

Department of Hotel, Restaurant, Institution Management and Dietetics

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/14/06)

Deborah Canter, Department Head

Date signed: 5/01/06

Virginia Moxley, Interim Dean

Date signed: 6/16/06

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 6/27/06

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 2/28/01)

Judy Miller, Department Head

Date signed: 2/28/01

Carol Kellett, Dean

Date signed: 3/01/01

James Coffman, Provost

Date signed: 3/07/01

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **4/2010**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **2/2006**

***Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.**

Documentation for Annual Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure, and Chronic Low Achievement Standards

**Department of Hotel, Restaurant, Institution Management and Dietetics
College of Human Ecology
Kansas State University**

The procedures listed in this document are consistent with those given in the *KSU Faculty Handbook*, *Department Head's Manual*, and College of Human Ecology promotion and tenure guidelines. The preparation of this document is based on information from the *KSU Faculty Handbook* (2000) and *Guidelines for Evaluating Unclassified Personnel* (1999), both available at <http://www.ksu.edu/uauac>. The updated Promotion and Tenure Checklist and timetable for relevant actions are available as part of the *Department Head's Manual* at <http://www.ksu.edu/depthead>.

Annual Evaluation

The evaluation will provide the basis for annual salary recommendations. The responsibility for developing and updating an annual evaluation system rests primarily with faculty in consultation with the Department Head. The annual evaluation is based on performance during the 12-month period ending December 31.

In early December, the Department Head shall inform faculty of the due date for submission of annual performance evaluation document (usually in the third week of January). Appropriate forms (see Appendix) should be completed by faculty with supporting documentation attached.

The Department Head will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty. The evaluation shall provide succinct assessments of effectiveness in performing each responsibility and these statements must include summaries of the achievements/evidence that support the assessments. The Department Head may solicit advice from faculty members who hold a rank higher than the rank of the faculty being evaluated.

Each faculty will review and must have the opportunity to discuss his/her written evaluation with the Department Head. Before the Department Head submits the evaluation to the Dean, each faculty must sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review and discuss the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, faculty members have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations by the Department Head to the Department Head and to the Dean.

Promotion and Tenure

Tenure eligibility

Tenure is not granted below the rank of associate professor. For individuals appointed at the rank of assistant professor, applications for tenure must be made before or during the sixth year of the probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service will be notified by the Dean that the seventh year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment. For individuals appointed at the rank of associate or full professor, applications for tenure must be made before or during the fifth year of the probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the fifth year of service will be notified by the Dean that the sixth year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment.

For the purposes of counting regular annual appointments as part of the probationary period, a year is credited if the individual is on a full-time appointment for at least eight months of an academic year. Individuals appointed at lesser levels do not count that year a part of the probationary period.

Faculty members on probationary appointments who have met the criteria and standards for tenure prior to the maximum time may be granted early tenure. Because candidates may be considered for tenure at any time during their probationary period, no time credit shall be granted for service prior to employment at KSU.

Mid-probationary review

Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, a mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of appointment. A positive mid-probationary review does not insure that tenure will be granted in the future nor does a negative review mean that tenure will be denied.

Procedures for the mid-probationary review are similar to procedures for the tenure review, with the exception that assessment from external reviewers is not required and that a formal vote from eligible departmental faculty is not taken. The candidate is responsible for preparing the review document and the Department Head is responsible for making the file available to the eligible tenured faculty members in the department at least 14 calendar days prior to a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress. Documents from annual performance review shall also be available to eligible tenured faculty for review. The Department Head shall provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions, and discuss the review and assessment with the candidate. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file. If the candidate desires feedback beyond the department, the candidate may request a review by the Dean.

Promotion criteria

Successful candidates for promotion will demonstrate superior professional accomplishments. The candidates for promotion are expected to have received above average annual evaluations

during the review period and exceeded the minimum and recommended performance criteria specified in the department's annual performance evaluation forms.

Promotion to *associate professor* reflects substantial professional contribution that indicates excellent in teaching, research, and other creative endeavor or directed service. The candidate should document (1) active engagement and high commitment to teaching as well as a record of effective instruction; (2) competence as a researcher, with evidence of potential to contribute to the knowledge base of the chosen discipline at a national and/or international level; and (3) effective involvement in service to the profession as well as to the public and that he/she can be reasonably expected to continue a program of effective service.

Promotion to *professor* is based on attainment of excellence in the assigned responsibilities of the faculty member and recognition of excellence by all appropriate constituencies. The candidate should demonstrate (1) a sustained record of excellence in teaching and serving as an effective role model for colleagues and students; (2) an extensive record of research, scholarship, and other creative endeavor that is recognized nationally or internationally; (3) evidence of serving as a role model for less senior faculty, students, and the profession; and (4) a sustained record of effective involvement in the service to the profession and the public. Major requirements for the professor rank candidate are to make a significant contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline, to perform significant professional service, and to develop a national and/or international reputation as a leader in his/her field or profession.

Promotion and tenure evaluation procedures

Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure unless they resign. After consultation with the Department Head, a faculty member may request an early tenure review. There is no explicit time in rank required for promotion. However, the median time for promotion at KSU has been approximately six years. Promotion may be granted earlier when the faculty member's cumulative performance at rank clearly meets the standards for promotion.

The candidate compiles and submits a file that documents his/her professional accomplishments, achieved during the review period, in accordance with the KSU Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Tenure and Promotion Document, available at <http://www.ksu.edu/uau/forms/promotio.html>. The candidate is encouraged to consult with the Department Head and senior tenured faculty concerning the content and preparation of the document. The file should be submitted to the Department Head by September 15 to adhere to the university promotion and tenure timeline (<http://www.ksu.edu/ucua/depthead/promotion>).

The Department Head will coordinate the review by 5-6 outside reviewers. The Department Head should provide each external evaluator with a written description of the candidate's responsibilities during the evaluation period and pertinent materials from the candidate's file. Outside reviewers should include recognized leaders in the candidate's area of expertise. Three outside reviewers should be selected by the Department Head, in consultation with eligible faculty members, and three selected by the candidate.

Tenured faculty who hold a higher rank than the rank being sought (for promotion cases) or currently held (for tenure only cases) by the candidate are eligible to review and provide recommendation. The Department Head is responsible for making the candidate's file and outside reviews available to eligible faculty at least 14 calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the application. Eligible faculty members will individually review the candidate's file and provide written comments, and will then meet to discuss the candidate's application. Any member of the eligible faculty may request a meeting with the candidate to discuss, for the purpose of clarification, the records of accomplishment submitted by the candidate. Recommendation (i.e., vote) and written comments from each eligible faculty are forwarded to the Department Head.

The Department Head will independently evaluate the candidate's document and forward a written recommendation to the Dean, accompanied by an explanation of his/her judgment. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible faculty, outside reviewer letters, and the candidate's file are forwarded to the Dean. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation alone is shared with the candidate.

Confidentiality

Any written comments or recommendations submitted by individual faculty and outside evaluators are not to be disclosed to the candidate. All files should be kept confidential, by all individuals participated in the process, from those who are not involved (e.g., other faculty members within or outside of the department).

Chronic Low Achievement

Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his/her professional duties shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies. The minimum performance expectations for HRIMD faculty are defined in the annual evaluation forms in the Appendix. When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum level, the Department Head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The Department Head will also indicate, in writing, a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations, the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three evaluations in any five-year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the Department Head and the Dean.

Timeline

Mid-probationary review

Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, a mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of appointment.

Date	Activity
September/October	Department Head discusses mid-probationary review procedure with the candidate and provides guidelines for document preparation.
Mid-October	The Candidate submits a notebook of materials to the Department Head who checks for format and completeness of documents. Eligible tenured faculty members in the department are notified of the availability of the materials.
Early November	Eligible faculty members review the materials individually and then meet to discuss the candidate's performance. A written statement incorporating comments from all eligible faculty members is submitted to Department Head.
Mid-November	Department Head provides a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. A meeting is arranged between the Department Head and the candidate to discuss the review.
Late November	The candidate may submit a written response for the file or request a review by the Dean.

Promotion and tenure review

Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure unless they resign. After consultation with the Department Head, a faculty member may request an early tenure review. There is no explicit time in rank required for promotion.

The candidate should check with the College and University timelines to make sure that all deadlines are met.

Date	Activity
Late August	Department Head discusses promotion and tenure procedure with the candidate and provides guidelines for document preparation.
Mid-September	Department Head solicits letters from outside reviewers.
Early October	The Candidate submits a notebook of materials to the Department Head who checks for format and completeness of documents and inserts letters from external reviewers. Eligible tenured faculty members in the department are notified of the availability of the materials.
Late October to Early November	Eligible faculty members review the materials individually and then meet to discuss the candidate's performance. Written comments and vote by each individual faculty are submitted to Department Head.
Mid-November	Department Head writes a letter of recommendation for the candidate and submits the candidate's notebook of materials, with external review letters, his/her written recommendation, and written recommendations and unedited comments of the faculty to the Dean. The Department Head sends a copy of his/her letter to the candidate.

Appendix

HRIMD Annual Performance Evaluation Forms

HRIMD TEACHING EVALUATION

INSTRUCTOR

MINIMUM PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (Minimum performance is met by achieving all performance criteria listed below.)

CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<p>1. Teach 3-4 courses (9-12 hours) depending on other assignments in the department. TEVAL average or above, or some form of documentation that teaching is above average.</p>	<p>Portfolio, which contains all written information presented to students during the semester. This should include: courses taught and number of students in each course, course syllabi, course examinations, handouts, assignments, learning outcomes of special projects (include actual student projects). TEVAL for each course taught or some form of student evaluations of classes taught, forms of student feedback, peer evaluations.</p>	
<p>2. Develop course assignments that develop critical thinking skills, active learning, and team learning.</p>	<p>Portfolio with assignments, learning outcomes of special projects, student evaluations of projects.</p>	
<p>3. Advise undergraduate students. Expedite undergraduate student scholarship award nominations and professional development.</p>	<p>List names of advisees and number of times seen per year. Include if possible student evaluation of advising.</p> <p>List names of students assisted with scholarships and awards received. Self-reported documentation of professional development activities that benefited students.</p>	

RECOMMENDED PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

RECOMMENDED PERFORMANCE CRITERIA		
CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
1. Assist undergraduate students with special projects and work related practica.	Self-reported documentation of names of students instructor assisted with special projects and/or practica and learning outcomes.	
2. Support student organizations by attendance and participation in projects and activities.	List student organizations sponsored/supported and activities of student organizations.	

HRIMD TEACHING EVALUATION

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

MINIMUM PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (Minimum performance is met by achieving all performance criteria listed below.)

CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<p>1. Teach 2 courses (6 semester hours) depending on other assignments in the department. TEVAL average or above, or some form of documentation that teaching is above average.</p>	<p>Portfolio, which contains all written information presented to students during the semester. This should include: courses taught and number of students in each course, course syllabi, course examinations, handouts, assignments, learning outcomes of special projects (include actual student projects). TEVAL for each course taught or some form of student evaluations of classes taught, forms of student feedback, peer evaluations.</p>	
<p>2. Demonstrate innovative instructional techniques in existing courses. Develop course assignments that develop critical thinking skills, active learning, and team learning.</p>	<p>Self report of innovative teaching techniques or projects. Include assignments, handouts, results of projects, student feedback.</p>	
<p>3. Advise undergraduate and graduate students (upon achieving graduate faculty status). Expedite undergraduate student scholarship award nominations and professional development.</p>	<p>List names of advisees and number of times seen per year. Include if possible student evaluation of advising.</p> <p>List names of students assisted with scholarships and awards received. Self-reported documentation of professional development activities that benefited students.</p>	
<p>4. Serve as chairperson or member of Masters and Dissertation supervisory committees.</p>	<p>Listing of graduate committees and chairs held. Include status of each graduate student.</p>	

RECOMMENDED PERFORMANCE CRITERIA		
CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
1. Assist undergraduate students with special projects and work related practica.	Self-reported documentation of names of students assisted with special projects and/or practica and learning outcomes.	
2. Support student organizations by attendance and participation in projects and activities.	Self-reported documentation of student organizations and activities participated in during the year.	
3. Develop new and innovative courses of curriculum.	Portfolio of course syllabus, course assignments, handouts, course examinations, learning outcomes of special projects for new courses. For curriculum, self-report which includes documentation of new curriculum.	
4. Utilize team teaching or an interdisciplinary approach.	Self report of team teaching or interdisciplinary efforts. Include syllabus, teaching improvements as a result of team teaching or interdisciplinary endeavors.	
5. Provide guidance to graduate research and teaching assistants.	Self-reported documentation of names of students and special assistance give for each particular student.	
6. Direct problems and special courses for undergraduate and graduate students.	Self-reported documentation of names of students who were assisted with special projects; title of projects; and learning outcomes of projects.	

HRIMD TEACHING EVALUATION

ASSOCIATE AND FULL PROFESSOR

MINIMUM PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (Minimum performance is met by achieving all performance criteria listed below.)

CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<p>5. Teach 2 courses (6 semester hours) depending on other assignments in the department. TEVAL average or above, or some form of documentation that teaching is above average.</p>	<p>Portfolio, which contains all written information presented to students during the semester. This should include: courses taught and number of students in each course, course syllabi, course examinations, handouts, assignments, learning outcomes of special projects (include actual student projects). TEVAL for each course taught or some form of student evaluations of classes taught, forms of student feedback, peer evaluations.</p>	
<p>6. Demonstrate innovative instructional techniques in existing courses. Develop course assignments that develop critical thinking skills, active learning, and team learning.</p>	<p>Self report of innovative teaching techniques or projects. Include assignments, handouts, results of projects, student feedback.</p>	
<p>7. Advise undergraduate and graduate students. Expedite undergraduate student scholarship award nominations and professional development.</p>	<p>List names of advisees and number of times seen per year. Include if possible student evaluation of advising.</p> <p>List names of students assisted with scholarships and awards received. Self-reported documentation of professional development activities that benefited students.</p>	
<p>8. Serve as chairperson or member of Masters and Dissertation supervisory committees. Serve as outside chairperson for PhD oral defense.</p>	<p>Listing of graduate committees and chairs held. Include status of each graduate student.</p>	

RECOMMENDED PERFORMANCE CRITERIA		
CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
7. Assist undergraduate students with special projects and work related practica.	Self-reported documentation of names of students assisted with special projects and/or practica and learning outcomes.	
8. Support student organizations by attendance and participation in projects and activities.	Self-reported documentation of student organizations and activities participated in during the year.	
9. Develop new and innovative courses of curriculum.	Portfolio of course syllabus, course assignments, handouts, course examinations, learning outcomes of special projects for new courses. For curriculum, self-report which includes documentation of new curriculum.	
10. Utilize team teaching or an interdisciplinary approach.	Self report of team teaching or interdisciplinary efforts. Include syllabus, teaching improvements as a result of team teaching or interdisciplinary endeavors.	
11. Provide guidance to graduate research and teaching assistants.	Self-reported documentation of names of students and special assistance give for each particular student.	
12. Direct problems and special courses for undergraduate and graduate students.	Self-reported documentation of names of students who were assisted with special projects; title of projects; and learning outcomes of projects.	
13. Assist other faculty in their curriculum development and teaching efforts; actively and productively address issues that could improve the quality of teaching in the department. Serve as a peer evaluator.	Self-reported documentation of efforts to assist faculty (e.g., reviewing exams, syllabi, assignments; conducting peer evaluations). Explain issues that you have addressed which have led to improvements in the quality of teaching in the department.	

HRIMD RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

MINIMUM PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (Research expectations will vary depending on load and departmental demand. Minimum performance can be met by achieving 2 of the 3 performance criteria listed below.)

CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<p>1. Publications – Beginning year 2 of appointment. First or second author on two (2) of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission to refereed journal • Association position paper • Book chapter • Other publication format 	<p>Submission of articles and/or publications in peer reviewed journals/books/chapters. Cite reference including names of co-author(s), if applicable, and status including date of submission and review status if known.</p> <p>Other publications (abstracts, proceedings, or edited publications). Cite references and status.</p> <p>Publications of research related information in technical/industry/extension/popular press. Cite references and status.</p>	
<p>2. Funding – Years 3-4: Submit proposal as co-investigator or collaborator on interdisciplinary team on which you have a significant role.</p> <p>Year 5 and beyond: Submit and obtain funding to support research activities.</p>	<p>Grants, contracts, and other sources of support including in-kind services. Indicate project title, co-investigator(s), source of funding, amount, general nature of grant, and status (funded, not funded, in review).</p> <p>Non-monetary program support. Indicate source, product/services donated, estimated value, and general use areas intended.</p>	
<p>3. Presentations - One scholarly oral or poster presentation per year at professional meeting based on peer review and contingent on available travel funds.</p>	<p>Presentations including interviews. Cite title, date, organization/society, audience, and relevant other information about presentation. Identify co-author(s) or presenters, if applicable.</p>	

RECOMMENDED PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<p>1. Other research activities and contributions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads or participates on research team • Obtains fellowship for research 	<p>Research projects for which you are responsible. List title and number, and describe status.</p> <p>Support for other projects. Indicate project and describe nature of your support or assistance.</p> <p>Computer software. Indicate program title and provide brief description of software, target audience, current use, and status of external distribution, if applicable.</p> <p>Other research contributions (e.g., editorial review boards). List type of activities, nature of contribution, and time demands.</p>	
<p>2. Recognition for achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtains KSU graduate faculty certification status • Has work cited by other researchers • Receives awards and prizes for excellence of research accomplishments <p>Research focus – Year 3 and beyond: Demonstrate research focus.</p>	<p>Self-reported documentation for additional accomplishments.</p>	

HRIMD RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS

ASSOCIATE AND FULL PROFESSOR

MINIMUM PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (Research expectations will vary depending on load and departmental demand. Minimum performance can be met by achieving 2 of the 3 performance criteria listed below.)

CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<p>1. Publications – First or second author on two (2) of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission to refereed journal • Association position paper • Book chapter • Other publication format 	<p>Submission of articles and/or publications in peer reviewed journals/books/chapters. Cite reference including names of co-author(s), if applicable, and status including date of submission and review status if known.</p> <p>Other publications (abstracts, proceedings, or edited publications). Cite references and status.</p> <p>Publications of research related information in technical/industry/extension/popular press. Cite references and status.</p>	
<p>2. Funding - Submission of a minimum of one grant per year.</p>	<p>Grants, contracts, and other sources of support including in-kind services. Indicate project title, co-investigator(s), source of funding, amount, general nature of grant, and status (funded, not funded, in review).</p> <p>Non-monetary program support. Indicate source, product/services donated, estimated value, and general use areas intended.</p>	
<p>3. Presentations - One scholarly oral or poster presentation per year at professional meeting based on peer review and contingent on available travel funds.</p>	<p>Presentations including interviews. Cite title, date, organization/society, audience, and relevant other information about presentation. Identify co-author(s) or presenters, if applicable.</p>	

RECOMMENDED PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<p>1. Other research activities and contributions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads or participates on research team • Obtains fellowship for research • Mentors visiting professor or research project and subsequent publications 	<p>Research projects for which you are responsible. List title and number, and describe status.</p> <p>Support for other projects. Indicate project and describe nature of your support or assistance.</p> <p>Computer software. Indicate program title and provide brief description of software, target audience, current use, and status of external distribution, if applicable.</p> <p>Other research contributions (e.g., editorial review boards). List type of activities, nature of contribution, and time demands.</p>	
<p>2. Recognition for achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has work cited by other researchers • Receives awards and prizes for excellence of research accomplishments 	<p>Self-reported documentation for additional accomplishments.</p>	

HRIMD SERVICE EVALUATION	
MINIMUM PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<i>GENERAL SERVICE – FOR ALL RANKS - SELF REPORTED DOCUMENTATION</i>	
1. Participates in and supports departmental activities, i.e., development and review of self-study documents, site visitations, etc.	
2. Maintains positive working relationship among HRIMD organization units (Justin, Housing and Dining Services, and KSU Union Food Service) and supervised practice sites.	
3. Attends and participates in departmental faculty/staff meetings.	
4. Contributes to the formulation of academic or administrative policy and programs.	
5. Cultivates productive relationships with outside agencies, organizations, industries, or individuals.	
<i>UNIVERSITY SERVICE - FOR ALL RANKS - DOCUMENT A MINIMUM OF ONE (1) ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA</i>	
1. Serves as an active member on department, college, or university committees, graduate council or faculty senate.	
2. Organizes and sponsors, or participates in, student professional societies and clubs/organizations.	
3. Provides leadership on departmental, college, university, standing or ad hoc committees, graduate council or faculty senate.	
<i>PROFESSIONAL SERVICE - FOR ALL RANKS - DOCUMENT A MINIMUM OF ONE (1) ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA</i>	
1. Holds an elected, appointed office, or other volunteer position in a professional association.	
2. Serves as Editor of refereed publication.	
3. Serves on an editorial review board of a professional journal.	

4.	Serves on an editorial committee for a journal, newsletter, or other publication.
5.	Serves as a reviewer for a refereed publication.
6.	Participates in "meaningful" activities of professional societies, i.e., presiding chair, committee member, site visitor, conference speaker, panel discussion leader, board member.
7.	Presents an invited lecture.
8.	Writes articles for professional organization's newsletters.
9.	Serves as member or chair of external evaluation team.
10.	Functions as chair or coordinator of professional meeting sessions or coordinator of a state, regional, or national convention.
11.	Receives recognition for outstanding contributions to professional societies.

PUBLIC SERVICE - FOR ALL RANKS - DOCUMENT A MINIMUM OF ONE (1) ACTIVITY RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA

1.	Serves as an expert witness.
2.	Provides training programs for different audiences.
3.	Provides consultation on voluntary basis.
4.	Provides professional expertise to specific interest groups and the general public.
5.	Participates in different types of public service media activities (radio interviews, TV appearance).
6.	Works with projects that benefit the community.
7.	Serves as a board member of a community organization.
7.	Receives recognition for outstanding public service.

HRIMD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION		
MINIMUM CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
(All Ranks Will Complete a Minimum of One Activity Per Category)		
<p>1. <u>Professional Organizations</u></p> <p>a. Maintains active membership in professional organizations which include local, state, and national associations.</p> <p>b. Attains continuing education through attendance at professional organization meetings.</p> <p>c. Actively participates in seminars and workshops sponsored by professional associations.</p> <p>2. <u>Self-Improvement</u></p> <p>a. Attends workshops or seminars related to teaching methods and techniques.</p> <p>b. Takes credit courses.</p> <p>c. Completes professional reading or other updating activities.</p> <p>d. Takes sabbatical or other leave to improve knowledge or skills.</p> <p>e. Consults with businesses or other educators.</p>	<p>Self-report on activities to include description, explanation, or list of related activities for this evaluation period:</p> <p>a. Organizations for which active membership is maintained.</p> <p>b. Participation in seminars and workshops sponsored by professional associations.</p> <p>c. Participation in seminars and workshops to improve teaching methods and techniques.</p> <p>d. Courses taken for credit.</p> <p>e. Professional reading or other updating activities over and beyond preparation for coursework.</p> <p>f. Sabbatical taken and what was done to improve knowledge and/or skills.</p>	

ALL RANKS

HRIMD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION EVALUATION

MIMIMUM CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides leadership to program. 2. Cultivates inter and intra departmental working relationships. 3. Coordinates updating of curriculum. 4. Conducts program faculty meetings. 5. Work collaboratively with department head and faculty to complete reports required for program, such as annual reports, self-study documents, program surveys, etc. 6. Corresponds with current and prospective students. 7. Communicates resource needs to department head. 8. Cultivates active relationship with industry representatives to remain current on issues facing the industry. 9. Establishes continuous quality improvement of the program. 10. Develops internship contacts. 11. Obtains continuous input from program graduates. 12. Seeks external support for program. 	<p>Self report of activities including description, explanation, and a list of related activities for evaluation period:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Major contributions to success of the program to include curriculum update, self-study document, results of program surveys, contacts with industry representative and advisory board meeting. b. Special projects implemented to achieve program goals. c. Recruitment activities. 	

3. Service

4. Professional Development

5. Program Administration

6. Extension

3. Service

4. Professional Development

5. Program Administration

6. Extension

**Department of Hotel, Restaurant, Institution Management and Dietetics
College of Human Ecology**

Professorial Performance Award

The Professorial Performance Award recognizes and rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process.

What the Professorial Performance Award is NOT:

- It is not a form of promotion review.
- It does not create a “senior” professoriate.
- It is not a “right” accorded to every faculty member at the rank of Professor.
- It is not granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties with a record free of notable deficiencies.

Criteria for the HRIMD Professorial Performance Award

1. The candidate must be a full-time faculty member.
2. The candidate must have held the rank of Full Professor at Kansas State University for at least six years or at least six years must have passed since the last Professorial Performance Award.
3. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review. “Sustained productivity” applies to teaching, research and service.
 - a. The candidate should be viewed as a role model for colleagues, and a person who acts as a mentor for less senior faculty and students.
 - b. The candidate’s teaching evaluations should show a consistent record of excellence (averaging 4.0 or above) on TEVAL or IDEA report scores of teacher excellence.
 - c. The candidate should demonstrate an extensive and sustained (ongoing) record of research, scholarship or other creative endeavors that is recognized nationally or internationally. This recognition should be evidenced by publications, national and/or international presentations or other appropriate citations.
 - d. The candidate should demonstrate a sustained and significant record of securing extramural funding to support research activities including graduate research assistantships.

- e. The candidate's record should show regular and systematic publication of research conducted either on his/her own, in collaboration with colleagues, or from work done with graduate students. Publications should be in reputable, peer-reviewed journals on the department's roster of top tier journals.
 - f. The candidate's record should show evidence of consistent involvement in service to his/her profession and to the public. Evidence of such includes election to major leadership positions within professional associations, appointment to committees or task forces of major importance, and recognition with national or international honors or awards.
 - g. The candidate's overall body of scholarship and leadership is deemed by colleagues as making a significant contribution to the knowledge base and advancement of the profession within the disciplines represented by HRIMD.
4. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to the current HRIMD standards.

The Professorial Performance Award Process

The timeline associated with the annual evaluation review outlined in the University Handbook will be used in the Professorial Award process.

- Eligible candidates for review should compile and submit documentation that showcases the individual's professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years in accordance with the criteria outlined above.
- The candidate's portfolio should be submitted to the department head at the same time as his/her regular evaluation documentation at the end of the calendar year.
- All tenure-track faculty members in HRIMD will be provided with the Professorial Performance Award criteria. These faculty members will be invited to review the candidate's portfolio and forward evaluation comments to the department head.
- The department head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials, including evaluation comments from the department's tenure-track faculty, and provide a recommendation for or against the award.
- The candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendations with the department head, and the candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation.

Within seven working days after the review and discussion, the candidate will have the opportunity to submit a written statement of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the department head and to the dean. A copy of the department head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

- The department head will submit the following items to the dean:
 - A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualifications for the award.
 - Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendations.
 - Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
 - The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.
- The dean will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the criteria and procedures established by HRIMD for the Professorial Performance Award.
- If the dean does not agree with recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award made by the HRIMD department head, an attempt will be made, through consultation, to reach a consensus. If this fails, the dean's recommendation will be used.
- The provost will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluation process was conducted in a manner consistent with the criteria and procedures approved by HRIMD and that there are no inequities in the recommendations based upon gender, race, religion, national origin, age or disability.
- If the provost does not agree with recommendations for the Professorial Performance Awards made by subordinate administrators, an attempt will be made, through consultation, to reach a consensus. If this fails, the provost's decision will prevail.

Amount of the Award

The Professorial Performance Award will be 8% of the average salary of all full-time faculty (instructor through professor excluding administrators at those ranks). However, funding for the award cannot come out of the legislatively-approved merit increment.

Cost of the Award

In the event that financial conditions in a given year preclude awarding the full amount as designated above, the provost shall, in concert with the Vice President for Administration and Finance, adopt a plan to phase in the full award for all that year's recommended and approved candidates.

Upon official notification from the Office of the Provost, the dean will consolidate the Professorial Performance Award with salary increases resulting from annual evaluation and issue the candidate a contract that includes the candidate's salary for the next fiscal year. The Professorial Performance Award will become part of the professor's base salary.