Redesignation of a Department or School

REDESIGNATION OF A DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL

There is no universal standard within the broad scope of academic administration defining the difference between a “Department” and a “School”. Within a university setting, academic units have an array of names: “Center,” “College,” “Faculty,” “School,” and “Department” are all commonly used monikers to describe academic discipline groups with administrative links. Although there are no set standards, some overall themes emerge. A “School” is often larger than a “Department” and contains multiple programs or sub-units. A “School” frequently has a graduate program or programs with certifications. It is more common for academic units with a professional-studies focus to be designated as a School.

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education considers an application by a Department to become a School as an enhancement. However, UCO regards the terms “School” and “Department” as interchangeable equivalent. School Directors and Department Chairs receive the same stipend and reassignment time. The faculty within a school have exactly the same rights, privileges and expectations as those within a department. Schools and Departments have identical rights and responsibilities within a college. Reasons to apply for a change in name often involve the perception of the unit by outside entities. If common practice within a discipline promotes the use of “School” over “Department” and a name change would allow significant advances in recruiting, retention or procuring donations, an application to change the name of a department to a school may be considered.

Application Process

Changing the name of an academic department requires the approval of the faculty and chair of the department, dean of the college, provost, president, the Regional University System of Oklahoma, and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher education. UCO values collaboration at all levels of the institution with the intent and goal of benefitting all stakeholders.

All proposals to change the name of a Department to a School (or that of a School to a Department) shall follow the process outlined below:

1) Before proposing redesignation, a department chair must receive consent, by vote, of a super-majority (75% or more) of the full-time, non-temporary department faculty. After consultation with the faculty of the respective department and dean of the college, the department chair dean of the college, the department chair will complete and submit the Redesignation
2) Name Change Request form to the dean. After careful consideration, the dean of the college will approve or disapprove the request via written notification to the chair of the department within 30 business days of the receipt of the Redesignation Name Change Request form. The notification should reflect the basis for the dean’s decision. If disapproved, the chair may resubmit the Redesignation Name Change request, addressing the concerns of the dean. If approved, the dean will forward the formal application to the provost for consideration.

4) The provost shall render a recommendation to the president within 45 business days of the receipt of the formal proposal. The provost may request internal stakeholders, including but not limited to the Deans’ Council, the Faculty Senate, and the Provost’s Advisory Council (PAC), and the President’s Cabinet to provide input on the proposal within this review period. The president of the university may also seek the advice of the cabinet.

5) If approved by the president, a recommendation for the name change will be submitted to the Regional University System of Oklahoma and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education for consideration.

6) Redesignation from Department to School will coincide with the appropriate academic year to allow for implementation of university processes (e.g., Banner, catalogs, class scheduling, and facilities).

Appendix E Tenure and Promotion

Tenure and Promotion Task Force Recommendations Summary

Section 2.7.2
At the end of the italicized paragraph (a RUSO citation), insert a new sentence: “Notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment to the governing board, will be given in writing not later than December 15 for a faculty member who has served two or more years in the institution in a tenure-track appointment.

Section E.2.2
In this paragraph, the same sentence is repeated twice, once for non-tenure track appointments and once for temporary appointments. Since all temporary appointments are non-tenure track appointments, combine the two statements into one as follows:
In the event that a faculty member on a non-tenure track appointment (either temporary or continuing) is the successful candidate of a search for a tenure-track position, all but one year of the faculty member’s non-tenure track appointment may, upon
recommendation of the screening committee, department chair/director and dean, count toward tenure and promotion consideration.

Throughout the Document (first occurrence in Section E.3.1)
Change the date that faculty members being reviewed for tenure and promotion (including pre-tenure and post-tenure processes) must submit their review materials to the department chair from September 1 to “on or before August 15”. Additionally, require all review materials to be submitted to the Dean “on or before September 15.”

Throughout the Document (first occurrence in Section E.3.1)
Include a statement limiting discussion during tenure and promotion review proceedings to the tenure and promotion review criteria: “Such comments shall be confined to the criteria of excellence in effective classroom teaching, scholarly or creative achievement, and contributions to the institution and to the profession.”

Pre-Tenure Evaluation Report
A pre-tenure evaluation report, analogous to that used in the post-tenure review (Figure 2.4) has been added as “Figure 2.1.a.”

Throughout the Document (first occurrence in Section E.4.1)
Insert a reminder that ratified measures must be stated on the tenure and promotion review evaluation forms.

Throughout the Document (first occurrence in Figure 2.2)
Add a reference to Appendix F following the asterisked statement that tenure-track faculty who have been assigned non-teaching, semi-administrative, or administrative duties will be evaluated and rated appropriate to their assigned duties. In other relevant places throughout the document (e.g., Figure 2.3), this statement has been inserted as a reminder.

Throughout the Document (first occurrence in Section E. 5.2.2 h)
Clarify that Tenure and Promotion review committees must meet at least once to discuss the candidates and hold a separate meeting to vote. The following language was added throughout as appropriate, “Following the meeting to conduct the reviews of all tenure candidates and…”

Update: Based on feedback received from Forum attendees, the Task Force updated this language further as follows: “A minimum of five (5) working days following the meeting to conduct the reviews of all tenure candidates, the chair of the Department Tenure Review Committee shall reconvene the review committee for a final meeting to hold the
tenure vote. The chair must give at least five (5) working days of written notice to the committee members before convening this meeting.”

### Section E.7.2.1

This section has been modified to reflect the fact that “Academic Affairs Form #94-1” is no longer in use since we no longer utilize a salary card. The language “on the Academic Credentials Summary (Academic Affairs Form #94-1)” has been replaced by “on the Letter of Intent.”

### Section E.8.2

k. Delete the words “At the request of the provost/vice president of academic affairs or the dean.” This meeting is always part of the process. Add letter “t” as follows: A tenured associate professor who is not recommended for promotion to the rank of professor is eligible to reapply in all subsequent years until successful. The same procedures for review and voting as outlined in Section E.8.2 will apply for each subsequent attempt.”

*Substantive changes listed are those that receive input from and/or approval from the Faculty Senate, Legal Counsel (as needed), Provost’s Advisory Council and Provost*