

**BYLAWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY**

*College of Engineering  
University of North Texas*

**Preamble**

To provide for and ensure individual participation in departmental affairs, the engineering technology faculty adopts these Bylaws for the governance of the department. The capacity of each faculty member to make a unique contribution to the collective efforts of the department is hereby acknowledged and affirmed. To facilitate the realization of those efforts, the affairs of the department shall be conducted through the various agents of the department herein described.

**ARTICLE I DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION AND MEETINGS**

**Section 1.** The departmental faculty (faculty) shall include all full-time members who hold tenured, tenure-track, and lecturer academic appointments in the Department of Engineering Technology.

**Section 2.** Departmental affairs shall be conducted by the following agents of the department:

- a. Chairperson
- b. Associate Chairperson
- c. Undergraduate Program Curriculum Committee (UPC)
- d. Graduate Program Curriculum Committee (GPC)
- e. Personnel Affairs Committee (PAC)
- f. Committee on Awards (COA)
- g. Ad-hoc committees, including the Promotion & Tenure Committee (PTC)
- h. Departmental representatives to College and University Committees

**Section 3.** Regular meetings of the departmental faculty shall be called by the Chairperson at least once each semester. An agenda of major items shall be provided with notification of faculty meetings. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairperson or upon request of at least one-third of the departmental faculty.

**Section 4.** Any issue affecting the department, excluding matters of tenure, promotion, and merit may be brought to a vote by petition of at least one-third of the faculty. Such matters referred to the faculty by petition shall be announced in writing to all voting members at least one week in advance of a called meeting. A quorum for meetings called to vote on petitioned issues shall be two-thirds of the departmental faculty.

**Section 5.** Faculty membership to College and University Committees such as the Faculty Council, College PAC, Faculty Senate and other ad-hoc committees shall be by nomination and election. Faculty may serve the corresponding term(s) as stipulated in the committee membership guideline.

**ARTICLE II THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON**

**Section 1.** The Department Chairperson is the chief executive officer. As such, this individual is responsible for specific duties assigned by the University Administration.

**Section 2.** The Department Chairperson shall act for the department in all matters requiring official communication with the University Administration.

**Section 3.** The Department Chairperson shall consult with the faculty when establishing and implementing administrative or educational policies.

**Section 4.** The Department Chairperson shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of all Department Committees with the exception of the PAC and the PTC.

### **ARTICLE III THE DEPARTMENT ASSOCIATE CHAIRPERSON**

**Section 1.** The Department Associate Chairperson is appointed by the Department Chairperson and works with faculty, departmental committees, administrative staff, and others to provide assistance and leadership with a variety of administrative duties assigned by the Department Chairperson.

**Section 2.** The Department Associate Chairperson shall have signature authority and represent ETEC at meetings in the absence of the Chairperson.

### **ARTICLE IV PERSONNEL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (PAC) PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE (PTC)**

**Section 1.** The PAC and PTC shall be established in accordance with University Policies.

**Section 2.** The PAC shall consist of all tenured faculty members of the department who do not simultaneously hold an administrative position as defined by the University. The PTC follows the Departmental, College and University Promotion & Tenure Guidelines and shall be formed from a subset of at least five PAC faculty members at the appropriate rank to evaluate P&T candidates. If the PTC composition requires it, additional faculty members external to ETEC will be recommended by the PAC, and approved by the department chair, college dean, and provost.

**Section 3.** The PAC shall assist the Department Chair in the annual faculty evaluation using the procedure detailed in these Bylaws. In addition, the PAC conducts the affairs of Article XI Grievance.

**Section 4.** The PAC Chair will be elected from the membership of the committee.

### **ARTICLE V PROGRAM COORDINATORS UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (UPC)**

**Section 1.** Faculty of each academic program shall elect a faculty Program Coordinator who will be appointed by the department chairperson by September 1. The Program Coordinators are appointed to serve for a 2-year term and may serve multiple consecutive terms.

**Section 2.** Each academic program shall have an Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) composed of all faculty members of the respective program. The Program Coordinators serve as chairs of the corresponding UPC.

**Section 3.** The UPCs are primarily responsible for all undergraduate program curriculum updates including the addition, expansion, deletion, or revision of departmental courses in accordance with established student outcomes. Program curriculum updates shall be presented to the departmental faculty and submitted to the Department Chairperson for approval prior to submission to the College Curriculum Committee. The Program Coordinators also assist the department chair in course scheduling.

**ARTICLE VI COMMITTEE ON AWARDS (COA)**

**Section 1.** The COA shall be composed of one faculty member from each program. Members are appointed to serve for a 2-year term and may serve multiple consecutive terms.

**Section 2.** The Chair of the COA shall be elected by the Committee.

**Section 3.** The COA coordinates the nominations and selection of individuals for awards.

**ARTICLE VII GRADUATE PROGRAM CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (GPC)**

**Section 1.** The GPC shall be composed of at least one faculty member elected from each track area who is actively involved with the graduate program in teaching and graduate student mentoring as Major Professor. Members are appointed to serve for a 2-year term and may serve multiple consecutive terms.

**Section 2.** The Associate Chair serves as chair of the GPC.

**Section 3.** The GPC is responsible for all graduate curriculum updates including the addition, expansion, deletion, or revision of courses. Curriculum updates shall be presented to the full departmental faculty for discussion and approval, and submitted to the Department Chairperson for approval prior to submission to the College Curriculum Committee. The GPC is also responsible for interacting with the College of Engineering and the Toulouse Graduate School on all matters related to graduate student affairs, and for carrying out the departmental evaluation and admission process of graduate student applications.

**ARTICLE VIII TERM OF ELECTED COMMITTEE CHAIRS**

**Section 1.** Elected committee chairs shall serve for a term of two years and shall be elected by September 1 each year.

**Section 2.** Elected committee chairs may serve multiple successive terms.

**ARTICLE IX MINUTES OF MEETINGS**

**Section 1.** Minutes of the general faculty meetings shall be made a matter of departmental record and available to the faculty. Approved minutes will be provided electronically to the faculty and filed with the department Administrative Assistant for archiving.

**ARTICLE X RECALL**

**Section 1.** Recall of any elected department committee chair may be accomplished by a majority vote of the committee membership.

**ARTICLE XI GRIEVANCE**

**Section 1.** For reappointment, promotion, and tenure appeals, the department follows the procedures described in UNT Policy 15.0.1. Academic Workload and Merit Evaluation due process for faculty complaints are addressed in UNT Policy 15.1.9.

**Section 2.** Any member of the departmental faculty, as defined in ARTICLE I, Section 1, may initiate a grievance procedure at the Department level on any matter except for tenure, reappointment, or promotion. The procedure is outlined in Sections 3-6; unless specified, time windows to be at least five working days from the next deadline as appropriate to meet stated UNT Policies.

**Section 3.** The faculty member may request a hearing before the Department Personnel Affairs Committee. Such request must be formal and presented to the Department Chair.

**Section 4.** The Department Chair will schedule a hearing for the purpose of clarification of issues. The faculty member may bring an advocate to the hearing. The Department Chair will notify the faculty member of the date, day and time of the hearing. The faculty member will have a minimum of five working days from the notification of the hearing until the scheduled hearing.

**Section 5.** The PAC will notify the Department Chair, in writing, of its findings within five working days of the hearing.

**Section 6.** The Department Chair will notify the faculty member and the Dean of the findings within fourteen working days of the hearing.

## **ARTICLE XII           IMPLEMENTATION**

**Section 1.** These Bylaws shall become effective when presented to the departmental faculty by the Chairperson and accepted by two-thirds of the faculty.

## **ARTICLE XIII           REVISING THE BYLAWS**

**Section 1.** Amendments to these Bylaws shall be by vote of two-thirds of the department faculty taken by paper ballots.

**Section 2.** Proposed amendments to the Bylaws shall be presented in writing to the Department Chairperson and shall contain the signatures of at least twenty-five percent of the faculty members. Within seven working days of the date of such a proposal, it shall be presented to the faculty in writing and discussed at a regular or called faculty meeting. Balloting on the proposed amendment shall be held within seven working days after presentation.

## **ARTICLE XIV           BYLAWS WHICH SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE**

In the event that there exists a conflict between bylaws, the bylaw which is most supported by the College of Engineering or the University Policy Manual shall have precedence. In the event that there is no predominance of support from either document, the bylaw which, if given precedence, would affect the greater number of faculty in a positive manner should be selected, unless there is compelling reason to do differently as determined by the appropriate Faculty Committee.

## **ARTICLE XV           ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER**

In the absence of specific provisions to the contrary, the rules of procedure described in Robert's Rules of Order (10th or most recent edition) shall be followed in all meetings of the Faculty and by committees, boards, and other deliberative bodies.

## **Bylaws**

The Strategic Plan of the Department of Engineering Technology (ETEC) and its Vision and Mission statements align with the goals and objectives of UNT and the College of Engineering (CENG). The sections below outline ETEC's annual faculty merit review process and promotion and tenure criteria. The Department believes that its faculty should encompass the intellectual diversity required for excellence in Teaching, Research and Scholarship, and Service (TRS). Hence, faculty selection and retention are two very important responsibilities of the faculty of ETEC.

### ***A. Required Documentation: Annual Merit Review***

The required documentation for the annual merit review is designed to cover the previous three calendar years (Jan-Dec) and follows the guidelines listed in *Appendix AMER*. The annual Faculty Workload Report (FWR) (*Appendix FWR*) is part of the review and reflects an expected or planned distribution of effort in TRS as agreed upon by the faculty member and the department chair.

### ***B. Required Documentation: Promotion and Tenure***

The required documentation for promotion and tenure is a cumulative record of TRS and follows the guidelines published by CENG and UNT. See *Appendix Promotion & Tenure*.

### ***Tenure-track Faculty in the Probationary Period***

Tenure-track faculty members in the probationary period undergo annual evaluations of their progress toward promotion/tenure separately from the annual merit review. The required documentation is cumulative and follows the guidelines published by CENG under "*Untenured Faculty Annual Evaluation*". The intent of this annual review is to offer the faculty member constructive feedback by the PAC and department chair based on a cumulative dossier toward meeting the requirements for promotion/tenure.

### ***C. Annual Merit Evaluation: Overall Rubric***

The overall goal of the annual merit review process is to provide a fair evaluation for each faculty member conducive to professional growth in TRS and for the continuous improvement of the quality and performance of the department. Faculty members naturally strive to achieve and maintain a balanced performance in TRS according to the annual FWR. The spirit of the annual merit evaluation is to offer a constructive and objective view of the faculty member's TRS performance. The statements pertaining to the annual merit review process are guidelines and serve as a basis for merit review and recommendations by the department chair for potential merit raises in ETEC. Merit raises recognize contributions averaged over the most recent three-year period. Outcomes of the annual merit performance reviews are integral to promotion/tenure. *The PAC and department chair will only consider efforts and accomplishments that are supported by documentation.*

A numerical score alone is insufficient; hence, the evaluation also has qualitative statements that assist the faculty member in identifying ways and opportunities for improvement; provide feedback to encourage professional growth in needed areas conducive to promotion/tenure; and offer observations concerning any other activity that benefits the faculty member, the program, and the department.

The overall numerical evaluation is based on a four point assessment scale given in Table C1. For example, using a FWR (T,R,S)=(40%,40%,20%) and partial scores (T,R,S)=(1.5,2.25,3.75) yields a total score of  $(0.6+0.9+0.75=2.25/4.0)$

	% Workload (FWR)	1.0: Unsatisfactory (U) ----- 1.5: Need Improvement (NI)	Meet Expectations (ME)	Exceed Expectations (EE)	Composite Score
	---	1.0, 1.5	2.0, 2.25 2.5, 2.75	3.0, 3.25, 3.5 3.75, 4.0	---
<b>Teaching</b>	40%	1.5			0.6 / 1.6
<b>Scholarly/Research</b>	40%		2.25		0.9 / 1.6
<b>Service</b>	20%			3.75	0.75 / 0.8
<b>Total</b>	100%	---	---	---	2.25 / 4.0

**Table C1. Four-Point Assessment Scale (with example)**

***D. Evaluation of Teaching Performance***

The annual evaluation helps assess the need for improving the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness in support of ETEC’s educational mission, the program’s ETAC/ABET accreditation, and the faculty member’s own growth toward teaching excellence. To that end, the department chair makes every effort to balance the faculty workload, and provide instructional assistance to faculty in the form of student TAs and graders contingent on the availability of resources and based on enrollment figures and department-wide workloads. In addition to the items in the College AMER guidelines under “Area I. Instructional Activities”, the faculty member may include other measures of teaching effectiveness; describe efforts in improving pedagogy such as peer observations, team-teaching, or participation in teaching workshops; and describe accomplishments such as publications and funding related to pedagogy.

**Teaching Performance Indicators** Faculty shall meet all the minimal teaching requirements:

1. Meeting class as scheduled and using class time to cover relevant course material;
2. Maintaining updated course materials;
3. Maintaining adequate office hours for course load and number of students;
4. Maintaining in the UNT Faculty Profile System a course syllabus which includes information such as course objectives, course content, grade components, and course policies.
5. Mentoring students under the constraints of the faculty Workload:
  - a. Undergraduate student mentoring via Capstone or undergraduate research
  - b. Graduate student mentoring and graduation as Major Professor
6. Participating in assessment efforts toward accreditation and organized curriculum improvement

Documented attributes conducive to meeting or exceeding expectations include (not limited to):

1. Course evaluations and student comments;
2. Undergraduate and graduate student mentoring;
3. Other performance submitted by the faculty including (not limited to)
  - a. peer observations;
  - b. participation in pedagogical workshops;

- c. teaching/research synergies such as funded educational projects;
- d. teaching/service synergies such as advising student-professional organizations, serving as teaching mentors, or establishing certificate programs.

**ETEC Teaching Rubric: see Appendix T-Rubric**

***E. Evaluation of Research and Scholarly Performance***

In order to promote and disseminate knowledge, faculty engage in scholarly, creative, and professional activities of the type that would be consistent with a favorable external peer review. Activities include (not limited to) intellectual contributions to the creation of new knowledge (basic scholarship); to the application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to the improvement of science, technology, and engineering processes; or to engineering technology pedagogy and education. The definition of evaluation criteria in research and scholarly performance emphasize the close association of the faculty and curricula with industry, recognizing professional practices, such as consulting and applied research, as essential parts of engineering technology faculty professional activity.

Excellence is characterized by a record of independent and collaborative work, and an indication of national or international impact and recognition evidenced by evaluative factors such as (not limited to):

1. Leadership in securing funded research from any external source including industry, federal and state agencies, and foundations.
2. A body of work published in archival, refereed journals and conference proceedings appropriate in the candidate's professional field.
3. Established interaction with professional peers as evidenced by technical presentations in national and international conferences, or other venues.
4. A record of student mentoring leading to published scholarly work.

The desired outcome includes primarily peer-reviewed publications and external funding received through the Office of Sponsored Research. However, all other university, college, and departmental support should also be noted. Keeping with the mission of scholarship in Engineering Technology, faculty are encouraged to highlight any and all applied research activities exhibiting industrial participation or collaboration. Refer to the guidelines in the College AMER under "Area II. Scholarly and Creative Activities".

**ETEC Research Rubric: see Appendix R-Rubric**

***F. Evaluation of Service Performance***

Excellence in service is characterized by a substantial record of recognized high quality, professional, and collegial contributions to the department, the college, the university, professional societies, and the community. The annual evaluation helps assess the faculty member's contribution to administrative activities and governance at various levels within the university, and to external constituencies. Refer to the guidelines in the College AMER guidelines under "Area III. Administration and Service". Faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of distinguished service acknowledged by others, and participation in high-demand committees. Demonstrated leadership abilities in mentoring Junior Faculty to achieve excellence in TRS are highly valued. It is the policy of the department that junior, tenure-track faculty



initially minimize the time spent on service for the probationary period of their appointment and instead concentrate on teaching and scholarly activities.

**Service Performance Indicators** A level of collegial service to the department, college, university, professional societies and the community at large is expected of all members of the faculty. It is the policy of the university to recognize exceptional service of this nature. Documented attributes conducive to meeting or exceeding expectations in service include (not limited to):

1. Committee work to the department, college or university;
2. Professional service such as editing/reviewing for a journal, chairing sessions at scholarly meetings, holding committee positions/offices in professional organizations;
3. Community service to the city, county, or state;
4. Public service activities such as serving as an unpaid consultant, or as a member of a panel, workshop, or seminar;
5. Student advising not related to the instructional process such as social fraternities, sororities, clubs, or career placement;
6. Abilities in mentoring Junior Faculty to achieve excellence in teaching, research, and service;
7. Other documented performance submitted by the faculty including (not limited to) recognitions and awards.

As part of community development, the ETEC department places distinct value in its interaction with the Industrial Advisory Board (IAB), the Alumni, and especially the graduating class of seniors and graduate students soon to be Alumni. Faculty are expected to make an effort to participate in the annual Senior Design Day, in the IAB meetings that normally occur twice per academic year, and to participate in at least one commencement ceremony per year. Faculty are also encouraged to participate in graduate student Thesis defenses in their general field of expertise.

**ETEC Service Rubric: see Appendix S-Rubric**

### ***G. AMER Review Process***

The department chair conducts an independent review using Table C1, takes the PAC assessment into consideration, and arrives at a final evaluation report that is shared and discussed with the faculty member prior to submitting the report to the CENG Dean's Office. The department follows established guidelines and processes by UNT Policy 15.0.8.3 and the College of Engineering to address the "Unsatisfactory" performance criterion.

The ETEC AMER review process is as follows:

- Faculty member fills out the ETEC AMER Summary and the College AMER reports
- PAC members evaluate faculty using the table in *Appendix PAC Faculty Evaluation Table*
- PAC Chair compiles PAC scores and comments using the table in *Appendix PAC Composite Evaluation Table*. The composite Table is forwarded to the department chair with a statement by the PAC chair indicating the participation of the PAC members.
- Department chair uses the PAC recommendation to arrive at his/her recommendation, meets with each faculty member, and makes a final recommendation sent to the Dean which becomes part of the departmental faculty folder.



### ***H. Timeline***

Refer to the published Academic Year CENG Administrative Calendar and policies. In general,

1. **Annual Merit Review:** faculty members submit their report by January 31<sup>st</sup> comprising the most recent 3 years (refer to *Appendix AMER*). Departmental reviews and recommendations are normally due to CENG the last Friday of March.
2. **Untenured Faculty Annual Evaluation:** tenure-track faculty in their probationary period submit their cumulative dossier by the first Monday of September to meet CENG submission deadlines published in early fall.
3. **Promotion and tenure:**
  - i. **March 31:** Faculty member and PAC each submits a list of four external reviewer names considered to be at arms-length of the candidate. The procedure followed to solicit external review letters is in *Appendix External Review*.
  - ii. **April 15:** The department chair invites reviewers to participate in the P&T review and points the reviewers to the faculty profile system. The process should ensure that by May 15 a sufficient number of external reviewers are committed to secure at least 5 letters by September 1. Every effort will be made to secure at least half of the letters from the list supplied by the candidate.
  - iii. **July 15:** Faculty member submits an “External Reviewer Dossier” to the department chair. The “External Review Dossier” is a condensed summary of the faculty member’s cumulative dossier used to solicit external review letters. The dossier may be updated by the candidate in the event of substantial accomplishments since its original submission. The candidate, PAC and department chair will determine the need for the updates to be made available to the external reviewers. External review letters may be solicited but are not required for Lecturer promotion cases.
  - iv. **First Monday of September:** Faculty member submits complete cumulative dossier to the department chair as a single PDF file and one hard-copy in a binder. Dossiers including external letters, PAC and chair recommendation letters are normally due to CENG the first week of November.

### ***I. Tenure and Promotion Criteria: see Appendix Promotion and Tenure***

### ***J. Chair Annual Evaluation***

Annual evaluations of the performance of the Chair are conducted based on UNT guidelines and processes.

**Appendix FWR: ETEC Faculty Workload Report**

The FWR is normally agreed upon for the AY and reflects the Teaching-Research-Service (TRS) effort of the faculty member. It is recognized that workloads may change from one semester to the next based on department-wide workloads, faculty research funding, major service commitments, faculty career goals, and other events.

Every effort is made to compensate for student mentoring loads, class sizes, or new course assignments. Extra teaching loads or student mentoring performance are taken into account toward merit. The effort equivalencies below are approximate, per long semester, and based on a nominal Monday- Friday nominal workweek.

**Note1:** while every effort is made to adjust teaching assignments to compensate for the faculty member research and service tasks, the department course assignments must be met each semester and take precedence over all other tasks.

**Note2:** the FWR follows the Academic Year while the AMER follows a Calendar Year schedule. Hence, the effective workload say in CY2013 is for SP2013+FA2013 which uses figures from the 2012-13 and 2013-14 FWRs. Faculty must exercise care in computing the correct CY TRS percentages.

**A. Organized Course Instruction in Teaching Load Credits (TLC)**

Course Type	TLC	Description
		<b>Lab Management LM:</b> lab prep, lecture/lab synchronization, report grading, student communication (via emails, B-Board). <b>Course Management CM:</b> prep, grading (grader mentoring), office hours, student communication (via emails, B-Board).
1-credit (0,3) LAB	6.60	3-hr LAB contact and LM
1-credit (0,3) LAB with TA	4.40	2-hr LAB contact and LM with TA mentoring.
1-credit (1,0) LEC	3.33	1 hour LEC contact plus course management
2-credit (1, 3) LEC+LAB	9.93	4 hour contact plus CM and LM.
2-credit (1, 3) LEC+LAB/TA	7.73	3 hour contact plus CM and LM with TA mentoring.
2-credit (2, 0) LEC	6.67	2 hour LEC contact plus CM
3-credit (2, 3) LEC+LAB	13.27	5 hour contact plus CM and LM
3-credit (2, 3) LEC+LAB/TA	11.07	4 hour contact plus CM and LM with TA mentoring
<b>3-credit (3, 0) LEC</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>3 hour LEC contact plus CM</b>
<b>3-credit (1,4) Capstone II</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>1 hour LEC contact plus Capstone requirements</b>
4-credit (3, 3) LEC+LAB	16.60	6 hour contact plus CM and LM
4-credit (3, 3) LEC+LAB/TA	14.40	5 hour contact plus CM and LM with TA mentoring
G/UG joint course		If # of G students is > 5 and course cannot be split due to teaching capacity, Instructor is assigned 20% additional TLC
Capstone Course/Advising		Instructor of Record receives assigned TLC. Advising faculty of a team receives 1.0 TLC/team/CY
New course or major revision		TLC on a case-by-case basis

**B. Baselines for tenured and tenure-track faculty**

Using a nominal/baseline workload of (T,R,S)=(40%,40%,20%) on a given year the expectations are

1. Teaching 40%: the equivalent of two organized (3, 0) courses per long semester.
2. Research: Tenured and tenure-track faculty holding a research & scholarship load are expected to demonstrate appropriate contributions to funding, publications, and student mentoring. The contribution levels can vary from year to year and are tied to the individual Faculty Workload. As a guideline, a 40% annual load would be met by a minimum of two publications, participation in an externally funded project, graduating two students as Major Professor of Thesis or Project, and submitting a proposal to an external agency, or by demonstrating substantial work in progress conducive to funding, publications and student mentoring.
3. Service 20%: a commensurate effort of service to the institution (department, college, university), profession, and community.

**C. Baselines for non-tenure track Full-time Lecturers**

Lecturers are encouraged but not required to participate in scholarship. The typical workload distribution (T,R,S)=(80%, 0%, 20%) leads to the equivalent of 4 organized (3, 0) courses per long semester and a combination of Capstone and MS mentoring assignments. Loads may be adjusted based on other service, scholarship, student advising, program coordination, or other academic tasks.

**APPENDIX: AMER**

The College “Annual Merit Evaluation Report (AMER)” guidelines for faculty are available in the College of Engineering website <http://engineering.unt.edu/forfaculty> (Accessed November 2014)

**ETEC AMER Report:** Single PDF file separate from the CENG AMER file:

1. Three-year Summary Table (see *Appendix: Faculty AMER Table*)
  2. Faculty self-assessment: faculty have an opportunity to reflect on each component (T, R, S); any supporting documentation should be included in Appendices. The College AMER provides guidelines on what items constitute T, R, and S. Faculty are responsible to submit any and all evidence of performance.
- **Teaching (T):** Provide a summary of a self-assessment on teaching performance. As needed, refer to materials in an appendix or in the CENG AMER such as course syllabi, course evaluations, student comments, and any other teaching assessment or evidence of performance. The summary would address items such as:
    - How do you think you did?
    - Describe the results of any research-based pedagogy strategies
    - What do you collect from course evaluations and student comments?
    - Any challenges due to facilities, resources?
    - Did you participate in teaching workshops? Do you plan to?
    - Any assessed curriculum improvements?
    - Any peer observations?
    - Comment on TA/Grader effectiveness
    - Describe any teaching/research and/or teaching/service synergies
    - What can be done to improve next year?
    - Other
  - **Research & Scholarly Work (R):** provide a summary of a self-assessment on research and scholarship performance. As needed, refer to materials in an appendix or in the CENG AMER such as the front page of publications, the front page of UNT proposal routing forms, editor letters of accepted publications, and any other research & scholarly assessment or evidence of performance. The summary would address items such as:
    - List of items in Area II: Scholarly and Creative Activities of the College AMER
    - Results of Article & Publication Citation Measures, e.g., Google Scholar; Research Gate; Impact Factor; Eigenfactor; other
    - Other assessment, e.g., grant success based on publications, on student work (Thesis, Project), on industry development
    - Other
  - **Service (S):** provide a summary of a self-assessment on service performance. As needed, refer to materials in an appendix or in the CENG AMER such as committee minutes, committee chair assessments, tangible service results, service awards and recognitions, and any other service assessment or evidence of performance.

**Appendix T-Rubric: ETEC Teaching Rubric**  
**Expectations tied to the Faculty Workload Report (Appendix FWR)**

Qualitative comments will be provided for “exceeds expectations”, “needs improvement” and “unsatisfactory” ratings, but not necessarily for “meets expectations” ratings. Merit is commensurate to the level and impact of the contributions.

**Unsatisfactory (U) 1.0:** denotes a refusal to carry a normal teaching load or repeated “needs improvement” ratings in a manner that disregards previous advice.

**Needs Improvement (NI) 1.5:** denotes a failure to meet the minimal teaching requirements or the faculty does not take initiative in implementing and documenting corrective actions. The faculty member working with the PAC and the department chair shall develop and implement a teaching performance improvement plan to address the deficiencies. The plan shall use available resources such as faculty mentors, peer observations, teaching workshops, and others. The plan shall be implemented immediately following the review and may include a revision in the faculty workload and course assignments. U or NI scores assigned to a faculty in the probationary period can lead to a negative recommendation for reappointment.

**Meets Expectations (ME) 2.0; 2.25; 2.5; 2.75**

In addition to meeting the minimal teaching requirements:

- Course evaluations are in the effective range
- Few student comments point to deficiencies or pedagogical weaknesses; these are observed sporadically; and the faculty member takes initiative in implementing corrective actions
- Effective student mentoring consistent with workload
- Motivation and participation in organized curriculum, educational, or pedagogical improvements

**Exceeds Expectations (EE) 3.0; 3.25; 3.5; 3.75; 4.0**

In addition to meeting the minimal teaching requirements, there is evidence of achievement in a combination of the following:

- Course evaluations are in the highly effective range
- Student comments point to one or more pedagogical strengths; these are observed on a consistent basis and/or across courses
- Effective student mentoring above workload expectations
- A record of teaching/research or teaching/service synergies
- Leadership in assessment efforts toward accreditation
- Leadership in organized curriculum, educational, or pedagogical improvements
- Recipient of teaching award

**Appendix R-Rubric: ETEC Research & Scholarly Performance Rubric  
Expectations tied to the Faculty Workload Report (Appendix FWR)**

Qualitative comments will be provided for “exceeds expectations”, “needs improvement” and “unsatisfactory” ratings, but not necessarily for “meets expectations” ratings. Merit is commensurate to the level and impact of the contributions.

**Unsatisfactory (U) 1.0:** denotes repeated “needs improvement” ratings in a manner that disregards previous advice.

**Needs Improvement (NI) 1.5:** denotes minimal or no demonstrated efforts in pursuing research and scholarly activities. The faculty member shall work with the PAC and the department chair to develop and implement a research & scholarly performance improvement plan to address the deficiencies. The plan shall use available resources such as faculty mentors, participation in on-going research, grant-writing workshops, and others. The plan shall be implemented immediately following the review and may include a revision of the FWR to better reflect the faculty member’s expected contribution to the department. U or NI scores assigned to a faculty in the probationary period can lead to a negative recommendation for reappointment.

**Meets Expectations (ME) 2.0; 2.25; 2.5; 2.75**

Performance commensurate with faculty workload.

**Exceeds Expectations (EE) 3.0; 3.25; 3.5; 3.75; 4.0**

Documented high activity in 2 out of the 3 categories and activity in the remaining category will be allocated an EE score. The categories are:

- Refereed journal publications, refereed conference publications, patents granted
- External funding (new or continuing)
- Individual (Major Professor) and committee work in undergraduate and graduate student leading to graduation and research/scholarly productivity

Consideration will be given to all other types of documented scholarly activities.

*Approved 19 October 2018*

---

***Appendix S-Rubric: ETEC Service Rubric***  
**Expectations tied to the Faculty Workload Report (FWR)**

Qualitative comments will be provided for “exceeds expectations”, “needs improvement” and “unsatisfactory” ratings, but not necessarily for “meets expectations” ratings. Merit is commensurate to the level and impact of the contributions.

**Unsatisfactory (U): 1.0:** denotes repeated “needs improvement” ratings in a manner that disregards previous advice.

**Needs Improvement (NI) 1.5** denotes minimal or no demonstrated efforts in service activities with documented evidence of refusal to carry out at least one appointment, or evidence of failure to exercise diligence and responsibility in carrying out an appointment. The faculty member shall work with the PAC and the department chair to develop and implement a service performance improvement plan to address the deficiencies. The plan shall use available resources such as faculty mentors, participation in on-going committees, and others. The plan shall be implemented immediately following the review and may include a revision of the FWR to better reflect the faculty member’s expected contribution to the department. U or NI scores assigned to a faculty in the probationary period can lead to a negative recommendation for reappointment.

**Meets Expectations (ME) 2.0; 2.25; 2.5; 2.75**

- Participation in service-related activities consistent with the FWR
- Observed collegiality and professionalism in committees and meetings

**Exceeds Expectations (EE) 3.0; 3.25; 3.5; 3.75; 4.0**

- Highly motivated, participative or effective leadership in service-related activities of broad impact to a community
- Awards or recognitions for service-related work



Approved 19 October 2018

Appendix: Faculty AMER Table

Excel table used by each faculty member to enter their 3-year AMER data. Faculty member enters data in the yellow-highlighted cells; Teaching-Load-Credit (TLC) follows approved TLC Table in Appendix FWR. Three-year averages are automatically calculated.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD
1	Barbieri, E		Note2: the FWR follows the Academic Year while the AMER follows a Calendar Year schedule. Hence, the effective workload say in CY2013 is for SP2013+FA2013 which uses figures from the 2012-13 and 2013-14 FWRs. Faculty must exercise care in computing the correct CY TRS percentages. In the example below, the 13-14-15 T/R/S averages are computed from SP+FA of 13-14-15																										
2	PROF																												
		AY 2013-2014						AY 2014-2015						AY 2015-2016						AVG 13, 14, 15									
SP13			FA13			SP14			FA14			SP15			FA15			SP16			T	R	S						
T	R	S	T	R	S	T	R	S	T	R	S	T	R	S	T	R	S	T	R	S	T	R	S	T	R	S			
52	25	23	45	45	10	40	40	20	35	55	10	50	30	20	10	60	30	20	40	40	38.67%	42.50%	18.83%						
WORKLOAD		TEACHING														AMER	TotTLC	SETE Avg	SPOT FA15										
		SPRING				FALL				Other SP		Other FA																	
T	R	S	C1	C2	C3	C4	C1	C2	C3	C4	CA3	N/A	AMER	N/A	TotTLC	SETE Avg	SPOT FA15												
CY 2015	25.00%	5.00%	70.00%	(2,3)	(3,0)	(3,0)	N/A	(2,3)TA	(3,0)	(3,0)	(3,0)	CA3	N/A	AMER	N/A	75.84	806	3											
Tot WL	100%	TLC	13.27	10.00	10.00	0.00	11.07	10.00	10.00	10.00	1.5	0	0	0	0	75.84	806	3											
CY 2014	20.00%	10.00%	70.00%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	(2,3)	(3,0)	(3,0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	TotTLC													
Tot WL	100%	TLC	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.27	10.00	10.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	33.27	804												
CY 2013	20.00%	15.00%	65.00%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	TotTLC													
Tot WL	100%	TLC	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	781												
3 YR AVG	21.67%	10.00%	68.33%													36.37	797.00	3.00											
WORKLOAD		PUBS			RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/MENTORING				#MSET Graduated			Other Grad Mentoring			SERVICE														
					Annual Expenditures from Office of Research / Describe in ETEC AMER source of funds and impact										Describe in ETEC AMER Service impact														
CY 2015	25.00%	5.00%	70.00%	J-Art	C-Art	Other	External	UNT	DONATION	Major Prof	Com. Memb.	MS	PhD	Com. Memb.	SEE ETEC AMER NARRATIVE														
CY 2014	20.00%	10.00%	70.00%	1	2	0	\$ 32,564.00	\$ -	\$ -	1	2	1	1	0															
CY 2013	20.00%	15.00%	65.00%	0	1	1	\$ -	\$ 23,569.00	\$ -	0	3	0	1	1															
3 YR AVG	21.67%	10.00%	68.33%	2	0	3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,563.00	2	1	2	0	2															
3 YR AVG	21.67%	10.00%	68.33%	1.00	1.00	1.33	\$ 10,855	\$ 7,856	\$ 854	1.00	2.00	1.00	0.67	1.00															
				ENTER A NUMBER OR ZERO				ENTER A NUMBER OR ZERO				ENTER A NUMBER OR ZERO																	

*Approved 19 October 2018*

---

***Appendix: PAC Faculty Evaluation Table***

Sample row of Excel table used by each PAC member to evaluate faculty AMER reports.

	WORKLOAD 3 YR AVG 2013, 2014, 2015				TEACHING	RESEARCH	SERVICE	COMPOSITE SCORE
Faculty					1.0 ; 1.5 ; 2.0 ; 2.25 ; 2.5 ; 2.75 ; 3.0 ; 3.25 ; 3.5 ; 3.75 ; 4.0			
	T	R	S	Total WL				
NAME	38.00%	42.00%	20.00%	100.00%	2.75	3.25	2.00	2.81

***Appendix: PAC Composite Evaluation Table***

Sample row of Excel table used by PAC Chair to compile composite scores and comments.

	COMPOSITE SCORE 1	COMPOSITE SCORE 2	COMPOSITE SCORE 3	COMPOSITE SCORE	COMPOSITE SCORE 5	COMPOSITE SCORE 6	COMPOSITE SCORE 7	COMPOSITE SCORE 8	COMPOSITE SCORE 9	PAC Composite
<b>Faculty</b>										
<b>NAME</b>	<b>2.25</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.52</b>

### ***Appendix: Promotion and Tenure***

Different individuals will demonstrate different strengths in qualifying for promotion/tenure; thus, promotion/tenure recommendations must be made on a case-by-case basis. In all cases, the overriding standard shall be the quality of performance both in terms of cumulative accomplishments at the time of consideration and the potential for continued success in TRS. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide complete and accurate cumulative records that highlight any and all performance achievements relevant to the promotion and tenure process. *The entire professional career will be used in evaluating faculty for promotion, with emphasis on the time since the last promotion.*

#### **Tenure-Track Faculty: *To Associate Professor with Tenure***

**Teaching:** The candidate must demonstrate competence in teaching, the capacity for continued growth and improvement, as well as an interest and demonstrated participation in maintaining program accreditation. Quality teaching is a minimum expectation that includes the ability to convey subject matter to students, to maintain academic standards, and to stimulate the interest of students.

**Research:** The candidate shall have demonstrated competence to carry out research of high quality and scholarly significance, and the ability to train students in Engineering Technology. The candidate's dossier shall show a record of growth, a demonstrated conviction for continued growth, and an indication of regional, national or international impact in independent and collaborative scholarly work as evidenced by evaluative factors such as but not limited to:

1. A combination of funded research by industrial, private, federal, state, and university sources.
2. A body of work published in archival, refereed journals and refereed conference proceedings. Quality of publications will be measured by Google Scholar citation, Science Citation Index, acceptance ratio, or other criteria justified by the candidate. Faculty member is responsible to provide evidence of the quality of scholarship.
3. A growing interaction with professional peers as evidenced by technical presentations in national or international conferences.

**Service:** an adequate involvement in professional and collegial contributions to the department, the college, the university, the professional societies, or the community.

The candidate's cumulative record reveals meeting program objectives in the following areas:

1. Success in receiving improved approval from students and or peers in course organization, clarity of presentations, and overall instructional efficacy.
2. Initiative and creativity in new course and curriculum development and existing course/program upgrades, and having taught lower and upper division undergraduate and graduate courses.
3. Initiative and active participation in continuous improvement of laboratory equipment/experiments.
4. Recognition of effective teaching and student mentoring with at least 2 MS students graduated as Major Thesis Professor and 2 Capstone teams advised.
5. An average of 2 refereed research publications per year with no 2-year period without a publication. At least 3 publications are with students, and at least 3 publications are as a lead author.
6. PI of externally supported grants that cover research expenditures e.g., graduate student costs, post-docs, travel, lab equipment, summer faculty salaries, course buyouts, etc. Co-PI role in externally supported grants will be considered commensurate to the credit level.

**Tenure-Track Faculty:** *To Full Professor*

In general, the criteria and guidelines stipulated in Section “To Associate Professor with Tenure” will be followed with considerably higher expectations of the candidates considered to the rank of Full Professor. Successful candidates exhibit a substantial record of achievements in TRS after promotion to associate professor. In addition, the candidates must demonstrate a sense of responsibility for the well-being of other members of the Department and a commitment to help the Department accomplish its goals. The PAC highly values leadership abilities in mentoring Junior Faculty members achieve excellence in TRS.

**Faculty in Lecturer Positions:** Refer to the CENG Lecturer Guidelines

*To Senior Lecturer*

**Teaching:** a record of teaching at the undergraduate and graduate (if applicable) levels that reveals:

1. Success in receiving improved approval from students and or peers in course organization, clarity of presentations, and overall instructional efficacy.
2. Initiative and creativity in new course and curriculum development and existing course/program upgrades.
3. Initiative and active participation in continuous improvement of laboratory equipment/experiments.
4. Active participation in activities such as student advising, alumni relations, recruiting and facilitation of student organizations.
5. Interest and demonstrated collegial participation in maintaining program accreditation.

**Service:**

1. Adequate involvement in professional contributions to the department, the college, the university, and perhaps the professional societies, and the community.
2. Continuous involvement in professional growth and developmental activities.

Research and scholarly activities such as pedagogical works published in educational conferences or refereed journals appropriate in the candidate’s professional field are highly encouraged but not required.

**Faculty in Lecturer Positions:** Refer to the CENG Lecturer Guidelines

*To Principal Lecturer*

In general, the criteria and guidelines stipulated in Section “To Senior Lecturer” will be followed with considerably higher expectations of the candidates considered to the rank of Principal Lecturer. Successful candidates exhibit a substantial record of achievements in teaching and service activities. In addition, the candidates must demonstrate a sense of responsibility for the well-being of other members of the Department and a commitment to help the Department accomplish its goals. The PAC highly values leadership abilities in mentoring Junior Faculty members achieve excellence in TRS.

## **Clinical Faculty Ranks**

ETEC faculty define classification of Clinical Faculty in different ranks based on UNT Policy 06.002 as indicated in the link below:

[https://policy.unt.edu/sites/default/files/06.005\\_NonTenureTrackFacultyReappointmentAndPromotion\\_2017.pdf](https://policy.unt.edu/sites/default/files/06.005_NonTenureTrackFacultyReappointmentAndPromotion_2017.pdf)

The three clinical faculty ranks in ETEC are Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor.

## **Clinical Faculty Appointments**

Appointment and promotion are based upon potential or demonstrated excellence in instruction, scholarly activities, and professional activities or service. The initial workload for the clinical faculty is 80 percent instruction and 20 percent service. Any other workload distribution among the various three categories should be clearly specified by the ETEC Chair and the dean of CENG at the time appointment.

As non-tenure track faculty, all clinical faculty must be reappointed each year, dependent upon satisfactory performance. The performance will be reviewed by the ETEC PAC and the Chair. Criteria for consideration for annual contract renewal at all three ranks will be consistent with UNT policy procedures, CENG, and the ETEC Policy and procedures. In order to be promoted, a clinical faculty member must meet the criteria specified for appointment to the higher rank.

Clinical faculty are expected to contribute to professional activities. Evidence of this include (but is not limited to) participation in some of the following activities:

- Students supervision and/or mentoring of students in sponsored external and internal capstone design projects.
- Developing new and expanding existing internships, co-operative education opportunities and partnerships with external partners.
- Engaging in paid professional consulting in the relevant area of professional practice.
- Participating in professional externships or seeking temporary or freelance employment in the area of professional practice, while on a professional leave of absence or during summer employment.
- Participating as a student in continuing education in the area of professional practice, including industry workshops, seminars, and courses.
- Attending major conferences where current issues of professional practice are discussed.
- Service in leadership positions of professional societies and organizations.

### *to Clinical Assistant Professor*

- Must hold a doctoral degree in Engineering or Engineering Science or any other fields relevant to the department's needs.
- The candidate must have at least five years of full time (or equivalent alternative) professional experience in the profession for which the person is being appointed as a clinical faculty member.
- Professional experience is experience acquired while "practicing the discipline in a work setting" and includes, but is not limited to, experience acquired in industry, college or university academic clinical instruction, and public/private/voluntary sector.
- Candidate should show evidence of a high level of competence in their specialty and demonstrate promise of moving toward excellence in instruction, scholarly activities, professional leadership, professional practice and/or service, as specified at appointment.

### *to Clinical Associate Professor*

Shall meet all criteria specified for Clinical Assistant Professor and shall be widely recognized in scholarly

and professional accomplishments with a demonstrated or emerging prominence in his or her field at the state, regional, national or international level as appropriate. In addition, the candidate must exhibit documented expertise in clinical instruction or professional practice and demonstrate evidence of excellence in teaching. It is required to serve for five (5) years in the Clinical Assistant Professor rank before applying for promotion to the Clinical Associate Professor. Exception would be granted with the approval of the Dean and the Provost.

*to Clinical Professor*

Shall meet all criteria specified for Clinical Assistant and Clinical Associate Professor and shall be widely recognized at the national or international level by leaders of relevant communities of practitioners as a leading authority within their disciplinary practice specialty. Evidence presented should demonstrate the national or international standing of the candidate. The candidate must exhibit documented evidence in clinical instruction and professional practice. It is required to serve for five (5) years in the Clinical Associate Professor rank before applying for promotion to the Clinical Professor rank. Exception would be granted with the approval of the Dean and the Provost.

General Criteria for Promotion of Clinical Assistant Professor to higher Ranks:

UNT Policy 06.005 on “Non-Tenure Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion” will be used to promote Clinical Assistant Professors to higher ranks.



***Appendix: External Review***

***Procedure to solicit external reviewers for tenure and promotion***

The selection of external reviewers should be from a pool of tenured faculty at institutions with programs at least comparable to Engineering Technology at the University of North Texas.

**Section 1.** The external evaluators should be chosen in the following manner.

- a. The candidate submits to the department chair at least four names and addresses of individuals who the candidate believes are professionally capable of evaluating the candidate's professional achievements. In some cases, the candidate may also supply a list of names of individuals who the candidate feels would not be able to serve as an objective external reviewer. If the candidate does submit such a list, the candidate should provide a brief statement on the nature of the conflict and why the individual should be disqualified as an external reviewer.
- b. Members of the department PAC submits to the Chair an additional list of at least four individuals so qualified. In cases where there are distinct and appropriate disciplinary sub-fields, it is recommended that the committee solicit such names from department faculty of that sub-field.
- c. The Department Chair may also submit the names of possible reviewers. The Department Chair, in concert with the department PAC will select a minimum of five referees from these lists. The selection will include at least one individual from each list, assuming qualifications are met. These names will not be revealed to the candidate.
- d. Every letter received must be sent forward with the candidate's file. No received letters may be excluded from the review.

**Section 2.** The Department Chair in liaison with the PAC chair will write the external referees. In selecting the external referees, the Department Chair and the PAC should attempt to ensure that the reviewers meet the following criteria.

- a. The reviewers should be tenured and hold the rank to which the candidate aspires. The selection of an external reviewer may deviate from this guideline only if the deviation is clearly explained and documented. For example, an associate professor may be a leading person in some special sub-field of the discipline, or in some cases it may be appropriate to solicit letters from researchers in industry. Professionals who are not members of the academic community may be able to comment on public service activities of the faculty member.
- b. The reviewers should be considered to be "at arm's length", meaning, they should not be the candidate's mentor, or former professor, or colleague, or co-authors. The T&P packet includes form VPAA-172 to describe the connection of the reviewer to the candidate.

**Section 3.** Outside reviewers should receive the candidate's complete vita and relevant supporting material and a copy of the UNT department's criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

**Section 4.** The external review letters must address the candidate's record as a scholar, the extent the candidate's scholarly/creative record constitutes a significant contribution to the discipline, and the candidate's potential for continued productivity. The reviewers should also address the question of whether the reviewer thinks the candidate should be promoted based on the UNT department's criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

**Section 5.** Letters of external review should state the reviewer's knowledge of, or relationship to, the candidate. This information should be requested to be part of the letter when the arrangements are made for the external reviews. External reviewers should also provide a bio-sketch with their evaluation letter.

**Section 6.** Upon receipt of the letters of evaluation, the Department Chair shall submit all of them to the department PAC for use in its deliberations. The PAC should include these letters with the evaluation, which is sent to the Chair, who will forward them with the candidate's dossier to the Dean of the College of Engineering. The Chair will also forward the bio-sketch for each of the external reviewers.

=====  
Bylaws based on

- i. "ETEC Department Constitution Dec 2009"
- ii. "Department of Engineering Technology, Merit Review: Evaluation Criteria and Supporting Documentation, Approved February 24, 2009"
- iii. "Department of Engineering Technology, Promotion and Tenure Document, Approved May 1, 2009"
- iv. ETEC Constitution, April 2013, as approved 5 December 2014
- v. Bylaws approved March 15, 2015