

RTP Criteria for the Department of Technology Management
College of Engineering and Technology
Utah Valley University
Date: 11/2020

Introduction

This Review, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Criteria document has been developed by the full-time faculty within the Department of Technology Management. The criteria were developed in accordance with (1) the standards of Technology Management discipline, (2) the principles and practices specified in UVU policy 635 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and (3) Utah Valley University mission, as well as with several UVU umbrella policies including *600 series academic* which can be found in [UVU's Online Policy System](#). In addition, the criteria are also tightly linked to the College of Engineering and Technology "Faculty Evaluation Guidelines" document. The idea is that the yearly faculty planning, reporting, and evaluation process should drive all RTP requests. Goals and their evaluation criteria should be set and agreed upon between the chair and faculty member in such a way that upon successful completion will meet the RTP criteria established in this document.

Philosophy

The Technology Management discipline we use in this document conforms to the NCES/IPEDS Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code 52.0216, Science/Technology Management. It defines Technology Management as a discipline that deals with "*science, technical, and business skills required for management of people and systems in technology-based industries, government agencies, and non-profit organizations.*"¹

The faculty within the Technology Management (TM) Department consider themselves a community of Technology Management educators who work together under the direction of a department chair to define educational curriculum, conduct and improve teaching, establish department standards, and solve department problems. This same philosophy was followed in the development of the RTP criteria found within this document.

The TM faculty members recognize that the development of any set of criteria cannot include every possible item of evaluation which a faculty member may desire. When issues arise, they must be resolved within the yearly faculty planning process and not after the fact; the resolution must also follow university policy.

Criteria Overview

In line with policy, the RTP criteria presented in this document are intended to be used as a part of the faculty evaluation process, a main item of which is the faculty portfolio. Other items in the faculty portfolio are not discussed in this RTP criteria document.

The criteria found in the next section of this document are in tabular form *organized around the Assessment Area (Teaching, Scholarship, Service)*. The columns in these tables are ordered by Review Period (Third Year on Tenure Track; Tenure and Advancement to Associate Professor; Promotion to Full Professor; Post-tenure).

¹ <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/cipdetail.aspx?y=56&cipid=91732>

The criteria are divided into two sections, Primary criteria and Secondary criteria. Primary criteria refer to the criteria required to “Meet Expectations.” Secondary criteria refer to the criteria for “Exceeding Expectation”). It is expected that all faculty members meet expectations by achieving a “Meets Expectation” rating each year by the department chair for each assessment area. To accomplish this, a faculty member must meet each of the Primary criteria. Associated with each Evaluation Item is a source of evidence. These Evaluation Item–source of evidence pairs form the basic criteria.

The Secondary criteria items are intended to be especially helpful for tenure and rank advancement and for merit pay determination. “Exceeding expectations” can be accomplished e.g. by the faculty member and the chair agreeing upon a set of goals that “Exceed Expectation” during the faculty member’s annual planning process. A faculty member can also exceed expectations by achieving over and above of the “Meeting Expectations” criteria in some other way during the academic year (e.g. by exceeding expectations without having planned to do so), provided that the faculty member documents those achievements and uses them to make a case for “Exceeding Expectations.”

| Career View | | Teaching | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| RTP Criteria for Technology Management Department – Area | | | | |
| Evaluation Item | Source of Evidence | | | |
| | Third Year on Tenure Track | Tenure and Advancement to Associate Professor | Promotion to Full Professor | Post-Tenure |
| Percent of Yearly Goals | 80% - 90% | 70% - 80% | 50% - 70% | 50% - 70% |
| Primary Criteria | | | | |
| Create yearly plan and update five-year plan, as applicable | Plan is approved by faculty member and department chair; Provost approval to continue | | | |
| Teaching effectiveness as evaluated by students | Student Rating of Instruction (SRI) score in at least second quartile overall as compared to the department and college for all classes for the entire evaluation period, not including summer. The focus is on overall trends, not a single term | | SRI score in at least third quartile overall as compared to the department and college for all classes for the entire evaluation period, not including summer. The focus is on overall trends, not a single term | SRI score in at least second quartile overall as compared to the department and college for all classes for the entire evaluation period, not including summer. The focus is on overall trends, not a single term |
| | Goals set and accomplished in yearly faculty plan and report to correct any items less than expected rating | | | |
| Teaching effectiveness as perceived by peers and/or colleagues | Overall minimum rating of 35/50 points (70%) each year based on two peer | Overall rating of 40/50 points (80%) for three of the previous five years based | Overall rating of 42.5/50 points (85%) for three of the previous five years based on two evaluations per year with at least one completed by a peer outside the department | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| | evaluations per year | on two evaluations per year in different subjects and by different people | | |
| Teaching effectiveness evaluated by other documentation | Supply a syllabus that meets university requirements and includes a classroom management policy statement supporting the creation of a civil learning atmosphere | Develops course materials that allow the students to improve their critical thinking skills regarding science, technology, and business | Designs, reviews, and revises curriculum and courses as needed so that they provide the students with skills relevant to the management of people and systems and/or critical thinking skills | |
| Professional development | Attends Teaching Academy or equivalent activity or work with established instructor to develop new prep | Attends two activities promoting effective teaching in five years | In yearly faculty plan, sets appropriate goals to continue teaching improvement | |
| Use of engaged learning | Applies one new technique to at least two courses | Applies one new technique to at least four courses | Applies engaged learning techniques in most courses | |
| Annual Chair Evaluation | Receives an overall minimum rating of "Meets Expectations" for each year based on faculty member's Annual Chair's Evaluation | Receives an overall rating of "Exceeds Expectations" for two of the previous five years based on Annual Chair's Evaluation | Receives a rating of "Exceeds Expectations" in teaching and at least one other category for three of the previous five years based on Annual Chair's Evaluation | Receives an overall minimum rating of "Meets Expectations" each year based on faculty member's Annual Chair's Evaluation |
| Secondary Criteria | | | | |
| <i>Evaluation Item</i> | <i>Candidates should work with department chair to choose items in order to reach the level of "Exceeds Minimal Goal"</i> | | | |
| Develop new course, program, degree, or apply technology to existing course | Develop new course, substantially update an existing course, or put existing course online | | | |
| Professional development activities which lead to improved teaching | Demonstrate the use of engaged learning pedagogy in additional classes | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Advising/mentoring of student projects or other faculty members | Advise student projects (e.g. Senior capstone) or assist new faculty members with new course prep for at least one semester |
| Teaching Awards | Nomination, recommendation, or receipt of college or institutional teaching award |
| Peer evaluation of course design | Receives a minimum of 85% based on peer evaluation form |
| Peer evaluation by Student Collaborators on Teaching (SCOTS) or similar | Receives a minimum of 85% based on peer evaluation form |
| Peer evaluation of course management | Receives a minimum of 85% based on peer evaluation form |
| Peer evaluation of subject expertise | Receives a minimum of 85% based on peer evaluation form |
| Internal or external teaching grant or source of funding | Apply for or obtain at least one internal or external grant or source of funding |
| SRI Student comments | List favorable student comments |
| Student feedback outside SRI | Letters of recommendation, additional course surveys, or surveys of graduates can be used to demonstrate teaching effectiveness |

| Career View | | Scholarship | | |
|--|--|---|---|-------------|
| RTP Criteria for Technology Management Department – Area | | | | |
| Evaluation Item | Source of Evidence | | | |
| | Third Year on Tenure Track | Tenure and Advancement to Associate Professor | Promotion to Full Professor | Post-Tenure |
| Percent of Yearly Goals | 5% - 15% | 10% - 20% | 15% - 35% | 15% - 35% |
| Primary Criteria | | | | |
| Presentations | One local presentation | One regional or above peer-reviewed presentation | Two national or international peer-reviewed presentations within the previous five years | |
| Publications | One submitted peer-reviewed publication as primary or secondary author in an academic journal or | One accepted peer-reviewed publication as primary or secondary author in an academic journal or | One peer-reviewed publication as primary author in an academic journal or professional publication within the previous five years | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | professional publication | professional publication | |
| Professional Development | Attend professional development as approved by Chair in annual plan | | |
| Degrees | Approved progress towards doctorate degree (if applicable) | Completed doctorate degree (if applicable) | n/a |
| Internal or external teaching grant or source of funding | n/a | Apply for or obtain at least one internal or external grant or source of funding | Apply for and receive one grant or source of funding from outside the university within the past five years |
| Engaged Scholarship and Undergraduate Research | n/a | | One research project with students accepted for presentation or publication within the past five years |
| Annual Chair Evaluation | Receives an overall minimum rating of “Meets Expectations” for each year based on faculty member’s Annual Chair’s Evaluation | Receives an overall rating of “Exceeds Expectations” in scholarship or service for two of the previous five years based on faculty member’s Annual Chair’s Evaluation | Receives a rating of “Exceeds Expectations” in scholarship or service for three of the previous five years based on faculty member’s Annual Chair’s Evaluation |
| Secondary Criteria | | | |
| <i>Evaluation Item</i> | <i>Candidates should work with department chair to choose items to be added to Annual Plan/Report in order to reach the level of “Exceeds Minimal Goal”</i> | | |
| Presentations | Peer reviewed presentation or additional presentations | | |
| Publications | Publication as primary or secondary author, publication of chapter in book, or additional publications | | |
| Other | Grants, patents, commendations, scholarship awards—college/university or professional development | | |

| | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Career View | Service |
|--------------------|----------------|

| RTP Criteria for Technology Management Department – Area | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Evaluation Item | Source of Evidence | | | |
| | Third Year on Tenure Track | Tenure and Advancement to Associate Professor | Promotion to Full Professor | Post-Tenure |
| Percent of Yearly Goals | 5% - 15% | 10% - 20% | 15% - 35% | 15% - 35% |
| Primary Criteria | | | | |
| University Service | Serve on one Department, School, or College committee | Over a five-year period serve on three committees on the Department, School or College level | Serve as faculty senator, major university initiative, act as department chair or other administrative position once within the past five years | Over a five-year period serve on three committees on the Department, School or College level |
| Professional/ Other Service | Be an active member in a professional organization every year | | | |
| | | Support the TM discipline by providing intellectual contributions to one or more of its professional organizations and/or communities | Leadership service at a regional or national level for a professional, educational, non-profit or political organization related to the University and/or discipline once within the past five years | Support the TM discipline by providing intellectual contributions to one or more of its professional organizations and/or communities |
| Student Service | Maintain availability of 10 regular office hours and/or lab hours per week in either face or face or online modality. | | | |
| | n/a | Involvement in student/campus organization or body once in the past five years | Primary sponsor for year-long extracurricular student activity | Involvement in student/campus organization or body once in the past five years |
| Annual Chair Evaluation | Receives an overall minimum rating of “Meets Expectations” for each year based on faculty member’s Annual Chair’s Evaluation | Receives an overall rating of “Exceeds Expectations” in scholarship or service for two of the previous five years based on faculty member’s Annual Chair’s Evaluation | Receives a rating of “Exceeds Expectations” in scholarship or service for three of the previous five years based on faculty member’s Annual Chair’s Evaluation | Receives an overall rating of “Exceeds Expectations” in scholarship or service for two of the previous five years based on faculty member’s Annual Chair’s Evaluation |
| Secondary Criteria | | | | |

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <i>Evaluation Item</i> | <i>Candidates should work with department chair to choose items to be added to Annual Plan/Report in order to reach the level of "Exceeds Minimal Goal"</i> |
| University Service | Serve on university committee or other university service |
| Professional or Other Service | Community service related to university and/or your discipline or leadership position in professional organization |
| Student Service | Faculty sponsor to student activities, initiatives, or organizations |
| Awards | Receive an award for service for university service or professional/other service |
| Other | Service as reviewer for professional journals, magazines, textbooks, and/or ancillary materials; service in recruiting full-time or adjunct faculty or advisory committee members as needed; service awards; or other, where weight is proposed by candidate and approved by the department chair |