

AGENDA OF THE FACULTY SENATE – NORMAN CAMPUS

October 21, 2026 – 3:30 pm

Thurman J White Forum Building
1704 Asp Avenue, Conference Room A
Norman, OK 73019

- **Call to order and determination of quorum**
- **Approval of the Senate Journal for the regular session of September 21, 2026**
- **Announcements**
 - **Senator Survey Results**
- **Senate Chair’s Report** (attached)
- **Lee Camargo Quinn, HR Director of Benefits and Retirement** – Updates on Benefits Enrollment
- **Sarah Ellis, Vice Provost for Faculty (Norman)** - Policy review
- **Committee of the Whole**
 - Administrative Accountability
 - Update on Student Visas
- **New Business**
- **Adjourn**

Long before the University of Oklahoma was established, the land on which the University now resides was the traditional home of the “Hasinai” Caddo Nation and “*Kirikir?i:*” Wichita & Affiliated Tribes.

We acknowledge this territory once also served as a hunting ground, trade exchange point, and migration route for the Apache, Comanche, Kiowa and Osage nations. Today, 39 tribal nations dwell in the state of Oklahoma as a result of settler and colonial policies that were designed to assimilate Native people.

The University of Oklahoma recognizes the historical connection our university has with its Indigenous community. We acknowledge, honor and respect the diverse Indigenous peoples connected to this land. We fully recognize, support and advocate for the sovereign rights of all of Oklahoma’s 39 tribal nations. This acknowledgement is aligned with our university’s core value of creating a diverse and inclusive community. It is an institutional responsibility to recognize and acknowledge the people, culture and history that make up our entire OU Community”

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The University of Oklahoma (Norman Campus)

Regular session – September 21, 2026 – 3:00 p.m.

Thurman J. White Forum Building, 1704 Asp Ave – Conference Room A

Office: Chemistry Building, Room 207 | Phone: 405-325-6789

Email: FacSen@ou.edu | Website <https://www.ou.edu/facultysenate>

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 pm by Chair Anderson.

PRESENT: Bert, Bisel, Browder, Cavallo, Cavazos, Cortest, de Sa e Silva, Elliott, Endersby, Ernest, Ethridge, Fagin, Fahes, Feng, Ghosh, Grispino, Grunsted, Hahn, Hambright, Hooper, Jablonski, Kaotzani, Kazempoor, Kershen, Ketchum, Kibbey, Myongjin, Kis, Lamothe, Ling, Liu, Meek, Mortazavi, Mountford, Muraleetharan, Noyori-Corbett, Oikeh, Olufowote, Phillips, Preuss, Quiroga, Sarmiento, Sharma, Smith, Warnken, Watson, West, Wood, Youngblood

FS Chair: Rebecca Anderson

FS Chair-Elect: Julia Abramson

FS Secretary: Sarah Breen

FS Executive Committee Members (Non-senators): Jeremy Bentley, Peter Soppelsa, Rodney Bates

FS Administrative Manager: Ann Seely

Guests: Lindsay Risley, Health and Wellness Manager

Sarah Ellis, Vice Provost for Faculty

ABSENT: Bhattarai (1), Cain (1), Gordon (1), Lungmus (1), Kang (1), Nollert (1), Schmeltzer (1)

Note: During the period from September 2026 to May 2027, the Senate holds eight regular sessions. The figures in parentheses above indicate the number of absences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome.....	2
Announcements.....	2
Senate Chairs Report.....	2
Lindsay Risley, Health and Wellness Manager: Employee Engagement Survey	2
Sarah Ellis, Vice Provost for Faculty: President's Advisory Committee for Faculty Accountability	2
Committee of the Whole.....	4

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM.

Quorum was achieved.

APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL

The Faculty Senate Journal for the regular meeting of May 11, 2026, was approved. Senator Hill moved to approve, and the motion was seconded by senator Sarmiento. The vote passed and the journal was approved.

WELCOME

Faculty Senate officers Rebecca Anderson (Chair), Julia Abramson (Chair-Elect), and Sarah Breen (Secretary) were introduced. Faculty Senate Executive Committee members were announced as follows: Arts & Humanities At-Large: Peter Soppelsa; Social Sciences At-Large: David McLeod; Professional Programs At-Large: Lee Fithian; STEM At-Large: Cindy Gordon; Faculty Welfare Chair: Rodney Bates; Compensation & Benefits Chair: Jeremy Bentley; and Recruitment, Retention & Development Co-Chairs: Mashhad Fahes and Janette Habashi. Topics on the radar for 2026–27 were outlined: Committee & Council Alignment and Inter-Campus Collaboration; and Responsible Governance of University Digital Systems. Senators were directed to complete two surveys to inform FSEC of topics of interest to their constituents and to volunteer for potential ad hoc service.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Faculty Senate is sad to report the death of Associate Professor Vincent Leseney, Musical Theatre, on June 20, 2026, and extends sympathy to his colleagues and family.

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT, BY CHAIR ANDERSON

The report was distributed via email. Chair Anderson opened the floor to questions. There were no questions.

LINDSAY RISLEY, HEALTH AND WELLNESS MANAGER: EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT SURVEY

Lindsay Risley, Health and Wellness Manager, discussed Wellbeing Awareness Month and the 2026 OU Engage Gallup Q12 Employee Engagement Survey, which will be available from September 28–October 9. Risley noted that employee engagement supports faculty and staff wellbeing, positively influences the student experience, and aligns with the university's strategic plan. She stated that engaged employees are 69% less likely to experience burnout, 47% less likely to be job hunting, and 69% more likely to be thriving overall. Employee engagement also supports organizational productivity and performance and contributes to OU's goals as a research institution.

Risley explained that the survey includes 12 engagement questions and one overall satisfaction question. The questions address basic needs, individual contributions, teamwork, and growth and are designed to distinguish exceptional workplaces from average workplaces. The survey should take fewer than 10 minutes to complete. Risley emphasized that responses provide baseline data and a starting point for conversations about improving the employee experience. Responses are confidential and reported in aggregate rather than individually.

Risley shared examples of departments using survey feedback to make improvements. The College of Pharmacy created opportunities for employees to build stronger relationships through activities such as regular walks and World Cup events. Information Technology introduced more intentional peer-to-peer recognition of accomplishments and projects. The police department on the Health Campus used feedback to prioritize equipment upgrades, including mobile data terminals for officers, to improve efficiency and support

electronic ticketing and dispatch operations. HR also developed a Play-Doh activity centered on shaping OU's future to encourage participation.

HR has a participation goal of 80% for 2026. Participation increased from 56% in 2024 to 75% in 2025, and the engagement index showed an increase in engaged employees. Colleges and offices achieving participation rates of 80% or higher will receive a certificate recognizing exceptional participation. Risley emphasized that broader participation provides more representative data and helps inform meaningful action.

Survey invitations will be emailed by Gallup beginning September 28, with reminders sent until the survey closes on October 9. Results are expected to be shared in mid-to-late November, before winter break, with action planning beginning in the spring semester. Risley noted that Darren Schaff is available to help leaders and teams interpret feedback and develop action plans.

Senator Quiroga asked how leaders are held accountable for taking action on survey feedback over time. Risley responded that Schaff has met with leaders, follows up with them, and suggests additional meetings, although leaders approach the process differently. Leaders may also contact him directly for assistance.

Senator Sarmiento asked whether faculty and staff responses would be differentiated in the results. Risley confirmed that the data would be broken down by campus and employee role.

SARAH ELLIS, VICE PROVOST FOR FACULTY: PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR FACULTY ACCOUNTABILITY

Sarah Ellis, Vice Provost for Faculty, discussed the work of the President's Council on Faculty Accountability, also referred to as the Presidential Advisory Committee on Faculty Accountability. Vice Provost Ellis introduced herself as a faculty member in music, former Faculty Senate Chair in 2017–2018, and chair of the committee. She explained that the committee began meeting during the summer and now meets weekly. Its charge is to review policies and practices related to tenure and promotion, faculty evaluation, and the hiring of regular faculty, with an emphasis on identifying best practices and strengthening clarity, consistency, and accountability.

Vice Provost Ellis noted that faculty evaluation practices are inconsistent across the university and that improvements are needed. The committee reviewed and endorsed campus-wide adoption of the OU Elevate IVE model for annual faculty evaluations, which was developed by a multidisciplinary team of OU faculty over five years and successfully piloted. Vice Provost Ellis stated that the President has approved the model and that implementation is expected to take approximately a year and a half. Lori Snider, director of OU Elevate, has been meeting with academic leaders to begin the rollout.

Policies under review include Faculty Evaluation, Adjustment in Salary, and Advancement in Rank; Faculty Tenure; Departmental Administration; College Administration; Faculty Accountability; and the Norman Campus policy on Minor and Severe Sanctions. The review includes both Board of Regents and Norman Campus policies where applicable. Vice Provost Ellis stated that proposed revisions are expected to be presented to the Faculty Senate at its October meeting and that the President would like revisions brought to the Board of Regents at its January meeting.

Senator Muraleetharan questioned the emphasis on responsible, shared governance, noting that faculty have long participated responsibly, and suggested that administrative accountability should also be examined. Vice Provost Ellis responded that shared governance generally works well at OU but that some policies are outdated or lack provisions clarifying responsibilities and addressing failures to follow policy. She emphasized the importance of faculty participation in shared governance, including service on Committee A and Faculty Senate. Vice Provost Ellis agreed to pass along the suggestion for a committee on administrative accountability.

Peter Soppelsa, a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, asked whether the policies include a definition of shared governance. Vice Provost Ellis explained that faculty responsibilities, such as authority over curriculum and criteria for evaluation, promotion, and tenure, should be stated explicitly in the relevant policies. She noted that the policies do not currently include a broad definition of shared governance and proposed adding one.

Senator Sharma asked whether the policy review would address salary inversion. Vice Provost Ellis responded that the Adjustment in Salary policy addresses this issue, and that deans may consider adjustments at the college level on a case-by-case basis, depending on available funds.

Senator de Sa e Silva raised concerns about faculty trust and engagement, asking what motivates faculty to help develop and follow policies when previous efforts, including a retention task force, have not produced visible action. The Senator also noted changes in institutional priorities, including the strategic plan's emphasis on diversity. Vice Provost Ellis responded that her role does not include setting the President's direction and acknowledged concerns about the demands placed on chairs, directors, and faculty. She encouraged faculty to participate in the policy review and stated that she works within her role to uphold existing policies or pursue revisions when needed. She also noted that OU has experienced substantial leadership changes over the past decade, alongside changes at the state and national levels.

Senator Phillips asked whether the revised policies would clarify distinctions between renewable-term and tenure-track faculty, noting that policies may not have kept pace with changes in faculty appointments. Vice Provost Ellis acknowledged confusion surrounding faculty appointment categories and emphasized the need to improve the representation and participation of renewable-term faculty in shared governance. She noted that earlier handbook language limiting their voice had been changed and that continued growth in renewable-term faculty hiring makes their inclusion increasingly important.

Senator Mountford asked whether a list of committee members was available. Vice Provost Ellis identified the committee members: Sarah Ellis, Chair, Vice Provost for Faculty; Shane Connelly, Psychology; Steven Gensler, Law; Jeff Kelly, Director, School of Biological Sciences; Darren Purcell, Geography and Environmental Sustainability; Wayne Riggs, Philosophy, Director, Center for Faculty Excellence; Deborah Trytten, Computer Science.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Chair Anderson convened the Committee of the Whole. We entered the Committee of the Whole at approximately 3:58pm. We exited at approximately 4:25pm.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Anderson asked if there was any new business, and no new business was introduced.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:29 pm. The next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate Meeting of this academic year will be held on October 21st, 2026, at 3:30pm.

Sarah Breen, Faculty Senate Secretary, 2026-27

Faculty Senate Chair's Report – October 2026

Our Fall semester is well underway. Although it has only been three weeks since the last Chair's report due to the Labor Day holiday, the Faculty Senate still engaged in a few noteworthy activities.

During these weeks, Faculty Senate held its first meeting of the year. Back in Spring of 2026, the Faculty Senate voted to approve revisions to our bylaws to align with changes to the charter, as well as add language related to our expectations for senators and the inclusion of non-regular faculty in our shared governance assembly. We also recently underwent a reapportionment; this task examined how many seats each college receives when factoring for incoming non-regular faculty, as well as adding 10 additional senators from the faculty. With both changes taking effect this semester, we now have 60 senators from across the University (an increase from 50 in previous years). I look forward to working with this expanded group in the coming year.

We welcomed two speakers at the Faculty Senate meeting. First, Lindsey Risley, OU Employee Health & Wellness Manager, relayed the importance of faculty participation in the upcoming Gallup employee engagement survey. Next, Sarah Ellis Vice Provost for Faculty, presented on the activities of the President's Advisory Committee for Faculty Accountability. We look forward to welcoming Sarah back to the next Faculty Senate meeting to present additional proposed policy changes to the Senate. Finally, we continued in our practice of Committee of the Whole, which was well received by senators last year when it was introduced to the senate agenda.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) met with Liz Karr, Vice Provost for Online Education to discuss concerns about online teaching brought forth from discussion in the senate last year. This was a productive conversation where FSEC members asked questions about teaching contracts and relayed their desire for continued prioritization of faculty input in the creation and delivery of online educational content. We appreciate her time in speaking with us and FSEC plans for ongoing conversations with Liz this year as she jumps into this new role. After concluding those conversations, FSEC discussed some new draft policies from the Provost office. FSEC members provided feedback to the Provost office aimed at providing avenues to strengthen and clarify the documents in context with faculty interests. These draft policies will be presented to the Faculty Senate at their next meeting.

FSEC also met with Provost André Wright and discussed two topics. First, his team introduced the idea of a "simple syllabus" to reduce recurring administrative tasks when it comes to updating University policy language. His team seeks to support faculty teaching by providing a starting point that checks for required syllabus language and accessibility support, while continuing to allow faculty members to develop and deliver their course content in a way that maintains each individual faculty member's teaching philosophy. While still in development to allow for feedback from faculty, the goal will be to adopt the simple syllabus as a standard platform by Fall 2027. Second, FSEC followed up about student visa issues and received some clarification about the impact to four year PhD programs.

As we move through October and into November, we will continue our discussions on proposed policy changes and prepare for a corresponding vote by the Faculty Senate next month.

Submitted by Rebecca Anderson, 2026-27 Chair, Faculty Senate

Adjustment in Faculty Salary Policy

Introduction:

This policy establishes the principles and procedures governing faculty salary adjustments. Consistent with the University's commitment to systematic evaluation of faculty performance, salary adjustments shall be based on documented achievement and merit from established review processes. The policy also provides mechanisms for addressing salary inequities that may arise from changing conditions or circumstances beyond the University's control while preserving the integrity of the merit-based compensation system.

Policy:

1. Norman Campus

All salary adjustments shall be based on systematic evaluations of faculty performance.

a) Salary Adjustments

- i. Faculty who meet or exceed expectations should receive annual merit raises, within the limits of the financial resources of the University.
- ii. At times when a faculty member is recognized with a special award designating a specific merit increase in salary to accompany the award, such special monetary award will be treated as additional to any increase recommended through normal procedures.
- iii. In certain circumstances, merit salary increases may cause the salary of a faculty member to equal or exceed the salary of faculty in higher ranks.

b) Procedures for Recommendations on Salary Adjustments

- i. The academic unit will annually collect (1) achievement data from all the academic unit's faculty and (2) evaluations of each faculty member's performance from their supervisors and from other sources identified in unit policies.
- ii. For each faculty member, the unit head (with input from Committee A, when appropriate) will prepare a recommendation based upon a comparison of faculty performance within the University and unit criteria and forward that recommendation to the dean.
- iii. The dean will review each recommendation and, if needed, will suggest any changes or adjustments. Chairs/Directors will have the opportunity to discuss these with the Dean if they disagree with the changes.
- iv. The salary recommendations from the college will be forwarded from the dean to the Senior Vice President and Provost for additional discussion, further recommendations, and administrative action.
- v. Each faculty member may request the reasons for the salary recommendation that was made. It is the responsibility of the chair to discuss such matters individually with the unit's faculty. These discussions should take place as soon as feasible following delivery of official salary notifications.

c) Adjustments of Salary Inequities

- i. For faculty meeting or exceeding expectations, adjustments in salary may be needed to correct inequities caused by annual variations in available funds, changing conditions in the academic

profession or in the economy, or other elements beyond the University's control. The responsibility for making adjustments, where needed, lies primarily with the dean, who, after consultation with the appropriate academic unit, recommends to the Senior Vice President and Provost specific salary adjustments to correct inequities. Such adjustments should be treated as additional to any increase recommended through normal procedures and subject to resource availability and approval of the Board of Regents..

2. Health Campus

Faculty Evaluation Policy

Introduction:

This policy establishes the criteria and procedures for faculty performance evaluations. Faculty performance evaluations serve two basic purposes: to provide information to the faculty member regarding their work so that they can build upon strengths and improve on weaknesses, and to provide a documented basis for recognizing the quality of the faculty member's work and how well the faculty member meets the academic unit's evaluation criteria for adjustment in salary, promotion, award nominations, and/or tenure.

Policy:

Every faculty member, without exception, is to be evaluated annually by the appropriate academic unit according to the criteria and procedures approved for that unit.

1. Each academic unit, with the participation of the dean and the Senior Vice President and Provost, shall create a policy document that 1) identifies standard percentage distributions of faculty effort across the areas of professional activity (teaching; research, and creative/scholarly activity; and professional and University service and public outreach); and 2) clearly and carefully states evaluation criteria and expectations associated with the standard distribution of effort.
2. Percentages of effort for a specific faculty member may deviate from the unit standard in some cases due to specific faculty assignments within an academic unit and/or the mission of an academic unit. Such variations are permitted if, in consultation with the dean and Senior Vice President and Provost, this is determined to assist the University in meeting its mission. As percentages of effort for a specific faculty member may deviate from the unit standards, each unit's evaluation policy must specify how expectations associated with different percentages of effort in each area of professional activity will be scaled.
3. Evaluation policy documents must be reviewed regularly through a process established by the dean and approved by the Senior Vice President and Provost. When review of a unit's policy identifies necessary changes, the unit will have a reasonable time to be established by the Provost to modify the policy and seek approval of the revised policy. If a unit does not modify its policy and seek approval within the allotted time, changes to the policy can be initiated by the dean or the Senior Vice President and Provost. The Senior Vice President and Provost's approval of the revised policy shall indicate a date on which it becomes effective. The revised policy for annual evaluation shall apply to all faculty beginning with the academic year following the effective date.

The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost may initiate policy review outside of the regular process, including requiring immediate changes as needed to comply with the law.

College Administration Policy

Definitions:

N/A

Policy:

1. College Organization

To accomplish its academic mission, the University is divided into colleges with deans as their chief administrative officers. Each dean is responsible for an administrative organization designed to meet the particular needs of the college. Associate deans, assistant deans, and staff support the college deans in carrying out the responsibilities of their offices to fulfill the mission of the college. The programs and faculty of a college usually are divided into separate units such as schools, departments, or divisions. When a college is divided into separate units, the dean shares (or delegates) many of the specific responsibilities outlined in this policy statement with college staff and the chairs/directors of the separate units. In colleges not divided into separate units, the college organization is similar to departmental organization as described in the [Departmental Administration Policy](#). Some colleges, particularly the Graduate College, College of Continuing Education, College of Professional and Continuing Studies, and University Libraries, are organized differently due to their unique missions within the University.

2. College Governance Documents

College faculty and administrators shall develop written policies and procedures to provide governance for the college. These governance documents shall be subject to review and approval of the Senior Vice President and provost and must be consistent with current policies of the University Regents, President, and Senior Vice President and Provost. The college governance documents shall be reviewed regularly by the college administration and faculty to ensure that they comply with current University and college policies. The college governance documents shall address at least the following subjects:

- a. The mission of the college and any of its separate units;
- b. Administrative organization of the college;
- c. Faculty governance within the college, including college committee structure and rules and procedures for faculty meetings;
- d. Procedures and criteria for hiring faculty, staff, and administrators;
- e. Procedures and criteria for annual faculty evaluation;
- f. Procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure;
- g. Procedures and criteria for evaluation of the dean and chairs/directors;
- h. Other policies defining the operation, authority, and policies of any separate units within the college.

3. General Responsibilities of the Dean

The dean provides leadership and administrative support to the programs and faculty of the

college in performing the missions of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. The dean represents the college in relations with the University Regents, the President, the Senior Vice President and Provost, other colleges, and other administrative officers of the University. The dean is responsible to the President through the Senior Vice President and Provost and is accountable to many constituencies including the faculty, staff, students, administrators, and alumni of the college. Whenever appropriate, the dean is expected to consult with, receive advice from, and communicate college decisions and recommendations of importance to the college to the constituents. However, the dean maintains the authority and discretion to carry out the University's mission and ensure compliance with applicable policies, rules, and laws within the college.

4. Specific Responsibilities of the Dean

The following is a non-exhaustive list of responsibilities of the dean. From time to time, the Senior Vice President and Provost or the faculty of the college may suggest additional specific responsibilities. In any particular college, the specific responsibilities of the dean may vary depending on the mission, organization, and size of the college. The specific responsibilities of an individual dean in a particular college must be flexible to respect these differences between colleges.

a. To the University at large, the Dean is responsible for:

- i. Representing the college whenever appropriate.
- ii. Implementing and disseminating information to college faculty and staff about all policies of the University.
- iii. Participating in the Dean's Council by advising the Senior Vice President and Provost concerning strategic planning, budgeting needs, University policy changes, activities, matters of mutual interest, and other priorities of the University.
- iv. Assisting the President and the Senior Vice President and Provost in the selection of deans and other University administrative officers.
- v. Providing an annual report to the President and other constituencies concerning the performance of the dean's college.
- vi. Cooperating with other colleges in the development of interdisciplinary programs consistent with University goals and objectives.
- vii. Contributing to a general spirit of University cooperation and collegiality.

b. To the College, the Dean is responsible for:

- i. Providing leadership in the organization, operations, development, and evaluation of the instructional, research/creative activity, and service programs appropriate to the college and consistent with University and college strategic planning.
- ii. Setting priorities for college-level alumni development and fund-raising activities and assisting the college and its separate units with

implementing and maintaining an active alumni development and fund-raising program.

- iii. Planning, preparing, submitting, and managing the college budget.
- iv. Fostering the welfare of the entire college faculty and staff and encouraging, facilitating, and mentoring their work and professional development.
- v. Recommending the appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty according to University and college guidelines (see the [Faculty Appointments Policy](#) and [Faculty Tenure Policy](#)).
- vi. Implementing personnel policies concerning faculty and staff of the college
- vii. Implementing disciplinary processes, including but not limited to the imposition of minor or severe sanctions.
- viii. Providing leadership to the faculty in reviewing, evaluating, and developing appropriate curricula and effective academic programs of study within the college.
- ix. Provide leadership over accreditation processes as appropriate to the college.
- x. Fostering an expectation of faculty excellence in research and creative activity and providing the infrastructure required to achieve that excellence.
- xi. Seeking advice from faculty, chairs/directors, and staff on matters affecting the college when appropriate.
- xii. Informing the college faculty and staff when it is in the best interest of a college to plan and effect reorganization among its units to respond to new circumstances or to strengthen existing programs.
- xiii. Presiding over meetings of the college faculty.
- xiv. Assuring that faculty and staff have access to University, college, and departmental policies.
- xv. Evaluating the performance of unit chairs/directors and other administrative staff reporting to the dean according to University and college policies. (See the [Departmental Administration Policy](#).)
- xvi. Initiating procedures to search for chairs/directors and other administrative staff of the college whenever a vacancy occurs. (See the [Departmental Administration Policy](#).)
- xvii. Evaluating the facility needs of the college and periodically advising the Senior Vice President and Provost of these facility needs.

- xviii. Developing strategies to recognize outstanding achievements by faculty and staff through appropriate awards and honors.
- xix. Fostering a spirit of cooperation and teamwork within the college.

c. To the students in the College, the Dean is responsible for:

- i. Providing an academic environment that nurtures all students in order to promote their success through counseling, professional advice, and other assistance when necessary.
- ii. Providing an academic advising system that informs students of all academic requirements of the college and their progress toward meeting those requirements.
- iii. Seeking advice from students on matters affecting the college.
- iv. Implementing University and college procedures to ensure an ethical and equitable academic atmosphere by enforcing policies involving such issues as academic misconduct, academic grade appeals, and ethics in research.
- v. Developing strategies to recognize outstanding achievement by students through appropriate awards and honors.
- vi. Enforcing admission and graduation requirements of the college.
- vii. On behalf of the faculty, recommending the conferral of a degree(s) for students who have met the requirements as determined by University and college regulations.

d. To external constituencies, the Dean is responsible for:

- i. Cooperating with and providing college-related leadership to University units that support the alumni development, fund raising, government relations, and public relations efforts of the University.
- ii. Communicating with graduates and other appropriate external constituencies concerning matters of interest to the college.
- iii. Seeking advice from graduates and other appropriate external constituencies concerning matters affecting the college.
- iv. Cooperating with the University in disseminating information about the college to the State Regents, the Legislature, and government entities.

5. Faculty Responsibility of a Dean

In addition to the administrative responsibilities described above, the dean may be involved in teaching, research/creative activity, and service. The extent of involvement in teaching, research/creative activity, and service should be determined by the dean in consultation with the Senior Vice President and Provost. While the dean is normally granted tenure within an academic unit of the college, the dean does not vote at faculty meetings of the unit.

6. Appointment of a Dean

The dean is normally appointed on a twelve (12) month basis. The dean of a college shall be initially appointed to a specific term as negotiated by the Senior Vice President and Provost, thereafter renewable by the Board of Regents upon the recommendation of the President.

7. Retention of a Dean

The dean of the college serves at the pleasure of the President upon the recommendation of the Senior Vice President and Provost and is entitled to 12-months notice of the termination or non-renewal of appointment unless good cause exists. Where termination is for good cause, it may be immediate and without prior notice. Retention or non-retention of a dean is recommended by the Senior Vice President and Provost after completion of the comprehensive evaluation process under Section 9(b) below.

8. Selection Procedure for a New Dean

The selection procedures for a new dean are described in the [Administrative Search Committees Policy](#).

9. Performance Evaluation of a Dean

Evaluation of the dean's performance is carried out by the Senior Vice President and Provost. It includes but is not limited to confidential evaluation by the faculty of the college. The faculty's assessment of the performance of their dean is carried out at regular intervals, as described below. The primary purpose of an evaluation is to provide constructive information toward how well job expectations are being met by the dean. The information will be made available to the dean, as well as to the University officers to whom the dean is responsible. A summary of the performance evaluation of the dean shall be shared with the appropriate college committee or group.

a. Annual Evaluation

An annual performance evaluation will be conducted of all deans by the Senior Vice President and Provost. The annual evaluation shall include:

- i. A self-assessment by the dean.
- ii. Confidential evaluation by the faculty of the college conducted by the Senior Vice President and Provost.
- iii. A report to the Senior Vice President and Provost from the college faculty and staff concerning the performance of the dean using the procedures and criteria adopted by the college.
- iv. A formal consultation between the dean and the Senior Vice President and Provost.

b. Comprehensive Evaluation

A comprehensive performance evaluation of the dean will occur at least every five years and shall be completed at least 12 months prior to the conclusion of a dean's appointed term. In addition to a compilation of the dean's annual evaluations, the comprehensive evaluation shall include input from the faculty, chairs/directors, and staff, students of the college, and other deans and administrative officers of the University. In planning the comprehensive evaluation, the Senior Vice President and Provost will respect differences among the various colleges. The comprehensive evaluation may include an external evaluation.

c. Evaluation Procedures and Criteria

The Senior Vice President and Provost shall develop written procedures and

criteria for the annual and comprehensive evaluation of the college dean. Evaluation procedures should provide the opportunity for input into the evaluation from the faculty, chairs/directors, staff, students, and appropriate external constituencies of the college.

10. Vacancy

Whenever a dean position is vacant, the Senior Vice President and Provost shall appoint an interim or acting dean of the college until a permanent dean assumes responsibility for the college. Prior to the appointment, the Senior Vice President and Provost shall seek input from representatives of the faculty, chairs/directors, and staff of the college involved to obtain advice on an appropriate candidate for the interim or acting dean. (For the effect of an interim appointment on the selection procedure for a new dean, see [Interim Officers Policy.](#))

11. Resolution of a Faculty Grievance Concerning the Dean

Faculty complaints about the dean will normally be resolved internally through meetings between the dean and faculty representatives. If dissatisfaction is widespread and cannot be resolved by the college, the college faculty, by a majority vote, may request that the Senior Vice President and Provost appoint a five member ad hoc committee, consisting of three faculty members who do not hold appointments in the involved college, a dean, and another University officer, to conduct an investigation and report its findings to the Senior Vice President and Provost. After receiving the committee report, the Senior Vice President and Provost will determine an appropriate course of action to resolve the grievances.

Approval Authority:

Senior Vice President and Provost

Former Policy Number:

5.2.1.2 / FHPN 2.8.1

Faculty Promotion Policy

Introduction:

This policy establishes the criteria and procedures governing promotion for Regular and Renewable Term (Lecturers and Instructors) Faculty. Promotion is one important way in which the University recognizes a faculty member's achievements and reflects a positive appraisal of high professional competence and accomplishment. Promotion decisions shall be based on a thorough evaluation of a faculty member's performance in all areas of faculty activity, consistent with the academic unit's approved promotion criteria, the faculty member's letter of appointment, distribution of effort, and any special conditions pertaining to the appointment.

Definitions:

Regular Faculty: Per The Regular Faculty Policy, the Regular Faculty of the University is composed of all faculty members with regular appointments, including tenure-track, tenured, and consecutive term/renewable term appointments. Promotion pathways are as follows: Assistant Professor to Associate Professor to Professor.

Renewable term (historically unranked) faculty include Lecturers (terminal degree required) and Instructors (Master's degree required). Promotion pathways are as follows: Lecturer to Senior Lecturer to Distinguished Lecturer, and Instructor to Senior Instructor to Distinguished Instructor.

Policy:

1. Norman Campus

a. Criteria for Promotion

- i. Each academic unit, with the participation and approval of the dean and the Senior Vice President and Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for promotion of all faculty (tenure track, tenured, and renewable term) in that unit. These criteria must consider how different distributions of effort are reflected in expected productivity.
- ii. Decisions to promote a faculty member must be based on a thorough evaluation of his or her performance in all applicable areas of faculty activity. The candidate's performance is judged by all recommending parties against the academic unit's approved criteria, the candidate's letter of appointment, distribution of effort, and any special conditions pertaining to the candidate's appointment.
- iii. Promotion criteria must be reviewed regularly through a process established by the dean and approved by the Senior Vice President and Provost. When the review of a unit's criteria identifies necessary changes, the unit will have a reasonable time, to be established by the Provost, to modify the criteria and seek approval of the revised criteria. If a unit does not modify their criteria and have them approved within the allotted time, changes to the criteria can be initiated by the dean or the Senior Vice President and Provost. The Senior Vice President and Provost's approval of the

revised criteria shall indicate a date on which they become effective. The revised criteria for promotion shall apply to all faculty beginning with the academic year following the effective date. However, when a faculty member is under consideration for both promotion to Associate professor and tenure, the criteria for both tenure and promotion will be the same and governed by the Faculty Tenure Policy.

The Office of Senior Vice President and Provost may initiate policy review outside of the regular process, including requiring immediate changes as needed to comply with the law.

- iv. The approved criteria determine the emphasis placed on the various areas of faculty activity, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1. Criteria for promotion in all units should include attainment of high standards in teaching, research, creative/scholarly activity, and professional and University service and public outreach. Service in a given rank for any number of years is not a sufficient reason for promotion.
 - 2. Promotion should indicate that the faculty member is of comparable stature with others in his or her field with similar workload assignments at the same stage in their careers at peer institutions.
 - 3. Renewable term Lecturers and Instructors who have five continuous years of full-time employment at the University and have attained high standards will be eligible for promotion to Senior. Senior Lecturers and Instructors who have five continuous years of full-time employment at the University and have attained high standards will be eligible for promotion to Distinguished. Unit heads and deans may initiate earlier promotions when merit/achievement warrants.
 - 4. Promotions should be earned on their own right and not be used as substitutes for salary increases.

b. Procedures for Promotion Decisions

- i. Recommendations regarding promotion shall originate in the academic units by procedures to be determined by the Senior Vice President and Provost.
- ii. The college dean or the Senior Vice President and Provost may, at his or her discretion, require an academic unit to initiate consideration of promotion for an individual faculty member. In such a case, the academic unit must follow the standard process and forward a recommendation.
- iii. The evaluation process for promotion of regular faculty should be substantially the same as that used in tenure considerations.
- iv. Primary responsibility for gathering complete information on professional activity rests with the individual faculty member. The unit head should work with the faculty member to create a promotion packet that contains all the required materials.

Candidates may include whatever materials they wish in the parts of the promotion packet that are their responsibility, in addition to the required materials. The entire promotion packet must be provided for consideration by any person or group making a recommendation.

- v. All recommendations must be in writing and, with the exception of the vote of the unit's faculty members, all recommendations must include a statement of reasons for the recommendation. Notification of all such recommendations made above the level of the academic unit, up to and including the recommendation of the Senior Vice President and Provost, must be provided to the unit's chair and the candidate. The numerical result of the formal secret ballot polling of the unit's faculty members shall be provided to the candidate if the candidate makes a request.
- vi. The unit head and Committee A members (if applicable) must provide their recommendations in all promotion packets. Each member shall record an independent opinion, by name, and with no obligation to represent majority departmental opinion. Reasons must be given for all recommendations.
- vii. Whenever possible, a promotion should be accompanied by an appropriate increase in salary. If budgetary limitations make this impossible in any particular year, an adjustment should occur at the next budget period when funds are available. Promotions must not be delayed because of budgetary constraints.

(Regents, 2-12-76, 10-6-77, 11-10-77, 2-16-78, 3-9-78, 6-15-78, 7-19-78, 12-14-78, 5-8-80, 3-18-81, 6-18-81, 7-22-81, 9-17-81, 9-9-82, 12-15-83, 3-8-84, 12-13-84, 12-12-85, 1-15-87, 7-23-87, 5-9-91, 6-13-91, 7-27-93, 6-27-95, 1-14-97, 3-29-00, 1-27-04)

2. Health Campus...