

4  
5

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACCREDITATION STANDARDS  
FOR FACULTY IN FOUR-YEAR HOSPITALITY  
MANAGEMENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

Diane Teel Miller

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Vocational and Technical Education

APPROVED:


J. D. Oliver, Chairman

S. B. Asselin

T. M. Babcock

J. P. Clouse

M. D. Olsen

  
S. J. Ritchey

January, 1988

Blacksburg, Virginia

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACCREDITATION STANDARDS  
FOR FACULTY IN FOUR-YEAR HOSPITALITY  
MANAGEMENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

Diane Teel Miller

Committee Chairman: James Dale Oliver  
Vocational and Technical Education

(ABSTRACT)

The problem for this study was to identify standards desirable for faculty when four-year hospitality management education programs are accredited. A modified Delphi technique was used to determine standards and reach agreement among a panel of hospitality professionals concerning desirable standards to be used to evaluate faculty during the self-study section of the specialized accreditation process. Nine faculty qualifications identified in the literature as being common to the self-study section of specialized accreditation constituted the framework of the study. These qualifications included academic preparation, scholarly productivity, applied professional experience, involvement in professional associations, competency in area of specialization, teaching effectiveness, interest in curricular experimentation, ability to work with students, and public service.

A professional panel consisting of 15 hospitality management education administrators/faculty and 12 hospitality management industry representatives developed standards for each of the above qualifications. The panel rated the desirability of the standards using a Likert-type scale (4=very desirable, 3=desirable, 2=undesirable, 1=very undesirable). All standards receiving a total of two-thirds of the responding panel members' votes in the very desirable and desirable categories were included in a proposed accreditation model of faculty standards. Unexpectedly, the panel questioned the inclusion of the qualification of public service and agreed to omit the evaluation of faculty on this qualification during specialized accreditation.

It was recommended that eight of the qualifications and their corresponding standards be used by The Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education (CHRIE) to form criteria necessary for the self-study section of specialized accreditation. It was also recommended that the developed standards be used by hospitality management faculty as a means of self-evaluation. Finally, it was recommended that hospitality management education administrators use the standards as (a) guidelines when hiring and evaluating faculty and (b) a means for assessing faculty needs prior to faculty development programs.

DEDICATION

TO

AND

"Whatever you do, do your work heartily, as for the Lord rather than for men;" Colossians 3:23 (NAS)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her appreciation to those individuals who contributed to the successful completion of this study. The completion of this study would have not been possible without the example of professional excellence, encouragement, support, patience, and sacrifice of her husband, . A very special thank you is extended to for the hours of nurturing and attention from Mom they sacrificed during their early childhood.

Deep appreciation is extended to Dr. J. Dale Oliver, graduate committee chairman, for his professional guidance, steadfast support, and understanding. The author is indebted to the other graduate committee members, Drs. Susan B. Asselin, Treva M. Babcock, James P. Clouse, Sanford J. Ritchey, and Michael D. Olsen, for their unique contributions, expertise, and support.

The author also wishes to thank the accreditation committee of The Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education for their assistance. Finally, the author expresses her gratitude to the members of the Delphi professional panel for their time, cooperation, and willingness to participate.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT. . . . .	ii
DEDICATION. . . . .	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	v
LIST OF TABLES. . . . .	.viii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
The Hospitality Industry. . . . .	1
Hospitality Management Education. . . . .	2
Background of the Problem . . . . .	5
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	10
Significance of the Study . . . . .	11
Delimitation. . . . .	13
Definition of Terms . . . . .	13
Summary . . . . .	15
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE. . . . .	16
Nature of Accreditation . . . . .	16
Relationship of Accreditation to Educational Quality . . . . .	27
Faculty Evaluation and Faculty Development. . . . .	31
Summary . . . . .	53
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	55
Purpose and Objectives. . . . .	55
The Delphi Technique. . . . .	56
Design of the Study . . . . .	60
Summary . . . . .	65
CHAPTER 4. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA . . . . .	66
Summary of Participation of the Panel of Experts . . . . .	66
Analysis of Data From Delphi I. . . . .	68
Analysis of Data From Delphi II . . . . .	69
Analysis of Data From Delphi III. . . . .	101
Summary . . . . .	133

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	134
Summary . . . . .	134
Findings. . . . .	136
Conclusions . . . . .	138
Recommendations . . . . .	139
Discussion. . . . .	141
REFERENCES. . . . .	148
APPENDIXES. . . . .	165
A. LETTER OF INVITATION TO PANEL MEMBERS . . . . .	166
B. DELPHI I: IDENTIFICATION OF FACULTY STANDARDS . . . . .	172
C. DELPHI II: RATING OF STANDARDS . . . . .	178
D. DELPHI III: REEXAMINATION OF STANDARDS FOR FOUR-YEAR HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS. . . . .	198
E. PROFESSIONAL PANEL. . . . .	223
F. A SCHEMATIC PRESENTATION OF SUGGESTED CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING FACULTY DURING ACCREDITATION OF FOUR-YEAR HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS . . . . .	228
VITA. . . . .	244

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Delphi II: Responses to the Degree Section of Academic Preparation. . . . .	70
2. Delphi II: Responses to the Course Work Section of Academic Preparation. . . . .	73
3. Delphi II: Responses to the Miscellaneous Section of Academic Preparation. . . . .	74
4. Delphi II: Responses to Scholarly Productivity. . . . .	78
5. Delphi II: Responses to Applied Professional Experience . . . . .	81
6. Delphi II: Responses to Continued Contact With the Profession . . . . .	84
7. Delphi II: Responses to Competency in the Area of Specialization . . . . .	88
8. Delphi II: Responses to Teaching Effectiveness. . . . .	91
9. Delphi II: Responses to Interest in Curricular Experimentation. . . . .	94
10. Delphi II: Responses to Ability to Work With Students . . . . .	96
11. Delphi II: Responses to Public Service. . . . .	99
12. Delphi III: Responses to the Degree Section of Academic Preparation . . . . .	103
13. Delphi III: Responses to the Course Work Section of Academic Preparation. . . . .	107
14. Delphi III: Responses to the Miscellaneous Section of Academic Preparation. . . . .	109
15. Delphi III: Responses to Scholarly Productivity . . . . .	110



16.	Delphi III: Responses to Applied Professional Experience . . . . .	113
17.	Delphi III: Responses to Continued Contact With the Profession . . . . .	117
18.	Delphi III: Responses to Competency in the Area of Specialization. . . . .	120
19.	Delphi III: Responses to Teaching Effectiveness .	123
20.	Delphi III: Responses to Interest in Curricular Experimentation. . . . .	126
21.	Delphi III: Responses to Ability to Work With Students . . . . .	128
22.	Delphi III: Responses to Public Service . . . . .	131

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### The Hospitality Industry

The hospitality industry is a composite of businesses that service the consumer, mainly away from home, in the areas of foodservice, lodging, travel, and recreation. Each of these businesses practices the "act of being hospitable." It is the shared hospitable nature that unites these service occupations into one large industry (Brymer, 1984).

Each of the main areas of the hospitality industry-- foodservice, lodging, travel, and recreation--is divided into independent business segments. Foodservice, the largest category, is further divided into restaurants, catering, clubs, and the foodservice establishments connected with lodging, institutions, and industrial complexes. The lodging segment of the hospitality industry is comprised of hotels, motels, resorts, institutional housing, and condominium hotels. Travel agencies, tour companies, and transportation are the business segments of the travel industry. The final category, recreation, consists of theme parks, recreation parks, and public parks.

As the largest and one of the fastest growing consumer industries in the United States (Tanke, 1984a) the hospitality industry offers extensive career opportunities for persons at differing ages, levels of experience, and levels of education (Lattin, 1985). Education for one of these career opportunities--hospitality management--is the concern of the present study. Although management positions still exist for employees who work their way up in the business, the trend is to hire graduates of college level hospitality management education programs (Lattin, 1985).

## **Hospitality Management Education**

### **Definition of Hospitality Management Education**

Hospitality management education programs prepare students for careers in management for the differing areas of the hospitality industry. Hospitality management education is a recognized field of study in proprietary schools, two-year colleges, and four-year baccalaureate colleges. Program offerings at different institutions vary according to the emphasis of the specific institution (Burgermeister, 1983). One institution may offer a comprehensive program while another may choose to emphasize only one area such as foodservice.

### Location of Hospitality Management Education

Hospitality management education is generally aligned with a larger unit within higher education. Historically, the institution administration/management programs originated in colleges of home economics and hotel/restaurant management programs developed in colleges of business (Powers & Riegel, 1984). Through the years a larger number of programs have been developed in the business areas. Guyette (1979) found that 40 four-year programs were housed in business and 27 four-year programs were a part of home economics or nutrition departments. In addition, at a few institutions hospitality management education programs can be found as a school or college unto themselves.

### Growth of Hospitality Management Education

The rapid growth of the hospitality industry has created an imbalance in the supply and demand for college educated managers (Tanke, 1984a). According to Fletcher (1985), the graduates from the college programs in hospitality management education can only fill 7% to 8% of the available positions. The expansion of the hospitality industry and the subsequent demand for management personnel has encouraged the growth of hospitality management education programs in higher education (Guyette, 1979). In

1974 there were approximately 41 four-year institutions offering programs in hospitality management education (Adler, 1985); by 1985 that number had increased to 128 (Pavesic & Brymer, 1986).

### Quality of Hospitality Management Education

As a field of study hospitality management education does not have an established level of quality, common criteria, or set of standards to which all participants subscribe. Therefore, new and expanding programs have no external quality control such as (a) guidelines, agreed upon by professionals in the field, or (b) a specialized accrediting agency requiring common minimal standards. Consequently, there is great variation in organizational structure, resources, curricula, emphasis, and faculty credentials at each institution (Olsen, 1984). Faculty that are sometimes unqualified to teach courses assigned to them is one result of this lack of standards (Olsen, 1984). The proliferation and diversity of new programs and lack of common standards and guidelines has prompted hospitality management professionals (Guyette, 1979) including The Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education (CHRIE) to be concerned for the quality of the hospitality management education available (Tanke, 1984a).

Currently the measures of quality that exist specific to hospitality education are the word of a program head or a subjective judgment based on the numbers of students enrolled in the program (Olsen, 1984). In addition to these subjective measures, some estimate of quality is obtained for those programs housed in institutions that come under a regional and/or specialized accrediting body (Powers & Riegel, 1984).

### Background of the Problem

#### Accreditation and Hospitality Management Education

CHRIE has explored the use of accreditation specific to hospitality management education to facilitate quality control within this field of study. Guyette (1979) surveyed postsecondary two- and four-year hospitality management education program leaders to determine their perceptions of specialized accreditation. The results indicated that specialized accreditation was favored by both groups. At the 1983 CHRIE Conference 80% of two- and four-year personnel present at a special accreditation meeting were in favor of specialized accreditation (Riegel & Powers, 1984).

Riegel and Powers (1984) presented six reasons or positions in support of specialized accreditation. In

support, some members of CHRIE believed that specialized accreditation would aid programs that suffer from limited resources. It was felt that specialized accreditation might help to equalize available resources. Another benefit of specialized accreditation might be the elimination of pressure to those programs housed in units that were accredited by other accrediting agencies, for example, the American Home Economics Association and the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. A third reason to introduce specialized accreditation was the success which other applied fields such as nursing and veterinary science have experienced with accreditation specific to their fields. A fourth position of CHRIE members was that specialized accreditation would act as a monitor for new programs and would help to maintain high quality programs. Also, standards for faculty were viewed as a positive outcome of specialized accreditation. Finally, it was felt that specialized accreditation would help to protect the programs and keep quality high through continued self-evaluation.

Based on a concern for quality educational programs and the interest in accreditation within the membership the Board of Directors of CHRIE established an accreditation committee. This committee investigated the possibility of forming a separate organization to serve as a specialized

accrediting body authorized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). The plan to form such an organization was presented to and accepted by the Board of Directors at the 1986 Annual CHRIE Convention.

### Need to Develop Accreditation Standards

Before this new accrediting body can be recognized by COPA certain requirements must be met. These requirements include the standards for the evaluation or self-study component of accreditation (Glidden, 1983). Typically the self-study evaluation covers goals and objectives; governance, administration, organization; curriculum; students and student services; library; facilities and equipment; financial resources; and faculty (Petersen, 1979). As was previously mentioned a common set of standards, incorporating the above mentioned areas, for hospitality management education does not exist on which to base criteria for the self-study component of accreditation.

The accreditation committee has been interested in developing accreditation criteria for the self-study components. Tanke (1984a) studied the curriculum needs of hospitality management education focusing on competency areas and descriptors of quality for curricula in hospitality management education. Tanke (1984a)



recommended that areas of the self-study not examined such as faculty be studied and the findings be used to form accreditation criteria.

Olsen and Tanke (1984) proposed that the next step in the accreditation process be the development of standards to be used during evaluation for the areas of facilities, administration, and faculty. Based on this recommendation standards for faculty in four-year hospitality management education programs was the focus of this study.

#### Importance of Faculty to Accreditation

Petersen (1979) found that the area of faculty qualifications was consistently included in all accrediting associations at the institutional and specialized levels (Petersen, 1979). Furthermore, Troutt (1981) submitted that a relationship between faculty and educational quality is assumed by most of the regional accrediting associations.

The importance placed on faculty is demonstrated in the following quotations from accrediting agencies. According to the Engineers' Council for Professional Development "the heart of any educational program is the faculty. All other matters are secondary to a competent, qualified, and forward-looking staff that can give an overall scholarly atmosphere to the operation" (Petersen,

1979, p. 118). Similarly, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools stated "the faculty and the quality of its instructional program are the main strengths of an institution of higher education" (Petersen, 1979, p. 31).

### Nature of Faculty Standards

The tendency of the existing specialized accrediting agencies has been to develop standards for the areas of faculty responsibilities, faculty benefits, and faculty qualifications (Petersen, 1979). Faculty responsibilities and benefits traditionally have been the decisions of the college while faculty qualifications have been determined by professionals in the field. Therefore, the area of faculty qualifications was singled out as the concern of the present study.

Petersen (1979) identified nine qualifications common to specialized accreditation standards. These faculty qualifications were divided into three groups based on the frequency of use by accrediting agencies. Qualifications mentioned most often included academic preparation, scholarly productivity, applied professional experience, and continued contact with the profession. Receiving the second most frequent mention were the qualifications of competency in the area of specialization and teaching effectiveness. Group three, or qualifications mentioned

infrequently, consisted of interest in curricular experimentation, ability to work with students, and public service.

### Statement of the Problem

Faculty qualifications traditionally are a part of the descriptors of quality for educational programs. Presently, the field of hospitality management education does not possess a set of standards that specifically address the qualities needed by faculty of four-year institutions. The problem for the present study was to identify standards desirable for faculty when four-year hospitality management education programs are accredited. Answers to the following research questions were sought to solve this problem.

1. What standards related to academic preparation are desirable for the faculty member of a four-year hospitality management education program?

2. What standards related to scholarly productivity are desirable for the faculty member of a four-year hospitality management education program?

3. What standards related to applied professional experience are desirable for the faculty member of a four-year hospitality management education program?

4. What standards related to continued contact with the profession are desirable for the faculty member of a four-year hospitality management education program?

5. What standards related to competency in an area of specialization are desirable for the faculty member of a four-year hospitality management education program?

6. What standards related to teaching effectiveness are desirable for the faculty member of a four-year hospitality management education program?

7. What standards related to interest in experimenting with curriculum are desirable for the faculty member of a four-year hospitality management education program?

8. What standards related to ability to work with students are desirable for the faculty member of a four-year hospitality management education program?

9. What standards related to public service are desirable for the faculty member of a four-year hospitality management education program?

### Significance of the Study

The quality of education provided in four-year hospitality management education programs has been questioned by professionals in the field. As a result, hospitality management education is seeking to improve itself through the use of specialized accreditation. As part of the preliminary process before COPA will grant accrediting status, the present study investigated the opinions of education and industry CHRIE members concerning the standards desirable for faculty qualifications in four-year institutions.

The timeliness of the present study was evident in three major concerns expressed by hospitality management professionals (Tanke 1984a). The first concern was the wide range of program offerings within the hospitality industry produced by rapid growth. Diversity in

organizational structure, resources, curricula, emphasis, and faculty credentials was a second concern. Finally, the absence of external quality control either through specialized accreditation or established guidelines within the field of hospitality management education was a concern.

This study assisted in the evolution of accreditation criteria to be presented to COPA for the purpose of gaining accrediting status for a new organization being formed from members of CHRIE. The development of and subsequent consensus of opinion concerning desirable standards for faculty will help to foster excellence and relevance in hospitality management education for current and future programs by helping to reduce the possibility of mediocre faculty.

The results of this study will benefit (a) hospitality management education administrators, faculty and students; and (b) the hospitality industry. Administrators may use the criteria developed for the self-study component of accreditation as a basis for making ongoing decisions when hiring faculty, evaluating faculty, and planning faculty development programs. Faculty will benefit through self-improvement facilitated by evaluation based on predetermined performance standards. Finally, the hospitality industry and its consumers will benefit through

employment of graduates that have been educated by competent faculty that are a part of a quality hospitality management program.

### Delimitation

The study was delimited to the use of administrators/faculty in four-year hospitality management programs and hospitality industry representatives as members of the professional panel utilized to identify faculty standards.

### Definition of Terms

The following definitions were utilized during the present study:

1. Ability to Work With Students. The instructor's relationships with students.
2. Academic Preparation. The advanced degrees held by the faculty including master's and doctorates, also courses taken in preparation for the degree.
3. Accreditation. A voluntary process to certify that educational programs meet or surpass predetermined criteria.
4. Applied Professional Experience. The amount and level of related on-the-job experience of faculty.
5. Competency in the Area of Specialization. The instructor's level of ability in a specific area.

6. Continued Contact With the Profession. The amount and type of participation by the faculty member in professional associations.

7. Criteria. The guidelines used to make judgments during the self-study component of the accreditation process.

8. Hospitality Industry. That part of the service industry which encompasses foodservice, lodging, travel, and recreation.

9. Hospitality Management Education. Education that prepares students for careers in management for the hospitality industry.

10. Interest in Curricular Experimentation. The willingness on the part of the instructor to try innovative teaching ideas and methods.

11. Public Service. The participation by faculty in activities that are of benefit to the community.

12. Scholarly Productivity. The extent and type of research conducted and publications produced by faculty.

13. Specialized Accreditation. Accreditation of a program in a particular field, discipline, or specialization.

14. Standard. Common characteristic or condition agreed upon as essential to meeting certain objectives.

### Summary

As a field of study, hospitality management education has experienced wide and rapid growth. However, there is diversity in organization, resources, curricula, emphasis, and preparation of faculty. This diversity has prompted concern among the membership of CHRIE for the quality of education available in hospitality management programs. CHRIE is planning to address the issue of program quality by introducing accreditation specific to the field of hospitality management education.

Prior to receiving accrediting authority from COPA quality standards and criteria for the areas of curriculum, facilities, administration, and faculty need to be developed. This study was designed to reach agreement among hospitality management professionals concerning the standards desirable for one of these elements--faculty qualifications at four-year institutions offering hospitality management education.

The results of this study were used to assist in the development of accreditation criteria that are necessary before COPA will grant recognition to a specialized body for the purpose of accrediting hospitality management education programs. Continued use of the results of this study will help to insure competent hospitality management education faculty at four-year institutions.



## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature examined the nature of accreditation including the definition, purpose, levels, process, and criticism. In addition, information from the literature delineating the relationship of accreditation to the improvement and maintenance of quality in postsecondary education was summarized. Finally, the review included a brief examination of those aspects of faculty evaluation and development literature that relate to the nine faculty qualifications incorporated into the research questions of the study.

#### Nature of Accreditation

##### Definition and Purpose

Accreditation is a voluntary process whereby an institution or specialized area of higher education receives approval of its educational activities from an independent source. Educational quality and institutional integrity are the two concerns of the accreditation process (Gruson, 1979; Young, 1983a). The purpose of accreditation is to establish for the public and academic community that the organization or specific program has

achieved or exceeds a predetermined minimal level of educational quality (Young, 1979). To accomplish this purpose five major goals of accreditation have been identified by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (1986b); these include the following:

- Foster excellence in postsecondary education through the development of uniform national criteria and guidelines for assessing educational effectiveness;
  - encourage improvement through continuous self-study and review;
  - assure the educational community, the general public, and other agencies or organizations that an institution or program has clearly defined and appropriate objectives, maintains conditions under which their achievement can be reasonably expected, is in fact accomplishing them substantially, and can be expected to continue to do so;
  - provide counsel and assistance to established and developing institutions and programs; and
  - endeavor to protect institutions against encroachments which might jeopardize their educational effectiveness or academic freedom.
- (p. 3)

### Levels and Process

Accreditation is accomplished at two levels within higher education (COPA, 1986b). Institutional accreditation deals with the institution as a whole. This comprehensive level of accreditation occurs through national accrediting bodies such as the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools and through regional

accrediting organizations, such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The second level or specialized accreditation is specific to professional and occupational programs within an institution. Accreditation for specialized areas is provided by professional associations which have accepted the responsibility for self-regulation (Tanke, 1985).

A self-study evaluation and on-site peer review are included in the accreditation process. During the self-study evaluation and peer review, predetermined standards applicable to the level of accreditation are applied to the educational programs of an institution or specialized program. The use of established standards by accrediting agencies is supportive of uniformity; however, it is not the purpose of accreditation to impose sameness through rigid requirements. The tendency is toward broad qualitative criteria at the institutional level and more specific criteria at the specialized level (Young, 1979). Specialized accrediting agencies tend to develop standards that are quantitative in nature especially for educational programs, admission requirements, and faculty (Petersen, 1979).

Accrediting agencies must be sanctioned by COPA (COPA, 1986a). The function of COPA is to coordinate the activities of the accrediting associations and to

disseminate information to the academic community. It is from COPA that CHRIE is seeking authority to accredit four-year baccalaureate programs in hospitality management education.

### Criticism of Accreditation and Corresponding Answers

Criticism has always been directed at accreditation (Millard, 1983a). A review of the literature indicated that criticism has been directed at the overall process of accreditation at both levels. Also, specialized accreditation has been singled out for additional criticism. An examination of the literature revealed that supporters of both institutional and specialized accreditation have responded to the criticism.

Four major criticisms have been aimed at the overall process of accreditation. First, accreditation has been criticized for evaluating the quality of an institution or program based on its specific purposes (Millard, 1983b; Troutt, 1981). Moreover, Dressel (1971) suggested that it has been difficult to collect sufficient evidence to prove that an institution or program has met its goals. Furthermore, Troutt (1981) found no research suggesting a relationship between institutional goals and educational quality. Finally, critics have suggested that when institutions or programs are evaluated against their own

goals meaningful comparisons of schools cannot be made (Young, 1976).

Accreditation critics also questioned the ability of accreditation to do what it claims to do--promote excellence and assure quality in higher education (Cohen, 1974; Gruson, 1979; Marcus, Leone, & Goldberg, 1983). According to Young (1976) critics have implied that accreditation has measured educational quality only through specific criteria (number of books in a library) and not through educational outcomes. Conversely, critics have claimed that the standards have become too diluted or too subjective (Millard, 1983a). Lack of demonstrated validity of these criteria has also been a criticism (Casey & Harris, 1979; Kells, 1980; Millard, 1983a; Young, 1976). Kells (1980) recommended that accrediting agencies follow the lead of theology and law and spend the time to conduct validity studies of their standards.

In addition, the relationship of accreditation to federal funding in higher education has been criticized (Bjork, 1985; Gruson, 1979; Proffitt, 1979). This relationship between the government and accreditation began with the passage of the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (Proffitt, 1979). The government used accreditation as a basis for school eligibility for receiving funds. Since 1952 the federal funds have come

to be a major source of student and institutional income (Harclerod, 1980); therefore, critics claimed that accreditation lost control of its own destiny and is no longer voluntary (Glidden, 1983; Young, 1976).

From within accreditation, specific accrediting bodies have opposed a dependency on accreditation by the government which would cause a change in focus from assessing to policing quality and integrity of an institution (Bjork, 1985). However, Chambers (1983) suggested that accrediting agencies must accept their role as a major source of information concerning postsecondary education to the federal government. According to Chambers (1983) the relationship between the government and accreditation remains relatively unstable. The 1980 administration suggested a break in the government/accreditation link; however, Congress did not approve of this break (Chambers, 1983; Orlans, 1980).

A fourth common criticism of accreditation was the practice of evaluating quality of education through the use of peers (Hollander, 1981; Millard, 1983a; Young, 1976). Hollander (1981) questioned the ability of the peer review to be impartial since the evaluation team is comprised of people from similar institutions. However, Young (1983a) expressed confidence in the ability of the

evaluation team to act with candor because personal reputations may be affected by their decisions.

Elkins (1983) felt that this criticism of peer review was based on public disclosure. He submitted that all negative decisions are not publicized and people are not aware of the number of accreditations that are denied. However, Elkins (1983) and Gruson (1979) agreed that the trend is toward more public disclosure.

In response to the criticism, Selden (1960) suggested that only a few really understand accreditation. The literature review indicated that this misunderstanding of accreditation is responsible for much of the criticism (Elkins, 1983; Kirkwood, 1973; Millard, 1983a; Stoodley, 1981; Young, 1979). Finally, Millard (1983b) proposed that the extent of the criticism is an indication of the importance of accreditation.

Six criticisms were found for the specialized level. When reviewing specialized accreditation, COPA (1977) identified six defects in specialized accreditation that may stimulate this criticism; these included (a) the numbers of accrediting agencies that an institution may have dealings with and corresponding costs; (b) the narrow focus of some specialized agencies; (c) duplication and overlap in subject matter areas; (d) the specific demands made by some agencies that are not considered reasonable

by administrators; (e) the possibility of a self-study and site visit that is out of proportion to the size of the unit; and (f) the lack of coordination between the agencies accrediting the same institution. Indeed these defects have been singled out for criticism.

The literature indicated that the first defect, existence of multiple accrediting bodies, is a major concern in higher education (Bjork, 1985; Harclerod, 1980; Kells, 1980; Kells, 1983b; Knisely, 1980; Marvin, 1950; Petersen, 1979). Currently, there are 14 institutional accrediting agencies, 7 organizations to accredit postsecondary education, and 36 specialized accrediting bodies (COPA, 1986b). Kells (1980) reported that some institutions must deal with as many as 20 accrediting agencies. Also, Kells and Parish (1979) stated that 40% of institutions have relationships with two to three accrediting agencies. Associated with the number of accrediting agencies was the cost to the institution that must participate in multiple accreditations. The expense of accreditation was therefore a concern of administrators in higher education (Kells, 1983a; Petersen, 1979).

Even with this concern for the increase in accrediting agencies that the institution must deal with, college presidents generally were more positive than



negative toward accreditation (Glidden, 1983). A 1975 survey for COPA found that 75% of institutional presidents considered institutional and specialized accreditation to be important and necessary (Pigge, 1979). The same study also reported that 86% of department heads or unit leaders believe institutional and specialized accreditation to be important and necessary.

Bjork (1985) and Carnegie Foundation (1982) contended that specialized accrediting agencies increased in direct response to the growth of disciplines and professions. Petersen (1980) also believed that new specialized accrediting agencies have developed to meet the need of quality assessment and assurance in new fields of study and that this need will continue as more specialized fields emerge. Since the establishment of COPA there has been an actual increase in the number of specialized accrediting agencies; however, the overall increase has slowed due to combining some specialized accrediting bodies (Harclerod, 1980).

The second defect and corresponding criticism was the extreme specialization and narrow focus of some specialized accrediting agencies (Russell, 1950; Selden, 1959). Selden (1959) implied that specialized accrediting agencies concentrate more on their own self-interests than on activities that will result in the improvement of all

accreditation. However, Elkins (1983) contended that scrutiny by the press, Federal Trade Commission, and the courts causes accreditation agencies to remember their service to the public of assuring educational quality.

The third defect of specialized accreditation identified by COPA (1977), duplication of functions by multiple accrediting bodies, was also a criticism of specialized accreditation (Kells, 1983b; Petersen, 1979; Pigge, 1979). One study by Pigge (1979) concluded that three out of four institution presidents felt that duplication of accreditation exists. Some attempts at eliminating duplication have taken place; however, Kells (1983b) believed that progress toward eliminating duplication was small.

Unreasonable demands that are not directly related to quality was the fourth defect of specialized accreditation identified by COPA (1977) and also a criticism. As an example of an unreasonable demand Kells (1983b) cited an accrediting agency requiring copies of faculty resumes in a specified style. According to Young (1983a) specific standards are characteristic of some accrediting agencies, yet the accreditation process should be viewed as a process of subjective judgments made by a collection of individuals.

The fifth defect and corresponding criticism was the possibility of an expected self-study and site visit that is unjustified based on the size of the program. Concurrent with this criticism was a frequent complaint by visitation teams that comprehensive and in-depth self-studies are rare (Semrow, 1977). Brookes (1985) suggested that the self-study can be less of a burden when the responsibility for accomplishing it is decentralized and more people participate in the process. The self-study was also viewed positively by some because of its potential for self-improvement (Astin, Bowen, & Chambers 1979; Kells, 1983a; Simmons, 1985).

The sixth defect, lack of coordination between agencies, has received critical attention (Kells, 1980). The Carnegie Foundation recommended that specialized accrediting team visits be coordinated and that information and summary reports be a shared effort. Bagby (1983) reported that while cooperation among the agencies was not widespread there was evidence that the accrediting bodies recognized a need for coordination and were moving toward joint processes. However, Kells (1983b) noticed a reluctance on the part of many accrediting agencies to cooperate.

In response to the criticism directed at specialized accreditation, Petersen (1979) suggested that the

criticism was often based on little evidence. Also in support of specialized accreditation, Proctor (1950) believed that accreditation has survived the criticism and justified its existence because of the significant contributions it has provided to institutions and to society. Similarly, Glidden (1983) contended that the criticism against specialized accreditation is not as prominent as the benefits that have been rendered to institutions.

#### Relationship of Accreditation to Educational Quality

Accreditation has had an influence on quality in education in the past and will continue to work to improve educational quality (COPA, 1986a). The influence of accreditation on educational quality began with the initial purposes of accreditation which were to improve and maintain standards of quality in higher education (Bjork, 1985; Carnegie Foundation, 1982; Coyle, 1959; Selden, 1960; Young, 1983b). Improving the quality of postsecondary education has continued to be the common interest of accrediting associations (Jung, 1986; Petersen, 1979; Selden & Porter, 1977; Stoodley, 1981; Young, 1983b).

The process of accreditation and the judgments reached through peer review provide assurance of quality to the academic community and to society (Thrash, 1979).

For example, in higher education, quality of an accredited institution is assumed through the accepted practice of transfer of credits between institutions (Guyette, 1979). In addition participation in the ongoing self-evaluation process provided by accreditation is considered a quality control for higher education (Guyette, 1979; Miller & Boswell, 1979). For society, a sense of confidence and legitimacy in the market place is achieved through accreditation. According to Atkin (1977) graduates of accredited institutions are perceived as having received an education appropriate to their profession; therefore, they are adequately prepared to function in society.

Evaluators of educational quality recognize that quality can be measured by quantitative or qualitative analysis of selected characteristics that are assumed to manifest quality (Kuh, 1981). For purposes of evaluation in accreditation it is assumed that specific characteristics common to all levels of accreditation or institutions do not exist (Troutt, 1979a, 1979b). Quality is measured according to the objectives of the educational institution. According to COPA (1986a) the educational quality of each institution is related to the appropriateness of the objectives to the institution, the degree to which the institution meets its objectives, and the effective use of the institution's resources in meeting

those objectives. Typically, these three criteria are judged by analyzing characteristics of internal elements of the program which include curricula, faculty, facilities, resources, and students (COPA, 1986a). However, the exclusive use of these traditional estimates of quality has recently been questioned (Bjork, 1985; Green, 1981).

Troutt (1979b) examined the standards of regional accreditation and their relationship to the assurance of quality. He concluded that present standards lack an emphasis on outcomes, and recommended that standards contain an outcome focus. This research by Troutt (1979b) corresponded to similar information available during the same time frame. Young and Chambers (1980) also suggested that the evaluation of programs would be more efficient if the emphasis was placed on educational outcomes instead of the educational process. Astin et al. (1979) also supported the measurement of educational quality through the use of outcomes; however, they were in favor of including outcomes as a measure of quality with the traditional internal measures of curricula, faculty, facilities, resources, and students. According to COPA (1986a) accreditation has redirected its primary focus of assessing quality from process and resources to analyzing results and learning outcomes.

While quality control has been the focus of accreditation from its inception, research studies concerned with accreditation and educational quality are limited (Marcus et al., 1983). One study was identified that dealt with accrediting associations' direct impact on the quality of education. Jung (1986) conducted case study research to determine the specific role of accreditation agency involvement in the improvement of educational quality. Jung (1986) concluded that accrediting agencies can be a direct source of aid for improving the quality of education through active involvement of agency staff, the site visit team, and use of consultants. Two benefits of direct involvement by an accrediting agency listed by Jung (1986) include the development of standard criteria for hiring part-time staff at one institution and the improvement of the faculty evaluation system at another institution.

Perception of the ability of accreditation to enhance quality of education was studied by Dalrymple (1970). He surveyed 370 chairs of counselor education to determine if they agreed that utilizing existing minimum standards and introducing accreditation would provide adequately trained counselors. Over one half of the 180 respondents agreed that accreditation and minimum standards of counselor education would insure adequately trained counselors. In

another study related to the perception of quality improvement, Pigge (1979) reported that 94% of responding institutions believed that accreditation improved the overall quality of the institution and its programs.

### **Faculty Evaluation and Faculty Development**

One of the purposes of faculty evaluation in higher education has been self-improvement of the faculty member (Boyd & Schietinger, 1976; Centra, 1979; Moomaw, 1977; Seldin, 1980; Stier, 1982; Whitman & Weiss, 1982). The process of faculty development has also been concerned with improvement of the individual as a teacher (Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Seldin, 1980). Accreditation's self-study component and, specific to this study, the section of the self-study concerned with faculty share this goal of self-improvement for the faculty.

The nine qualifications identified by Petersen (1979) as common to evaluation in accreditation are also found in other college/university faculty evaluation and faculty development literature. Some or all of the nine qualifications common to accreditation standards were included in the faculty evaluation work of Arreola (1979); Astin and Lee (1967); Centra (1979); Dressel (1971); Gustad (1961); Miller (1974, 1975a, 1979); Oliver (1984); Seldin (1984); and Whitman and Weiss (1982). The



following paragraphs provide a brief review of the literature related to these nine qualifications--academic preparation, scholarly productivity, applied professional experience, continued contact with the profession, competency in the area of specialization, teaching effectiveness, interest in curriculum experimentation, ability to work with students, and public service. The literature for higher education in general and the literature specific to hospitality management education were reviewed.

### Academic Preparation

Academic preparation refers to the advanced degrees held and coursework completed by the faculty. It was included in the group of faculty qualifications that were mentioned with the most frequency in accreditation self-study criteria.

The literature was mixed on the level of attainment needed by faculty and the importance of a terminal degree. To the public and to administrators and faculty a higher proportion of faculty with Ph.D. degrees was seen as an indication of quality (Miller, 1979). This view was upheld by Centra's (1977) findings that the presence of academic degrees is frequently mentioned as an extremely critical factor in faculty evaluation. Also support for

terminal degrees was provided by Rock, Centra, and Linn (1970). Their research found that where a greater proportion of the faculty held doctorates there appeared a small but significant increase in student achievement.

In contrast to the above positive information a study by Astin (1961) showed that student achievement was unrelated to highly trained faculty. Bayer (1975) also reported that the Ph.D. was not positively correlated with institutional excellence. Finally, an earlier study of faculty opinion of excellence in teaching by Bourgeois (1967) suggested that the doctorate does not necessarily mean a good teacher has been produced.

The importance placed on the terminal degree was also split in the field of hospitality management education (Rutherford, 1984). Wachtel and Pavesic (1983) felt that too much emphasis was placed on the doctoral degree and not enough on industry experience. Furthermore, Adler (1985) believed that education should not favor the person with a doctorate over someone with experience as a practitioner.

The opposite opinion was expressed by Olsen and Reid (1983) and Powers and Riegel (1984). Olsen and Reid (1983) and Nebel, Calnan, and Chacko (1986) reported a shortage of instructors with terminal degrees. In addition they suggested that instructors in hospitality

management education should possess doctoral degrees in one of the disciplines common to hospitality management education or in the area of the instructor's specialization.

In juxtaposition with this debate over the importance of a terminal degree the doctorate was being required for hospitality faculty in more and more institutions (Powers & Riegel, 1984). A study by Calnan, Chacko, and Nebel, (1986) indicated that administrators of hospitality management education prefer faculty with doctoral degrees.

Based on the literature available the percentage of hospitality faculty with doctorates varied with the sample studied. Rutherford (1982, 1984) reported the following demographic information concerning hospitality educators. In 1982, based on information provided by 140 educators, 76 faculty or 54% reported having doctoral degrees. In 1984 with a different sample of 105 educators, 36 faculty or 34% reported having a terminal degree. There was also a difference in recent surveys. Pavesic and Brymer (1986) reported that 58% of the 106 four-year faculty they surveyed possess a doctorate. This was a greater percent than the 40% reported by Nebel et al. (1986). One study was identified that singled out female faculty. Shaw (1985) when examining the role of women in hospitality

education found that 11 out of the first 100 listed in the CHRIE directory held doctorates.

The importance placed on doctorates by hospitality industry and hospitality educators has been examined. Tanke (1984b) asked representatives from the lodging industry (13), the foodservice industry (13), and education (80) to rate the importance of doctoral degrees to hospitality education. On a 5-point scale with 5 being the maximum importance the mean ranking for education was 3.68, for lodging 3.00, and for foodservice 2.00. Tanke (1984b) also asked how important is it that the terminal degree be in the educator's field of specialization. The educators' mean ranking was 4.12, lodging 4.09, and foodservice mean ranking was 4.00.

### Scholarly Productivity

Scholarly productivity refers to the extent and type of research conducted and publication produced. Accrediting agencies frequently included the area of scholarly productivity as a criterion in the self-study; it was included in the first group of qualifications identified by Petersen (1979).

According to Centra (1979), Creswell (1985), and Nelsen (1981) only a minority of faculty members were involved in research and publication on a regular basis.

Centra (1979) also suggested that faculty participation in research and publication varies by discipline and that this should be considered during evaluation. The amount of involvement by faculty in research and publication was shown by the findings of Ladd and Lipset (1977). Results of their survey (4,300 professors) indicated that 29% had never published an article, 60% had never published more than four articles, 59% had never written or edited a book, and 60% had never received funding for research.

Nevertheless scholarly productivity continued to be a part of the total evaluation of faculty. Seldin (1984), based on faculty performance surveys in 1978 and 1983, reported that in 1983 33.4% of the liberal arts college administrators considered research a major factor in faculty evaluation this was up from 24.5% in 1978. In 1983 29.2% of administrators considered publication a major factor; this figure was up from 19.0% in 1978. Seldin (1984) also found that research and publication were ranked fifth and sixth respectively among the factors to be considered by the administrators in overall faculty evaluation.

Scholarly productivity was measured using different methods. The number of publications was frequently used as an index of scholarly productivity (Centra, 1979; Creswell, 1985; Seldin, 1984). Another measure commonly used to judge the quality of scholarly productivity was

the extent of citations in other publications (Creswell, 1985; Miller, 1979; Seldin, 1984). Ratings by colleagues was a third common measure of the quality of scholarly productivity (Centra, 1979; Creswell, 1985; Seldin, 1984).

In comparison to higher education in general, Rutherford (1984) reported that 56% of the 105 hospitality management faculty in his study were involved in some form of publishing activity. Rutherford (1983) further described a difference in publication between levels of academic preparation. He found that hospitality management education faculty holding terminal degrees published more journal or periodical articles than faculty with master's degrees.

Olsen and Reid (1983) stated that research should be part of the role of the hospitality management educator. Moreover, Berger (1982) added that there was increased pressure on hospitality management education faculty to participate in original research. She suggested that there will be a growing dependency by the hospitality industry on institutions offering advanced degrees to provide research that will specifically meet the needs of the industry. Schaffer (1984) agreed and submitted that research related to foodservice should give priority to current industry needs. The response by the industry to research being completed in university hospitality

management education programs was studied by Rousselle and Brymer (1983). Less than 50% of the foodservice organizations reported that research from hospitality management programs was of use to them; however, 72% of the lodging organizations found the results of the university research helpful.

### Applied Professional Experience

Applied professional experience refers to the experiential learning of a professor as a practitioner in the field for which he/she is academically prepared. Professional experience was mentioned on a regular basis in specialized accreditation qualifications for faculty (Petersen, 1979).

Applied professional experience was absent from some higher education models of faculty evaluation (Arreola, 1979; Seldin, 1980) although it was sometimes included in a category of personal qualifications (Centra, 1979). It appeared that applied professional experience was more often a criterion for evaluation and a concern of faculty development when students benefit from the instructor having participated in the field or career for which the students are being prepared (Lovett, 1986; Powers & Riegel, 1984; Waskey, 1979). However, Lovett (1986) pointed out that the education system would come closer to

meeting the needs of society if more faculty could bring practical experience to the classroom.

Teacher education was an example of a field that has traditionally required previous on-the-job experience (Darter, 1980). Research by Darter (1980) revealed that 94% of the 586 teacher educators surveyed had previous experience as elementary or secondary school teachers. Two-thirds of the teachers had five or more years previous teaching experience.

In addition to being included in faculty evaluation, professional experience was sometimes found as an element in faculty development (Eble & McKeachie, 1985; Van Dyke, 1983). Using teacher education as an example, Darter (1980) stated that teacher education offered faculty opportunities for continued development. These developmental opportunities take the form of "a) supervision of student teachers, b) inservice programs, c) various types of field based programs, and d) teacher centered interaction between college and university faculty, elementary and secondary teachers and school administration personnel" (p. 3).

The mix of faculty academic credentials and work experience was also a concern related to hospitality management education (Adler, 1985; Powers & Riegel, 1984). Rutherford (1982) found that the average years of work



experience for 144 hospitality management education faculty was 7.3 years. Wachtel and Pavesic (1983) and Waskey (1979) asserted that educators that are equipped with current knowledge of the industry will make better instructors. Furthermore, Wachtel and Pavesic (1983) implied that the pursuit of additional academic credentials has caused some educators to lose touch with current industry procedures and trends by taking away the instructor's time for industry experience.

Powers and Riegel (1984) agreed that industry experience is useful; however, they explained that higher education is the domain of principles and ideas and they are supportive of academic preparation. Olsen and Reid (1983) supported industry experience and academic preparation. Their support of industry experience was also qualified; they recommended a mix of instructors with upper-level management experience and instructors with experience in staff positions.

It was noted earlier that professional experience was sometimes included in faculty development. Adler (1985) reported that 46% of 324 respondents perceived teacher work/study and/or faculty/industry exchange as a valuable professional developmental activity. Also Tabacchi and Stoner (1986) recommended faculty internships to increase faculty expertise in practice in the industry. They

suggested field experience through extended sabbaticals or during the summer months.

### Continued Contact With the Profession

Participation in professional associations was included in specialized accreditation self-studies on a regular basis (Petersen, 1979). However, it was not considered a major factor in faculty evaluation (Centra, 1979).

Faculty in higher education were typically members of professional organizations associated with their field (Wilson, 1979). Aligning with an organization provided a professional identity for the individual (Stark, Lowther, Hagerty, & Orczyk, 1986). The professional associations also provided a medium through which professors gained recognition in their field (Wilson, 1979). Recognition was achieved through serving on committees, publishing in or editing the professional journal, holding office, and presenting papers.

As an element of evaluation, professional society activity was classified by a majority of administrators to be a minor factor (Centra, 1979). Studies by Seldin (1984) yielded similar results; in 1978 only 17% and in 1984 only 24.5% of the administrators considered activity in professional associations a major factor in faculty

evaluation. In addition, Gustad (1961) found professional society activity to be ranked eighth in importance as a criterion for evaluating faculty.

Literature focusing on hospitality management education and membership in organizations was limited. Only one study was identified that included membership in organizations for hospitality management educators. Adler (1985) reported that 74.1% of the faculty surveyed (324 respondents) listed membership in professional organizations as a valuable developmental activity.

#### Competency in the Area of Specialization

According to Ruscio (1985), specialization has enabled the professoriate to cope with the creation and dissemination of information. Faculty competence in the area of specialization was expected and was routinely measured through evaluation. Faculty competence in general was a criteria of regional accreditation and was often evaluated in specialized accreditation (Petersen, 1979).

Competence was measured by evaluating traits of faculty performance (Hansen & Rogers, 1984). According to Hansen and Rogers (1984) the traits that are traditionally evaluated have been proposed through the works of Centra (1979) and Miller (1979). These traits such as academic

preparation, professional experience, and teaching effectiveness are included in this review of literature. A discussion of each is found under its own heading.

One article was identified addressing specialization in hospitality management education. Olsen and Reid (1983) suggested that faculty hold terminal degrees in their areas of specialization such as business or finance.

### Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness refers to the ability of the teacher to produce a desired result. The teaching effectiveness of faculty was traditionally included in faculty evaluation in higher education. For specialized accreditation teaching effectiveness was included in the second group of qualifications or the group receiving the second most frequent mention.

Measures of teaching effectiveness were divided into two categories--student achievement and the performance or characteristics of teaching (Ericksen, 1984; Millman, 1981). Assessing the achievement of students was held by some to be the only valid measure of teaching effectiveness (Kerlinger, 1971). However, there was disagreement with this position (Fincher, 1983; Landers, 1978). Landers (1978) pointed out that evaluating teaching effectiveness based solely on the "learning-equals-

effective-teaching" (p. 356) approach allows for the "possibility [that] an unenthusiastic, disorganized, generally disliked instructor may possibly come out 'smelling like a rose'" (p. 356). Centra (1979) and Trent and Cohen (1973) reported that this form of measure of teaching effectiveness was infrequently used when evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure.

The second method for measuring teaching effectiveness was to measure teaching performance. This was accomplished through a variety of personnel and means. Each of the following persons was suggested at some time as potential evaluators of teaching performance: (a) department chairs, (b) deans, (c) students, and (d) colleagues (Centra, 1979; Landers, 1978; Miller, 1974, 1975a, 1975b; Seldin, 1984). The means used to evaluate teaching performance were also varied. Included in these means were classroom visitations, content of course syllabi and examinations, videotapes, and critical incidents (Centra, 1979; Landers, 1978; Miller, 1975a; Scriven, 1981; Seldin, 1984).

Teaching behavior was also scrutinized when evaluating teaching effectiveness. Eble (1970, 1972), Miller (1974), and Seldin (1975) identified behaviors that are used by evaluative personnel. These behaviors included (a) is well prepared for class, (b) demonstrates

comprehensive subject knowledge, c) motivates students to do their best, (d) encourages intelligent independent thought by students (e) treats students with respect, (f) discusses points of view other than his own, (g) is dynamic and energetic person, (h) seems to enjoy teaching, (i) communicates effectively to the level of his students, and (j) is fair and reasonable to students in grading procedures.

Teacher personality and attitudes were also examined for a relationship to teacher effectiveness. Feldman's (1986) review of the literature showed that personality traits are not very likely to be associated with perceived teacher effectiveness by students or teachers. Results of Feldman's (1986) own study of student perceived teacher effectiveness using 14 traits found a positive relationship between teacher effectiveness and four of the traits. Traits with a positive association were (a) positive self-regard, (b) energy, (c) enthusiasm, and (d) positive regard for others. The literature concerned with the relationship between attitudes, interests, and values of teachers and teacher effectiveness showed a small positive association with teachers that are student-centered versus content-centered, out-of-class contact with students, and teachers who are role oriented to teaching and reported enjoying teaching (Feldman, 1986).

Teaching effectiveness of hospitality management faculty may relate to the academic preparation/industry experience debate. Waskey (1979) suggested that students perceive their instructors to be more effective if they continued to update their information by spending time in industry. He concluded that faculty who have spent time in the field can act as positive role models for the students. Waskey's (1979) report was based on personal experience and observations; research specific to the teaching effectiveness of hospitality management faculty was not available.

#### Interest in Curricular Experimentation

Interest on the part of the instructor to try new teaching techniques and ideas was sometimes included in accreditation self-studies. Helping faculty become more aware of new technologies and teaching techniques was found to be typically a function of faculty development procedures (Hedberg, 1979; Kozma, 1978).

Innovation has been characterized as a process or a product (Davis, Strand, Alexander, & Hussain, 1982). The process approach deals with the individual or group as a new idea is considered, developed and implemented (Davis et al., 1982). Because it is individuals that are being

evaluated in the accreditation self-study this review considered innovation as a process.

The literature revealed some common characteristic of individuals who participate in innovation. The individuals' attitude toward change and their perception of the need for change will influence the decision (Kozma, 1978). Kozma (1985) also concluded that innovation is often influenced by past innovative experiences. Sachs (1977) conducted a study of characteristics of faculty that did or did not participate in an innovative program (Educational Development Program) at Michigan State University. Sachs (1977) concluded that data from his study dispells two previous ideas. Innovators in the Michigan group represented all age groups and not just the younger faculty members. He also concluded that innovation is not limited to certain disciplines; faculty from across the University were involved in the innovation project.

Motivation for implementing innovation was discussed in the literature. Sachs (1977) found the two principal motivators of innovation to be personal satisfaction and growth. However, Spitzer (1977) determined that personal satisfaction was of lesser importance in the decision for innovation than was indirect organizational incentives such as support of administration. Kozma (1978) studied



outside stimuli or resources as a motivator. He exposed a group of 10 faculty to seminars to build awareness of innovation, provided handouts describing new technological ideas, and provided released time, technical assistance and funds for implementation. Results showed that between the 10 a total of 24 techniques were used in instruction that had not been used the previous year. The average was 2.4 new techniques per person. This average increase in use of new techniques was found to be greater than the use of new ideas by a random sample of faculty members not receiving outside motivation. More recently Kozma (1985) concluded that available resources allows for innovation and may even prompt it. Conversely, absence of innovation by faculty in higher education may be due to lack of resources (Kozma, 1979). Other items identified as hindrances to innovation included faculty skepticism and resistance to change (Kozma, 1979).

A review of the literature specific to hospitality management education revealed a lack of information or research concerned with the innovation of faculty in four-year hospitality management programs.

#### Ability to Work With Students

Included in the third group of faculty qualifications found least often in specialized accreditation self-

studies was the relationship of the teacher to the students (Petersen, 1979). However, student-faculty interaction was considered a variable in the perceived quality of undergraduate education (Berry, 1985).

A positive relationship with faculty was viewed as valuable for the student (Whitman, Spendlove, & Clark, 1986). Classroom interactions were usually the origins of the student-faculty relationship (Berry, 1985). Wilson, Gaff, Dienst, Wood, and Bavry (1975) suggested that students observe behaviors in faculty members during class that either encourage or discourage a relationship.

Berry (1985) and Wilson et al. (1975) considered informal out-of-class associations to have the greatest impact on students. Informal faculty-student interactions were found to be positively associated with educational outcomes such as satisfaction (Berry, 1985; Pascarella, 1980), educational aspirations (Pascarella, 1980), personal and intellectual development (Berry, 1985; Pascarella, 1980), and academic achievement (Chickering, 1969; Pascarella, 1980; Pascarella, Terenzini, & Hibel, 1978).

Wilson et al. (1975) summarized salient student-faculty relationships as assuming a mentor role. Such relationships being close, continuous, extending beyond the classroom, and possessing intellectual stimulation.

Ericksen (1984) reported that the mentor relationship was quickly provided for honor students and suggested that faculty make an effort to establish a mentor relationship with under achieving students. He concluded that the foundation for the student-teacher relationship was respect for the individuality of each student.

Faculty-student relationships were evaluated either by examining the advisor role of the faculty (Centra, 1979; Seldin, 1984) or through incorporating student-faculty relationships in student evaluations of faculty (Centra, 1979). Including advising in overall faculty performance evaluations had declined to some degree. Seldin (1984) found a decrease in importance of student advising in evaluation from 66.7% in 1978 to 61.7% in 1983. However, this same study still characterized student advising as a major factor in faculty evaluation (Seldin, 1984). The opposite view was found by Centra (1979), whose study of criteria for evaluating faculty placed student advising as a minor factor.

One of the functions of advising was giving out information to the students (Ericksen, 1984). Kramer and Gardner (1977) estimated that 80% of advising takes the form of passing out information. Furthermore, Centra (1979) reported that knowledge of school related

information and facts (curriculum requirements, etc.) was a criterion for evaluating advising.

Career counseling was another function of advising. Career guidance was often a topic of discussion between advisor and student (Berry, 1985; Wilson et al., 1975). However, faculty's perception of their influence on a career decision is mixed. Wilson et al. (1975) reported that 53% of the faculty they surveyed had some influence on decisions and only 25% felt they had a large influence.

Centra (1979) offered that knowledge of careers is also included when evaluating advising. Furthermore, Bess (1982) studied faculty interest in a variety of educational activities and found that 44% of faculty surveyed showed a preference for career guidance.

Student-faculty relationship was also judged by the students. Centra (1979) explained that student-teacher rapport or interaction is routinely included in student evaluation of faculty. Typically students rate faculty based on the instructor's availability for consultation, discernment of when a student does not understand the material, willingness to help a student who is having difficulty, freedom in class to ask questions and express opinions, and concern for whether the students learn the material (Centra, 1979). In addition, Wilson et al. (1975) reported that students select positive teacher

student relationships based on relationships with continuity.

A review of the literature indicated that the area of student-faculty relationships specific to hospitality management educators has yet to be developed.

### Public Service

Public service is one-third of the traditional mission of colleges and universities--teaching, research, and service (Berte, & O'Neil, 1977; Hansen & Rogers, 1984). Public service usually refers to faculty members contributing their expertise and skills to government or community concerns (Centra, 1979; Florestano & Hambrick, 1984; Miller 1974). The public service of faculty was included in overall faculty evaluation (Centra, 1979; Miller, 1974; Seldin, 1984) and was included in specialized accreditation self-studies some of the time (Petersen, 1979).

Public service was an accepted and expected part of the teaching, research, public service triangle; however, it was not treated equally (Florestano & Hambrick, 1984; Martin, 1977). Centra (1979) reported that public service was treated as a minor factor during faculty evaluation. Similarly, Seldin (1984) found that only 17.4% of the deans he studied treated public service as a major factor,

although this percentage was up from 13.7 in 1978. Also Gustad (1961) found that public service was ranked 10th in importance as a criterion for faculty evaluation. Public service may be a minor factor in evaluation yet Florestano and Hambrick (1984) pointed out that the delivery of public service by faculty has high priority at many institutions.

Reasons for the low status of public service were presented by Hohenstein (1960). Included in these reasons were the absence of tradition, lack of public service training in graduate school, imbalance between time spent in service and the results of that service, and inequality of visibility.

A review of the literature related to management education for the hospitality industry indicated that public service has not been singled out for special attention. No studies related specifically to voluntary public service were identified in the literature.

### Summary

The review of literature provided information on the nature of accreditation. The nature of accreditation section described the definition, purposes, levels, and process of accreditation. Also common criticisms of accreditation and answers to those criticism were

presented in the section on the nature of accreditation. A separate discussion of the relationship of accreditation to the improvement and maintenance of educational quality in higher education was included. Finally, this chapter presented a review of the literature dealing with faculty evaluation and development as they related to nine faculty qualifications. These faculty qualifications are composed of academic preparation, scholarly productivity, applied professional experience, continued contact with the profession, competency in the area of specialization, teaching effectiveness, interest in curriculum experimentation, ability to work with students, and public service.. Each of the qualifications was examined in terms of the academic community in general and the field of hospitality management education.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the purpose and objectives of the study and a description and justification of the selected methodology. The design of the study, including the selection of the panel of professionals, instrumentation, and the data collection and analysis processes, is also presented. Finally, the procedures for development of a proposed self-study component for accreditation are described.

#### Purpose and Objectives

The problem for the present study was to identify standards necessary for faculty when four-year hospitality management education programs are accredited. These standards will form a basis for the self-study evaluation component in future accreditation. In addition to evaluation of faculty during accreditation, these standards may be applied to other forms of faculty evaluation, for making ongoing decisions when hiring faculty, and for planning faculty development programs.

Currently, no standards or guidelines for hospitality management education faculty exist. According to Glidden



(1983) and Kells (1983c) the formulation of standards for specialized accreditation originates with the professionals in the specific field that the accreditation is serving. The establishment of initial faculty standards for hospitality management education depends, therefore, on achieving agreement among professionals concerning which standards to incorporate into accreditation criteria.

An objective of the present study was to seek the participation of hospitality management education and industry professionals in identifying faculty standards for accreditation. A further objective was to allow the professionals to reach general agreement concerning which of the standards should be incorporated into the faculty evaluation segment of an accreditation model. The Delphi technique, an accepted planning methodology (Fendt, 1978), was used in the present study. The appropriateness of the Delphi technique to this study is outlined in the following section.

## **The Delphi Technique**

### **Description of the Delphi Technique**

The Delphi technique is a tool for organizing group communication, without direct discussion, in order to refine group opinion and arrive at a consensus (Fendt, 1978; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Winkle, Piercy, & Hovestadt,

1981). Unique characteristics of the Delphi technique include sequential questionnaires with anonymous responses, the convergence of the responses into a consensus, and a statistical group response such as the mode (Judd, 1972).

### Advantages and Disadvantages of the Delphi Technique

The Delphi technique achieves a consensus similar to that of a committee meeting without the disadvantages inherent in direct group contact (Gow, 1979). It has been found that dominant individuals will unduly influence a group decision and the resulting position will be more extreme than the average for the individuals that compose the group (Jaeger & Busch, 1984). Other possible drawbacks of group discussion include group pressure for conformity, irrelevant and biasing communication (Winkle et al., 1981), and "the unwillingness of people to abandon positions to which they have publicly committed themselves" (McGaw, Browne, & Rees, 1976, p. 60).

The elimination of the time and expense involved in face-to-face meetings is another advantage of the Delphi technique. Participation constraints which occur as the size of a committee increases are also eliminated.

The time required between each round of questionnaires to analyze the data and prepare the next round is considered a disadvantage for implementing the Delphi

technique (Gow, 1979). According to Tersine and Riggs (1976) the interest of the participants may decline if there is a long delay between rounds. The demand for commitment to the study may also be viewed as a disadvantage. In addition, Brooks (1979) cautioned that an "inadequate panel can produce no more than pooled and manipulated ignorance" (p. 379).

### Implementation of the Delphi Technique

The Delphi technique begins with the selection of a panel of professionals i.e., experts who are willing to spend time with the process. Panel members need to be knowledgeable on the problem being considered, and be willing to share their personal perceptions (Brooks, 1979). According to Jaeger and Busch (1984) the people selected "should be informed decision-makers who are fully cognizant of the implications of their recommendations" (p. 3). Brooks (1979) also recommended that the panel members represent different points of view related to the topic.

This panel participates in group communication through a series of controlled questionnaires referred to as rounds or phases. For an unmodified Delphi the first questionnaire is typically open-ended sentences concerning the problem to be addressed. Results of the first round

are the basis for the second round which consists of questions with ranked responses.

During a third round the panel members are provided with their own response to the second round plus the mode ranking of the panel. This feedback is provided to apply peer pressure and help achieve a consensus (Brooks, 1979). Finally, during the third round the panel members are asked to change their rating to that of the mode or to provide arguments against the change. Additional rounds following the procedure in round three may be added as dictated by the design of the study.

#### Uses of the Delphi Technique

Originally, the Delphi technique was used as a forecasting method (Helmer, 1975) especially in the areas of scientific and technological events (Weaver, 1971). Today use of the Delphi technique has expanded to include a variety of group communication needs in fields other than science and technology (Dalkey, 1975).

Higher education is one of the fields that has found success with the Delphi technique (Brooks, 1979). According to Judd (1972) the Delphi technique has been used to help solve problems in higher education in the areas of curriculum and campus planning, goals and objectives, cost-effectiveness/cost-benefit analysis, values, and elements

of evaluation. Also, within education the Delphi technique has been used to establish standards for teacher examinations (Jaeger & Busch, 1984), to develop competencies for teachers (Copeland, 1977; Hudson, 1983; Shores & Chiappetta, 1977; Simpson & Brown, 1977), to determine research priorities (Hecht, 1977), and for resource allocation (Uhl, 1975).

### Design of the Study

#### Selection of the Panel of Experts

The present study sought the opinions of professionals in the field of hospitality management and hospitality management education. The panel for this study consisted of representatives from four-year hospitality management education programs and representatives from the hospitality industry. Nominations for panel members was the method of selection used to form the panel. The CHRIE accreditation committee chairman asked the accreditation committee to nominate the panel members.

Each panel member was expected to be a member of CHRIE. Education representatives were current faculty or administrators in four-year hospitality management education programs in the United States. A blend of teaching experience and industry experience was desired. Industry representatives were currently employed in a

management position in the hospitality industry. An undergraduate degree related to the hospitality industry was desirable for the industry representatives.

Participation of 30 panel members was sought allowing for at least 15 members each from education and industry. Thirty members was the desired number based on the advice of Norman Dalkey, an expert in Delphi methodology. He recommended a 30-35 member panel for social issues (Gow, 1979). Anderson (1970) suggested that beyond 25 to 30 members problems may have arisen in the collection and treatment of the data. Finally, a panel of this size facilitated the collection of the data in blocks of time that did not discourage participation (Gow, 1979).

Letters of invitation to participate on the panel were sent to over 30 persons nominated by the accreditation committee (Appendix A). The letter was positive emphasizing their anonymous participation as an expert with a group of their peers. According to Turoff (1972) "a 'valid' Delphi, in any form should be designed in such a manner that the respondent feels he is exchanging information with a peer group as opposed to responding to a poll" (p. 180).

The letter included a response date and a personal information sheet. Return of the information sheet was considered acceptance on the part of the panel member to

participate in the total Delphi process. Any nominated panel members who did not return their information sheets by the deadline were contacted by telephone and asked of their intention to participate. Acceptance to serve on the committee by more than 30 persons was permitted in order to allow for attrition.

### Instrumentation

Traditionally the Delphi process is composed of four rounds or phases. For this study the first phase was modified thus resulting in a completed Delphi in three phases. Generally the first phase allows for complete freedom in exploring the topic. Phase I of this study, however, provided the panel members with the faculty qualifications identified in the literature and listed in the research questions (Chapter 1). Space was provided for members to list those standards they considered to be important for each qualification (Appendix B).

The standards from Phase I were compiled and organized into questionnaire form for Phase II (Appendix C). The questionnaire was structured with a four point Likert-type scale. This format allowed the panel member to react positively or negatively to including the standard in accreditation criteria by rating each standard. The scale was based on a desirability code (Lauffer, 1984) and

consisted of (4) very desirable, (3) desirable, (2) undesirable, and (1) very undesirable. During Phase II the panel members were given an opportunity to add or change standards.

Phase III listed the standards and reported the mode for each standard. The rating of each individual panel member was provided. In addition, this final questionnaire asked the panel members to determine if they would prefer to change their rating to the modal response of the group. Panel members not wishing to change their rating to the mode were asked to provide arguments for keeping their original ranking (Appendix D).

### Data Collection Process

Questionnaires for each phase of the Delphi were mailed to the panel members. A cover letter describing the intent of the questionnaire accompanied the questionnaire. Each questionnaire included a self-addressed stamped return envelope.

The present study sought a 100% return during each phase. Telephone calls were made to panel members to provide "friendly reminders" and to determine their intention to remain a participant in the study.



### Data Analysis

All standards listed by the panel members in Delphi I were included in Phase II. Standards mentioned by more than one panel member were summarized into a common standard. The standards were categorized into like topics for ease in developing Phase II.

The mode for each standard in Delphi II was determined and reported in Phase III along with the initial response of the panel member. Additions or changes were noted and included in Phase III.

Because the panel members had the option of changing their position on any standard, the mode was recalculated at the completion of Phase III. Data from this round were used to establish the acceptable standards for each faculty qualification for the accreditation model. The standards which received a two-thirds majority of the responding panel members from the categories of very desirable and/or desirable together were included in the accreditation model. Since standards for faculty in hospitality management education have not previously been established it was felt that a two-thirds vote for each standard would better illustrate the importance placed on that standard by the professionals (Gow, 1979).

### Suggested Accreditation Criteria

The standards determined by the panel members to be desirable for faculty were compiled and organized into proposed criteria to be used during the self-study component of a specialized accreditation process. The criteria were patterned after the Delphi III questionnaire and consisted of the qualification, the divisions within the qualification, and the corresponding standards. The standards were prioritized based on mode and category--very desirable or desirable. The highest mode in the category of very desirable received top priority.

### Summary

This study utilized professionals in the field of hospitality management education and the hospitality industry to identify standards that might be applied to faculty when four-year hospitality management education programs are accredited. The standards were agreed upon through a modified Delphi technique employing three rounds. Standards selected as very desirable and desirable were prioritized according to mode and incorporated into a suggested model for the self-study component of specialized accreditation. Results of this study should be applicable to other forms of faculty evaluation and development.

## CHAPTER 4

### PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

Standards to be used as a basis for evaluating faculty during the accreditation of four-year hospitality management education programs were identified using three rounds of a modified Delphi technique. A summary of the participation of the panel of professionals and the results of the three Delphi rounds are included in this chapter.

#### Summary of Participation of the Panel of Experts

Thirty-one professionals--16 educators and 15 industry representatives--returned their Panel Member Information Questionnaire (Appendix A) signifying their agreement to participate in the study. Of that number 27, or 87% of the original members, completed through round two and were included in round three of the study (Appendix E). All 27 of the questionnaires in the final round were returned. A greater percentage of the educators, 15 members or 94% compared to 12 industry representatives or 80%, were involved in the study to its completion.

On the Panel Member Information Questionnaire five educators reported being the dean or head of the department, seven reported being a professor as well

as the dean or head of the department, and three were classified as professors. The highest degree reached by the educators included 1 master's degree, 1 Doctor of Education degree, and 13 Doctor of Philosophy degrees. The distribution of the terminal degrees was as follows: three in hotel administration, three related to food management, five in higher education, and one in business and public administration.

The hospitality industry was represented by seven members with professional associations in foodservice and five with professional associations in the lodging industry. Positions within industry held by the panel members included five in human resources/personnel management and seven in top management such as president, owner, vice-president, chief executive officer, etc. The industry representatives held three master's degrees, six bachelor's degrees, and three associate or equivalent degrees.

The 15 educators on the panel and 10 of the 12 industry representatives were members of CHRIE. In order to get the desired number of industry representatives, it was necessary to relax the CHRIE membership requirement (Chapter 3).

Some panel members declined to answer individual questions or sections of questions in each of the rounds.

Reasons, when given, for not rating an item included lack of time and lack of interest. Analysis of the data from Delphi II and III was based on the percentage of those responding to the question.

### Analysis of Data From Delphi I

Delphi I (Appendix B) consisted of a listing of the nine qualifications identified by Petersen (1979) as being common to the evaluation of faculty during accreditation. The panel members provided standards for the areas of academic preparation, scholarly productivity, applied professional experience, continued contact with the profession, competency in the area of specialization, teaching effectiveness, interest in curricular experimentation, ability to work with students, and public service. The standards varied in degree of specificity ranging from very specific to very general. Duplicated standards were summarized into a common standard and all standards were included as items to be rated in Delphi II (Appendix C). Standards referring to a common theme under each qualification were grouped accordingly. This grouping was used as a basis for organizing the questionnaire for Delphi II.

During the analysis of Delphi I (Appendix B), comments challenging the necessity of two of the qualifications were

noted. Unexpectedly, interest in curricular experimentation and public service were singled out by panel members as inappropriate qualifications. Realizing that these two qualifications were in the group identified by Petersen (1979) as being infrequently included in accreditation criteria, a decision was made to allow the panel to rate the desirability of retaining the qualifications. This option was incorporated into Delphi II and III.

### Analysis of Data From Delphi II

The purpose of Delphi II (Appendix C) was to provide the panel members with the opportunity to rate the standards suggested during Delphi I. The panel members rated each standard on a Likert-type desirability scale (Lauffer, 1984) consisting of the following values: 4 = Very Desirable, 3 = Desirable, 2 = Undesirable, and 1 = Very Undesirable. Data analysis for each of the nine qualifications follows below.

#### Academic Preparation

The common themes that emerged under the qualification of academic preparation were degrees, course work, and miscellaneous. The distribution of responses by the educators and industry representatives within academic preparation is presented in Tables 1 through 3.

Table 1

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to the Degree Section of Academic Preparation

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
1. The faculty member should have obtained a minimum of a bachelor's degree	12	2	1	0	10	2	0	0	22	4	1	0
2. The faculty member should have obtained at least a master's degree	13	2	0	0	6	5	1	0	19	7	1	0
3. The faculty member should have obtained at least a doctor's degree	2	12	1	0	2	7	1	2	4	19	2	2
4. The bachelor's degree should be in one of the following areas:												
A. Accounting	7	4	1	1	5	7	1	0	12	11	2	1
B. Business Administration	7	5	1	0	5	6	1	0	12	11	2	0
C. Communications	3	4	6	1	0	9	0	0	3	13	6	1
D. Economics	4	6	3	1	0	6	3	1	4	12	6	2
E. Education	3	2	7	3	2	2	2	0	5	4	9	3
F. Finance	8	4	2	0	4	7	0	0	12	11	2	0
G. Foods/Nutrition	5	6	3	0	6	4	1	0	11	10	4	0
H. Foodservice Management	11	3	1	0	10	2	0	0	21	5	1	0
I. Hotel/Restaurant/Institution Management	13	1	1	0	11	1	0	0	24	2	1	0
J. Marketing	8	4	2	0	4	7	0	0	12	11	2	0
K. Personnel/Human Resources	8	3	3	0	4	7	0	0	12	10	3	0
L. Psychology	2	5	3	4	0	7	4	0	2	12	7	4
M. Public Administration	1	3	8	3	0	2	8	0	1	5	16	3
N. Research/Development	1	3	9	2	0	4	6	0	1	7	15	2
O. Travel/Tourism	5	8	1	0	3	7	0	0	8	15	1	0
P. Vocational Education	1	5	6	3	1	5	2	0	2	10	8	3
5. The master's degree should be in one of the following areas:												
A. Accounting	7	6	0	1	1	7	0	1	8	13	0	2
B. Business Administration	8	5	1	0	4	6	0	0	12	11	1	0
C. Communications	2	7	4	1	0	7	2	1	2	14	6	2

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
D. Economics	2	8	3	1	0	4	3	2	2	12	6	3
E. Education	2	8	3	1	0	7	3	0	2	15	6	1
F. Finance	6	7	1	0	1	7	1	0	7	14	2	0
G. Foods/Nutrition	7	4	2	0	2	6	0	1	9	10	2	1
H. Foodservice Management	10	5	0	0	2	8	0	0	12	13	0	0
I. Hotel/Restaurant/Institution Management	11	4	0	0	7	3	0	0	18	7	0	0
J. Marketing	9	5	0	0	1	7	1	0	10	12	1	0
K. Personnel/Human Resources	8	6	0	0	2	8	0	0	10	14	0	0
L. Psychology	3	5	4	3	0	2	7	0	3	7	11	3
M. Public Administration	3	3	7	1	0	3	7	1	3	6	14	2
N. Research/Development	3	5	5	1	0	2	6	0	3	7	11	1
O. Travel/Tourism	6	7	0	0	1	5	2	0	7	12	2	0
P. Vocational Education	2	4	7	2	0	7	0	0	2	11	7	2

6. The doctor's degree should be in one of the following areas:

A. Accounting	8	5	0	1	2	4	2	1	10	9	2	2
B. Business Administration	10	3	1	0	1	7	1	1	11	10	2	1
C. Communications	5	5	4	0	0	4	4	1	5	9	8	1
D. Economics	3	6	5	0	0	6	3	1	3	12	8	1
E. Education	6	4	5	0	2	6	0	0	8	10	5	0
F. Finance	8	5	1	0	0	7	2	1	8	12	3	1
G. Foods/Nutrition	7	5	3	0	1	8	0	1	8	13	3	1
H. Foodservice Management	12	2	0	1	5	4	1	0	17	6	1	1
I. Hotel/Restaurant/Institution Management	12	1	0	1	5	5	0	0	17	6	0	1
J. Law	7	5	2	0	4	4	1	1	11	9	3	1
K. Marketing	10	4	0	0	0	8	1	1	10	12	1	1
L. Personnel/Human Resources	8	6	0	0	1	8	2	0	9	14	2	0

(table continues)



Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
M. Psychology	5	4	6	0	0	5	2	2	5	9	8	2
N. Public Administration	3	4	7	1	0	2	4	2	3	6	11	3
O. Research/Development	4	9	2	0	0	4	3	2	4	13	5	2
P. Travel/Tourism	7	6	1	0	0	7	2	0	7	13	3	0
Q. Vocational Education	2	7	5	1	0	3	4	0	2	10	9	1
7. The degree should be related to faculty rank as follows:												
A. Instructor												
a. Bachelor's	9	1	2	1	10	2	0	0	19	3	2	1
b. Master's	8	5	0	0	3	7	2	0	11	12	2	0
B. Assistant Professor												
a. Bachelor's	4	0	0	7	9	3	0	0	13	3	0	7
b. Master's	6	6	1	0	3	8	1	0	9	14	2	0
c. Doctor's	8	4	0	0	1	8	2	1	9	12	2	1
C. Associate Professor												
a. Bachelor's	5	0	0	6	10	2	0	0	15	2	0	6
b. Master's	6	2	2	2	6	5	1	0	12	7	3	2
c. Doctor's	11	1	0	0	3	7	2	0	14	8	2	0
D. Full Professor												
a. Master's	6	3	1	3	9	3	0	0	15	6	1	3
b. Doctor's	12	1	0	0	6	5	1	0	18	6	1	0

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

Table 2

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to the Course Work Section of Academic Preparation

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
1. The faculty member should have had undergraduate or graduate course work in the following subjects:												
A. Accounting	12	3	0	0	10	2	0	0	22	5	0	0
B. Biology	2	5	6	2	1	3	5	1	3	8	11	3
C. Business Administration	10	5	0	0	8	4	0	0	18	9	0	0
D. Chemistry	2	5	7	1	1	4	6	0	3	9	13	1
E. Computers	12	2	1	0	8	3	0	0	20	5	1	0
F. Economics	5	8	2	0	5	5	2	0	10	13	4	0
G. Education	3	8	4	0	5	5	1	0	8	13	5	0
H. Finance	10	5	0	0	2	10	0	0	12	15	0	0
I. Food Preparation	11	3	1	0	8	3	0	0	19	6	1	0
J. Foreign Languages	3	8	3	1	1	6	3	1	4	14	6	2
K. Humanities	5	6	4	0	2	6	3	0	7	12	7	0
L. Labor Relations	6	8	1	0	4	7	1	0	10	15	2	0
M. Laws Related to the Hospitality Industry	5	7	2	0	5	7	0	0	10	14	2	0
N. Marketing	10	3	1	0	9	2	1	0	19	5	2	0
O. Mathematics	4	7	2	1	0	11	0	0	4	18	2	1
P. Nutrition	3	7	5	0	5	3	1	0	8	10	6	0
Q. Psychology	5	5	5	0	2	8	0	0	7	13	5	0
R. Research Methods	8	5	1	0	1	6	3	0	9	11	4	0

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

Table 3

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to the Miscellaneous Section of Academic Preparation

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
1. The institution from which the faculty member received the degree should have a reputation for quality	10	3	0	0	8	3	0	0	18	6	0	0
2. The faculty member should continue to receive Continuing Education Units	3	4	6	1	4	8	0	0	7	12	6	1
3. The faculty member should provide documentation of academic preparation	10	5	0	0	6	6	0	0	16	11	0	0
4. The faculty member should have had previous teaching experience	3	11	0	1	4	6	2	0	7	17	2	1
5. The faculty member should have had hands-on experience in the hospitality industry as part of academic preparation	11	3	1	0	11	1	0	0	22	4	1	0

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable; 1 = very undesirable

As shown in Table 1, having a bachelor's degree (Item 1) rated highest in the very desirable category with 81.4% of the votes. The percentage of educators and industry representatives giving a very desirable rating to a bachelor's degree did not differ greatly, 80.0% for the educators and 83.3% for the industry representatives. The lowest rating received for the bachelor's degree was undesirable given by an educator. The favored content area for the bachelor's degree was hotel/restaurant/institution management (Item 4, I) with 88.9% of the panel rating it as very desirable. A larger percentage of industry representatives (91.7%) gave the higher rating than did educators (86.7%).

The master's degree also rated highest in the very desirable category. Approximately seventy percent (70.4) of the panel members gave a very desirable rating to having a master's degree (Item 2). In contrast to the ratings for the bachelor's degree, the master's degree was ranked over 30 percentage points higher by educators (86.7%) than industry representatives (50.0%). Hotel/restaurant/institution management (Item 5, I) as an area of study for a master's degree was also rated very desirable by 72.0% of the responding panel members.

The very desirable rating given to the bachelor's and master's degree was not shared by the doctor's degree. The

highest rating given to the doctor's degree (Item 3) was desirable by 70.4% of the panel members. Very desirable received 14.8% of the vote. The panel selected two preferred areas of study for the doctor's degree. These were foodservice management (Item 6, H) with 68.0% for the very desirable category and hotel/restaurant/institution management (Item 6, I) with 70.8% for very desirable.

The panel members were asked what undergraduate or graduate courses are desirable for the hospitality educator. Table 2 indicates that the subject receiving the highest rating, for the total panel and by groups, was accounting (Item 1A) with 81.4% of the total panel rating it as very desirable. Two additional courses received over 70% of the vote in the very desirable category. These included computers (Item 1E) with 76.9% and food preparation (Item 1, I) with 73.1%.

The miscellaneous section of academic preparation contains five standard statements that could not be included in the degree or course work categories. The standard addressing hands-on experience as part of the faculty member's training (Item 5) received 81.5% of the votes for very desirable. By groups this standard received a greater percentage of the industry representative vote, 91.7% compared to 73.3% vote by educators. Table 3

presents the distribution of responses for the miscellaneous section of academic preparation.

### Scholarly Productivity

The faculty qualification of scholarly productivity was divided into the common themes of research, publication, and miscellaneous. The distribution of responses for the three sections are presented in Table 4.

A little more than half (51.9%) of the panel members rated publishing research (Item 3) as very desirable. Publishing research received more of a percentage of the very desirable rating from the educators (73.3%) than from industry representatives (25.0%). The desired number of research projects to be completed yearly was one (Item I, 4A) with 45.8% of the votes.

The desired number of publications for a faculty member per year was one (Item II, 7A). In reference to being published in refereed journals (Item II, 1) the modal rating, with 50.0% of the panel votes, was desirable.

Evidence of the faculty member remaining current in the field (Item III, 2) received 88.9% vote for very desirable. This percentage is the highest given to a standard in Delphi II and is shared with a standard in the qualification of competence in the area of specialization.

Table 4

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to Scholarly Productivity

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Research</b>												
1. The faculty member of a larger university should conduct research relating to the hospitality industry	10	5	0	0	3	7	2	0	13	12	2	0
2. The faculty member of a smaller university should conduct research relating to the hospitality industry	2	11	1	0	2	8	2	0	4	19	3	0
3. The faculty member should have published findings of completed research	11	3	1	0	3	5	4	0	14	8	5	0
4. The number of yearly research projects completed by a faculty member should be												
A. One	6	4	1	2	5	6	0	0	11	10	1	2
B. Two	2	1	3	7	2	4	3	0	9	7	4	2
C. Three	4	6	0	3	0	0	5	2	4	6	5	5
D. Four	5	3	3	4	0	0	4	6	5	3	7	10
E. Five	2	2	1	7	0	0	3	6	2	2	4	13
F. More than five	2	2	1	7	0	0	2	9	2	2	3	16
<b>II. Publication</b>												
1. The faculty member should be published in refereed journals (manuscripts have been reviewed and approved by a peer group)	9	4	0	1	0	9	3	0	9	13	3	1
2. The faculty member should be involved in scholarly writing prior to textbook publications	4	8	1	2	0	8	4	0	4	16	5	2
3. The faculty member should be involved in publication as determined by the institution's review process	9	5	1	0	1	9	2	0	10	14	3	0

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
4. The faculty member should be published in trade publications	4	9	0	0	1	9	2	0	5	18	2	0
5. The faculty member should author material for or in Cooperative Extension publications	1	7	3	2	1	7	3	1	2	14	6	3
6. The faculty member should author textbooks	3	9	2	1	0	7	5	0	3	16	7	1
7. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should be												
A. One	7	1	2	2	3	7	1	0	10	8	3	2
B. Two	7	3	0	2	1	3	5	0	8	6	5	2
C. Three	4	1	1	2	4	3	3	0	8	4	4	2
D. Four	0	7	2	2	0	0	3	4	0	7	5	6
E. Five	1	5	0	4	0	4	4	1	1	9	4	5
F. More than five	2	3	1	4	0	4	0	6	2	7	1	10
8. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should vary according to the teaching rank	4	3	3	4	1	8	2	1	5	11	5	5
III. Miscellaneous												
1. The faculty member should be active in presenting lectures, seminars, etc., in areas of the faculty member's expertise	10	5	0	0	6	6	0	0	16	11	0	0
2. There should be evidence that the faculty member is remaining current in the field	13	2	0	0	11	1	0	0	24	3	0	0

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable



### Applied Professional Experience

The faculty qualification of applied professional experience divided into the common themes of management level experience, technical or on-line experience, continued professional experience, and miscellaneous. The distribution of responses for applied professional experience is presented in Table 5.

For those responding to management level experience, the preferred number of years of experience was four (Item I, 1D) with 57.1% vote for very desirable. By groups, the industry representatives selected four years (60.0%) and the educators (58.3%) selected three years for the preferred number of years for management level work experience.

The preferred number of years for technical experience was three (Item II, 1C) with 45.5% vote for very desirable. Two years of technical experience received 52.4% of the total vote in the desirable category. When asked if technical experience should relate to subjects taught (Item II, 2) 50.0% of the educators and 58.3% of the industry representatives rated that relationship as very desirable.

The panel members were asked to rate the importance of continued and regular on-the-job experience (Item III, 1). The modal response for this standard was desirable with 46.2% of the total vote. A higher percentage of industry

Table 5

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to Applied Professional Experience

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Management level</b>												
1. The faculty member should have a minimum of ____ years management experience in some area of the hospitality industry												
A. One	4	2	2	3	3	0	3	3	7	2	5	6
B. Two	5	4	1	2	1	4	1	3	6	8	2	5
C. Three	7	3	2	0	5	5	2	0	12	8	4	0
D. Four	6	3	1	1	6	4	0	0	12	7	1	1
E. Five	5	4	2	1	3	7	0	0	8	11	2	1
F. Other	7	4	1	1	2	1	0	0	9	5	1	1
2. The management experience should be related to the courses taught by the faculty member	9	5	0	0	7	5	0	0	16	10	0	0
<b>II. Technical or On-Line Experience</b>												
1. The faculty member should have a minimum of ____ years experience in the technical areas of the hospitality industry												
A. One	6	4	0	1	3	1	3	1	9	5	3	2
B. Two	5	6	1	0	2	5	1	1	7	11	2	1
C. Three	5	4	2	1	5	4	1	0	10	8	3	1
D. Four	1	5	3	2	4	4	0	0	5	9	3	2
E. Five	2	4	1	4	4	3	1	0	6	7	2	4
F. Other	1	3	0	2	1	1	1	0	2	4	1	2
2. The technical experience should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member	7	6	0	1	7	5	0	0	14	11	0	1

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>III. Continued Professional Experience</b>												
1. The faculty member should continue to obtain on-the-job managerial experience at regular intervals	5	5	3	1	5	7	0	0	10	12	3	1
<b>IV. Miscellaneous</b>												
1. At times, professional experience should be acceptable in lieu of academic preparation	7	6	1	1	7	5	0	0	14	11	1	1

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

representatives (58.3%) rated continued professional experience as desirable than did educators (35.7%).

Nearly 60% (58.3%) of the industry professionals compared to under 50% (46.7%) of the educators agreed that, at times, professional experience should be acceptable in lieu of academic preparation (Item IV, 1). For the panel, with every member rating this question, 51.9% selected very desirable and 40.7% selected desirable.

#### Continued Contact With the Profession

Three categories emerged for continued contact with the profession. These were membership in associations, involvement in associations, and direct contact with the profession. The distribution of responses by group within this qualification is presented in Table 6.

The panel of professionals rated membership in professional associations (Item I, 1) and membership in trade/industry associations (Item I, 2) as very desirable with 63.0% and 55.6% respectively. Eighty percent of the educators compared to 41.7% of the industry representatives rated membership in professional associations as very desirable. Trade/industry associations were rated higher by the industry panel members (66.7%) than by the educators (46.7%). Of the specific associations mentioned in Delphi I and subsequently included in Delphi II, The National

Table 6

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to Continued Contact With the Profession

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Membership in Associations</b>												
1. The faculty member should be a member of professional associations	12	3	0	0	5	7	0	0	17	10	0	0
2. The faculty member should be a member of trade/industry associations	7	8	0	0	8	4	0	0	15	12	0	0
3. These professional associations might include												
A. American Hotel & Motel Association	6	8	0	1	5	7	0	0	11	15	0	1
B. Council on Hotel, Restaurant & Institutional Education	6	8	0	1	6	5	0	0	12	13	0	1
C. Council of Hotel & Restaurant Trainers	2	9	1	1	3	8	0	0	5	17	1	1
D. National Restaurant Association	7	7	0	1	7	3	0	0	14	10	0	1
E. Society for Foodservice Management	3	9	2	1	2	8	0	0	5	17	2	1
4. The faculty member should have an association with a wine group	0	6	6	1	0	4	7	0	0	10	13	1
5. Membership in professional associations should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member	6	6	1	1	4	6	2	0	10	12	3	1
6. Membership in professional associations should reflect the faculty member's area of specialization	6	8	0	1	8	3	1	0	14	11	1	1
7. The faculty member should hold membership at the national level of the association	6	7	1	1	8	1	2	0	14	8	3	1
8. The faculty member should hold membership at the state level of the association	6	5	3	1	3	9	0	0	9	14	3	1

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>II. Involvement in Associations</b>												
1. The faculty member should attend at least _____ convention(s) of an association for which he/she is a member per year												
A. One	8	5	0	2	6	5	0	0	14	10	0	2
B. Two	5	4	1	2	3	7	1	0	8	11	2	2
C. Three	2	7	1	2	0	2	6	0	2	9	7	2
D. Other	0	0	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	5	2	2
2. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis, on the program of an association's yearly convention	7	6	0	2	1	8	2	1	8	14	2	3
3. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis, in the following:												
A. Committee Work	7	6	0	0	2	9	1	0	9	15	1	0
B. Holding an Office	4	8	0	1	0	8	3	1	4	16	3	2
C. Paper Reviewer	3	9	1	0	0	8	4	0	3	17	5	0
4. The faculty member should participate, as possible, on editorial boards of professional associations	6	6	1	1	1	4	5	0	7	10	6	1
<b>III. Direct Contact With Industry</b>												
1. The faculty member should function as a lecturer to industry	6	8	0	1	4	8	0	0	10	16	0	1
2. The faculty member should function as a consultant to industry	8	6	0	1	5	5	1	0	13	11	1	1
3. The faculty member should function as a board member with industry	3	10	1	1	2	5	4	0	5	15	5	1

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

Restaurant Association (Item I, 3D) was given the highest rating with 56.0% of the votes for very desirable.

The modal selection for all the standards pertaining to involvement in associations, except for one, fell in the desirable category. Attendance at at least one professional convention each year received 53.8% of the panels' vote for very desirable. Percentages falling in the desirable category for other methods of involvement included 51.9% for program participation (Item II, 2); 60.0% for committee work (Item II, 3A); 64.0% for holding an office; 68.0% for reviewing papers; and 41.7% for serving on an editorial board.

Of the three kinds of direct contact with the profession mentioned, lecturer (Item III, 1), consultant (Item III, 2), and board member (Item III, 3), only consultant received a rating of very desirable with a 50.0% vote. Functioning as a lecturer to industry received 59.3% of the vote for desirable and serving as a board member in industry received a 57.7% desirable vote.

#### Competency in the Area of Specialization

Three themes emerged for the qualification of competency in the area of specialization. The panel wrote standards concerning generalist versus specialist, evidence of specialization, and maintenance of specialization.

Responses by groups for this qualification are presented in Table 7.

In the generalist versus specialist section, panel members responding to the desirability of core courses in hospitality management education (Item I, 1), 53.8% rated having core courses before specializing as very desirable. Table 7 indicates that a greater percentage of educators (60.0%) rated this standard very desirable than did industry representatives (45.5%).

Similarly, concerning evidence of specialization, educators rated course work in area of specialization (Item II, 1) higher (46.7%) than industry representatives (16.7%). Relating industry experience to area of specialization (Item II, 2) received a rating of very desirable with 61.5% of the vote. In contrast to course work, industry panel members gave 72.7% of their vote and educators gave 53.3% of their vote to this standard.

Five standards were developed for the section on maintenance of specialization. Remaining current in the area of specialization (Item III, 1) received 88.9% for very desirable. This is the highest percentage given for very desirable in Delphi II and is shared with another standard concerning the faculty member staying current in the field under the qualification of scholarly productivity.



Table 7

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to Competency in the Area of Specialization

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Generalist Versus Specialist</b>												
1. The faculty member should have a foundation of core courses in hospitality education before specializing	9	5	0	1	5	5	1	0	14	10	1	1
2. The faculty member in a small program should be a generalist	8	3	3	1	7	5	0	0	15	8	3	1
3. The faculty member in a small program should be a specialist	0	4	7	3	0	3	9	0	0	7	16	3
4. The faculty member in a large program should be a generalist	1	6	4	3	2	6	4	0	3	12	8	3
5. The faculty member in a large program should be a specialist	7	7	0	1	2	9	1	0	9	16	1	1
<b>II. Evidence of Specialization</b>												
1. Course work of the faculty member shows concentration in area of specialization	7	7	0	1	2	10	0	0	9	17	0	1
2. Industry experience of the faculty member is related to area of specialization	8	6	0	1	8	3	0	0	16	9	0	1
3. The faculty member has served as a consultant in the area of specialization	4	9	0	1	4	5	3	0	8	14	3	1
4. The faculty member is published in the area of specialization	7	8	0	0	0	7	5	0	7	15	5	0
5. The faculty member is recognized as one of the outstanding persons in the area of specialization	7	7	0	1	1	9	2	0	8	16	2	1
6. The faculty member has had paid employment in the area of specialization	6	6	0	2	2	9	1	0	8	15	1	2

(table continues)

∞  
∞

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>III. Maintenance of Specialization</b>												
1. The faculty member remains current in area of specialization through seminars, meetings, site visits, readings, continued education, publications, involvement in industry associations, etc.	13	1	1	0	11	1	0	0	24	2	1	0
2. Course outlines for the courses of the faculty member are updated based on new developments in area of specialization	11	3	0	1	8	4	0	0	19	7	0	1
3. The faculty member is evaluated by education peers every three years	6	5	0	4	6	5	1	0	12	10	1	4
4. The faculty member is evaluated by industry peers every three years	2	5	4	4	3	7	2	0	5	12	6	4
5. The faculty member maintains certification by industry practitioners; i.e., CHA	1	8	1	4	3	6	3	0	4	14	4	4
*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable												

### Teaching Effectiveness

Standards were developed for who should evaluate teaching effectiveness, elements of teaching effectiveness, and evidence of teaching effectiveness. However, the majority of the standards were concerned with elements of teaching effectiveness. Responses to standards for teaching effectiveness are presented in Table 8.

The panel was asked to rate the desirability of teaching effectiveness being evaluated by students (Item I, 1), by peers (Item I, 2), and by the chair or dean (Item I, 3). The preferred evaluator was the chair or dean with 55.6% of the votes for very desirable.

Six standards addressing the elements of teaching effectiveness were rated very desirable by over 70% of the responding panel members. Of these six Items II, 3, 8, 14, and 21 received 80% or above and Items II, 20 and 24 received over 70%. The highest rated element received a 85.2% vote for very desirable and was concerned with the instructor's responsibility as a role model.

The one standard suggested for evidence of teaching effectiveness referred to the use of student grades as proof of teaching effectiveness. This standard received a desirable rating with a 37.5% vote. Rating number three or undesirable received a 33.3% vote.

Table 8

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to Teaching Effectiveness

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Who Should Evaluate Effectiveness</b>												
1. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by students	10	5	0	0	0	9	1	2	10	14	1	2
2. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by peers	1	8	1	1	1	9	2	0	2	17	3	1
3. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by the chair or dean	7	8	0	0	8	4	0	0	15	12	0	0
<b>II. Elements of Teaching Effectiveness</b>												
1. The faculty member has had course work in teaching methods for the college level	4	9	1	1	3	9	0	0	7	18	1	1
2. The faculty member can design and organize a course on paper, including objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation experiences	9	5	0	1	3	9	0	0	12	14	0	1
3. The faculty member displays interest in developing the student as a person and as a future leader in the industry	12	1	1	1	10	2	0	0	22	3	1	1
4. The faculty member understands that learning is based on previous experience and knowledge	8	5	0	1	7	4	1	0	15	9	1	1
5. The faculty member is capable of evaluating student performance	13	1	0	1	5	6	0	0	18	7	0	1
6. The faculty member is capable of advising students in academics	8	5	1	1	6	4	1	0	14	9	2	1
7. The faculty member is capable of advising students in careers	8	5	1	1	3	9	0	0	11	14	1	1
8. The faculty member realizes that the instructor is often a role model	13	1	0	1	10	2	0	0	23	3	0	1

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
9. The faculty member is sensitive to stress factors in students	5	8	1	1	5	7	0	0	10	15	1	1
10. The faculty member accepts administrative responsibilities	3	8	3	1	2	10	0	0	5	18	3	1
11. The faculty member possesses an appreciation of higher academic rank	4	4	4	3	2	4	6	0	6	8	10	3
12. The faculty member supports student activities	6	7	1	1	6	6	0	0	12	13	1	1
13. The faculty member encourages academic/business relationships for students	8	5	0	1	10	2	0	0	18	7	0	1
14. The faculty member has a professional "presence" in the classroom	14	0	0	1	7	4	0	0	21	4	0	1
15. The faculty member is a firm leader in the classroom	6	6	2	1	8	4	0	0	14	10	2	1
16. The faculty member uses correct communication in the classroom	10	1	1	2	8	4	0	0	18	5	1	2
17. The faculty member has a knowledge of adult learning theory	2	8	2	2	3	9	0	0	5	17	2	2
18. The faculty member has a working knowledge of teaching techniques including case studies, role playing, etc.	6	7	0	1	4	7	0	0	10	14	0	1
19. The faculty member is familiar with competency based curriculum	4	6	2	2	3	7	1	0	7	13	3	2
20. The faculty member has the ability to establish and maintain a rapport with students	10	4	0	1	11	1	0	0	21	5	0	1
21. The faculty member encourages creative thinking	13	1	0	1	8	3	0	0	21	4	0	1
22. The faculty member is fair and prompt with grades	9	5	0	1	2	9	0	0	11	14	0	1
23. The faculty adapts teaching style to needs of the students	3	7	3	1	6	5	1	0	9	12	4	1
24. The faculty member delivers information in a clear, well-organized interesting format	12	2	0	1	7	4	0	0	19	6	0	1
<b>III. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness</b>												
1. Students have learned under the instruction of the faculty member as evidenced by grades	2	5	3	3	1	4	5	1	3	9	8	4

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

### Interest in Curricular Experimentation

The two common themes that emerged from Delphi I in this area were a section for general and evidence of interest in curricular experimentation. Responses by groups for this qualification are presented in Table 9.

Included in the general section was the challenge by the panel to include this qualification in accreditation standards. Concerning the desirability of including interest in curricular experimentation as a major consideration when evaluating faculty (Item I, 1), 53.8% of the panel members selected desirable and 15.4% selected very desirable. A greater percentage of industry representatives (66.7%) rated this standard as desirable than did educators (42.9%).

For demonstrating evidence of curricular experimentation (Item II, 1), willingness to try new ideas (Item II, 1C) was rated very desirable with 51.9% of the votes. Approximately the same percentage of industry panel members (50.0%) and educators (53.3%) selected very desirable for willingness to try new ideas. The remaining suggested standards received 40% or above in the desirable category.

Table 9

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to Interest in Curricular Experimentation

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. General Information</b>												
1. Interest in curricular experimentation should be a major consideration when evaluating faculty	3	6	3	2	1	8	3	0	4	14	6	2
<b>II. Evidence of Interest in Curricular Experimentation</b>												
1. The faculty member demonstrates interest in curricular experimentation through												
A. Correlation of curriculum with industry needs	5	9	0	1	5	7	0	0	10	16	0	1
B. Commitment to thorough preparation for classes and minimum reliance on textbooks	6	7	0	1	2	10	0	0	8	17	0	1
C. Willingness to try new ideas	8	6	0	1	6	6	0	0	14	12	0	1
D. Leadership in acceptance of curriculum change	8	5	1	1	2	9	1	0	10	14	2	1
E. Tests the value of the change	6	6	1	1	1	11	0	0	7	17	1	1
F. Varying lecture format	6	6	1	1	4	6	1	0	10	12	2	1
G. Use of computers	6	5	3	1	3	6	3	0	9	11	6	1
H. Use of case studies	3	8	3	1	6	6	0	0	9	14	3	1
I. Use of outside field visits	0	11	1	2	5	6	1	0	5	17	2	2
J. Keeping up-to-date on new teaching methods through reading and attendance at teaching skills workshops	3	7	1	3	5	7	0	0	8	14	1	3
2. The faculty member should teach a new course every two years	3	2	5	4	1	5	5	0	4	7	10	4

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

### Ability to Work With Students

Suggested standards for ability to work with students were divided into the areas of who should evaluate ability to work with students and evidence of ability to work with students. Responses for this qualification are presented in Table 10.

The modal ratings for standards concerning who should evaluate ability to work with students were in the desirable category. The highest percentage (65.4%) was given to the dean as the evaluator of ability to work with students (Item I, 1).

For evidence of ability to work with students, the modal ratings of all the suggested standards are in the desirable and very desirable categories. The standard for evidence of ability to work with students that was rated the highest was Item II, 6, the faculty member has the respect of the students. With all panel members responding, this standard received 85.2% for very desirable. Both the educators and industry representatives rated having the respect of the students over 80%. The standard with the second highest rating (80.8%) for very desirable was Item II, 5, the faculty member is available to the students.



Table 10

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to Ability to Work With Students

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Who Should Evaluate Ability to Work With Students</b>												
1. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by students	5	7	1	1	2	6	3	1	7	13	4	2
2. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by chair or dean	4	9	0	1	3	8	1	0	7	17	1	1
3. The faculty member should submit a list of student activities he/she is involved in to chair	3	8	2	1	2	9	1	0	5	17	3	1
<b>II. Evidence of Ability to Work With Students</b>												
1. The faculty member should establish a rapport with students without losing class control	8	4	0	2	9	3	0	0	17	7	0	2
2. The faculty member encourages the students in activities that relate to the hospitality industry	6	7	1	1	9	3	0	0	15	10	1	1
3. The faculty member participates in student organizations	3	8	1	1	3	8	1	0	6	16	2	1
4. The faculty member shows appreciation of student development toward professional status	8	4	0	1	3	9	0	0	11	13	0	1
5. The faculty member is available to the students	10	3	0	1	11	1	0	0	21	4	0	1
6. The faculty member has the respect of the students	13	1	0	1	10	2	0	0	23	3	0	1
7. The faculty member shows genuine concern for the students	13	2	0	0	8	4	0	0	21	6	0	0
8. The faculty member is a leader not a friend	7	5	0	2	7	4	0	0	14	9	0	2
9. The faculty member expects and receives only quality work	0	10	4	1	5	7	0	0	5	17	4	1

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
10. The faculty member has good oral communication skills	11	4	0	0	4	8	0	0	15	12	0	0
11. The faculty member has knowledge of the career opportunities in the hospitality industry	8	7	0	0	9	3	0	0	17	10	0	0
12. The faculty member participates in advising	5	7	0	2	5	7	0	0	10	14	0	2
13. The faculty member has directed internship programs	0	8	2	3	1	8	2	0	1	16	4	3
14. The faculty member has directed independent studies	2	8	2	2	0	10	1	0	2	18	3	2
15. The faculty member has directed special classroom projects	2	9	1	2	1	9	1	0	3	18	2	2

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

### Public Service

The common themes found in public service included importance of public service, evidence of public service, and amount of public service. Responses to this qualification are presented in Table 11.

Included in the section on importance of public service was the challenge by the panel to include or not include this qualification in accreditation standards. When asked if the faculty member should be evaluated on the public service he/she performs (Item I, 1), 40.0% of the panel selected undesirable. A greater percentage of industry panel members (66.7%) gave a rating of undesirable than did the educators (15.4%). Over 50% (53.8%) of the educators rated public service as very desirable.

Willingness to serve in the community when asked (Item II, 5) was rated the highest of the standards in the section concerning evidence of public service with a 66.7% vote for desirable. The percentage of the educators and industry representatives rating this standard as desirable was 60.0% and 75.0% respectively.

The selected standard for number of hours per year for public service was five to ten (Item III, 3A) with 50.0% of the panel selecting very desirable.

Table 11

Delphi II: Frequency of Responses to Public Service

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Importance of Public Service</b>												
1. The faculty member should be evaluated on the public service he/she performs	7	4	2	0	0	4	8	0	7	8	10	0
2. Public service should only be a concern after all teaching responsibilities have been met	6	2	6	1	2	9	1	0	8	11	7	1
3. Public service is good public relations and helps to recruit students	1	12	0	1	5	7	0	0	6	19	0	1
<b>II. Evidence of Public Service</b>												
1. The faculty member participates in community activities, such as the Chamber of Commerce, Etc.	3	6	4	1	1	1	10	0	4	7	14	1
2. The faculty member participates on college and department committees	8	7	0	0	2	9	1	0	10	16	1	0
3. The faculty member has established acquaintanceships and rapport with local restaurateurs and inn keepers	6	8	0	0	6	6	0	0	12	14	0	0
4. The faculty member is involved in the development of continuing education for people in the industry	6	6	1	1	2	10	0	0	8	16	1	1
5. The faculty member is willing to serve in the community when asked	2	9	3	1	2	9	1	0	4	18	4	1

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>III. Amount of Public Service</b>												
1. Early each academic year, the department head and the instructor should agree on an hourly allocation in public service	1	3	6	5	0	2	8	1	1	5	14	6
2. Public service requests should be rotated through the entire faculty and no faculty member should be exempt from minimum volunteer consultations	3	4	2	4	1	8	2	1	4	12	4	5
3. The faculty member should participate in _____ hours of public service each year												
A. Five - Ten	5	2	1	4	6	1	1	2	11	3	2	6
B. Ten - Twenty	5	3	0	4	4	4	3	0	9	7	3	4
C. Twenty - Thirty	3	3	3	4	1	3	4	0	4	6	7	4
D. Thirty - Forty	2	1	4	5	1	3	5	1	3	4	9	6
E. Forty - Fifty	1	2	2	7	0	2	5	2	1	4	7	9
F. More than fifty	1	1	3	7	2	0	5	2	3	1	8	9

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

### Analysis of Data From Delphi III

Delphi III was a repeat of the questionnaire in Delphi II with changes or additions that had been suggested by the panel (Appendix D). The purpose of Delphi III was to reach general agreement (Chapter 3) as to which of the suggested standards should be included in an accreditation model for four-year hospitality management faculty. General agreement that a certain standard should be included in the accreditation criteria was said to exist when the standard received at least 66% responses in the desirable and very desirable categories. To achieve at least a 66% response the panel was provided with their responses on Delphi II and with the modal ratings from Delphi II. Panel members were asked to compare their response to that of the mode and make a decision to retain their original rating or change to that of the mode. An analysis of the responses for Delphi III, by sections, follows below.

#### Academic Preparation

Having a minimum of a bachelor's degree (Item 1) received 85.2% response for very desirable and 11.1% for desirable for a total of 96.3%. Educators (80.0% very desirable) and industry representatives (91.7% very desirable) responded to having a bachelor's degree nearly equally. The desirability of the bachelor's degree being

related to the faculty member's teaching/research assignment (Item 8) had a total of 95.7%, with a larger percentage in the desirable category. All but five (Items 4C, E, M, N, and P) of the suggested areas for a bachelor's degree received at least 66.7% of the responses in the desirable and very desirable categories. Hotel/restaurant/institution management remained the preferred area for the bachelor's degree with 94.1% of the panel members selecting very desirable. This percent was up from 88.9% in Delphi II. The distribution of responses for the bachelor's degree is presented in Table 12.

Seventy-five percent of the industry panel members and 86.7% of the educators rated having at least a master's degree (Item 2) as very desirable. The percentage of educators selecting very desirable did not change from Delphi II. However, the percentage of educators selecting very desirable for the master's degree rose from 50.0% to 75.0%. The area of study receiving the highest percentage of the responding vote (76.0%) remained hotel/restaurant/institution management (Item 5I). All but four of the areas of study (Items 5L, M, N, and P) received 66% vote for the categories of desirable and very desirable. Of those panel members responding, 45.8% rated having the master's degree relate to the teaching/research assignment (Item 9) as desirable and 54.2% rated it very desirable.

Table 12

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses to the Degree Section of Academic Preparation

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
1. The faculty member should have obtained a minimum of a bachelor's degree	12	2	1	0	11	1	0	0	23	3	1	0
2. The faculty member should have obtained a minimum of a master's degree	13	2	0	0	9	2	1	0	22	4	1	0
3. The faculty member should have obtained at least a doctor's degree	0	14	1	0	0	10	1	1	0	24	2	1
4. Suggested or recommended areas for the bachelor's degree include												
A. Accounting	7	5	1	1	8	2	1	0	15	7	2	1
B. Business Administration	7	8	0	0	9	2	0	0	16	10	0	0
C. Communications**	1	6	5	2	0	10	1	0	1	14	7	3
D. Economics	3	7	2	2	0	8	2	1	3	15	4	3
E. Education**	1	4	7	2	1	3	7	0	2	7	14	2
F. Finance	10	3	1	1	8	3	0	0	18	6	1	1
G. Foods/Nutrition	6	5	3	1	9	2	1	0	15	7	4	1
H. Foodservice Management	12	3	0	0	10	2	0	0	22	5	0	0
I. Hotel/Restaurant/Institution Management	15	0	0	0	11	1	0	0	26	1	0	0
J. Marketing	10	2	1	1	7	4	0	0	17	6	1	1
K. Personnel/Human Resources	10	1	2	1	8	4	0	0	18	5	2	1
L. Psychology	1	8	2	3	0	9	1	0	1	17	3	3
M. Public Administration**	0	1	11	2	0	1	9	0	0	2	20	2
N. Research/Development**	1	2	10	1	0	3	7	3	1	5	17	4
O. Travel/Tourism	3	8	0	1	1	10	0	0	4	18	0	1
P. Vocational Education**	0	5	8	1	1	8	1	0	1	13	9	1
Q. Culinary Arts	0	8	4	0	1	6	0	0	1	14	4	0
5. Suggested or recommended areas for the master's degree include												
A. Accounting	5	10	0	0	0	10	0	1	5	20	0	1
B. Business Administration	4	9	0	1	2	9	0	0	6	18	0	1
C. Communications	1	10	2	1	0	9	3	0	1	19	5	1

(table continues)



Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
D. Economics	0	11	2	1	0	8	3	1	0	19	5	2
E. Education	0	11	3	0	1	9	2	0	1	20	5	0
F. Finance	4	9	0	1	1	8	1	0	5	17	1	1
G. Foods/Nutrition	4	9	1	1	3	8	0	1	7	17	1	2
H. Foodservice Management	7	8	0	0	3	9	0	0	10	17	0	0
I. Hotel/Restaurant/Institution Management	10	4	0	0	9	2	0	0	19	6	0	0
J. Marketing	8	5	0	1	2	8	1	0	10	13	1	1
K. Personnel/Human Resources	7	6	0	1	1	9	0	0	8	15	0	1
L. Psychology**	1	4	7	3	0	2	8	0	1	6	15	3
M. Public Administration**	1	3	9	1	0	1	9	0	1	4	18	1
N. Research/Development**	1	4	9	0	0	2	8	0	1	6	17	0
O. Travel/Tourism	4	9	0	1	0	9	3	0	4	18	3	1
P. Vocational Education**	0	5	5	2	0	5	3	1	0	10	8	3

6. Suggested or recommended areas for the doctor's or terminal degree include

A. Accounting	8	5	0	1	5	3	2	1	13	8	2	2
B. Business Administration	5	8	0	1	1	8	1	1	6	16	1	2
C. Communications	3	7	2	1	0	7	3	1	3	14	5	2
D. Economics**	1	8	4	1	0	7	3	1	1	15	7	2
E. Education	3	6	5	0	1	8	2	1	4	14	7	1
F. Finance	6	7	0	1	0	8	2	1	6	15	2	2
G. Foods/Nutrition	2	7	4	0	1	9	0	1	3	16	4	1
H. Foodservice Management	12	1	0	1	8	2	1	0	20	3	1	1
I. Hotel/Restaurant/Institution Management	12	1	0	1	8	3	0	0	20	4	0	1
J. Law	8	4	1	1	6	3	1	2	14	7	2	3
K. Marketing	9	4	0	1	1	8	2	0	10	12	2	1
L. Personnel/Human Resources	6	7	0	1	1	8	2	0	7	15	2	1
M. Psychology	2	7	4	0	0	7	1	2	2	14	5	2
N. Public Administration**	1	4	9	1	0	0	8	2	1	4	17	3
O. Research/Development	0	12	1	1	0	5	3	2	0	17	4	3

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
P. Travel/Tourism	5	8	0	1	0	9	2	0	5	17	2	1
Q. Vocational Education**	0	7	6	1	0	5	5	1	0	12	11	2
R. Chemistry**	0	0	8	4	0	2	5	1	0	2	13	5
S. Microbiology**	0	1	7	4	0	1	6	1	0	2	13	5
T. Sociology**	0	5	3	4	0	5	2	1	0	10	5	5
7. The degree should be related to faculty rank as follows:												
A. Instructor												
a. Bachelor's	11	2	1	1	10	2	0	0	21	4	1	1
b. Master's	4	10	0	1	3	7	2	0	7	17	2	1
B. Assistant Professor												
a. Bachelor's	6	3	0	6	11	1	0	0	17	4	0	6
b. Master's	4	9	1	1	3	8	1	0	7	17	2	1
c. Doctor's	8	5	0	1	1	9	2	0	9	14	2	1
C. Associate Professor												
a. Bachelor's	7	1	0	6	11	1	0	0	18	2	0	6
b. Master's	6	4	2	2	9	2	1	0	15	6	3	2
c. Doctor's	11	2	0	1	4	5	2	0	15	7	2	1
D. Full Professor												
a. Master's	7	4	1	3	10	2	0	0	17	6	1	3
b. Doctor's	12	2	0	1	9	2	1	0	21	4	1	1
8. The bachelor's degree should be in an area related to the faculty member's teaching/research assignment	5	8	0	1	5	4	0	0	10	12	0	1
9. The master's degree should be in an areas related to the faculty member's teaching/research assignment	8	7	0	0	5	4	0	0	13	11	0	0
10. The doctor's or terminal degree should be in the area of the faculty member's teaching/research assignment	8	6	1	0	4	4	0	0	12	10	1	0
11. The relationship of faculty degrees to rank should be left to the individual institution not accreditation standards	8	4	1	1	3	5	0	0	11	9	1	1

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

\*\*The categories of very desirable and desirable total less than two-thirds majority of the responding panel members.

The faculty member should have obtained at least a doctor's degree (Item 3) received 88.9% of the panel's vote for the category of desirable. This percentage was up from 70.3% in Delphi II. A higher percentage of educators (93.3%) viewed the doctor's degree as desirable than did the industry members (83.3%). After round three, no members of the panel rated the doctor's degree as very desirable. Two areas of study received at least 80% of the responding members vote for very desirable. These were foodservice management (80.0%) and hotel/restaurant/institution management (80.0%). All but seven (Items 6D, E, N, Q, R, S, and T) of the suggested areas of study for a doctor's degree received 66.7% vote for desirable and very desirable. Over ninety-five percent (95.7%) of the responding panel members agreed that the doctor's degree should be in an area related to the faculty member's teaching/research assignment (Item 10).

The following courses were given over 80.0% vote in the very desirable category: accounting (Item 1A, 88.5%), business administration (Item 1C, 85.2%), marketing (Item 1N, 84.6%), and computers (Item 1E, 80.8%). All but two of the of the areas (Item 1B, and D) received a total of 66% in the desirable and very desirable categories. The distribution of responses for course work is presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses to the Course Work Section of Academic Preparation

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
1. The faculty member should have had undergraduate or graduate course work in the following subjects:												
A. Accounting	12	2	0	0	11	1	0	0	23	3	0	0
B. Biology**	1	6	5	2	1	1	8	1	2	7	13	3
C. Business Administration	12	2	0	0	11	1	1	0	23	3	1	0
D. Chemistry**	0	7	6	1	1	2	8	0	1	9	14	1
E. Computers	11	3	0	0	10	2	0	0	21	5	0	0
F. Economics	3	10	1	0	2	8	2	0	5	18	3	0
G. Education	2	7	5	0	4	7	1	0	6	14	6	0
H. Finance	7	6	0	0	1	10	0	0	8	16	0	0
I. Food Preparation	12	3	0	0	9	3	0	0	21	6	0	0
J. Foreign Languages	2	11	1	0	0	9	3	0	2	20	4	0
K. Humanities	3	10	1	0	2	7	3	0	5	17	4	0
L. Labor Relations	4	9	1	0	2	10	0	0	6	19	1	0
M. Laws related to the Hospitality Industry	3	10	1	0	2	10	0	0	5	20	1	0
N. Marketing	11	2	1	0	11	1	0	0	22	3	1	0
O. Mathematics	2	11	1	0	1	11	0	0	3	22	1	0
P. Nutrition	2	11	1	0	4	7	1	0	6	18	2	0
Q. Psychology	2	8	4	0	0	11	1	0	2	19	5	0
R. Research Methods	4	10	0	0	0	10	2	0	4	20	2	0
S. Communications	4	7	1	0	0	9	0	0	4	16	1	0
2. The faculty member's course work background should relate to teaching assignment	7	8	0	0	5	4	0	0	12	12	0	0

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

\*\*The categories of very desirable and desirable total less than two-thirds majority of the responding panel members.

The Miscellaneous section included five standards. When asked to rate the desirability of faculty member having hands-on experience in the hospitality industry as part of their academic training (Item 5), one-hundred percent of the industry members and 66.7% of the educators selected very desirable for this qualification. These percentages were up from Delphi II (91.7% and 73.3% respectively). The distribution of responses for the miscellaneous section is presented in Table 14.

#### Scholarly Productivity

The distribution of responses for the three categories in scholarly productivity--research, publication, and miscellaneous--is presented in table 15.

The panel members agreed (85.2%) that the faculty member should have published findings of completed research (Item I, 3). The selected number of yearly research projects remained one with 65.4% vote for very desirable. While the mode remained very desirable for the total group, there was an actual number increase of six votes. Agreement was reached that relating research to the hospitality industry (Items I, 1 & 2) should be evaluated. However, the panel selected a rating of very desirable for the faculty member at a larger university and desirable for the faculty member at a smaller university for these standards.

Table 14

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses to the Miscellaneous Section of Academic Preparation

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
1. The institution from which the faculty member received the degree should have a reputation for quality	10	3	0	2	9	3	0	0	19	6	0	2
2. The faculty member should continue to receive Continuing Education Units (CEU)	2	8	4	1	3	9	0	0	5	17	4	1
3. The faculty member should provide documentation of academic preparation	13	2	0	0	11	1	0	0	24	3	0	0
4. The faculty member should have had previous teaching experience	3	11	0	1	2	8	2	0	5	19	2	1
5. The faculty member should have had hands-on experience in the hospitality industry as part of academic preparation	10	3	1	1	12	0	0	0	22	3	1	1

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

Table 15

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses to Scholarly Productivity

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Research</b>												
1. The faculty member of a larger university should conduct research relating to the hospitality industry	11	4	0	0	6	5	1	0	17	9	1	0
2. The faculty member of a smaller university should conduct research relating to the hospitality industry	2	11	1	0	0	9	3	0	2	20	4	0
3. The faculty member should have published findings of completed research	11	3	1	0	4	5	3	0	15	8	4	0
4. The number of yearly research projects completed by a faculty member should be												
A. One	10	2	0	2	7	5	0	0	17	7	0	2
B. Two	9	2	1	2	5	4	2	0	14	6	3	2
C. Three	2	8	0	3	0	6	2	2	2	14	2	5
D. Four**	1	2	3	6	0	0	1	10	1	2	4	16
E. Five**	1	1	1	9	0	0	0	11	1	1	1	20
F. More than five**	1	1	1	9	0	0	0	12	1	1	1	21
5. The number of yearly research projects completed by the faculty member should be in keeping with university and programmatic standards	7	5	2	0	5	4	0	0	12	9	2	0
<b>II. Publication</b>												
1. The faculty member should be published in refereed journals (manuscripts have been reviewed and approved by a peer group)	8	5	0	1	0	10	2	0	8	15	2	1
2. The faculty member should be involved in scholarly writing prior to textbook publications	3	10	0	2	0	11	1	0	3	21	1	2

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
3. The faculty member should be involved in publication as determined by the institution's review process	7	8	0	0	0	11	1	0	7	19	1	0
4. The faculty member should be published in trade publications	3	11	0	0	1	10	1	0	4	21	1	0
5. The faculty member should author material for or in Cooperative Extension publications	1	8	2	2	1	7	3	1	2	15	5	3
6. The faculty member should author textbooks	3	9	2	1	0	6	6	0	3	15	8	1
7. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should be												
A. One	9	2	0	1	6	5	1	0	15	7	1	1
B. Two	8	4	0	1	3	4	3	0	11	8	3	1
C. Three	6	4	0	2	2	3	3	2	8	7	3	4
D. Four**	1	5	2	2	0	3	2	5	1	8	4	7
E. Five**	1	5	0	4	0	2	2	6	1	7	2	10
F. More than five**	1	1	1	7	0	0	1	10	1	1	2	17
8. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should vary according to the teaching rank and research assignment	2	7	1	4	0	9	2	1	2	16	3	5
9. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should vary with tenure track or year-to-year appointment	5	7	1	1	4	5	1	1	9	12	2	2
III. Miscellaneous												
1. The faculty member should be active in presenting lectures, seminars, etc., in the areas of the faculty member's expertise	12	3	0	0	10	2	0	0	22	5	0	0
2. There should be evidence that the faculty member is remaining current in the field	15	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	27	0	0	0

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

\*\*The categories of very desirable and desirable total less than two-thirds majority of the responding panel members.



The number of publications remained one with a 62.5% for very desirable. All standards concerning publication received their highest rating in the desirable category. However, these same standards received at least a total 66.7% for desirable and very desirable.

Two standards were developed for the section of miscellaneous. The second standard, there should be evidence that the faculty member is remaining current in the field (Item III, 2), received 100% of the panel members votes from industry representatives and educators in the very desirable category. This 100% response is up from Delphi II; two educators' responses changed from desirable to very desirable and one industry representative vote was modified from desirable to very desirable.

### Applied Professional Experience

Table 16 presents the distribution of responses for the sections in applied professional experience. Two standards were developed for the first section concerning management level experience. Concerning the minimum number of years for management level experience (Item I, 1), one (Item I, 1A), three (Item I, 1C), four (Item I, 1D), and six (Item I, 1G) years received over 50.0% for very desirable and two (Item I, 1B) and five (Item I, 1E) years

Table 16

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses to Applied Professional Experience

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Management Level</b>												
1. The faculty member should have a minimum of _____ years management experience in some area of the hospitality industry												
A. One	7	1	0	4	7	0	1	2	14	1	1	6
B. Two	5	5	0	3	2	6	0	2	7	11	0	5
C. Three	8	2	1	1	6	5	1	0	14	7	2	1
D. Four	7	4	1	1	6	3	1	0	13	7	2	1
E. Five	4	5	2	1	3	7	0	0	7	12	2	1
F. Other	6	0	1	1	1	3	0	2	7	3	1	3
G. Six	4	2	1	0	8	4	0	0	12	6	1	0
2. The management experience should be related to the courses taught by the faculty member	12	2	0	0	10	2	0	0	22	4	0	0
<b>II. Technical or On-Line Experience</b>												
1. The faculty member should have a minimum of _____ years experience in the technical areas of the hospitality industry												
A. One	10	1	0	1	7	1	2	1	17	2	2	2
B. Two	4	8	1	0	1	8	1	0	5	16	2	0
C. Three	7	3	1	1	5	5	0	0	12	8	1	1
D. Four	1	6	2	2	4	5	0	0	5	11	2	2
E. Five	2	5	0	4	3	5	0	1	5	10	1	4
F. Other	1	5	0	3	2	3	1	0	3	8	1	3

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
2. The technical experience should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member	12	1	0	1	10	2	0	0	22	3	0	1
<b>III. Continued Professional Experience</b>												
1. The faculty member should continue to obtain on-the-job managerial experience at regular intervals	1	11	1	1	3	9	0	0	4	20	1	1
<b>IV. Miscellaneous</b>												
1. At times, professional experience should be acceptable in lieu of academic preparation	10	4	0	1	9	3	0	0	19	7	0	1

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

received approximately 50.0% for desirable. One year (Item I, 1A) and three years (Item I, 1C) were the preferred number. For one year (Item I, 1A) the votes were equal for educators and industry representatives. A greater percentage of educators (66.7%) selected three years (Item I, 1C) than did industry representative (50.0%). One-hundred percent of the responding panel members agreed, with a mode of very desirable, that the management level experience should relate to the courses taught by the faculty member (Item I, 2).

Standards in the second section pertain to continued professional experience. The faculty member should continue to obtain on-the-job managerial experience at regular intervals (Item III, 1) received 92.3% of the total ratings in the desirable and very desirable categories.

One standard was identified for the section of miscellaneous, at times, professional experience should be acceptable in lieu of academic preparation (Item IV, 1). A larger percentage of industry representatives (75.0%) compared to educators (66.7%) selected the rating of very desirable for this standard.

#### Continued Contact With the Profession

Continued contact with the profession was divided into sections dealing with membership and involvement in

associations and a third section concerned with direct contact with the profession. The distribution of responses by groups within this qualification is presented in Table 17.

The panel of professionals rated membership in professional associations (Item I, 1) and membership in trade/industry associations (Item I, 2) as very desirable with 85.2% and 77.8% respectively. Relating membership in professional associations with the faculty member's teaching assignment (Item I, 5) was rated desirable with 60.0% of the votes.

All of the standards for involvement in associations received at least a total of 66.7% for desirable and very desirable. Being involved as a paper reviewer (Item II, 3C) had the highest rating with 80.8% of the responding panel members rating it desirable.

Of the three kinds of direct contact mentioned, lecturer (Item III, 1), consultant (Item III, 2), and board member (Item III, 3), only consultant received a rating of very desirable with a 63.0% vote. Functioning as a lecturer to industry rose from 59.3% in Delphi II to 74.1% of the vote for desirable and serving as a board member in industry rose from 57.7% to 70.4% desirable vote.

Table 17

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses to Continued Contact With the Profession

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Membership in Associations</b>												
1. The faculty member should be a member of professional associations	12	3	0	0	11	1	0	0	23	4	0	0
2. The faculty member should be a member of trade/industry associations	10	5	0	0	11	1	0	0	21	6	0	0
3. These professional associations might include												
A. American Hotel & Motel Association	4	10	0	1	3	9	0	0	7	19	0	1
B. Council on Hotel, Restaurant & Institutional Education	5	8	0	1	4	8	0	0	9	16	0	1
C. Council of Hotel & Restaurant Trainers	2	11	0	1	11	0	0	0	3	21	0	1
D. National Restaurant Association	9	4	0	1	6	5	0	0	15	9	0	1
E. Society for the Advancement of Foodservice Management	3	10	1	1	0	11	0	0	3	21	1	1
F. Foodservice Management Educational Council	1	9	1	1	1	6	1	0	2	15	2	1
G. American Dietetics Association**	1	8	4	1	1	4	4	0	2	12	8	1
H. Travel & Tourism Research Association	3	8	2	1	1	6	2	0	4	14	4	1
I. American Home Economics Association**	0	4	6	3	1	4	4	1	1	8	10	4
J. International Foodservice Executives Association	1	9	2	2	1	4	3	1	2	13	5	3
K. American Culinary Federation**	1	8	3	2	2	3	3	1	3	11	6	3
4. The faculty member should have an association with a wine group**	0	5	8	1	0	3	9	0	0	8	17	1
5. Membership in professional associations should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member	4	8	0	1	4	7	1	0	8	15	1	1

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
6. Membership in professional associations should reflect the faculty member's area of specialization	9	5	0	1	8	4	0	0	17	9	0	1
7. The faculty member should hold membership at the national level of the association	9	4	1	1	5	5	2	0	14	9	3	1
8. The faculty member should hold membership at the state level of the association	4	7	3	1	2	9	0	0	6	16	3	1
<b>II. Involvement in Associations</b>												
1. The faculty member should attend at least _____ convention(s) of an association for which he/she is a member per year												
A. One	9	4	0	2	10	1	0	0	19	5	0	2
B. Two	4	6	0	2	1	10	0	0	5	16	0	2
C. Three	2	7	1	2	0	7	3	0	2	14	4	2
D. Other	1	5	1	3	0	10	2	0	1	15	3	3
2. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis, on the program of an association's yearly convention	6	7	0	2	0	10	2	0	6	17	2	2
3. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis, in the following:												
A. Committee Work	6	8	0	0	0	11	1	0	6	19	1	0
B. Holding an Office	3	10	0	1	0	8	4	0	3	18	4	1
C. Paper Reviewer	2	11	1	0	0	10	2	0	2	21	3	0
4. The faculty member should participate, if possible, on editorial boards of professional associations	5	8	1	1	0	8	4	0	5	16	5	1
<b>III. Direct Contact With Industry</b>												
1. The faculty member should be able to function as a lecturer to industry	5	9	0	1	1	11	0	0	6	20	0	1
2. The faculty member should be able to function as a consultant to industry	9	5	0	1	8	3	1	0	17	8	1	1
3. The faculty member should function as a board member within industry	3	10	1	1	0	9	3	0	3	19	4	1

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

\*\*The categories of very desirable and desirable total less than two-thirds majority of the responding panel members.

### Competency in the Area of Specialization

Three sections emerged for competency in the area of specialization including generalist versus specialist, evidence of specialization, and maintenance of specialization. Responses by groups for this qualification are presented in Table 18.

Five standards were developed for the section of generalists versus specialist. Of the five all but Item I, 3, the faculty member of a small program should be a specialist, received two-thirds vote in the categories of very desirable and desirable. Of the panel members responding to the desirability of core courses in hospitality management education (Item I, 1), 70.4% rated having core courses before specializing as very desirable. There was a mode change for industry representatives on this standard. The mode in Delphi II was tied at very desirable and desirable; the mode for Delphi III was desirable.

While all the standards in the section dealing with evidence of specialization received at least 66.7% of the ratings for desirable and very desirable, only the relationship of industry experience to specialization (Item II, 2) was rated in the very desirable category with 73.1% of the votes.



Table 18

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses to Competency in the Area of Specialization

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Generalist Versus Specialist</b>												
1. The faculty member should have a foundation of core courses in hospitality education before specializing	10	4	0	1	9	3	0	0	19	7	0	1
2. The faculty member in a small program should be a generalist	8	3	3	1	10	1	0	0	18	4	3	1
3. The faculty member in a small program should be a specialist**	0	3	8	3	0	2	10	0	0	5	18	3
4. The faculty member in a large program should be a generalist	1	7	3	3	1	9	2	0	2	16	5	3
5. The faculty member in a large program should be a specialist	5	9	0	1	2	10	0	0	7	19	0	1
<b>II. Evidence of Specialization</b>												
1. Course work of the faculty member shows concentration in area of specialization	5	9	0	0	0	12	0	0	5	21	0	0
2. Industry experience of the faculty member is related to area of specialization	9	5	0	0	10	2	0	0	19	7	0	0
3. The faculty member has served as a consultant in the area of specialization	3	11	0	1	2	8	2	0	5	19	2	1
4. The faculty member is published in the area of specialization	4	11	0	0	0	7	4	0	4	18	4	0
5. The faculty member is recognized as one of the outstanding persons in the area of specialization	5	9	0	1	1	9	2	0	6	18	2	1
6. The faculty member has had paid employment in the area of specialization	4	8	0	2	1	10	1	0	5	18	1	2

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>III. Maintenance of Specialization</b>												
1. The faculty member remains current in area of specialization through seminars, meetings, site visits, readings, continued education, publications, involvement in industry associations, etc.	14	1	0	0	11	1	0	0	25	2	0	0
2. Course outlines for the courses of the faculty member are updated based on new developments in area of specialization	13	2	0	0	10	2	0	0	23	4	0	0
3. The faculty member is evaluated by education peers every three years	8	4	0	3	7	4	1	0	15	8	1	3
4. The faculty member is evaluated by industry peers every three years	1	8	2	4	1	10	1	0	2	18	3	4
5. The faculty member maintains certification by industry practitioners; i.e., CHA	1	9	0	4	0	11	1	0	1	20	1	4

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

\*\*The categories of very desirable and desirable total less than two-thirds majority of the responding panel members.

All five of the standards in the miscellaneous section received at least 66.7% of the responding panel members' ratings in the desirable and very desirable categories. Remaining current in the area of specialization (Item III, 1) received 92.6% for very desirable.

### Teaching Effectiveness

Group responses to standards for teaching effectiveness are presented in Table 19. Teaching effectiveness was divided into the sections of who should evaluate, elements of teaching effectiveness, and evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Three standards were identified for the section who should evaluate effectiveness. Evaluation by the dean or chair (Item I, 3) retained the highest rating with 65.4% of the responding panel members selecting very desirable. However, evaluation by all three, students (Item I, 1), peers (Item I, 2), and chair (Item I, 3) received over 80% total for desirable and very desirable.

The panel developed standards for 24 elements by which to evaluate teaching effectiveness. All but one standard (Items II, 11) received at least 66.7% of the responding panel members' votes for desirable and very desirable. The highest rated standard, Item II, 3, with the total panel responding, received a 96.3% rating in the very desirable

Table 19

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses to Teaching Effectiveness

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Who Should Evaluate Effectiveness</b>												
1. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by students	9	6	0	0	0	8	1	2	9	14	1	2
2. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by peers	5	7	1	1	1	10	1	0	6	17	2	1
3. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by the chair or dean	8	6	0	0	9	3	0	0	17	9	0	0
<b>II. Elements of Teaching Effectiveness</b>												
1. The faculty member has had course work in teaching methods for the college level	3	10	1	1	3	9	0	0	6	19	1	1
2. The faculty member can design and organize a course on paper, including objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation experiences	7	7	0	1	2	10	0	0	9	17	0	1
3. The faculty member displays interest in developing the student as a person and as a future leader in the industry	14	0	1	0	12	0	0	0	26	0	1	0
4. The faculty member understands that learning is based on previous experience and knowledge	11	2	0	1	11	1	0	0	22	3	0	1
5. The faculty member is capable of evaluating student performance	14	0	0	1	9	3	0	0	23	3	0	1
6. The faculty member is capable of advising students in academics	10	4	0	1	10	2	0	0	20	6	0	1
7. The faculty member is capable of advising students in careers	7	6	1	1	5	7	0	0	12	13	1	1
8. The faculty member realizes that the instructor is usually a role model	14	1	0	0	11	1	0	0	25	2	0	0
9. The faculty member is sensitive to stress factors in students	5	8	1	1	4	8	0	0	9	16	1	1

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
10. The faculty member accepts administrative responsibilities	3	7	3	2	2	10	0	0	5	17	3	2
11. The faculty member possesses an appreciation of higher academic rank**	5	4	4	2	1	3	8	0	6	7	12	2
12. The faculty member supports student activities	5	8	1	0	2	10	0	0	7	18	1	0
13. The faculty member encourages academic/business relationships for students	13	2	0	0	11	1	0	0	24	3	0	0
14. The faculty member has a professional "presence" in the classroom	13	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	25	0	0	1
15. The faculty member is a firm leader in the classroom	8	5	0	1	12	0	0	0	20	5	0	1
16. The faculty member used correct communication in the classroom	12	0	1	1	10	2	0	0	22	2	1	1
17. The faculty member has a knowledge of adult learning theory	2	10	1	2	2	10	0	0	4	20	1	2
18. The faculty member has a working knowledge of teaching techniques including case studies, role playing, etc.	7	7	0	1	4	8	0	0	11	15	0	1
19. The faculty member is familiar with competency based curriculum	3	8	1	2	2	10	0	0	5	18	1	2
• 20. The faculty member has the ability to establish and maintain a rapport with students	13	1	0	1	11	1	0	0	24	2	0	1
21. The faculty member encourages creative thinking	13	1	0	1	10	2	0	0	23	3	0	1
22. The faculty member is fair and prompt with grades	9	4	1	1	5	7	0	0	14	11	1	1
23. The faculty member adapts teaching style to needs of the students	3	10	0	1	5	7	0	0	8	17	0	1
24. The faculty member delivers information in a clear, well-organized, interesting format	12	2	0	1	9	1	0	0	21	3	0	1
III. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness												
1. Students have learned under the instruction of the faculty member as evidenced by grades	2	7	3	3	1	8	2	1	3	15	5	4
2. Other												
A. Assessment by students	7	3	2	1	3	6	0	0	10	9	2	1
B. Student performance in higher level courses	3	6	1	1	0	9	0	0	3	15	1	1

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

\*\*The categories of very desirable and desirable total less than two-thirds majority of the responding panel members.

category. Thirteen of the 24 suggested standards (Items II, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, and 24) received their highest rating as very desirable.

Each standard in the section evidence of teaching effectiveness received at least 66.7% total rating for desirable and very desirable. Student assessment of teaching effectiveness (Item III, 2A) had the highest very desirable rating with 45.5% of the members' votes.

#### Interest in Curricular Experimentation

Two sections for this qualification emerged a general section and a section concerned with evidence of curricular experimentation. Responses by groups are presented in Table 20.

The one standard included in the general section dealt with the desirability of including interest in curricular experimentation as a major consideration when evaluating faculty (Item I, 1). The mode for this standard remained desirable yet the responses on the mode increased from 53.8% to 73.1%. The panel reached agreement to keep this qualification as part of the accreditation criteria with a total percentage for desirable and very desirable of 84.6.

For demonstrating evidence of curricular experimentation (Item II, 1), willingness to try new ideas (Item II, 1C) was rated very desirable with 66.7% of the votes. The

Table 20

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses To Interest In Curricular Experimentation

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. General Information</b>												
1. Interest in curricular experimentation should be a major consideration when evaluating faculty	3	8	2	1	0	11	1	0	3	19	3	1
<b>II. Evidence of Interest in Curricular Experimentation</b>												
1. The faculty member demonstrates interest in curricular experimentation through the following:												
A. Correlation of curriculum with industry needs	4	11	0	0	4	8	0	0	8	19	0	0
B. Commitment to thorough preparation for classes and minimum reliance on textbooks	5	8	0	0	0	11	0	0	5	19	0	0
C. Willingness to try new ideas	8	6	0	0	8	2	0	0	16	8	0	0
D. Leadership in acceptance of curriculum change	6	7	1	0	0	11	1	0	6	18	2	0
E. Tests the value of the change	5	6	1	0	1	11	0	0	6	17	1	0
F. Varying lecture format	4	8	1	0	3	8	1	0	7	16	2	0
G. Use of computers	4	8	2	0	2	8	2	0	6	16	4	0
H. Use of case studies	4	8	2	0	3	9	0	0	7	17	2	0
I. Use of outside field visits	0	12	0	1	5	7	0	0	5	19	0	1
J. Keeping up-to-date on new teaching methods through reading and attendance at teaching skills workshops	4	7	1	2	4	8	0	0	8	15	1	2
2. The faculty member should teach a new course every two years**	1	3	6	4	0	4	8	0	1	7	14	4

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

\*\*The categories of very desirable and desirable total less than two-thirds majority of the responding panel members.

highest rating for the remaining examples of interest in curricular experimentation (Items II, 1A, B, and D-J) was desirable. These suggested examples of evidence received at least 66.7% total vote for desirable and very desirable.

### Ability to Work With Students

Table 21 presents the responses of the panel members for the two sections concerning the ability to work with students. In the first section of who should evaluate ability to work with students, students (Item I, 1) and deans (Item I, 2) as evaluators of the faculty member's ability to work with students received their highest rating in desirable. A total of 100% of the responding panel members agreed that the chair or dean should evaluate this qualification. In contrast, evaluation by students received a total of 88.9%.

All the suggested standards in evidence of ability to work with students received a total of at least 66.7% for desirable and very desirable. The highest rated standard was the availability of the faculty member to the students (Item II, 5) with a 96.3% vote for very desirable.

### Public Service

The distribution of responses by groups for public service is presented in Table 22. Public service divided



Table 21

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses To Ability To Work With Students

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Who Should Evaluate Ability to Work With Students</b>												
1. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by students	6	9	0	0	1	8	2	1	7	17	2	1
2. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by chair or dean	3	12	0	0	3	9	0	0	6	21	0	0
3. The faculty member should submit a list of student activities he/she is involved in to chair	4	8	2	1	1	11	0	0	5	19	2	1
<b>II. Evidence of Ability to Work With Students</b>												
1. The faculty member should establish a rapport with students without losing class control	13	1	0	1	11	1	0	0	24	2	0	1
2. The faculty member encourages the students in activities that relate to the hospitality industry	11	4	0	0	11	1	0	0	22	5	0	0
3. The faculty participates in student organizations	4	8	2	0	1	11	0	0	5	19	2	0
4. The faculty member shows appreciation of student development toward professional status	8	5	0	2	3	9	0	0	11	14	0	2
5. The faculty member is available to the students	14	1	0	0	12	0	0	0	26	1	0	0
6. The faculty member has the respect of the students	13	1	0	1	12	0	0	0	25	1	0	1
7. The faculty member shows genuine concern for the students	13	1	0	1	12	0	0	0	25	1	0	1
8. The faculty member is a leader not a friend	8	4	0	2	10	2	0	0	18	6	0	2
9. The faculty member expects and receives only quality work	9	5	0	1	4	8	0	0	13	13	0	1

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
10. The faculty member has good oral communication skills	10	4	0	1	10	2	0	0	20	6	0	1
11. The faculty member has knowledge of the career opportunities in the hospitality industry	9	6	0	0	12	0	0	0	21	6	0	0
12. The faculty member participates in advising	5	8	0	2	6	6	0	0	11	14	0	2
13. The faculty member has directed internship programs	0	9	2	3	1	9	2	0	1	18	4	3
14. The faculty member has directed independent studies	2	11	1	1	0	10	1	0	2	21	2	1
15. The faculty member has directed special classroom projects	2	9	1	2	1	10	0	0	3	19	1	2

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

into the sections of importance of public service, evidence of public service, and amount of public service.

Section one dealt with the importance of public service. Including public service as a qualification when evaluating faculty (Item I, 1) did not receive the necessary 66.7% total from the categories of desirable and very desirable to be included in the accreditation criteria. The highest rating was 48.1% for undesirable. By groups, this suggested standard received a higher negative percentage from the industry representatives (66.7%) than from educators (40.0%). The mode for this standard remained undesirable; however, the responses on the mode increased. Response changes by educators was responsible for this increase.

The highest ratings given evidence of public service were desirable. Participation on college and department committees (Item II, 2) received the highest total rating with 100% of the panel members selecting either desirable or very desirable.

The selected amount of public service was 10 to 20 hours each year (Item III, 3B). This amount received a total of 66.7% for desirable and very desirable.

Table 22

Delphi III: Frequency of Responses to Public Service

Item/Rating*	Distribution of responses											
	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>I. Importance of Public Service</b>												
1. The faculty member should be evaluated on the public service he/she performs**	6	3	5	1	0	4	8	0	6	7	13	1
2. Public service should only be a concern after all teaching and research responsibilities have been met	5	4	5	1	1	11	0	0	6	15	5	1
3. Public service is good public relations and helps to recruit students	1	12	0	1	3	9	0	0	4	21	0	1
<b>II. Evidence of Public Service</b>												
1. The faculty member participates in community activities, such as the Chamber of Commerce, etc.**	3	6	5	1	1	6	5	0	4	12	10	1
2. The faculty member participates on college and department committees	7	8	0	0	1	11	0	0	8	19	0	0
3. The faculty member has established acquaintanceships and rapport with local restaurateurs and inn keepers	5	9	0	1	5	7	0	0	10	16	0	1
4. The faculty member is involved in the development of continuing education for people in the industry	5	6	1	1	2	10	0	0	7	16	1	1
5. The faculty member is willing to serve in the community when necessary	3	9	2	1	2	9	1	0	5	18	3	1

(table continues)

Item/Rating*	Educators				Industry representatives				Total group			
	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
<b>III. Amount of Public Service</b>												
1. Early each academic year, the department head and the instructor should agree on an hourly allocation in public service**	1	2	7	4	0	1	10	1	1	3	17	5
2. Public service requests should be rotated through the entire faculty and no faculty member should be exempt from minimum volunteer consultations**	2	6	2	5	0	9	2	1	2	15	4	6
3. The faculty member should participate in _____ hours of public service each year												
A. Five - Ten	6	1	4	4	7	0	1	2	13	1	5	6
B. Ten - Twenty	6	2	0	4	7	1	4	0	13	3	4	4
C. Twenty - Thirty**	2	2	4	4	1	3	5	0	3	5	9	4
D. Thirty - Forty**	1	1	5	5	1	3	5	1	2	4	10	6
E. Forty - Fifty**	1	1	0	10	0	1	2	5	1	2	2	15
F. More than Fifty**	1	0	1	10	2	0	2	5	3	0	3	15

\*Rating scale: 4 = very desirable, 3 = desirable, 2 = undesirable, 1 = very undesirable

\*\*The categories of very desirable and desirable total less than two-thirds majority of the responding panel members.

### Summary

This chapter presented the data of three Delphi rounds conducted to identify standards for faculty in four-year hospitality management programs during accreditation. The information was analyzed according to the divisions within the Delphi II and Delphi III questionnaires. In addition, the responses from the separate groups--educators and industry representatives--and the total panel were presented in table form.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the study and a summary of the findings. In addition, conclusions are drawn and recommendations for use of the results of the study are presented. A discussion of the study concludes the chapter.

#### Summary

As a field of study hospitality management education does not have an established level of quality, common criteria, or set of standards to which all participants subscribe. CHRIE has explored and agreed to implement the use of accreditation specific to hospitality management education to facilitate quality control within hospitality management education. However, before specialized accreditation can be implemented certain requirements established by COPA must be met. Included in these requirements are the standards for the evaluation of faculty during the self-study component of accreditation.

The purpose of this study was to identify standards desirable for faculty when four-year hospitality management education programs are accredited. Standards related to

nine qualifications suggested by the literature as being common to specialized accreditation were sought. These qualifications included academic preparation, scholarly productivity, applied professional experience, continued contact with the profession, competency in the area of specialization, teaching effectiveness, interest in curricular experimentation, ability to work with students, and public service.

Based on the tradition of using the professionals in the field that is to receive specialized accreditation to develop the evaluation standards, this study sought the assistance of hospitality management professionals to identify desirable standards related to each of the nine qualifications. The Delphi technique, a tool for organizing group communication without direct discussion, was implemented to reach agreement on which standards are desirable for future specialized accreditation of four-year hospitality management education programs.

A panel of 15 hospitality management educators and 12 hospitality management professionals participated in three rounds of the Delphi process. Standards for each of the nine qualifications were identified and rated on a Likert-type desirability scale (4=very desirable; 3=desirable; 2=undesirable; 1=very undesirable). Agreement of the panel members to include a standard in faculty evaluation was



said to exist when each standard received a total of 66.7% or above in the desirable and very desirable categories.

Unexpectedly, the necessity of including the qualifications of interest in curricular experimentation and public service in accreditation standards was challenged in Delphi I. When presented to the panel for rating in Delphi II and III, the qualification of interest in curricular experimentation received a positive response from more than 66% of the panel members. However, the panel did not reach agreement that public service should be a qualification for evaluating faculty.

### Findings

The items in this section provide a summary of the findings of the study.

1. For the qualification of academic preparation the panel identified 95 standards (Appendix D). The panel reached agreement on 68 of the standards; 41 of the 68 standards received a modal rating of desirable and 27 were given the higher rating of very desirable (Appendix F).

2. Twenty-six standards were developed for the qualification of scholarly productivity (Appendix D). Agreement was reached for 21 of the these. Of the 21 agreed upon, 8 standards received modal ratings of very desirable and 13 were rated as desirable (Appendix F).

3. The panel members identified 17 standards for the qualification of applied professional experience (Appendix D). Fifteen of the initial standards were selected by the professionals to be included in the self-study component of specialized accreditation. A modal rating of very desirable was given to nine of the selected 15 (Appendix F).

4. For the qualification continued contact with the profession 30 standards were suggested (Appendix D). Agreement to include 16 of these standards in accreditation criteria was reached. The panel members rated 5 of the chosen 16 as very desirable (Appendix F).

5. The panel developed 16 standards (Appendix D) to be used to make judgments concerning the qualification of competency in the area of specialization; agreement was reached on 15 of the standards. Six of these standards were given a modal rating of very desirable (Appendix F).

6. Thirty standards were suggested for the qualification of teaching effectiveness (Appendix D). The panel members agreed on 29 standards to be incorporated into accreditation criteria. The highest rating, very desirable, was given to 15 of the 29 (Appendix F).

7. For interest in curricular experimentation the panel members identified 12 standards (Appendix D). The panel decided on 10 of the initial 12 standards. One

standard out of the 10 was given the highest rating of very desirable (Appendix F).

8. For the qualification ability to work with students, 18 standards were developed (Appendix D) and agreed upon. Eight standards received an intensity rating of very desirable (Appendix F).

9. Ten standards were suggested for judging the qualification of public service (Appendix D). However, including public service as a qualification was challenged in Delphi I. Consequently, the panel was asked to rate, in Delphi II and III, the desirability of including it as a qualification. The decision was made to eliminate public service as a qualification when evaluating four-year hospitality management education faculty.

### Conclusions

The findings of the study justify the following conclusions:

1. Agreement on desirable faculty standards to be used during the self-study component of specialized accreditation of four-year hospitality management education was reached among hospitality management educators/administrators and hospitality management representatives.

2. As a whole the professional panel elected to eliminate the qualification of public service from

accreditation criteria. However, the decision was heavily influenced by the industry representative vote (Table 22).

3. The panel members used all four categories (very desirable, desirable, undesirable, very undesirable) when rating the standards. Based on the individual ratings, selected standards under each qualification are considered more desirable than others.

### **Recommendations**

The following recommendations were made as a result of this study:

1. The following eight qualifications should be used to evaluate faculty in four-year hospitality management programs during accreditation: academic preparation, scholarly productivity, applied professionals experience, continued contact with the profession, competency in the area of specialization, teaching effectiveness, interest in curricular experimentation, and ability to work with students. Because of the difference in the vote on public service by educators and industry representatives, the CHRIE accreditation committee may wish to reevaluate the importance of including or excluding the qualification in criteria.

2. The standards identified and agreed upon as desirable for a specialized accreditation process should be

used to make judgments concerning each of the previously mentioned qualifications (Appendix F).

3. The intensity rating of the selected standards should be used as a basis for assigning priority status or importance to each standard.

4. These qualifications and standards should be made available to hospitality management education administrators and faculty.

5. Individual faculty members should use these qualifications and standards as guidelines for self-evaluation and self-improvement.

6. These faculty qualifications and standards should be used as guidelines by hospitality management administrators when hiring and evaluating faculty, and for assessing faculty needs prior to faculty development programs.

7. Future research should be conducted to increase the body of knowledge for hospitality management education. Specific areas that were identified in the literature as being represented by minimal or no research include the following: continued contact with the profession, competency in the area of specialization, teaching effectiveness, interest in curricular experimentation, ability to work with students, and public service.

8. Future research should be conducted to determine the extent to which hospitality management faculty are

currently being evaluated by some or all of the qualifications included in the present study.

9. Future research should be conducted to determine the usefulness of these criteria as a means of self-evaluation for the hospitality management faculty member.

10. Future research should be conducted to determine the relationship of possession of one or some of these qualities by a faculty member and success in teaching in a four-year hospitality management program.

### Discussion

Prior to this study judgment concerning the quality of faculty in a four-year hospitality management program was based, by necessity, on criteria borrowed from other disciplines and assumed to be applicable to the field of hospitality management. The results of this Delphi study have yielded an end product that has immediate utility, for the CHRIE accreditation committee, as well as having future applications for hospitality management education.

Analysis of the completed study particularly the results of Delphi III revealed several points of interest. These include the need to remain current in the field, a comparison of the panel groups on education and work experience, the research and publishing activity of

faculty, and evidence of Delphi technique's influence on the panel members.

Perhaps the most notable point is the emphasis placed by the panel on remaining current in the field. This theme appeared in five of the nine qualifications. Under the qualifications of scholarly productivity (Table 15) and competency in the area of specialization (Table 18) the standards related to remaining current were rated very desirable. Indeed the only standard to receive 100% of the panel members' votes for very desirable concerned remaining current and was located in scholarly productivity. Standards for remaining current were also included in the qualifications of academic preparation (Table 12), applied professional experience (Table 16), and interest in curricular experimentation (Table 20). For these qualifications the standards were rated desirable.

The inclusion of this "current" status theme in more than one qualification leaves the impression that hospitality management professionals feel that the educator might become "out-of-date" if an effort is not made to know what the state of the art is in hospitality management. Remaining current in the field may impact the teaching effectiveness of the faculty member. The literature review suggested that students perceive their instructors to be more effective if they continue to update their information

by spending time in the industry (Waskey, 1979). This frequent mention of remaining current in the field seems to underscore the need for individual hospitality management educators to pursue activities that will provide current information and application of the information. Also, it stresses the importance of faculty development programs to administrators of hospitality management programs.

Also of interest is the comparison of ratings between the educators and industry representatives concerning education and experience standards. When asked if professional experience should be acceptable in lieu of academic preparation, 75.0% of the industry representatives compared to 66.7% of the educators selected the rating of very desirable (Table 16). This disparity found in the present study can also be found, as revealed in the literature review, in hospitality management education as a whole.

Another point of comparison is years of work experience. For minimum number of years of management experience the industry representatives preferred six and the educators selected three (Table 16); however, both groups chose one year minimum technical experience. The panel's decision varied somewhat from what is actually happening in the field. According to the literature



review, the average number of years of work experience for the faculty member is 7.3 (Rutherford, 1982).

A final area for comparison of education and experience is that of academic preparation. Concerning the degrees a faculty member should possess, the modal ratings were the same for bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees (Table 12) with bachelor's and master's receiving ratings of very desirable and doctor's receiving a rating of desirable. The desirable and not very desirable rating from the educators is interesting considering that 14 of the 15 panel members held doctoral degrees (Chapter 4). However, the importance of the terminal degree is being debated in hospitality management education (Adler, 1985; Olsen & Reid, 1983; Powers & Riegel, 1984; Rutherford, 1984; Wachtel & Pavesic, 1983) and this rating may be reflective of this debate.

Research and publishing are also areas of interest. The present study revealed that research related to the hospitality industry would be very desirable by faculty at a larger university and desirable by faculty at a smaller university (Table 15). These findings are in agreement with opinions expressed in the literature review. In fact original research by hospitality management education is desired by the industry to meet some of its needs (Berger, 1982; Rousselle & Brymer, 1983; Schaffer, 1984). That the

faculty member should be involved with publishing was apparently assumed by the panel; all the standards addressing publishing activity were given at least two-thirds vote. However, the literature available indicates that not all hospitality management faculty have been published (Rutherford, 1984).

A final area of interest is the effects of the Delphi technique and modal ratings on the panel members. When comparing the data from Delphi II and Delphi III it can be seen that panel members did make changes in their ratings to agree with the majority. The 100% very desirable rating given to remaining current in the field under scholarly productivity is an example. For Delphi II there were a total of 24 votes for very desirable and 3 for desirable (Table 4). When rating the same standard in Delphi III, three panel members elected to change their rating to that of the other panel members making it a 100% response (Table 15). One more example of the influence of the modal rating is the standard addressing the importance of evaluating faculty on interest in curricular experimentation. During Delphi II there were a total of 14 responses for desirable and the categories of very desirable and desirable totaled 69.2% (Table 9). For Delphi III the mode remained desirable yet there was an increase in numbers on the mode to 19 increasing the total percentage to 84.6% (Table 20).

Since the purpose of the Delphi technique is to reach agreement among a group of professionals, it appears that in the present study the Delphi technique as a process for group communication has facilitated the merger of opinions of hospitality management professionals.

Every standard suggested in Delphi I was included in the questionnaires of Delphi II and III. Therefore, the content of the study was the original work of the panel of professionals. As a result of having authors with varied backgrounds, the standards range from very general to very specific. The specific nature of some of the standards was a cause of concern for some of the panel members. Because this is an initial look at the opinions of hospitality professionals concerning faculty, it seems appropriate to have allowed freedom of expression in the degree of specificity used.

All segments of the hospitality industry were included in the initial panel nominations; however, the completed panel included members from only foodservice and lodging. Of these two groups more representatives from foodservice (7 of the 12 panel members or 58.3%) agreed to participate in the study. The distribution of hospitality management administrators and educators is also skewed in favor of the administrators. Only three of the education representatives (20.0%) reported being only a professor and not an

administrator or administrator/professor combination. It is highly possible that the distribution of the panel members in both groups is responsible for the outcome of the acceptance or rejection of any selected standard. The results of this study and the responses to any particular standard should be read with composition of the panel in mind.

These qualifications and standards developed for faculty in hospitality management education may share commonalities with faculty accreditation standards and evaluation in other disciplines. However, this work presents the initial and unique effort of hospitality management professionals to establish faculty criteria to which all in hospitality management education can subscribe. The qualifications and standards as developed are adaptable to all settings of faculty evaluation not just accreditation. Continued use of the criteria by individual faculty members as a means of self-evaluation and by administrators for planning faculty development as well as faculty evaluation will help to ensure quality faculty for the field of hospitality management education.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Adler, H. (1985). Professional development of faculty in hotel and restaurant administration programs. In C. U. Lambert (Ed.), Proceedings of the 1985 CHRIE Conference on Excellence Through Interaction (pp.104-115). University Park, PA: Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education.
- Anderson, D. P. (1970, March). Clarifying and setting objectives on an intermediate school district's objectives utilizing the Delphi technique. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Symposium, Minneapolis, MN.
- Arreola, R. A. (1979). Essential components of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176 604)
- Astin, A. W. (1961). A re-examination of college productivity. Journal of Educational Psychology, 52, 173-178.
- Astin, A. W., & Lee, C. B. T. (1967). Current practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. In C. B. T. Lee (Ed.), Improving college teaching (pp. 296-311). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Astin, A. W., Bowen, H. R., & Chambers, C. M. (1979). Evaluating educational quality: A conference summary. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Atkin, J. M. (1977). Back to normal school. New York: American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 143 258)
- Bagby, S. A. (1983). Interagency cooperation in accreditation. In K. E. Young, C. M. Chambers, & H. R. Kells (Eds.), Understanding accreditation (pp. 358-378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bayer, A. E. (1975). Faculty composition, institutional structure, and students' college environment. Journal of Higher Education, 46, 549-565.

- Berger, F. (1982). Teaching and research: A critical balance. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 23, 34-37.
- Berry, E. B. (1985, March). Student-faculty interaction: Design or default? Paper presented at the National Conference on Higher Education of the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, IL.
- Berte, N. R., & O'Neil, E. H. (1977). Old and new models of service. In W. B. Martin (Ed.), New directions for higher education: Redefining service, research, and teaching (pp. 17-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bess, J. L. (1982). University organization: A matrix analysis of the academic professors. New York: Human Science.
- Bjork, L. G. (1985). Environmental change and regulatory reform in postsecondary institutional accreditation. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 590)
- Bourgeois, D. P. (1967). A study of faculty opinion concerning selected factors related to excellence in teaching at the University of Southwestern Louisiana. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette.
- Boyd, J. E., & Schietinger, E. F. (1976). Faculty evaluation procedures in southern colleges and universities. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Brookes, P. J. (1985). Letter to Lieutenant General R. H. Forman concerning Accreditation of TRADOC Service Schools, December. Fort Leavenworth, KS.
- Brooks, K. W. (1979). Delphi technique: Expanding applications. The North Central Association Quarterly, 53, 377-385.
- Brymer, R. A. (Ed.). (1984). Introduction to hotel and restaurant management (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

- Burgermeister, J. (1983). Assessment of the educational skills and competencies needed by beginning hospitality managers. In D. M. Laudadio & L. C. Laudadio (Eds.), Proceedings of the 1985 CHRIE Conference on the World of Hospitality (pp. 11-21). University Park, PA: Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education.
- Calnan, T. W., Chacko, E. H., & Nebel, E., III. (1986). Hospitality doctorates--A seller's market? In C. U. Lambert (Ed.), Proceedings of the 1986 CHRIE Conference on 40 Years: Traditions of Excellence (p. 216-218). Washington, DC: Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education.
- Carnegie Foundation. (1982). The control of the campus. Washington, DC: Author.
- Casey, R. J., & Harris, J. W. (1979). Accountability in higher education: Forces, counterforces, and the role of institutional accreditation. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Education.
- Centra, J. A. (1977). How universities evaluate faculty performance: A survey of department heads (GREB Research Report No. 75-5BR). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Centra, J. A. (1979). Determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chambers, C. M. (1983). Federal government and accreditation. In K. E. Young, C. M. Chambers, & H. R. Kells (Eds.), Understanding accreditation (pp. 233-269). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. (1969). Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, L. (1974). Assessing outcomes for accreditation. North Central Association Quarterly, 48, 314-319.
- Copeland, L. L. (1977). A national study using the modified Delphi technique to identify teacher competencies for evaluating industrial arts student teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.



- Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. (1977). Statement on proliferation in accreditation. Washington, DC: Author.
- Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. (1986a). Educational quality and accreditation: A call for diversity, continuity, and innovation. Washington, DC: Author.
- Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. (1986b). The balance wheel for accreditation. Washington, DC: Author.
- Coyle, E. J. (1959). A program of accreditation for private business schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959). Dissertation Abstracts International, 20, 03.
- Creswell, J. W. (1985). Faculty research performance: Lessons from the sciences and the social sciences (ASHE-ERIC Report No. 4). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Dalkey, N. C. (1975). Toward a theory of group estimation. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), The Delphi method (pp. 236-261). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dalrymple, F. M. (1970). Counselor educators' perceptions of the 1967 ACES standards and accreditation of programs of counselor education (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, 11A.
- Darter, C. L., Jr. (1980). Qualifications of professional education faculty. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 198 084)
- Davis, R. H., Strand, R., Alexander, L. T., & Hussain, M. N. (1982). The impact of organizational and innovation variables on instructional innovation in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 53, 568-586.
- Dressel, P. L. (1971). Accreditation and institutional self-study. North Central Association Quarterly, 6, 277-287.
- Eble, K. E. (1970). Project to improve college teaching. Academe, 4, 3-6.

- Eble, K. E. (1972). Professors as teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eble, K. E., & McKeachie, W. J. (1985). Improving undergraduate education faculty development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Elkins, C. M. (1983). Accreditation: Dispelling the myths. Journal of Allied Health, 12, 249-261.
- Ericksen, S. C. (1984). The essence of good teaching: Helping students learn and remember what they learn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Feldman, K. A. (1986). The perceived instructional effectiveness of college teachers as related to their personality and attitudinal characteristics: A review and synthesis. Research in Higher Education, 24, 139-179.
- Fendt, P. F. (1978, October). Alternative futures for adult and continuing education in North Carolina: A Delphi futures planning study. Paper presented at the First Meeting of the Education Section of the World Future Society, Houston, TX.
- Fincher, C. (1983). The purpose and function of faculty evaluation. Revision of a paper presented at the Meeting of the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, Athens, GA, September 8-9, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 887)
- Fletcher, S. W. (1985). Insider's insights. In G. W. Lattin (Ed.), The lodging and foodservice industry (pp. 31-32). East Lansing MI: Educational Institute of the American Hotel and Motel Association.
- Florestano, P. S., & Hambrick, R. (1984). Rewarding faculty members for profession-related public service. Education Record, 65, 18-21.
- Glidden, R. (1983). Specialized accreditation. In K. E. Young, C. M. Chambers, & H. R. Kells (Eds.), Understanding accreditation (pp. 187-208). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Gow, K. F. (1979). CETA and vocational education administrators' perceptions of procedures for the implementation and operation of jointly delivered programs in Virginia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Green, K. C. (1981). Accreditation and quality: Minimal requirements versus distinguishing characteristics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 997)
- Gruson, E. S. (1979). Issues in accreditation, eligibility and institutional quality. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 415)
- Gustad, J. W. (1961). Policies and practices in faculty evaluation. Washington, DC: Committee on College Teaching, American Council on Education.
- Guyette, W. C. (1979). A descriptive study of the perceptions of postsecondary hospitality management program leaders toward specialized hospitality accreditation (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3132A.
- Hansen, R. B., & Rogers, B. G. (1984, April). Convergent and discriminant validation measures of faculty competence by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Measurement in Education, New Orleans, LA.
- Harclerod, F. F. (1980). Accreditation: History, process, and problems (Higher Education Research Report No. 6). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Hecht, A. R. (1977, July). A modified Delphi technique for obtaining consensus on institutional research priorities. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Region AERA Special Interest Group on Community College Research, Palos Hills, IL.
- Hedberg, J. G. (1979, March). The politics of instructional innovation in higher education: A cross cultural analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communication and Technology, New Orleans, LA.

- Helmer, O. (1975). Foreword. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), The Delphi method (pp. xix-xx). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hohenstein, W. V. (1960). Service: The neglected person of the academic trinity. National Forum, 40, 18-19.
- Hollander, T. E. (1981, December). Regional accreditation public policy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Boston.
- Hudson, C. J. (1983). Teacher competencies needed to utilize microcomputers in vocational agriculture. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Jaeger, R. M. & Busch, J. C. (1984, April). The effects of a Delphi modification of the Angoff-Jaeger standard-setting procedure on standards recommended for the National Teacher Examinations. Paper presented at the Joint Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association and the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, LA.
- Judd, R. C. (1972). Delphi decision methods in higher education administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 109 941)
- Jung, S. M. (1986). The role of accreditation in directly improving educational quality. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Kells, H. R. (1980). Proliferation and agency effectiveness in accreditation: An institutional bill of rights. In Current issues in higher education (pp.19-26). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Kells, H. R. (1983a). Improving institutional performance through self-study. In K. E. Young, C. M. Chambers, & H. R. Kells (Eds.), Understanding accreditation (pp. 119-132). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kells, H. R. (1983b). Institutional rights and responsibilities. In K. E. Young, C. M. Chambers, & H. R. Kells (Eds.), Understanding accreditation (pp. 107-118). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Kells, H. R. (1983c). Roles of accrediting bodies. In K. E. Young, C. M. Chambers, & H. R. Kells (Eds.), Understanding accreditation (pp. 154-166). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kells, H. R., & Parish, R. M. (1979). Multiple accreditation relationships of postsecondary institutions in the United States (Technical Report No. 1). Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1971). Student evaluation of university professors. School and Society, 69, 353-356.
- Kirkwood, R. (1973). Myths of accreditation. Educational Record, 54, 211-215.
- Knisely, W. H. (1980). Commentary. In Current issues in higher education (p. 28). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Kozma, R. B. (1978). Faculty development and the adoption and diffusion of classroom innovation. Journal of Higher Education, 49, 438-449.
- Kozma, R. B. (1979). Communication, rewards, and the use of classroom innovations. Journal of Higher Education, 50, 761-771.
- Kozma, R. G. (1985). A grounded theory of instructional innovation in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 56, 300-319.
- Kramer, H. C., & Gardner, R. E. (1977). Advising by faculty. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Kuh, G. D. (1981). Indices of quality in the undergraduate experience (Higher Education Research No. 4). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Ladd, E. C., & Lipset, S. M. (1977, November 28). Scholarly articles published by professors. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 2.
- Landers, A. D. (1978). Evaluating teachers. In O. Milton (Ed.), On college teaching (pp.355-375). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Lattin, G. W. (1985). The lodging and foodservice industry. East Lansing, MI: Educational Institute of the American Hotel & Motel Association.
- Lauffer, A. (1984). Assessment tools for practitioners, managers, and trainers. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (1975). The Delphi method, techniques and applications. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Lovett, C. M. (1986, March). Faculty careers in the 1980's: A reassessment. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, DC.
- Marcus, L. R., Leone, A. O., & Goldberg, E. D. (1983). The path to excellence: Quality assurance in higher education (Higher Education Research Report No. 1). Washington, DC: American Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Martin, W. B. (1977). Editor's notes. In W. B. Martin (Ed.), New directions for higher education: Redefining service, research, and teaching (pp. vii-ix). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Marvin, C. H. (1950). Higher education evaluates accreditation. In Proceedings. New York: Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.
- McGaw, B., Browne, R. K., & Rees, P. (1976). Delphi in education: Review and assessment. The Australian Journal of Education, 20, 59-71.
- Millard, R. M. (1983a). Accreditation serves as "conscience" of the educational community. Proceedings, Southern Association of Colleges & Schools, 35, 11-14.
- Millard, R. M. (1983b). The accrediting association: Ensuring the quality of programs and institutions. Change, 15, 32-37.
- Miller, R. I. (1974). Evaluating faculty performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Miller, R. I. (1975a, May). Assessing teacher effectiveness. In T. B. Massey (Ed.), Improving university teaching (pp. 28-61). Heidelberg, Germany: University of Heidelberg.
- Miller, R. I. (1975b). Developing programs for faculty evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, R. I. (1979). The assessment of college performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, J. W., & Boswell, L. E. (1979). Accreditation, assessment, and the credentialing of educational accomplishment. Journal of Higher Education, 50, 219-225.
- Millman, J. (1981). Student achievement as a measure of teacher competence. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 146-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Moomaw, W. E. (1977). Practices and problems in evaluating instruction. In J. A. Centra (Ed.), New directions for higher education: Renewing and evaluating teaching (pp. 77-91). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nebel, E. C., III, Calnan, T. W., & Chacko, H. (1986). Desperately seeking doctorates: The hospitality-educator shortfall. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 27, 36-38.
- Nelsen, W. C. (1981). Renewal of the teacher-scholar: Faculty development in the liberal arts college. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Oliver, R. L. (1984). Evaluating university teaching: Instructions for departmental chairs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 359)
- Olsen, M. D. (1984). Accreditation--A necessary step toward quality in hospitality education at the baccalaureate level? Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 8, 63-66.
- Olsen, M. D., & Reid, R. D. (1983). How to judge the hospitality program. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 24, 37-40.

- Olsen, M. D., & Tanke, M. (1984). The accreditation process in hospitality education. Unpublished monograph.
- Orlans, H. (1980). The end of a monopoly? On accrediting and eligibility. Change, 12, 32-37.
- Pascarella, E. T. (1980). Student-faculty informal contact and college outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 50, 545-595.
- Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Hibel, J. (1978). Student-faculty interactional settings and their relationship to predicted academic performance. Journal of Higher Education, 49, 450-463.
- Pavesic, D. V., & Brymer, R. A. (1986). Recruitment and retention factors for the hospitality professoriate. In C. U. Lambert (Ed.), Proceedings of the 1986 CHRIE Conference on 40 Years: Traditions of Excellence (p. 73-80). Washington, DC: Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education.
- Petersen, D. G. (1979). Accrediting standards and guidelines. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Petersen, D. G. (1980). The perceptions of accrediting agencies. Proceedings: National forum on accreditation of allied health education. Washington, DC: American Society of Allied Health Professions.
- Pigge, F. L. (1979). Opinions about accreditation and interagency cooperation: The results of a nationwide survey of COPA institutions. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Powers, T. F., & Riegel, C. D. (1984). An affirmative definition of hospitality education. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 5, 43-48.
- Proctor, B. S. (1950). Accreditation in industrial arts education: A study to develop the purposes, criteria, policies, and procedures for the accreditation of industrial arts teacher education programs for the baccalaureate. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.



- Proffitt, J. R. (1979). The federal connection for accreditation. Journal of Higher Education, 50, 145-157.
- Riegel, C. D., & Powers, T. F. (1984). Accreditation: A non-solution whose time has come? Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 9, 83-93.
- Rock, D. A., Centra, J. A., & Linn, R. L. (1970). Relationships between college characteristics and student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 7, 109-121.
- Rousselle, J. R., & Brymer, R. A. (1983). The research needs of hospitality industry: A survey. In D. M. Laudadio & L. C. Laudadio (Eds.), Proceedings of the 1983 CHRIE Conference on The Worlds of Hospitality (pp. 169-180). University Park, PA: Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education.
- Ruscio, K. P. (1985, March). Specialization in academic disciplines: Spokes on a wheel. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, IL.
- Russell, J. D. (1950). Accrediting of institutions of higher education. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1, 89-91.
- Rutherford, D. G. (1982). Who teaches hospitality education? The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 23, 38-41.
- Rutherford, D. G. (1983). An analysis of career determinants and publishing patterns among the hospitality professoriate. Journal of Hospitality Education, 7, 7-16.
- Rutherford, D. G. (1984). The implications of program proliferation, publishing pressure and the disappearing experience factor for the senior college HRA professoriate. In C. U. Lambert (Ed.), Proceedings of the 1984 CHRIE Conference on Management Education: 2001 (pp. 13-21). University Park, PA: Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education.

- Sachs, S. G. (1977). A study of instructional innovators at Michigan State University (Research Report No. 143). East Lansing: Michigan State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 143 321)
- Schaffer, J. D. (1984). A critical analysis of research in the foodservice industry: Implication for educators and practitioners. In C. U. Lambert (Ed.), Proceedings of the 1984 CHRIE Conference on Management Education: 2001 (pp. 68-73). University Park, PA: Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education.
- Scriven, M. (1981). Summative teacher evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp. 146-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Selden, W. K. (1959). Three basic problems of accrediting. School and Society, 87, 308-309.
- Selden, W. K. (1960). Accreditation: A struggle over standards in higher education. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Selden, W. K., & Porter, H. V. (1977). Accreditation: Its purposes and uses. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Seldin, P. (1975). How colleges evaluate professors. Croton-on-the-Hudson, NY: Blythe-Pennington.
- Seldin, P. (1980). Successful faculty evaluation programs. Crugers, NY: Coventry.
- Seldin, P. (1984). Changing practices in faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Semrow, J. J. (1977). Institutional assessment and evaluation for accreditation (Topical Paper No. 9). Tucson: University of Arizona. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 148-190)
- Shaw, M. (1985). The role of women in hospitality education. In C. U. Lambert (Ed.), Proceedings of the 1985 CHRIE Conference on Excellence Through Interaction (pp. 45-47). University Park, PA: Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education.

- Shores, J. H., & Chiappetta, E. L. (1977, April). Two Delphi based approaches to the establishment of valid competencies for teachers: Ranking and factor analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Simmons, H. L. (1985). The trustee role in accreditation. New Directions for Community Colleges, 13, 67-73.
- Simpson, R. D., & Brown, D. R. (1977). Validating science teaching competencies using the Delphi method. Science Education, 61, 209-219.
- Spitzer, D. R. (1977). Incentives in instructional development. Educational Technology, 17, 17-21.
- Stark, J. S., Lowther, M. A., Hagerty, B. M. K., & Orczyk, C. (1986). A conceptual framework for the study of preservice professional programs in colleges and universities. Journal of Higher Education, 57, 241-258.
- Stier, W. F., Jr. (1982, April). Faculty evaluation: A positive approach. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Houston, TX.
- Stoodley, R. V., Jr. (1981). Educational excellence: Accreditation and its potential. Journal of Studies in Technical Careers, 3, 275-288.
- Tabacchi, M. H., Stoner, R. G. (1986). Faculty internships: Industry-academe collaboration. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 27, 46-49.
- ✓ Tanke, M. L. (1984a). Accreditation criteria for hospitality management curriculum (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1984). University Microfilms International, 8423434.
- ✓ Tanke, M. L. (1984b). Accreditation survey results. University Park, PA: Council on Hotel Restaurant and Institutional Education.
- ✓ Tanke, M. L. (1985). Accreditation: What it is...and is not. F.I.U. Hospitality Review, 3, 38-44.

- Tersine, R. J., & Riggs, W. E. (1976). The Delphi technique: A long-range planning tool. Business Horizons, 19, 51-55.
- Thrash, P. A. (1979). Accreditation: A perspective. Journal of Higher Education, 50, 172-177.
- Trent, J., & Cohen, A. (1973). Research on teaching in higher education. In R. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching (pp. 997-1071). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Troutt, W. E. (1979a). Regional accreditation evaluative criteria and quality assurance. Journal of Higher Education, 50, 198-210.
- Troutt, W. E. (1979b). The quality assurance function of regional accreditation (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 29, 06.
- Troutt, W. E. (1981). Relationships between regional accrediting standards and educational quality. In R. I. Miller (Ed.), New directions for institutional research: Institutional assessment for self-improvement (pp. 45-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Turoff, M. (1972). Delphi conferencing: Computer-based conferencing with anonymity. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 3, 159-204.
- Uhl, N. P. (1975, April). Consensus and the Delphi process. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- Van Dyke, J. (1983). Placing teachers in industry. VocEd, 58, 48-49.
- Wachtel, J. M., & Pavesic, D. V. (1983). The doctorate dilemma. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 24, 35-37.
- Waskey, F. H. (1979). The application of industrial field experience to academic teaching methods. Journal of Hospitality Education, 4, 41-48.
- Weaver, W. T. (1971). The Delphi forecasting method. Phi Delta Kappan, 52, (5), 267-271.

- Whitman, N. A., Spendlove, D. C., & Clark, C. H. (1986). Increasing students' learning: A faculty guide to reducing stress among students (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Whitman, N., & Weiss, E. (1982). Faculty evaluation: The use of explicit criteria for promotion, retention, and tenure (ASHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 2). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Wilson, L. (1979). American academics: Then and now. New York: Oxford University.
- Wilson, R. C., Gaff, J. G., Dienst, E. R., Wood, L., & Bavry, J. L. (1975). College professors and their impact on students. New York: Wiley.
- Winkle, C. W., Piercy, F. P., & Hovestadt, A. J. (1981). A curriculum for graduate-level marriage and family therapy education. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 7, 201-210.
- Young, K. E. (1976). Major issues in accreditation (The President's Annual Report 1975-76). Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.
- Young, K. E. (1979). New pressures on accreditation. Journal of Higher Education, 50, 132-143.
- Young, K. E. (1983a). Accreditation: Complex evaluative tool. In K. E. Young, C. M. Chambers, & H. R. Kells (Eds.), Understanding accreditation (pp. 19-35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, K. E. (1983b). Prologue: The changing scope of accreditation. In K. E. Young, C. M. Chambers, & H. R. Kells (Eds.), Understanding accreditation (pp. 1-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Young, K. E., & Chambers, C. M. (1980). Accrediting agency approaches to academic program evaluation. In E. C. Craven (Ed.), New directions for institutional research: Academic program evaluation (pp. 89-103) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**APPENDIXES**

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INVITATION TO PANEL MEMBERS



## VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

*Blacksburg, Virginia 24061*

DIVISION OF HOTEL, RESTAURANT &amp; INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT

April 17, 1987

Dear

I am conducting a study to identify standards considered desirable for faculty in four-year hospitality management education programs. The standards will ultimately be incorporated into a model to be used during the accreditation process of hospitality management education programs. Because you are considered an expert in the field of hospitality management, I am seeking your participation in the study. Your willingness to serve on a panel will be beneficial to me as well as to the field of hospitality management education.

A modified Delphi technique consisting of three rounds will be used to identify and reach a consensus on faculty standards. The first round will present to you qualifications identified in the literature as being included in evaluation of faculty during accreditation. You will be asked to supply the standards you feel are desirable for each qualification. In succeeding rounds you will be asked to rank the desirability of including each standard in the accreditation process.

If you agree to participate in this study you will be one of a thirty member panel of experts. Anonymity is a characteristic of the Delphi technique; therefore, your name will not be associated with responses during the study. When making your decision to participate please remember



that the success of the Delphi technique and this study depends on the completion of all the rounds by all the panel members. This study will require approximately one to two hours of your time three times during the summer. I have set a target date of July 31, 1987 for the completion of the rounds.

I need your reply as soon as possible to whether you are willing to participate. Enclosed please find a personal data form and a return envelope. Completion of the enclosed form will be considered your acceptance to serve on the panel through the completion of the Delphi technique.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Diane T. Miller

Michael D. Olsen, Ph. D.  
Co-chairman  
CHRIE Accreditation  
Committee

Enclosures

PANEL MEMBER INFORMATION  
(Education Representative)

Personal Information

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Name of institution \_\_\_\_\_

Type of institution \_\_\_\_\_

Your title or position \_\_\_\_\_

Your degrees (Please include area) \_\_\_\_\_

Years of college teaching experience \_\_\_\_\_

Years of hospitality industry experience \_\_\_\_\_

Positions held in hospitality industry \_\_\_\_\_

Institution Responsibilities

Titles and numbers of courses taught (please use back of  
paper or attach a separate sheet if necessary) \_\_\_\_\_

Number of courses taught each semester/quarter \_\_\_\_\_

Number of preparations each semester/quarter \_\_\_\_\_

Average class size \_\_\_\_\_

Number of advisees \_\_\_\_\_

Administrative responsibilities \_\_\_\_\_

Institution Information

The program of hospitality management education at your institution is entitled \_\_\_\_\_

Hospitality management education at your institution includes

- Restaurant management
- Hotel/motel management
- Catering management
- Travel/tourism management
- Recreation (theme parks, etc.) management
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

Hospitality management education at your institution is

- A major in the department of \_\_\_\_\_
- A department in the division of \_\_\_\_\_
- A division in the school of \_\_\_\_\_
- A school in the college of \_\_\_\_\_
- A college

How many students does your program currently have

\_\_\_\_\_ Undergraduate          \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate

Of the number of students, how many are

\_\_\_\_\_ Majors                  \_\_\_\_\_ Minors

How many faculty are currently employed for your program

\_\_\_\_\_ Full-time          \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time

The size of your institution is

- Under 5000
- Between 5000 - 10,000
- Over 10,000

The population of the area where your institution is located is

- Under 50,000
- 50,000-100,000
- 100,000-200,000
- Above 200,000

THANK YOU!

PANEL MEMBER INFORMATION  
(Industry Representative)

Personal Information

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Company \_\_\_\_\_

Position \_\_\_\_\_

Years in this position \_\_\_\_\_

Other positions held in the hospitality industry \_\_\_\_\_

Education/training preceding this position \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever taught courses related to hospitality management? \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, in what capacity? \_\_\_\_\_

Company Information

Estimate of percent of management positions that are filled with graduates with four-year hospitality management related degrees \_\_\_\_\_

The scope of the company can be described as

- Local only
- State wide
- Nation wide
- International

The segment(s) of the hospitality industry included in the company is

- Foodservice
- Lodging
- Tourism/travel
- Recreation
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

Thank You!

APPENDIX B

DELPHI I

IDENTIFICATION OF FACULTY STANDARDS



## VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

*Blacksburg, Virginia 24061*

DIVISION OF HOTEL, RESTAURANT &amp; INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT

June 1, 1987

Dear

Thank you for agreeing to participate on the panel to identify standards for hospitality management education faculty. The decisions reached by this panel are crucial to the implementation of accreditation in college and university hospitality management education programs. Your input into this process is valued because of your reputation as an expert in the field of hospitality management.

Enclosed is the first round of the Delphi process. The questionnaire is divided into nine sections. Each section represents a qualification included in the self-study faculty component of accreditation. A description of each qualification is included on a separate page. There is a place for your name at the end of the second page; this is for my record keeping only.

Round one is probably the most time consuming and perhaps difficult round. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Your responses will be the basis for round two; therefore, it is important for you to complete this first round and return it to me in the enclosed envelope by June 15, 1987.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Diane Miller

Enclosures

## DEFINITION OF QUALIFICATION

For the purposes of this study the definition for qualification shall be a quality, accomplishment, circumstance, etc., that fits a person for the position of faculty member in a four-year hospitality management education program.

## DEFINITION OF STANDARD

For purposes of this study the definition for standard shall be any common characteristic or condition that can be used to make a judgment concerning the qualifications of a faculty member in a four-year hospitality management education program.

---

**ACADEMIC  
PREPARATION**

The advanced degrees held by the faculty, including master's and doctorates; also courses taken in preparation for the degree, etc.

**SCHOLARLY  
PREPARATION**

The extent and type of research conducted and publications produced, including books, refereed journal articles etc.

**APPLIED  
PROFESSIONAL  
EXPERIENCE**

The amount and level of related on-the-job experience, for example management or labor related experience in the hospitality industry.

**CONTINUED  
CONTACT WITH  
THE PROFESSION**

The amount and type of participation in professional associations, including offices held, seminars led, papers presented, journals edited, etc.

**COMPETENCY IN  
THE AREA OF  
SPECIALIZATION**

The instructor's level of ability in a specific area, for example, competence in areas such as food preparation, nutrition, labor relations, cost control, etc.

**TEACHING  
EFFECTIVENESS**

The capacity of the instructor to produce a desired result, including knowledge of teaching techniques, student characteristics, etc.; also advising responsibilities, and administrative duties.

**INTEREST IN  
CURRICULAR  
EXPERIMENTATION**

The willingness on the part of the instructor to try innovative teaching ideas and methods.

**ABILITY TO  
WORK WITH  
STUDENTS**

The instructor's relationships with students, including in-class rapport, out-of-class associations, advising, etc.

**PUBLIC  
SERVICE**

The participation by the instructor in activities that are of benefit to the community, including committee work, volunteer consultation, etc.

---



## DELPHI I

## Identification of Faculty Standards

Directions

Below you will find nine faculty qualifications identified as important for faculty in accredited institutions. In the space provided for each qualification please list the standards you consider to be desirable for faculty in four-year hospitality education programs.

1. ACADEMIC PREPARATION

2. SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY

3. APPLIED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

4. CONTINUED CONTACT WITH THE PROFESSION

5. COMPETENCY IN THE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION

6. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

7. INTEREST IN CURRICULAR EXPERIMENTATION

8. ABILITY TO WORK WITH STUDENTS

9. PUBLIC SERVICE

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ Education \_\_\_\_\_ Industry \_\_\_\_\_  
(Check one)

APPENDIX C  
DELPHI II  
RATING OF STANDARDS



COLLEGE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

## VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

*Blacksburg, Virginia 24061*

DIVISION OF HOTEL, RESTAURANT &amp; INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT

July 14, 1987

Dear

Thank you for completing round one of the Delphi study to determine four-year hospitality management faculty standards. Your thoroughness in round one has helped the committee arrive at a comprehensive listing of standards for faculty. These standards are now ready to be rated according to the importance you place on each for being included in accreditation standards.

The Delphi II is sixteen pages; however I am hopeful that completing it will not take an unfair amount of your time. The sections for which you have already formed opinions should move quickly.

The final round, round three, is dependent on your completing this second questionnaire. Please return the form in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible. I apologize that I do not have the luxury of allowing more time for this round. This topic is of interest to many members of CHRIE and I am scheduled to hold a paper session at the Annual Conference in Atlanta. The paper session has been changed from the one printed in the program. It is now scheduled for Saturday, August 8 from 10:50 am to 11:20 am.

Thank you again for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Diane Miller

Enclosures

DELPHI II  
RATING OF STANDARDS

Directions

Below is a listing of possible standards to be used to evaluate faculty in four-year hospitality management programs. The list was compiled from the standards identified by the panel in Delphi I. Please indicate your opinion for including each standard in the evaluation component of accreditation by placing a circle around the appropriate number. Please take this opportunity to edit any statement that you feel needs clarification.

---

Rating Scale:    4 = Very desirable            3 = Desirable  
                      2 = Undesirable                1 = Very Undesirable

---

ACADEMIC PREPARATION

I. Degrees

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member should have obtained a minimum of a bachelor's degree | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The faculty member should have obtained at least a master's degree       | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member should have obtained at least a doctor's degree       | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. The bachelor's degree should be in one of the following areas:           |   |   |   |   |
| A. Accounting   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| B. Business Administration  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| C. Communications   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| D. Economics  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| E. Education  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| F. Finance  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| G. Foods/Nutrition  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| H. Foodservice Management   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I. Hotel/Restaurant/Institution Management                                  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

---

Rating Scale:    4 = Very desirable            3 = Desirable  
                      2 = Undesirable            1 = Very Undesirable

---

J.	Marketing	4	3	2	1
K.	Personnel/Human Resources	4	3	2	1
L.	Psychology	4	3	2	1
M.	Public Administration	4	3	2	1
N.	Research/Development	4	3	2	1
O.	Travel/Tourism	4	3	2	1
P.	Vocational Education	4	3	2	1
Q.	Other _____	4	3	2	1

5. The master's degree should be in one of the following areas:

A.	Accounting	4	3	2	1
B.	Business Administration	4	3	2	1
C.	Communications	4	3	2	1
D.	Economics	4	3	2	1
E.	Education	4	3	2	1
F.	Finance	4	3	2	1
G.	Foods/Nutrition	4	3	2	1
H.	Foodservice Management	4	3	2	1
I.	Hotel/Restaurant/Institution Management	4	3	2	1
J.	Marketing	4	3	2	1
K.	Personnel/Human Resources	4	3	2	1
L.	Psychology	4	3	2	1
M.	Public Administration	4	3	2	1
N.	Research/Development	4	3	2	1
O.	Travel/Tourism	4	3	2	1
P.	Vocational Education	4	3	2	1
Q.	Other _____	4	3	2	1

6. The doctor's degree should be in one of the following areas:

A.	Accounting	4	3	2	1
B.	Business Administration	4	3	2	1
C.	Communications	4	3	2	1

---

Rating Scale:    4 = Very desirable            3 = Desirable  
                      2 = Undesirable            1 = Very Undesirable

---

D.	Economics	4	3	2	1
E.	Education	4	3	2	1
F.	Finance	4	3	2	1
G.	Foods/Nutrition	4	3	2	1
H.	Foodservice Management	4	3	2	1
I.	Hotel/Restaurant/Institution Management	4	3	2	1
J.	Law	4	3	2	1
K.	Marketing	4	3	2	1
L.	Personnel/Human Resources	4	3	2	1
M.	Psychology	4	3	2	1
N.	Public Administration	4	3	2	1
O.	Research/Development	4	3	2	1
P.	Travel/Tourism	4	3	2	1
Q.	Vocational Education	4	3	2	1
R.	Other_____	4	3	2	1

7. The degree should be related to faculty rank as follows:

A.	Instructor-				
	a. Bachelor's	4	3	2	1
	b. Master's	4	3	2	1
B.	Assistant Professor-				
	a. Bachelor's	4	3	2	1
	b. Master's	4	3	2	1
	c. Doctor's	4	3	2	1
C.	Associate Professor-				
	a. Bachelor's	4	3	2	1
	b. Master's	4	3	2	1
	c. Doctor's	4	3	2	1
D.	Full Professor-				
	a. Master's	4	3	2	1
	b. Doctor's	4	3	2	1

---

Rating Scale:	4 = Very desirable	3 = Desirable
	2 = Undesirable	1 = Very Undesirable

---

## II. Course Work

1. The faculty member should have had undergraduate or graduate course work in the following subjects:

A. Accounting	4	3	2	1
B. Biology	4	3	2	1
C. Business Administration	4	3	2	1
D. Chemistry	4	3	2	1
E. Computers	4	3	2	1
F. Economics	4	3	2	1
G. Education	4	3	2	1
H. Finance	4	3	2	1
I. Food Preparation	4	3	2	1
J. Foreign Languages	4	3	2	1
K. Humanities	4	3	2	1
L. Labor Relations	4	3	2	1
M. Laws related to the Hospitality Industry	4	3	2	1
N. Marketing	4	3	2	1
O. Mathematics	4	3	2	1
P. Nutrition	4	3	2	1
Q. Psychology	4	3	2	1
R. Research Methods	4	3	2	1
S. Other _____	4	3	2	1

## III. Miscellaneous

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The institution from which the faculty member received the degree should have a reputation for quality | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The faculty member should continue to receive Continuing Education Units                               | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member should provide documentation of academic preparation                                | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |



---

Rating Scale:    4 = Very desirable            3 = Desirable  
                   2 = Undesirable                1 = Very Undesirable

---

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. The faculty member should have had previous teaching experience  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. The faculty member should have had hands-on experience in the hospitality industry as part of academic preparation | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY

#### I. Research

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member of a larger university should conduct research relating to the hospitality industry  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The faculty member of a smaller university should conduct research relating to the hospitality industry | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member should have published findings of completed research                                 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. The number of yearly research projects completed by a faculty member should be                          |   |   |   |   |
| A. One   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| B. Two   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| C. Three   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| D. Four  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| E. Five  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| F. More than five  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

#### II. Publication

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member should be published in refereed journals (manuscripts have been reviewed and approved by a peer group) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|--|---|---|---|---|

---

Rating Scale:    4 = Very desirable            3 = Desirable  
                      2 = Undesirable            1 = Very Undesirable

---

- |    |  |   |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | The faculty member should be involved in scholarly writing prior to textbook publications              | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. | The faculty member should be involved in publication as determined by the institution's review process | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. | The faculty member should be published in trade publications   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. | The faculty member should author material for or in Cooperative Extension publications                 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. | The faculty member should author textbooks   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. | The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should be                                       |   |   |   |   |
|    | A. One   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | B. Two   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | C. Three   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | D. Four  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | E. Five  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | F. More than five  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. | The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should vary according to the teaching rank      | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### III. Miscellaneous

- |    |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The faculty member should be active in presenting lectures, seminars, etc, in areas of the faculty member's expertise | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | There should be evidence that the faculty member is remaining current in the field                                    | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

---

Rating Scale:	4 = Very desirable	3 = Desirable
	2 = Undesirable	1 = Very Undesirable

---

### APPLIED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

#### I. Management Level

1. The faculty member should have a minimum of \_\_\_\_\_ years management experience in some area of the hospitality industry

A. One	4	3	2	1
B. Two	4	3	2	1
C. Three	4	3	2	1
D. Four	4	3	2	1
E. Five	4	3	2	1
F. Other _____	4	3	2	1

2. The management experience should be related to the courses taught by the faculty member

4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---

#### II. Technical or On-Line Experience

1. The faculty member should have a minimum of \_\_\_\_\_ years experience in the technical areas of the hospitality industry

A. One	4	3	2	1
B. Two	4	3	2	1
C. Three	4	3	2	1
D. Four	4	3	2	1
E. Five	4	3	2	1
F. Other _____	4	3	2	1

2. The technical experience should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member

4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---

#### III. Continued Professional Experience

1. The faculty member should continue to obtain on-the-job experience at regular intervals

4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---

---

Rating Scale:	4 = Very desirable	3 = Desirable
	2 = Undesirable	1 = Very Undesirable

---

## IV. Miscellaneous

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. At times, professional experience should be acceptable in lieu of academic preparation | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

## CONTINUED CONTACT WITH THE PROFESSION

## I. Membership in Associations

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member should be a member of professional associations                                 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The faculty member should be a member of trade/industry associations                               | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. These professional associations might include  |   |   |   |   |
| A. American Hotel & Motel Association   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| B. Council on Hotel, Restaurant & Institutional Education   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| C. Council of Hotel & Restaurant Trainers   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| D. National Restaurant Association  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| E. Society for Foodservice Management   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| F. Other _____  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. The faculty member should have an association with a wine group                                    | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. Membership in professional associations should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

---

Rating Scale:    4 = Very desirable            3 = Desirable  
                      2 = Undesirable            1 = Very Undesirable

---

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 6. Membership in professional associations should reflect the faculty member's area of specialization | 4   3   2   1 |
| 7. The faculty member should hold membership at the national level of the association                 | 4   3   2   1 |
| 8. The faculty member should hold membership at the state level of the association                    | 4   3   2   1 |

## II. Involvement in Associations

- |  |               |
|--|---------------|
| 1. The faculty member should attend at least _____ convention(s) of an association for which he/she is a member per year |               |
| A. One   | 4   3   2   1 |
| B. Two   | 4   3   2   1 |
| C. Three   | 4   3   2   1 |
| D. Other _____   | 4   3   2   1 |
| 2. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis, on the program of an association's yearly convention       | 4   3   2   1 |
| 3. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis in the following:   |               |
| A. Committee Work  | 4   3   2   1 |
| B. Holding an Office   | 4   3   2   1 |
| C. Paper Reviewer  | 4   3   2   1 |
| D. Other _____   | 4   3   2   1 |
| 4. The faculty member should participate, as possible, on editorial boards of professional associations                  | 4   3   2   1 |

---

Rating Scale:	4 = Very desirable	3 = Desirable
	2 = Undesirable	1 = Very Undesirable

---

### III. Direct Contact With Industry

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member should function as a lecturer to industry         | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The faculty member should function as a consultant to industry       | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member should function as a board member within industry | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### COMPETENCY IN THE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION

#### I. Generalist Versus Specialist

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member should have a foundation of core courses in hospitality education before specializing | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The faculty member in a small program should be a generalist   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member in a small program should be a specialist   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. The faculty member in a large program should be a generalist   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. The faculty member in a large program should be a specialist   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

#### II. Evidence of Specialization

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Course work of the faculty member shows concentration in area of specialization | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Industry experience of the faculty member is related to area of specialization  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

---

Rating Scale:    4 = Very desirable            3 = Desirable  
                      2 = Undesirable            1 = Very Undesirable

---

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. The faculty member has served as a consultant in the area of specialization                      | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. The faculty member is published in the area of specialization                                    | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. The faculty member is recognized as one of the outstanding persons in the area of specialization | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. The faculty member has had paid employment in the area of specialization                         | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### III. Maintenance of Specialization

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member remains current in area of specialization through seminars, meetings, site visits, readings, continued education, publications, involvement in industry associations, etc. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Course outlines for the courses of the faculty member are updated based on new developments in area of specialization   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member is evaluated by education peers every three years  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. The faculty member is evaluated by industry peers every three years   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. The faculty member maintains certification by industry practitioners; i.e., CHA   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

---

Rating Scale:	4 = Very desirable	3 = Desirable
	2 = Undesirable	1 = Very Undesirable

---

### TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

#### I. Who Should Evaluate Effectiveness

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by students          | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by peers             | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by the chair or dean | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

#### II. Elements of Teaching Effectiveness

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member has had course work in teaching methods for the college level   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The faculty member can design and organize a course on paper, including objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation experiences | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member displays interest in developing the student as a person and as a future leader in the industry                    | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. The faculty member understands that learning is based on previous experience and knowledge   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. The faculty member is capable of evaluating student performance  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. The faculty member is capable of advising students in academics  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. The faculty member is capable of advising students in careers  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |



---

Rating Scale:    4 = Very desirable            3 = Desirable  
                      2 = Undesirable                1 = Very Undesirable

---

- |     |  |   |   |   |   |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 8.  | The faculty member realizes that the instructor is often a role model  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9.  | The faculty member is sensitive to stress factors in students  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. | The faculty member accepts administrative responsibilities   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. | The faculty member possesses an appreciation of higher academic rank   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. | The faculty member supports student activities   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 13. | The faculty member encourages academic/business relationships for students                                   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. | The faculty member has a professional "presence" in the classroom  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 15. | The faculty member is a firm leader in the classroom   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16. | The faculty member uses correct communication in the classroom   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 17. | The faculty member has a knowledge of adult learning theory  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 18. | The faculty member has a working knowledge of teaching techniques including case studies, role playing, etc. | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 19. | The faculty member is familiar with competency based curriculum  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 20. | The faculty member has the ability to establish and maintain a rapport with students                         | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 21. | The faculty member encourages creative thinking  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

---

Rating Scale:      4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
                          2 = Undesirable            1 = Very Undesirable

---

- |     |  |   |   |   |   |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 22. | The faculty member is fair and prompt with grades                                      | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 23. | The faculty adapts teaching style to needs of the students                             | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 24. | The faculty member delivers information in a clear, well-organized, interesting format | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### III. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

- |    |  |   |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Students have learned under the instruction of the faculty member as evidenced by grades | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | Other _____  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### INTEREST IN CURRICULAR EXPERIMENTATION

#### I. General Information

- |    |  |   |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Interest in curricular experimentation should be a major consideration when evaluating faculty | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|

#### II. Evidence of Interest in Curricular Experimentation

- |    |  |   |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The faculty member demonstrates interest in curricular experimentation through   |   |   |   |   |
| A. | Correlation of curriculum with industry needs                                    | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| B. | Commitment to thorough preparation for classes and minimum reliance on textbooks | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| C. | Willingness to try new ideas   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| D. | Leadership in acceptance of curriculum change                                    | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

---

Rating Scale:    4 = Very desirable            3 = Desirable  
                      2 = Undesirable                1 = Very Undesirable

---

E. Tests the value of the change	4	3	2	1
F. Varying lecture format	4	3	2	1
G. Use of computers	4	3	2	1
H. Use of case studies	4	3	2	1
I. Use of outside field visits	4	3	2	1
J. Keeping up-to-date on new teaching methods through reading and attendance at teaching skills workshops	4	3	2	1
2. The faculty member should teach a new course every two years	4	3	2	1

#### ABILITY TO WORK WITH STUDENTS

I. Who Should Evaluate Ability to Work With Students				
1. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by students	4	3	2	1
2. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by chair or dean	4	3	2	1
3. The faculty member should submit a list of student activities he/she is involved in to chair	4	3	2	1
II. Evidence of Ability to Work With Students				
1. The faculty member should establish a rapport with students without losing class control	4	3	2	1

---

Rating Scale:     4 = Very desirable             3 = Desirable  
                       2 = Undesirable                 1 = Very Undesirable

---

- |     |  |   |   |   |   |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 2.  | The faculty member encourages the students in activities that relate to the hospitality industry | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3.  | The faculty participates in student organizations  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4.  | The faculty member shows appreciation of student development toward professional status          | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5.  | The faculty member is available to the students  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6.  | The faculty member has the respect of the students   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7.  | The faculty member shows genuine concern for the students  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8.  | The faculty member is a leader, not a friend   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9.  | The faculty member expects and receives only quality work  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. | The faculty member has good oral communication skills  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. | The faculty member has knowledge of the career opportunities in the hospitality industry         | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. | The faculty member participates in advising  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 13. | The faculty member has directed internship programs  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. | The faculty member has directed independent studies  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 15. | The faculty member has directed special classroom projects                                       | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

---

Rating Scale:	4 = Very desirable	3 = Desirable
	2 = Undesirable	1 = Very Undesirable

---

### PUBLIC SERVICE

#### I. Importance of Public Service

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member should be evaluated on the public service he/she performs              | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Public service should only be a concern after all teaching responsibilities have been met | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Public service is good public relations and helps to recruit students                     | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. Other _____   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

#### II. Evidence of Public Service

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The faculty member participates in community activities, such as the Chamber of Commerce, etc.             | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. The faculty member participates on college and department committees                                       | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member has established acquaintanceships and rapport with local restauranteurs and inn keepers | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. The faculty member is involved in the development of continuing education for people in the industry       | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. The faculty member is willing to serve in the community when asked   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

#### III. Amount of Public Service

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Early each academic year, the department head and the instructor should agree on an hourly allocation in public service | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|--|---|---|---|---|

Rating Scale:	4 = Very desirable	3 = Desirable
	2 = Undesirable	1 = Very Undesirable

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Public service requests should be rotated through the entire faculty and no faculty member should be exempt from minimum volunteer consultations | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member should participate in _____ hours of public service each year   |   |   |   |   |
| A. Five - Ten   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| B. Ten - Twenty   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| C. Twenty - Thirty  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| D. Thirty - Forty   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| E. Forty - Fifty  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| F. More than fifty  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Industry \_\_\_\_\_ Education \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX D

DELPHI III

REEXAMINATION OF STANDARDS FOR FOUR-YEAR  
HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT EDUCATION FACULTY



## VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

*Blacksburg, Virginia 24061*

DIVISION OF HOTEL, RESTAURANT &amp; INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT

July 30, 1987

Dear

Thank you for your prompt return of round two. The Delphi process will be completed with this third and final round. Directions for Delphi III are on the survey. If you have any questions please call me.

During this round the panel will seek consensus on whether or not to include each standard in accreditation for four-year hospitality management education. At the completion of this study a listing of those faculty standards chosen by two-thirds the panel as "very desirable" and "desirable" will be compiled. I will recommend that this list be incorporated into evaluation standards for the self-study component of accreditation.

Thank you once again for your willingness to participate in this project. Your time and cooperation have been invaluable. A preliminary report of the findings of this study will be given at the CHRIE Convention in Atlanta. The paper session is scheduled for Saturday, August 8 at 10:50. A copy of the final listing of faculty standards selected by the panel for accreditation of four-year hospitality management education programs will be sent to you. Also, I may be able to provide you a copy of the dissertation upon request.



It has been my pleasure to have you as a part of this panel and to talk to many of you on the phone. If you are in Atlanta in August, I hope you will attend the paper session and introduce yourself to me. If there is ever anyway I can be of service to your organization please do not hesitate to ask.

Sincerely,

Diane Miller

Enclosures

## DELPHI III

REEXAMINATION OF STANDARDS FOR FOUR-YEAR  
HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT EDUCATION FACULTYDirections

The following list of faculty standards is a duplicate of Delphi II; however, some of the statements will show minor editing based on comments from the panel. Also, some new statements have been generated based on comments from Delphi II. These statements are marked with an asterisk (\*). Round three is the panel's opportunity to reach, if possible, agreement on what standards are desirable during accreditation for faculty in four-year hospitality management education programs. This phase of the study provides you, as a member of this panel, a chance to reconsider your initial responses in view of the ratings given by the other members. The most frequently chosen response for each statement is enclosed in brackets and your response is underlined. Please complete the following steps:

1. Review each faculty standard and note the indication of the rating most frequently chosen by members of the panel.
2. Compare your response with that of the panel.
3. If your response differs, make a decision to
  - a. change your rating to agree with the most frequently chosen rating for that standard, or
  - b. keep your rating as it is.
4. Indicate your decision
  - a. to change to that of the group by circling the number enclosed in brackets
  - b. to keep your rating as it is by doing nothing
5. If you decide not to agree with the rating most frequently mentioned, defend your decision in the space provided.
6. Rate the new statements.
7. Return Delphi III in the enclosed envelope by July 29, 1987.

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable                      3 = Desirable  
                   2 = Undesirable                        1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments**ACADEMIC PREPARATION****I. Degrees**

- |   |     |     |     |   |
|---|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 1. The faculty member should have obtained a minimum of a bachelor's degree | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| 2. The faculty member should have obtained at least a master's degree       | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| 3. The faculty member should have obtained at least a doctor's degree       | 4   | [3] | 2   | 1 |
| 4. Suggested or recommended areas for the bachelor's degree include         |     |     |     |   |
| A. Accounting   | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| B. Business Administration  | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| C. Communications   | 4   | [3] | 2   | 1 |
| D. Economics  | 4   | [3] | 2   | 1 |
| E. Education  | 4   | 3   | [2] | 1 |
| F. Finance  | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| G. Foods/Nutrition  | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| H. Foodservice Management   | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| I. Hotel/Restaurant Institution/Management                                  | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| J. Marketing  | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| K. Personnel/Human Resources  | [4] | 3   | 2   | 1 |
| L. Psychology   | 4   | [3] | 2   | 1 |
| M. Public Administration  | 4   | 3   | [2] | 1 |
| N. Research and Development   | 4   | 3   | [2] | 1 |
| O. Travel/Tourism   | 4   | [3] | 2   | 1 |
| P. Vocational Education   | 4   | [3] | 2   | 1 |
| *Q. Culinary Arts   | 4   | 3   | 2   | 1 |

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable                      3 = Desirable  
                   2 = Undesirable                         1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

5. Suggested or recommended areas for the master's degree include:

A. Accounting	4	[3]	2	1
B. Business Administration	4	[3]	2	1
C. Communications	4	[3]	2	1
D. Economics	4	[3]	2	1
F. Education	4	[3]	2	1
F. Finance	4	[3]	2	1
G. Foods/Nutrition	4	[3]	2	1
H. Foodservice Management	4	[3]	2	1
I. Hotel/Restaurant/ Institution Management	[4]	3	2	1
J. Marketing	4	[3]	2	1
K. Personnel/Human Resources	4	[3]	2	1
L. Psychology	4	3	[2]	1
M. Public Administration	4	3	[2]	1
N. Research/Development	4	3	[2]	1
O. Travel/Tourism	4	[3]	2	1
P. Vocational Education	4	[3]	2	1

6. Suggested or recommended areas for the doctor's or terminal degree include the following:

A. Accounting	[4]	3	2	1
B. Business Administration	4	[3]	2	1
C. Communications	4	[3]	2	1
D. Economics	4	[3]	2	1
E. Education	4	[3]	2	1
F. Finance	4	[3]	2	1
G. Foods/Nutrition	4	[3]	2	1
H. Foodservice Management	[4]	3	2	1
I. Hotel/Restaurant/ Institution Management	[4]	3	2	1

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

				<u>Comments</u>		
J.	Law	[4]	3	2	1	
K.	Marketing	4	[3]	2	1	
L.	Personnel/Human Resources	4	[3]	2	1	
M.	Psychology	4	[3]	2	1	
N.	Public Administration	4	3	[2]	1	
O.	Research/Development	4	[3]	2	1	
P.	Travel/Tourism	4	[3]	2	1	
Q.	Vocational Education	4	[3]	2	1	
*R.	Chemistry	4	3	2	1	
*S.	Microbiology	4	3	2	1	
*T.	Sociology	4	3	2	1	
7. The degree should be related to faculty rank as follows:						
A.	Instructor-					
	Bachelor's	[4]	3	2	1	
	Master's	4	[3]	2	1	
B.	Assistant Professor-					
	Bachelor's	[4]	3	2	1	
	Master's	4	[3]	2	1	
	Doctor's	4	[3]	2	1	
C.	Associate Professor-					
	Bachelor's	[4]	3	2	1	
	Master's	[4]	3	2	1	
	Doctor's	[4]	3	2	1	
D.	Full Professor-					
	Master's	[4]	3	2	1	
	Doctor's	[4]	3	2	1	
*8.	The bachelor's degree should be in an area related to the faculty member's teaching/research assignment	4	3	2	1	
*9.	The master's degree should be in an area related to the faculty member's teaching/research assignment	4	3	2	1	

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
                   2 = Undesirable        1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

- \*10. The doctor's or terminal degree should be in the area of the faculty member's teaching/research assignment      4    3    2    1
- \*11. The relationship of faculty degrees to rank should be left to the individual institution not accreditation standards      4    3    2    1

## II. Course Work

1. The faculty member should have had undergraduate or graduate course work in the following subjects:

A. Accounting	[4]	3	2	1
B. Biology	4	3	[2]	1
C. Business Administration	[4]	3	2	1
D. Chemistry	4	3	[2]	1
E. Computers	[4]	3	2	1
F. Economics	4	[3]	2	1
G. Education	4	[3]	2	1
H. Finance	4	[3]	2	1
I. Food Preparation	[4]	3	2	1
J. Foreign Languages	4	[3]	2	1
K. Humanities	4	[3]	2	1
L. Labor Relations	4	[3]	2	1
M. Laws related to the Hospitality Industry	4	[3]	2	1
N. Marketing	[4]	3	2	1
O. Mathematics	4	[3]	2	1
P. Nutrition	4	[3]	2	1
Q. Psychology	4	[3]	2	1
R. Research Methods	4	[3]	2	1
*S. Communications	4	3	2	1

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable                      3 = Desirable  
                   2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

- \*2. The faculty member's  
 course work background  
 should relate to teaching  
 assignment    4    3    2    1

## III. Miscellaneous

1. The institution from which  
 the faculty member received  
 the degree should have  
 a reputation for quality                              [4] 3    2    1
2. The faculty member should  
 continue to receive Continuing  
 Education Units (CEU)                              4 [3] 2    1
3. The faculty member should  
 provide documentation of  
 academic preparation                                [4] 3    2    1
4. The faculty member should  
 have had previous teaching  
 experience    4 [3] 2    1
5. The faculty member should  
 have had hands-on experience  
 in the hospitality industry  
 as part of academic  
 preparation    [4] 3    2    1

**SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY**

## I. Research

1. The faculty member of  
 a larger university  
 should conduct research  
 relating to the  
 hospitality industry                                      [4] 3    2    1
2. The faculty member of a  
 smaller university should  
 conduct research relating  
 to the hospitality industry                              4 [3] 2    1

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable                      3 = Desirable  
                   2 = Undesirable                        1 = Very undesirable

---

					<u>Comments</u>	
3.	The faculty member should have published findings of completed research	[4]	3	2	1	
4.	The number of yearly research projects completed by a faculty member should be					
	A. One	[4]	3	2	1	
	B. Two	[4]	3	2	1	
	C. Three	4	[3]	2	1	
	D. Four	4	3	2	[1]	
	E. Five	4	3	2	[1]	
	F. More than five	4	3	2	[1]	
*5.	The number of yearly research projects completed by the faculty member should be in keeping with university and programmatic standards	4	3	2	1	

## II. Publication

1.	The faculty member should be published in refereed journals (manuscripts have been reviewed and approved by a peer group)	4	[3]	2	1	
2.	The faculty member should be involved in scholarly writing prior to textbook publications	4	[3]	2	1	
3.	The faculty member should be involved in publication as determined by the institution's review process	4	[3]	2	1	
4.	The faculty member should be published in trade publications	4	[3]	2	1	



---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

5. The faculty member should author material for or in Cooperative Extension publications 4 [3] 2 1
6. The faculty member should author textbooks 4 [3] 2 1
7. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should be
- A. One [4] 3 2 1
- B. Two [4] 3 2 1
- C. Three [4] 3 2 1
- D. Four 4 [3] 2 1
- E. Five 4 [3] 2 1
- F. More than five 4 3 2 [1]
8. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should vary according to the teaching rank and research assignment 4 [3] 2 1
- \*9. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should vary with tenure track or year-to-year appointment 4 3 2 1

## III. Miscellaneous

1. The faculty member should be active in presenting lectures, seminars, etc., in the areas of the faculty member's expertise [4] 3 2 1
2. There should be evidence that the faculty member is remaining current in the field [4] 3 2 1

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable                      3 = Desirable  
                   2 = Undesirable                         1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments**APPLIED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE****I. Management Level**

1. The faculty member should have a minimum of \_\_\_\_\_ years management experience in some area of the hospitality industry

A. One	[4]	3	2	1
B. Two	4	[3]	2	1
C. Three	[4]	3	2	1
D. Four	[4]	3	2	1
E. Five	4	[3]	2	1
F. Other	[4]	3	2	1
*G. Six	4	3	2	1

2. The management experience should be related to the courses taught by the faculty member

[4]	3	2	1
-----	---	---	---

**II. Technical or On-Line Experience**

1. The faculty member should have a minimum of \_\_\_\_\_ years experience in the technical areas of the hospitality industry

A. One	[4]	3	2	1
B. Two	4	[3]	2	1
C. Three	[4]	3	2	1
D. Four	4	[3]	2	1
E. Five	4	[3]	2	1
F. Other	4	[3]	2	1

2. The technical experience should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member

[4]	3	2	1
-----	---	---	---

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

## III. Continued Professional Experience

1. The faculty member should continue to obtain on-the-job managerial experience at regular intervals                      4 [3] 2 1

## IV. Miscellaneous

1. At times, professional experience should be acceptable in lieu of academic preparation                      [4] 3 2 1

## CONTINUED CONTACT WITH THE PROFESSION

## I. Membership in Associations

1. The faculty member should be a member of professional associations                      [4] 3 2 1
2. The faculty member should be a member of trade/industry associations                      [4] 3 2 1
3. These professional associations might include the following:
- A. American Hotel & Motel Association                      4 [3] 2 1
- B. Council on Hotel, Restaurant & Institutional Education                      4 [3] 2 1
- C. Council of Hotel & Restaurant Trainers                      4 [3] 2 1
- D. National Restaurant Association                      [4] 3 2 1

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

				<u>Comments</u>	
E.	Society for the Advancement of Foodservice Management	4	[3]	2 1	
*F.	Foodservice Management Educational Council	4	3	2 1	
*G.	American Dietetics Association	4	3	2 1	
*H.	Travel & Tourism Research Association	4	3	2 1	
*I.	American Home Economics Association	4	3	2 1	
*J.	International Foodservice Executives Association	4	3	2 1	
*K.	American Culinary Federation	4	3	2 1	
4.	The faculty member should have an association with a wine group	4	3	[2] 1	
5.	Membership in professional associations should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member	4	[3]	2 1	
6.	Membership in professional associations should reflect the faculty member's area of specialization	[4]	3	2 1	
7.	The faculty member should hold membership at the national level of the association	[4]	3	2 1	
8.	The faculty member should hold membership at the state level of the association	4	[3]	2 1	

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable                      3 = Desirable  
                   2 = Undesirable                        1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

## II. Involvement in Associations

1. The faculty member should attend at least \_\_\_\_\_ convention(s) of an association for which he/she is a member per year
- |                |     |     |   |   |
|----------------|-----|-----|---|---|
| A. One         | [4] | 3   | 2 | 1 |
| B. Two         | 4   | [3] | 2 | 1 |
| C. Three       | 4   | [3] | 2 | 1 |
| D. Other _____ | 4   | [3] | 2 | 1 |
2. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis, on the program of an association's yearly convention
- |  |   |     |   |   |
|--|---|-----|---|---|
|  | 4 | [3] | 2 | 1 |
|--|---|-----|---|---|
3. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis in the following:
- |                      |   |     |   |   |
|----------------------|---|-----|---|---|
| A. Committee Work    | 4 | [3] | 2 | 1 |
| B. Holding an Office | 4 | [3] | 2 | 1 |
| C. Paper Reviewer    | 4 | [3] | 2 | 1 |
| D. Other _____       | 4 | [3] | 2 | 1 |
4. The faculty member should participate, if possible, on editorial boards of professional associations
- |  |   |     |   |   |
|--|---|-----|---|---|
|  | 4 | [3] | 2 | 1 |
|--|---|-----|---|---|

## III. Direct Contact With Industry

1. The faculty member should be able to function as a lecturer to industry
- |  |   |     |   |   |
|--|---|-----|---|---|
|  | 4 | [3] | 2 | 1 |
|--|---|-----|---|---|
2. The faculty member should be able to function as a consultant to industry
- |  |     |   |   |   |
|--|-----|---|---|---|
|  | [4] | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|--|-----|---|---|---|

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

3. The faculty member should function as a board member within industry      4 [3] 2 1

**COMPETENCY IN THE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION****I. Generalist Versus Specialist**

1. The faculty member should have a foundation of core courses in hospitality education before specializing      [4] 3 2 1
2. The faculty member in a small program should be a generalist      [4] 3 2 1
3. The faculty member in a small program should be a specialist      4 3 [2] 1
4. The faculty member in a large program should be a generalist      4 [3] 2 1
5. The faculty member in a large program should be a specialist      4 [3] 2 1

**II. Evidence of Specialization**

1. Course work of the faculty member shows concentration in area of specialization      4 [3] 2 1
2. Industry experience of the faculty member is related to area of specialization      [4] 3 2 1
3. The faculty member has served as a consultant in the area of specialization      4 [3] 2 1

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

- |    |  |           |
|----|--|-----------|
| 4. | The faculty member is published in the area of specialization                                    | 4 [3] 2 1 |
| 5. | The faculty member is recognized as one of the outstanding persons in the area of specialization | 4 [3] 2 1 |
| 6. | The faculty member has had paid employment in the area of specialization                         | 4 [3] 2 1 |

## III. Maintenance of Specialization

- |    |   |           |
|----|---|-----------|
| 1. | The faculty member remains current in area of specialization through seminars, meetings, site visits, readings, continued education, publications, involvement in industry associations, etc. | [4] 3 2 1 |
| 2. | Course outlines for the courses of the faculty member are updated based on new developments in area of specialization   | [4] 3 2 1 |
| 3. | The faculty member is evaluated by education peers every three years  | [4] 3 2 1 |
| 4. | The faculty member is evaluated by industry peers every three years   | 4 [3] 2 1 |
| 5. | The faculty member maintains certification by industry practitioners; i.e., CHA   | 4 [3] 2 1 |

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments**TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS****I. Who Should Evaluate Effectiveness**

1. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by students      4 [3] 2 1
2. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by peers      4 [3] 2 1
3. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by the chair or dean      [4] 3 2 1

**II. Elements of Teaching Effectiveness**

1. The faculty member has had course work in teaching methods for the college level      4 [3] 2 1
2. The faculty member can design and organize a course on paper, including objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation experiences      4 [3] 2 1
3. The faculty member displays interest in developing the student as a person and as a future leader in the industry      [4] 3 2 1
4. The faculty member understands that learning is based on previous experience and knowledge      [4] 3 2 1
5. The faculty member is capable of evaluating student performance      [4] 3 2 1



---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

				<u>Comments</u>
6.	The faculty member is capable of advising students in academics	[4]	3 2 1	
7.	The faculty member is capable of advising students in careers	4	[3] 2 1	
8.	The faculty member realizes that the instructor is usually a role model	[4]	3 2 1	
9.	The faculty member is sensitive to stress factors in students	4	[3] 2 1	
10.	The faculty member accepts administrative responsibilities	4	[3] 2 1	
11.	The faculty member possesses an appreciation of higher academic rank	4	3 [2] 1	
12.	The faculty member supports student activities	4	[3] 2 1	
13.	The faculty member encourages academic/business relationships for students	[4]	3 2 1	
14.	The faculty member has a professional "presence" in the classroom	[4]	3 2 1	
15.	The faculty member is a firm leader in the classroom	[4]	3 2 1	
16.	The faculty member uses correct communication in the classroom	[4]	3 2 1	

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

- |     |  |           |
|-----|--|-----------|
| 17. | The faculty member has a knowledge of adult learning theory  | 4 [3] 2 1 |
| 18. | The faculty member has a working knowledge of teaching techniques including case studies, role playing, etc. | 4 [3] 2 1 |
| 19. | The faculty member is familiar with competency based curriculum  | 4 [3] 2 1 |
| 20. | The faculty member has the ability to establish and maintain a rapport with students                         | [4] 3 2 1 |
| 21. | The faculty member encourages creative thinking  | [4] 3 2 1 |
| 22. | The faculty member is fair and prompt with grades  | 4 [3] 2 1 |
| 23. | The faculty member adapts teaching style to needs of the students  | 4 [3] 2 1 |
| 24. | The faculty member delivers information in a clear, well-organized, interesting format                       | [4] 3 2 1 |

## III. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

- |    |  |           |
|----|--|-----------|
| 1. | Students have learned under the instruction of the faculty member as evidenced by grades | 4 [3] 2 1 |
|----|--|-----------|

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

## 2. Other

*A. Assessment by students	4	3	2	1
*B. Student performance in higher level courses	4	3	2	1

## INTEREST IN CURRICULAR EXPERIMENTATION

## I. General Information

1. Interest in curricular experimentation should be a major consideration when evaluating faculty	4	[3]	2	1
--	---	-----	---	---

## II. Evidence of Interest in Curricular Experimentation

1. The faculty member demonstrates interest in curricular experimentation through the following:				
A. Correlation of curriculum with industry needs	4	[3]	2	1
B. Commitment to thorough preparation for classes and minimum reliance on textbooks	4	[3]	2	1
C. Willingness to try new ideas	[4]	3	2	1
D. Leadership in acceptance of curriculum change	4	[3]	2	1
E. Tests the value of the change	4	[3]	2	1
F. Varying lecture format	4	[3]	2	1
G. Use of computers	4	[3]	2	1
H. Use of case studies	4	[3]	2	1

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

				<u>Comments</u>
I. Use of outside field visits	4	[3]	2	1
J. Keeping up-to-date on new teaching methods through reading and attendance at teaching skills workshops	4	[3]	2	1
2. The faculty member should teach a new course every two years	4	3	[2]	1

#### ABILITY TO WORK WITH STUDENTS

I. Who Should Evaluate Ability to Work With Students				
1. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by students	4	[3]	2	1
2. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by chair or dean	4	[3]	2	1
3. The faculty member should submit a list of student activities he/she is involved in to chair	4	[3]	2	1
II. Evidence of Ability to Work With Students				
1. The faculty member should establish a rapport with students without losing class control		[4]	3	2 1
2. The faculty member encourages the students in activities that relate to the hospitality industry		[4]	3	2 1

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

				<u>Comments</u>
3.	The faculty participates in student organizations	4	[3] 2 1	
4.	The faculty member shows appreciation of student development toward professional status	4	[3] 2 1	
5.	The faculty member is available to the students	[4]	3 2 1	
6.	The faculty member has the respect of the students	[4]	3 2 1	
7.	The faculty member shows genuine concern for the students	[4]	3 2 1	
8.	The faculty member is a leader not a friend	[4]	3 2 1	
9.	The faculty member expects and receives only quality work	4	[3] 2 1	
10.	The faculty member has good oral communication skills	[4]	3 2 1	
11.	The faculty member has knowledge of the career opportunities in the hospitality industry	[4]	3 2 1	
12.	The faculty member participates in advising	4	[3] 2 1	
13.	The faculty member has directed internship programs	4	[3] 2 1	
14.	The faculty member has directed independent studies	4	[3] 2 1	

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

15. The faculty member has directed special classroom projects 4 [3] 2 1

**PUBLIC SERVICE****I. Importance of Public Service**

1. The faculty member should be evaluated on the public service he/she performs 4 3 [2] 1
2. Public service should only be a concern after all teaching and research responsibilities have been met 4 [3] 2 1
3. Public service is good public relations and helps to recruit students 4 [3] 2 1

**II. Evidence of Public Service**

1. The faculty member participates in community activities, such as the Chamber of Commerce, etc. 4 3 [2] 1
2. The faculty member participates on college and department committees 4 [3] 2 1
3. The faculty member has established acquaintanceships and rapport with local restaurateurs and inn keepers 4 [3] 2 1
4. The faculty member is involved in the development of continuing education for people in the industry 4 [3] 2 1

---

Rating scale: 4 = Very desirable      3 = Desirable  
 2 = Undesirable                      1 = Very undesirable

---

Comments

5. The faculty member is willing to serve in the community when necessary      4 [3] 2 1

## III. Amount of Public Service

1. Early each academic year, the department head and the instructor should agree on an hourly allocation in public service      4 3 [2] 1
2. Public service requests should be rotated through the entire faculty and no faculty member should be exempt from minimum volunteer consultations      4 [3] 2 1
3. The faculty member should participate in \_\_\_\_\_ hours of public service each year
- A. Five - Ten      [4] 3 2 1
- B. Ten - Twenty      [4] 3 2 1
- C. Twenty - Thirty      4 3 [2] 1
- D. Thirty - Forty      4 3 [2] 1
- E. Forty - Fifty      4 3 2 [1]
- F. More than Fifty      4 3 2 [1]

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Industry \_\_\_\_\_ Education \_\_\_\_\_

THANK YOU !

APPENDIX E  
PROFESSIONAL PANEL



## PROFESSIONAL PANEL

## Educators

Mr. Melvin Barrington  
Chairman  
Hotel/Restaurant/Tourism  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Joseph Cioch  
Director  
HRIM  
105 Stone Hall  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Dr. Horace Divine  
HRIM  
The Pennsylvania State University  
20 Henderson Building  
University Park, PA 16802

Dr. David Dunn  
Dean  
Hotel Administration  
104 Statler Hall  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Steve Fletcher  
Chairman  
HRIM  
101 Flint Laboratory  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Raymond J. Goodman  
Program Director  
HRIM  
McConnell Hall  
University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824

Dr. L. Kotschevar  
School of Hospitality Management  
Florida International University  
Tamiami Campus  
Miami, FL 33199

Dr. Robert Small  
1025 Yale  
Claremont, CA 91711

Dr. Donald Smith  
HRIM  
245 D Todd Hall  
Washington State University  
Pullman, WA 99164-4724

Dr. Marian Spears  
Hotel Restaurant Management & Dietetics  
104 Justin Hall  
Kansas State  
Manhattan, KS 66506

Dr. Mary Tanke  
School of Hospitality Management  
Florida International University  
Tamiami Campus  
Miami, FL 33199

Dr. Terry Umbreit  
HRIM  
Washington State University  
Pullman, WA 99164

Dr. Allene Vaden  
Dean  
Home Economics  
Southern Station Box 5035  
Southern Mississippi University  
Hattiesburg, MS 39406

Dr. Peter Van Kleeck  
Dean  
School of Hotel & Restaurant Management  
NAU Box 5638  
Northern Arizona University  
Flagstaff, AZ 86011

Dr. Thomas E. Walsh  
HRIM  
11 Mackey Hall  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011

### Industry Representatives

Villa Banfi  
Cedar Swamp Road  
Old Brookville, NY 11545

ARA Services Inc.  
Independence Square West  
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Conti Cross Inn  
Routes 611 and 313  
Doylestown, PA 18901

Evans Farm Inn  
1696 Chain Bridge Road  
McLean, VA 22101

Vice President  
Imperial 400  
1000 Wilson Blvd.  
Suite 820  
Arlington, VA 22209

Red Roof Inns Inc.  
4355 Davidson Road  
Amlin, OH 43002

ARA Services  
Independence Square West  
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Senior Vice President  
Food and Beverages  
Hilton Hotel Corporation  
9336 Civic Center Drive  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

P.O. Box 1061  
Belvedere, CA 94920

Sky Chefs  
P.O. Box 619777  
DFW Airport, TX 75261

Ritt and Associates  
1400 E. Touhy  
Des Plaines, IL 60618

Furrs Cafeteria  
P.O. Box 6747  
Lubbock, TX 79413

APPENDIX F

A SCHEMATIC PRESENTATION OF SUGGESTED CRITERIA FOR  
EVALUATING FACULTY DURING ACCREDITATION  
OF FOUR-YEAR HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT  
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

NOTE: The qualifications and standards in the following model are arranged hierarchically according to (a) the frequency with which the qualification is included in specialized accreditation and (b) the intensity ratings given to the standards by the professional panel. The numbers next to each item do not necessarily correspond to the same item number on the Delphi III instrument.

QUALIFICATIONS MOST OFTEN INCLUDED IN  
SPECIALIZED ACCREDITATION

Academic Preparation

I. Degrees

1. The faculty member should have obtained a minimum of a bachelor's degree (very desirable)
2. The bachelor's degree should be in an area related to the faculty member's teaching/research assignment (desirable)
3. Suggested or recommended areas for the bachelor's degree include the following:

Very Desirable

- A. Hotel/restaurant/institution management
- B. Foodservice management
- C. Finance
- D. Personnel/human resources
- E. Marketing
- F. Business administration
- G. Accounting
- H. Foods/nutrition

Desirable

- I. Travel/tourism
  - J. Psychology
  - K. Economics
4. The faculty member should have obtained at least a master's degree (very desirable)
  5. The master's degree should be in an area related to the faculty member's teaching/research assignment (very desirable)
  6. Suggested or recommended areas for the master's degree include:

Very Desirable

- A. Hotel/restaurant/institution management

Desirable

- B. Accounting
  - C. Education
  - D. Economics
  - E. Communications
  - F. Business administration
  - G. Travel/tourism
  - H. Finance
  - I. Foods/nutrition
  - J. Foodservice management
  - K. Personnel/human resources
  - L. Marketing
7. The faculty member should have obtained at least a doctor's degree (desirable)
  8. The doctor's or terminal degree should be in the area of the faculty member's teaching/research assignment (very desirable)
  9. Suggested or recommended areas for the doctor's or terminal degree include the following:

Very Desirable

- A. Hotel/restaurant/institution management
- B. Foodservice management
- C. Marketing
- D. Accounting

Desirable

- E. Research/development
  - F. Travel/tourism
  - G. Foods/nutrition
  - H. Business administration
  - I. Economics
  - J. Finance
  - K. Personnel/human resources
  - L. Psychology
  - M. Education
  - N. Communications
  - O. Marketing
10. The relationship of faculty degrees to rank should be left to the individual institution not accreditation standards (very desirable)



## II. Course Work

1. The faculty member's course work background should relate to teaching assignment (very desirable/desirable, tie)
2. The faculty member should have had undergraduate or graduate course work in the following subjects:

### Very Desirable

- A. Business administration
- B. Accounting
- C. Marketing
- D. Food preparation
- E. Computers

### Desirable

- F. Mathematics
- G. Research methods
- H. Laws related to the hospitality industry
- I. Foreign language
- K. Psychology
- L. Labor relations
- M. Nutrition
- N. Economics
- O. Humanities
- P. Communications
- Q. Finance
- R. Education

## III. Miscellaneous

1. The faculty member should provide documentation of academic preparation (very desirable)
2. The faculty member should have had hands-on experience in the hospitality industry as part of academic preparation (very desirable)
3. The institution from which the faculty member received the degree should have a reputation for quality (very desirable)
4. The faculty member should continue to receive Continuing Education Units (CEU) (desirable)

5. The faculty member should have had previous teaching experience (desirable)

### Scholarly Productivity

#### I. Research

1. The faculty member of a larger university should conduct research relating to the hospitality industry (very desirable)
2. The faculty member should have published findings of completed research (very desirable)
3. The number of yearly research projects completed by the faculty member should be in keeping with university and programmatic standards (very desirable)
4. The faculty member of a smaller university should conduct research relating to the hospitality industry (desirable)
5. The number of yearly research projects completed by a faculty member should be

#### Very Desirable

- A. One
- B. Two

#### Desirable

- C. Three

#### II. Publication

1. The faculty member should be involved in scholarly writing prior to textbook publications (desirable)
2. The faculty member should be published in trade publications (desirable)
3. The faculty member should be involved in publication as determined by the institution's review process (desirable)

4. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should vary according to the teaching rank and research assignment (desirable)
5. The faculty member should be published in refereed journals (manuscripts have been reviewed and approved by a peer group) (desirable)
6. The faculty member should be published in trade publications (desirable)
7. The faculty member should author material for or in Cooperative Extension publications (desirable)
8. The faculty member should author textbooks (desirable)
9. The number of yearly publications for a faculty member should be

Very Desirable

- A. One
- B. Two
- C. Three

Desirable

- D. Four

### III. Miscellaneous

1. There should be evidence that the faculty member is remaining current in the field (very desirable)
2. The faculty member should be active in presenting lectures, seminars, etc, in the areas of the faculty member's expertise (very desirable)

### Applied Professional Experience

#### I. Management Level

1. The faculty member should have a minimum of \_\_\_\_\_ years management experience in some area of the hospitality industry

Very Desirable

- A. One
- B. Three
- C. Four
- D. Six

Desirable

- E. Five
  - F. Two
2. The management experience should be related to the courses taught by the faculty member (very desirable)

## II. Technical or On-Line Experience

1. The faculty member should have a minimum of          years experience in the technical areas of the hospitality industry

Very Desirable

- A. One
- B. Three

Desirable

- C. Two
  - D. Four
  - E. Five
2. The technical experience should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member (very desirable)

## III. Continued Professional Experience

1. The faculty member should continue to obtain on-the-job managerial experience at regular intervals (desirable)

## IV. Miscellaneous

1. At times, professional experience should be acceptable in lieu of academic preparation (very desirable)

## Continued Contact With the Profession

## I. Membership in Associations

1. The faculty member should be a member of professional associations (very desirable)
2. The faculty member should be a member of trade/industry associations (very desirable)
3. Membership in professional associations should reflect the faculty member's area of specialization (very desirable)
4. The faculty member should hold membership at the national level of the association (very desirable)
5. The faculty member should hold membership at the state level of the association (desirable)
6. Membership in professional associations should relate to the subjects taught by the faculty member (desirable)

## II. Involvement in Associations

1. The faculty member should attend at least \_\_\_\_\_ convention(s) of an association for which he/she is a member per year

Very Desirable

A. One

Desirable

B. Two

C. Three

2. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis, on the program of an association's yearly convention (desirable)
3. The faculty member should participate, if possible, on editorial boards of professional associations (desirable)
4. The faculty member should participate, on a regular basis in the following:

Desirable

- A. Paper Reviewer
- B. Committee Work
- C. Holding an Office

## III. Direct Contact With Industry

1. The faculty member should be able to function as a consultant to industry (very desirable)
2. The faculty member should function as a board member within industry (desirable)

QUALIFICATIONS RECEIVING THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT  
MENTION IN SPECIALIZED ACCREDITATION

## Competency in the Area of Specialization

## I. Generalist Versus Specialist

1. The faculty member should have a foundation of core courses in hospitality education before specializing (very desirable)
2. The faculty member in a small program should be a generalist (very desirable)
3. The faculty member in a large program should be a specialist (desirable)
4. The faculty member in a large program should be a generalist (desirable)

## II. Evidence of Specialization

1. Industry experience of the faculty member is related to area of specialization (very desirable)
2. Course work of the faculty member shows concentration in area of specialization (desirable)
3. The faculty member has served as a consultant in the area of specialization (desirable)

4. The faculty member is published in the area of specialization (desirable)
5. The faculty member is recognized as one the outstanding persons in the area of specialization (desirable)
6. The faculty member has has paid employment in the area of specialization (desirable)

### III. Maintenance of Specialization

1. The faculty member remains current in area of specialization through seminars, meetings, site visits, readings, continued education, publications, involvement in industry associations, etc. (very desirable)
2. Course outlines for the courses of the faculty member are updated based on new developments in area of specialization (very desirable)
3. The faculty member is evaluated by education peers every three years (very desirable)
4. The faculty member maintains certification by industry practitioners; i.e., CHA (desirable)
5. The faculty member is evaluated by industry peers every three years (desirable)

### Teaching Effectiveness

#### I. Who Should Evaluate Effectiveness

1. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by the chair or dean (very desirable)
2. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by peers (desirable)
3. The teaching effectiveness of the faculty member should be evaluated by students (desirable)

## II. Elements of Teaching Effectiveness

Very Desirable

- A. The faculty member displays interest in developing the student as a person and as a future leader in the industry
- B. The faculty member has a professional presence in the classroom
- C. The faculty member realizes that the instructor is a role model
- D. The faculty member has the ability to establish a rapport with students
- E. The faculty member encourages academic/business relationships for students
- F. The faculty member encourages creative thinking
- G. The faculty member is capable of evaluating student performance
- H. The faculty member understands that learning is based on previous experience and knowledge
- I. The faculty member used correct communication in the classroom
- J. The faculty member deliver information in a clear, well-organized, interesting format
- K. The faculty member is a firm leader in the classroom
- L. The faculty member is capable of advising students in academics
- M. The faculty member is fair and prompt with grades

Desirable

- N. The faculty member has a knowledge of adult learning theory
- O. The faculty member has had course work in teaching methods for the college level



- P. The faculty member supports student activities
- Q. The faculty member is familiar with competency based curriculum
- R. The faculty member adapts teaching style to needs of the students
- S. The faculty member can design and organize a course on paper, including objectives, learning experiences, and evaluation experiences
- T. The faculty member accepts administrative responsibilities
- U. The faculty member is sensitive to stress factors in students
- V. The faculty member has a working knowledge of teaching techniques including case studies, role playing, etc.
- W. The faculty member is capable of advising students in careers

### III. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Students have learned under the instruction of the faculty member as evidenced by student feedback (very desirable)
2. Students have learned under the instruction of the faculty member as evidenced by grades (desirable)
3. Students have learned under the instruction of the faculty member as evidenced by student performance in higher level courses (desirable)

QUALIFICATIONS RECEIVING THE LEAST FREQUENT  
MENTION IN SPECIALIZED ACCREDITATION

Interest in Curricular Experimentation

I. Evidence of Interest in Curricular Experimentation

1. The faculty member demonstrates interest in curricular experimentation through

Very Desirable

- A. Willingness to try new ideas

Desirable

- B. Correlation of curriculum with industry needs
- C. Commitment to thorough preparation for classes and minimum reliance on textbooks
- D. Use of outside field visits
- E. Leadership in acceptance of curriculum change
- F. Tests the value of the change
- G. Use of case studies
- H. Varying lecture format
- I. Use of computers
- J. Keeping up-to-date on new teaching methods through reading and attendance at teaching skills workshops

Ability to Work With Students

I. Who Should Evaluate Ability to Work With Students

1. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by chair or dean (desirable)
2. The faculty member should submit a list of student activities he/she is involved in to chair (desirable)

3. The ability of a faculty member to work with students should be evaluated by students (desirable)

## II. Evidence of Ability to Work With Students

### Very Desirable

1. The faculty member is available to the students
2. The faculty member has the respect of the students
3. The faculty member shows genuine concern for the students
4. The faculty member should establish a rapport with students without losing class control
5. The faculty member encourages the students in activities that relate to the hospitality industry
6. The faculty member has knowledge of the career opportunities in the hospitality industry
7. The faculty member has good oral communication skills
8. The faculty member is a leader not a friend

### Desirable

9. The faculty participates in student organizations
10. The faculty member has directed independent studies
11. The faculty member has directed special classroom projects
12. The faculty member has directed internship programs
13. The faculty member participates in advising
14. The faculty member shows appreciation of student development toward professional status

15. The faculty member expects and receives only quality work

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**