

Governance of the Department of Engineering Technology
Revised: May 3rd, 2007

Introduction

The Department of Engineering Technology's primary objective is to meet the technical education needs of the Hamilton and Middletown area communities and other distant constituent sites within the state of Ohio. Our vision is to be a statewide leader in Engineering Technology education. Our associate degree programs are designed to prepare students for immediate employment in local industries and our bachelor's degree program is designed to enable graduates of associate degree programs to continue their education with a convenient schedule. To help working adults improve their job skills, we offer technical workshops, courses, and programs in conjunction with Continuing Education.

A. Departmental Membership

General department membership consists of the department chair, full-time faculty*, visiting faculty, other affiliated faculty, lab technicians, and others agreed upon by the current department membership. The dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science (SEAS), regional campus deans, and all Engineering Technology (ENT) part-time faculty have standing invitations to attend meetings.

B. Departmental Meetings

Departmental meetings are held at regular intervals, minimally twice each semester, during the academic year. The chair schedules these meetings in advance and informs all participants. The agenda will be established by the chair with input from the general department membership. It will normally be distributed one week (or sooner) prior to meetings. Minutes of meetings are distributed to the faculty, SEAS dean, and regional campus deans. Copies are kept on file by the chair and the SEAS dean.

C. Decision Making in the Department

Issues requiring faculty decisions are treated in one of two ways. First, when appropriate, some issues, which the chair concludes can be handled with informal faculty input, are decided by consensus. Second, when a formal vote is necessitated, a simple majority is required for an issue to pass. For voting purposes related to curriculum and personnel, department membership is restricted to full-time faculty* and others approved by full-time faculty. For all other business, voting includes all members as defined above under section A.

*Note: For the purpose of this document, full-time faculty consist of tenured, tenure-track, and full-time visiting faculty.

D. Employment of New Faculty

1. Employment of full-time faculty:

- a. Candidates for full-time teaching positions must evidence competency based on the following criteria:
 1. Formal education including the Master's Degree in a field appropriate to the teaching assignment,
 2. Practical experience other than teaching in the appropriate specialization,
 3. Evidence of continuing involvement and interest in the field of concentration, and
 4. An understanding of and a commitment to technical education.
- b. Unless otherwise stated by the department, and evidenced by written agreement, when hiring full-time faculty the department intends that each will be capable of earning tenure and promotion.

- c. The ENT faculty, regional campus deans, and SEAS dean shall have the opportunity to interview and evaluate the candidates. The chair will recommend the department's final choice to the SEAS dean and the regional campus deans.

2. Employment of part-time, visiting, and affiliated faculty:

- a. Candidates must possess the baccalaureate degree or its equivalent.
- b. Equivalency may be demonstrated by industrial experience, licensure, certification, or similar recognition.
- c. Individuals possessing more advanced degrees are preferred when all other qualifications are equal.

Note: In very special cases it may be to the department's advantage to employ faculty, temporarily, who do not meet the educational requirements set forth above.

E. Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

1. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

The following is intended to elaborate the department's position while remaining consistent with all-University policy. For more and current information, see Miami University's web site at <http://www.muohio.edu/mupim>. For promotional consideration, the department requires the earned Masters Degree.

- a. Recognizing that Successful Teaching is very difficult to evaluate, the department, nevertheless, believes that it is the foremost quality in promotion and tenure considerations. Faculty should refer to the department's teaching evaluation plan (Appendix I) for guidance in assessing and improving teaching.
- b. Professional Development/Research of the faculty member must be a continuing process. The continual growth of industry and rapid changes in technology mandate that the Engineering Technology faculty keep current in their academic disciplines. Professional development may be evidenced by participation in professional societies, continuing education, attendance at seminars and conferences, contacts/consulting with local industry, etc. Research may be evidenced by unique consulting experiences, professional and creative (e.g., software) publications, and research grants.
- c. Service activities to the department, campus, university, discipline, and the public are of great importance. Activities within the university setting include departmental governance and development, committee work, advising, administrative duties, etc. Disciplinary service could mean serving as an ABET reviewer, chairing a session at a national conference, or significant involvement with a professional society. Public service can be defined as outreach, such as contribution of talent and time to one's community including recruiting, civic board membership, etc. It can also be engagement, which utilizes the application of one's disciplinary expertise to real world issues or problems, such as consulting to local industry.
- d. Collegiality within the department, regional campuses, division, and the university is an equally important consideration in the tenure process.

2. Procedure for Promotion and Tenure

Promotion and tenure processes are publicized in the Miami University Policy and Information Manual (MUPIM) and available at <http://www.muohio.edu/mupim>

Faculty are encouraged to become familiar with these processes. Probationary faculty will receive informal P&T reviews during their first two years at Miami then formal P&T reviews during their third, fourth, and fifth years at Miami. These reviews are intended to guide and counsel the faculty member.

- a. All promotion and/or tenure recommendations shall be made by an appropriate faculty committee of at least three (3) voting members. A simple majority vote will rule, however, the

committee is encouraged to work toward a consensus. Voting results will be included in the final report of the committee. The department chair sits on this committee without voting privileges and submits an independent recommendation. The committee shall be composed of the non-voting department chair and:

Promotion: all faculty currently at or above the rank sought. If there is an insufficient number of faculty at or above the rank sought, the dean of Engineering and Applied Science may appoint qualified faculty from other Engineering and Applied Science departments to serve on the committee.

Tenure: all faculty currently tenured in the ENT department. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty, the dean of Engineering and Applied Science may appoint qualified faculty from other Engineering and Applied Science departments to serve on the committee.

- b. Eligible faculty members must declare their intent to pursue promotion and/or tenure the semester prior to the fall semester in which they intend to apply. During that same semester, the department chair will review the P&T process and time-table with the faculty member. Eligible faculty members shall notify the Department chair within two weeks of the above discussion whether or not they wish to be considered that year for promotion and/or tenure.
- c. On or about October 1, the faculty member will prepare and submit to the chair the promotion and/or tenure materials. At this time, the material will also be shared with the dean(s) of the regional campuses. The faculty member will assume the responsibility of preparing the materials in a professional manner consistent with University guidelines. Assistance of the chair or other knowledgeable individuals may be sought.
- d. On or about October 23, the regional campus dean (s) will prepare an evaluation and send it to the dean of Engineering and Applied Science, Department chair, and the candidate.
- e. On or about October 23, the department P&T Committee will submit their evaluation of the candidate to the department chair.
- f. On or about November 12, the department chair will submit an evaluation to the dean of Engineering and Applied Science. This evaluation will include the department chair's letter, the P&T Committee's evaluation, the evaluation(s) from the regional campus dean(s), and the candidate's supporting materials complete with appropriate cover form.
- g. On or about November 26, the School of Engineering and Applied Science P&T Advisory Committee will make recommendation to the dean of Engineering and Applied Science.
- h. On or about December 4, the dean may inform the candidate of his/her recommendation.
- i. On or about December 9, the dean submits all evaluation materials to the University Secretary.

F. Evaluation of Faculty and Retention of Faculty

Faculty should refer to MUPIM section 7.5.

All faculty will be reviewed annually. This review shall include an annual report, following the School of Engineering and Applied Science format, prepared by the faculty member and submitted to the chair on or about January 30. The chair will prepare an evaluation of the faculty member and review this report with the faculty member on or about March 1.

The following apply to tenure track (probationary) faculty:

- In each year of the probationary period, the department P&T committee writes a letter of evaluation. This letter is shared with the department chair and the probationer.
- In each year of the probationary period, the department chair writes a letter of evaluation in consultation with the department tenure committee and regional campus dean(s).
- The department chair's letter must be formally acknowledged by the department P&T committee, the regional campus dean(s), and the probationer before forwarding to the dean of Engineering and Applied Science so that errors of fact and omission might be eliminated.

- In the candidate's final year of probationary period, the department P&T committee reviews the candidate's cumulative record and makes a positive or negative recommendation for tenure to the department chair. The department chair prepares a letter evaluating the quality of academic performance and effectiveness of the candidate in teaching and advising, professional service, and research, scholarship and/or creative achievement. The letters from the department chair, P&T committee, and regional campus dean(s) are forwarded to the dean of Engineering and Applied Science along with the candidate's dossier and supporting documentation.
- In the event the tenure committee's evaluation differs from that of the chair, the tenure committee shall forward its evaluation to the probationer, with a copy to the regional campus dean(s). Such evaluations are subsequently reviewed by the dean of Engineering and Applied Science, and then officially transmitted to the probationer. Whenever the dean's evaluation differs from that of the department chair or the department tenure committee, the dean must so inform the staff member, the chair, the committee, and the regional campus dean, in writing, citing the basis for the judgment.

Concerns regarding professional collegiality should be shared as promptly as possible with the person whose behavior is questioned. Notice of uncollegiality must be given to that person in writing no later than his or her next annual evaluation after occurrence of the behavior considered uncollegial.

G. Salary Recommendations

Salary recommendation for each faculty member are made by the chair on request of the dean of the appropriate regional campus. Decisions on salary increases are based on the amount of money allotted to the campus, and the judgment of the regional campus dean who may seek advice from various sources such as deans, chairs, and coordinators.

H. Teaching Assignments

The chair or his/her designate will coordinate the building of the course schedule in close consultation with all faculty members. The final schedule is approved by the total department. The department recognizes the preparation of the course schedule as a most important activity.

The normal teaching load for full-time faculty will average 9-12 credit hours (12-16 contact hours) per semester. With approval of the chair, SEAS dean, and regional campus deans, teaching loads may vary from the norm in consideration of administrative duties, research assignments, enrollment patterns, etc. Services expected of faculty members in addition to their assigned teaching load include student advising and counseling; course coordination; laboratory development and management; working on campus, school, university, and professional organization committees and projects; and research and other scholarly work.

Whenever possible, eligible full-time faculty will be given first choice of departmental overload assignments. Faculty from other Miami departments and community personnel are also utilized extensively for part-time/overload assignments. Course coordinators are responsible for recommending to the chair competent part-time staff. The chair submits all recommendations to the dean for final approval.

Each faculty member will submit, on request by the chair or his/her designate, recommendations for summer offerings, being cognizant of the credit hour allotment plus the impact on first and second semester offerings. The chair prepares and submits the schedule. If enrollment contingent, faculty are required to indicate in writing the minimum number of students (and salary) at which they are willing to teach the course.

I. Faculty and Staff Grievance Procedures

Faculty and staff should refer to the Miami University Policy and Information Manual (MUPIM 3.7) available at <http://www.muohio.edu/mupim>

The Department's goal is to reconcile differences at the department level. Most complaints can be resolved through discussion between the staff member and the immediate supervisor. Individuals are encouraged to engage in direct consultation with each other so the problem can be solved through conciliation, if possible. Any retaliation against an employee for having made a complaint is grounds to file a second complaint based on retaliation. Should such informal procedures not resolve the matter, the formal grievance procedures described below are available. Every effort shall be made to expedite the processing of a grievance and to render a decision as quickly as possible. Time periods mentioned in MUPIM in any of the formal procedures are to be considered as maximal. Any time limit specified, however, may be extended by mutual agreement between the respondent and the complainant, unless otherwise stated in the specific grievance procedure. If the complainant does not take the grievance to the next level within the time specified, the grievance shall be considered resolved. If the respondent does not respond to a grievance within the specified time limits, the grievance can be taken to the next step of the formal grievance procedure.

- a. **Resolving the issue within the department:** As the initial step, when differences occur, the involved parties are encouraged to meet in an attempt to reconcile their differences. If not satisfied, the complainant should file a written complaint with the chair. If the complaint is against the chair, then the complaint should be filed with the regional campus dean's office. The chair or the dean's office will attempt to resolve the issue. If not satisfied, the complainant may proceed to a formal grievance procedure as indicated below.
- b. **Formal Grievance.** The University has several grievance procedures designed for specific groups.
 - **Instructional Staff.** Instructional staff may pursue a solution through appeal to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee if the grievance relates to the complainant's role as a member of the instructional staff. See Section 8.1 of this manual.
 - **Administrative Staff.** Section 13.5 of this manual describes the procedures available to members of the administrative staff for the resolution of grievances.
 - **Classified Civil Service Employees.** The *Supervisory, Administrative and Technical Support Staff (SATSS) Handbook* describes the procedures available to Classified Civil Service employees for the resolution of grievances.

J. Student Grievance Procedure

Detailed grievance procedures are available in Miami University Policy and Information Manual (MUPIM 5.5) at <http://www.muohio.edu/mupim>

The Department's goal is to reconcile differences between instructor and student. The student has the option of filing a formal complaint (grievance) or resolving the issue within the department

- c. **Resolving the issue within the department:** As the initial step, when differences occur, the student is encouraged to meet in private with the instructor. If not satisfied, the student should file a written complaint with the chair. This written complaint will then be shared with the instructor. The chair will work with the instructor and the student in an attempt to resolve the dispute. The chair will then respond to the student and the instructor regarding actions taken. This information will be filed in the department's "Student Complaint File".
- d. **Formal Grievance.** The student and faculty should refer to the student handbook appendix L. The student meets with the instructor to try to solve the issue. If not resolved, a formal written complaint is filed with the chair. A grievance committee is formed by the Chair. This will be a committee of at least three faculty and/or staff with at least one member from outside the

department. The committee will hear and review the complaint then make their recommendation to the chair for action. If the student is not satisfied with the decision or actions taken, s/he may request a conference with the dean of SEAS or the dean of the appropriate regional campus. If the student is still not satisfied, s/he may appeal to the grievance committee of SEAS or the appropriate regional campus. See the student handbook for details.

K. Department Budget

The department's annual budget for supplies, equipment, travel etc, is administered through the regional campus deans' offices. The chair will coordinate the budget for the department and must approve requests from the faculty in the above areas. Since guidelines often need clarification, the faculty should consult with the chair on specific questions related to the budget. Because State grants may be unpredictable and sometimes on short notice, faculty members should maintain a continuing list of equipment needs for his/her area.

L. Concurrence by the Faculty

Ratified by the Faculty of the Department of Engineering Technology this 3rd day of May 2007.

Appendix I

Teaching Evaluation Plan Department of Engineering Technology Updated: May 3, 2007

Introduction:

Consistent with the mission, vision, and values of the School of Engineering and Applied Science, Engineering Technology affirms the primacy of teaching, student learning, and advising and we are dedicated to the process of continually improving all three. This plan serves as a guide to assist us in this process and reflects our commitment to the general principles for teaching evaluation developed by the School of Engineering and Applied Science.

ENT Values: The faculty and staff of Engineering Technology value and are committed to:

- promoting a learning environment that is invigorating, challenging, rewarding, and free from prejudice and bias;
- engaging students in the process of imaginative, creative, and critical thinking in the solution of technical problems;
- encouraging students to examine and reflect on the contexts of their knowledge base and the solutions to problems they derive;
- diversity of staff, students, and faculty;
- mutual respect for others and teamwork.

Evaluation and Assessment of Teaching and Learning:

The department utilizes a continuous cycle for the assessment and improvement of teaching and learning which includes:

1. Goals and objectives for our programs and associated courses, utilizing input from advisory councils, employer expectations, and industry benchmarks;
2. Assessment instruments and procedures (summative evaluation) to assist us in determining whether goals and objectives are being met;
3. Continuous improvement by utilizing the results from summative evaluations to improve faculty teaching, student learning, and to revise and improve the goals and objectives of our programs and associated courses.

Goals and Objectives:

The department has an active industrial advisory committee for each of its degree programs—Electrical and Computer Engineering Technology associate degree, Mechanical Engineering Technology associate degree, an Electro-Mechanical Engineering Technology bachelor's degree and a Mechanical Engineering Technology bachelor's degree (see attached list of advisors by program). We meet with these advisors at least twice per year to discuss matters affecting our programs and to solicit their input regarding the goals and objectives for the programs. We combine this input with feedback we receive from employers, professional societies, and other industry sources to establish and/or modify the goals and objectives for the programs.

The department utilizes a standard format for course syllabi which includes goals and objectives (see attached example.) These goals and objectives are regularly reviewed by the department (or sub-committees within the department) to insure that there is continuity from course to course and that the information being covered is consistent with the goals and objectives for the program. Each course has a coordinator (see attached course coordinator list.) The coordinator has the responsibility to maintain the relevancy of the course outline, textbook, lab materials and assignments, and to work with all faculty who are teaching the course (both full- and part-time faculty) to insure that they are covering the same material.

Assessment Instruments and Procedures:

Teaching is the most important element of a full time faculty member's responsibility. As such, *every* course must be evaluated in some formal way (summative or formative) and *every* course must include some form of evaluation that provides for student feedback.

Program and Faculty Evaluation – Summative Evaluation:

Faculty seeking tenure or promotion must use multiple means of summative evaluation. These evaluation tools are designed to help faculty improve teaching and to assess student learning. These assessment data must also provide sufficient evidence for the department and the university to be confident in decisions on tenure and promotion. In addition, part-time, full-time, and temporary faculty (non-tenure) must also use multiple means of summative evaluation. Summative teaching assessment instruments include but are not limited to the following (see explanations below):

- Updated Course Books
- Peer Evaluations
- Students Evaluations

How a faculty member chooses to be evaluated is ultimately up to the individual. Full-time faculty members should use this plan as a guideline for their annual report. All courses each semester must contain at least one of the formal teaching evaluation components. The purpose of this plan is to promote a multidimensional evaluation process where many factors contribute to a sense of how the faculty member is teaching.

Updated Course Books (formal assessment instrument)

ENT faculty will keep current books prepared according to the guidelines that meets the general requirements of the Technology Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (TAC/ABET). These binders cover courses the faculty member coordinates or is currently teaching. Examples of syllabi, tests, labs, etc. help assess how well our students synthesize the engineering technology information required to be successful in future courses and as a graduate of our program. All course books are prepared every three years and updated for significant course changes. At least one updated course book per year should be submitted to the department. These books will undergo a departmental review as well as periodic review by a consultant knowledgeable about TAC/ABET.

All updated course books should contain new material from recent classes. Part-time faculty will keep their own course books (under the supervision of the course coordinator) containing samples of all current tests, homework, and lab reports for each course they teach. These books are to be submitted to the course coordinator at the end of the course.

Peer Evaluations (formal assessment instrument)

Peer evaluations are also an important component of the teaching evaluation plan. Peer evaluations consist of classroom visitations, a detailed course book review, assessment of course syllabus, handouts, teaching aids, and more. Information about peer evaluation methods and procedures is available from the Administrative Assistants for the Department (301-A Mosler Hall in Hamilton and 109 Johnston Hall in Middletown). Each evaluation should be conducted by an ENT department faculty member familiar with the course and course materials being reviewed. A summary type report should be written and submitted to the faculty member whose course is being reviewed. The inclusion of any peer evaluation report in an annual report or promotion and tenure document shall be at the sole discretion of the faculty member. All pre-tenure faculty should choose to have at least one annual peer evaluation.

Student Evaluations (formal assessment instrument)

Faculty will have their classes evaluated by students on a regular basis every time the courses are offered (i.e., at least two courses per year) using the School of Engineering and Applied Science Student Evaluation Form. These evaluations shall be conducted in such a manner as to ensure credibility and integrity:

- ◆ The faculty member shall not administer his or her own evaluations. A third party shall announce the evaluation, distribute the forms, place the student-completed and unused forms in the envelope provided with the forms, seal the envelope and sign across the seal. This same individual should immediately deliver the sealed envelope to the Department Chair of Engineering Technology or the department secretary.
- ◆ The faculty member shall not receive any evaluation results until final grades for the semester have been submitted.

Continuous Improvement – Formative Evaluation:

The assessment data attained through formative evaluations are utilized by individual faculty for personal growth and improvement, annual reports, and promotion and tenure. Formative evaluations through alumni and graduate surveys, exit interviews, employer feedback, and other data are used to improve our programs and the courses in the programs. This closed loop of assessment enables us to monitor the effectiveness of our teaching and student learning and to make adjustments as needed to continually improve our programs. Probationary faculty must use multiple means of formative evaluation as a means to instructional improvement. Formative assessment instruments include but are not limited to:

- Teaching portfolios
- One minute evaluations
- Small group discussions
- Mid-term informal evaluations
- Teaching grants
- Video tape and evaluation from audio visual
- Alumni surveys
- Surveys of current year graduates
- Exit interviews of graduates
- Industry/Employer surveys

- Focus groups

Evaluation and Assessment of Advising:

An equally important role for faculty is advising students. Full-time faculty are expected to advise students on a regular basis. As such, they should be knowledgeable about the requirements for all of the departmental programs, including the Miami Plan for Liberal Education, and the career opportunities available to our graduates. The department utilizes exit interviews and senior/graduate surveys to assess advising. This assessment information is used to identify opportunities for improvement.

Attachments:

Programs and advisors, sample course syllabus, course coordinators, peer evaluation information.