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The Academic Programs Council (APC) is charged to serve as an advisor to the President, Provost, and the Faculty Senate on matters concerned with the instructional programs and curricula of the University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus and Tulsa Campus. Its main responsibility is to evaluate new undergraduate courses, and existing or proposed undergraduate programs with regard to their educational value and to make recommendations to the Office of the Provost.

The Council is organized into two subcommittees—Courses and Programs. Guidelines for the subcommittees are as listed below.

**Course Subcommittee is charged to:**

1. Look for conformance to University standards and practice in form and procedure with all significant information provided on the form by the department submitting the request.
2. Look for proper prerequisites and course numbers; match level of instruction.
3. Check the course description to make sure it is compact, clear, and indicates the level of instruction to ensure that it would make good sense to the general student.
4. Look for duplication of courses in the same or other departments.
5. Note the impact of the course on degree programs.

**Programs Subcommittee is charged to:**

1. Protect the rights of students in program deletions.
2. Review for duplication of programs.
3. Determine ‘Are there adequate resources for the program?’
4. Look for logical prerequisites.
5. Determine ‘Does the program make sense?’
6. Determine ‘Are University rules satisfied?’
7. Review checksheets for correctness and clarity.
8. Assess the impact on other programs, of program deletions and course changes.
9. Determine ‘Are course changes coordinated with program changes?’
10. Determine ‘Does the program have faculty academic review?’

The APC reviews and makes recommendations regarding the undergraduate components of slashlisted undergraduate/graduate courses and of BS/MS accelerated degree programs, but otherwise, the review and approval of courses and programs offered for graduate credit resides with the Graduate Council. The APC also reviews and makes recommendations regarding Law School courses and programs because these do not fall under Graduate Council oversight.

The APC meets monthly to review changes in programs and courses proposed by individual departments and make recommendations. Program changes include substantive changes—those that impact what a student must do to earn a degree—that must be approved by both the OU and State Regents, and nonsubstantive changes—
those that do not impact what a student must do to earn a degree—that are recommended to the Provost for final approval and reported to the State Regents.

All APC meetings in AY2021-2022 were held via Zoom on the following dates, with Courses and Programs considered as tabulated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Courses Recommended for Provost Review</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Programs Recommended for Provost Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03 September</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 October</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 November</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 December</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 February</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 March</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 April</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 May</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table above, APC reviewed 289 courses and 50 programs changes in 2021-22. Almost all of the recommendations to the Provost for review were resolved, or the course/program change requests were withdrawn by department or tabled by Provost Office pending Departmental response.

**An Important and Continuing Issue**

The Academic Programs Council continues to encounter violations of the stated and published Prefinals and Finals Weeks policies with regard to final projects, final presentations and final exams.

The violations are in the majority related to Sections 4.10.1(A) & (B) in the OU Faculty Handbook:

**4.10.1(A)** Assignments or projects worth less than 10 percent combined total of a student’s grade may be assigned at any time prior to pre-finals week and may be due during pre-finals week. However, no assignments or projects may be due on the last two days of pre-finals week. Quizzes may be given during pre-finals week, but cannot account for more than 3% combined total of the final grade. Exams may not be given during pre-finals week. Tuesday/Thursday classes were frequently in violation because projects were allowed to be due on the Tuesday and Thursday of prefinals week rather than the Thursday of the week prior and Tuesday of prefinals week. Rarely a non-comprehensive ‘midterm’ exam was scheduled during this week.

**4.10.1(B)** Assignments, take-home examinations, in-class examinations, or projects worth more than 10 percent of a student's grade must be scheduled at least 30 days prior to the first day of finals and must
be due or given prior to pre-finals week. Any assignment that is to take the entire semester to complete may be accepted or presented during the first three weekdays of pre-finals week provided the syllabus explicitly states that the assignment can be turned in prior to pre-finals week.

Several members of APC drafted a document regarding the Final Exam Period and sent it to the Provost and Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for review and approval. APC recommends the Faculty Senate work with the Provost’s Office to revise the Faculty Handbook and its prefinals and finals week policies to make the text explicit and clear to all faculty.

DRAFT

4.10 FINAL EXAM PREPARATION PERIOD

Pre-finals week will be defined as the seven calendar days before the first day of finals. Faculty may cover new course material throughout this week.

4.10.1 Student-Faculty Policies and Information

(A) No assignments or projects may be due the last two days of pre-finals week (typically Saturday and Sunday).
(B) Assignments or projects worth less than 10 percent combined total of a student’s grade may be due during the first five days of pre-finals week.
(C) Assignments due during pre-finals week that are worth more than 10 percent of a student’s grade must be scheduled at least 30 days prior to the first day of finals week.
(D) Any assignment that does not following (A)-(C) must be listed in the course syllabus and approved by the faculty member’s direct supervisor.

This policy does not apply to:

- Make-up assignments and tests,
- Laboratory examinations,
- Classes meeting one day a week for more than one hour,
- Classes with no university scheduled final exam,
- Laboratory classes,
- Graduate classes,
- Courses that do not meet for 16 weeks.

Student Government Association (SGA) Registered Student Organizations (RSO’s) may not require student attendance at meetings or programs during pre-finals week.

Violations to this policy should be reported to the chair of the department in which the course is taught or, in special circumstances, to the dean of the college and may be grounds for grade appeal. This policy shall be reviewed no sooner than 2027.
Finally, APC requests that the Faculty Senate continue to encourage both the President’s Office and the Student Government Association to fill the student appointee vacancies on the APC. Student members, as representatives of the larger undergraduate population, would offer important perspectives on course and program offerings and through the APC have a significant and immediate voice in raising concerns and/or recommendations for discussion by the Council.

**Academic Programs Council (Norman) 2021-22**

**Ex-officio, nonvoting members**
- Andre Wright  Sr. VP and Provost
- Mark Morvant  Vice Provost for Instruction
- Kellie Dyer  Registrar
- Lisa Cannon  Coordinator of Academic Publications and Curriculum, and Programs Moderator
- Grey Allman  attends as designate
- Karen Rupp Serano  Associate Dean for Scholarly Comm. & Resources

**Administrative, nonvoting members**
- Jessica Burgett  Courses Moderator
- Alyssa Giles  Courses Moderator

**Faculty Senate Appointees** (6 faculty for 3-year terms—1/3 to retire this year) **Subcommittee**
- Ralph Beliveau  Journalism  2019-2022  Programs
- Deborah Trytten  Computer Science  2019-2022  Programs Lead
- Kieran Mullen  Physics  2020-2023  Courses
- Jody Worley  Human Relations-Tulsa  2020-2023  Programs
- Paul Spicer  Anthropology  2021-2024  Courses
- Rebecca Huskey  Classics and Letters  2021-2024  Courses

**SGA Appointees** (2 students for 1 year term)
- Vacant  Student  2021-2022  TBD
- Vacant  Student  2021-2022  TBD

**Presidential Appointments** (3 faculty for 3-year terms—1/3 to retire each year)
- Karen Hayes-Thumann  Visual Arts  2019-22  APC Chair
- Jane Wickersham  History  2020-2023  Courses Lead

At the May 6, 2022, meeting the leadership of the APC for AY 2022-2023 was determined as:

Jane Wickersham  History  2020-2023  Chair-elect
Rebecca Huskey  Classics and Letters  2021-2024  Courses Lead
The Athletics Council met four times in the academic year of 2021 and 2022. The meeting dates were September 23rd 2021, November 16th 2021, March 2nd 2022, and May 11th, 2022. Dr. Chris Dalton (Engineering) was elected to assume the role of council chair for the 2022-23 academic year. The council completed all required business and below is the chair’s annual report to summarize these meetings.

2020-2021 Athletics Council membership:

Faculty members: David McLeod (Chair), Chris Dalton (Chair-elect), Daniel Larson, Emily Johnson, Satish Kumar, and Christopher Sadler, Susan Hahn, Katherine O'Neal
Staff members: Erin Wolfe and Lindsey Mitchell
Student members: Keti Mdzinarishvili, Genna Ille
Student-athletes: Rayvon Allen, Ivana Corley
Alumni: Greg Anderson and Andrew Hewlett
Ex Officio: Joe Castiglione (Athletics Director), Gregg Garn (Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA), Brittany Washington (Administrative Assistant to the Senior Associate Athletic Directors)
Athletics Department Attendees: Marcus Bowman (Senior Associate Athletics Director, Chief Financial Officer), Alex Hensley (Governance and Special Projects), Jason Leonard (Executive Director, Athletics Compliance), Mike Meade (Senior Associate Athletics Director, Academic Services), Larry Naifeh (Executive Associate Athletics Director), Lindy Roberts-Ivy (Senior Associate Athletics Director, Senior Women’s Administrator), and Brent Sumler (Director of Student-Athlete Experience & Well-being)

Summary: As the charge of this committee is to advise the University president and athletic director in athletics-related matters, the emphasis of the council meetings is on 1) open exchange and disclosure of information about athletic department activities, and 2) inquiry and feedback from council members who represent the University of Oklahoma community and a variety of areas of expertise. The overall council contains four subcommittees that work directly with athletic staff to report on activities more extensively in the areas of ‘Academic Integrity and Student Welfare’, ‘Equity and Sportsmanship’, ‘Fiscal Integrity and Personnel’, and ‘Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance’. The meetings were well supported by athletic department staff, including the regular attendance and direct engagement with the Athletic Director, Joe Castiglione. The Council members were actively involved in unfettered discussion and inquiry. The following material details the specific items discussed in each of the four Council sessions. The meeting minutes and subcommittee reports are also provided to the University president for review.

In addition to normal business, a wide variety of topics were discussed throughout the year. among these, four primary themes emerged as the most important conversations among the council throughout this cycle. These included discussions around responses to COVID, the Transfer Portal, Name Image and Likeness, and the Alston decision.

- COVID
  - Throughout the year multiple conversations, were connected to the department’s response to COVID. These included extensive steps taken to ensure the safety of student athletes both on
campus, and in competition as well as the financial implications of the previous seasons and the fiscal impact of the pandemic on overall operations.

- The Transfer Portal
  - Many conversations connected back to a relatively recent change in NCAA procedure which allows students to enter a portal and declare their intention to transferring to another university to continue their athletic career. A loosening of previous restrictions and the advancement of modern technology appear to have created a phenomenon where student athletes are far more likely to transfer than they may have been in previous years. This creates a particular set of circumstances that complicates the way students are recruited and retained and can have implications on athletic program success. This is further complicated by the following themes of NIL and the Alston case.

- Name Image Likeness (NIL)
  - Recent court rulings have determined student athletes may now profit from the use of their name, image, and likeness. To address the impact of these policies on student athletes and the structure of intercollegiate athletics at OU, significant work has been done by the athletics department. This is a continually evolving space, where a wide variety of strategies have been used by universities across the nation to both protect students and allow them the agency to make decisions about their own finances. Multiple steps have been taken by the OU Athletic Department to promote equity and financial responsibility, and to make sure that opportunities are available to as wide a variety of student athletes as possible. Many complications will continue to arise from this policy, but the Athletic Department has been proactive in doing everything possible to minimize risks and support inclusivity for student athletes.

- Alston
  - In 2021 the Supreme Court upheld a district case that ruled schools profiting from intercollegiate athletics had a responsibility to pay for additional academic related expenses for student athletes, above and beyond traditional scholarships, meals, and room and board. This shifted the national landscape as the conferences and NCAA developed policy to be in compliance. University of Oklahoma Athletic Department decided to create a system which rewards academic success and personal development to access these additional financial supports. Other universities have taken different routes, some of which give a one-time full cash award to a student at the beginning of the year or used other strategies. The national landscape has yet to see the ways this case, in conjunction with NIL, will impact student recruiting and transfer in the years to come.

Meeting Highlights
(as documented in meeting minutes)

- September 23rd 2021
  - Dr. McLeod called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance
  - Previous Minutes Approved
  - Introductions were made
  - Subcommittee Reports
- Fiscal Integrity
  - Andrew Hewlett gave the fiscal integrity report for the subcommittee.
  - The report covered the fiscal state of the dept and how things have been transitioning since COVID.

- Athletic Directors Report
  - Mr. Castiglione opened his report by welcoming everyone to the meeting and thanking them for committing to serve on the council. He shared the athletics departments intent to be transparent about what we are doing and invites feedback from our council members on what it is that we can be doing better.
  - He mentioned that he could not possibly fit everything that has happened in the last six months in this report so he will stay brief and open it up to questions. He stated that we are in the middle of an unprecedented time in history. We are learning as we go with information that is constantly changing. One of the most challenging things was making the decisions on how to get our teams safely back into competition. He shared that there are many things happen within college athletics and that our department has done a wonderful job at trying to balance and take them all head on. He shared that one major thing he is dealing with today is the Alston Case. This is a case that concerns the compensation of collegiate athletes within the NCAA. The SEC announced today that they are going to allow each of their member instructions to make the decisions on how they would like to handle it at their institution. The Big 12 has a call later today to discuss what their decision is.
  - Mr. Castiglione then went on to discuss the history of athletics council and how when this started a major role of this council is to be a link to the faculty senate. Our common goal is to support the mission of The University of Oklahoma. He always welcomes the access to share what we are doing within athletics with the faculty senate and university. He mentioned that if anyone on the council has a link to the faculty senate that he is happy if you share this with them.
  - Lastly, he discussed the work that was done for the future shift from the Big 12 to the SEC and the work that was done both by him and our university president and their staff to make sure the best decision was being made for the university as a whole. He shared that there is still a lot more work to be done for this transition and that he is happy to unpack this further down the road. This transition is not scheduled to take place until 2025.

- Faculty Athletics Representative Report
  - Dr. Gregg Garn welcomed and thanked everyone for their time on the council this upcoming year. He mentioned his new graduate assistant, Brittany Washington. She is coming from a wonderful internship at the NCAA and is super knowledgeable about the NCAA as a whole. Dr. Garn also mentioned the progress we are making when it comes to academics with student athletes.

- Student Athlete Innovative Leaders Report
  - The Student-Athlete Innovative Leaders report was given. It was shared that the first upcoming event is the Athletes for Athletes game this Saturday. Looking for
opportunities to work with elementary schools again this year. Just made a Tik Tok account to increase their social media accounts and actively looking for fundraisers. Something else that they are doing this year is creating competitions.

- **November 16th 2021**
  - Dr. McLeod called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance
  - Previous Minutes Approved
  - Introductions were made
  - Guest Speaker
    - Dr. Nicole Been, the new director of DEI initiatives for OU athletics, gave an in-depth overview of focus areas since starting her role. She shared the DEI framework and provided an overview of the initiatives. Dr. Been also shared that Brent Sumler contributed tremendously to developing the DEI framework.
    - Dr. Been then began by discussing several initiatives and frameworks that have taken place since she’s been in this role. For example, she talked about events that fostered civic engagement related to registering to vote, humanity talks, and the Black Lives Matter Movement.
    - She also talked about developing assessments that align with our values as an institution and department. She stressed the importance of having a unified front and placing value on creation and implementation related to DEI. Additionally, she discussed her plans to revamp the hiring process to ensure diversity in the candidate pools.
    - Dr. Been plans to develop and address transgender and non-binary policies and formulate policies. Additionally, she mentioned that retention is up. She ended by giving an overview of a
  - Subcommittee Reports
    - Academic Integrity
      - Mike Meade gave the Academic Integrity Subcommittee Report. The link to the digital report was shared prior to the meeting for Council Members to review. Mike recognized that report is a very lengthy document and stated that he would present critical aspects of the report.
      - Mike started by sharing the 10-year admissions summary. He shared that the trend has continued to be consistent with past years and with the non-student-athlete body. The following section that Mike covered was the graduation rates of our student-athletes. For 2020-2021 the graduation success rate was 89%. The GSR is important because of the NCAA’s academic-based revenue model.
      - Two separate rates are assessed and compared, the federal graduation rate and the graduation success rate. The federal graduation rate excludes mid-year enrollees and transfers. In order to be considered in these numbers, a student must be enrolled during a fall semester of their freshman year. Since the federal graduation rate does not count these two groups of students, the Graduation Success Rate was created to encompass all student-athletes that we are giving
scholarships to. The GSR also considers if a student-athlete left before graduation due to the chance to play professionally.

- Mike also discussed the Academic Progress Rate (APR). The APR is a real-time measure of a student-athlete’s academic progress and timely graduation within five years. This also is used to see how programs are doing on retaining student-athletes. The most common reason for losing points is based on the student-athletes decision to leave the university. For example, if a student-athlete is on any amount of scholarship, they are counted in this number. If a team has a perfect 1000, this means they have had no point loss in the last five years, or they have been granted a delayed graduation.

- Mike reviewed the overall academic performance of student-athletes and individual team performance. The new cumulative GPA for all student-athletes for last semester is 3.19. The all-sport overview highlights numbers over the past two years for each team. Mike pointed out that Women’s gymnastics had an outstanding spring 2021 semester. They had a 3.62 cumulative team GPA.

- He also discussed the attendance policy, reiterating that student-athletes are only allowed to miss ten classes a semester related to their sport. If unforeseen circumstances cause them to miss more than the ten days, there is a process to approve it.

- Mike reviewed student-athlete class enrollment and majors for fall 2021. He shared that the most popular degrees were Health and Exercise Science, Human Relations, Communications, and Sociology. However, we do have a wide range of majors represented across all our student-athletes and teams.

- Mike gave insight on the study abroad program and mentioned that numbers had been down due to the pandemic and traveling restrictions. He noted that one student-athlete was able to participate. We are currently planning to participate in the short-term program for nine days in March of 2022.

- Mike reviewed student-athlete class enrollment and majors for fall 2021. He shared that the most popular degrees were Health and Exercise Science, Human Relations, Communications, and Sociology. However, we do have a wide range of majors represented across all our student-athletes and teams.

- Mike gave insight on the study abroad program and mentioned that numbers had been down due to the pandemic and traveling restrictions. He noted that one student-athlete was able to participate. We are currently planning to participate in the short-term program for nine days in March of 2022.

- Mike recognized our student-athletes accomplishments and achievements, which were seen across a variety of sports.

- Mike briefly reviewed the 2020-2021 student-athlete experience report and touched on a few significant events and programs administered for student-
athletes. He also went over the PROS services review, which outlines the psychological services offered to student-athletes. Mike stressed that there was a 173% increase in the number of students engaged in individual contact hours (counseling services). He also mentioned that there was a 7% decrease in the number of students seen. However, there was a 4% increase in the number of new students seen. Also, Mike mentioned that a new provider had been hired.

- Lastly, Mike shared that our Faculty In Residence (FIR) develops a yearly report that is included in the full Academic Annual Report. This section contains different engagement opportunities and happenings that occur in Headington Hall.

   - Athletic Directors Report
     - Mr. Castiglione shared that Faculty Senate extended an invitation to future meetings. He invited the group to let him know what they would like to address or cover. He stressed that he was more than willing to do so and shared his belief in transparency.
     - He mentioned that he would be focusing on two critical topics that have been in the news quite a bit. He wanted to provide an overview of where we are concerning them. The first topic was on the Alston Case and the Supreme Court action earlier this summer. He briefly reviewed the specifics of this action, detailing that NCAA took a judgment that was reached in the ninth District Court brought about by a lawsuit related to more financial benefits for student-athletes, commonly known as the Alston case. The NCAA actually lost that case, and the judge ruled on what they thought was appropriate, untethered to educational benefits for student-athletes. And there was a wide range of academic and sensible awards, medical benefits, support for other academic needs, by computers, or other things, kind of a broad range of things that an institution could provide. That would be considered still tethered to education. The NCAA then appealed the judgment, and the courts did not rule in their favor again. Since the decision, many institutions were left to figure out how to work through this ruling, as it quickly becomes a competitive matter, especially recruiting. He mentioned that the Supreme court and the NCAA left the authority up to the conference offices. The Big 12 conference left it up to the individual institutions to decide how they would handle how they would award the amount of $5,980.00. However, the conference did decide that only those receiving financial aid would be eligible for those funds.
     - Mr. Castiglione shared that the University of Oklahoma had a group of people in our program, staff members, compliance, and student-athlete representatives decide that student-athletes at the institution will have access to the $5980. He also stressed that this benefit is not a financial benefit or anything related to the cost of attendance. He described how student-athletes would be awarded these funds. They will be awarded based on incentives, academics, and student-athlete development. The idea behind this plan is to reward student-athletes for investing in themselves. He stressed that the institution feels that there needs to be a bar set that student-athletes must reach to access this incentive award.
Mr. Castiglione then went over name, image, and likeness (NIL). He mentioned that NIL is constantly changing, which often creates challenges. He talked about the opportunities that student-athletes at the university have been taking advantage of both locally and nationally. He mentioned that they are still in the process of coming out and will gain in the next couple of months asked products and services. He noted that it's in the forefront and that our student-athletes have been good at bringing ideas back to the clients.

Mr. Castiglione reiterated that the institution is not here to organize student-athletes' deals and negotiate deals related to their image and likeness. However, student-athletes must show the institution their agreements and any requests that they may get. So far, many of them have been reasonable. Although some may ask for certain things like our logos, many student-athletes don't control those. He also mentioned that the department launched a battery program, which serves as a monitoring program. The program is constantly evolving over time. It is a live certification program. He shared that we recently received some data demonstrating that we are one the best institutions in the production regarding our student-athletes. He mentioned that for the end of October, we've had a total number of 388 NIL transactions at some level, that's led to contracts of about 136 athletes involving 16 different sports. And the total of our contracts is around 100,000.

Faculty Athletics Representative Report

Dr. Greg Garn gave the FAR report and started by introducing Brittany Washington and sharing how great of an addition she has been to the Athletics Department and the excellent work she has done so far. He shared that she is helping him develop this year's FAR Report. After introducing her, he gave her the opportunity to introduce herself to the group. After her introduction, Brittany briefly provided the group with background on her academic and professional experiences. She is very excited to be joining the Athletics Department as a Graduate Assistant.

Dr. Garn elaborated on several points posed by Mr. Castiglione related to the Alston case. He shared that case had foundational implications for the NCAA to the point of where we're now in the process of changing our constitution. So quickly shared that the NCAA is changing in ways that the division appears to be so different, and the needs in the different divisions are so diverse that NCAA is struggling to hang together and figure things out. As a result, Dr. Garn expects conference offices to have more power and more distinctions between the various divisions. He then recognized Pat Fields, a football team member who received the National Football Foundation Post Scholarship award for $18,000 to continue his education beyond what he is doing.

Student Athlete Innovative Leaders Report

The Student-Athlete Innovative Leaders report was given. It was shared that the group hosted a movie night a Lloyd Noble. It was mentioned that attendance was down slightly due to COVID. They plan to host another movie night in December and show a Christmas movie. The group hosted a community event with elementary students, and the event went well. It was shared that football, track and field, tennis, among other
sports, had individual activities for the participants. The SAIL group plans to develop a website and increase its presence on social media.

- Dr. Garn asked about the representation of sports on the SAIL committee.
- It was shared that the representation is even across sports.

**March 2nd 2022**

- Dr. McLeod called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance
- Previous Minutes Approved
- Introductions were made
- Subcommittee Reports
  - Fiscal Integrity
    - Dr. Daniel Larson stated that this subcommittee focuses on the finances and budget of the athletic department. Dr. Larson is the subcommittee chair and gave the report. He also shared that the committee meets regularly with Marcus Bowman and Carrie Utley. Dr. Larson stated that they review budgets and funding and have a unique role within the council. The subcommittee met with an accounting firm, BKD. The subcommittee and reviewer looked at a submitted NCAA report with detailed information about OU's revenue and budgets. This report also included data about financial aid and how student-athlete participation plays a role in overall operations. Dr. Larson mentioned that the subcommittee and the accounting firm were able to review and pose questions related to the report. As they reviewed the report, Dr. Larson stated that 0 exceptions were found and that the report's findings were ordinary without garnering serious attention. He mentioned where OU athletics sits with the university and that we are generating as much as we spend. Another major topic that was assessed and discussed was the impact of COVID-19 on both the athletics department and campus-wide. He mentioned as the COVID year has passed, we are at flat levels, which is good. Dr. Larson then opened it up for questions.
  - Governance and Compliance
    - Alex Hensley gave the Governance and Compliance Subcommittee report and stated how important this report and compliance office is and how big of a job making sure that our student-athletes and staff stay in compliance year-round.
    - Alex Hensley shared that things are essentially back to normal in regards to regulation and that they are operating in how they were prior to COVID.
    - He then briefed the council on Alston and NIL. In regards to Alston, Alex Hensley briefed the ruling and its implications.
    - Alex shared that the report covers what the OU Athletic Department does as a whole. He mentioned that Sooner Success Retention Awards will commence in June of 2022. He gave an overview of the award and its requirements for student-athletes. A detailed explanation of the award is illustrated in Exhibit B of the 2021-2022 Athletics Council Compliance Report.
• Alex Hensley then gave an overview of NIL which, as of July 1st, 2021, student-athletes were permitted to use their name, image, and likeness for their financial gain. NIL does not permit the endorsement and promotion of an institution's services. A more detailed explanation of the NIL policy is provided in Exhibit A-1. In addition, student-athletes will receive an online curriculum that will help them navigate the NIL process and maximize their value. He also shared that INFLCR monitors the NIL process. Alex Hensley also stated that student-athletes are required to let compliance know the details of NIL contracts and compensation. Alex Hensley also shared that the OU Exchange began in December 2021. It is an easier way for small businesses to find our student-athletes.

• Alex Hensley shifted the conversation to the topic of NCAA major infractions. It was reported that 20 major infractions cases occurred nationally in 2021. He expressed that his figure was low due to COVID. Half of the cases were negotiated resolutions, including streamlined penalties. Most of the major national infractions were related to unethical conduct, impermissible recruiting, and lack of head coach control.

• In regard to OU athletics, Alex Hensley shared that we focus on providing education in these areas. He mentioned that we did not have any level 1 or level 2 violations. However, we did report 42 level III infractions, and the average in the Big 12 was 17. Alex Hensley gave an overview of Exhibit E, which illustrated that a large proportion of the infractions were related to recruiting.

• Dr. Garn asked for further clarification about Exhibit E and how it differs from other Big 12 institutions.

• Alex Hensley responded by stating that we do more monitoring compared to other schools in the conference. We have processed more infractions than other schools to protect us from higher-level infractions. Furthermore, Alex shared that our efforts related to reporting violations demonstrate institutional control, which is the philosophy of OU.

• Greg Anderson asked if the number of student-athletes or the number of sports contributed to the issue.

• Alex Hensley shared that he could not give an honest answer.

• Another NIL-related question was posed about INFLCR and Foundry related to how these platforms help student-athletes.

• Brent Sumler shared that educational tools are provided to help student-athletes understand and give them an overview of the NIL process and procedures.

• Dr. Gregg Garn asked about collectives and how the university would use them, and also about aspects of specific use.

• In response to his question, it was shared that it could be a myriad of things. We are still trying to determine what it could possibly be. It was shared that we
have been very strategic in making connections with eager boosters. The department wants to ensure that they are doing things the right way before giving the green light.

- Joe Castiglione also provided a response. He expressed that there will be multiple with different purposes. They will generate and share money, costing money for them to operate. This is pro-qui, they are interested in something. He further shared that this is a very unique time, new opportunities are unregulated, and there is not an easy answer to this. He shared that he is uncertain about regulation and that schools are going to test the waters. NCAA provided a waiver to schools. States will be changing laws, very unique places, and trying to navigate. He shared that we must prepare for a lot of bad ethics. NIL is not operating in the way it should on all avenues. Mr. Castiglione shared that those discussions related to NIL have shifted since last November, and the landscape is constantly evolving. Also, he shared that a bill was passed, and three weeks later, it changed.

- A question was asked related to how much of a distraction NIL is for student-athletes.

- Mike Meade shared that concerns are there, but the department has not seen a difference. We are still trying to adjust to this new change. It is important that messaging about NIL is clear, and that is evident in team rules. Mike Meade also shared that challenges related to NIL have been expressed to him by colleagues from other universities.

- Another question related to NIL was directed to the SAIL representative regarding their perspective.

- The SAIL representative shared that NIL has been a major topic of discussion, even before the Alston Ruling. They shared that it is critical that student-athletes go through INFLCR. It was also expressed that from their perspective, NIL opportunities are limited. As a result, it is not discussed much. However, it is still important to be up to date on NIL procedures and regulations.

- Joe Castiglione concludes this discussion by sharing that house. We are looking to define our role and how it serves all of our student-athletes, and that NIL is not acting as it should. He further shared that Softball has been the best team to activate within the space within the intended way of NIL. Hybrid is coming faster, allowing us to engage media partners.

- Athletic Directors Report
  - Mr. Castiglione started his report by sharing the recent news of the hiring of OU head football coach Brent Venables. He shared that we are embarking on an exciting and new transition in a variety of areas specifically related to recruitment. He advised the council that Brent can fulfill commitments as the new head coach and that his leadership is bringing us in a great direction.
Mr. Castiglione then recounted his last meeting with the OU Faculty Senate. He expressed that the meeting was productive, and they had plentiful points of discussion. He encouraged the committee to provide input and feedback for the next meeting.

Mr. Castiglione then transitioned to discussing the Alston Case. He mentioned that many activities are occurring related to the outcomes of this case. He noted that discussions based on institutional action plans for executing the Alston Ruling are only limited to the Big 12. We cannot see what other conferences are doing to develop their plans of action. It would cause collusion or a violation of antitrust. However, he mentioned that some institutions have made their plans public.

He stated that our team did a phenomenal job in developing our plan. He also shared that Brent Sumler did an excellent job in educating our teams based on our plan of action.

Mr. Castiglione also reiterated that this award is only available to student-athletes receiving aid. He also shared that this award is incentive-based. He also mentioned that this award clearly encourages and incentivizes student-athletes to invest in themselves. He followed up by expressing that the biggest advantage associated with this award is that every student-athlete receiving aid is eligible for the full amount of the award regardless of the amount of aid they receive.

Brent Sumler provided more details on the award. He shared that student-athletes are required to meet the requirements of a full academic year before receiving the award. They also must be on an active roster, cannot be in the transfer portal, and must be on an active roster for the following semester. The award is based on education success, career development, and community involvement. He mentioned that student-athletes could qualify for the career and community-based awards even if they don’t meet some of the educational award requirements. Student-athletes who are undergraduate students must be enrolled in 12 hours, and graduate students must be enrolled in 9 hours. Opportunities related to earning the educational award include attending two money coach sessions, creating a Handshake account, and updating their resumes every semester. They will also earn a bonus of $250 if they have 2.5 or higher. Regarding the career development aspect, student-athletes must attend two career development events such as meeting with career services, attend any OU career fair, or attend a Varsity O event. In order to fulfill the community service component, they must complete 5 hours of community service.

Student athletes’ participation and progress in meeting the award requirements are tracked using an Excel file. Sports admin and coach have access to the file. Also, student-athlete participation outside of athletics is also tracked. He also mentioned that OU athletics collaborates with other offices across campus to track student-athlete participation. Student-athletes are also able to upload their community service hours to a program, Helper. He further added that student-athletes are notified every Sunday about the events on a weekly basis and on a semester basis.

A question was posed regarding how student-athletes perceive the award requirements and if it was considered to provide the award once they graduate.
The conversation then turned to the potential impact of NIL on the financial aid process. Mr. Castiglione mentioned income generated from NIL could become taxable. NIL is going to affect Pell grants.

Brent contributed to the conversation, sharing that student-athletes have discussions about investing their money and strategies that allow them to manage their money. He shared that the goal is to equip them with skills that will benefit them once they graduate. He shared that Men’s golf has an investment program, NFTS, where they get the education that they need to make personal decisions.

As a follow-up to the Alston reward, Mike Meade shared that the Alston reward and financial management are beneficial for equivalency teams. He expressed that it could be a recruiting tool, serving to help some student-athletes to finance their education from a coach’s perspective.

Dr. Gregg Garn asked for clarity on the difference between headcount and equivalency sports.

Mike Meade stated that 100% of educational expenses are covered or 0%. Equivalency sports have a range.

Several committee members expressed that they appreciate the award models incentive base structure.

Faculty Athletics Representative Report

Dr. Gregg Garn began his report by sharing that Mike Meade's comments brought some things to his attention related to the transfer portal. He shared that the student-athletes are transferring at a unique time. He raised the idea of when it would be a good time for student-athletes to transfer in and then communicate to coaches. He expressed that there is no clear deadline for when student-athletes can transfer in.

Dr. Gregg Garn then applauded Brent Sumler’s efforts in supporting our student-athletes affected by the Ukraine/Russian Crisis. Dr. Gregg Garn gave Brent Sumler the opportunity to share what the department has done. Brent Sumler shared that as department talked about awareness and assessing who in the student-athlete population could be affected. They identified one student, and they reached out to the coach and offered support. Brent Sumler also shared that they reached out to former student-athletes and prospective student-athletes within guidelines. He also shared that Dr. Surratt was contacted to see what they’re doing university-wide and also PROs.

Overall, the department has done an excellent job in providing written and verbal support.

Student Athlete Innovative Leaders Report

It was shared that SAIL has been working a lot within their subcommittees. It was shared that SAIL is updating the Sooner Choice Awards for the next iteration of the awards showcase. It was also shared the committee is preparing for the next round of elections. They will be updating the election process for the upcoming election year.

May 11th, 2022

Dr. McLeod called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance

Previous Minutes Approved
Introductions were made

Athletic Directors Report

- Mr. Castiglione was unable to attend this meeting due to a conflict. Toby Baldwin provided an update and presentation on NIL in his absence.

- Toby Baldwin reported on NIL in place of the athletic director's report. Mr. Baldwin began by providing an overview of the collective process associated with NIL. We currently have one collective associated with the university, and we (athletics) can't be involved with them. It's called One Oklahoma. It was announced the Friday before the spring game on April 22, 2022. It is a group of like-minded businessmen and people interested in football, primarily Barry Switzer. They are working to be a 501© 3 charitable organization and work with our student-athletes to promote charities across the state of Oklahoma. They currently have about 30 charities they are working with. He elaborated by saying that they will pay our student-athletes to promote charities, make charitable organizations appearances, sign autographs for security events, and things like that.

- Mr. Baldwin also shared that we are currently in talks with several others and recently met with a group to support men's women's basketball as well. He also mentioned that we use a third party to educate student-athletes and coaches about collectives. It's our way of keeping an arm's length, where we have little control. Today, athletics has had over 900 transactions. He provided several examples of collectives, including taking a picture with a company's t-shirt while using a tagline, and they get to keep the t-shirt or the clothing item. He also shared that we've had several student-athletes receive use of a car.

- The recent adoption of the NIL has been used as an educational opportunity that they believe provides a holistic approach to student-athlete's lives. He credited the Student-Athlete Experience team, led by Brenton Sumler, for doing an excellent job in that regard.

- He mentioned that Brent does a great job putting together our student-athlete development. In support of the Alston case related to monetary compensation, student-athletes must have financial literacy classes every semester. Mr. Baldwin then gave an overview of the numbers related to student-athlete transactions. Our average value is $2,380. He shared that he is proud of gender equity in the transactions. Over 140 of our student-athletes have engaged in NIL. Compared to the other 150 Division I schools, who average transaction is $1,511, which is pretty positive, according to Mr. Baldwin. Regarding female student-athletes, we're 51/49, male to female, across the board. He shared that their goal is to be even across the board quickly. He mentioned that softball and gymnastics have driven the high number of female transactions. It is estimated that softball probably has more transactions than any other sport per capita, so it's very good across the board there. He stated that 26% of our student-athletes are participating in NIL compared to 20% at other schools. He mentioned that the reality, some student-athletes don't want to get into this sort of atmosphere. In his previous role in compliance with education, he saw similar patterns. Some student-athletes
would rather focus on other things. The stress of having 1090 and paying taxes serves as a deterrent. However, those student-athletes that want to maximize this prospect are being provided with the appropriate level of support related to educational opportunities. They are educating them to say some opportunities are very low on your time demands and can pay well. And then they're on the other spectrum, and large time demands are running your camp. He mentioned that we must figure out how to educate them on the contract side and negotiate those types of deals. To do this, we want to partner with the OU College of Law to talk about partnering with them. So those can teach those people how to help to contract their legal clinic, and we want to partner with them as well.

- He also mentioned the pursuit of partnering with OU's Business College and Gaylord to help provide necessary skills and support, such as communicative skills.
- Mr. Baldwin then opened up for questions. Someone asked him to elaborate on NIL transactions related to equity in terms of dollars. He mentioned that a handful of male athletes skewed numbers.

○ Faculty Athletics Representative Report
- Dr. Garn began his report by acknowledging all the hard work this committee has done this year. He also thanked Brittany Washington for their efforts and support in organizing these meetings this year. Dr. Garn then stressed the importance of getting faculty and staff around athletics so that we hear what's going on, the good, the bad, and everything in between. He then thanked athletics for their commitment as well. He recognized the challenges that often arise in their line of work. Dr. Garn again thanked and celebrated this group for their efforts.

○ Student Athlete Innovative Leaders Report
- A brief update on SAIL's student-athlete celebration was provided. It was a big success. They got a lot of good feedback from student-athletes, faculty, and staff. They are currently preparing for the upcoming school year

○ Other
- Dr. McLeod announced that the council must appoint a new athletics council chair. He shared that according to this kind of policy and practice used over the years, one of our faculty representatives is typically in the final year of their placement or term. He further added that we have one available candidate. He nominated Dr. Dalton to be the next chair. Brittany Washington will be sending out a Qualtrics Survey for members to cast votes. Dr. McLeod then prompted Dr. Dalton to introduce himself.
Meetings were held monthly, beginning in October of 2021 and ending in April of 2022.

We want to begin by praising University leadership for its careful stewardship of institutional resources. This complex task requires balancing the needs of multiple constituencies and we appreciate their approach in these challenging times. Before turning to specific recommendations for continued improvement, we want to note one area for commendation this year, in the area of transparency about the budget.

**Transparency:** Promoting faculty and staff engagement with the OU budget was an identified priority from last year, which we pursued jointly with the Faculty Senate Faculty Welfare Committee, and we want to note the substantial progress that was made here. Materials to facilitate informed dialogue about the University’s budget have been developed and should be made widely available going forward.

What follows are suggestions for continued attention and improvement:

**Website:** We need to make sure that the information on the budget council webpage is up to date. The roster and reports are now several years old. If it is difficult to keep the roster updated, we would recommend deleting that, or perhaps just listing the chairperson. We do want to ensure, however, the annual reports are posted by the following fall as these form an important resource for subsequent discussions.

**Communication:** The Budget Council is aware that the lapse in its functioning in 2019-20 affected communications within the University, but we are eager to again center the Budget Council in discussions of matters related to the budget. The Budget Council chair attends the large Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting every semester, which could promote better integration of these communications and can help ensure that communication to/from campus leadership is streamlined.

**Facilitating Shared Governance:** The discussions about financing the strategic plan, in particular, raised questions about shared governance. While the need to finance the plan undoubtedly arose when it was approved, and we cannot speak to that process, we would have appreciated more opportunity to consider the financing of this plan and to make recommendations. Since much of this planning occurs over the summer, after the state appropriation is known, it is important to have Budget Council leadership resolved by the spring of the preceding year.

We also would recommend having a plan in place for resuming meetings in the fall as early as possible. Identifying presidential and student appointments quickly is essential to realizing these goals. It wasn’t until
November of this academic year that we had a full Budget Council, which was much too late for adequate discussion of the proposal for financing the strategic plan.

**Research and Teaching:** We are also concerned by the growing emphasis on research at the University, which does not provide unrestricted revenues to support many of the core functions of the university, e.g., teaching. While none of us question the value of research to the state and its communities, we would like to see more active discussions about the priority of research in our annual budgets. Efforts to recruit excellent researchers often exacerbate inequalities in salaries and the cost of building and maintaining research facilities uses valuable and limited university resources.

**Responsibility Centered Management:** The move to Responsibility Centered Management also raises some concerns that warrant additional discussion. As units compete with each other for enrollments, we worry that this will introduce distortions to the curriculum, especially with regard to General Education classes. It is also not clear how research expenditures would figure into the revenue calculations for this approach.

**Faculty Salary Equity:** We continue to await requested results from analyses of the factors shaping faculty salaries.

**Leadership Transition:** The chair for the Budget Council in 2022-23 will be Jill Edy, from the Department of Communication in the Dodge Family College of Arts and Sciences.
CONTINUING EDUCATION COUNCIL (NORMAN)
2021-22 ANNUAL REPORT
SUBMITTED BY VINCENT DEBERRY, CHAIR

Overview:
- Respectfully submitted by Vincent Deberry, Chair of the Continuing Education Council (CEC)
- Context and outcomes presented
- Purposes of the CEC (see below)
- The CEC is under the umbrella of OU Outreach/College of Continuing Education (CCE’s) Senior Associate Vice President – Dr. Belinda Biscoe.

Outcomes of the CEC Annual Report are intended to:
- Provide context for the Continuing Education Council (CEC)
- Discuss how the CEC can best serve its members and the University of Oklahoma, i.e. informing campus dialogue and goal-setting (short and long term) for the Council
- Formulate new goals, outcomes (short and/or long-term) for the Council

Purposes of the Continuing Education Council (CEC):
The Continuing Education Council (CEC) works with and supports the Senior Associate Vice President for University Outreach/College of Continuing Education and reports to the Faculty Senate on matters concerning non-credit, non-degree continuing education. The Council provides a forum for faculty and administrators to discuss lifelong learning as it impacts the University of Oklahoma. It also serves an advocacy role in raising the level of campus discussion on such issues as:
- Cross-disciplinary interaction
- The role of the University in non-credit, non-degree workplace education and community/public service
- Certification and non-credit, non-degree programming
- Non-credit, non-degree interdisciplinary continuing education
- Non-credit, non-degree distance education

The CEC serves a proactive role in providing information about outreach and lifelong learning to the Faculty Senate, the Provost’s Office, and the President’s Office and informing campus dialogue regarding these issues. In addition, the CEC provides substantive input and acts as a constructive sounding board for the Senior Associate Vice President and CCE staff regarding outreach and non-credit, non-degree distance education, and lifelong learning. Finally, the CEC serves as a liaison between the President’s office, the College of Continuing Education, and the faculty and staff, providing effective communication between these and other campus groups.

Administrative Liaison:
1. The Provost of the Norman campus or a designated representative will be an ex-officio member of the Council without vote.
2. The Vice President for Outreach will be an ex-officio member of the Council without vote and will provide staff support for the Council.
CONTINUING EDUCATION COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Committee Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>André Wright</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Biscoe</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Díaz de la Rubia</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td>VACANT Faculty/HSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Hewes</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Grunsted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talisha Haltiwanger Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Pitblado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Meredith Raymond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kimmel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Shreder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendees:

- Michelle Grunsted
- Michael Soreghan
- Shannon Johansen
- Vincent Deberry, Chair
- Nina Barbee

CEC 2021-2022 MEETINGS

The CEC Committee meetings this year were held on November 10, 2021, March 29, 2022, and April 22, 2022. For context, at the first meeting, the Outreach/CCE historical document was shared with the CEC:

**Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education – Now, Outreach/College of Continuing Education**

In 1937, Thurman J. White came to the University of Oklahoma as an instructor in what was then called the extension division. White had a passion for adult education, believing all adults should have access to continual education and training to keep up with the increasing demands of social and technological change. White’s vision and leadership eventually led to the formation of the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education. In 1957, White secured one of 12 grants given by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for creating university-based residential conference centers around the world. The grant, the largest the university had received to date, was used to build the Thurman J. White Forum and other structures that, when completed in 1962, formed the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education. As OCCE developed and expanded, the International Association of Continuing Education Hall of Fame was added. We partner with public agencies and organizations to build healthy, safe, and sustainable communities, create a more fair and democratic society, and increase civic involvement.

- **CORE VALUES shared:**
  - **Lifelong Learner** - The lifelong learner is at the core of every activity in which we are engaged.
  - **Lifelong Learning**
    As an organization involved in the educational enterprise, we will engage in those activities that foster lifelong learning.
  - **Change Agent**
    We provide leadership for societal change by enhancing and enriching the communities with which we are involved.
  - **Respect, Civility, Social Responsibility**
    Respect, civility, and social responsibility are fundamental to all of our interpersonal interactions.
  - **Stewardship**
    We strive to be effective stewards of the resources we manage to ensure they are leveraged for maximum efficiency.
  - **Cultural Inclusion**
    All of our activities and programs reflect the high value we place on cultural inclusiveness.
  - **Trust**
    Trustworthiness and cooperation are characteristic of all our work relationships.
Knowledge Sharing
We value sharing knowledge and information that enables us to transcend organizational barriers, communicate ideas, and better serve our constituents.

Continuous Improvement
In response to changing environments, we strive for continuous improvement in our staff development, corporate capacity, and service to others.

Outreach/CCE Departments: More than 16 diverse departments focusing on education, business as well as public and community services.

Continuing Education Council (CEC) Meeting
Wednesday, November 10, 2021       Noon – 1:00 p.m. central
Via Zoom

Purposes of the Continuing Education Council (CEC):
The CEC provides a forum for faculty and administrators to discuss lifelong learning as it impacts the University of Oklahoma as well as cross-disciplinary issues, the role of the University in non-credit, non-degree workplace education and community/public service; certification and non-credit, non-degree programming, interdisciplinary continuing education, and distance education.
The CEC serves an active role in providing information about outreach and lifelong learning to the Faculty Senate, the Provost’s Office, and the President’s Office and informing campus dialogue regarding these issues. In addition, the CEC provides substantive input and acts as a constructive sounding board for the Senior Associate Vice President and CCE staff regarding outreach and non-credit, non-degree distance education, and lifelong learning. Finally, the CEC serves as a liaison between the President’s Office, the College of Continuing Education, and the faculty and staff, providing effective communication between these and other campus groups.

Meeting Purposes – to:
• Introduce current and past CEC members
• Provide orientation to membership
• Begin discussing Outreach/College of Continuing Education (CCE) partnerships and collaborations with other colleges, schools, and departments

Meeting Outcomes:
• Orientation provided to CEC members
• History and current context of OU Outreach/College of Continuing Education provided
• Action steps recorded for CEC work moving forward to include collaborations

Meeting Facilitators:
• Vince Deberry, CEC Chair – Director ,Center for Public Management, Outreach/CCE
• Nina Barbee, CEC Coordinator – Director, Continuing Education, Outreach/CCE
• Belinda Biscoe – Ex-Officio CEC, Senior Associate Vice President, Outreach/CCE

AGENDA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>1. Welcome</td>
<td>Chair, Vincent Deberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Land Acknowledgement</td>
<td>Nina Barbee (Choctaw)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Brief remarks from Provost Wright</td>
<td>Provost Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Introductions – Name, Title, Affiliation</td>
<td>Nina Barbee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Agenda overview</td>
<td>Belinda Biscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Review of CCE Historical Document with CEC Members</td>
<td>Belinda Biscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Orientation: History and current context for Outreach/CCE including</td>
<td>Belinda Biscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary film: “Mirrors from the Past”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. New business:</td>
<td>Vince Deberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion about Outreach partnerships and collaborations with other colleges,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schools, and departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>Chair, Vincent Deberry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MINUTES:**

Introductions were made by Committee Members and Outreach Staff. Dr. Biscoe would like the CEC Committee to help be a bridge to Outreach, faculty and community. Showed the Mission Statement and departments. Outreach helps to match the mission of the University with the community. As an orientation for new members Dr. Biscoe shared a documentary film, that she and staff produced several years ago “Mirrors from the Past: Reflections and Directions for the Future” about OU Outreach/College of Continuing Education and the Division of Public and Community Services. The documentary provides a historical perspective about the evolution of the college and its important role in connecting the university faculty and staff over many decades to transformational work in the State of Oklahoma, nation, and the world, including providing programs and services for the adult and life-long learner. As the outreach arm of the university we continue to connect “town and gown” in ways that improve the quality of life for individuals and communities. The film showed a long and impactful history highlighting the many collaborations established and programs developed by Outreach/CCE and the Division of Public and Community Services spanning decades. The film showed that since its inception Outreach/CCE is almost 100% self-supporting. That is a little-known fact in many circles. The film focused on the mission and core values. Interestingly, committee members were excited to learn about the many collaborations Outreach/CCE has developed and maintained, i.e. joint programming with academic colleges, noncredit programming partners, and service/work stemming from federal, state, local, and regional funding sources, including foundations. The documentary film was extremely well-received and offered an opportunity for group sharing and many thoughtful questions from members. Several ideas were proposed, and the members suggested continuing the discussion for innovative and collaborative programming across campus for all future meetings. Feedback from
members indicated an interest to explore the Outreach/CCE website to learn more. The video recording of the meeting and the PowerPoint slides were sent to CEC Members. New business included lively discussion about Outreach/CCE partnerships and collaborations. The conversation will continue in more depth in the March 29, 2022 CEC Meeting.

Continuing Education Council (CEC) Meeting
Tuesday, March 29, 2022  2:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. central
Thurman J. White Forum Bldg., Suite B1-3
In-Person

Purposes of the Continuing Education Council (CEC):
The CEC provides a forum for faculty and administrators to discuss lifelong learning as it impacts the University of Oklahoma as well as cross-disciplinary issues, the role of the University in non-credit, non-degree workplace education and community/public service; certification and non-credit, non-degree programming, interdisciplinary continuing education, and distance education.
The CEC serves an active role in providing information about outreach and lifelong learning to the Faculty Senate, the Provost’s Office, and the President’s Office and informing campus dialogue regarding these issues. In addition, the CEC provides substantive input and acts as a constructive sounding board for the Senior Associate Vice President and CCE staff regarding outreach and non-credit, non-degree distance education, and lifelong learning. Finally, the CEC serves as a liaison between the President’s Office, Outreach/College of Continuing Education (CCE), and the faculty and staff, providing effective communication between these and other campus groups.

Meeting Purposes – to:
- Highlight mutually beneficial partnerships and collaborations between Outreach/CCE and OU academic units that positively impact OU, the community, state, and nation.
- Discuss pending partnerships and collaborations between Outreach/ (CCE with other colleges, schools, departments, and programs, including funding and other benefits.

Meeting Facilitators:
- Vincent Deberry, CEC Chair – Director, Center for Public Management, Outreach/CCE
- Belinda Biscoe – Ex-Officio CEC, Senior Associate Vice President, Outreach/CCE
- Nina Barbee (Choctaw) – CEC Coordinator, Director for Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning, Director for the American Indian Institute (Aii), Outreach/CCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>1. Welcome Context Setting</td>
<td>Vince Deberry, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Land Acknowledgement</td>
<td>Belinda Biscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nina Barbee (Choctaw)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MINUTES:**

The group was welcomed by CEC Chair, Vincent Deberry. The land acknowledgement was given by Nina Barbee. Dr. Biscoe provided context for the meeting – building on the goals and outcomes discussed in the November meeting.

Due to the amount of material to cover and the time constraint for the length of the meeting, the Minutes were deferred by Vince Deberry.

Introductions were made by CEC Members and several Outreach directors. The directors were invited to share a few highlights of their collaborations and partnerships across the OU campus with academic units. It is noted that time allowed for just a few presentations to be made. The presenters focused on specific points as each presentation followed a model or template. This kept the focus consistent and of value throughout. Of importance was how this intersection of colleges, departments, schools, and programs with Outreach have proven to be mutually beneficial in terms of providing programs that serves the service and community mission of the university in addition to the business side of this work or financial enhancements.

The presentations also identified the ultimate outcomes everyone seeks to achieve and how the work of our college with these partners is aligned with **Pillars One and Two in the OU Live on University Strategic Plan.** After each presentation, questions were entertained
Although the focus of this meeting was to showcase ongoing work. The directors did provide the group with exciting information about programming to come, things in progress, and future collaborative efforts between OU Outreach/CCE within OU and outside partners and connections in the state of Oklahoma, the region, nationally, and internationally.

The presentations were well-received as indicated by feedback from CEC members.

To build on the seeds of potential shared, the next meeting, April 29, 2022, will build on this platform. The group was given specific questions (below) to ponder prior to the meeting. The directors are invited again, and this time will bring one of their partners to share more about how the partnership works. It will be an interactive and robust discussion including a collaborative activity that demonstrates the many facets – benefits and challenges – of true collaborative work.

- Where is your college, department, school, program headed in the future where funding and collaboration might be helpful?
- What collaborative partnerships do you have within the university?
- What is the ultimate outcome you want to achieve?
- What collaborative interdisciplinary partnerships can help you achieve your outcomes?

Takeaways and next meeting—Deeper dive into cross-campus interdisciplinary collaborations. The intention is to keep the conversation going – seedlings bloom for the future.

Continuing Education Council (CEC) Luncheon Meeting
Friday, April 22, 2022  11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. central
Thurman J. White Forum Bldg., Suite B1-3

The third meeting included CEC members, CCE directors who presented at the March 29th meeting and some of the partners engaged with Outreach/CCE departments in collaborative work. The purpose was to paint a picture of how these partnerships can provide additional support to assist with grant and contract development as well as other innovative programming. This meeting provided robust discussion with all attendees to understand existing faculty partnerships, desired outcomes, and how the council might communicate through the faculty senate about potential opportunities for new and innovative research and programming.

Purposes of the Continuing Education Council (CEC):
The CEC provides a forum for faculty and administrators to discuss lifelong learning as it impacts the University of Oklahoma as well as cross-disciplinary issues, the role of the University in non-credit, non-degree workplace education and community/public service; certification and non-credit, non-degree programming, interdisciplinary continuing education, and distance education.
The CEC serves an active role in providing information about outreach and lifelong learning to the Faculty Senate, the Provost’s Office, and the President’s Office and informing campus dialogue regarding these issues. In addition, the CEC provides substantive input and acts as a constructive sounding board for the Senior Associate Vice President and CCE staff regarding outreach and non-credit, non-degree distance education, and lifelong
learning. Finally, the CEC serves as a liaison between the President’s Office, Outreach/College of Continuing Education (CCE), and the faculty and staff, providing effective communication between these and other campus groups.

Meeting Purposes – to:
- Build on March 29th meeting outcomes that highlighted a few mutually beneficial partnerships and collaborations between Outreach/CCE and OU academic units that positively impact OU, the community, state, and nation while aligning with Pillars 1 and 2 of the University Live On Strategic Plan.
- Continue the conversation outlined in the action steps from March 29th -- specifically --discuss pending and potential partnerships and collaborations between Outreach/ (CCE with other colleges, schools, departments, and programs, including funding and other benefits. Take a deeper dive into cross-campus interdisciplinary collaborations.

Meeting Facilitators:
- Vincent Deberry, CEC Chair – Director, Center for Public Management, Outreach/CCE
- Belinda Biscoe – Ex-Officio CEC, Senior Associate Vice President, Outreach/CCE
- Nina Barbee (Member of the Choctaw Nation) – CEC Coordinator, Director for Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning, Director for the American Indian Institute (Aii), Outreach/CCE

### Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>1. Welcome as we enjoy lunch</td>
<td>Vince Deberry, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Land Acknowledgement</td>
<td>Nina Barbee (Choctaw)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Approval of the Minutes (two previous meetings)</td>
<td>Vincent Deberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Introductions – CEC Members – Name, Title, Affiliation</td>
<td>Vincent Deberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Special appreciation and thank you to CEC Chair, Vincent Deberry</td>
<td>Belinda Biscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Election of new CEC Chair:</td>
<td>Nina Barbee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nomination form was sent to all CEC members this week via email for confidential responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We now ask for any additional nominations from the floor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Voting: Each member’s vote will be written on small papers provided and collected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For those CEC members not in attendance, an email voting form will be emailed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The total votes will be tabulated, and the new CEC Chair will be announced via email.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Note: All nominees are contacted to confirm their willingness and availability to participate in this role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Setting context for the meeting</td>
<td>Belinda Biscoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

slides
8. Icebreaker: Collaborative Superpowers  
Nina Barbee

slides  
9. Discussion: 
Mutual Benefits of Collaborations from the perspectives of CCE and partners  
Belinda Biscoe

slides  
10. Imagine Tomorrow: Next steps 
Let’s keep the conversation going. 
What opportunities exist for the next school year?  
Belinda Biscoe

1:00 p.m.  Adjourn  
Vincent Deberry, Chair

MINUTES:

The group was welcomed by CEC Chair, Vincent Deberry. The land acknowledgement was given by Nina Barbee (Choctaw). Dr. Biscoe provided context for the meeting – building on the goals and outcomes discussed in the March meeting.

Minutes from the two previous meetings were reviewed and approved by the CEC. A motion was made by Bonnie Pitblado and seconded by Christina Miller.

Introductions were given by CEC Members in attendance, OU Outreach/College of Continuing Education (CEC) presenters, and OU academic partners. Attendees included: André Wright, Belinda Biscoe, Bonnie Pitblado, Vince Deberry, Christina Miller, Dena Newhouse for Michelle Grunsted, Kate Meredith Raymond, Michael Soreghan, Talisha Haltiwanger Morrison, Susan Kimmel, Charlene Shreder, Nina Barbee, Shannon Johansen, Dick Pryor, Jennifer Dell, Geneva Stretch, Annie Baghdayan, Maria Cox (via Zoom), Sandra Whalen, and Sepideh Stewart, Associate Professor of Mathematics, OU Mathematics Department.

Belinda Biscoe extended appreciation to outgoing CEC Chair, Vincent Deberry. The group acknowledged his service and thoughtfully applauded his service.

**Election of new CEC Chair:** A nomination form was sent to all CEC members via email for confidential responses (nominations). Nominations were requested from the floor. Following this process, the new CEC Chair was unanimously confirmed as Dr. Bonnie Pitblado, The Robert E. and Virginia Bell Endowed Professor in Anthropological Archaeology, Ph.D. University of Arizona, 1999, OU Dodge Family of Arts and Sciences, Department of Anthropology. She has been an active member of the CEC and we are honored and excited to welcome her as Chair.

Belinda Biscoe gave brief context for the meeting. Questions posed from the March meeting to ponder about future collaborations across academic units were tied in with the goals of the April meeting. Nina Barbee facilitated an icebreaker – Collaborative Superpowers.

After some discussion of desired collaborative superpowers, Biscoe shared a few slides about the mutual benefits of collaborations from the perspectives of CCE and partners. A few of the partners were in attendance and then gave presentations to the group about the intersecting needs of departments, colleges, and schools.
and those of CCE. Success stories about students were shared, i.e. School of Social Work and the collaboration and partnership grant work with the OU Mathematics Department, featuring Dr. Sepideh Stewart.

This spurred discussion and questions among group members. Members envisioned future collaborative work with CCE and others. It was also recognized that this work identified the ultimate outcomes everyone seeks to achieve and how the work of our college with these partners is aligned with Pillars One and Two in the OU Live on University Strategic Plan.

The meeting ended with a few next steps for reflection:
Imagine Tomorrow: Let’s keep the conversation going.
What opportunities exist for the next school year?

CEC Chair, Vincent Deberry adjourned the meeting. Words of appreciation for his service were again shared.

A FEW HIGHLIGHTS
OUTREACH/COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION (CCE)

- OU Outreach/CCE, the “outreach arm” of the University of Oklahoma, oversees and coordinates the Outreach Certificate Review Committee (CRC).
  **Purpose:** To provide a means of recognizing participation or achievement of participants attending noncredit continuing education activities and to provide program directors a mechanism with which to motivate persons to participate in activities. The University of Oklahoma (OU) offers three types of certificates, each representing a different level of participation or achievement. The University of Oklahoma Board of Regents authorized the basis of this policy.

- **A Few Examples of OU Outreach/CCE Programming 2021-2022:**
  Continuation of technology bootcamps (Fullstack Academy partnership) to include:
  - Cybersecurity (fulltime and part-time)
  - Coding (fulltime and part-time)
  New program launches include:
  - Data Analytics
  - Developer Operations
  - Product Management

- **New launch: Spring 2022 – Department: CPM**
  Facilitating Virtual Learning: Approved by the Outreach Certificate Committee (CRC) in April for roll out for a Certificate of Achievement.

- **The American Indian Institute (Aii) launched a new Native Perspectives Virtual Speaker Series and the first-ever virtual MicroConference held in November.**

- **New grant programs, i.e. EDUTAS, professional learning for public school administrators throughout the State of Arkansas.**
CCE offers a diverse array of noncredit certificate programming designed for the adult learner/lifelong learner, ie. meeting career needs of professionals to upskill, reskill and build talent stacks, developing custom training for community (educational) leaders, etc. Learning that spans a lifetime.

CCE collaborates to form successful partnerships with individuals, departments, organizations, businesses and communities (regionally and nationally) focused on the adult learner (noncredit certificate programs) and community-based learning.

We invite you to learn more by visiting our website: outreach.ou.edu.
The University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors is a 10–12-member committee. The Provost/President may also appoint one alum and one student. Five faculty are from OU-HSC and five faculty are from Norman.

AWARDS: David Boren, David Ross Boyd, Regents Professorship, Regents Awards for Superior Teaching, Superior Research and Creative Activity, Superior Professional and University Service & Public Outreach, University Distinguished Teaching Award, General Education Teaching Award, Merrick Foundation Teaching Award.

On September 10, 2021, the UCFAH Chairs Past and Present meet with Provosts’ Offices Staff for training. The Provosts’ Offices (Norman and OUHSC) share responsibility for soliciting nominations, uploading dossiers, and scheduling the Fall meeting of the committee, and the Spring meeting where we identify awardees. On October 12, 2021, a memo was sent to Chairs and Directors soliciting nominations for Faculty Awards and Honors.

On November 2 - 3, 2021 the UCFAH held the Fall Meeting. The committee members met in November to outline duties of this committee, walk committee members through the evaluation process, online platform that hosts dossiers. At those meetings, Council reviewed the UCFAH Charter, and proposed several edits. These were approved by the Provosts and recently approved by the Faculty Senate. We appreciate your help in ensuring that these governing documents remain relevant and up to date.

Committee members had an additional meeting in November with Dr. Jane Irungu to address strategies to identify and mitigate implicit bias in the review of candidates for faculty awards and honors. In future years, the Chair recommends that this training be part of the Fall Meeting.

On December 10, 2021, all committee members had access to nominees’ dossiers. This year, we reviewed 49 nominations. Committee members review ½ of these nominations, on an A team or B team. The Chair reviews all nominations. All evaluations were due to the Provosts’ Office (Norman, or HSC) on January 11, 2022.

On January 19, 2022, committee members held the Spring meeting over Zoom to review scores, discuss merits of individual dossiers and determine the committee’s recommendations to the Provosts. We recommended: 2 recipients for the David Boren Professorship (1 Norman/1 OUHSC), 1 recipient for David Ross Boyd Professorship, 2 recipients for Regents Professorship (1 Norman/1 OUHSC), 2 recipients for Regents’ Award for Superior Professional and University Service (1 Norman/1 OUHSC), 5 recipients for Regents’ Award for Superior Teaching (3 Norman/2 OUHSC), 1 recipient for General Education Award, 1 recipient for University Distinguished Teaching Award, and 1 recipient for the Merrick Teaching Award. The committee elected Dr. Andrew John from the HSC campus to serve as Chair next year.

A memo was sent to the Provosts’ Offices on January 25, 2022. (Attached at end.)

The awards were announced by Provosts’ Offices on April 15, 2022. All nominators whose nominee did not receive an award or honor received substantive feedback from the committee identifying the specific elements that would strengthen a future nomination, either in that same award, or for a different award if the committee determined another award that would be a better fit for that candidate.

As departing Chair, I am happy to provide Units with advice re: the awards and nomination process. Committee members share a commitment to recognize faculty from all Units, read files attentively to comprehend the full arc of a nominee’s career, and to identify those faculty who we hope serve as models of truly outstanding work as teachers, researchers, and in University, community, or disciplinary service. Prior to the end of the year, expect to work with CFE on a Nomination Workshop.
MEMORANDUM

CONFIDENTIAL

TO:    Andrée-Denis Wright, Ph.D., Senior Vice President and Provost
       Norman Campus

       Gary E. Raskob, Ph.D., Interim Senior Vice President and Provost
       Health Sciences Center

FROM:  Jennifer Davis, Ph.D.
       Chair, University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors

DATE:  January 26, 2022

SUBJECT: Recommendations of the University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors

1)    The University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors met on Wednesday, January 19, 2022, to consider nominees and recommend recipients of awards. The purpose of this memorandum is to offer the findings of the Council.

The following members were present:

Jennifer Davis (Chair)    History    College of Arts and Sciences
Ioana Giones             Communication    College of Arts and Sciences
Andrew John              Communication Sciences and Disorders    College of Allied Health
Emily Johnson            Modern Languages, Literatures and Linguistics    College of Arts and Sciences
Emma Kientz              Nursing    College of Nursing
Frederick Miller         Medicine    College of Medicine
Annie Moreau             Ophthalmology    College of Medicine
Thomas Neeson             Geography and Environmental Sustainability    College of Atmospheric and Geographic Sciences
Raymond Orr              Native American Studies    College of Arts and Sciences
Wei Yue                   Pharmaceutical Sciences    College of Pharmacy
Tavana Farzaneh           Student    Student Government Association

2)    An outstanding group of 49 highly qualified nominees were evaluated. The members of the Council are to be commended for the difficult challenge of selecting from such a distinguished group of nominees.
Our recommendations for the 2021-2022 academic year are as follows (in alphabetical order, by category):

**David L. Boren Professorship** (4 Nominations Received)

- Georgia Kosmopoulos
- Kenneth Randall

Department of Economics
Department of Rehabilitation Sciences
College of Arts and Sciences
College of Allied Health

**David Ross Boyd Professorship** (6 Nominations Received)

- Tohren Kibbey

Civil Engineering and Environmental Science
College of Engineering

An HSC nominee is not being recommended for this award because the nominees’ scores did not merit an award in this category.

**Regents’ Professorship** (3 Nominations Received)

- Amanda Bogie
- Petra Klein

Department of Pediatrics
School of Meteorology
College of Medicine
College of Atmospheric and Geographic Sciences

**Regents’ Award for Superior Professional and University Service and Public Outreach** (9 Nominations Received)

- Sherri Baker
- Sarah Ellis

Department of Pediatrics
School of Music
College of Medicine
College of Fine Arts

**Regents’ Award for Superior Research and Creative Activity** (7 Nominations Received)

- Mary Beth Humphrey
- Pierre-Emmanuel Kastetter

Department of Medicine
School of Meteorology and School of Civil Engineering and Environmental Science
College of Medicine
College of Atmospheric and Geographic Sciences and College of Engineering

**Regents’ Award for Superior Teaching** (13 Nominations Received)

*By policy, the majority of the Regents’ Awards must be given in the category of Superior Teaching.*

- Eric Abraham
- Shannon Dulin
- T. Karl Hoskison
- Misty Miller
- Lindsay Robertson

Department of Physics and Astronomy
School of Geosciences
Department of Internal Medicine
Department of Clinical and Administrative Sciences
College of Law

College of Arts and Sciences
College of Earth and Energy
School of Community Medicine, College of Medicine
College of Pharmacy
College of Law
General Education Teaching Award (1 Nomination Received)

Eligibility limited to Norman Campus

David Boeck Division of Architecture College of Architecture

University Distinguished Teaching Award (5 Nominations Received)

Tarren Shaw Department of Biology College of Arts and Sciences

Merrick Teaching Award (1 Nomination Received)

Eligibility limited to Norman Campus

Eric Johnson College of Law College of Law

3) 2022-2023 Committee: After a committee vote, Andrew John, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Allied Health, HSC campus, agreed to serve as Chair of the University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors for the 2022-2023 term.

4) Other Business:

Charter Update: All committee members voted unanimously to update the University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors Charter with approval by both Provosts.

All committee members attended an Implicit Bias workshop prior to reviewing the nomination dossiers and meeting. We also paid primary attention to the criteria for each award as instructed. We are pleased to report the final gender distribution below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominations</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU Norman</td>
<td>24 (62%)</td>
<td>15 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUHSC</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26 (53%)</td>
<td>23 (47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>9 (53%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The members of the committee thank you for the opportunity to participate in this very important process. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 405.255.4306. Thank you.
Email

- Three years ago: staff and faculty who leave the university will have their email addresses disabled
  - Faculty have a one year grace period; it is much shorter for staff.
  - Emeritus faculty will continue to maintain their email address.
  - For those who are continuing to perform services for the university, they are able to maintain their email address if a sponsoring unit requests it. This extension is reviewed annually.

- New email policy is currently being discussed:
  - All university business over email must be conducted through the OU email system.
    - University business seems to be defined as anything that touches OU in some way. This seems to include conversations with granting agencies, with journals (submissions and reviews), with professional societies and with community service organizations.
    - Communication with and by students is apparently covered, as well.
  - Concerns
    - Poor performance of the OU servers.
    - Delayed support for non-Windows-based clients. These delays can be on the order of years.
    - Email filtering rules drop critical messages from students without warning or error messages.
      - In CS, it is common for us to exchange code by email (this is *much* more convenient than other forms of code exchange when helping students with quick coding questions). However, many of these messages are dropped without error by the OU servers.
    - Faculty professional lives are bigger than our service to OU. Our network-based identities need to be persistent across all of these activities and across time (including beyond our formal association with OU). Hence, faculty are encouraged to establish non-OU email identities. But, this is in conflict with the coming requirements that all OU-related traffic be through the OU email servers.
    - Faculty/staff should not be responsible for enforcing the rules about OU email. For example, what happens when students send email from non-OU addresses?

- Phishing testing
  - OUIT catches ~90% of phishing attempts before they reach our mail boxes
  - Individuals need to be wary of the content of email, including opening of pdf files and the web links that are included in email and contained documents
  - Outlook has a ‘report phishing’ button that can be used if someone suspects that an email is a phishing attempt
  - In testing, OU Norman was at ~7% ‘gocha’ rate. Industry standard is 4%.
  - Individuals who open offending pdfs or web links are required to participate in additional training and are subject to an even greater number of ‘gotcha’ probes.
Concerns
  - Tools for detecting/reporting offending pdf are not available for all email clients.

Security Policies
- OUIT has been proposing a range of security policies that can affect research that is done by many groups on campus. Includes:
  - How we access our computers from off campus.
  - How we secure our data.
  - How we share data and computing with collaborators on and off campus.
- New end-point device policy (desktops, laptops, etc.)
  - IT expects to have admin access to all machines.
  - IT will be installing software updates and executing scanning tools.
  - Personally owned machines are expected to satisfy all security requirements. No policing by OUIT is planned for these machines. But, OUIT has been explicit about individuals assuming the risk for lost data.
- Encryption
  - All portable storage devices must be encrypted. OUIT has a central key escrowing system for this.
  - We have had one incident already where many individuals were locked out of their encrypted files for multiple days.
- Multi-factor authentication
  - Generally, seems to be working well.
  - Expect continued expansion of its use.
  - Moving from Duo to Ping
- OUIT will be hiring more staff to address security.
- Passwords
  - Small change to password requirements.
  - Passwords must be changed at least once per 365 days.

Student Issues
- Computers not subject to security requirements.
- OU has transitioned over to using electronic ID cards (called “Mobile ID”). Some faculty do not accept these as valid IDs for entry into exams.
  - Virtual card readers are available through the Sooner Card office for this authentication.
- MyMedia videos that are recordings of a class cannot be used outside of that class. This is being done to protect the privacy of student participants at the cost of being able to use videos in other contexts.

General Issues
- Preferred names: everyone has the ability to specify a preferred name in accounts.ou.edu. IT is working to have various OU systems referred to this preferred name rather than one’s given name. If a user finds a system that uses their given name, they should contact OUIT.
Communication
• Trying to figure out how best to communicate to all faculty about critical issues. Seem to be settling on a quarterly email message.
• Also willing to visit individual units to discuss OUIT policies and challenges.

IT Governance
• New committees are being set up for IT governance. Seem to be about making policy decisions. ITC only plays an advisory role, so we are not part of this process.
• Faculty senate has already appointed a member to the Teaching & Learning committee.
• Expecting a Research committee to start soon.
• External review panel for research computing has been convened; will visit in July.

Computer Purchases
• Restrictions on purchases have been relaxed, specifically for externally provided funds and some internal funds (e.g., start-up packages)
• Some restrictions for what hardware can be purchased. These stem from federal requirements.
• Supply chain problems still delaying purchases & will continue to do so for a while.
• Purchases of Apple computers are no longer being held up (there was a prior concern about a security bug in the M1 processor).
• Approval process for non-standard computing purchases is opaque. There seems to be a long chain of individuals that must approve purchases, but faculty have no way of tracking/facilitating progress through this chain.

Supercomputer and Associated Services
• OURdisk: central harddisk system that is maintained by OUIT. Cost to start is just the purchase of the disks; OUIT handles installation and covers cost of power/cooling/maintenance.
  o Can be mounted on supercomputer or computers external to OUIT, but unclear that both are possible simultaneously.
  o $860 / share (10 TB)
• OURstore: central tape backup system. Cost to start is just the purchase of tapes. $50 / share (7.65 TB)
• OURcloud: cloud computing nodes. Just have to buy a share of a computer. $347 / share
• New supercomputer is coming online now; ready for general use in the Fall. Includes many new GPUs.
  o Flash disk cache
  o Groups can purchase computing that is part of the supercomputer, but is reserved only for their use
• Globus: new service for exchanging large data sets with those from outside OU.
• Support for HIPAA and other sensitive information coming in 2023 (both storage and computation).

ITC Membership
• One current ITC faculty member left the university in December 2021 and needs to be replaced: Sam Workman (term: 2021-2024)
Next/Continuing Big Tasks

- Getting Research and Teaching use cases in front of the key IT decision makers.
  - Need to be clear about what our requirements are.
- Develop a vision for Research Data. What should OU be doing with respect to managing, securing, backing up, sharing research data? Are we satisfying obligations to funding agencies for making code and data available?
- IT Policies and Standards are written with very legalistic language. To those outside of IT, it is often unclear who the actors are and what they are required to do. We need to bridge this gap if these are going to have any meaning.
History and Membership:
Research Council was approved as a council by the President of the university upon recommendation of the Faculty Senate and The University of Oklahoma Student Association in December, 1972 and revised May 10, 1974, June 28, 1978, and July 2, 1982. Council was restructured Spring 1991. Research Council consists of fifteen members, five are appointed by the Office of the President, ten by Faculty Senate.

In 2013, the Faculty Senate approved a plan to balance the Research Council membership to reflect the disciplines represented by recent patterns among submitted proposals. The new structure for the Research Council began in 2014-2015, and is as follows at the end of the 2020-2021:

- Engineering, Energy, Mathematical and Physical Sciences (3 members)
- Social and Behavioral Sciences (3 members)
- Life Sciences (2 members)
- Humanities (3 members)
- Education/Professional/Other (2 members)
- Fine Arts (2 members)

The faculty members of the 2021-2022 Research Council, terms, and appointment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Service Dates</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia Abramson</td>
<td>August 2021 - May 2022</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Almasri</td>
<td>August 2021 - May 2024</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Avery</td>
<td>August 2020 - May 2023</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deven Calrson</td>
<td>August 2019 - May 2022</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Jones</td>
<td>August 2020 - May 2023</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gegory Lee</td>
<td>August 2021 - May 2022</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Marshall</td>
<td>August 2021 - May 2024</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Robbins</td>
<td>August 2020 - May 2023</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Rogers</td>
<td>January 2020 - May 2022</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Souza</td>
<td>August 2021 - May 2024</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalin Teodoriu</td>
<td>August 2020 - May 2023</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Engineering/Engineering/Energy/Mathematics/Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying Wang</td>
<td>August 2020 - May 2023</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Engineering/Engineering/Energy/Mathematics/Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra Williams-Diehm</td>
<td>August 2021 - May 2024</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wimberly</td>
<td>August 2021 - May 2024</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Engineering/Engineering/Energy/Mathematics/Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhibo Yang</td>
<td>August 2021 - May 2024</td>
<td>Presidential</td>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2021-2022 Chair of the Research Council is Dr. Cynthia Rogers from the Department of Economics.

The 2022-2023 Chair of the Research Council will be Dr. Ying Wang from the Department of Mathematics.

The Research Council is administered through the Office of the VPRP, Secretary to the Research Council for 2021-2022 is Dianna Crissman. The 2022-2023 Secretary will be Kate Mukomolov.

Budget:
A total of $400,000 was split between the Faculty Investment Program ($250,000) and Junior Faculty Fellowships ($150,000). This amount is unchanged from FY 2021. For 2021-2022, a total of $284,537.41 was awarded for the FIP, including funded projects whose funding will come out of the 2022-23 budget. The total amount awarded for JFF was $147,782.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FIP Budget Allocation</th>
<th>JFF Budget Allocation</th>
<th>Total VPRP Budget Allocation</th>
<th>FIP Funding Awarded</th>
<th>JFF Funding Awarded</th>
<th>Total VPRP Funding Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$301,738</td>
<td>$151,188</td>
<td>$452,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$278,107</td>
<td>$140,276</td>
<td>$418,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$257,377</td>
<td>$173,382</td>
<td>$430,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$291,535</td>
<td>$133,014</td>
<td>$424,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$289,690</td>
<td>$145,980</td>
<td>$435,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$314,698</td>
<td>$142,633</td>
<td>$457,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$286,454</td>
<td>$116,406</td>
<td>$402,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$265,294</td>
<td>$127,946</td>
<td>$393,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$260,408</td>
<td>$159,453</td>
<td>$419,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Activities (2021-2022):
The primary activity of the Research Council during the 2020-2021 academic year was to advise and make recommendations to the Vice President for Research (VPR) pertaining to awards and honors under his administration, namely:

- Faculty Investment Program (Up to $15,000)
- Junior Faculty Fellowships ($7,000 + Fringe)
- George Lynn Cross Research Professorship (recommendation to President)
- Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award for Excellence in Educational Research

Other activities:
The Research Council had discussions about how its role aligns with the guidelines set out in the OU Faculty handbook. The Council Chair did some outreach with Faculty Senate leaders and previous Research Council members. See attached letter describing the situation and requesting clarification of Research Council’s Role. A meeting was held on June 27, 2022 with VPRP and his staff to discuss how to proceed.
In 2021-2022 there were 42 submissions for the Faculty Investment Program, of which 21 were funded (50%).

In comparison: 20 (59%) of 34 submissions were funded in 2020-2021, and 17 (43%) of 20 submissions were funded in 2019-2020. See Appendix B for historical data.

We continue to see a growing number of applications from scholars in Education and Professional Programs, which had the largest number of applicants in 2021-2022 and a 38% success rate. Humanities was the second largest source of applicants (10) of which the success rate was 60%. Fine Arts only had one application and it was successful. This suggests opportunity to grow the applicant pool in Fine Arts.

In terms of gender, 45% of the applicants were identified as female which is higher than the previous two academic years. The percentage of success proposals award to females was 62% which is the highest in the past three years (and the success rate was 45%, 26%, 57% in FY 2019, 2020 and 2021, respectively).

**Junior Faculty Fellowship (JFF):**
Junior Faculty Fellowship (JFF) Submissions rebounded to pre-COVID 19 levels. There were 35 submissions of which 19 were funded (54%) for a total of $147,781.18.
The distribution of applications across disciplines is comparable to typical (non-COVID19) years with Social and Behavioral Sciences dominating applications and awards. Unlike the FIPS there are few applications from Education, Professional and Other category. The funding rate was above 50% for all discipline categories with Humanities have the highest success rate (67%).

In terms of gender, the percentage of applications (54%) and the success rates (53%) for female applicants was higher than the previous year.

**History of JFF Funding:**

- 2021 – 2022: of 35 submissions 19 were funded (54%)
- 2020 – 2021: of 19 submissions 18 were funded (95%).
- 2019 – 2020: of 26 submissions 15 were funded (58%).
- 2018 – 2019: of 35 submissions 14 were funded (40%)
- 2017 – 2018: of 54 submissions 17 were funded (31%)
- 2016 – 2017: of 54 submissions 17 were funded (31%)
- 2015 – 2016: of 69 submissions 16 were funded (23%)

The quality of proposals was high and some meritorious proposals did not get funded due to budget limitations.

**George Lynn Cross Professorship**

The Research Council received 6 nominations for the 2022 George Lynn Cross Research Professorship. Three nominations were advanced to the stage of collecting external letters. The final vote was close between the top two nominations. The Council’s recommendation to the President was Dr. Mark Yeary (School of Electrical and Computer Engineering).

There was some discussion about the process and how onerous a nomination is. A suggestion was made that nominations which are found to be meritorious for the award be kept in the pool for three years. This way nominees that are deserving of the award don’t have to be completely resubmitted.
Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award:
There were only 2 nominations for the Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award for Excellence in Educational Research. The Council nominated Dr. Tim Ford (Educational Leadership and Policy Studies) for the award.

Diversity Equity and Inclusion:
In 2020 Research Council has mandated a more extensive Diversity, Equity and Inclusion training as a part of the preparation for new council members in collaboration with the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. This focuses on helping members recognize their own implicit biases in the context of peer review and the evaluation of research proposals. This has been continued this year.

a) Award by gender: The significant gender disparities that we noted last year are not apparent this year. For both the FIP and the JFF applications and success rates for female applicants are comparable to pre-COVID years. (See appendix 1 for historical data for context).

b) Award by race and ethnicity: Research Council has not, to date, been able to track race or ethnicity of applicants resulting in an inability to identify potential bias or room for improvement. We were told by legal counsel that we could not request the data on the applications, so we have requested the data from HR and is awaiting fulfillment of the request. Consequently, Council has not made much progress in compiling retrospective data.

Concluding remarks and Recommendations:
The number of applications this past year for both the FIP and the JFF bounced back to levels representative of pre-COVID period. There remained disruptions and modification requests of awards due to ongoing disruptions in travel and research plans. With increase in travel opportunities, we expect applications to increase, reducing the percentage of meritorious awards that are fundable within the budget.

The Council continues to pay attention to differences in funding opportunities and creative activities across disciplines. JFF awards were distributed across 22 departments and 8 colleges, including fine arts and humanities. As noted in Council discussions, as well as during the June 27, 2022 meeting with the VPRP, the scoring criteria includes potential for external funding, which puts some disciplines at a competitive disadvantage. This could be addressed by refining evaluation criteria.

Regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion, the Research Council has included DEI training as a part of each years Research Council training the past three years. Council hopes to be able to track applications and awards by race and ethnicity, gender and discipline going forward, although we do not have a mechanism in place to facilitate this.

Finally, it is clear that Research Council is not performing its role as set out in the Faculty Handbook. Discussion on refining Council’s role and/or modifying the Faculty Handbook have commenced.
Appendix B:
Historical data on FIP and JFF submission and award:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2020-2021 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$229,436</td>
<td>$14,382</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Female 10</td>
<td>Male 72%</td>
<td>Female 10</td>
<td>Male 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,752</td>
<td>$2,752</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>Male 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,801</td>
<td>$7,801</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>Male 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$28,487</td>
<td>$14,243</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Female 33%</td>
<td>Male 67%</td>
<td>Female 33%</td>
<td>Male 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$63,438</td>
<td>$12,688</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Female 58%</td>
<td>Male 42%</td>
<td>Female 58%</td>
<td>Male 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>$260,408</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 41%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male 59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 41%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male 59%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2019-2020 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$234,950</td>
<td>$14,094</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Female 11</td>
<td>Male 69%</td>
<td>Female 22%</td>
<td>Male 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$51,470</td>
<td>$12,870</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>Male 0%</td>
<td>Female 0%</td>
<td>Male 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Female 25%</td>
<td>Male 25%</td>
<td>Female 25%</td>
<td>Male 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$13,546</td>
<td>$13,546</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Female 33%</td>
<td>Male 67%</td>
<td>Female 33%</td>
<td>Male 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$51,320</td>
<td>$12,830</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Female 45%</td>
<td>Male 55%</td>
<td>Female 45%</td>
<td>Male 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>$265,724</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>44%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 37%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male 63%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 37%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male 63%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2018-2019 Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$104,856</td>
<td>$14,379</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Female 44%</td>
<td>Male 56%</td>
<td>Female 44%</td>
<td>Male 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$42,845</td>
<td>$14,280</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Female 70%</td>
<td>Male 30%</td>
<td>Female 70%</td>
<td>Male 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$65,821</td>
<td>$13,164</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$35,627</td>
<td>$11,776</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Female 75%</td>
<td>Male 25%</td>
<td>Female 75%</td>
<td>Male 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$18,609</td>
<td>$9,305</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Female 0%</td>
<td>Male 100%</td>
<td>Female 0%</td>
<td>Male 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
<td>Female 50%</td>
<td>Male 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>$286,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,641</strong></td>
<td><strong>42%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 58%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male 42%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 58%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male 42%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Investment Program

#### Academic Year 2017-2018 Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$93,720</td>
<td>$13,721</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Female 10</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$69,756</td>
<td>$16,934</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$72,251</td>
<td>$14,452</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$51,874</td>
<td>$12,970</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$28,557</td>
<td>$11,779</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>$214,608</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,683</strong></td>
<td><strong>42%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 26</strong></td>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>48%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Faculty Investment Program

#### Academic Year 2016-2017 Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$46,680</td>
<td>$11,670</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Female 4</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$9,350</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$86,250</td>
<td>$14,375</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Female 4</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$46,907</td>
<td>$9,881</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Female 4</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$35,257</td>
<td>$8,324</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$54,569</td>
<td>$13,674</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Female 0</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>$240,690</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,588</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 43</strong></td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 18</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Faculty Investment Program

#### Academic Year 2015-2016 Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$129,451</td>
<td>$14,383</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Female 17</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Female 7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$46,452</td>
<td>$21,648</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52,450</td>
<td>$14,438</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$40,652</td>
<td>$10,163</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$9,908</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,999</td>
<td>$7,899</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>$291,530</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,147</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 33</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Junior Faculty Fellowship Program

### Academic Year 2020-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$18,802</td>
<td>$9,401</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Female 2 Males 0</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 100%</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 100%</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$24,434</td>
<td>$9,305</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Female 4 Males 4</td>
<td>Female 4 Males 4</td>
<td>Females 4 Males 4</td>
<td>Females 4 Males 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$25,452</td>
<td>$8,846</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Female 1 Males 2</td>
<td>Female 1 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 1 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 1 Males 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$23,452</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Female 1 Males 2</td>
<td>Female 1 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 1 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 1 Males 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$17,363</td>
<td>$8,681</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Female 2 Males 0</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 100%</td>
<td>Females 2 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 2 Males 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>$159,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 10 Males 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 5 Males 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 5 Males 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 5 Males 5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Year 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$36,632</td>
<td>$9,158</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Female 3 Males 2</td>
<td>Female 3 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 3 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 3 Males 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$49,342</td>
<td>$8,224</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Female 6 Males 4</td>
<td>Female 6 Males 4</td>
<td>Females 6 Males 4</td>
<td>Females 6 Males 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$26,324</td>
<td>$8,162</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$25,648</td>
<td>$8,548</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Female 2 Males 1</td>
<td>Female 2 Males 1</td>
<td>Females 2 Males 1</td>
<td>Females 2 Males 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>$127,945</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,533</strong></td>
<td><strong>58%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 13 Males 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 10 Males 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 10 Males 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 10 Males 5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Year 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Gender of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Submitted Proposals</th>
<th>Gender of Successful Proposals</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$44,052</td>
<td>$8,810</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Female 3 Males 2</td>
<td>Female 3 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 3 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 3 Males 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$56,435</td>
<td>$8,062</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Female 12 Males 5</td>
<td>Female 12 Males 5</td>
<td>Females 12 Males 5</td>
<td>Females 12 Males 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Female 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
<td>Females 0 Males 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 1 Males 1</td>
<td>Female 1 Males 1</td>
<td>Females 1 Males 1</td>
<td>Females 1 Males 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,919</td>
<td>$5,760</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Female 4 Males 2</td>
<td>Female 4 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 4 Males 2</td>
<td>Females 4 Males 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>$116,406</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 21 Males 14</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 14 Males 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 14 Males 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 14 Males 10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Junior Faculty Fellowship Program

### Academic Year 2017-2018 Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Gender of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$66,200</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Female 10, Male 10</td>
<td>0, 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$13,952</td>
<td>$6,976</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Female 11, Male 11</td>
<td>1, 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6,055</td>
<td>$6,055</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Female 1, Male 2</td>
<td>0, 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$59,910</td>
<td>$8,683</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Female 4, Male 5</td>
<td>0, 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0, Male 0</td>
<td>0, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$16,516</td>
<td>$8,259</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Female 3, Male 1</td>
<td>0, 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>$142,623</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,290</strong></td>
<td><strong>31%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 24, Male 20</strong></td>
<td><strong>7, 41%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Year 2016-2017 Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Gender of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$43,883</td>
<td>$8,777</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Female 12, Male 13</td>
<td>0, 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$33,928</td>
<td>$8,482</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Female 7, Male 10</td>
<td>0, 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$34,738</td>
<td>$8,343</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Female 3, Male 3</td>
<td>0, 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$24,707</td>
<td>$8,069</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Female 4, Male 7</td>
<td>0, 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9,317</td>
<td>$9,317</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Female 1, Male 0</td>
<td>0, 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9,317</td>
<td>$9,317</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Female 1, Male 0</td>
<td>0, 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>$145,982</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,587</strong></td>
<td><strong>31%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 16, Male 11</strong></td>
<td><strong>4, 24%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Year 2015-2016 Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Funding Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Gender of Total Number Awarded</th>
<th>Gender Percentage of Successful Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Physical Sciences</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$26,515</td>
<td>$8,845</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Female 3, Male 0</td>
<td>0, 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$42,459</td>
<td>$8,492</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Female 6, Male 3</td>
<td>0, 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Female 0, Male 0</td>
<td>0, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$48,097</td>
<td>$8,015</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Female 4, Male 3</td>
<td>1, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Female 0, Male 0</td>
<td>0, 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Professional/Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$8,983</td>
<td>$8,983</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Female 2, Male 8</td>
<td>0, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>$153,014</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,313</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female 13, Male 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4, 50%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Tomás Díaz de la Rubia  
VPRP  
FROM: Cynthia Rogers  
Chair, Research Council  
DATE: April 26, 2022  
SUBJECT: Role of the Research Council  

Recently Dr. Hambright reached out to me seeking feedback on the role of the Research Council vis-à-vis the VPRP’s office. The RC has engaged this topic in a series of discussions both at our monthly meetings and via email. This letter summarizes our response.

The RC appreciates your concern about the RC’s role in shared governance on the OU Norman Campus. Composed of regular faculty members, who are both appointed and elected, the RC provides an important mechanism for inclusive input and transparency necessary for shared governance. The Research Council is not being utilized in the capacity to which it was designed to function, as laid out in the OU Faculty handbook.

Currently, the RC serves a very narrow set of functions. We evaluate and make recommendations for two research award programs (Junior Faculty Fellowship, and Faculty Investment Program), and recommend recipients for two Research Professorships (George Lynn Cross and the Rinsland).

Previous RCs have had much larger roles in VPRP awards, including choosing recipients of all Research awards as well as defining what types of awards should be given. More importantly, previous RCs provided advice and planning for support of all faculty research and creative activity on Campus.

To the extent that the role of the RC has been limited to a narrow set of functions, we are concerned that OU is no longer operating in compliance with the OU Faculty Handbook.

The role of the RC in advising the President, Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Research and Faculty Senate is set out in the OU Faculty Handbook:

3.26 RESEARCH COUNCIL  
The Research Council is charged with the promotion and development of research and creative activity throughout the University community. The Council serves as adviser to the President, the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Research and Faculty Senate in matters regarding research.
(Adapted from: Structure, Descriptions, Charters, and Purposes of University and Campus Councils, Committees, and Boards appointed by the President of the University, 6-23-78)

The Council also makes recommendations to the Vice President for Research on the allocation of internal funds in support of the research and creative activity of the faculty. These funds are for a variety of specific programs, the details of which are announced to all eligible faculty periodically by the Vice President for Research. Application is made through and additional program information is available from the Office of Research Services.

(Vice President for Research, 5-19-88, 8-28-04)

The new OU Lead On Strategic Plan was created by the President’s Academic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, which originated “as a special committee under Faculty Handbook policy as agreed by President Gallogly and the Faculty Senate” (https://www.ou.edu/leadon/papbac). The formation of such committee, exclusive of the Research Council, is at odds with the requirement that administrative advisory committees are not supposed to duplicate work of the councils as outlined in the OU Faculty Handbook:

2.7.5 OTHER UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES
Several other types of committees are used as appropriate:

(A) Administrative Advisory Committees
Officers of the University are authorized to establish special advisory committees for subjects not covered by the council or standing committee structure, so long as they do not duplicate the work of the councils and standing committees. These committees are composed of members selected in a way determined by the establishing official. The number and purposes of these committees are reviewed regularly by the President and the Faculty Senate.

Further, the OU Lead On, University Strategic Plan (page 26) calls for open, transparent, and peer-reviewed decision making process for the vast majority of VFRP faculty and staff support funding decisions:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Tactic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop a transparent culture of performance and accountability in all areas of research administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish open, transparent, and peer-reviewed decision-making processes for the vast majority of funding and faculty and staff support decisions made in the Office of the Vice President for Research and Partnerships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

(OU Lead On, University Strategic Plan, page 25)

The RC clearly has a much larger mandate than just awarding the JFF, FIPS and 2 VPRP Research Professorships. Managing these awards is a large task that the RC accomplishes in a transparent, peer-reviewed manner. However, shared governance and transparency dictates that RC play an advisory role in creative and research activities more broadly.

We strongly urge the VPRP to revisit and reinstate of the broader advisory role of the RC in accordance with the OU Faculty Handbook and as a mechanism for “developing a transparent culture of performance and accountability in all areas of research administration” as indicated in Strategy 4 of the Lead On, University Plan.
To this end, we suggest the following measures be taken:

1. Create an inventory and review all VPRP awards and initiatives (e.g. the Big Idea Challenge Initiative, the SSHA Grant, the Strategic Equipment Investment Program, etc.) to identify mechanisms which protect and advance shared governance and faculty inclusion,
2. Include the RC in discussions, planning and implementation of all initiatives that involve faculty research,
3. Coordinate with the RC regarding the utilization of outside advisory boards such as the Strategic Research Advisory Board,
4. Seek RC feedback and guidance on all new faculty research initiatives before such initiatives are rolled out,
5. Schedule regular meetings with RC council representative (could be chair or designated liaison) to provide updates on VPRP activities related to faculty research.

We look forward to engaging with you about the RC’s role in the interest of shared governance and faculty inclusion in University initiatives. Given that you will be out of the country during our next (and last) regularly scheduled RC meeting, we would like to schedule a special meeting to discuss the RC’s role.
I. Membership
The 2021-22 Faculty Compensation and Benefits committee members, academic units, and terms:

- Anthony Natale (Social Work) (8/2018-5/2024), Chair, anatale@ou.edu
- Andrew Cuccia (Accounting) (8/2021-5/2024)
- Tassie Hirschfeld (Anthropology) (8/2018-5/2022)
- David Howard (Music) (8/2019-5/2022)
- Russel Jones (Philosophy) (8/2021-5/2024)
- Rebecca Lorramm (Geography and Environmental Sustainability) (1/2021-5/2022)
- Ying Wang (Mathematics) (8/2021-5/2024)

II. Meetings
The Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee met monthly for 90 minutes. Four meetings occurred during the Fall semester, and four meetings occurred during the Spring semester.

III. Issues
1. Retiree Benefits. The committee engaged in a series of conversations with the Faculty Senate, OU HR representatives, OU retirees, and the President. The FCBC explored challenges from the most recent rollout of OU changes to Medicare retiree plans.

   ⇒ Outcome: Cataloged the issues and worked to establish a formal relationship between retirees and OU HR to impact retiree benefits decisions. Continued advocacy for free standing retiree benefits council.

2. Pay Equity. The committee designed a survey for regular faculty to gather their pay equity satisfaction, perceptions, and recommendations for policies and practices. The committee then analyzed the data and prepared the final report (see attached report).

   ⇒ Outcome: The regular faculty pay equity satisfaction, perceptions, and recommended policies and practices report was presented to the Faculty Senate in April.

   ⇒ Outcome: The regular faculty pay equity satisfaction, perceptions, and recommended policies and practices report was presented to the President, Provost, and Vice President of Human Resources. Conversations about how best to proceed are ongoing.

IV. Chair Election
Anthony P. Natale was unanimously supported for the Chair position for the 2022-2023 academic year.
Membership
The members of the 2021-22 Faculty Welfare Committee were:
Stephanie Burge
Boyko Dossev
Phil Gibson
Wayne Riggs
Sarah Robbins (Chair)

Tasks Continued from 2020-21

- **Teaching Evaluation Working Group (TEWG):** The Faculty Senate Faculty Welfare Committee and the Office of the Provost charge the Working Group on Teaching Evaluation with evaluating and improving course evaluations with respect to reducing biases and improving actionability, with the goal of improving teaching, learning, and equity. During 2021-22, the work group pushed the student experience survey to a number of departments. TEWG concluded their work and a new Faculty Evaluation Work Group has been established from the Provost’s Office.

- **Update to the Faculty Handbook:** During 2021-22, the committee met with Jennifer Hembree from the new OU Policy Office to preview the new system for tracking and displaying policies for campus and discuss processes for soliciting input from faculty on changes to policy. This work is on-going.

- **Building Understanding of University Finances Curriculum:** Some of the proposed curriculum from the Faculty Welfare Committee was pulled to be included in a Faculty Leadership Series sponsored by the Center for Faculty Excellence. The chair worked with Megan Elwood Madden to prepare sessions led by Stewart Berkshaw and Jeff Blahnik. The sessions provided an overview of the university budget and the student recruitment program. There are opportunities for committee involvement in future sessions in the Faculty Leadership series.

- **Non-Regular Faculty Representation in Shared Governance:** The Faculty Senate Executive Committee in 2021-22, the ad hoc committee composed of non-regular faculty appointed to explore the issue in-depth and make recommendations for future involvement in shared governance was unable to find a common time to meet. Members were invited to attend a Faculty Welfare Committee as a way to move forward. The Faculty Welfare Committee plans to survey department chairs as a way of building their understanding of how non-regular faculty are utilized across campus, to meet with non-contingent faculty in select departments, and then to survey non-regular faculty about their needs in early fall 2021.

New Tasks

- **Changes to General Curriculum & Faculty Involvement:** The committee discussed the process for changing the general curriculum and how faculty should be involved in these discussions based on the recent example of changes with the addition of a new course requirement to the general curriculum. After discussion, the committee decided no action was required at this time.
• **9-month Appointments & Expectations for Summer Work**: After discussions about faculty leave within the committee, the chair met with Lee Camargo-Quinn from HR to get a better understanding of faculty leave accrual and work expectations during summer months. With this information and after further discussion, the committee decided no action was required at this time.

**Possible Tasks for 2022-23**

- Continue to monitor progress with the OU Policy database and work with the Provost’s office to determine an appropriate scope for the Faculty Handbook once the policy database is live.
- Continue work related to non-regular faculty with a goal of appropriate representation in shared governance and ensuring this population has a voice in decisions related to their appointments.

**Chair Election**

Stephanie Burge was elected Chair for the 2022-23 FWC committee.
The Faculty Senate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (hereafter FSDEI) was constituted by the Faculty Senate in the fall of 2017 and given the following charge:

1. Investigate, discover, and promote best practices for faculty recruiting and retention.
2. Gather and review information on the allocation of university resources (awards research grants, prizes, etc.) and advancement (tenure, promotion, named professorships, etc.) relative to metrics of diversity, equity, and inclusion.
3. Suggest to the Senate appropriate proposals, strategies, and forums for advancing the goals of the committee.
4. Work with the Office of University Community to set priorities, advance policy, and follow up on the progress of proposed initiatives.
5. Report at least yearly to the Senate and, upon approval, the President and the Provost.

During 2021-22, the FDEIC met three times in the school year. 2021-22 committee members were:
- Heather Shotton (Chair)
- Shawn Churchman
- Lori Franklin
- Paul Ketchum
- Jacquelyn Reese
- Talisha Morrison
- Roksana Alavi

In the Fall 2021 when the HB 1775 was passed, this committee worked on a statement in support of academic freedom. This statement was meant to be sent to Faculty Senate for approval and then distribution. The chair of the committee researched the other university’s responses to similar legislations. At the end, it was decided that it might not be prudent to release this statement. The worry was that it might bring negative attention to the university and/or those who teach in the DEI-related topics.

In the Spring 2022, the committee discussed issues of faculty retention and recruitment. Anecdotally, we hear the reasons faculty who belong to the marginalized populations leave OU. It was suggested that we reach out to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) and recommend a taskforce on collecting data on this issue. We hoped to work with the DEI office in this taskforce. It was proposed but it was decided to wait until the next year to get this process going.

We recommend that the university collect stats for LGBTQ and also first-generation faculty. The former was promised a few years back, but it was never actualized. Collaboration with DEI office is recommended.

Roksana Alavi from Professional and Continuing Studies was appointed to the committee for 2021-2024 and was elected to serve as FDEIC Chair for the 2022-2023 academic year.