

Policies and Procedures 03

Updated and Reissued
April 1, 2022

Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Evaluation and Recommendations Relating to Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Faculty Review.

Section 1: Guiding Principles

1.1 This document sets forth nominal criteria and procedures for tenure, promotion, annual faculty evaluations and recommendations, progress towards tenure letters, and post-tenure review within the College of Engineering. These criteria reflect general guidelines and policies with the understanding that every case may be individual and unique. With this in mind, reasonable latitude regarding interpretation of the language contained herein shall be allowed.

1.2 The University of Oklahoma Norman Campus Faculty Handbook shall supersede the policies and procedures in this document in case of conflict.

1.3 Individual units within the College may augment these criteria for tenure, promotion, or annual evaluation with additional criteria or with more detailed specifications of achievement expected. Similarly, individual units may add other procedural steps. In accordance with University Regents' policy, any such additional criteria, more detailed specifications, or added procedural steps must be approved by both the Dean and the Senior Vice President and Provost in writing before they may become effective.

1.4 These statements assume a traditional pattern of faculty activities and career development along with suggested levels of achievement and recognition. However, nothing in these statements prohibits the consideration of other activities and achievements as a basis for exceptional faculty appointments and personnel actions. The burden of justification for such exceptional actions is necessarily greater than that required in the evaluation of normal career paths. Accordingly, plans and bases for such irregular considerations should be developed with the early concurrence of the Director and Dean of the College and must be in writing.

1.5 The procedures leading to and the reasons behind each recommendation concerning tenure or promotion and each faculty evaluation, review, or progress towards tenure letter should be clear and transparent. Moreover, appropriate advisory groups such as Committee A and the Dean's Senior Advisory Committee should be involved in these procedures to the greatest extent possible.

1.6 All agreements between an individual faculty member and Committee A, the Director, the Dean, or any other University officials regarding tenure, promotion, workload, distribution of faculty effort, or faculty review and evaluation should be in writing.

1.7 Because of the profound and long-term impact of each annual evaluation, tenure decision, or promotion decision, both the faculty and the administration should exercise great prudence and must be allowed great latitude in these deliberations, limited only by the requirement that the basis for action must not violate academic freedom or any applicable laws and must not discriminate in relation to race/ethnicity, religion, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, sexual orientation, or status as a veteran.

Section 2: Responsibilities of the Faculty by Rank and Tenure Status

2.1 A faculty member's workload consists of three activities: teaching, research and creative/scholarly activity, and service. Evaluation of these activities is discussed in Section 3.

2.2 Teaching is the transmission of knowledge, cultural values, and faculty expertise to students.

Teaching activities include:

- Classroom and laboratory instruction
- Supervision of thesis and dissertation students
- Serving on thesis and dissertation committees
- Mentoring and advising students
- Supervising independent studies
- Supervising undergraduate research students
- Supervising undergraduate capstone activities
- Mentoring student competition teams
- Supervising graduate student research outside of thesis and dissertation work
- Learning assessment to support program accreditation
- Development of materials to support teaching, including textbooks

2.3 Research means systematic, original investigation directed toward the enlargement of human knowledge or the solution of contemporary problems related to the faculty member's area(s) of expertise. Creative/scholarly activity means significantly original or imaginative accomplishment in literature, the arts, or professions related to the faculty member's area(s) of expertise. Research and creative/scholarly activity may be evinced by:

- Authorship of fully peer reviewed publications (including papers in both journals and conference proceedings)
- Authorship of publications with some type of peer review
- Authorships and/or editorship of books and monographs
- Authorship of book chapters
- Technology transfer activities which may include:
 - Commercialization of technology developed at OU
 - Patent applications and patents granted where at least one inventor lists OU as the primary affiliation
 - Activities to promote licensing of technology developed at OU

- Software developed at OU and distributed external to OU
- Direct involvement (e.g. part ownership, officer, scientist, or engineer) in a company which is developing or commercializing OU technology
- Funding obtained to aid commercialization of technology developed at OU (such as government SBIR/STTR grants or seed capital from private investors)
- Presentation of research to professionals
- Creation of research products such as software, databases, data sets, or evaluation instruments to meet the needs and requirements of certain funding agencies.
- Development and submission of research proposals to external and internal funding sources
- Interdisciplinary research
- Research that impacts STEM education
- Personal recognition by professional societies (e.g., fellows, best paper awards)
- Supervision of postdoctoral researchers

2.4 Service is activity that supports the mission of the University, College, or unit and benefits the professional community, the University community, or the public. These activities must be related to the faculty member's professional experience and/or area(s) of expertise. Examples of service include:

- Professional and public service, which may include:
 - Service to professional and academic societies, including leadership positions, membership on program committees, service as session chair, and conference organization work
 - Service as editor-in-chief or on editorial boards of professional journals
 - Reviewing for journals or conferences
 - Reviewing proposals for funding agencies
 - Other reviewing activities directly related to the faculty member's expertise
 - Service to program accreditation organizations (program evaluator, commissioner, etc.)
 - K-12 outreach in STEM
 - Consulting
 - Presentations to the general public as a representative of the University
 - Service on public commissions and boards (e.g., city, state, federal) directly related to the faculty member's expertise
- University service, which may include
 - Service on University committees
 - Outreach activities (e.g. recruiting)
 - Administration of a unit, program or the College
 - Mentorship of student organizations
- College and unit service, which may include
 - Participation in College and unit committees
 - Activities related to maintaining the accreditation of programs
 - Graduate and undergraduate program coordination
 - Seminar coordination

- Mentorship of junior faculty members
- Mentorship of student technical societies or engineering student organizations
- Mentorship of student competition teams
- Activities designed to increase the diversity of the College

2.5 All faculty members are expected to contribute to the fulfillment of the total responsibilities of their unit for teaching, research and creative/scholarly activity, and service. In particular, each faculty member is generally expected to maintain an active, vigorous program of research and creative/scholarly activity, to continually strive to improve teaching, to perform learning assessment activities to support program accreditation and submit the materials in a timely manner, and to contribute to service as appropriate for their appointment and rank. Each faculty member's distribution of effort for the calendar year will be documented in writing, will be well justified, and will be determined by the Director and Committee A in consultation with the faculty member. Excessive workload in one area should be offset by reduction of the workload in another area.

2.6 Teaching Expectations

2.6.1 In consultation with the Dean, each School in the College of Engineering will develop a teaching load policy that is consistent with the policies of the University and with Faculty Handbook 3.16.1. This teaching load policy should be related to practice at peer and aspirational peer institutions and it must be approved by the Dean.

2.6.2 The Director, in consultation with Committee A and the Dean, may adjust teaching workloads for justifiable reasons. Illustrative justifications may include the effort required to teach a particular course, research and creative/scholarly activity, the terms of an original university appointment, or exceptional university or professional service.

2.6.2.1 The effort required to teach a course is not equal for every course. The number of courses a faculty member teaches may be adjusted to compensate for factors such as:

- Number of credit hours
- Student contact hours
- Method of delivery
- Laboratory sections and courses with a laboratory component
- Number of students
- Capstone or individual or small group based project courses
- Status of the course in the curriculum (required, elective, lower division, upper division, courses taken by non-majors, service courses)
- New course preparation
- Significant course revision or development
- Textbook development
- Teaching assignment outside of specialization to meet unit or College needs
- Development or utilization of innovative teaching methods

2.6.2.2 The teaching load of a faculty member may be adjusted under circumstances such as but not limited to the following:

- Course buyout from funded research, consisting of at least 12.5% of the 9 month salary, subject to approval and adjustment by the Director based on current circumstances and unit needs
- Research expenditures (as defined by the policies of the unit)
- Documented evidence of research and scholarly/creative activity as defined in 2.3
- Service activities as deemed appropriate by the unit, such as mentoring of student competition teams, coordination of the graduate or undergraduate program, preparation for accreditation visitations, or major leadership positions in professional societies
- Teaching of certain zero credit hour courses that involve effort and student contact similar to those of credit bearing courses
- Release during the probationary period for faculty to establish their research program and in recognition of newness of teaching activities
- Supervision of substantial numbers of graduate student dissertations and theses

2.6.2.3 The assigned distribution of faculty effort need not be equal for all faculty members in a unit. Based on their pattern of activity and accomplishments over a period of years, some faculty members may consistently teach loads that are greater or less than the presumptive nominal teaching load specified by the teaching load policy of the unit.

2.6.2.4 In all cases, the faculty member's distribution of effort must accurately reflect the actual workload so that annual evaluations can be performed fairly and objectively with respect to mutually agreed upon expectations and align with the work actually done by the faculty member.

2.6.2.5 The assignment of more than six courses in a year should occur only under extraordinary circumstances.

2.6.3 A faculty member who, without prior agreement of the Director and Committee A, does not meet the teaching load requirements of the unit will be expected to make arrangements to make up the shortfall in the subsequent academic year, if feasible. This may happen for a variety of reasons including, for example, if a course is cancelled because there is not sufficient enrollment for it to be offered. Teaching load calculations exclude semesters in which a faculty member is on sabbatical, research leave or unpaid leave. Faculty with less than a 1.0 FTE appointment will be expected to teach a proportionate share of the course load, implemented in consultation with the Director, Committee A and the Dean.

2.7 FACULTY RANK – TENURED/TENURE-TRACK

2.7.1 This section defines expectations of tenured/tenure-track faculty by rank. These definitions are for the usual case; the College and units have the authority to redefine these expectations in unusual cases with the approval of the Director, Dean, and Senior Vice President and Provost.

2.7.2 Assistant professors should have the primary focus of their activities and achievements during the period of their probationary appointments in the areas of teaching and research and creative/scholarly activity. Assistant professors are expected to establish a vigorous program of research and

creative/scholarly activity. They should be actively involved with learning successful methods for teaching and may be involved in developing new teaching methods. Assistant professors must make contributions in research and creative/scholarly activity and also in teaching. Some involvement in service activities is expected and encouraged, but should not be considered as an alternative to the expectation for achievements in teaching and research and creative/scholarly activities.

2.7.3 Associate professors are expected to be achieving recognition and stature, both nationally and internationally, for their research and creative/scholarly activities. They should demonstrate a continuing dedication to improving their teaching methods and teaching effectiveness and may be involved in developing new teaching methods. This will normally be concurrent with higher levels of professional service bringing increased professional recognition as well as increased involvement in unit, College, and University level service as compared to assistant professors.

2.7.4 Professors should have attained status as a leading scholar within their area of professional expertise as perceived by the appropriate national and international communities. Vigorous research activity will generally continue, although the role of a professor is expected to evolve over the course of an entire career. Each professor should exemplify a profound dedication to excellence in teaching. Professors are expected to fulfill an expanded service role compared to associate professors to meet the mission of the unit, College, and University. They are expected to contribute to the mentorship of junior faculty.

2.8 FACULTY RANK – RANKED RENEWABLE TERM

2.8.1 This section defines expectations of ranked renewable term faculty by rank. In general, the primary duties of ranked renewable term faculty are teaching and teaching-related activities. These definitions are for the usual case; the College and units have the authority to redefine these expectations in unusual cases with the approval of the Director, Dean, and Senior Vice President and Provost.

2.8.2 Assistant professors should have the primary focus of their activities and achievements in the area of teaching and teaching-related activities. Representative examples of such activities are academic/career advising, grant-writing efforts that benefit both instruction and research in the undergraduate and graduate programs, integration of research-based teaching methods, and performing related service activities for the unit, College, and/or University. They should be actively involved with developing and implementing effective methods for teaching, continuously improving teaching, and assisting in curricular development.

2.8.3 Associate professors are expected to be achieving recognition and stature for their teaching and teaching-related activities at the university and beyond. Representative examples of such activities include demonstrating continuous improvement in teaching methods and teaching effectiveness, integration of research-based teaching methods, involvement in nationally-disseminated scholarly work (related to professional development, discipline-specific research, pedagogical research, or creative work appropriate to the field), and service to the unit, College, and/or University. They should have significant service activity related to teaching, advising, and/or outreach.

2.8.4 Professors are expected to have attained status as exceptional teachers at the University and national communities. Representative examples of relevant teaching and teaching-related activities include presenting at national conferences and conventions, publishing articles in disciplinary or pedagogical journals, contributing to the production of textbooks or other innovative instructional materials, innovative contributions to the curriculum at the University and national level, and/or

securing of either pedagogical or discipline-specific research grants. Professors are expected to fulfill an expanded service role, above the level of associate professors, in order to meet the mission of the unit, College, and University. They are also expected to contribute to the mentorship of junior faculty (particularly those related to educational activities) within the unit, College, and University.

Section 3: Annual Evaluation of Faculty and Documentation of Faculty Activity and Accomplishments

3.1 In addition to the major assessments required at the time of tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, and progress towards tenure letters, each faculty member will be provided with an annual review of activities and accomplishments. These annual reviews will consider performance in relationship to the primary areas of expected faculty activities enumerated in Section 2. The performance and achievements of a faculty member within any one year may vary greatly among the prescribed areas of professional activity. Accordingly, the individual faculty member and Committee A have a responsibility to ensure that the cumulative activities of the faculty member carried out over many years are appropriate to the immediate and long-term mission of the unit and the College.

3.2 Committee A and each individual faculty member equally share the responsibility to review the possible activities for the coming year and to articulate appropriate plans and assignments of duties and activities. This planning should lead to a reasonable congruence between the individual's efforts and accomplishments and the mission of the unit, College, and University. A clear, mutual understanding of the relative weights or efforts to be committed in various activities is critical since they will become the basis for the next annual evaluation. The relative weights for each faculty member shall be recorded in writing and shall be reviewed at least annually.

3.3 Faculty evaluations will necessarily be reviewed by certain administrators and others who are involved in personnel recommendations and decisions (e.g. Campus Tenure Committee). However, these evaluations should be considered as essentially private communications between the individual faculty member, Committee A, and University administration and should be treated as such to the extent possible under current University policy and applicable law.

3.4 The impact on annual evaluations of leave for personal, medical, or professional reasons or for military service should be agreed upon by the faculty member and Committee A prior to the start of the leave when possible. This agreement should be recorded in writing and must conform to the policies given in Faculty Handbook 3.21.

3.5 The following are minimal procedures to be followed within the College of Engineering for annual faculty evaluations. The evaluation process should result in quantitative and qualitative distinctions among the faculty and a relative ranking of performance of faculty members in their agreed-upon responsibilities.

3.6 Each unit shall establish and publish policies and procedures for annual evaluation of faculty in concordance with this document and with the Faculty Handbook. Activity and accomplishments accrued over some number of preceding years (typically three) may be considered; however, the annual evaluation should be based primarily on activity and achievements during the given year.

3.7 The annual expenditures figure reported by the Vice President for Research for each faculty member shall be used for annual evaluations of tenured/tenure-track faculty and may be used for annual evaluations of ranked renewable term faculty as applicable. Units may elect to consider additional expenditures such as those from OU Foundation accounts and internal funding sources. Research expenditures should be computed based on the University fiscal year. Other metrics of activity and achievements shall be computed based on the calendar year.

3.8 DOCUMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

3.8.1 Each faculty member shall annually prepare and maintain an incremental professional record of their activities and accomplishments according the schedule and procedures published by the unit, the College, and the Senior Vice President and Provost. This record is incremental in the sense that it reports activities and accomplishments that occurred over a specified period of time and in addition to those reported in previous years. Currently, this record is known as the *faculty mini-vita*.

3.8.2 The primary responsibility for entering data in the professional record and ensuring that the data are correct rests with the individual faculty member, although the unit and College may assist by providing certain appropriate data and information.

3.8.3 The University has legitimate needs to generate reports of faculty activity and accomplishments in instructional, research and creative/scholarly activity. Therefore, the University will provide an electronic system for recording appropriate faculty activities and accomplishments.

3.8.3.1 Faculty members are strongly encouraged to use the electronic system provided by the University to prepare their annual mini-vita.

3.8.3.2 Individual faculty members who do not use the electronic system provided by the College to prepare their annual mini-vita should still use this electronic system to record and document their annual activity and accomplishments so that these data will be readily available for satisfying the reporting needs of the College.

3.8.3.3 In concordance with 3.3 above, any electronic system provided by the University to record and document faculty activity and accomplishments must carefully safeguard the confidentiality of any annual evaluation data such as confidential teaching evaluations and actual performance evaluation data to the extent possible under current University policy and applicable law.

3.8.3.4 Each faculty member should report the following data using the electronic system provided by the College.

- Teaching activities, including:
 - A list of the credit bearing course sections taught during the calendar year and the number of students enrolled in each section, including honors reading, honors research, independent study, thesis research, and dissertation research
 - In some units it may be appropriate to include a list of certain zero credit hour courses taught that involve effort and student contact similar to those of credit bearing courses
 - Supervision of undergraduate capstone activities
 - A list of the students who completed dissertations or theses under the faculty member's supervision during the calendar year

- A list of the non-thesis master's degree students who completed their degrees during the calendar year under the faculty member's supervision
- The number of students advised during the calendar year, reported in categories of undergraduate students, graduate students, MS students supervised, and PhD students supervised
- Membership on thesis and dissertation committees within the unit, as well as outside the unit or University
- Awards and recognitions received during the calendar year
- Research and creative/scholarly activity, including:
 - A listing of each grant and contract that was in force during any part of the calendar year
 - The annual research expenditures figure reported by the Vice President for Research
 - A listing of peer reviewed scholarly publications. Each publication should be listed one time, ideally on the record for the year in which publication first occurred. Publications shall be listed in the following categories:
 - Abstract reviewed conference papers
 - Fully peer reviewed conference papers
 - Fully reviewed journal papers
 - Fully reviewed book chapters
 - Reviewed textbooks, including major textbook revisions and open educational resource textbooks.
 - Books edited
 - Research monographs
 - Self-published materials such as E-books and web-based publications, provided that use by others is documented as a form of peer review
 - Additional quantitative metrics of research quality
 - The unit will specify the selection and number of metrics to be reported
 - The unit will specify how the metrics are calculated and should consider the limitations and biases inherent in every quantitative measure of research quality
 - Examples include the h-index, number of citations received during the calendar year, total number of citations, total number of citations excluding self citations, impact factors, and others
 - Presentations given during the calendar year
 - Patents, listed in the year submitted and in the year granted, provided that at least one inventor lists OU as the primary affiliation
- Service activities performed during the calendar year, including:
 - Service activities at the unit, College, and University level
 - Professional and public service activities

3.8.4 Each faculty member may augment the official record with additional information, discussions, or self-appraisals that would be helpful in understanding and evaluating the faculty member's career objectives and accomplishments.

3.9 ANNUAL EVALUATION

3.9.1 Each School will develop and publish, with participation and approval of the Dean and the Senior Vice President and Provost, a systematic procedure for performing faculty annual evaluations. The criteria for evaluation shall be carefully and clearly stated.

3.9.2 It is the responsibility of Committee A to evaluate annually each faculty member's accomplishments and performance in teaching, research and creative/scholarly activity, and service and to relate these evaluations to the immediate and long-term programs and missions of the unit, College, and University. Evaluations will be summarized and structured in accordance with forms prescribed by the Dean and the Senior Vice President and Provost for the presentation of annual evaluations. These forms will be filled out by Committee A and will convey the evaluation, substantiating statements, and recommendations.

3.9.3 The contribution to the annual evaluation of each type of faculty activity and accomplishment will be determined by the unit. For example, some activities and accomplishments listed in 3.8.3.4 may not be considered by some units. The methods for determining these contributions must be clearly articulated in writing to all faculty members, must consider each faculty member's assigned distribution of effort for the calendar year, and must be applied with uniformity and fairness.

3.9.4 It is understood that the criteria for evaluating performance in each major area of activity must consider the individual faculty member's distribution of effort for the calendar year. For example, the levels of research activity and achievement that are considered outstanding for a faculty member allocated 0.75 FTE to research are necessarily greater than those for a faculty member allocated 0.25 FTE to research.

3.9.5 All faculty members must comply with University, College, and Unit regulations. Substantiated violations of these regulations may be reflected in the annual evaluation.

3.9.6 EVALUATION OF TEACHING

3.9.6.1 Each evaluation should include an assessment of overall teaching quality and effectiveness. This assessment must draw on data from regular student experience surveys. It may include other available data such as:

- Systematic peer evaluation or classroom observation
- Alumni or student-exit-interview data
- Course materials evaluation
- Alignment with unit and College goals
- Innovations that improve student learning
- Innovations that improve knowledge delivery
- Continuous improvement of content, teaching methods, etc.

3.9.6.2 The assessment should provide an interpretation and evaluation of the raw data in relation to such variables as the level and the nature of the course; e.g., lecture versus laboratory or core courses versus major elective courses. Other variables such as instructor grading patterns may also be considered.

3.9.6.3 Timely submission of learning assessment materials to support program accreditation is required and may be considered in the evaluation of teaching. The unit may establish and enforce format requirements and deadlines for the submission of these materials.

3.9.7 EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

3.9.7.1 Each evaluation should include a critical assessment of the quality, quantity, and significance of the individual's research, innovative engineering, engineering science, and creative/scholarly activities. This assessment may consider the activities and accomplishments listed in 2.3. Annual research expenditures reported by the VPR will be considered. Each unit will determine what, if any, additional external funding (e.g. funds contributed through the OU Foundation) is to be considered. The evaluation of research and creative/scholarly activity should address the questions of whether this total activity has earned or is earning the individual significant national or international recognition and/or contributes significantly to technology transfer as defined in 2.3. Research expenditures shall be evaluated with the expectation that the funding should provide support for research and education programs, for graduate student stipends, and/or for the continued renewal and expansion of research facilities.

3.9.7.2 Which quantitative metrics of research quality and of creative/scholarly activity are used, as well as how they are calculated and how they are integrated into the evaluation shall be determined by the unit. Each quantitative metric of research quality and of creative/scholarly activity should be used meaningfully, thoughtfully, and with consideration of its limitations. In particular, great care should be exercised in applying citation counting metrics in the evaluation of assistant professors and other faculty with non-traditional career paths, since citation counts usually accrue over a period of years.

3.9.8 EVALUATION OF SERVICE

3.9.8.1 Each evaluation should include a critical assessment of the quality, quantity, and significance of an individual's service contributions and their role in the success of the unit, College and University. The quantitative evaluation should differentiate between normal and expected service versus those who have made substantial or unusual contributions or have, by innovation and leadership, significantly enhanced the reputation of the unit within the profession, society in general, or the University.

3.9.9 SUMMATION

3.9.9.1 Committee A will prepare a written summary of the overall annual evaluation of each faculty member. This should include a synopsis of the individual's strengths and weaknesses along with an evaluation of how well the individual's activities have met agreed-upon expectations in teaching, research and creative/scholarly activity, and service. Finally, this statement should include suggestions for professional development and future activities for each faculty member.

3.9.9.2 The summary must be shared with the individual faculty member. This document can be the basis of discussions with the Director and/or Committee A regarding an individual's overall performance and effectiveness.

3.9.9.3 Each faculty member shall be given an opportunity to respond in writing to the annual evaluation and to consult with Committee A before the evaluation is forwarded to the Dean. Any written response becomes part of the official evaluation document. Each faculty member shall be provided a period of at least one week to (a) examine the evaluation before they are required to decide whether or not they

wish to respond to the evaluation; (b) provide the response if so desired; and (c) sign the evaluation. By signing the evaluation, the faculty member acknowledges receipt of the evaluation and confirms that they were provided with an opportunity to respond in writing; the signature by itself does not indicate agreement or disagreement with the evaluation.

3.9.9.4 The summary should be forwarded to the Dean in advance of the annual budget recommendations.

3.10 In addition to annual evaluations, each tenured faculty member will periodically undergo post-tenure review as prescribed by the Faculty Handbook 3.7.6.

Section 4: Tenure and Promotion – Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

4.1 The annual evaluations, progress towards tenure letters and dossier must be prepared in accordance with University policy. These documents will form the bases for the decisions and recommendations of the faculty, Committee A, the Director, the Dean, and other offices or committees involved in personnel actions. The exact nature of the recommendation and the specific procedures to be followed by each entity involved will vary with:

- Whether the decision is for tenure, promotion, or both
- Applicable University personnel policy
- Current instructions and guidelines provided by the Senior Vice President and Provost and the College

4.2 Confidential assessments from off-campus scholars and distinguished professionals in the field are particularly informative in regard to the evaluation of research. Such letters are required as part of any dossier accompanying a recommendation on tenure or promotion.

4.2.1 As a nominal target, at least six letters should be obtained wherever possible. Such letters shall be solicited by the Director of the candidate's unit from a list of qualified reviewers agreed upon in advance by Committee A. This list should include a balance of evaluators from current peer and aspirational peer institutions and should include some individuals suggested by the candidate. Where possible, at least half of the individuals should have had no substantial professional or personal relationships with the candidate. Previous dissertation and postdoctoral advisors, doctoral committee members, coauthors, and close personal friends should not be asked to serve as external evaluators; exceptions to this requirement may be necessary in some cases but must be explained and justified by the unit.

4.2.2 Each unit shall establish and publish a policy to determine what materials are sent to the external evaluators. The policies must be applied with uniformity and fairness. A representation of the candidate's distribution of effort during the probationary period should be included. The candidate's curriculum vitae must be included. Other materials, such as the candidate's research and teaching statements, sample publications, or the entire dossier may be sent in accordance with the policies of the unit and the Senior Vice President and Provost.

4.2.3 A suggested draft letter for solicitation of external reviews is included at the end of this document and should be adapted as required to reflect the unique circumstances of each tenure or promotion case. This letter should be updated to reflect the most recent policies and recommendations from the Senior Vice President and Provost.

4.3 Great care should be exercised in applying citation based metrics and impact factors in tenure decisions, since citations usually accrue over a period of years.

4.4 Evaluations for promotion and tenure shall be based on the cumulative record of the faculty member's entire professional history and potential for professional growth. Summary evaluation statements will be prepared by Committee A as prescribed in the University personnel policy for decisions on tenure and promotion.

4.5 For each tenure or promotion decision, Committee A will review the non-confidential evaluation materials with the candidate to ensure that they are a correct and valid appraisal of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance. This shall be done prior to final distribution of the materials to those involved in the decision process. Recommendations for or against tenure and/or promotion must not be discussed during this meeting.

4.6 If Committee A and the candidate are not able to achieve a general agreement on the interpretations and evaluations of past activities, then the faculty member may elect to prepare a statement of his or her position. This statement will be included in the dossier when it is sent forward.

4.7 All tenure and promotion recommendations shall be in writing. Reasons for the recommendations must be explicitly presented with relation to the dossier and other appropriate materials, the sole exception being the individual votes in a poll of voting eligible faculty. The Director and the candidate should receive timely notification of each recommendation as the case progresses. The Director shall also make this information available to the voting eligible faculty members involved in the original recommendations.

4.8 If the Director's recommendation concerning tenure or promotion is at variance with the faculty vote or the recommendation of Committee A, or if the Dean's recommendation is at variance with the Director's recommendation, the reasons shall be provided in the dossier. A summary of the reasons shall also accompany the notification of the recommendation that is given to the candidate.

4.9 In exceptional cases where an individual has significant documented experiences and achievements in industry, government, another academic institution, or other professional practice, it may be appropriate to recognize these professional accomplishments through initial appointment as associate professor or early promotion to associate professor before the granting of tenure. In such cases, the Director and Committee A must clearly communicate to the individual that granting the rank of associate professor is independent of the tenure decision and that the tenure decision will occur later in accordance with the procedures prescribed in Section 4. The case of initial appointment at the rank of professor is addressed in 4.12.

4.10 TENURE

4.10.1 Granting tenure usually comprises a continuing commitment until the faculty member retires or leaves the University voluntarily (see Faculty Handbook 3.7). This commitment should only be made after a careful assessment of the faculty member's unique set of research, teaching, creative/scholarly activity, and service contributions to the programs and responsibilities of the unit, College, and University and the faculty member's potential for professional growth. The decision should reflect a favorable comparative evaluation against other individuals in the same or similar disciplines who were granted tenure at comparable institutions. Moreover, the decision regarding any individual faculty

member must inevitably be made in the context of the current circumstances within the academic units, which may have changed from earlier plans.

4.10.2 The procedures in Faculty Handbook 3.7.5 shall be used for tenure decisions.

4.10.3 Recommendations concerning tenure will be made at the end of the initially agreed-upon tenure probationary period except in extraordinary cases.

4.10.4 The faculty member, Director, Dean, and Senior Vice President and Provost must agree in writing to the terms of any leave of absence and how it will affect the probationary period of a tenure-track faculty member. Such leave may be granted, for example, for medical conditions, family situations or emergencies, for professional reasons, or for military service. The policy of the College of Engineering regarding leaves shall be that given in Faculty Handbook 3.21. All agreements concerning leave during the probationary period should be reached prior to approval of the leave if possible.

4.10.5 For each year of the probationary period, the Director and Committee A will provide the faculty member with both a timely annual evaluation of performance during the past calendar year and a timely progress towards tenure letter that reviews the faculty member's entire probationary period at the University and provides a critical analysis of the progress towards tenure with respect to the tenure criteria established by the unit.

4.10.6 Any unit may elect to perform a review at the end of the third year of the probationary period that is more extensive than the annual review. The policy for such reviews should be published, clear, and uniformly applied.

4.10.7 Any faculty member recommended for tenure should have demonstrated contributions to the teaching activities of the University. This will be evinced in good to outstanding teaching effectiveness as shown on previous annual evaluations. Evidence such as letters from peers, students, or alumni may be considered. Any individual recommended for tenure should have shown a clear capacity for growth and development in this area of primary academic concern.

4.10.8 Any faculty member recommended for tenure should have demonstrated significant achievements as a research scholar, an innovative professional, and a research mentor. The significance of these achievements should be reflected in the confidential assessments from off-campus scholars and distinguished professionals prescribed in 4.2. The faculty member should also show strong potential for ongoing professional growth. Research effectiveness should be evinced by scholarly publications and externally funded research expenditures. It may additionally be evinced by a record of technology transfer achievements as defined in 2.3. Expectations concerning publications and external funding should be clearly articulated by the unit and the College.

4.10.9 Any faculty member recommended for tenure should have contributed to service within the unit, College, University, and profession.

4.11 PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

4.11.1 A recommendation of promotion to associate professor will normally be based upon the criteria for the award of tenure. The quality and magnitude of the individual's cumulative professional accomplishments should compare favorably with those of associate professors at comparable institutions. Although it is not necessary that both tenure and promotion recommendations be made at

the same time, in those instances where an individual has been appointed directly to the faculty following completion of a doctoral program, tenure and promotion recommendations will usually be concurrent. It is improbable that an individual would be granted tenure without having established an adequate basis for promotion.

4.12 PROMOTION TO OR APPOINTMENT AS PROFESSOR

4.12.1 A recommendation for promotion to or initial appointment as professor will be based primarily upon an evaluation of the unique cumulative contributions of the individual in teaching, research, and creative/scholarly activities over his or her professional career. In all but the most exceptional cases, a faculty member should have earned unquestioned recognition as an effective, committed teacher and earned a well-established, widespread reputation for research, scholarship, and innovative contributions to the advancement of the faculty member's areas of expertise and specialization.

4.12.2 The cumulative record of achievements offered in support of promotion to or initial appointment as professor should encompass activities in teaching, research and creative/scholarly activity, and service, although there may be greater latitude in the distribution and concentration of effort among these areas than normally expected at the tenure decision and promotion to associate professor. The application process for promotion to professor from associate professor should not usually be initiated before the faculty member has completed five years of service as an associate professor. Early promotion to full professor may be considered only in extraordinarily meritorious cases. It is essential for a recommendation for promotion to professor that the individual's cumulative professional record constitute a significant contribution to the major objectives of the unit, College, and University and that the quality and visibility of these accomplishments demonstrably enhance the stature and the reputation of the unit.

Section 5: Promotion – Ranked Renewable Term Faculty

5.1 The annual evaluations and dossier must be prepared in accordance with University policy. These documents will form the basis for the decisions and recommendations of the faculty, Committee A, the Director, the Dean, and other offices or committees involved in personnel actions. The exact nature of the recommendation and the specific procedures to be followed by each entity involved will vary with:

- Applicable University personnel policy
- Current instructions and guidelines provided by the Senior Vice President and Provost and the College

5.2 Confidential assessments from off-campus teaching scholars and former students are particularly informative in regard to the evaluation of the candidate. Such letters are required as part of any dossier accompanying a recommendation on promotion from associate professor to professor.

5.2.1 As a nominal target, at least four letters should be obtained from off-campus teaching scholars wherever possible. Such letters shall be solicited by the Director of the candidate's unit from a list of qualified reviewers agreed upon in advance by Committee A. This list should include a balance of evaluators from current peer and aspirational peer institutions and should include some individuals suggested by the candidate. Where possible, at least half of the individuals should have had no substantial professional or personal relationships with the candidate. Previous dissertation and postdoctoral advisors, doctoral committee members, coauthors, and close personal friends should not

be asked to serve as external evaluators; exceptions to this requirement may be necessary in some cases but must be explained and justified by the unit.

5.2.2 Additional confidential letters of assessment from former students are also helpful. This list should include both undergraduate and graduate students as applicable and should include some students suggested by the candidate. Persons with a conflict of interest should not be asked to serve as evaluators.

5.2.3 Each unit shall establish and publish a policy to determine what materials are sent to the external evaluators but must include, as a minimum, the candidate's curriculum vitae, teaching philosophy, data from student experience surveys, and summary of teaching and teaching-related activities. The policies must be applied with uniformity and fairness. A representation of the candidate's distribution of effort during the period of employment should be included. Other materials, such as the candidate's teaching evaluations, sample publications, or the entire dossier may be sent in accordance with the policies of the unit and the Senior Vice President and Provost.

5.2.4 A suggested draft letter for solicitation of external reviews is included at the end of this document and should be adapted as required to reflect the unique circumstances of each promotion case. This letter should be updated to reflect the most recent policies and recommendations from the Senior Vice President and Provost.

5.3 Evaluations for promotion shall also include peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching abilities and activities. These peer evaluations should be done by individuals with a record of exceptional teaching at the University and may also include faculty serving on the undergraduate or graduate curriculum committees, faculty involved with online course or program development, and individuals associated with the Center for Faculty Excellence.

5.4 Evaluations for promotion shall be based on the cumulative record of the faculty member's entire professional history and potential for professional growth. Summary evaluation statements will be prepared by Committee A as prescribed in the University personnel policy for decisions on promotion.

5.5 For each promotion decision, Committee A will review the non-confidential evaluation materials with the candidate to ensure that they are a correct and valid appraisal of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance. This shall be done prior to final distribution of the materials to those involved in the decision process. Recommendations for or against promotion must not be discussed during this meeting.

5.6 If Committee A and the candidate are not able to achieve a general agreement on the interpretations and evaluations of past activities, then the faculty member may elect to prepare a statement of his or her position. This statement will be included in the dossier when it is sent forward.

5.7 All promotion recommendations shall be in writing. Reasons for the recommendations must be explicitly presented with relation to the dossier and other appropriate materials, the sole exception being the individual votes in a poll of voting eligible faculty. The Director and the candidate should receive timely notification of each recommendation as the case progresses. The Director shall also make this information available to the voting eligible faculty members involved in the original recommendations.

5.8 If the Director's recommendation concerning promotion is at variance with the faculty vote or the recommendation of Committee A, or if the Dean's recommendation is at variance with the Director's recommendation, the reasons shall be provided in the dossier. A summary of the reasons shall also accompany the notification of the recommendation that is given to the candidate.

5.9 In exceptional cases where an individual has significant documented experiences and achievements in industry, government, another academic institution, or other professional practice, it may be appropriate to recognize these professional accomplishments through initial appointment as associate professor or early promotion to associate professor. The case of initial appointment at the rank of professor is addressed in 5.11.

5.10 PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

5.10.1 A recommendation of promotion to associate professor will be based on demonstrated excellence in teaching and teaching-related activities. Candidates are also expected to demonstrate meaningful service and/or scholarly activity. Representative service and scholarly activities include course-related outreach, advising student organizations, professional development, discipline-specific research, pedagogical research, or creative work appropriate to the field. Teaching-related activities may be evaluated through demonstrated improvement of teaching skills, development of teaching materials, and curriculum development. Course objectives, learning outcomes, and methods of assessment must be clearly addressed. The candidate should have made significant contributions to teaching through activities such as revisions of existing courses, development of new courses or teaching methods, or advising of undergraduate students. Where possible, the candidate should also have expanded their pedagogical activities beyond the classroom into areas such as overseeing instructional laboratories, coordinating activities of teaching assistants, coordinating interdepartmental research mentoring of undergraduates, and/or coordinating placement of undergraduates into research groups.

5.10.2 Except in extraordinary cases, the application process for promotion to associate professor from assistant professor should not be initiated before the faculty member has completed five years of service as an assistant professor.

5.11 PROMOTION TO OR APPOINTMENT AS PROFESSOR

5.11.1 A recommendation for promotion to or initial appointment as professor will be based primarily upon an evaluation of the cumulative contributions of the individual in teaching, teaching-related activities, and scholarly activities over his or her professional career. In addition to having pedagogical or discipline-specific research, candidates will have attained status as exceptional teachers, recognized by the university and beyond. This recognition could develop from activities such as presenting at national conferences and conventions, publishing articles in disciplinary or pedagogical journals, contributing to the production of textbooks or other innovative instructional materials, innovative contributions to the curriculum at the university and national level, and/or securing of either pedagogical or discipline-specific research grants. Candidates for professor are also expected to have fulfilled an expanded service role to meet the mission of the unit, College, and University. They are also expected to have contributed to the mentorship of junior faculty (particularly those related to educational activities) within the unit, College, and University. It is essential for a recommendation for promotion to professor that the individual's cumulative professional record constitute a significant contribution to the major objectives of the unit, College, and University, and that the quality and visibility of these accomplishments demonstrably enhance the stature and the reputation of the unit.

5.11.2 Except in extraordinary cases, the application process for promotion to professor from associate professor should not be initiated before the faculty member has completed five years of service as an associate professor.

Section 6: Promotion – Lecturers and Instructors

6.1 The annual evaluations and dossier must be prepared in accordance with University policy. These documents will form the basis for the decisions and recommendations of the faculty, Committee A, the Director, the Dean, and other offices or committees involved in personnel actions. The exact nature of the recommendation and the specific procedures to be followed by each entity involved will vary with:

- Applicable University personnel policy
- Current instructions and guidelines provided by the Senior Vice President and Provost and the College

6.2 Evaluations for promotion shall include peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching abilities and teaching-related activities. These peer evaluations should be done by individuals with a record of exceptional teaching at the University and may also include faculty serving on the undergraduate or graduate curriculum committees, faculty involved with online course or program development, and individuals associated with the Center for Faculty Excellence.

6.3 Evaluations for promotion shall be based on the cumulative record of the faculty member's entire professional history and potential for professional growth. Summary evaluation statements will be prepared by Committee A as prescribed in the University personnel policy for decisions on promotion.

6.4 Confidential assessments from teaching scholars and former students are particularly informative in regard to the evaluation of the candidate. Student experience survey data should be included for each course the candidate has taught. Any dossier accompanying a recommendation on promotion from senior lecturer to distinguished lecturer or from senior instructor to distinguished instructor should also include letters from teaching scholars and former students.

6.4.1 As a nominal target, at least four letters should be obtained from teaching scholars wherever possible. The letters may be obtained from teaching scholars at the University of Oklahoma, although at least one letter must be obtained from a teaching scholar outside of the College of Engineering at the University of Oklahoma. Such letters shall be solicited by the Director of the candidate's unit from a list of qualified reviewers agreed upon in advance by Committee A. Where possible, at least half of the individuals should have had no substantial professional or personal relationships with the candidate. Previous dissertation and postdoctoral advisors, doctoral committee members, coauthors, and close personal friends should not be asked to serve as external evaluators; exceptions to this requirement may be necessary in some cases but must be explained and justified by the unit.

6.4.2 Additional confidential letters of assessment from former students are also helpful. Such letters shall be solicited by the Director of the candidate's unit from a list of potential students agreed upon in advance by Committee A. This list should include both undergraduate and graduate students as applicable and should include some students suggested by the candidate. Close personal friends should not be asked to serve as evaluators.

6.4.3 Each unit shall establish and publish a policy to determine what materials are sent to the evaluators but must include, as a minimum, the candidate's curriculum vitae, teaching philosophy, data

from student experience surveys, and summary of teaching and teaching-related activities. The policies must be applied with uniformity and fairness. A representation of the candidate's distribution of effort during the period of employment should be included. Other materials, such as the candidate's teaching evaluations, sample publications, or the entire dossier may be sent in accordance with the policies of the unit and the Senior Vice President and Provost.

6.4.4 A suggested draft letter for solicitation of reviews is included at the end of this document and should be adapted as required to reflect the unique circumstances of each promotion case. This letter should be updated to reflect the most recent policies and recommendations from the Senior Vice President and Provost.

6.5 For each promotion decision, Committee A will review the non-confidential evaluation materials with the candidate to ensure that they are a correct and valid appraisal of the faculty member's accomplishments and performance. This shall be done prior to final distribution of the materials to those involved in the decision process. Recommendations for or against promotion must not be discussed during this meeting.

6.6 If Committee A and the candidate are not able to achieve a general agreement on the interpretations and evaluations of past activities, then the faculty member may elect to prepare a statement of his or her position. This statement will be included in the dossier when it is sent forward.

6.7 All promotion recommendations shall be in writing. Reasons for the recommendations must be explicitly presented with relation to the dossier and other appropriate materials, the sole exception being the individual votes in a poll of voting eligible faculty. The Director and the candidate should receive timely notification of each recommendation as the case progresses. The Director shall also make this information available to the voting eligible faculty members involved in the original recommendations. Voting eligible faculty should include tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, ranked-renewable faculty, instructors, and lecturers who have attained the rank being voted on.

6.8 If the Director's recommendation concerning promotion is at variance with the faculty vote or the recommendation of Committee A, or if the Dean's recommendation is at variance with the Director's recommendation, the reasons shall be provided in the dossier. A summary of the reasons shall also accompany the notification of the recommendation that is given to the candidate.

6.9 In cases where an individual has significant documented experiences and achievements in industry, government, another academic institution, or other professional practice, it may be appropriate to recognize these professional accomplishments through initial appointment as senior lecturer/instructor or early promotion to senior lecturer/instructor. The case of initial appointment at the rank of distinguished lecturer/instructor is addressed in 6.11.

6.10 PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER OR SENIOR INSTRUCTOR

6.10.1 A recommendation of promotion to senior lecturer or senior instructor will be based on demonstrated excellence in teaching and teaching-related activities. Teaching-related activities may be evaluated through demonstrated improvement of teaching skills, development of teaching materials, and curriculum development. Course objectives, learning outcomes, and methods of assessment must be clearly addressed. The candidate should have made significant contributions to teaching through activities such as revisions of existing courses, development of new courses or teaching methods, or

advising of undergraduate students. Where possible, the candidate should also have expanded their pedagogical activities beyond the classroom into areas such as overseeing instructional laboratories, coordinating activities of teaching assistants, coordinating interdepartmental research mentoring of undergraduates, and/or coordinating placement of undergraduates into research groups.

6.10.2 Except in extraordinary cases, the application process for promotion to senior lecturer or senior instructor from lecturer or instructor should not be initiated before the faculty member has completed five years of service as a lecturer or instructor.

6.11 PROMOTION TO OR APPOINTMENT AS DISTINGUISHED LECTURER OR DISTINGUISHED INSTRUCTOR

6.11.1 A recommendation for promotion to or initial appointment as distinguished lecturer or distinguished instructor will be based primarily upon an evaluation of the cumulative contributions of the individual in teaching, teaching-related activities, and scholarly activities over his or her professional career. In addition to having pedagogical or discipline-specific research, candidates will have attained status as exceptional teachers, recognized by the university and beyond. This recognition could develop from activities such as presenting at national conferences and conventions, publishing articles in disciplinary or pedagogical journals, contributing to the production of textbooks or other innovative instructional materials, innovative contributions to the curriculum at the university and national level, and/or securing of either pedagogical or discipline-specific research grants. Additional activities that are not expected but may be considered as additional support for promotion are: to have fulfilled an expanded service role to meet the mission of the unit, College, and University, to have contributed to the mentorship of junior faculty (particularly those related to educational activities) within the unit, College, and University. It is essential for a recommendation for promotion to distinguished lecturer or distinguished instructor that the individual's cumulative professional record constitute a significant contribution to the major objectives of the unit, College, and University, and that the quality and visibility of these accomplishments demonstrably enhance the stature and the reputation of the unit.

6.11.2 Except in extraordinary cases, the application process for promotion to distinguished lecturer or distinguished instructor from senior lecturer or senior instructor should not be initiated before the faculty member has completed five years of service as a senior lecturer or senior instructor.

Section 7: Salary Recommendations

7.1 The procedures in Faculty Handbook 3.13.2 in conjunction with policies issued by the Provost will be used to determine salary adjustments.

7.2 Recommendations for merit based salary increases will be prepared by the Director (along with Committee A, where appropriate). Recommendations shall be based on previously completed evaluations and plans and priorities of the College and unit. These recommendations must be within College budget allocations and guidelines and must comply with University personnel policy.

7.3 The recommendation of the Director will be reviewed by the Dean in light of the annual evaluations, comparative evaluations of the units within the College, plans and priorities of the College, and the overall College budget structure and strategy. The Dean will discuss these considerations with the Director and will explain any contemplated modifications or adjustments to the Director's recommendation. The Director will inform each faculty member of any modifications or adjustments

made by the Dean and will provide a summary of the reasons for these changes in writing. The Dean will provide recommendations to the Senior Vice President and Provost and provide copies to the Director.

7.4 Evaluation for purposes of salary recommendation during any leave will be made based on the policy of the unit and Faculty Handbook 3.21. In the absence of any specific policy, the numerical scores for teaching, research and creative/scholarly activity, and service, as well as the overall numerical score, shall be the average of the scores from the previous three years.

SUGGESTED LETTER FOR EXTERNAL RESEARCH EVALUATIONS – TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Dear _____:

Dr. _____, assistant professor of _____, will be considered for a permanently tenured position in the School of _____ faculty during the Fall semester of this year. Since the quality of a University is directly dependent upon the quality of its permanent faculty, tenure decisions are among the most critical choices that a university makes.

As part of our review process, we are soliciting assessments of Dr. _____'s research contributions from academic colleagues and distinguished professionals outside of the University of Oklahoma. I hope that you will assist us in this important task. Dr. _____'s distribution of effort during the pretenure period typically consisted of A% research, B% teaching and C% service. We would like to receive your candid assessment of the quality and importance of Dr. _____'s past research work and/or technology transfer and his or her potential for future contributions. It will be particularly helpful if you can compare his or her contributions and potential with those of other individuals whom you have known at similar points in their career development. These letters of evaluation are treated as confidential by the University to the extent we are permitted to do so by law. These assessments will become part of Dr. _____'s tenure dossier to be reviewed in accordance with our procedures for the tenure decision which generally include review by the departmental tenured faculty, a select group of college faculty appointed by the Dean, the Campus Tenure Committee, and relevant administrators at the University of Oklahoma.

We ask for your letter of evaluation and a copy of your own curriculum vita to include with the tenure dossier. In your letter, it is important that you elucidate the extent of your professional or personal relationship with Dr. _____; the intent is to identify potential cases of partiality or conflicts of interest that might otherwise not be known by us. We ask that evaluators not provide comments as to whether a candidate should or should not be awarded tenure at the University of Oklahoma but rather comments on how the candidate's research record compares with those who have recently been awarded tenure at your institution.

We are enclosing Dr. _____'s current curriculum vita. We would also be happy to provide copies of any papers or publications which may not be readily accessible to you.

We will need to receive your response no later than _____ to use it in our overall evaluation. If you feel that you cannot meet the schedule, or for other reasons cannot provide an appropriate assessment of Dr. _____'s research work, please note this below and return the enclosed material at your earliest convenience.

We would be grateful for your assistance in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Professor and Director

SUGGESTED LETTER FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS – RANKED RENEWABLE TERM FACULTY

Dear _____:

Dr. _____, _____ professor of _____, will be considered for promotion to the rank of _____ in the School of _____ during the Fall semester of this year. Since the quality of a University is directly dependent upon the quality of its faculty, promotion decisions are critical and must be given due process. As part of our review process, we are soliciting assessments of Dr. _____'s academic contributions from colleagues and distinguished professionals outside the University of Oklahoma.

Dr. _____'s distribution of effort over the most recent academic year consisted of A% teaching, B% research, and C% service. An explanation for this atypical workload distribution is in order. The University of Oklahoma's faculty handbook allows for the appointment of ranked renewable term faculty, who are considered regular faculty, but whose workload may be modified by the terms of their renewable appointment. In general, the primary duties of ranked renewable term faculty are teaching and teaching-related activities. Dr. _____ is a ranked renewable term faculty member currently at the rank of _____ professor. In Dr. _____'s case, his/her appointment stipulated that the teaching workload be at A% and consist of teaching X classes per year, advising undergraduate and/or graduate students, developing teaching materials for XYZ class(es), assisting in curriculum development, overseeing instructional laboratories, and coordinating teaching assistants (ADJUST LIST AS APPROPRIATE TO THE SPECIFIC FACULTY MEMBER'S DUTIES). Research activities, set at B%, were focused in areas of pedagogical or discipline-specific research aimed at assisting in the professional development and growth of the faculty member and should not be evaluated relative to the extent of a traditional tenured/tenure-track faculty member. For service, Dr. _____ was charged with serving as advisor for the XYZ student organization, performing course-related outreach, and hosting teaching seminars for the faculty (ADJUST LIST AS APPROPRIATE TO THE SPECIFIC FACULTY MEMBER'S DUTIES).

Under these terms, we would like to receive your candid assessment of the quality and importance of Dr. _____'s cumulative academic record and potential for future contributions. It will be particularly helpful if you can compare his/her contributions with those of other individuals whom you have known at similar points and positions in their career development. These letters of evaluation are treated as confidential by the university to the extent we are permitted to do so by law. These assessments will become part of Dr. _____'s promotion dossier to be reviewed in accordance with our procedures for promotion, which includes a review by departmental faculty members at or above the rank being considered, by a select group of college faculty appointed by the Dean, and by relevant administrators at the University of Oklahoma.

We ask for your letter of evaluation and a copy of your own curriculum vita to include with the dossier. In your letter, it is important that you elucidate the extent of your professional or personal relationship with Dr. _____; the intent is to identify potential cases of partiality or conflicts of interest that might otherwise not be known by us. We ask that evaluators not provide comments as to whether a candidate should or should not be promoted at the University of Oklahoma but rather comments on how the candidate's academic record compares with those in similar appointments who have recently been promoted at your institution.

We are enclosing Dr. _____'s current curriculum vita, as well as Sections 1.X-1.Y of his/her dossier. We will need to receive your response no later than _____ to use it in our overall evaluation. If you feel that you cannot meet the schedule, or for other reasons cannot provide an appropriate assessment of Dr. _____'s academic work, please note this below and return the enclosed material at your earliest convenience.

We would be grateful for your assistance in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Professor and Director

Boren, Kristi D.

From: Ellis, Sarah J.
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 2:22 PM
To: Klier, John
Cc: Shehab, Randa L.; Boren, Kristi D.; Donaghe, Megan E.
Subject: Re: GCoE Policy and Procedure Changes

Hi John,

Thank you for your patience. We have reviewed the policy changes and approve all of them.

All best,

Sarah

Sarah Ellis
(she/her/hers)
Vice Provost for Faculty
Professor, Music Theory
University of Oklahoma

On Sep 7, 2022, at 10:01 AM, Klier, John <klier@ou.edu> wrote:

Hello Vice Provost Ellis,

The GCoE faculty have over the past 18 months reviewed, modified, and voted to approve several of our college governance documents. Following our PP01 process, a committee of faculty led the review and modification, and the changes were passed by a majority vote of the faculty meeting quorum. We are submitting these faculty approved documents for Provost review and approval.

GCoE Policy and Procedure 02 for Academic Standards and Regulations. They modified the GPA requirement for nonresident transfer student admissions to match that of resident transfer students.

GCOE Policy and Procedure 03 Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Evaluation and Recommendations Relating to Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Faculty Review. They voted to add language for promotion guidelines for instructor/lecturers, see section 6.

GCOE Policy and Procedure 07 Student Course and Instruction Evaluation. They voted to change the language to align with the new University student experience survey.

In addition, in 2021 faculty also voted to make some changes as described below: This was sent to the Provost office some time ago for approval, but we have not received a reply.

GCoE Policy and Procedure 05 for Academic Appeals in April 2021. Changes were made to streamline the process.

Thank you,

John Klier, Ph.D.

Dean, AT&T Chair

202 W. Boyd St., Rm. 107, Norman, OK 73019-1021

(405) 325-2621 | JKlier@ou.edu | www.ou.edu/coe

<image001.png>

<GCoE PP02 - Discussed by Faculty 2022-04-01.pdf><GCoE PP03 - Approved by Faculty 2022-04-01.pdf><GCoE PP07 - Approved by Faculty 2022-04-01.pdf><GCoE ACADEMIC APPEAL PROCEDURES PP05 Oct2020 recommendation_final.pdf>