

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS
DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL AND ENERGY ENGINEERING**

CRITERIA ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION

This document presents guidelines for the annual merit evaluation in a manner consistent with the UNT policies.

1. Introduction

The Policy manual Numbers 15.1.9 describes the University of North Texas policy on the academic workload and merit evaluation of the faculty.

The overall goal of the annual merit evaluation process is to provide a fair evaluation for each faculty member, as well as to continually improve the overall quality and performance of the entire department. The annual merit evaluation covers the performance period of each calendar year. The following guidelines are to serve as a basis for annual merit evaluation and potential merit raises in the Department of Mechanical and Energy Engineering.

1.1. Workload Emphasis

There are three main components to the evaluation criteria: Teaching, scholarly activity (research and publication), and service. A balance of the quantity and quality in all three components of teaching, scholarly, and service activities will be considered for the purpose of merit evaluations. The weighting of each of the three components will coincide with the Faculty Workload Report for each faculty member, as submitted by the department to the Dean's office for that year.

1.2. Rating

The department chairperson will provide a rating for each of the criteria, as well as an overall rating, which incorporates the workload weighting factor. The following rating will be given to each of three components indicated in 1.1: Exceeding Expectation, Meeting Expectation, and Below Expectation. The mapping of numerical scores for the corresponding ratings are as follows:

Rating	Below Expectation	Meeting Expectation	Exceeding Expectation
Scores	1	2	3

The following are three examples of the final score of an annual merit evaluation:

Example I:

	Teaching	Research	Service
Teaching Load	40%	40%	20%
Components Score	2	3	2
Subtotal	0.8	1.2	0.4
Total Merit Score	2.4		

Example II:

	Teaching	Research	Service
Teaching Load	40%	40%	20%
Components Score	2	1	2
Subtotal	0.8	0.4	0.4
Total Merit Score	1.6		

	Teaching	Research	Service
Teaching Load	40%	40%	20%
Components Score	3	3	2
Subtotal	1.2	1.2	0.4
Total Merit Score	2.8		

The three-year average of overall merit score of between inclusive 2.0 and 2.6 shall be considered as meeting the departmental expectation, greater than 2.6 shall be considered exceeding the departmental expectation and less than 2 shall be considered below the departmental expectation.

The department chairperson will meet with each of faculty members on the chair's evaluation and recommendation. It is understood that:

- Items under each category of teaching, scholarly, and service activities do not necessarily carry equal weight.
- Achievement of all characteristics is not required for maximum scoring.
- The characteristics are not an exhaustive list of possible activities contributing to the assigned rating in each category.
- Relevant categories and listed items will be applied to all lecturers based on individual agreements on the workload with the department chair.

1.3. Merit Raise Criteria

When the merit salary raise is granted by University, the three-year average of the total scores of the annual merit evaluation shall be calculated and serve as the basis for the merit raise. A faculty who receives a three-year average score of below 2.0 shall not receive a merit salary increase.

1.4. Required Documentation

The required documentation is designed for an evaluation period of one calendar year except for research award and expenditure data which are usually reported by the fiscal year. While it is important that each faculty member make their best effort to submit the required documentation on time and in order, the departmental chair shall notify the faculty member of any deficiencies in documentation prior to the evaluation so that the faculty may correct the deficiency. The faculty member shall have a minimum of one-week notice of any deficiency prior to the scheduled chair-faculty meeting.

1.5. Release Time

If release time was granted during the academic year, the faculty member's performance rating in a given category shall be proportional to and reflect the Faculty Workload Report weighting. For example, if a faculty member is solely supported by a research grant for the year, the workload for teaching should be zero, and higher research productivities are expected. Service to the university, however, shall remain consistent with the workload assignment. Alternatively, if release time was granted as part of a university sponsored incentive program, such as proposal writing initiatives, evaluation will be made by the department chair on a case by case basis. Supporting documentation indicating such incentive release time is granted must be provided.

1.6. Appeals

Faculty who disagree with an annual evaluation may launch an appeal as soon as possible upon receipt of the evaluation. The appeal process is outlined in the UNT Policy Manual 15.1.9.

2. Teaching

Although the major goal of the annual evaluation is for merit reward purposes, another goal of the evaluation is to help the faculty member improve effectiveness in teaching. The evaluation must consider the number of students in each class, student evaluations, the development of new and restructured courses, and awards received for exceptional teaching. Consideration should be given to the extra time required to provide "off-site" instruction, if faculty are involved in teaching at satellite campuses or, developing interactive video-based instruction. Also, there should be consideration for the faculty member's role in advising students, supervising graduate students in research, and other activities related to instruction. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information considered relevant to evaluate effectiveness as a university instructor in documents as outlined below. It is understood that all faculty will meet the minimal requirements:

- Meet class as scheduled
- Use class time to cover relevant course materials
- Maintain adequate office hours to meet students for course load and number of students
- Prepare a course syllabus which includes information such as course objectives, course content, grade components, and course policies
- Participation in ABET required processes

2.1. Exceeding Expectation

A teacher exceeds the departmental expectation would qualify as a master teacher whose instructional performance would be characterized by continuous improvement in course contents and significant innovations in the presentation of course materials. Specific characteristics of a teacher in this category may include, but are not limited to:

- Student evaluation results exceed the departmental norm, defined by university metrics.
- Publication of a recognized textbook, pedagogical article or teaching tool in a peer reviewed journals, such as the *Journal of Engineering Education*
- New program development
- Receive outstanding recognition from student evaluation
- Graduating Master and or Ph.D. students as a major professor
- Formal recognition of teaching excellence by department/college/university or other professional peer groups
- Recipient of an instructional grant.

2.2. Meeting Expectation

A teacher meeting the departmental expectation would be effective in teaching and continuously improves the content and delivery of courses, in addition to meeting the minimum teaching requirements. Specific characteristics of a teacher in this category should include, but are not limited to:

- Student evaluation of instruction at or near the departmental norm within 0.5%
- Application of new instructional techniques and methods,
- New course development or curriculum development,
- Major professor of one or more thesis or dissertation students.
- Serving as a faculty advisor for undergraduate senior design teams when required

2.3. Below Expectation

A teacher below the departmental expectation does not conform to the instructional role of a faculty member in the Department. The performance of faculty in this category is indicated when a faculty member is deficient in one or more of the specific minimum requirements. A faculty member who does not meet the departmental teaching expectation will be required to take actions as defined in the policy, which includes a comprehensive development plan to improve performance.

2.4. Required Documentation

To properly evaluate instructional performance, the faculty must provide documentation in support of his/her accomplishments. Any accomplishments not supported by documentation will not be accepted. Evaluation or recognition of teaching performance might be done by using SETE scores, or equivalent, and peer evaluations, or externally in the form of an award or some other type of recognition.

Documentation required will include: 1) Student evaluation of teaching performance for courses taught for the calendar year under evaluation, 2) Peer evaluation of teaching performance – if available, 3) Department/college/university or other professional peer group recognition – if available.

Instructional Development

Each faculty member is required to submit copies of letters of acceptance or actual copies of all published material. The publications will only be counted in the year they are published.

These publications include: 1) Textbooks (year published), 2) chapters included in other textbooks, 3) papers presented at professional meetings on instructional development, and 4) instructional development articles.

Instructional Activities

The faculty member must provide evidence of proper conduct of classes and any teaching innovations of course improvement projects implemented. Such evidence will include: description of new course preparations or revisions, full description of course innovations, and

statement of thesis and/or dissertation committee responsibility (major and minor).

3. Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Activity

Scholarly, creative, and professional activity is defined as the intellectual contribution of the Department's faculty to either a) the creation of new knowledge (basic scholarship) or b) the application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to the improvement of science and technology of the type that would be consistent with a favorable external peer review. The desired outcome of the research process includes publications in basic and applied outlets. In accordance with the strategic goals of the University, the department seeks to increase graduate student enrollment, with an emphasis on full-time graduate student status, and a substantial increase in externally funded research. Only publications that are in print or on-line, patents that have been issued, and presentations that have been made during the evaluation calendar year should be included for consideration in this evaluation period. Publications listed as "in press" must include a copy of a letter of acceptance for publication on official letterhead. Research proposals for external funding shall include those submitted through the Office of Sponsored Research with the indication of accepted, pending or rejected status during the past fiscal year. External Funding is defined as actual extramural funding received through the Office of Sponsored Research. It does not include HEAF matching funds, startup funding, or cost sharing estimates. However, all other university, college, and departmental support should be noted in the evaluation package. On joint proposals, the sum of the amounts assigned to each of the principal investigators cannot exceed the total amount of the award. Amounts quoted shall be identical to those on record in the Office of Sponsored Research.

3.1. Exceeding Expectation

A scholar's performance exceeding the departmental expectation would be characterized as exceptional on the basis of the quality and quantity of research. A scholar in this category would be involved in an ongoing program of research, characterized by a consistent record of funding, publications, and presentations. Specific characteristics of an outstanding researcher include, but are not limited to:

- At least three basic and/or applied research publications in peer reviewed journals during the evaluation calendar year.
- At least two important peer-reviewed conferences with students co-authors during the evaluation calendar year
- Having a total of more than \$100,000 in external research funding during the past fiscal year.
- Having a total of more than \$80,000 research expenditure during the past fiscal year
- Graduated at least two graduate students (two Ph.D., or one Ph.D. and one Master students).
- Supporting at least two full research assistantships during the evaluation year from an external funding source.
- Receiving awards recognizing the research accomplishments from the outside or inside the university.

3.2. Meeting Expectation

A scholar meeting the departmental expectation would be characterized by the external

validation of efforts, through publication, presentations, and/or external funding, indicating that the individual is making a contribution to the discipline. Specific characteristics of a researcher in this category include, but are not limited to:

- At least two basic and/or applied research publications in peer reviewed journals during the evaluation calendar year.
- At least one important peer-reviewed conferences with student co-authors during the evaluation calendar year.
- Having a total of more than \$50,000 in external research funding during the past fiscal year.
- Having a total of more than \$30,000 research expenditure during the past fiscal year
- Graduated at least one graduate student (one Ph.D. or one Master student).
- Supporting at least one full research assistantship during the evaluation year from an external funding source.

3.3. Below Expectation

A scholar below the departmental expectation should take actions for improvements as defined by the UNT policy. Improvements in both quality and quantity of research are required. Specific characteristics of a researcher in this category include:

- No basic and/or applied research publication in a peer reviewed journal during the evaluation calendar year
- Absence of any of the characteristics outlined in 3.2
- Absence of active preparation and submission of research grant proposals.

3.4. Required Documentation

To properly evaluate research performance, the faculty must provide supportive documentation according to the college AMER guidelines. Any accomplishments not supported by documentation will not be considered. The individual faculty member should provide:

- a) A list of all publications in print or in press, including the title and complete citation of articles published during the academic evaluation year, as well as the previous two academic evaluation years. For works listed as “in-press”, a copy of the letter of acceptance on official letterhead should be included. When requested, a reprint must be produced.
- b) A list of all presentations in the evaluation calendar year, including title, name of meeting, date, and whether contributed or invited. When requested, a copy of the program abstract must be produced.
- c) A list of all research proposal activity completed through the Research Office during the academic year. Provide application date, funding organization, proposal title, Co-PIs on the proposal, total dollar amount request of proposal, UNT portion of the proposal, length of project, and current status (pending, accepted, or rejected). Faculty is encouraged to use the reported data from the research office. Unless otherwise noted, it will be assumed that the requested funding is evenly divided among PI and Co-PI(s) listed.
- d) A list of on-going external research grants, or contracts that were actually received at the beginning of the evaluation calendar year, as recorded by the Research Office, or equivalent. Provide start date, funding organization, proposal title, Co-PIs on the grant,

- total dollar amount of contract, UNT portion of research contract, when applicable
- e) A list of patent disclosures that were submitted to the Research Office during the evaluation calendar year. Provide co-inventor names, title of disclosure, and date submitted.
 - f) Patents that were issued during the evaluation calendar year. Provide co-inventor names, title of patent, issue date, and patent number.
 - g) Scholarly books or book chapters that were published in the evaluation calendar year. Provide complete citation.
 - h) A gift exceeding \$10,000 in cash of the annual income that is used for research by the faculty, and received due to the faculty's substantial involvement, as recognized by departmental chair or Dean of Engineering.

4. University, Professional, and Public Service

Service is an important aspect of the faculty member's responsibilities. In order of priority, a faculty member should provide service:

- 1) To the University, the College, and the Department
- 2) To the professional organizations in the faculty's discipline
- 3) To the public.

Service to the University, the College, and the Department is in the form of participation in activities that are necessary for any organization to operate, such as committee and task force assignments. Service to the profession includes working as an officer, attendance at meetings, etc. The following performance levels assume the faculty member has received no release time or additional compensation other than salary for the listed service activities (e.g. Department Chair, Center Director, Associate Chair, Program Coordinator, or Graduate Advisor). Service to the department is often in the form of ad hoc or short term projects (e.g., departmental instrumentation purchase and setup). 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.

4.1. Exceeding Expectation

A faculty member exceeding the departmental expectation achieves a very high level of service to the University, the member's profession, and/or the public. The faculty member will have served professional organizations as a major officer, or been in leadership roles of committees. Specific characteristics of a faculty member in this category may include, but are not limited to:

- Active participation in at least two committees (at least one at the university or college level) as at least a group/task leader
- Formal recognition of exceptional service to the University, College, Department, professional group, or officer in a national organization, and leadership in professional societies such as president, chair of technical division, or on board of governors, or equivalent
- Editor/associate editor of a peer reviewed technical journal
- Director of a center or institute

- Election to and membership on the faculty senate
- Facilitator of a major equipment donation of more than \$50,000 in market value
- Coordinator of ABET activities.

4.2. Meeting Expectation

A faculty member meeting the departmental expectation shall provide a high level of service to the University, the member's profession, and/or the public. The faculty member will have served professional organizations by being an officer, served the University by being on the University Senate, or serving on a committee, task force or other projects. Specific characteristics of a faculty member in this category may include, but are not limited to;

- Officer in a professional society such as a committee chair, organization,
- Active service on at least one major committee or task force,
- Facilitator of an equipment donation to the department worth more than \$10,000 in market value.
- For non-tenure track faculty: acting as a faculty advisor for undergraduate students.

4.3. Below Expectation

A faculty member in this category does not conform to the service role of a faculty member in the Department. Below-expectation performance is indicated when a faculty member has not significantly participated in university, college or departmental service.

4.4. Required Documentation

To properly evaluate service performance, the faculty must provide supportive documentation according to the college AMER guidelines. Any accomplishments not supported by documentation will not be considered. The example documentation includes, but not limited to:

- a) A list of committee served and roles and tasked assigned
- b) The description of accomplished outcomes serving on university/professional committees
- c) Support letters (emails acceptable) from the committee chair or peers confirming the level of contribution
- d) Evidence of awards or other types of recognition.