CPSGG School Policies
(Modified from 2010 APR self-study)

The school is committed to a diverse faculty, in terms of research areas and demographics, which can provide a strong basic education in geology and geophysics and conduct basic as well as applied research. The school has a long history and tradition of petroleum geosciences education and research, and this will continue.

Tenure and Promotion

All tenure track faculty will get a “progress toward tenure” letter and ranked renewable term faculty will receive a progress toward promotion letter each spring.

The faculty decided that our tenure guidelines will not set specific targets in terms of number of publications, research, etc. that are required for tenure (see guidelines). All junior faculty are told that we do have benchmarks that we use in our yearly evaluation system and they are a good minimum target for tenure. Tenure track faculty should publish at least two refereed papers and at least 2 abstracts per year, and bring in $60k per year in external funding. Papers and abstracts with students with are included in this total. The opinions of recognized researchers working in the candidate’s field of specialization at institutions with strong overall research programs will be crucial in the assessment of the accomplished research and research potential. Tenure track faculty should teach 3 courses per year after the first year. We expect good teaching. We use student course evaluations although we acknowledge that this method is not perfect and teaching is difficult to evaluate. The faculty member should also help to teach introductory courses, if possible. Tenure track faculty should supervise and complete several graduate students within the probationary period. In terms of service, we expect the faculty member to be involved in school, college, and some university committees. The faculty member should also participate in appropriate professional activities. Ranked renewable term faculty, if they have a teaching intensive effort distribution, will be expected to teach more.

Effort Distribution

Faculty set our expected course load at 3 regular courses per year for a 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service effort distribution. The average teaching load for the School is 4 per year. Effort distributions for faculty can vary to take advantage of different faculty strengths. Most faculty are on the 40-40-20 system except
for assistant professors (45/45/10). Some faculty who are not active in research have a higher teaching effort (e.g., 60%) and teach up to 6 courses/year. New assistant professors are only required to teach 2 courses in their first year. Supervision of graduate students is considered “teaching” in our evaluation system and 3 students is considered a ‘good’ load.

Ranked renewable term faculty members in the School of Geology and Geophysics are eligible for promotion as outlined in the Norman Campus Faculty Handbook. The ranked renewable term faculty members will be evaluated for promotion based on the effort percentages (teaching, research, and service) agreed upon when they were hired and the guidelines provided in the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. For example, if the school and a ranked renewable term faculty member agree that he/she will be evaluated and reviewed like tenured or tenure-track faculty members (45-45-10; teaching, research, and service for assistant professors), then promotion to the associate level will be based on the criteria for promotion in the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines document.

Ranked renewable term faculty will be afforded all the rights of tenured or tenure-track faculty members in the school except that they will not participate or vote on tenure decisions. The ranked renewable term faculty members will be evaluated yearly based on the effort percentages (teaching, research, and service) agreed upon when they were hired (or modified at a later date). A ranked renewable term faculty members’ effort distribution may include teaching, research, and service in any combination that is consistent with the needs of the school, college, and the university.

**Tenure and Promotion**

All tenure track faculty will get a “progress toward tenure” letter and ranked renewable term faculty will receive a progress toward promotion letter each spring.

The faculty decided that our tenure guidelines will not set specific targets in terms of number of publications, research, etc. that are required for tenure (see guidelines). All junior faculty are told that we do have benchmarks that we use in our yearly evaluation system and they are a good minimum target for tenure. Tenure track faculty should publish at least two refereed papers and at least 2 abstracts per year, and bring in $60k per year in external funding. Papers and abstracts with students with are included in this total. The opinions of recognized researchers working in the candidate’s field of specialization at institutions with strong overall research programs will be crucial in the assessment of the accomplished research and research potential. Tenure track faculty should
teach 3 courses per year after the first year. We expect good teaching. We use student course evaluations although we acknowledge that this method is not perfect and teaching is difficult to evaluate. The faculty member should also help to teach introductory courses, if possible. Tenure track faculty should supervise and complete several graduate students within the probationary period. In terms of service, we expect the faculty member to be involved in school, college, and some university committees. The faculty member should also participate in appropriate professional activities. Ranked renewable term faculty, if they have a teaching intensive effort distribution, will be expected to teach more.

Evaluations

Expectations - Teaching

Teaching expectations are tenured faculty are three regular courses per year for a 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service effort distribution. Three course is considered a “good” load. Faculty are expected to also supervise graduate students and 3 students is considered a ‘good’ load. The faculty also have a target of teaching 75 students per year. The average for all faculty should be above 75. In our evaluation system, if a faculty member teaches 3 courses, supervises three graduate students, and teaches 75 students they would get a 3.01/5.0 on the evaluation system.

Our policy for faculty release from teaching is one month of salary for one course.

Scholarly and Creative Activity

In terms of evaluation, if faculty publish two refereed papers, 2 abstracts, and bring in $60k in external funding, they will receive a “good” (3.0) in our evaluation system.

The average publication rate of refereed papers is currently above 3.0 per year on average which has increased from 1.5 in 2005. One of our strategic goals is to increase faculty research and scholarship.

Since 2006, external expenditures have increased from around $1 million to about $2.5 million in FY2016. About 60% of the faculty carry some form of external research funding. We currently have good diversity of funding sources with both federal and industry support (approximately equal amounts). We will strive to maintain a diverse funding base and we encourage faculty to seek funding in several ways.

We use external funding as an important component of our evaluation system. Faculty are expected to provide funding for graduate students, particularly if they have more than one student. We have instituted a policy
where faculty are expected to provide one semester (or year) of research support for each semester (or year) of support that a student receives as a teaching assistant. This applies only to students who receive school support. This policy has allowed us to increase the number of students the school supports. The School also provides “seed funds” for travel or equipment to help develop a proposal for external funding. The School will strive to become more proactive in interdisciplinary research efforts.

Most (80-90%) of the SRI funds the school receives are returned to the faculty that have the grants. They should use the funds to support research. Most of the funds are used for seed projects (travel, student support, small equipment purchases, and faculty salaries to support research). The other SRI funds are used, along with vacant position and foundation funds, to provide start-up funds for new faculty.

**Service**

The faculty are expected to serve on school, college and university committees as well as conducting professional service. The faculty members are particularly active in professional service, including several editorships, associate editorships, a research councilor position, and service on NSF/ACS panels and other panels. We also encourage our faculty to conduct outreach.

**Evaluation**

The faculty are evaluated by Committee “A” (including the Director) on the basis of information submitted on the online university faculty activity site. Faculty can also provide a written statement. Committee “A” reviews all teaching activities as a block, all research as a block, and all service as a block using a quantitative system. Committee A can make adjustments to the scores if they feel there is a particular problem. The evaluation system has been a source of faculty friction in the past with some faculty arguing for a more qualitative system. As a result of these discussions, the system had been regularly modified (See document the “Formulae”). The evaluation is typically rigorous and evaluations range between 1.0 and 5.0 on the Provost’s form. The evaluation assessments are used in advising faculty members of possible ways to improve.

**Mentoring**

All junior faculty are offered mentors from the faculty. These could be faculty in the school or in another department. The director will work with the faculty member to find one or more appropriate mentors. The school will pay for lunches to facilitate discussions between the junior faculty member and the mentor.
Committee A

The director serves as a member of committee A and two faculty are elected to serve on staggered two year terms.

Student Policies

Details on the undergraduate and graduate programs (e.g., admissions) are included on the website. We also have a progress toward degree from that all graduate students are required to fill out each year. This helps with monitoring and improving the time to degree for our students.
1. TENURE

1.1 Preface

This section sets forth the criteria and procedures that govern recommendation for tenure in the ConocoPhillips School of Geology and Geophysics. Tenure is not a right but is, instead, a privilege conferred as a guarantee of academic freedom, a reward for exemplary performance during the probationary period, and as recognition that continued high productivity can be expected in the future.

Tenure is subject to the provisions and exceptions outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

A tenure recommendation requires thorough assessment of an individual’s research and teaching accomplishments and potential for future growth. The recommendation to grant or deny tenure should reflect evaluation against other individuals actually or potentially available. Projected future professional contributions to the programs and responsibilities of the School of Geology and Geophysics must also be considered.

Because of the profound long-term impact of each tenure decision, the tenured faculty must exercise prudence and should be allowed great latitude in deliberations. The bases for decisions should not violate academic freedom or discriminate on the basis of race, creed, religion, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, age, or national origin.

Criteria for Tenure Recommendation

1.2 General

All faculty members are expected to recognize and to contribute to the fulfillment of the total programmatic responsibilities of the School and the College through research, teaching, and professional service. It is expected that, during the probationary period, research and teaching will be the primary focus of the candidate’s activity and achievement. Some contribution to other functions of the University, the external community, and the individual’s profession are to be expected and encouraged; however, such accomplishments are not to be considered alternatives to basic achievements in research and teaching.

1.3 Teaching

Teaching is an important mission of the University, and evidence of effective teaching is, therefore, one of the requirements for a favorable tenure recommendation. Teaching is construed to mean formal undergraduate and graduate instruction, the less-formal seminar,
laboratory or field course instruction, and the highly individualized instruction that occurs through the interaction between faculty member and student in research. Participation in undergraduate and graduate teaching and in research supervision is normally expected.

Assessment of classroom teaching is to be made against School standards and primarily through evaluation by peers and students.

1.4 Research and Scholarship

Research and scholarship in the University environment represent not only a very effective form of teaching, but are directed toward a major mission of the University – the discovery of new knowledge. Evidence of effectiveness in this pursuit, therefore, assumes an importance comparable to that accorded teaching as a criterion in recommendation for tenure. While teaching can be judged best against local standards and through assessment of local impacts, research and scholarship are judged against national and international standards.

Important evidences of research and scholarship are the quantity and significance of published results, and the quality of the medium of publication. Other indicators of research accomplishment include presentation at professional meetings or specialized symposia, adequacy of external funding obtained to support the faculty member’s research efforts and those of his or her graduate students, and the judgment by peers, which must include at least four external reviews from recognized researchers working in the candidate’s field of specialization at institutions with strong overall research programs. These external assessors will be provided copies of the candidate’s most significant publications and such other documentation of research productivity and quality as may be deemed appropriate. The assessors will be selected by Committee “A” of the academic unit from a list of the most knowledgeable workers in the field. Committee “A” may also select as many additional external assessors as they feel necessary. The Dean of the Mewbourne College of Earth and Energy may at his/her discretion request additional external assessments. A phone call will be made or an e-mail sent to each assessor selected to ascertain that he or she feels competent and willing to serve. A written assessment will be requested. These assessments will form a part of the record reviewed in reaching a decision on the tenure question.

1.5 Service

Any faculty member recommended for tenure should have demonstrated an understanding and acceptance of the responsibilities that the faculty have for professional service and leadership within the University, the community, and the profession. This acceptance should be reflected through participation in appropriate professional activities.

1.6 Procedure for Judgment

Award of tenure will normally, but not necessarily, accompany promotion to Associate Professor. The procedure used in consideration for tenure is similar to that used for promotion to Associate Professor and the same documentation may be used if both tenure and promotion are considered concurrently.
1.7 Mechanics

The recommendation\(^1\) made by the School will be forwarded as required in the Faculty Handbook to the Dean of the Mewbourne College of Earth and Energy. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation to the Provost.

2. PROMOTION

2.1 Preface

Promotion is one of the ways in which the University recognizes superior performance and high potential among its faculty. Promotion is based neither upon anticipation of achievement, nor on length of service in a given rank. The standards for promotion are both internal to the School and external through comparisons to faculty in other institutions.

Promotion is subject to the provisions and exceptions outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

2.2 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

No candidate shall be considered for promotion to Associate Professor unless those sitting in judgment believe his/her potential is sufficient to indicate that expeditious promotion to the rank of Professor is probable. Occasional candidates may come from an industrial or government environment and thus lack experience in teaching and research with students and in such cases this different background may be taken into account.

2.2.1 Teaching

Teaching is an important University function and it must be demonstrated that the overall teaching performance of a candidate has significantly contributed to the instructional needs of the School.

2.2.2 Research

Research is a vital University function and the candidate shall have exhibited research abilities and performance judged equal to or better than those of faculty at the new rank in comparable institutions. The candidate shall have a significant research program and shall be deemed likely to continue to be a productive researcher. While opportunities for external funds vary from field to field, it is expected that every effort will have been made to obtain external support for research and graduate students.

2.2.3 Service

The candidate must have demonstrated an appreciation of the need for service to the School, the Mewbourne College of Earth and Energy, the University, and his or her profession. For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, it is not expected that the individual necessarily be involved at all levels but rather that a meaningful contribution should have been made to one or more of the above. Exemplary performance in service will not be accepted in lieu of suitable performance in either research or teaching.

2.3 Procedure for Judgment
2.3.1 Teaching Assessment

Assessment of teaching performance may involve student, faculty, alumni or other evaluations and the quality of theses or dissertations completed under the candidate's direction. If the candidate has had teaching experience elsewhere at the University level, outside opinions should be sought. In general, the standard is internal for classroom teaching and external for review of thesis and dissertation quality.

2.3.2 Research Assessment

Assessment of research performance shall involve judgments of the strength and significance of the candidate's research, the extent to which he or she has developed it, the level of external support attained, the quantity and quality and impact of refereed publications reporting original research results, judgment of the candidate's contribution to multi-authored publications, the quality and rigor of the publication media used, and of participation in invited symposia in which the candidate participates, and of lectures or papers presented at professional meetings. Judgments must include both internal and external peers. At least four external reviews must be obtained from recognized researchers working in the candidate’s field of specialization at institutions with strong overall research programs. These external assessors will be provided copies of the candidate’s most significant publications and such other documentation of research productivity and quality as may be deemed appropriate. The assessors will be selected by Committee “A” of the academic unit from a list of the most knowledgeable workers in the field. Committee “A” may also select as many additional external assessors as they feel necessary. The Dean of the Mewbourne College of Earth and Energy may at his/her discretion request additional external assessments. A phone call will be made or an e-mail sent to each assessor selected to ascertain that he or she feels competent and willing to serve. A written assessment will be requested. These assessments will form a part of the record reviewed in reaching a decision on the tenure question.

2.3.3 Service Assessment

Assessment of performance in service shall involve internal or external judgments as to the significance of the services performed in relation to the needs of the School, the College of Earth and Energy, the University and the candidate's profession. For promotion to Associate Professor, performance in service is deemed less important than either teaching or research which will require most of the candidate's energies.

2.4 Mechanics

The recommendations made by the School will be reviewed by the Dean of the College of Earth and Energy. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation and the recommendation originating in the School to the Provost.

2.5 Promotion to Professor

2.5.1 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

No candidate shall be considered for promotion to Professor unless those sitting in judgment believe that his/her research record and production of advanced degree students have resulted
in national and international recognition for excellence. Occasional candidates from non-
university environments may not have had access to teaching experience and research
students and in such cases this different background may be taken into account.

2.5.2 Teaching

The candidate's teaching performance must be judged to have contributed significantly to the
program of instruction in the School.

2.5.3 Research

Productivity in research is the distinguishing characteristic of the full Professor. The
candidate shall have a significant research program and shall be deemed likely to continue
to be a productive researcher. This productivity shall be judged by the same criteria used to
evaluate candidates for promotion to Associate Professor, but the level of attainment shall be
such as to have assured widespread recognition of excellence in research and, if the candidate
has had access to them, the production of research students.

2.5.4 Service

Candidates must have exhibited a commitment to service. This service need not encompass
all aspects of the field but must be sufficient to have resulted in a strong internal or external
recognition of the contributions, made to the University or the School or to the candidate's
profession.

2.6 Procedure for Judgment

2.6.1 Teaching Assessment

This assessment shall follow the procedures set forth for promotion to Associate Professor
but performance must be judged exemplary in some aspect of the spectrum of teaching
activities.

2.6.2 Research Assessment

This assessment is the one considered most significant in the judgment of a candidate for
promotion to the rank of Professor but it should be recognized that research, as an intellectual
endeavor, is inseparable from teaching at the highest level through the joint prosecution of
research with graduate students. The procedure for judgment includes the elements set forth
under Research Assessment for Promotion to Associate Professor but the level of attainment
must be higher and such as to have resulted in broad national and, preferably, international
recognition for excellence. At least six external reviews must be obtained from recognized
researchers working in the candidate’s field of specialization at institutions with strong
overall research programs. These external assessors will be provided copies of the
candidate’s most significant publications and such other documentation of research
productivity and quality as may be deemed appropriate. The assessors will be selected by
Committee “A” of the academic unit from a list of the most knowledgeable workers in the
field. Committee “A” may also select as many additional external assessors as they feel
necessary. The Dean of the Mewbourne College of Earth and Energy may at his/her
discretion request additional external assessments. A phone call will be made or an e-mail
sent to each assessor selected to ascertain that he or she feels competent and willing to serve.
A written assessment will be requested. These assessments will form a part of the record reviewed in reaching a decision on the tenure question.

2.6.3 Service Assessment

With the exception of very unusual cases, this assessment will follow the procedures set forth for Promotion to Associate Professor but the weight accorded to this area of performance is greater in the case of promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

2.7 Mechanics

The recommendations made by the School will be reviewed by the Dean of the College of Earth and Energy. The Dean will then forward his/her recommendation and the recommendation originating in the School to the Provost.
Addendum to Tenure and Promotion Policy
Policy for Promotion of **Ranked Renewable Term Faculty**
ConocoPhillips School of Geology and Geophysics
February, 2010

Ranked renewable term faculty members in the School of Geology and Geophysics are eligible for promotion as outlined in the Norman Campus Faculty Handbook.

The ranked renewable term faculty members will be evaluated for promotion based on the effort percentages (teaching, research, and service) agreed upon when they were hired and the guidelines provided in the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. For example, if the school and a ranked renewable term faculty member agree that he/she will be evaluated and reviewed like tenured or tenure-track faculty members (45-45-10; teaching, research, and service for assistant professors), then promotion to the associate level will be based on the criteria for promotion in the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines document.

Ranked renewable term faculty will be afforded all the rights of tenured or tenure-track faculty members in the school except that they will not participate or vote on tenure decisions. The ranked renewable term faculty members will be evaluated yearly based on the effort percentages (teaching, research, and service) agreed upon when they were hired (or modified at a later date). A ranked renewable term faculty members’ effort distribution may include teaching, research, and service in any combination that is consistent with the needs of the school, college, and the university.

¹These recommendations must comply with the Faculty Handbook.
Faculty Evaluation Formula:

TEACHING:

The following teaching evaluation system was voted upon and unanimously approved by the 13 (2/3 of total) faculty present at a meeting held on December 4, 2002. This method was implemented for the first time for the Academic Year 2003 Evaluation (completed in early 2004).

The teaching evaluation is based on the following four parameters:

-Number of courses taught during the calendar year (including summer field camp);
-Number of students enrolled in those courses;
-Number of graduate students supervised;
-Average Z score of Questions 14, 15, 16.

Each of these numbers shall be divided by a benchmark number.

The numerical values derived from formulae for teaching, research, and service—with appropriate FTE weighting factors applied—shall be used as guidelines, and can be modified at the discretion of Committee.

At a January 28, 2003 faculty meeting, the faculty voted unanimously in favor of the following benchmarks for the four chosen evaluation categories:

Teaching Load:  3
Students Taught: 75
Graduate students supervised + undergraduate theses completed: 3
Student evaluations – median values of 3/5

In addition, it was decided that Committee A would have final discretion in determining a faculty member's involvement (for calculation purposes) for a jointly-taught course. It was decided that if, for example, two faculty members actively participate in the entire course, then each can be given a weighting of .75 for the course; if two faculty members only split a course and do not participate in the other half, then 0.5 would be the likely award.

At the February 11, 2003 Faculty meeting, the methods for including an "Expectation Factor" and FTE weighting were discussed. As a result of that meeting, Alan Witten wrote the following procedure, with examples. It is this formula that will comprise the final numerical score for the Teaching Evaluation.

Let T, R, and S represent Teaching, Research, and Service scores, respectively, such as 5, 3, and 2. Also, FT, FR, and FS represent the fraction of time devoted to teaching, research, and service, respectively. The benchmark used is FT=0.4, FR=0.4, and FS=0.2.

The weighted final evaluation, E, should be computed using the formula

\[ E = 0.4\times(0.4/FT)\times T + 0.4\times(0.4/FR)\times R + 0.2\times(0.2/FS)\times S \]
where the coefficients of each term are the baseline weightings, 40:40:20, and terms in parenthesis are adjustments for a different proportion.

To demonstrate that this works, assume faculty member A has a 40:40:20 split and faculty member B has a 60:20:20 split. For simplicity, let the teaching score is the number of courses taught and the research is the number of papers published. If faculty member A teaches 4 courses his score for teaching, \( T \), will be 4. Faculty member B devotes 50\% more time to teaching so that he should teach 6 courses, \( T=6 \), to have a comparable performance to faculty member A. Assuming faculty member A published 4 papers, his research score, \( R \), would be 4. Since faculty member B devotes half as much time to research, 2 papers, \( R=2 \), should produce a comparable performance to faculty member A. Both have the same proportion of service, \( FS=0.2 \), and give them the same service score, \( S=2 \).

To recap:

for faculty member A, \( T=4, R=4, S=2 \) and \( FT=0.4, FR=0.4, \) and \( FS=0.2 \)

for faculty member B, \( T=6, R=2, S=2, \) and \( FT=0.6, FR=0.2 \) and \( FS=0.2 \)

Using the above formula, faculty member A receives an evaluation

\[
EA = 0.4*(0.4/0.4)*4 + 0.4*(0.4/0.4)*4 + 0.2*(0.2/0.2)*2 = 1.6+1.6+0.4 = 3.6
\]

and faculty member B receives an evaluation

\[
EB = 0.4*(0.4/0.6)*6 + 0.4*(0.4/0.2)*2 + 0.2*(0.2/0.2)*2 = 1.6+1.6+0.4 = 3.6
\]

which is correct.

To include non full time faculty, the formula is divided by the FTE or

\[
E = \left[0.4*(0.4/FT)*T + 0.4*(0.4/FR)*R + 0.2*(0.2/FS)*S\right]/FTE
\]

Assume that faculty member B is only half-time, \( FTE = 0.5 \). His individual scores (\( T, R, \) and \( S \)) should be half of that of a full time faculty or \( T=3, R=1, \) and \( S=1 \). Given his 60:20:20 split, his evaluation will be

\[
EB = [0.4*(0.4/0.6)*3 + 0.4*(0.4/0.2)*1 + 0.2*(0.2/0.2)*1]/0.5 = [0.8+0.8+0.2]/0.5 = 3.6
\]

and, again, this is correct.

The above formula does not take into account aspects of a non full-time faculty member's work that could be counted towards his evaluation. For example, if the a half-time faculty member spends his other time doing research, his publication that result from this work could be counted towards his research score and this will unfairly double his score. If this is to be accounted for, different formulas must be considered.

The calculation procedure is as follows:
C/3 + ST/75 + GSS/3  +  student evaluation (see below)

Where:

C= Number of major courses taught and average is 3
ST = Number of students and average is 75
GSS = Number of graduate students supervised and 3 is the average

Student evaluation. Take the average score of questions 14, 15, 16 for all courses.

Median score*
3.0-4.0  - no change
< 3.0 – consider reducing teaching evaluation by .5
4.0 -4.5 – consider increasing teaching evaluation by .25
4.5 -5.0  – consider increasing teaching evaluation by .5

These ranges apply to undergraduate courses. Graduate course also score higher. Also consider that some courses with many MPG&E students get low evaluations.

FTE correction
Three of the four teaching evaluation components (number of courses, number of students in those courses, number of grad students) are FTE dependent (for 1.0 FTE the benchmarks are 3 courses, 75 students, and 3 students, so for 0.5 FTE the benchmarks are 1.5 courses, 37.5 students, and 1.5 students).

RESEARCH:

1999 FACULTY EVALUATIONS: RESEARCH

Criteria for Evaluation of Research
The following general criteria were used by Committee A in assigning credit for research. Credit was assigned for publications, for grants, and for unfunded proposals. The relative credit for each remained consistent with 1997 and 1998 criteria.

Publications
Refereed publications in what were judged to be major journals were assigned 8 points each. Publications in books or other edited volumes were assigned 2 to 6 points.
Extended or expanded abstracts were assigned 4 points, and abstracts were assigned 3 points. This credit was based on the visibility that associated meeting presentations provide.
No credit was given for publications in press or submitted.
Note that only publications with a 1999 publication date were considered in evaluation.

Grants
Credit was given for awards continuing in 1999 and for awards new in 1999. No credit was given for no-cost extensions (no new money) of awards beyond their funded duration.

External grants
A basic credit, in points, for each external grant was obtained by the product of there factors:
Grant amount /($5,000*number of years awarded*number of investigators)

Added to the basic credit were:
- 2 points if the grant was through the OVPRA;
- 1 point if the grant is new in 1999

Note that a grant awarded in 1999, but with funding delayed until 2000, will begin receiving credit in 2000, not in 1999.

**Internal grants**
Each internal grant was awarded 1 to 3 points with larger grants receiving more points.

**Proposals**
Recognition was given to the effort required in preparing and submitting external proposals. Each unsuccessful proposal submitted in 1999 for external funding was awarded 1 to 2 points depending on the size of the requested funding.

Note that successful proposals were evaluated as grants.

**Overall research evaluation**

A standard research performance for a pre-assigned research weighting of 40% is:

\[
\text{2 papers } + 2 \text{ abstracts } + 2 \text{ S30K grants } + 2 \text{ unsuccessful proposals } = \\
2(8) + 2(3) + 2(8) + 2(2) = 42 \text{ points}
\]

For the usual 1.0 FTE of a faculty member not on sabbatical, this score would be 3.01 on a scale of 0 to 5 (at the low end of the “Very Good” range).

The score is calculated as follows:

\[
\text{No. of papers published (not in press or submitted) } \times 8 = A
\]
\[
\text{(Total grant size / 30) } \times 8 = B
\]
\[
\text{Number of abstracts } \times 3 = C
\]
\[
\text{Number of proposals } \times 2 = D
\]

\[
\frac{(A + B + C + D)}{42} \times (3.01) = \text{ Score for research}
\]

Thus, a faculty member reporting 3 papers and 120k in grant funding has:

\[
24 + 32 = 56
\]
Scores > 5.0 are truncated to 5.0.

SERVICE:

1999 FACULTY EVALUATIONS: SERVICE

The service category is in many ways the most difficult to assess because the nature and benefit of the service efforts vary so widely. Beginning in 1999 (for CY 1998 evaluations), Committee A adopted the following scheme. Committee A elected to weight heavily:

- The activities that constituted major, important service to the School (e.g., Director, Committee A, chair of a major School committee)
- Committee service that gave the School substantial visibility in the campus community (e.g., Research Council, Faculty Senate)
- Professional service that promoted the visibility of the School in professional societies and similar agencies (e.g., associate editor of a major journal, chair of a national council, panel member for NSF or DOE)
- Reviews of manuscripts and proposals, as these represent a measure of the faculty member’s role in the science
- Other activities, such as colloquia, workshops

Unlike teaching and research, for which there are fairly clear expectations, the standard for service is ill-defined. To arrive at a suitable standard, Committee A created fictive scenarios for performance and assigned proper weights to each activity. The example below is one of those fictive scenarios that depicts a faculty member’s service activity at 0.20 FTE (1 day/week), which Committee A would rate as superior (5.00).

PROFILE OF A SERVICE RATING OF “5” AT 20% EFFORT (=0.20 FTE = 1 work day/week)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Editor, major professional journal</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, major committee of a national professional society</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer, short course or symposium for major national society</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF/DOE Panel</td>
<td>25-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, 2 major committees with regular meetings (e.g., Budget Council, Research Council, Campus Tenure, etc.)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, 1 committee with virtually no meetings (e.g., Faculty Appeals)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COLLEGE
Faculty Senate Representative 10

**SCHOOL**

Chair, major School committee (e.g., USC) 15
Graduate study Committee 20
Member, major School committee (e.g., GAC, USC) 5
Faculty Supervisor to student organization 5
Undergraduate student advisor (1 pt each) 2
Serving on grad committees (2 pts each) 2
Lab supervision 5?

**REVIEWS**

8 manuscripts for journals, 6 NSF grant proposals, @ 2 pts/ea 28

**OTHER**

Gave 2 invited university colloquia, @ 5 pts/ea 10

**TOTAL** 135

On this basis, the service evaluation was standardized linearly to 135 service points for a score of 5.00 at 0.20 FTE.

Consequently, the service evaluation was calculated simply as:

\[
A/(135*B)
\]

Where:

\(A\) = your service points
\(B\) = your assigned effort weight fraction, which is 20\% for most faculty members

e.g., if you obtained 86 points with an effort weight fraction of 0.20 (20\% assigned effort), then your service score was \(= 86/(135*0.2) = 3.19\).

Some examples of other activities and the points awarded to them:

**PROFESSIONAL**

Organized session at regional GSA 5

**SCHOOL**

Committee A 30
Other major committee 5-30
Supervised common-use lab 10
Serving on graduate student committees 2 pt each
Undergraduate advisor 1 pt for each advisee
(Note: this only applies for spring 2011 since Donna started doing the advising last fall)

**REVIEWS**
The range of points for individual entries varied as:

- **PROFESSIONAL**: 2 TO 20
- **UNIVERSITY**: 2 TO 10
- **COLLEGE**: 2 TO 5
- **SCHOOL**: 2 TO 100
- **REVIEWS**: 2 TO 10
- **OTHER**: 2 TO 5

Partial-year or split appointments are difficult to assess for their service component to the School. Committee A took these measures into account on a case-by-case basis, evaluating what should be construed as full-year versus partial-year service, or full FTE versus split (Partial) FTE load in the School.

If you joined the School in 1999, then your service score was adjusted to reflect the partial-year effort as:

$$\frac{A}{135B} \times \frac{1.00}{C}$$

Where:

- **C** = your fractional year of service

Sabbatical leaves exempt a faculty member for University service but have no direct bearing on that faculty member’s activity in professional societies, reviews for journals or agencies, etc. Therefore, if you were on leave for part of 1999, and based on your reported activities, your value of C was adjusted appropriately between 1.00 and your actual fraction of time in residence.

For split appointments, two methods were evaluated. First, the full service effort reported in the minivita was prorated to the proportion of FTE assigned to the School, i.e.

$$\frac{A}{135B} \times \frac{1.00}{C} \times \frac{D}{1.00}$$

Where:

- **D** = your FTE assigned to the School

Conversely, activities reported in the original minivita that had no direct bearing on the School were deleted, and the remaining activities that did relate to service for the School (measured again as A, total points, but less than the total reported on the original minivita) were evaluated at the assigned FTE. i.e.

$$\frac{A}{135B} \times \frac{1.00}{C} \times \frac{1.00}{D}$$

The service evaluation given for CY 1999 was the higher of these two formulations.
SERVICE:

Based upon the above rationale, the following was the formula used to compute Service score:

Service Score = (No. points)/135 X 0.2 = Service score for a person with a 20% service split.

For non-tenured faculty, the Score = (No. points)/135 X 0.1
CPSGG Faculty Meeting Procedures

CPSGG has faculty meetings at the beginning of each semester and then at approximately one month intervals. If the need arises, extra meetings can be called to address particular issues (e.g., tenure or hiring vote).

In the first meeting of the academic year the Director provides an overview of the financial situation and the plans for the year. In the last meeting, a committee A member who will serve for two years is elected by a vote of the faculty.

Minutes of the meetings are distributed to the faculty and they have been checked by the Director.

All faculty should attend the faculty meetings. The staff usually use a pool to determine the optimum time and date for the meeting to maximize attendance.

We follow ‘Roberts Rules of Order’ in the meetings.
ConocoPhillips School of Geology and Geophysics

Graduate Admissions Policy

Admissions Procedure

Application Submission

The official Graduate Admissions application is maintained by the Office of Graduate Admissions: [https://www.ou.edu/content/admissions/apply/graduate.html](https://www.ou.edu/content/admissions/apply/graduate.html). Students create application and submit required materials to the Office of Graduate Admissions (OGA). Once the application is submitted and evaluated by the OGA they will ‘roll’ it over to the CPSGG and the Graduate Admissions Coordinator, Rebecca Fay, will have access to evaluate and assign the application as needed.

Application Deadlines

Students are either admitted for the Fall or Spring semester. The Fall semester sees a larger amount of applications and there are multiple deadlines that a student can apply by.

Fall Entry:

January 10th (to be considered for either RA and/or TA position)

April 1st (to be considered without funding, International Students)

May 1st (to be considered without funding, US Students)

The April 1st deadline is required by the OGA and the department cannot overrule it. This date is to ensure there is enough time to process VISAs and other requirements documents for International Students.

Spring Entry:

September 1st (All students, all types of funding)

Application Requirements

CPSGG’s Graduate Application requirements are pretty standard and can be found at [http://www.ou.edu/content/mcee/geology/apply/graduate-application.html](http://www.ou.edu/content/mcee/geology/apply/graduate-application.html).

- Our department requires that students have a BS degree (or MS degree if applying for PhD), and maintained a 3.0/4.0 GPA. If the GPA is lower than 3.0, the OGA requires the department to provide justification of admission. Normally this justification needs to come from the Faculty Advisor who wishes to provide admission to this particular student. Low GPA Justification is a requirement of the OGA and the application cannot be processed without it.
- GRE Scores must be received by the time of official Graduate Admission Committee Review. The department looks for baseline scores of 31% Verbal and 36% Quantitative (roughly a 146 in each area under the new GRE scores). We look at the percentage scores, as these don’t vary as much between differing GRE tests. If a student scores are below these baselines, the Graduate Admissions Committee will look through the transcript and other support materials to see if
there is evidence that the student performed poorly on the tests, but has great strengths in other areas. Low GRE scores will not solely disqualify a candidate. The Committee will make potential Faculty Advisors aware of low GRE scores and any concerns that may stem from them.

- Every International student needs to provide proof that they have met one of the OGA’s English Proficiency Requirements ([https://www.ou.edu/content/admissions/apply/international/english-proficiency-requirements.html](https://www.ou.edu/content/admissions/apply/international/english-proficiency-requirements.html)). The most common way is by providing the TOEFL scores. As a department we like to see scores at least in the high 80s. As the degree does require a Thesis/Dissertation to be produced, students need to have good skills in English to succeed. If a student does not meet one of the requirements put forward by the OGA, the department cannot override their standards.

- A Personal Statement, Resume, and any information on previous Academic Accomplishments, Research Experience, Presentations and/or Publications are required. These materials give both the potential Faculty Advisor and Graduate Admissions Committee a good idea of the student’s background, area of interest and potential within our degree programs. This is the place for students to indicate why they are specifically drawn to our program, faculty members, etc.

- Each student is required to have 3 Letters of Recommendation submitted on their behalf. Recommenders are contacted directly from the Application System and need to upload their letter directly to the system. In order to review an application, there needs to be at least 2 letters received by the time of review. Occasionally recommenders cannot be fully relied upon and we don't wish to fully dismiss an application for missing 1 letter.

- Students are STRONGLY encouraged to reach out to a potential Faculty Advisor within CPSGG whom the student would like to work with while in their degree program. No student will be admitted without having a dedicated Faculty Advisor committed to working with them. Students can research Faculty Members on the Geology.ou.edu website. Student and Faculty Advisor communication often occurs through email, phone, skype, and campus visits.

Any questions or issues that students may have with completing the application requirements can be directed to the OGA or Graduate Admissions Coordinator. The OGA and Graduate Admissions Coordinator work together to make sure materials are received and uploaded in a timely manner.

**Application Review**

Applications are reviewed three times a year:

- **Fall semester reviews**: Late-January and Early-May
- **Spring semester review**: Early-September

Prior to application review the Graduate Admissions Coordinator will download the applications received by the deadline and email them to CPSGG Faculty Members in a spreadsheet; this document will include: name, degree program, citizenship, GPA, GRE scores, area of interest and Faculty Member contacted. Faculty Members will be given a timeframe to review applications and submit Nominations for Review. The Graduate Admissions Coordinator and Graduate Admissions Chair will maintain the list of Nominated students. Only those applications that have been put up for Nomination will move onto the next review process – full Graduate Admissions Committee review. Applications that were not
nominated will not be processed yet, but the majority will be denied for lack of Faculty Member interest and not having a dedication Faculty Advisor prior to admission.

Once all Nominations have been collected the Graduate Admissions Committee will hold a review session. The Graduate Admissions Committee consists of the Graduate Admissions Chair, Graduate Admissions Coordinator, and 4 other faculty members (for both areas of Geology and Geophysics). The Graduate Admissions Committee reviews each part of the application and uses a rubric (at the end of this document) to evaluate each application. Each part of the application is given a numerical score and recorded through the Application System. Once the review is completed the applications are ranked by total numerical score. Actual application review might take place during the meeting or over the course of a week, after which the Committee will reconvene.

Once applications are ranked, the list is reviewed by the CPSGG Director and sent to all Faculty Members. The Ranking information assists in making funding decisions. Faculty Members who are eligible for a Teaching Assistant will be encouraged to provide offers to a student who ranked highly on the list. Those students ranked higher are also more attractive for Faculty Members who are interested in working out a possible 50% RA/50% TA offer with the department.

Denial of Applications

To start the process of sending out Denial decisions the Graduate Admissions Coordination emails the list of those students who will be processed to all Faculty Members. If there is a student who was previously overlooked, a Faculty Member can request to save their application. Depending on when in the admissions process this application might be saved for the next review process, or individually reviewed by a Graduate Admissions Committee member. Faculty Members are highly encouraged to make all review nominations earlier in the Admissions Season, this makes sure that the whole admissions process is moving along in a timely fashion. Denials are processed through the OGA application system. Letters are produced by the OGA.

New Student Requirements

New Employees

New Students who will be holding either a Research Assistantship (RA) or Teaching Assistantship (TA) will be notified of this position in their offer letters. CPSGG will follow up with the New Employee paperwork requirements and other relevant information. Students should work to complete the paperwork ASAP, this will allow them to get on the payroll and get their first paycheck on time. Late paperwork could result in a delay in pay. Students should work with the Account and Budget Rep to make sure they have provided all the necessary information and understand how CPSGG’s timesheet/reporting processes work.

New TAs

All new CPSGG TAs are required to attend the Orientations put on by the Graduate College. The TAO Orientation is required for all TAs, the DITA is also required for all International TAs. International TAs also need to work with the English Assessment Program (EAP) to make sure they are qualified to teach; CPSGG will often require that international students pass the EAP prior to assigning them a TA assignment.
ConocoPhillips School of Geology and Geophysics

Undergraduate Advising Policy

Departmental Advising

CPSGG students are advised by the Departmental Advisor (Rebecca Fay) once they have met the following requirements: officially are admitted into Mewbourne College of Earth and Energy (http://www.ou.edu/content/mcee/student_services/advising_information.html) and have had an initial appointment with MCEE Student Services to go over the college orientation and were academically advised for the following semester.

Semesterly Advising

Students are required to meet with the Departmental Advisor each semester in order to get their ‘Advising Hold’ removed. Advising Appointments typically start in October for Spring Semester, and March for Fall Semester.

Making Appointments

Students need to make an appointment with the Departmental Advisor, appointments are typically made via iAdvise, email or in-person. Prior to each appointment, students are asked to review their degree program and Degree Navigator requirements; this ensures that they are prepared with questions and a plan for the following semester.

During Appointments

The length of advising appointments can vary on a student’s preparedness, progress within degree program and overall understanding of degree requirements.

During an appointment the advisor will begin by inquiring about the current semester’s process and noting any issues/concerns that may affect course completion or future semester enrollments. If there are any issues, the advisor will discuss any options such as participating in tutoring, office hours, or even looking into a course withdrawal. The advisor should make sure to provide any contact information that may be helpful in making sure the student follows through with assistance that may be needed.

After discussing the current semester’s process, the advisor and student will go through the degree program and the remaining requirements as indicated by Degree Navigator. While going through the degree audit, they will come up with a course plan for the following semester. This plan should include a couple of course alternatives (when applicable) to account for unknown course availability, scheduling conflicts, and student interest. Course plans are created based on the student’s progress within the current semester and their anticipated grade outcomes.

Once a course plan is in place, the advisor will input ‘Notes’ into Degree Navigator and review them with the student. The advisor will look up the student’s registration window and make sure they know when that opens. At this time the advisor will release the ‘Advising Hold’ and any permissions that
may inhibit proper enrollment. The student should contact the advisor if there are any further questions and/or issues with enrollment.

Overrides

When creating a course plan, the advisor will note any course options that may require an override. Most courses do not have any override restrictions, but occasionally we run into situations where an override is warranted. If the advisor has previous permission from the Faculty Member they will provide the proper override. If the situation has not already been approved by the Faculty Member, the student will need to request permission and have the approval/denied communication sent to the advisor. In cases where courses are frequently provided with overrides, the course requirements will be evaluated and updated as necessary.

Course Limits

Core Geology/Geophysics courses are monitored once registration opens. If a Core course fills and a number of students still need to enroll, the Faculty Member will be contacted for permission to increase course size. Being able to accommodate students in Core courses is a priority and helps with their continuous degree progress. Sometimes we do run into issues with limits such as classroom/lab size, field trip size, etc. that may impact the ability to accommodate students.

Non-Semesterly Advising

Current CPSGG students are welcome to make appointments throughout the year to go over degree questions/concerns, create degree completion plans, or go over any current course concerns. Non-CPSGG or non-OU students are also welcome to make appointments throughout the year to look at CPSGG degree options and go over degree plans. These appointments are typically made via email, phone or in-person.
Scholarship Program Requirements

To be eligible for a School of Geology and Geophysics Scholarship:

✓ Maintain at least a cumulative 3.00 grade point average each semester at OU.
✓ Formally declare your major in Geology or Geophysics (a form is available in the MCEE Student Services, P110 Sarkeys Energy Center).
✓ Enroll in at least one regular, letter-graded Geology or Geophysics class a semester.
✓ Complete GEOL 1114 by the end of your freshman year.
✓ Maintain full time student status. The School of Geology and Geophysics must approve any departure from the appropriate curriculum sheet.
✓ Enroll and participate in the School’s colloquium course, GEOL 4970 001 (1 credit hour), each semester.
✓ Write a letter of acknowledgment to the corporate or individual donors of your scholarship funds.
✓ Attend each semester’s Alumni Advisory Council luncheon and related functions, and participate as much as possible in the School’s extracurricular activities.

To earn continued support from the School of Geology and Geophysics:

✓ Complete the Scholarship application through CASH each year.
✓ Maintain at least a cumulative 3.00 grade point average each semester at OU.
✓ Maintain satisfactory progress toward your degree completion.
School of Geology and Geophysics Fieldtrip Policies

Our fieldtrip policies are listed below. A FAQ section follows which contains some specific information.

Doug Elmore

1) The University policy regarding alcohol and drugs “prohibits illegal use of drugs and alcohol in the workplace, on University property, or as part of any University-sponsored activities (faculty handbook).”

2) Fieldtrip leaders should follow the policies as required by their units.

3) A maximum of 8 passengers (including the driver) can be transported in the vans. If you drive 55 mph or below, you can have a maximum of 10 passengers (including the driver). Please fill up the vehicles when you return.

4) The faculty handbook requires that each participant file a release. In addition, if the trip is outside the Oklahoma City area for a period exceeding 24 hours an itinerary must be filed in the department office and the OU Department of Public Safety prior to the trip. The relevant section of the faculty handbook is copied below.

Faculty Handbook:

“(A) Itineraries
An itinerary should be filed with the department or college office and with the OU Department of Public Safety for any University sponsored activity that is conducted off-campus for a period exceeding 24 hours. The itinerary should include a list of the names of all participants, student numbers of student participants, telephone numbers where the group may be reached or emergency telephone numbers, destinations and, if possible, trip routes.”

“(B) Commercial travel and unusual activities
Academic units sponsoring field trips by commercial carrier or trips involving unusual activity (hiking, climbing, athletic activities, etc.) are responsible for obtaining releases, i.e., written acknowledgment from students that they have received reasonable notice of the nature of the activity and understand the possibility of risk. For information about releases, contact the Office of Risk Management and Safety Services or the Office of Legal Counsel.”

“(C) Liability
The Oklahoma Governmental Tort Claims Act adopts and delimits the doctrine of sovereign immunity for the State of Oklahoma, all of its political subdivisions, and its employees. Since the University of Oklahoma is a duly authorized agency of the State of Oklahoma, all instructional travel that has been approved, scheduled, and sponsored by the University and is the complete control of an authorized University employee is afforded the liability protections of the Act. For purposes of instructional travel, the authorized university employee is the instructor(s), including graduate assistants, assigned to the course.

University employees are protected by the Act from liability as long as they are acting in good faith and within the scope of their University employment. Volunteers may at time be authorized to perform services
for the University, and duly authorized volunteers are also protected under the act within the scope of their employment.

The University’s liability for student accidents and injury in instructional travel is limited by the Act. Low cost accident and illness insurance policies are available for field trip participants from the Center for Student Life.”

3) Require all students to wear seat belts.

4) All persons operating University owned vehicles must be employees of the University of Oklahoma and must have a valid driver's license appropriate for the vehicle being driven.

We recommend that the fieldtrip leader get contact information for each participant on the trip. Although this might sound like a major headache, if a student were to be hurt in an accident, I am sure that you would want to contact their parents or guardian without delay. A section for this information is included on the attached representative release forms. One form is for required fieldtrips and the other is for optional trips.

Frequently asked Questions

The answers in blue are from Legal Counsel and the red comments are from Risk Management.

1) Please clarify the distinction between getting waivers for students in a class going on a day trip, and graduate students doing field work as part of their degree work (research). The graduate students are paid as RAs and have some health insurance. Do they need to sign waivers for all their activities?

Graduate students who are employees of the University, in the conduct of their employment, should not require releases. I would caution the supervisor to know the field areas and potential risks in advance of sending an RA or GA there.

It is my understanding that graduate students, professional staff (and faculty), and paid undergraduate student workers gainfully employed on a research project do not have to file releases for field activity. After all, they were hired to perform those activities and are covered by Worker's Compensation during their deployment. Is that correct? As an employer (and as an employee), I don't understand how OU can be held harmless in the event of an injury to my person or my personnel if that injury was caused by negligence on the part of the University.
Graduate students, who are in the performance of their employment at OU, are covered by workers' compensation because they are employees paid to perform a specific job, and no waiver would apply in the event of injury to one of them in the performance of that job. The hiring department, usually the employee's direct supervisor, is required to stipulate that the employee was performing his/her job at the time of injury for workers' compensation benefits to be provided. Also, FYI... health insurance excludes employee work-related injuries.

2) Considering waivers, it is my understanding that people who "volunteer" during a field project do have to sign waivers. Volunteers should not perform essential duties, drive university vehicles, nor perform tasks which parallel those of paid employees. Allowing them to do so places a liability on the university for wages and benefits, not to mention injury incurred during the performance of a task.

Does the above statement generally reflect university policy? **YES**

I think that is generally accurate. However, volunteers have driven University vans before and have limited liability under the Oklahoma Tort Claims Act when driving.

3) Considering itineraries, opportunities may arise making it difficult to submit timely itineraries with significant amount of detail. Would it be permissible to submit a blanket itinerary for a given geographic region and a given time frame? If so, that would alleviate my greatest concern regarding application of this requirement.

I believe this would be sufficient.

The request for specific itineraries may relate to the need of the University to assure prompt response to emergencies, specifically for fieldtrips and remote operations. Frequent communication with the home department could meet this requirement for specific itineraries when the operation is extremely mobile and constantly on the move.

4) We have a large undergraduate class which we would like to have visit a few local places. Is it permissible to simply ask the students to convene at these places rather than go to all the trouble of getting and paying for vans, obtaining legal drivers, doing all the waivers, etc., just to go 2 miles? Are there any liability issues here?

This should not require a release. Such travel is treated in the same manner as a student driving to OU's campus. It is their own liability.

This happens frequently. Rather than reporting to their normal University of Oklahoma classroom, the students report to a different "classroom." Care should be taken to observe their safety for issues such as unsafe locales, driving at night, rural locations, unsafe parking facilities, etc.
for the upcoming semesters. These requirements are put on by the Graduate College and their office can assist with any questions/issues that may come up.

Registration

Once all Admissions decisions are completed, students will be sent information on setting up their OU Accounts (email, etc.) and encouraged to contact their Faculty Advisor regarding courses. Once course decisions have been made, students can register for the upcoming semester. If assistance is required, students should contact the Graduate Admissions Coordinator.

Change of Program

Current CPSGG students are eligible to apply for a Change of Program once they are in their final semester of their MS degree. These students need to submit a Change of Program application through the OGA Application System; by indicating they are a ‘Current OU Student’ will eliminate many of the application requirements and associated fee. These students also need to complete the ‘Petition to Change Program’ form (the Graduate Admissions Coordinator has these forms); this form needs to be signed by the student’s current MS committee and committed PhD Faculty Advisor. This form also asks for a projected timeline of PhD completion and funding information for the duration of their PhD. This form needs to be turned in prior to the processing of the Change of Program application. Students need to complete their MS degree prior to being fully admitted into the PhD program.

Admissions Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>GRE (Total &gt;1000*)</th>
<th>New GRE equivalent</th>
<th>Verbal %</th>
<th>Quant %</th>
<th>GPA/coursework coursework less than CPSGG UG requirements, subtract 1-2 matrix points</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Research Experience/awards</th>
<th>Personal Statement</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&gt;650</td>
<td>&gt;750</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>&gt;3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;550</td>
<td>&gt;700</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>&gt;3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;500</td>
<td>&gt;650</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>&gt;3.5, Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;450</td>
<td>&gt;600</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>&gt;3.25, Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;400</td>
<td>&gt;550</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>&gt;3.0, Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;400</td>
<td>&lt;550</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>&lt;3.00, Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>