

Proposed Handbook Language for the Professorial Performance Award (Approved by Faculty Senate 12-13-05)

C49.1 Significance of the Award. The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a ~~periodic~~ **base** salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process. The Performance Award review, it is important to note, is not a form of promotion review. It does not create a "senior" professoriate.

C49.2 Development and Revisions of the Professorial Performance Award Process. Departments develop their own mechanisms for review as they have for annual merit evaluation. As is the case in merit review, it may be that responsibility for the evaluation of materials involves personnel of any rank or several ranks. Each department will also specify criteria according to which candidates qualify for the award according to its own disciplinary standards of excellence. Nonetheless, all such criteria for the award will adhere to the following guidelines: 1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or **professorial performance award** ~~performance review~~; 2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and 3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to ~~full~~ **professor** according to current approved departmental standards.

C49.3 The Professorial Performance Award document must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty in the department, by the department's administrative head, and by the dean. Provision must be made for a review of the document at least every five years as a part of the review of the procedures for annual merit evaluation or whenever standards for promotion to ~~full~~ **professor** change.

C49.4 Recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award are considered annually.

C49.5 Responsibilities of Professorial Performance Award Candidates. Eligible candidates for review compile and submit a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department. The department head, in consultation with the personnel committee assembled for the purpose of the Professorial Performance award, when applicable, will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award.

C49.6 Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the department head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate has the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations by the department head and to the next administrative level.

C49.7 The department head must submit the following items to the appropriate dean:
a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

C49.8 Responsibilities of the Deans. The dean will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that the evaluations are consistent with the criteria and procedures established by the department for the Professorial Performance Award.

C49.9 A dean who does not agree with recommendations for the Professorial Performance Award made by a department head must attempt to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the dean's recommendation will be used. If any change has been made to the department head's recommendations, the dean must notify, in writing, **to the** candidate of the change and its rationale. Within seven working days after notification, such candidates have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations to the dean and to the provost. All statements of unresolved differences will be included in the documentation to be forwarded to the next administrative level. All recommendations are forwarded to the provost.

C49.10 Responsibilities of the Provost. The provost will review all evaluation materials and recommendations to ensure that
a. the evaluation process was conducted in a manner consistent with the criteria and procedures approved by the unit,
b. there are no inequities in the recommendations based upon gender, race, religion, national origin, age or disability.

C49.11 If the provost does not agree with recommendations for **professorial performance awards** ~~salary increases~~ made by subordinate administrators, an attempt must be made to reach consensus through consultation. If this fails, the provost's recommendation will be used. The candidate affected by the disagreement must be notified by the provost, in writing, of the change and its rationale.

C49.12 The dean will consolidate the 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 performance award will become part of the professor's base salary.**

C49.13 Basis and source of the award amount. The Professorial Performance Award will be 8% of the average salary of all-University faculty. However, funding for the award cannot come out of the legislatively-approved merit increment; it must be an infusion of additional money from tuition or other sources.