

Smith College of Engineering and Technology

Common Rank, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Criteria and Expectations

Departments ratified the common RTP criteria and expectations for the following sections to serve as their respective RTP criteria:

- Introduction
- Section 1 Required Files Per Policy 637 Faculty Tenure
- Section 2 Teaching
- Section 3 Scholarship and Creative Works introductory paragraphs
- Section 3.1 General
- Respective Scholarship/Creative Works criteria by department/program
- Section 4 Service

Departments and Initial Ratification Dates: **All updates approved by 8/18/2023.**

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| • Architecture/Engineering Design | 5/4/2023 |
| • Construction Technologies | 5/4/2023 |
| • Culinary Arts | 5/4/2023 |
| • Digital Media | 5/4/2023 |
| • Electrical and Computer Engineering | 5/4/2023 |
| • Engineering Technology | 5/5/2023 |
| • Information Systems & Technology | 5/5/2023 |
| • Mechanical and Civil Engineering | 5/4/2023 |
| • School of Aviation Science | 5/5/2023 |
| • Technology Management | 5/4/2023 |
| • Transportation Technologies | 5/4/2023 |

CET Dean’s Office Approval Date: **8/21/2023**

This document describes common RTP criteria and expectations for the Smith College of Engineering and Technology. It describes (1) what to include in the portfolio, (2) what type of artifacts are needed to provide evidence and documentation, (3) minimum requirements for tenure and promotion, and (4) where to upload specific artifacts.

Tenure portfolios must include documentation from the midterm review, including the midterm recommendation letters from the RTP Committee, department chair, dean, and Provost. Any concerns noted during the midterm review must be addressed in the respective areas in the tenure portfolio. Faculty who received years toward tenure upon hire without a midterm review are excluded from this requirement.

References to Faculty Success, Activities, and auto-generated reports apply to the current digital portfolio system at Utah Valley University. If the institution changes to a different portfolio system, adjustments will be made without negatively impacting faculty.

Color-coding key:

- Auto-Generated Reports within the Portfolio (pulled from Activities data entered when faculty members submit their portfolio by the deadline)
- Reflections created by faculty members

1. Required Files Per Policy 637 Faculty Tenure

These files are required by Policy 637 for tenure. Academic Affairs also requires these elements for rank advancement. Refer to Policy 637 for explanations of what to include for elements stated in 1.1-1.3 in this document. All required sections must be completed to recommend faculty members for midterm review, tenure, or rank advancement.

Note: When faculty members submit their final tenure portfolio, they must include their midterm review with reflections on how they addressed any concerns. When faculty members submit their rank advancement portfolios, they must include any previous negative decisions (if having received any) with reflections on how they addressed any concerns.

1.1. Table of Contents (PDF)

1.2. College and Department RTP Criteria (PDF)

1.3. Faculty Narrative/Information Statement (PDF)

1.4. Curriculum Vitae

1.4.1. Auto-Generated Vitae Report

1.4.1.1. Faculty members must keep the Activities section of Faculty Success up to date so that the auto-generated Curriculum Vitae Report will refer to teaching, scholarship/creative works, service activities, awards, and all other relevant information.

1.4.1.2. Faculty members may upload an additional CV in PDF.

- 1.5. Faculty members must also include any documents relating to a Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) and disciplinary actions, with reflections on how they remediated or otherwise addressed the issues relating to the PIPs or disciplinary actions.

2. Teaching

Effective teaching is of utmost importance at Utah Valley University. The portfolio must provide evidence of high-quality teaching and a commitment to self-improvement as an educator. High-quality teaching and a commitment to self-improvement are assessed through aggregating all teaching elements to demonstrate exceptional care, exceptional accountability, and exceptional results. Tenure-track, tenured, and lecturers/professionals-in-residence are expected to meet the expectations set forth in this section.

2.1. Self-Assessment of Teaching

- 2.1.1. The self-assessment should provide an overall assessment of teaching performance, improvements (either required or self-initiated), impacts on students, and experiences for the probationary period. (More specific self-assessments/reflections are included for each specific area.)
- 2.1.2. Upload a two- or three-page PDF named **Self-Assessment of Teaching**.

2.2. Supervisor Assessment of Teaching

- 2.2.1. Supervisor assessments of teaching should assess the faculty member's (1) learning environment, (2) academic standards of the discipline and the department, (3) preparation, and (4) instructional performance. Departments use supervisor and peer observation/assessment forms that include narrative feedback.
- 2.2.2. Direct supervisor assessments of teaching (separate from the annual reviews) are required. These assessments may include observation of face-to-face class or live streaming sessions, or review of recorded video lectures. Supervisor assessments should also include a review of the syllabus, Canvas organization and contents, etc. of the course observed.
- 2.2.3. Supervisor observations need to provide specific details for strengths as well as areas for improvement. The observation should include qualitative, actionable comments.
- 2.2.4. Minimum direct supervisor assessment of teaching.
 - 2.2.4.1. For midterm candidates, at least **one assessment per academic year** is required.
 - 2.2.4.2. For tenure candidates, at least **one assessment per academic year** is required.

2.2.4.3. For rank advancement, at least **one assessment every other academic year** with a minimum of two must be included.

2.2.4.4. For department chairs pursuing rank advancement to Professor, a CET Associate Dean can conduct the supervisor assessment of teaching.

2.2.4.5. Faculty members use the Observations link within Faculty Success Activities to enter supervisor observations/assessments. For each observation/assessment, upload one PDF. Include **Supervisor Assessment** in the filename.

2.2.5. Reflections on Supervisor Assessments

2.2.5.1. Faculty members must include a reflection paragraph within the Activities Observation entry that sufficiently addresses concerns and demonstrates changes and substantive improvement.

2.3. Peer Assessments of Teaching

2.3.1. Peer assessments should assess the faculty member's (1) learning environment, (2) academic standards, (3) preparation, and (4) instructional performance. Departments use supervisor and peer observation/assessment forms that include narrative feedback.

2.3.2. Direct peer assessments of teaching are required. These assessments may include observation of face-to-face class or live streaming sessions, or review of recorded video lectures. Peer assessments should also include a review of the syllabus, Canvas organization and contents, etc. of the course observed.

2.3.3. Peer observations need to provide specific details of strengths as well as areas for improvement. The observation should include qualitative, actionable comments.

2.3.4. Minimum direct peer assessment of teaching.

2.3.4.1. For midterm candidates, at least **one assessment per academic year** is required.

2.3.4.2. For tenure candidates, at least **one assessment per academic year** is required.

2.3.4.3. For rank advancement, at least **one assessment every other academic year** with a minimum of two must be included.

2.3.4.4. Faculty members use the Observations link within Faculty Success Activities to enter peer observations/assessments. For each observation/assessment, upload one PDF. Include **Peer Assessment** in the filename.

2.3.5. Reflections on Peer Assessments

2.3.5.1. Faculty members must include a reflection paragraph within the Activities Observation entry that sufficiently addresses concerns and demonstrates changes and substantive improvement.

2.3.6. Auto-Generated Supervisor and Peer Observations/Assessments Files

2.3.6.1. This report contains data entered in the Observations section of Faculty Success Activities. It includes observer type, class, date, faculty reflections, and hyperlinks to the uploaded supervisor and peer assessment files.

2.3.7. Other Optional Potential Peer Assessments Additional peer assessments can be helpful supplements for faculty members who may wish to give additional context to their teaching or further demonstrate their exemplary teaching abilities.

2.3.7.1. Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL) and/or College Flexible Learning Council (CFLC) Reviews

2.3.7.1.1. The quality review (QR) document is considered a peer assessment.

2.3.7.1.2. The faculty member's response document to the QR is required. If concerns or areas for improvement are identified in the QR, faculty members must provide a reflection document.

2.3.7.1.3. Create one PDF for all QR/faculty review combinations in chronological order.

2.3.7.1.4. Name the file **OTL-CFLC Quality Reviews** and upload it in the Peer Assessment File(s) category.

2.3.7.2. Peer Observation for the Enhancement of Teaching (POET)

2.3.7.2.1. The POET review is considered a peer assessment.

2.3.7.2.2. If concerns or areas of improvement were identified, the faculty reflection on the POET is required.

2.3.7.2.3. Faculty members use the Observations link within Faculty Success Activities to enter POET observations/assessments. For each observation/assessment, upload one PDF. Include **POET Assessment** in the filename.

2.4. Auto-Generated Scheduled Teaching Report

2.4.1. Faculty members must keep the Activities section of Faculty Success up to date so that the auto-generated Scheduled Teaching Supplemental Report will be complete, including pedagogical innovations, new teaching material developed, activities that enhanced student learning, etc., for each class. Activities demonstrating substantive improvements resulting from feedback in supervisor, peer, and other assessments as well as from SRIs will be particularly valuable.

2.5. Student Rating of Instruction (SRI)

2.5.1. **SRI Summary Table.** The first upload should be a PDF of the standard CET SRI summary spreadsheet (see Excel file template).

2.5.1.1. The table must include the SRI score for each class by semester and the department, college, and university semester averages. The averages will be provided by the Dean's Office until the averages are integrated automatically into the system.

2.5.1.2. The SRI score to report is the Instructor Evaluation (Avg) SRI score that is listed above the category scores (not the Student Experiences or Overall Evaluation scores).

2.5.1.3. **Optional.** The summary PDF may also include a line chart that depicts the semester instructor, department, college, and university averages to show trends over time.

2.5.1.4. Save the spreadsheet as a PDF. Name the file **SRI Summary Table**.

2.5.2. **SRIs (including scores and comments)** from all courses during the evaluation period (including summer courses, if taught) must be included (per Policy 637.) This includes the scores and comments.

2.5.2.1. Faculty members should encourage students to complete SRIs at the end of the semester to have a more representative response rate. Higher response rates usually provide more representative feedback from students than a lower response rate.

2.5.2.2. The classes should be arranged in sequence by semester, and then by course in the same sequence as the SRI summary table.

2.5.2.3. Upload one PDF for the entire evaluation period. Name the PDF file **SRIs**.

2.5.3. Reflections on SRIs

- 2.5.3.1.** Faculty members must include a reflection document that identifies trends in strengths and areas for improvement in the overall instructor SRI score, category scores (e.g., Instructor was prepared, Instructor had clear expectations, etc.), and in the open-ended comments sections. The reflections should address continuous development of teaching and provide context for SRI scores.
- 2.5.3.2.** Faculty members are expected to describe how their teaching substantively improved in response to the student feedback. Subsequent semesters should show improvement in those areas.
- 2.5.3.3.** The reflection document should be organized in chronological order. Upload only one PDF with all reflections. Name the file **SRI Reflections**.

2.6. Curriculum and Course Development

- 2.6.1.** Faculty members enter data in the Scheduled Teaching and in the Curriculum and Course Development areas in the Activities section of Faculty Success. The required information includes development type, faculty role, course/program details, and a **reflection or narrative stating changes made, contributions made to improve the curriculum, and impact on students**.
 - 2.6.1.1.** Course New: New courses developed or taught by the faculty member for the first time
 - 2.6.1.2.** Course Modified: Substantive and significant revisions to courses/contributions to course development, hybrid, or online course development
 - 2.6.1.3.** Program: New program development (e.g., R401), new curriculum degree map, USHE articulation agreements formed, etc.
- 2.6.2.** Within the Curriculum and Course Development area of Activities, faculty must upload supporting PDF documents (e.g., sample syllabi, lesson plans, quizzes or tests, assignment instructions/rubrics, projects, etc. that they created). Faculty may upload a document from a department chair or program coordinator to attest to the magnitude, quality, and impact of the curriculum changes made by the faculty member.
- 2.6.3.** [Within the portfolio, the auto-generated Curriculum and Course Development report will contain the details entered and files uploaded in the Activities section.](#)

2.7. Professional Development Related to Teaching

2.7.1. Faculty members describe professional development training, workshops attended, Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL) training, external discipline-related trainings/certifications, etc. related to teaching.

2.7.1.1. The document should briefly list and explain how the professional development helped improve teaching. The more specific, the better.

2.7.1.2. Faculty must include related documentation (such as certificates received) in the same sequence.

2.7.1.3. Upload one PDF. Name the file **Professional Development Teaching**.

2.8. Other Evidence Related to Teaching

2.8.1. Faculty members may upload additional artifacts to serve as evidence or documentation of teaching.

2.8.2. Some Other Forms of Evidence

2.8.2.1. Student Consultants on Teaching (SCOTs) assessments (Faculty use the Observations link within Faculty Success Activities to enter POET observations/assessments. For each observation/assessment, upload one PDF. Include **SCOT Assessment** in the filename.)

2.8.2.2. Department-approved other forms of teaching evidence

2.8.2.3. Mentor research or capstone projects not already accounted for as teaching load or as scholarship/creative works.

2.8.3. Faculty members must include appropriate narratives and reflections to explain the artifacts.

2.8.4. Save files as PDFs with appropriate naming conventions.

2.9. Midterm and Tenure Annual Review Expectations

2.9.1. Teaching is evaluated as at least Meets Expectations on all annual evaluations by the department chair. If not met, a justifiable reason must be given along with an explanation and a plan for improvement that is tracked in the following year's evaluation. Having a consistent pattern of Meets Expectations, Sometimes Exceeds Expectations, or Exceeds Expectations does not alone result in a recommendation for tenure.

2.10. Rank-Advancement to Professor Annual Review Expectations

2.10.1. As stated in Policy 632, faculty members must perform at a level above that required of an associate professor. Teaching is evaluated as at least Meets Expectations on all annual evaluations by the department chair/dean and evaluated at least two of the five years as Sometimes Exceeds Expectations or Exceeds Expectations. If not met, a justifiable reason must be given along with an explanation and a plan for improvement that is tracked in the following year's evaluation. Having a consistent pattern of Meets Expectations, Sometimes Exceeds Expectations, or Exceeds Expectations does not alone result in a recommendation for rank advancement.

2.11. Rank Advancement to Senior Lecturer/Professional in Residence Expectations

2.11.1. Seven completed years of university service before application is required as stated in Policy 632 Sections 5.7.1 and 5.7.2.

2.11.2. Faculty must earn Meets Expectations in teaching on all annual evaluations by the department chair/dean with at least two of the five years evaluated as Sometimes Exceeds Expectations or Exceeds Expectations. If not met, a justifiable reason must be given along with an explanation and a plan for improvement that is tracked in the following year's evaluation.

2.11.3. To attain the level of Senior Lecturer, a faculty member must be excellent in teaching and enhance the learning process by continually learning themselves. They adhere to Policy 635; they respect students just as they want to be respected in turn. They are prepared to teach, exhibit enthusiasm for what they teach, and are concerned with their students and their progress in learning in the course. They show an example to their students of a consummate professional—a role model.

2.11.4. To attain the level of Senior Professional in Residence, a faculty member must be excellent in teaching. Effective teachers enhance the learning process by continually learning themselves. They strive to stay proficient in their disciplines by being well-read, current, and active in professional activities that enhance their competency. They adhere to Policy 635; they respect students just as they want to be respected in turn. They are prepared to teach, exhibit enthusiasm for what they teach, and are concerned with their students and their progress in learning in the course. They show an example to their students of a consummate professional—a role model.

3. Scholarship and Creative Works

UVU is primarily a teaching institution; however, tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship and/or creative works to stay current with and contribute to the knowledge base in their respective discipline.

Lecturers and professionals in residence are not required to engage in scholarship and/or creative works. If they choose to engage in these activities, they should not report the activities in their rank advancement portfolio.

3.1. General

- 3.1.1.** Each department has specific requirements to define scholarship and creative works and requirements for midterm, tenure, and rank advancement. However, scholarship and creative works must meet these two conditions:
 - 3.1.1.1.** Contribute to the body of knowledge (i.e., a deliverable; does not include attendance in professional development activities)
 - 3.1.1.2.** The resulting product must have successfully undergone an external peer review, competitive reviewer/evaluation, or editorial review.
- 3.1.2.** Common types of scholarship and creative works that can apply to all departments:
 - 3.1.2.1.** Peer-reviewed journal article publications
 - 3.1.2.2.** Peer-reviewed articles in conference proceedings
 - 3.1.2.3.** Presentations related to the faculty member's scholarly area
 - 3.1.2.4.** Books or chapters published within the respective discipline
 - 3.1.2.5.** High-stakes grants applied for and obtained
- 3.1.3.** Types of scholarship and creative works applicable in select departments (see respective department section for information on whether these activities count toward scholarship or creative works):
 - 3.1.3.1.** Continuing education required to stay relevant in field
 - 3.1.3.1.1.** Certification/training requiring more than 20 hours
 - 3.1.3.1.2.** Required licensure within field
 - 3.1.3.2.** Creative works describing genesis of work and how developed into a high-quality artifact (e.g., culinary arts recipe/faculty competition)

3.1.4. Not Acceptable for Scholarship or Creative Works

- 3.1.4.1.** Self-published, articles in predatory journals, scam conferences, and monographs from vanity presses are not acceptable at any institution of higher education.
- 3.1.4.2.** Attending a conference is considered professional development, not scholarship. Attendance does not meet the conditions set forth in 3.1.
- 3.1.4.3.** Student work is not faculty scholarly work unless the faculty member is an author—not a facilitator. If students have been evaluated, it is their work, and the faculty member may not take credit for it. Instead, mentoring student researchers should go under service or teaching, depending on the department’s rationale.

3.1.5. Faculty Success Activities

- 3.1.5.1.** Faculty members should keep the Activities section in Faculty Success up to date so that these auto-generated reports will be complete in the portfolio:

- 3.1.5.1.1.** Presentations

- 3.1.5.1.2.** Intellectual Contributions

- 3.1.5.1.3.** Contracts, Grants, and Sponsored Research

- 3.1.5.2.** Faculty members must upload PDF artifacts within the respective scholarship/creative works section in Activities so that the auto-generated reports will embed links to those artifacts. This will avoid having to upload multiple files within the midterm, tenure, and rank advancement portfolios.

3.1.6. Authorship (if applicable)

- 3.1.6.1.** Student Co-authors: When students are co-authors, faculty should provide a statement that identifies the co-author as a student and explains the faculty contribution level to the publication, particularly when the publication lists the student first.
- 3.1.6.2.** Faculty Co-authors: Faculty should explain their significant contributions when faculty co-authors are listed.

3.1.7. Midterm and Tenure Review Expectations for All Departments

- 3.1.7.1.** Faculty members must Meet Expectations in scholarship/creative works for all annual evaluations by the department chair. If not met, a justifiable reason must be given along with an explanation and a plan for improvement that is tracked in the following year’s evaluation.

3.1.7.2. Having a consistent pattern of Meets Expectations, Sometimes Exceeds Expectations, or Exceeds Expectations does not alone result in a recommendation for tenure.

3.1.8. Rank Advancement to Professor Expectation for All Departments

3.1.8.1. As stated in Policy 632, faculty members must perform at a level above that required of an associate professor. Faculty members must earn a Sometimes Exceeds Expectations or Exceeds Expectations twice within a five-year period and at least a Meets Expectations in scholarship/creative works on all other annual evaluations by the department chair/dean. If not met, then a justifiable reason must be given along with an explanation and a plan for improvement that is tracked in the following year's evaluation.

3.1.8.2. Having a consistent pattern of Meets Expectations, Sometimes Exceeds Expectations, or Exceeds Expectations does not alone result in a recommendation for rank.

3.2. Architecture and Engineering Design Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

3.2.1. Scholarship includes the following activities/evidence/artifacts: peer-reviewed, competitive-reviewed, external-reviewed presentations and/or publications; faculty-provided training to external peer institutions and/or industry; joint industry-academic intellectual projects/contributions; new or renewal of licenses/certifications substantial and associated with the discipline; high-level grant award; other significant authored works.

3.2.2. Creative Works include the following activities/evidence/artifacts: design projects showcasing the origins and purposes of the work through completion of the final product, joint industry-academic physical/creative/**technical** projects; officially approved externships with supporting evidence describing the contribution; other significant projects/products.

3.2.3. Midterm Review

3.2.3.1. At least one quality activity/evidence/artifact of scholarship or creative works as defined above.

3.2.4. Tenure Review

3.2.4.1. At least two additional quality activity/evidence/artifact of scholarship or creative works as defined above (a total of three artifacts). New or renewal of licensure can count for one of the three deliverables.

3.2.5. Rank Advancement to Professor

3.2.5.1. At least four additional quality activities/evidence/artifacts of scholarship or creative works as defined above. New or renewal of licensure can count for one of the four deliverables.

3.3. Construction Technologies Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

3.3.1. Scholarship includes the following activities/evidences/artifacts: peer-reviewed, competitive-reviewed, external-reviewed presentations and/or publications; expert witness testimony/narrative; construction defects forensic analysis; faculty-provided training to external peer institutions and/or training; joint industry-academic intellectual projects/contributions; new significant, industry-focused licenses/certifications; high-level grant award; other significant authored works.

3.3.2. Creative Works include the following activities/evidences/artifacts: construction projects showcasing the origins and purposes of the work through successful completion of the final product, joint industry-academic physical/creative/technical projects; other significant projects/products.

3.3.3. Midterm Review

3.3.3.1. At least one quality activity/evidence/artifact of scholarship or creative works as defined above.

3.3.4. Tenure Review

3.3.4.1. At least two additional quality activities/evidences/artifacts of scholarship or creative works as defined above.

3.3.5. Rank Advancement to Professor

3.3.5.1. At least four additional quality activities/evidences/artifacts of scholarship or creative works as defined above.

3.4. Culinary Arts Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

3.4.1. Scholarship and Creative Works may include the following activities/evidences: researching and executing current and relatable trends in menu and recipe development, such as the Presidential Scholarship Ball, CAI Scholarship Gala, FIB internship program; internal and/or external professional presentations; certification through American Culinary Federation (ACF) or similar; ServSafe Food Service Manager Certification through the National Restaurant Association (NRA); writing and receiving money or equipment through external grants.

3.4.2. Midterm Review

3.4.2.1. At least one quality activity/evidence of scholarship or creative works as defined above.

3.4.3. Tenure Review

3.4.3.1. At least two additional quality activities/evidences of scholarship or creative works as defined above. One must be a certification with the ACF.

3.4.4. Rank Advancement to Professor

3.4.4.1. At least two additional quality activities/evidences of scholarship or creative works as defined above.

3.4.4.2. Additionally, two of the following activities/evidences must be accomplished: national recognition in professional level culinary or pastry competitions; nomination and induction to American Academy of Chefs (AAC); recipient of a Presidential Medallion through the ACF; creation and publication of a professional book.

3.5. Digital Media Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

3.5.1. For research-based work, publications must be subjected to formal acceptance peer reviewed (or competitively reviewed) processes or editorial review. Evaluations should consider the quality of journals, the impact of articles or textbooks on the field, the length of the work and so forth. Collaboration, both within and across disciplines, in the creation of intellectual contributions is desirable.

3.5.2. Scholarship includes the following activities/evidence/artifacts: Publish in refereed academic journals, scholarly books, or chapters, publish in proceedings from scholarly conferences. Funded research and/or substantive grants at a regional or national level.

3.5.3. Creative works as scholarship should meet the same criteria as that of publication in professional journals. They should be peer or competitively reviewed in a medium or publication acknowledged as relevant within the scope of the faculty member's discipline, or, in the case of a creative work published via performance or presentation, assessed in writing by a generally recognized authority, critic, or disinterested peer in the field, and the work must contribute to the body of knowledge or innovation in the faculty member's discipline.

- 3.5.4.** Creative works vary greatly within the Digital Media Department and may include the following activities/evidence/artifacts: Exhibition or electronic publication of discipline-based works. Completion and delivery of a creative work with documentation from peers and those in professional practice that attest to its professionalism and relevance. Juried exhibition of works at conferences, and symposiums.
- 3.5.5.** For faculty choosing creative works instead of publications, one of the following types of creative works is required by tenure submission. Accompanying the submitted creative work, there should be a narrative/reflection describing the genesis and development of that creative work from start to finish. A description of the resulting “product” or creative work and the impact of the work as gathered from an audience and/or external reviewer(s).
 - 3.5.5.1.** Write, produce, or direct a narrative, animated, or documentary film, or serve as another key contributor such as cinematographer or editor.
 - 3.5.5.2.** Design or develop a website or web application that is above the technical, aesthetic, and professional level of the department’s graduating students.
 - 3.5.5.3.** Exhibit a title in a peer-reviewed show open to a general audience. This could be digital imagery, audio, video, digital publication, or a combination of these.
 - 3.5.5.4.** Compose, record, or produce a soundtrack, or other musical or audio-based work, released publicly through traditional or by digital means.
- 3.5.6.** Midterm Review
 - 3.5.6.1.** At least one quality activity/evidence/artifact of scholarship or creative works as defined above.
- 3.5.7.** Tenure Review
 - 3.5.7.1.** At least one additional quality activity/evidence/artifact of scholarship or creative works as defined above.
- 3.5.8.** Rank Advancement to Professor
 - 3.5.8.1.** At least three additional quality activity/evidence/artifacts of scholarship or creative works as defined above

3.6. Electrical and Computer Engineering Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

- 3.6.1.** Scholarly works must contribute to the body of knowledge in the faculty member's academic field and have an external peer review. It is up to the candidate to put forward an argument as to the quality, relevance, and sustainability of the scholarly works. Major scholarly works that count toward the numbers specified for midterm, tenure and promotion include peer-reviewed conference proceedings and peer-reviewed journal articles.
- 3.6.2.** One peer-reviewed publication may be replaced by any one of the following: (1) Award of a grant that undergoes rigorous grant proposal review (in some cases inclusive of internal grants), (2) a book or book chapter published through a publisher, (3) a patent submitted/approved through the Tech Transfer Office, (4) a substantial professional engineering report or design, peer reviewed and accepted by the commissioning agency (not reports directly associated with a grant, or (5) first-time professional licensure: Professional Engineer (P.E.) or Structural Engineer (S.E.).
- 3.6.3.** Midterm Review
 - 3.6.3.1.** One peer-reviewed scholarly work is required.
- 3.6.4.** Tenure Review
 - 3.6.4.1.** Two additional peer-reviewed scholarly works are required (total of three). At least two of the three must be peer-reviewed publications in academic journals or conference proceedings.
- 3.6.5.** Rank Advancement to Professor
 - 3.6.5.1.** Four peer-reviewed scholarly works during the rank advancement evaluation period are required. At least three of the four must be peer-reviewed publications in academic journals or conference proceedings.

3.7. Engineering Technology Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

- 3.7.1.** Scholarship includes the following activities/evidences/artifacts: peer-reviewed, competitive-reviewed, external-reviewed presentations and/or publications; faculty-provided training to external peer institutions and/or industry; industry projects implemented with new or existing technology with supporting evidence; officially approved externships with supporting evidence describing the contribution; new industry certifications and licensing substantial and associated with the discipline; practical creative works with resulting evidence; technical expert to solve industry problems; master systems integrator to build industry solutions; industry certifier; provide substantive technical expertise to a peer-reviewed project; joint industry-academic intellectual projects/contributions; grant awards; and other significant authored works.

3.7.2. Midterm Review

3.7.2.1. At least one quality activity/evidence/artifact of scholarship or creative works as defined above is required.

3.7.3. Tenure Review

3.7.3.1. At least one additional quality activity/evidence/artifact of scholarship or creative works (total of two) as defined above is required.

3.7.4. Rank Advancement to Professor

3.7.4.1. At least three quality activities/evidences/artifacts of scholarship or creative works as defined above are required during the rank advancement evaluation period.

3.8. Information Systems and Technology Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

3.8.1. In combination with section 3.1, scholarly works must contribute to the body of knowledge in the faculty member's academic field, have an external peer review or editorial review, and may consist of any of the following: journal articles, articles in conference proceedings, posters and presentations, books or chapters published, case studies, obtained external research grants. At least one of the scholarly works must be a peer-reviewed journal article or peer-reviewed conference publication for both tenure and rank advancement. It is up to the candidate to put forward an argument as to the quality, relevance, and substantiality of the scholarly works.

3.8.2. Midterm Review

3.8.2.1. One peer-reviewed scholarly work is required.

3.8.3. Tenure Review

3.8.3.1. Two additional peer-reviewed scholarly works are required (total of three); at least one of these must be a peer-reviewed journal article or peer-reviewed conference publication.

3.8.4. Rank Advancement to Professor

3.8.4.1. On average, one peer-reviewed scholarly work is required every two years. Because rank advancement has a five-year review window, a minimum of three additional peer-reviewed scholarly works are needed. At least two of the scholarly works within the five-year window must be a peer-reviewed journal article and/or peer-reviewed conference publication.

3.9. Mechanical and Civil Engineering Scholarship/Creative Works

- 3.9.1.** Scholarly works must contribute to the body of knowledge in the faculty member's academic field and have an external peer review. It is up to the candidate to put forward an argument as to the quality, relevance, and sustainability of the scholarly works. Major scholarly works that count toward the numbers specified for midterm, tenure and promotion include the following:
 - 3.9.1.1.** Peer-reviewed publications in academic journals
 - 3.9.1.2.** Peer-reviewed full-paper publications in conference proceedings
 - 3.9.1.3.** Obtained full (non-provisional) patents, if credit not already given for provisional patent
 - 3.9.1.4.** Provisional patents reviewed and approved through UVU Tech Transfer
 - 3.9.1.5.** Award of grants that undergo rigorous grant proposal review, in some cases inclusive of internal grants
 - 3.9.1.6.** Publication of discipline-related books or book chapters, either peer-reviewed or published by a mainstream publisher
 - 3.9.1.7.** Substantial professional engineering reports or designs, peer-reviewed and accepted by the commissioning agency (not reports directly associated with a grant)
 - 3.9.1.8.** First time professional licensure: Professional Engineer (P.E.) or Structural Engineer (S.E.)
 - 3.9.1.9.** Other scholarly works as proposed by the applicant and approved by the department RTP committee, the department chair, and the dean.
- 3.9.2.** Midterm Review
 - 3.9.2.1.** One peer-reviewed scholarly work is required.
- 3.9.3.** Tenure Review
 - 3.9.3.1.** Two additional peer-reviewed scholarly works are required (total of three). At least two of the three must be peer-reviewed publications in academic journals or conference proceedings.
- 3.9.4.** Rank Advancement to Professor
 - 3.9.4.1.** Four peer-reviewed scholarly works during the rank advancement evaluation period are required. At least three of the four must be peer-reviewed publications in academic journals or conference proceedings.

3.10. School of Aviation Sciences Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

3.10.1. Midterm Review

3.10.1.1. Faculty members are expected to complete one national or international invited presentation or one peer- or competitively reviewed publication of applied aviation research.

3.10.2. Tenure Review

3.10.2.1. Faculty are expected to complete one additional national or international invited presentation and one peer- or competitively reviewed publication of applied aviation research since the midterm evaluation period.

3.10.3. Rank Advancement to Professor

3.10.3.1. Faculty are expected to complete four additional national or international invited presentations, competitively reviewed publications, and/or conference proceedings of applied aviation research since tenure.

3.11. Technology Management Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

3.11.1. Midterm Review

3.11.1.1. At least one scholarly *presentation* output: (1) a peer-reviewed talk or (2) peer-reviewed conference proceeding.

3.11.2. Tenure Review

3.11.2.1. An additional two scholarly *presentation* outputs (total of three).

3.11.2.2. At least one scholarly *publication* output: (1) peer-reviewed journal article, (2) book chapter, or (3) book.

3.11.3. Rank Advancement to Professor

3.11.3.1. A minimum of three scholarly *presentation* outputs.

3.11.3.2. At least two scholarly *publication* output: (1) peer-reviewed journal article, (2) book chapter, or (3) book.

3.11.3.3. At least one funded grant from a source that is not Utah Valley University that is written, submitted, and obtained.

3.12. Transportation Technologies Scholarship/Creative Works Requirements

- 3.12.1.** Scholarship includes the following activities/evidences/artifacts: peer-reviewed or competitive-reviewed project, external-reviewed presentations or publications, peer/industry requested/solicited trainings, joint industry-academic intellectual projects/contributions, and external/peer-reviewed authored or co-authored works.
- 3.12.2.** Creative works include the following activities/evidences/artifacts: Transportation projects showcasing skills, abilities and purposes of work through the progress of creative projects, examples pictures; documentation; YouTube videos; joint industry-academic physical/creative/technical projects; other significant projects/products; and externships with supporting evidence describing the contribution. For YouTube videos, external reviews from transportation technologies faculty at other institutions are required. For industry transportation projects, completion and delivery of a creative work with documentation from peers and those in professional practice that attest to its professionalism and relevance is required.
- 3.12.3.** Industry certifications include the following: new licenses/industry certifications (e.g., ASE Master certifications/ I-Car certifications, Chief, paint certification trainings), industry specific manufacturer training (e.g., Polaris, Yamaha, Kawasaki, Toyota, GM, Ford, Honda Cumming, Kenworth, Freightliner, etc.).
- 3.12.4.** Grants/donations include the following: industry (external); UVU school sponsored (internal), such as GEL, Quick Gel, FLSPE grants offered by UVU's office of innovation. Other industry donations that support faculty and student success, such as new equipment donations, scholarship donations. Faculty Internships in Business (FIB), and have been vetted by Institutional Advancement, etc.
- 3.12.5.** Midterm Review
 - 3.12.5.1.** One scholarly or creative works project during the two-year period.
- 3.12.6.** Tenure Review
 - 3.12.6.1.** Two additional scholarly/creative works are required.
 - 3.12.6.2.** An industry certification is required.
- 3.12.7.** Rank Advancement to Professor
 - 3.12.7.1.** Two grants must be submitted with at least one grant awarded.
 - 3.12.7.2.** Any combination of two additional scholarship/creative works: industry certifications, peer-reviewed article publications, and/or industry project is required.

4. Service

Tenured, tenure-track, and professional-in-residence faculty are expected to engage in service activities at various levels. Lecturers are not expected to engage in service activities. If lecturers choose to engage in these activities, they should not report them in their rank advancement portfolio.

- 4.1. Faculty must keep the Activities section of Faculty Success up to date so that [the auto-generated Faculty Service Report](#) will be complete in the portfolio.
- 4.2. Faculty must specify roles (such as Committee Member, Committee Chair, etc.), dates, full committee names (not abbreviations), their contributions, and the impact.
- 4.3. Faculty must embed PDF artifacts, such as letters from committee chairs, directors, etc. that describe their contributions and time commitment. This will embed links within the Faculty Service Report to those artifacts and minimize the number of individual files to upload in the portfolio.

4.4. Types of Service

This section includes sample lists of service at different levels. These lists are not exhaustive lists. Other significant service may apply.

4.4.1. Department Service Examples

- 4.4.1.1. Department committee member or chair
- 4.4.1.2. Program coordinator
- 4.4.1.3. Recruitment
- 4.4.1.4. Faculty Mentor
- 4.4.1.5. Department chair (for rank advancement)
- 4.4.1.6. Contributions to accreditation reports
- 4.4.1.7. SkillsUSA advisor
- 4.4.1.8. Capstone or student project team coach (if not part of teaching load)

4.4.2. College Service Examples

- 4.4.2.1. College Flexible Learning Council
- 4.4.2.2. College Scholarly Activities Committee
- 4.4.2.3. Other college service

4.4.3. University Service Examples

- 4.4.3.1. Faculty Senate
- 4.4.3.2. Faculty Senate Committee
- 4.4.3.3. Grievance or Appeals Committee
- 4.4.3.4. University Curriculum Committee
- 4.4.3.5. First Generation Student Success Committee
- 4.4.3.6. GEL Committee
- 4.4.3.7. Other university committee or task force member or chair

4.4.4. Professional Service Examples

- 4.4.4.1. Editor or reviewer of a professional journal, conference, etc.
- 4.4.4.2. Chair a conference session
- 4.4.4.3. Site coordinator for a conference
- 4.4.4.4. Industry/community-sponsored service
- 4.4.4.5. Other Professional Service associated with the discipline

4.5. Midterm Service Expectations

- 4.5.1. Consistent and meaningful department level service is required.
- 4.5.2. Service evaluated as at least Meets Expectations on annual evaluations by the department chair. If not met, a justifiable reason must be given along with an explanation and a plan for improvement that is tracked in the following year's evaluation.

4.6. Tenure Service Expectations

- 4.6.1. Consistent and meaningful department and (college or university) service is required.
- 4.6.2. Service evaluated as at least Meets Expectations on annual evaluations by the department chair. If not met, a justifiable reason must be given along with an explanation and a plan for improvement that is tracked in the following year's evaluation.

4.7. Rank Advancement to Professor Service Expectations

- 4.7.1.** Leadership (such as serving as a committee chair or professional service) is expected for rank advancement to Professor.
- 4.7.2.** Combination of consistent and meaningful department and (college or university) service.
- 4.7.3.** Service evaluated as at least Meets Expectations on all annual evaluations by the chair/dean with some evaluated as Sometimes Exceeds Expectations or Exceeds Expectations. If not met, a justifiable reason must be given along with an explanation and a plan for improvement that is tracked in the following year's evaluation.

4.8. Rank Advancement to Senior Professional in Residence Expectations

- 4.8.1.** A professional-in-residence ensures that students and the department remain engaged service-wise with the community through activities such as community outreach, industry partnering, and curriculum alignment to meet the needs of industry partners, and other industry-related service as assigned by the department chair.