional or non-participatory.
7. Community: No participation in any community service activity at any level for each year is apparent, is misrepresented, or is lacking.
8. Professional Organization: No participation in professional association activities by attending meetings, participating on international, national and/or regional committees, by holding office, and being involved in similar professional activities.
9. Student Collaboration:
 - a. Collaborating with students on projects is not evident or nonexistent.
 - b. Minimal or no evidence of writing letters of recommendations for students associated with professional employment or post graduate education compatible with their career goals.

IV. Summary

University and/or Community Service effectiveness is evaluated according to university criteria. The criteria are: Above Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations and Well Below Expectations. Listed below are general recommended guidelines associated with the aforementioned criteria for tenure at Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor:

1. Above Expectations – A faculty member effectiveness is evaluated by her/his consistency over a sustained period of time resulting in a preponderance of data accompanied with commensurate other Service to the University and Community service largely identified with Above Expectations activities.
2. Meets Expectations - A faculty member effectiveness is evaluated by her/his consistency over a sustained period of time resulting in data accompanied with commensurate other Service to the University and Community data largely identified with Above Expectations and Meets Expectations activities.
3. Below Expectations - A faculty member effectiveness is evaluated by her/his consistency over a sustained period of time resulting in data accompanied with commensurate other Service to the University and Community data largely identified with Meets Expectations and Below Expectations activities.
4. Well Below Expectations - A faculty member effectiveness is evaluated by her/his consistency over a sustained period of time resulting in data accompanied with commensurate other Service to the University and Community data largely identified with Below Expectations activities.