

Utah Tech University Policy Addenda

Guidelines for Using OER in the RTP Process

I. Purpose

Open Educational Resources (OER) are teaching or learning materials in the public domain that can be reused, revised, remixed, redistributed, and retained.

It is well known that engaging with OER, whether it be by creating, editing, and/or adopting, takes numerous hours of a faculty member's time. Therefore, the Goal 1 Strategy 1 Open Education sub-working group has discussed and adapted guidance and suggestions for faculty members who engage with OER in various ways to utilize the work in the RTP process.

Currently, OER is not officially listed in the verbiage of policy 641 Faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion or addendum 641a Faculty Performance Standards. However, faculty members can make a justification that their work and projects surrounding OER fit within the performance standards utilizing their Annual Faculty Activity Plan (AFAP) and tenure portfolios.

II. Guidelines

AFAP & RTP Portfolios

OER fits well within the three performance standards of student learning and success, scholarship and creative activity, and service. Faculty members can list various OER activities that fit within these categories. The faculty member is encouraged to work with their department chair to make sure the justification is accepted and clear in their AFAP.

Following are suggested scenarios, activities, and evidence a faculty member can use to justify OER projects as part of their AFAP and ultimately leading to the inclusion of the activities in their tenure portfolio. This OER Contributions Matrix was created by Driving OER Sustainability for Student Success (DOERS3) a collaborative of higher education systems and organizations to work towards "realizing the promise of high-quality, accessible, and sustainable OER implementations to achieve equity and student success at scale." Begun by University System of Maryland (USM), City University of New York (CUNY), and State University of New York (SUNY) one of their projects was to link OER to the main areas of RTP as that directly affects the sustainability of OER initiatives over time.

OER Contributions Matrix

ADOPT

| Contribution | Evidence Examples | Research | Teaching | Service |
|----------------------------------|---|----------|----------|---------|
| Use OER in a class or classes | Survey and gather data on how the use of an OER in class affected student learning. A similar study was conducted in British Columbia as well as in the United States via the Open Education Research Group . | | Yes | |
| Use Open Access research article | Provide evidence of the Open Access Journal Articles that were used in course outline | | Yes | |

ADAPT

| Contribution | Evidence Examples | Research | Teaching | Service |
|--|--|----------|----------|---------|
| Revise others' OER to be more relevant to student needs | Survey students in class to learn more about the impact the revised materials have had on their learning. A similar study was conducted in British Columbia. | | Yes | Yes |
| Revise or remix OER to be in alignment with course learning outcomes | Provide evidence on what was revised or remixed to best suit the course learning outcomes. Survey students in class to learn about the impact the revised materials had on their learning. | | Yes | |

| CREATE | | | | |
|--------------|--|----------|----------|---------|
| Contribution | Evidence Examples | Research | Teaching | Service |
| Make new OER | When creating OER make it available to peers for their review. Document their reviews and include in your dossier. The following is a common rubric used to review Open Textbooks. | Yes | Yes | |

| IMPROVE LEARNING | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------|----------|---------|
| Contribution | Evidence Examples | Research | Teaching | Service |
| Improve student outcomes | To best understand the improvement of student outcomes, increased student engagement, innovation, and reduction in cost- survey students in your course. Review the survey and questions conducted in “ A multi-institutional study of the impact of open textbook adoption on the learning outcomes of post-secondary students ”. | | Yes | |
| Innovation | | | Yes | |
| Increasing student engagement | | | Yes | |
| Reduce material costs to students | | | Yes | |
| | | | | |

| COMMUNITY | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------|----------|----------|---------|
| Contribution | Evidence Examples | Research | Teaching | Service |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|-----|-----|
| Mentoring others in OER | Provide recommendation letters from mentorships and via the mentee. | | | Yes |
| OER leadership (change culture, policy change, lead an initiative) | Provide a list of committees and specific actions you took related to OER and committee work. For tasks led, describe the initiative, provide evidence of change, and seek references and recommendation on the work completed. | | | Yes |
| Disseminate knowledge about OER | Provide list of workshops, webinars, presentations related to OER and OE advocacy | | | Yes |
| Peer review existing OER | Provide citations of the reviews conducted. | | Yes | Yes |

RESEARCH

| Contribution | Evidence Examples | Research | Teaching | Service |
|---|---|----------|----------|---------|
| Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) about OER | Provide citations and links to work completed related to SOTL and OER. | Yes | Yes | |
| Conference Presentations | Provide citations, links, recordings, and slides of the work done to disseminate OER knowledge. | Yes | | Yes |
| Grant writing | Provide excerpts from grant proposals, including budgetary asks and narrative as to how the grant will benefit the department and/or institution. | Yes | | Yes |

III. References

“[OER Contributions Matrix](#)” by DOERS3. [CC BY 4.0](#).

Policy Owner: Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost
Policy Steward: [Steward]

History:

Approved 03/11/22

Revised 0/0/00

DRAFT