

Rules and Regulations
of the
School of Engineering
University of Kansas

Engineering Senate

Revised April 12, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLE I _r	GENERAL STATEMENT	4
ARTICLE II _r	ACADEMIC SCHEDULES	5
Section 1	Class Schedules	
Section 2	Final Examinations	
ARTICLE III _r	ACADEMIC WORK AND ITS EVALUATION	6
Section 1	Withdrawal Policies	
Section 2	Grading	
Section 3	Undergraduate Student Retention, Probation, Dismissal and Reinstatement	
Section 4	Graduate Student Retention, Probation, Dismissal and Reinstatement	
Section 5	Enrollment	
Section 6	Academic Misconduct	
ARTICLE IV _r	GRADUATION AND DEGREES	13
Section 1	Requirements for Graduation with the Bachelor’s Degree	
Section 2	Granting of Degrees	
Section 3	Graduation with Scholastic Honors	
ARTICLE V _r	ADMISSION TO THE SCHOOL	15
Section 1	Requirements for Undergraduate Admission	
Section 2	Evaluation and Acceptance of Advanced Standing Credits	
ARTICLE VI _r	PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING PROMOTION AND TENURE EVALUATIONS	18
Section 1	Introduction	
Section 2	Procedures of the Evaluation Process	
Section 3	General Criteria for Promotion	
Section 4	Categories of Evaluation	
Section 5	Research and Scholarship	
Section 6	Service and Administration	
Section 7	Documentation of the Evaluation	
Section 8	Documentation of Teaching, Research, and Service Performance	
Section 9	Relative Percent Effort of the Categories of Evaluation	

ARTICLE VIIr	SABBATICAL LEAVES	34
Section 1	Policy					
Section 2	Procedure					
ARTICLE VIIIr	GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE	35
Section 1	Committee Formation					
Section 2	Policy and Procedure					

ARTICLE I GENERAL STATEMENT

The University Senate Rules and Regulations (USRR) shall be the primary Rules and Regulations of the Engineering Senate. The Engineering Senate may choose to make rules and regulations which are more restrictive than those of the University Senate when allowed to do so by the Rules and Regulations of the University Senate.

In those matters about which the University Senate is silent, the Engineering Senate shall have the right to develop, promulgate, and enforce rules and regulations which promote the professional aims of the School of Engineering with respect to educational and research activities.

ARTICLE IIr ACADEMIC SCHEDULES

Section 1 Class Schedules

2r.1.1 Each of the departments of the School of Engineering shall prepare appropriate schedules of the classes they plan to offer and then representatives of each of the departments shall meet together with the Director of Academic Services in the Office of the Dean to finalize the days, times, and room assignments for each course.

Section 2 Final Examinations

2r.2.1 “The instructor of a course shall decide whether a final examination is necessary unless the department in which a course is given makes that decision.” (USRR 1.3.3). Whether or not a final examination will be prescribed shall be made known to all of the enrolled students during the first week of the class. “Except for those excused in advance by the instructor, all students are required to take the final examinations when prescribed.” (USRR 1.3.4). The basis for the excusing of any student shall be made known to all of the enrolled students during the first week of class. “The faculty of the School may also prescribe conditions under which individual students may be exempted from final examinations, provided that such exemption is based on grades received in the course prior to the time of the final examination.” (USRR 2.1.3).

ARTICLE IIIr ACADEMIC WORK AND ITS EVALUATION

Section 1 Withdrawal Policies

- 3r.1.1 The University Senate has developed regulations for withdrawal from a course. The School of Engineering will follow the University regulations, USRR 2.2.5.
- 3r.1.2 Withdrawal from any course at the University of Kansas in Period 2 must be recorded in advance by the student's faculty adviser, or, in departments which do not have assigned advisers, the department chair. The withdrawal must also be acknowledged via a stamp issued by the Dean of Engineering's office. The withdrawal form must be completed and submitted to the appropriate Registrar's office before the University's deadline.
- 3r.1.3 No student shall be allowed to repeat for credit a course in which he or she has already received college credit either at KU or elsewhere, except by consent of the Dean of the School in which credit is to apply for a degree and the Chair of the department which offers the course unless the University retake policy applies. In the event that a student circumvents this rule and is discovered, the student will be notified by the School of Engineering's Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies that they have been administratively disenrolled from the course, or if they have completed the course, that any grade obtained has been changed to a "W" by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies.
- 3r.1.4 Retroactive Withdrawal: Students may petition to retroactively withdraw from one or all courses in a semester per USRR 2.3.3. The committee reviewing the petition is appointed by the Dean and chaired by an Associate Dean. A written policy on retroactive withdrawal from engineering courses is available in the Office of the Dean.

Section 2 Grading

- 3r.2.1 "Individual schools or colleges may adopt the use of plus or minus to describe intermediate levels of performance between a maximum of A and a minimum of F. Intermediate grades represented by plus or minus shall be calculated as 0.3 units above or below the corresponding letter grade." (USRR 2.4.1—in part). The School of Engineering does not employ the plus or minus in its grading.

- 3r.2.2 Within the first week of every course offered by the School of Engineering, the instructor of that course shall make available to each student, in writing, the policy to be used in determining the student's final grade in that course.

Students enrolling in the course after the first week shall bear the responsibility of informing themselves of the grading policy.

- 3r.2.3 A student has the right to appeal their final grade within a fixed period of time after the grade is received by the student. The period shall be limited to two months following the first day of the subsequent semester, summer school excepted. The student shall first make an effort to resolve the problem by appealing directly to his or her instructor. Should this approach fail, a formal appeal may be made as outlined in Section 3r.2.5

- 3r.2.4 The basis for such an appeal is that the student proposes that the criteria for arriving at the final grade were not those criteria stated in the grading policy distributed during the first week of classes as required by Section 3r.2.2.

- 3r.2.5 The appeal shall be made in writing to the Dean of the School of Engineering within the time period specified in Section 3r.2.3. The instructors involved shall be promptly informed of the appeal made against them. The Dean will then appoint an appeal committee comprising a faculty member from the department offering the course, a faculty member from the School of Engineering (but not the same department offering the course), and an Associate Dean of the School of Engineering. This Associate Dean will chair the committee. This committee shall be appointed within one week following the receipt of the formal appeal.

Before the first meeting, the student making the appeal shall be informed of the committee membership and be given the opportunity to object to any of the panel members. If, in the opinion of the Associate Dean chairing the committee, any of the panel members should be dismissed for cause, vacancies shall be filled as necessary.

The committee will set a hearing date. Such hearing will take place within one month of the date of the appeal. Both the instructor giving the grade and the student shall have the opportunity to argue their respective positions. The hearing proceedings shall be audio recorded.

- 3r.2.6 The appeal committee will render its decision within one week of the hearing. The decision of the committee is final. Should a change of grade be recommended, the proper change of grade form shall be completed and filed with the appropriate offices by the instructor within one week of the decision of the committee.

Section 3 Undergraduate Student Retention, Probation, Dismissal and Reinstatement

- 3r.3.1 A student whose University overall or Engineering grade-point average in any semester is less than a 2.00 will be placed on probation.
- 3r.3.2 A student on probation may be dismissed for failure to enroll in at least 12 credit-hours that count toward his or her degree and earn a grade-point average of at least 2.00 in the next semester or for failure to retain a University overall or Engineering cumulative average of at least 2.00 for two consecutive semesters.
- 3r.3.3 A student on probation will be returned to good standing if in the next semester the student's University overall or Engineering cumulative and semester university and engineering grade-point averages are 2.00 or higher while the student was enrolled in at least 12 credit hours that count toward his or her degree. The student will be continued on probation if the semester average is above 2.00 but the University overall or Engineering cumulative average is less than 2.00.
- 3r.3.4 A student on probation in the School of Engineering who has been dismissed for poor scholarship may appeal for special consideration by presenting a written petition to the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies. A student does not automatically become eligible to re-enroll after a certain period of time.

Section 4 Graduate Student Retention, Probation, Dismissal and Reinstatement

- 3r.4.1 GPA Requirement: All graduate students in the School of Engineering must earn a grade of "B" or better in any undergraduate course(s) which they may be required to take to make up background deficiencies.
- 3r.4.2 English Proficiency Requirement: All graduate students in the School who are required to take courses at the Applied English Center must complete those requirements within two semesters of their initial enrollment by passing the University English

Proficiency Test. Failure to complete the English proficiency requirement within this time will result in dismissal from the graduate engineering program.

Section 5 Enrollment

- 3r.5.1 No undergraduate student in the School of Engineering may enroll for more than 19 hours per semester, or nine hours during the summer session, except by permission of the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies.
- 3r.5.2 The School of Engineering reserves the right to deny admission to courses offered by the School to any student who is officially enrolled in another division of the University and who does not meet the standards established by the School of Engineering for admission or re-admission. The School also reserves the right to limit admission of students in another division to a course to provide enough space for regularly enrolled engineering students.

Section 6 Academic Misconduct

- 3r.6.1 Definition: Academic misconduct and sanctions which may be imposed are defined and described by Article II, Section 6 of the University Senate Rules and Regulations.
Academic misconduct by a student shall include, but not be limited to, disruption of classes; threatening an instructor or fellow student in an academic setting; giving or receiving unauthorized aid on examinations or in the preparation of notebooks, themes, reports or other assignments; knowingly misrepresenting the source of any academic work; unauthorized changing of grades; unauthorized use of University approvals or forging of signatures; falsification of research results; plagiarizing of another's work; violation of regulations or ethical codes for the treatment of human and animal subjects; or otherwise acting dishonestly in research.

- 3r.6.2 Initiation of Action:
a. Student Academic Misconduct
When an instructor determines that a student has committed academic misconduct as described above, the instructor may charge the student with academic misconduct (Instructor Processing Details, page 13).

In addition to informing the School of Engineering, the KU Office of Research Integrity will be informed of all charges filed alleging dishonesty in research. KU Human Resources will be informed of all charges filed alleging sexual harassment.

An attempt shall be made to resolve the issue directly with the student. An instructor may impose a sanction of censure-warning or reprimand or reduction of grade. The Dean or Associate Dean may impose more severe sanctions including: 1) transcript citation of academic misconduct, 2) suspension from a specific course, 3) suspension from the University of Kansas and 4) expulsion from the University of Kansas. Should the student not wish to contest the finding or sanction, the matter ends there. However, should the student request hearing, any previously-imposed sanctions shall be suspended and a hearing must be held. The hearing must be held within 30 days following the request from the student. If the 30 days ends during a semester break, the hearing must be held within 30 days of the start of the following Fall/Spring semester.

If the student petitions the Judicial Board Chair for a Judicial Board hearing, specifically alleging reasons why a fair hearing cannot be obtained at the School level, and the Judicial Board Chair grants the petition, the hearing will be held before a Judicial Board panel. A copy of any such petition shall be made available to the opposing party, who shall have the opportunity to respond.”

b. Instructor or School Administrator Misconduct

The student shall attempt to resolve the issue directly with the charged party, or failing that, with the appropriate Departmental Chair and/or the Dean. Should a resolution satisfactory to the student not be obtained, a hearing must be held.

3r.6.3 Hearing Panel

If a hearing is necessary, the Dean or his or her designee shall appoint a hearing panel to consider the case and to make a recommendation to the Dean for its disposition.

The Hearing Panel shall be composed of at least five members to include three faculty and two students. Members should be from departments different from that of the charged party. The Chair of the panel shall be designated by the appointing authority. Members of the panel should be told the identity of the charged party so that a member can recuse him/herself if there is a conflict of interest. Before the first meeting, the charged party shall be informed of the membership and given the opportunity to object to any of the panel members. If, in the opinion of the appointing authority, any of the panel members should be dismissed for cause, vacancies shall be filled as necessary.

- 3r.6.4 **Statement of Charges:** A written statement of all charges shall be provided by the complainant to the charged party before the appointment of any hearing panel. The charged party may provide a written response to the charges if he or she so desires.
- 3r.6.5 **Documentation:** At the first meeting of the Hearing Panel, the panel members, the complainant, and the charged party shall each receive copies of the statement of charges, any written reply from the charged party, and any documents provided by either party for presentation to the panel. Other documents may be provided later only with permission from the Hearing Panel and with the stipulation that the opposing party be given reasonable time to provide any rebuttal documentation. All materials concerning the alleged violation shall be treated as confidential and shall be returned to the Dean after the hearing.
- 3r.6.6 **Representatives:** Each party may have one supportive friend or representative in attendance at the hearing. However, if such a person is to be present, the Chair of the panel must be informed at least 24 hours before the hearing including whether the representative is a lawyer. If the representative is a lawyer, the University General Counsel shall be informed and asked to attend the hearing also.
- 3r.6.7 **Witnesses:** One witness at a time may be called by the complainant, the person charged, or the hearing panel.
- 3r.6.8 **Hearing procedures:** A hearing may be held even if one or both complainant and charged party fail to appear. Hearings shall, at a minimum, provide for the procedural guarantees as outlined in Article XIV, Section 2 of the University Senate Code. Unless altered by the Chair of the Hearing Panel, the hearing shall be conducted in accord with the following outline:
- a) Introduce the hearing panel members, the complainant, the charged party, and representatives, if any.
 - b) Explain the hearing procedures which follow.
 - c) The charged party may choose to remain silent and not reply to the charges.
 - d) Review the charges which led to the hearing, including possible sanctions.
 - e) Allow the complainant to explain the alleged incident or event which led to the charge of academic misconduct.
 - f) Allow the charged party to reply and explain the alleged incident or event.
 - g) Hear any witnesses.

- h) The two parties may question one another and any witnesses appearing. Hearing Panel members may ask questions of either party and of any witness.
- i) The complainant has the responsibility to persuade the panel by a preponderance of evidence that an act of academic misconduct has occurred.
- j) The hearing's proceedings shall be audio recorded.

3r.6.9 Findings and Recommendations: Immediately after the hearing, the panel members shall reach a determination of their recommendations for what specific sanctions, if any, should apply. The Chair shall compile comments, rationale, and recommendations in writing and forward them to the Dean within seven calendar days after the hearing.

3r.6.10 Action: The Dean shall review the report of the hearing panel, **its recommendation** and any relevant information, and may impose the sanctions of admonition, warning, censure upon a student and reduction of grade, or disciplinary probation upon a student, **and with notice to the** Provost, a sanction of suspension **or dismissal** of a student. The determination of the charge and any sanction shall be communicated in writing to the two parties involved within 30 days from the hearing.

3r.6.11 Appeal: Within thirty days after receipt of notice of action, either party may appeal the action to the University Senate's Judicial Board as specified by University Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI.

3.r.6.12 Instructor/Departmental Processing of a Charge of Academic Misconduct

1. When an instructor determines that a student has violated academic integrity, the instructor may charge the student with academic misconduct by completing the Charge of Academic Misconduct form. The instructor must complete the Charge of Academic Misconduct form provided by the School within 21 calendar days from the point of the discovery. Any reduction in a student's grade due to academic misconduct must be accompanied by the Charge of Academic Misconduct form.

2. To complete the Charge of Academic Misconduct form, briefly document the alleged academic misconduct, and review the case with your department chair.

3. Recommend by the instructor one or more sanction listed below:

- Censure-written warning or reprimand
- Reduction of Grade for Specific Work (Indicate grade: zero, F, D, or other _____)
- Reduction of Grade for the Course (Indicate grade: F, D, or other _____)
- (Not Eligible for Course Repeat Policy, Withdrawal, or Retroactive Withdrawal)

University Senate Rules and Regulations Information is available at:

<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/USRR.htm>

4. Both the instructor and department chair must sign and date the Charge of Academic Misconduct form. The signature of the department chair indicates awareness of the charging instructor's charge, not necessarily agreement with the charging instructor's recommendations. If the department chair is also the charging instructor, the undergraduate or graduate coordinator in the department reviews and signs on behalf of the department. If a course is cross-listed, the department of the instructor making the charge files the charge and processes the case.

5. Student notification of the Charge of Academic Misconduct must be sent as soon as possible, not to exceed 30 days from the date of the instructor's filing of academic misconduct charges. The department chair is responsible for contacting the student to sign and return the form. If it is possible, present the form, notification letter, and policy to the student in person, and obtain his/her signature on the misconduct form, explaining the deadlines for signing and returning.

6. If initial attempts to contact the student by phone or email are not successful within 10 days, notification must be sent by certified mail to the student's: 1) permanent address on file if courses are not in session or the student is not enrolled; or 2) to local address on file if student is enrolled in the current semester. Do not send the original charge form, but send a copy of the charge form along with a letter of explanation. Mail materials to the student by certified mail with return receipt requested. Retain copy of original packet before mailing.

7. The student is given the opportunity to select one statement below in response to the alleged charge of misconduct:

- I admit to the above charge of academic misconduct and accept the recommended sanction.
- I admit to the above charge of academic misconduct but wish to appeal the recommended sanction.
- I deny the charge of academic misconduct and wish to appeal the recommended sanction.

Students may submit additional information or a written statement if they choose.

8. The student must be given 10 calendar days to review the document and determine his/her response. Students cannot be given the impression that they are required to respond immediately. Informing the student that the document will be available for his/her signature in the Department Office during the 10 day period is a common practice.

9. Failure of the student to respond within 10 calendar days of notification will be judged to indicate the student's agreement with the charge and sanctions. If a hearing is desired, the student must request a hearing within 10 calendar days of notification.

10. When a signed form is received from the student, or 10 days have elapsed since the student's notification, proceed as follows:

- a. If the student admits to the charge and does not wish to appeal recommended sanctions of Censure, Reduction of Grade for Specific Work, or Reduction of Grade for the Course, process charge and impose sanction.
 1. Document the final sanction on the Charge of Academic Misconduct form.
 2. If the sanction requires changes to the student's transcript, submit a grade change online using the reason of academic misconduct for the grade change, or submit to the School of Engineering Dean's Office a Change of Grade Form noting the grade determined and a notation of academic misconduct for the explanation of the change.
 3. Retain a copy of the Charge of Academic Misconduct form for the department files, send a copy to the student, and send any remaining copies (including original) to the Office of the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education in the School of Engineering if the student is an undergraduate and the Office of the Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Studies if the student is a graduate student. All evidence presented by the charging instructor should be included.
 4. Upon receiving the signed Charge of Academic Misconduct form, the appropriate Associate Dean will review the student's record which shall include contacting the Provost (864-4904) to inquire about previous infractions. Previous documented misconduct should be considered in determining elevated sanctions. After reviewing the file, the Associate Dean should make one of the following recommendations:
 - No additional disciplinary action recommended
 - Transcript Citation of Academic Misconduct - (Must also indicate grade: F, D, or other _____)
 - Suspension from a specific course
 - Suspension from the University of Kansas - Noted on Transcript
 - Expulsion from the University of Kansas - Noted on Transcript
 5. Notify the student, charging instructor and the department in writing of the actions taken within 30 days. In the event that the Associate Dean in the School of Engineering has recommended additional disciplinary action, the student should also be notified of the right to appeal.
- b. If the student wishes to deny the charge and/or appeal recommended sanctions of Censure, Reduction of Grade for Specific Work, or Reduction of Grade for the Course, the Office of the appropriate Associate Dean in the School of Engineering is responsible for scheduling the hearing within 30 days from the date the student submits an appeal.
 1. The Department chair will retain a copy of the Charge of Academic Misconduct form for the department files, send a copy to the student, and send any remaining copies (including original) to the Office of the appropriate Associate Dean in the School of Engineering. All evidence presented by the charging instructor should be included.
 2. Upon receiving the signed Charge of Academic Misconduct form, the Associate Dean will review the student's record which shall include contacting Provost (864-

4904) to inquire about previous infractions. Previous documented misconduct should be considered in determining elevated sanctions. After reviewing the file, the Associate Dean should make one of the following recommendations:

- No additional disciplinary action recommended
- Transcript Citation of Academic Misconduct - (Must also indicate grade: F, D, or other _____)
- Suspension from a specific course
- Suspension from the University of Kansas - Noted on Transcript
- Expulsion from the University of Kansas - Noted on Transcript

3. Follow School of Engineering policy for scheduling and conducting the hearing.
4. In the event that the Associate Dean in the School of Engineering has recommended additional disciplinary action, the student should be notified of these recommendations and the right to appeal in the scheduled hearing.
5. If the sanction requires changes to the student's transcript, submit a grade change online using the reason of academic misconduct for the grade change, or submit to the School of Engineering Dean's Office a Change of Grade Form noting the grade determined and a notation of academic misconduct for the explanation of the change.
6. Notify the student and charging instructor in writing of the actions taken within 30 days.

- c. If the recommended sanctions include Transcript Citation for Academic Misconduct, Suspension, and/or Expulsion and the student is not a student in the School of Engineering, the other entity on campus should be advised of the Academic Misconduct.
- d. If the student is enrolled in the School of Engineering, the student's department should be advised if the charge is from another department.

11. If a charge of academic misconduct is pending during an end of semester grade submission deadline, the instructor should temporarily assign a grade of WG (Waiting Grade) to the student. If you have difficulties with successful submission of this grade, please contact the University Registrar at 864-4422.

CHARGE OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Last Name	First Name	Initial	KU ID #
Department	Course #	Course Title	Cr. Hrs. Semester

1. Briefly describe the alleged academic misconduct: _____ (Attach supporting evidence.)

2. Recommend one or more sanctions listed below:
 - () Censure-written warning or reprimand
 - () Reduction of Grade for Specific Work (Indicate grade: zero, F, D, or other _____)
 - () Reduction of Grade for the Course (Indicate grade: F, D, or other _____)
 - () Not Eligible for Course Repeat Policy, Withdrawal, or Retroactive Withdrawal

Instructor Signature	Date	Instructor's Name Printed
----------------------	------	---------------------------

.....

Department Chair or their Designate:

- () No previous incidence(s) on file – No change to recommended sanction above.
- () Previous incidence(s) on file – Recommended sanction elevated to: _____

Department Chair Signature	Date	Chair's Name Printed
----------------------------	------	----------------------

.....

Student Contact

E-mail Date: _____ Direct Contact Date: _____ Certified Mail Date: _____

All information above must be completed and available to the charged student within 10 calendar days of discovery and investigation of the misconduct.

Student/Faculty Initial: _____

Student: You must sign this form and return it to the chairperson of the department **within ten (10) calendar days**. FAILURE TO RETURN THIS FORM ON TIME WILL BE JUDGED TO INDICATE YOUR AGREEMENT WITH THE ABOVE CHARGE OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AND TO WAIVE YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL THE CHARGES. Regardless of your selection below, this form will be sent the Office of the appropriate Associate Dean in the School of Engineering for review. You should be aware that upon receiving this form, the Associate Dean has the right to impose additional sanctions. In this case, you will be notified of the additional sanctions in writing and have an opportunity to accept or appeal the escalated sanctions.

- _____ I admit to the above charge of academic misconduct and accept the recommended sanction.
- _____ I admit to the above charge of academic misconduct but wish to appeal the proposed sanction.
- _____ I deny the charge of academic misconduct and wish to appeal the proposed sanction.

Student Signature	Date	() I received information regarding policy & procedures. () I did not receive information regarding policy & procedures.
-------------------	------	---



Documents forwarded to Associate Dean for the School of Engineering by Department: _____ (Date)

Student Misconduct Record Review _____ (Date)

Recommendations:

- No additional sanctions recommended
- Transcript Citation of Academic Misconduct - (Must also indicate grade: F, D, or other)
- Suspension from a specific course
- Suspension from the University of Kansas - Noted on Transcript
- Expulsion from the University of Kansas - Noted on Transcript

Associate Dean Signature

Date

Associate Dean Name Printed



Hearing Scheduled: _____
Date Time Location

Findings:

Charge Dismissed.

SANCTION(S) IMPOSED: _____

Results of Misconduct Hearing will be communicated to the student in writing within 30 days of decision.

Template: Confidential Notification of Charge

Confidential

Dear Mr. Jayhawk:

An academic misconduct charge was brought forth by Instructor _____ on _____ alleging _____ in the following course: A sanction of _____ has been recommended.

It is important that you understand your rights and responsibility regarding this charge. Charges of Academic misconduct are taken seriously in the School of Engineering. The following resources are available to you.

. You may review the University Policy at:
. <https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/USRR.htm>

| . You may review the School of Engineering Policy and Procedure at:
. <http://www.policy.ku.edu/schooldept.shtml#panel6>

| . The KU Student Handbook is available at: <http://www.studenthandbook.ku.edu/>

You have 10 calendar days to review documents and determine how you wish to respond to the alleged charge of misconduct. The documents are available for your review in the _____ office at _____. Among these documents is the Charge of Academic Misconduct Form, on which you can indicate and sign your agreement with one of the following statements:

- I admit to the above charge of academic misconduct and accept the recommended sanction.
- I admit to the above charge of academic misconduct but wish to appeal the recommended sanction.
- I deny the charge of academic misconduct and wish to appeal the recommended sanction.

You may submit additional information or a written statement if you choose. Failure to respond within 10 calendar days of notification will be taken as an indication of your agreement with the charge and sanctions.

I am available to discuss this information with you. To schedule an appointment, you may contact _____ at _____ or at _____ or contact me directly at _____ and/or at _____.

If you do not wish to discuss this matter in person but want to review and respond to the Charge of Academic Misconduct Form, contact _____ or come by the office.

Sincerely,

Instructor

Template: Confidential E-mail Notification of Hearing (*Send with Read Receipt*)
Confidential

Dear Mr. Jayhawk:

An academic misconduct charge was brought forth by Professor _____ on DATE alleging CHARGE (i.e., plagiarism by you on a paper submitted) while fulfilling the requirements of COURSE. A sanction of _____ was recommended.

On DATE, you were informed of the charge and requested to appeal the recommended charge and/or sanction. It is important that you carefully prepare your presentation and plan to attend the hearing. If you are unable to attend, the hearing will proceed as scheduled in your absence.

Individuals attending the hearing will be kept to a minimum to insure the confidentiality of the proceedings. You and/or the charging instructor may request that an observer/advisor or witness(es) attend the hearing.

The Associate Dean (or designate) must be notified in writing 10 calendar days prior to the hearing of any observer and/or witness(es) that will be attending the hearing.

Typically, students do not bring legal counsel. However, if you wish to bring an attorney, University General Counsel will be contacted and asked to attend the hearing also. The hearing may be delayed until such time as all parties, including legal representatives from both sides, can attend.

It is important that you understand your rights and responsibility regarding this charge. Charges of Academic misconduct are taken seriously in the School of Engineering. The following resources are available to you.

. You may review the University Policy at:
. <https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/USRR.htm>

. You may review the School of Engineering Rules and Regulations at:
. <http://www.policy.ku.edu/schooldept.shtml#panel6>

. The KU Student Handbook is available at:
. <http://www.studenthandbook.ku.edu/>

If you have questions, please contact _____ in the Department.

_____ Associate Dean of Engineering, is also available to address your questions or concerns.

Template: Confidential E-mail Notification of Hearing Outcome

Confidential

Mr. Jayhawk

1111 Lane

City, KS Zip

Dear Mr. Jayhawk:

An academic misconduct charge was brought forth by Professor _____ on DATE alleging CHARGE (i.e., plagiarism by you on a paper submitted) while fulfilling the requirements of COURSE A sanction of _____ was recommended

On DATE, you were informed of the charge and requested to appeal the recommended charge and/or sanction.

A School of Engineering Academic Misconduct Hearing was held on DATE to review your case. After careful deliberation, the panel recommends.....

- Censure - A written reprimand (warning) for actions which constitute academic misconduct.
- Reduction of Grade for Specific Work – A grade of _____ has been assigned for the work in question. With this sanction, you may be permitted to withdraw from the course within the approved withdrawal period.
- Reduction of Grade for the Course – A grade of _____ has been assigned to the course. You will not be allowed to withdraw from the course. You will not be allowed to apply the Course Repeat Policy to remove the assigned grade from your grade point average calculation.

May comment on the severity of the issue and long term implications or offer words of wisdom.

Per university policy, all sanctions of Reduction of Grade for Specific Work, Reduction of Grade for the Course, Disciplinary Probation, Suspension from a Specific Course, Suspension, and Expulsion that are applied by the College and the Schools or their designated departments will be communicated to the Office of the Provost. The purpose of asking that notices of sanctions be communicated to the Provost's office is so that students whose academic misconduct in one department or school has been established will not be regarded, and hence punished, as first-time offenders in another unit. Elevated sanctions will strongly be considered for second offences of academic misconduct.

If you are dissatisfied with the resolution of the charge, you may seek review by the Judicial Board. All appeals must be made within 30 calendar days of the initial decision.

Sincerely,

cc: Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
Dean, School of Engineering
University Registrar
Assistant Dean, Student Academic Services
Department Chair
Charging Instructor

ARTICLE IVr GRADUATION AND DEGREES

Section 1 Requirements for Graduation with the Bachelor's Degree

4r.1.1 Grade Point Average

In addition to completing each of the required and elective courses listed in an undergraduate curriculum of the School:

- a) A student must attain a University overall or Engineering cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.00 in the courses applied toward the degree.
- b) In addition to the requirement in item (a), a student must attain at least a 2.00 in all courses taken in the School of Engineering, including those courses not applied toward a degree.
- c) A student entering with advanced standing must attain a University overall or Engineering cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.00 in courses taken at the University of Kansas and applied toward the degree.
- d) In addition to the grade-point policies previously adopted, a student receiving a bachelor's degree from the school must have an all-university (KU) GPA of 2.00.
- e) A student must be officially enrolled in the School of Engineering while completing the last 30 hours of credit to be applied toward the degree. This regulation may be waived under the conditions found in Article III, Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 of the University Senate Rules and Regulations.

4r.1.2 Credit for ROTC Courses

Students may enter the Reserve Officers Training Corps to train for commissions as regular or reserve officers. Each engineering department establishes the number of ROTC course credit-hours that count toward the degree. A student who discontinues one of the ROTC programs before completion normally may not apply ROTC credits toward a degree. If the student discontinues the program for the convenience of the military service, some credits-hours might be used through the procedure of submitting a petition to the department.

Section 2 Granting of Degrees

4r.2.1 "Degrees shall be granted by the authority of the Board of Regents upon the recommendation of the faculties of the several schools."

(USRR 3.2.1) A list of those who have submitted an application for graduation in that semester and fulfilled the academic requirements for the Bachelor's degree shall be presented to the faculty or its designated representatives for consideration for recommendation for the degree. The names of the students so recommended will be forwarded through University officials to the Board of Regents for their action.

Section 3 Graduation with Scholastic Honors

Students must have taken at least 64 credit-hours in residence at the University of Kansas to be considered for graduation with School honors. Students with transfer credit must also have overall grade-point averages, including transfer credit, that are in the upper ten percent of the class. Grades marked "CREDIT" on the student's transcript are not calculated into the grade-point average for awarding distinction or highest distinction.

4r.3.1 Degrees carrying the title "with distinction" may be awarded to students having grade point averages in the upper ten percent of the graduation class of the School.

Degrees carrying the title "with highest distinction" may be awarded to students having grade point averages in the upper three and one-third percent of the graduating class of the School.

ARTICLE Vr ADMISSION TO THE SCHOOL

Section 1 Requirements for Undergraduate Admission

5r.1.1 The general regulations for admission to the University of Kansas are covered in Article II, Section 2 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations for freshman and Article II, Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations for transfers. The general regulations for readmission to the University of Kansas are covered in Article II, Section 3 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. These regulations apply to the School of Engineering except as amended herein.

5r.1.2 Students may enter the School of Engineering as freshmen, but all admissions, both in-state and out-of-state, are selective. General requirements for admission to the University are included under Admission in the General Information chapter of the undergraduate catalog.

Applications for admission are judged on several factors, including, but not limited to: high school record, scores on national tests, academic record at the college or university level, and trend of grades. High school transcripts, college transcripts, if applicable, and an official ACT (or SAT) score report are required.

5r.1.3 Minimum academic standards for admission

To be considered for admission to the School of Engineering, all applicants must meet or exceed the following minimum standards:

a) For beginning in-state and out-of-state freshmen, be in the top 50% of their graduating class or equivalent with at least a 3.00 GPA (4.00 = "A") in the Kansas qualified admissions college prep curriculum from an accredited high school or equivalent, meet eligibility requirements for Math 104, i.e., minimum math ACT of 22 or equivalent SAT, and have a composite ACT of 21 or equivalent SAT.

b) All transfer students shall have an overall college GPA of 2.50 or better, with grades of "C" or better in those courses in mathematics, science, and engineering applicable to the engineering degree. No upper-level engineering credits from non-ABET accredited institutions are acceptable as transfer credit. Transfers between School of Engineering departments, including changes from "undecided," must be approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies.

Each department may set higher minimum admission standards with the consent of the Dean. Meeting the minimum standards does not guarantee admission to the School of Engineering.

Section 2 Evaluation and Acceptance of Advanced Standing Credits

- 5r.2.1 The School of Engineering does not routinely accept course credits from a foreign institution, or from a vocational-technical program in the United States. Before such courses may be added to a student's official KU record as advanced standing credits, they must be validated by:
- a) examination by the department or school offering the course on the KU campus,
 - b) earning a grade of "C", or higher, in a course for which the proposed transfer credit is a prerequisite, or
 - c) earning a grade of "C", or higher, in a related course.
- 5r.2.2 Credits for English composition at a foreign institution of higher education will not be accepted for the required English courses in any engineering curriculum.
- 5r.2.3 A student must be continuously enrolled in ENGL 101 or ENGL 105 until one is passed. Once ENGL 101 is successfully passed, the student must be continuously enrolled in ENGL 102 until it is passed.
- 5r.2.4 Credits from courses completed at the secondary level, whether from U.S. or from foreign schools, will be added to a student's official record of college credits if obtained by the student through one of the following:
- a) The College Entrance Examination Board's advanced placement (AP) test.
 - b) KU's own credit by examination program.
 - c) The College Level Examination Program.
 - d) Other methods approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies.
- 5r.2.5 A course from another college or university will apply toward a Bachelor of Science in Engineering degree as transfer or non-resident credit only if the grade received is at least a "C".
- 5r.2.6 Courses in the specialized engineering sciences and in engineering design normally will not transfer as credit toward the degree unless

these courses were taken in an engineering degree program accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc.

- 5r.2.7 Not more than 64 hours of community or junior college credits can be transferred to count toward a Bachelor of Science in Engineering degree. After being classified as a junior at the University of Kansas, a student may not subsequently use community or junior college credits as non-resident credits to be applied toward the degree, except by petition in advance of taking the courses.

ARTICLE VIr PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING PROMOTION AND TENURE EVALUATIONS

Section 1 Introduction

6r.1.1 This article sets forth the procedures and guidelines used in the School of Engineering to evaluate those faculty nominated for promotion and tenure. This article is intended to be in accordance with Article VI of the Rules and Regulations of the University's Faculty Senate and with Guidelines and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion found in the Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff. This Article has been developed specifically for the School of Engineering by its Engineering Senate.

6r.1.2 The traditional functions of higher education involve advancing knowledge through research and scholarly activity, conveying knowledge through teaching, and applying knowledge through service. The evaluation of faculty accomplishments in these areas forms the basis of recommendation considerations for promotion in rank and award of continuous tenure.

6r.1.3 In the following sections are described the School of Engineering's:

- a) Procedures to be followed in an evaluation.
- b) General criteria for promotion to the different ranks and for awarding of tenure.
- c) Functional categories to be used in an evaluation with specific examples of activities.
- d) Manner in which a recommendation is to be documented.
- e) Relative expected level of activity to be given to the different categories.

This portion of the Engineering Senate's Rules and Regulations forms a set of guidelines and is not to be construed as a set of inflexible rules. Reasonable flexibility should be exercised in the evaluation of a candidate's accomplishments.

Section 2 Procedures of the Evaluation Process

6r.2.1 Constitution of Promotion and Tenure Committees

6r.2.1.1 Department Committees

- a) Associate Professor Rank: For candidates aspiring to the rank of Associate Professor, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall comprise all tenured members of the faculty

in that department of the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

- b) Professor Rank: For candidates aspiring to the rank of Professor, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall comprise all tenured members of the faculty in that department of the rank of Professor.

6r.2.1.2 School Committee

The School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of tenured members of the faculty of the School of Engineering. Committee members shall hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor with the provision that at least a majority of the members shall hold the rank of Professor. The committee shall have one member from each of the School's departments that have faculty who are qualified to serve on this committee. Members shall hold two-year overlapping terms, and shall not serve if seeking promotion during their terms. Members shall be selected by their respective departments.

The Committee shall select a Chair, a Vice Chair, and a Secretary from among its members at its first meeting each academic year.

Upon completion of a two-year term as a committee member, a faculty member is eligible for additional terms if selected by his or her department. The selection shall be made no later than the end of the third week of the Fall semester of each academic year.

6r.2.2 Annual Nominations for Promotion and/or Tenure

6r.2.2.1 Chronology

The timing of the several steps described below shall be determined by the Dean. This must be done as soon as possible each Fall after it is known when recommendations will be due to the Office of Academic Affairs, and the schedule shall then be promptly announced to the faculty by the Dean.

6r.2.2.2 Nominations Within a Department

Each year, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review the qualifications and performance of each member of its faculty below the rank of full Professor with a view toward nomination as a candidate for promotion and/or the awarding of tenure. Early in this process, the Department Committee shall meet with each potential candidate for promotion and/or tenure award to determine whether that person wishes to proceed through

the process or to defer consideration of the matter to another year. The person's decision in this matter shall be honored. However, a mandatory tenure review will be made for any tenure-track appointment during the last year (sixth year if no prior service is present) of the allowable duration before attaining tenure. It is suggested that the review process be initiated in the spring preceding the academic year in which the nomination shall be considered. Such early consideration will provide ample time for the candidate to develop a complete promotion and/or tenure dossier.

6r.2.2.3 Nomination Outside a Department

An individual faculty member shall always be entitled to recommend himself or herself, or others, for promotion and/or tenure outside the regular departmental review procedure. The rules governing this are detailed in the Rules and Regulations of the Faculty Senate.

6r.2.2.4 Dossiers

Once a person has agreed to become a candidate for promotion and/or tenure award, it is the candidate's responsibility to supply the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee with such materials as he or she believes will support the nomination. Suggested documentation is described in Sections 6r.7 and 6r.8. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee should supplement the materials provided by the candidate whenever this would be useful in assessing the nominee's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. All materials so collected shall be assembled in a dossier.

6r.2.2.5 Departmental Committee Recommendations

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review the assembled dossier, provide the evaluations requested in the University's forms, and determine whether promotion and/or tenure should be recommended affirmatively. If the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, by majority vote of its members, gives an affirmative recommendation, it shall forward its recommendation on the University form, along with the dossier, to the Engineering Senate's Promotion and Tenure Committee. Action to be taken in the event of a negative recommendation is specified in Section 6r.2.2.7.

After arriving upon recommendations, the Department Committee, via its chair, shall provide written feedback to all candidates on the committee's vote, ratings, and rationale for ratings.

6r.2.2.6 Engineering Senate Committee Recommendations

Upon receiving the recommendation from the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure committee shall evaluate the dossier according to these School of Engineering criteria, and determine whether promotion and/or tenure should be recommended affirmatively. If the Committee, by majority vote of its members, gives an affirmative recommendation, it shall forward its recommendation and the supporting materials to the Dean for subsequent forwarding to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT). Action to be taken in the event of a negative recommendation is specified in Section 6r.2.2.7.

After arriving upon recommendations, the School Committee, via its chair, shall provide written feedback to all candidates on the committee's vote, ratings, and rationale for ratings.

6r.2.2.7 Failure to Receive Affirmative Recommendation; Withdrawal

If the nominee fails to receive an affirmative recommendation by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee or the School Promotion and Tenure Committee, he or she shall be promptly informed in writing by that Committee that their dossier will be forwarded for consideration to, respectively, the School Promotion and Tenure Committee or the Dean and subsequently the UCPT only if the nominee specifically so requests. Even in a case of affirmative recommendation by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee or the School Promotion and Tenure Committee, the nominee may at any time request that the nomination be withdrawn.

6r.2.2.8 Checkback from a Higher Committee

Should a School or Department Promotion and Tenure Committee receive a request for information letter (formerly "checkback") from a higher level committee, the committee shall invite the candidate to assist with the response or to include his or her own response.

Section 3 General Criteria for Promotion

6r.3.1 Promotion to Associate Professor

Because the rank of Associate Professor represents one of the higher levels of academic rank, a person promoted to this position shall have demonstrated the attainment of beginning stages of authority and knowledge in a declared area of specialty within the broader scope of his or her program.

Specialization is not to be construed as “narrowness” at the expense of isolating a teacher’s scholarly activities from the practical applications of their interest to the broader teaching spectrum. Rather, specialization is to signify in-depth awareness, scholarship, and learning in a manner in which the person’s teaching ability is enhanced. Demonstrated teaching ability, based on such in-depth understanding, is a requirement for promotion to Associate Professor.

At the time of consideration for promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate must have demonstrated sound research capability and potential for continued growth in research and/or professional development activities.

Further, for promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate should have demonstrated successful, substantial, and sustained service efforts to the Department, School, University, his or her profession, and/or the external community.

6r.3.2 Promotion to Professor

Because the title of Professor represents the highest level of academic rank, it should be reserved for a person who has demonstrated mastery of a specialty in his or her program, in the sense specialty is defined under the Associate Professor requirements.

The candidate should have clearly demonstrated competence as a teacher. Further, the candidate should be a positive contributor to faculty and student morale and spirit, and have shown leadership in the development of an atmosphere which promotes the pursuit of creative and intellectual learning.

A candidate for the rank of Professor should have been engaged in significant research and publication or other scholarly activities which further the knowledge of the profession, and/or have engaged in significant professional activities which have established their position as a leader in the profession.

The candidate should also have demonstrated a continued contribution by way of substantial service to the Department, School, University, his or her profession, and/or the community at large.

6r.3.3 Awarding of Tenure

Normally, the awarding of tenure will be done concurrently with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Therefore, the criteria for awarding of tenure are generally the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor. In some cases, where a candidate has demonstrated significant achievements either at the University or through prior service, but where the candidate had been a member of the University faculty for an insufficient time to render a tenure decision, promotion may be recommended without tenure.

6r.3.4 Time in Academic Rank

The guidelines for time in academic rank are those specified in the University's Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff. The statement is, "In most fields five to six years between appointment as an Assistant Professor and promotion to Associate Professor, and five or six years from Associate Professor to full Professor."

Prior service, either at another university or in an industry or government professional position, should be considered for time-in-grade purposes toward promotion. The time-in-grade credit will be negotiated by the candidate and the Provost at the initial hire and will be documented in the official offer signed by the Provost.

The Department Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall make a recommendation for time-in-grade credit for prior service. The School Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall consider this recommendation and concur or make an alternate recommendation. These recommendations for credit shall be forwarded with the promotion dossier.

The School of Engineering encourages the development of a faculty which has professional experience in industry or government. Further, the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), the accreditation body for engineering degree programs in the U.S. and elsewhere, strongly recommends that a significant portion of the engineering faculty have industrial experience.

Promotion and/or tenure recommendations that are made before the “normal” time in grade has elapsed should be based on truly exceptional performance.

Section 4 Categories of Evaluation

6r.4.1 Introduction

The categories of professional activity which are to be evaluated in the process of consideration for promotion and/or award of tenure are:

- a) Teaching
- b) Research and Scholarship
- c) Service and Administration

These categories are defined in what follows and a listing of activities within each are presented. Because professional development can relate to teaching, research, scholarship, and service activities, it is included as a component within each of the three categories given above. The listing in each is intended to represent examples and is not exhaustive. Thus, where appropriate, additional activities should be documented and evaluated. The listings of activities in each category are divided into Class I and Class II activities. Those items in Class I are, in general, to be given more weight in the evaluation process than items in Class II.

6r.4.2 Teaching

6r.4.2.1 General Statement

Teaching refers to classroom instructional activities and to small group or individual activities related to classroom instruction. Student advising is also considered a part of the teaching function. At the graduate level, teaching is defined additionally to include supervision of theses and dissertations, direction of individual studies, graduate student committee membership, and student evaluation activities such as Ph.D. qualification and comprehensive examinations. Activities which involve the development of teaching aids and materials such as course syllabi, textbooks, class notes, etc., are also a part of the teaching function.

Professional practice is an important part of the preparation and continuing development of a School of Engineering faculty

member. Past and continuing industrial experience and consulting are not only recognized, but in fact emphasized by the engineering accrediting agency.

6r.4.2.2 Teaching—Class I Activities

- a) Teaching of undergraduate courses.
- b) Teaching of graduate courses.
- c) Direction of graduate students' nonthesis reports, theses, and dissertations.
- d) Teaching special problems courses.
- e) Teaching short courses.
- f) New course development.
- g) Textbook or other educational publications.
- h) Student advising.
- i) Significant course modification.
- j) Development or utilization of innovative teaching methods.
- k) Laboratory development.
- l) Preparation of proposals for improvement of instruction.
- m) Enhancement of instruction using examples and case studies obtained through professional practice.

6r.4.2.3 Teaching—Class II Activities

- a) Preparation of lecture notes.
- b) Doctoral and master's committee membership.
- c) Participation in oral examinations.
- d) Preparation and grading of special graduate examinations.
- e) Minor course modifications.
- f) Attending teaching effectiveness seminars and/or short courses.

Section 5 Research and Scholarship

6r.5.1.1 General Statement

Research and scholarship refer to activities related to the discovery and interpretation of facts, critical evaluation of available information, design, and creativity. Activities concerned with the communication of research findings and/or scholarly ideas are a part of this category. Such communication takes the form of publication in scholarly books or journals, presentation at professional meetings, technical reports, etc. Professional practice that extends and develops an individual's research development and productivity are also included in this category.

6r.5.1.2 Research and Scholarship—Class I Activities.

- a) Preparation and submission of research project proposals to funding agencies.
- b) Supervision of funded and/or unsponsored research projects.
- c) Supervision of graduate students, completed or in progress.
- d) Publication of books or monographs.
- e) Publication of refereed papers.
- f) Presentation of papers and seminars at national or international professional conferences.
- g) Presentation of invited lectures.
- h) Receipt of special honors, fellowships, lectureships, etc.
- i) Receipt of patents.
- j) Publication of external technical reports.

6r.5.1.3 Research and Scholarship—Class II Activities

- a) Research development through professional practice, sabbaticals, participation in courses, schools, etc.
- b) Publication of in-house research reports, technical memoranda.
- c) Presentation of papers and seminars at local meetings.
- d) Publication of non-refereed or in-house papers.

Section 6 Service and Administration

6r.6.1.1 General Statement

Service includes professionally related activities that are of benefit to University, local, state, national, or international communities, but which are not teaching, research, or scholarship. Professional practice which does not directly and demonstrably enhance teaching or research productivity is considered a service activity.

Service in an administrative position that is related to the academic and/or research mission of the University is included in this category.

6r.6.1.2 Service and Administration—Class I Activities

- a) Service to professional and academic societies (officer, major committees, program chair, etc.).
- b) Service as a member of the editorial board of professional journals.
- c) Service on local, state, national, and international committees.

- d) Service on major departmental, school, or university committees.
- e) Service as a program director for conferences, institutes, short courses, etc.
- f) Service in a major academic administrative position.
- g) Service in a major research administrative position (director of laboratory or institute, etc.).
- h) Service in major department administrative positions.
- i) Service as an advisor to student professional and academic societies.

6r.6.1.3 Service and Administration—Class II Activities

- a) Service on minor committees.
- b) Service in professional and academic societies.
- c) Participation in minor departmental administrative duties.
- d) Participation in KU Speaker's Bureau.
- e) Speak at civic organization meetings.
- f) Reviews of others' books, articles, reports, and proposals.

Section 7 Documentation of the Evaluation

6r.7.1 General Statement

The three main categories of evaluation for promotion and tenure are listed in Section 6r.4.1 as teaching, research and scholarship, and service and administration. Each candidate and department should present as much information as possible in the dossier to document the candidate's performance in each area. The information should be well-organized, concise, complete, and easily understood in its basic form with appendices providing more detail as necessary.

Documentation of performance for a person who holds a joint appointment in two or more University units should receive special attention by the candidate and the units to ensure that all pertinent information is presented. The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee of the candidate's primary department normally should be responsible for organizing the unit-related documentation. Every effort should be made to coordinate the evaluation activities with the units in which the joint appointment is held.

Particular items of documentation for evaluation of candidates for promotion and tenure are suggested in the subsections that follow.

Section 8 Documentation of Teaching, Research, and Service Performance

6r.8.1 Documenting Teaching Performance

Effective teaching is often difficult to document in a recommendation for promotion or tenure. It is important that a variety of factors be considered and it is incumbent on the evaluators to develop means of objectively assessing teaching competence. Factors in addition to classroom performance, as indicated in Section 6r.4, are relevant in the evaluation procedure.

Suggested items of documentation to be used in the evaluation of teaching follow.

6r.8.1.1 Documentation Directly Related to Classroom Teaching

- a) Semester-by-semester listing of courses and numbers of students taught.
- b) School, university, regional, national, or international awards for teaching excellence.
- c) Reporting and assessment of current and past student evaluations.
- d) Solicited or unsolicited statements by current and past students.
- e) Solicited or unsolicited statements by alumni (this may be particularly important for some faculty members whose contributions are better recognized by students after they graduate than while the students are in school).
- f) Statements by peers, within and outside of the School of Engineering, relating to the:
 - i) Faculty member's instructional performance.
 - ii) Faculty member's depth of understanding a particular field.
 - iii) Ability to relate the field of specialization to other areas.
- g) Statements by the departmental Chair regarding teaching ability.

6r.8.1.2 Specific Evaluation of Graduate Teaching

- a) Evaluation by graduate students. This may be done better on an individual basis than by surveys where the number of graduate students per class is small.
- b) Documentation of quantity of individual student guidance (problem courses, master's theses, dissertations).
- c) A measure of the quality of individual student guidance. This may be provided by peers or by careful evaluation of the

- student comments.
- d) Evaluation of the quality of theses, dissertations, and master's non-thesis problem work.
 - e) Statements by the department's Chair or other faculty on the performance of the individual as a member of graduate student committees and an examiner in oral examinations for graduate students.

6r.8.1.3 Other Teaching Activities

- a) Documentation of contributions to the development of new textbooks or courses including information as to the quality, originality, and amount of effort involved.
- b) Statements by the department on the breadth of courses taught by the individual and the importance of this breadth to the department.
- c) Description of short courses and seminars, including evaluations where appropriate.
- d) Description of innovative teaching methods with comments as to quantity and quality of effort.
- e) Documentation of development of new laboratories or improvements of existing laboratories.
- f) Statements relative to special advising activities.

6r.8.2 Documentation of Performance in Research, Scholarship, and Professional Development

In this documentation, emphasis should be given to the levels of excellence and the contributions to knowledge due to the candidate's work. Specifically, documentation of the following type should be considered.

6r.8.2.4 Technical Papers

- a) Listing of peer-reviewed papers, including an indication of the type and prestige of the journal or other publication venue, the type of paper (e.g., letter to editor, review or invited paper, new material).
- b) Listing of papers submitted for peer review but not yet accepted (rejected papers must not be included), with a review by School or other peers if possible.
- c) Listing of non-peer reviewed presentations and publications including an indication of the prestige of the venue, method of selection of papers, etc.

6r.8.2.5 Research Reports

- a) Listing of reports, including an indication of the newness and importance of the material, thoroughness of treatment, breadth of distribution, extent of review by research sponsor or others, and candidate's contribution in the case of a report with multiple authors.
- b) Listing of reports published as a government document or a part of a report series.
- c) Indication of references made to candidate's reports by other researchers.

6r.8.2.6 Books

Listing of research or scholarly books, including an indication of the prestige of or the "series" of which the book is a part, and extent of adoption by other universities or other research or scholarly organizations. Textbooks or other educational materials are to be documented in the teaching portion of the candidate's dossier.

6r.8.2.7 Patents

Listing of patents and a statement by peers as to the importance of the patents.

6r.8.2.8 Research Projects

- a) Listing of submitted research project proposals indicating titles, funding agencies, requested amounts, whether awarded or not, and the participation of the candidate in preparation of the proposal (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Co-I, etc.).
- b) Listing of completed and ongoing research project titles including, where appropriate, an indication of the quality of work, dollar amount of projects, number of students working on and funded by the projects, and degree of satisfaction by the sponsor, and the participation of the candidate in completion of the project.
- c) Statement of the relation of the research to the frontier of knowledge (i.e., position in the spectrum of research from conventional to frontier).
- d) Statement, where appropriate, regarding national and international cooperation involved in the candidate's research.
- e) Statement regarding the degree to which the candidate cooperated with other faculty in his or her research.

6r.8.2.9 Awards

A listing of any awards received by the candidate for papers, research projects, or general research, scholarly, or related professional development merit.

6r.8.2.10 Consulting

- a) A statement relative to the quality of the consulting. This probably will require exterior judgment by someone associated with the work.
- b) Statement as to whether the consulting is routine or involves frontier areas of knowledge.
- c) Statement regarding any publications that resulted from the consulting.
- d) Statement as to whether the consulting enhances teaching and research, and if so, in what way.

6r.8.2.11 Prior Industrial Service and Industrial Leave

Prior industrial service or industrial service during leave is of great importance to the School of Engineering faculty. However, this must be evaluated to the extent possible. Documentation might include the following:

- a) Statement from appropriate outside persons regarding both the quality and the level of the work.
- b) Statement as to whether the industrial work is, in some manner, equivalent to a comparable amount of teaching and research at a university. This is important because of the need to evaluate equivalent times spent in universities and industrial or government organizations.
- c) Statement regarding the importance of the position held by the candidate, preferably supported by referees external to the University.
- d) Statement regarding the relevance of the outside work to the University position held by the candidate.

6r.8.3 Documentation of Service and Administration

Service activities are often diffuse and/or “taken for granted” and therefore may require particular care in their documentation. Accomplishments in the performance of major administrative duties should be described as the time commitment is often substantial. Examples of types of acceptable documentation of service and administration follow.

6r.8.3.12 General Service to the University Community

- a) Specification of committee work with statements highlighting special accomplishments (e.g., indication of committee responsibility such as Chair, Secretary, etc.).
- b) Service for student organizations with supporting statements from students or peers where appropriate.
- c) Documentation of minor administrative responsibilities.

6r.8.3.13 Service to Local, State, National, or International Community

- a) Specification of the nature and value of the service.
- b) Statement, from persons outside the University, indicating the importance of the service and the time commitment.
- c) Documentation of special professional society service, such as committee activities, program and/or conference organization, etc.

6r.8.3.14 Major University Administrative Service

- a) Documentation of the nature of the administrative position, including primary responsibilities and time commitment.
- b) Evaluations of performance by the person's supervisor and others who dealt with him or her in their administrative capacity. Special accomplishments should be described.

Section 9 Relative Percent Effort of the Categories of Evaluation

6r.9.1 The relative importance of the different categories (teaching; research and scholarship; service and administration) is variable by Department, individual, and by rank. Normal ranges of weighting for each category are set forth in this document to provide guidelines. The weightings are to serve as a general guide in assessing a relative importance to be placed on each category.

Individual departments may set their own guidelines as expressed in their Faculty Evaluation Plan.

6r.9.2 In addition, the percent effort are set forth for the following purposes:

- a) To encourage a certain minimum effort in all three categories.
- b) To recognize, insofar as reasonable, variation of individual capabilities and/or interests.
- c) To encourage the development of teaching effectiveness by junior members of the faculty and an increasingly broad range

of activities on the part of senior members.

Table 6r.9.1 gives the range of Percent Effort for promotion to each rank.

Table 6r.9.1 Normal Percent Effort for Promotion to Each Rank

Category	Promotion to	
	Associate Professor	Professor
Teaching	40-60%	30-50%
Research and Scholarship	30-50%	30-50%
Service and Administration	10-30%	10-40%

ARTICLE VIIIr SABBATICAL LEAVES

Section 1 Policy

7r.1.1 The general policies and procedures found in Article VIII of the Rules and Regulations of the University Faculty Senate shall govern.

Section 2 Procedure

7r.2.1 A peer-group evaluation of each sabbatical leave request shall be done by the standing committee of the Engineering Senate on Sabbatical Leave.

7r.2.2 This committee shall be constituted each year and consist of one member from each department in the School. The Dean of the School will ask each of the departments to provide a member. Each department will select its representative in whatever fashion it deems appropriate. The committee shall elect from its members a Chair.

7r.2.3 The committee shall evaluate each sabbatical leave request and send its evaluations and recommendations to the Dean of the School. The requests will be ranked in order and those judged unworthy of a favorable recommendation noted.

7r.2.4 The Departmental Chair shall also prepare an evaluation of the merit of any applicant in his or her department and forward it to the Dean of the School.

7r.2.5 The Dean of the School of Engineering shall also prepare evaluations of the merit of the applicant's request and send them together with the Departmental Chair's and peer-group committee's Evaluations to the Vice Provost for Faculty Development. The file on each applicant will then be evaluated by the University Faculty Committee on Sabbatical Leaves and their recommendations made to the Chancellor.

ARTICLE VIIIr GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Pursuant to Article XIV of the University Senate Code and Articles V and VI of the University Senate Rules and Regulations of the University of Kansas, the School of Engineering establishes the following procedure for the hearing of grievances within the unit. This procedure shall be the sole procedure available to unit members at the unit level. However, if a grievance is against the Dean of Engineering, the grievance procedures of the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Development will be used. No person shall be subjected to discharge, suspension, discipline, harassment, or any form of discrimination for having utilized or having assisted others in the utilization of grievance procedures.

Section 1 Committee Formation

- 8r.1.1 A Grievance Committee for a specific grievance is formed by the Engineering Senate's Faculty, Rights, Privileges and Responsibilities Committee (FRPR). The Grievance Committee for the specific purpose of hearing the grievance shall be constituted as the tenured members of the FRPR Committee except those who are Department Chairs. The minimum number of members on the Grievance Committee shall be four. Members of the Grievance Committee shall elect a Chair at its first meeting. In the event that there are less than four members of the Grievance Committee, the necessary additional members will be selected by the Grievance Committee from those holding Chaired Professorships in the School of Engineering who are not Department Chairs. Information concerning the Grievance Committee designated to hear grievance and the grievance procedure adopted by the unit shall be easily available to all persons employed in or using the services of the unit.
- 8r.1.2 The Grievance Committee's term of service ends when FRPR and the Grievance Committee are notified in writing by the Dean of Engineering that a final decision has been made concerning the recommendation of the Grievance Committee. In the event that the School of Engineering Grievance Procedure is changed during the processing of a grievance, the procedure in effect when the grievance is filed will be used to process the grievance. The membership of a Grievance Committee remains the same until the Grievance Committee is disbanded unless it is necessary to add members to meet the minimum of four.
- 8r.1.3 The Grievance Committee may hold closed meetings as necessary to insure prompt and fair consideration of a grievance. This

includes, but is not limited to, election of a Chair, evaluation of the grievance to determine if a hearing should be held, organization of hearings, and deliberations leading to the recommendation of the committee.

Section 2 Policy and Procedure

- 8r.2.1 Because the Grievance Committee has the responsibility to hear grievances, it cannot function to develop evidence on behalf of either complainant or respondent. It is appropriate, however, for the Office of the Dean of the School of Engineering, in its administrative capacity, to consider complaints before scheduling a grievance hearing, to interview parties, to secure documents, and to seek a conciliatory solution. If the problem is not solved in this fashion, the Dean of Engineering shall refer the complainant to FRPR for the formation of a Grievance Committee, or if appropriate, to the University Senate's Judicial Board. If a Grievance Committee is formed, the Office of the Dean of Engineering shall make available to the Grievance Committee that information which it has developed concerning the complaint. This shall not be construed, however, to deny the right of an individual to file a complaint directly with the FRPR Committee.
- 8r.2.2 The Grievance Committee may establish procedures in addition to those listed in this document concerning the operation of the Grievance Committee's activities. The basic requirements of the grievance procedure as stated here, however, may not be altered by the Grievance Committee's procedures. All procedures shall ensure prompt and fair handling of complaints but shall attempt to minimize the formalism of legal process. Should the Grievance Committee adopt procedures in addition to those presented here or should it propose any change or amendment to this procedure, it shall submit those procedures or changes or amendments to the General Counsel of the University and the faculty of the School shall so be notified. Unless the General Counsel determines that the procedures or changes or amendments as submitted are in conflict with existing law, rules of the Board of Regents, or rules or regulations of the University, the procedures or changes or amendments shall become effective 30 days after such submission.
- 8r.2.3 The Grievance Committee shall not entertain a grievance that was filed after either six months have elapsed since the action or event complained of, or six months after the complainant knew of or reasonably could have known of the action or event complained of.

A complaint must be submitted in writing to the Grievance Committee and a copy sent to the respondent. The written statement of the complaint or grievance shall set forth the facts upon which the complaint or grievance is based and shall indicate the provision or provisions of the university rules and regulations alleged to have been violated, or the acts of established university bodies or officials alleged to have been unlawful, arbitrary, or capricious. The complainants and respondents must share copies of materials to be used in evidence and names of witnesses with each other and the Grievance Committee before a hearing of the complaint or grievance.

- 8r.2.4 The Grievance Committee shall schedule a hearing within two weeks of the submission of a complaint or grievance unless the Grievance Committee determines that there is good cause to schedule the hearing later.
- 8r.2.5 No member of the Grievance Committee for whom hearing a complaint constitutes a conflict of interest shall sit with the Grievance Committee while that complaint is being heard nor shall any party involved in the complaint participate in the rendering of any decision on the complaint or grievance.
- 8r.2.6 Except when all parties agree that the hearing before the Grievance Committee shall be public, all proceedings and related documents provided for in this grievance procedure shall be closed and considered confidential. All parties involved, their counsel or advisor, the Grievance Committee, and the Dean of Engineering shall be provided with a copy of the original grievance. Public reports by the Grievance Committee may refer to the types of cases heard, but no mention may be made of the names of the parties nor any reference made which would permit their identification.
- 8r.2.7 A party against whom a complaint or grievance is brought shall have the privilege of remaining silent and refusing to give evidence. He or she shall be informed of this privilege during the initial stage of the proceeding.
- 8r.2.8 Each party to a proceeding shall be entitled to a full examination of the evidence presented by the other party, including the opportunity to cross examine witnesses. To this end, the complainants and respondent shall provide each other with copies of materials to be used in evidence and names or witnesses at least one week before a hearing by the Grievance Committee of the complaint or grievance.

- 8r.2.9 The complainant shall bear the burden of proof unless the action complained of is the result of disciplinary proceedings. In such situations, the party supporting the application of sanctions to individual members of the university community shall have the burden of persuading the Grievance Committee of the facts upon which the applications of sanctions must be based.
- 8r.2.10 The Chair of the Grievance Committee shall have the power to keep order, rule on questions of procedure, relevance, and evidence, and shall possess other powers normal and necessary for a fair and orderly hearing.
- 8r.2.11 The grievance proceedings shall be as informal as possible. Therefore, while each party to a proceeding may represent his- or herself, or be represented by an advisor or counsel of his or her choice, representation by legal counsel is not encouraged. Hearings shall be closed except as provided in Section 6, rules of evidence which govern court proceedings shall not apply, there shall be no permanent recording of proceedings, and no permanent record shall be kept. A temporary file of the documents associated with the grievance shall be maintained by the Chair of FRPR for a period of one calendar year after the decision of the Dean of Engineering concerning the recommendation of the Grievance Committee.
- 8r.2.12 After hearing the evidence and arguments presented concerning each complaint, the Grievance Committee shall deliberate and decide, by majority vote, whether or not to uphold each complaint and shall include such decisions with any recommendation to the Dean of the School of Engineering. The Dean of Engineering shall be provided with a copy of the original grievance. The Grievance Committee has no enforcement powers and does not command sanctions. Each party to the proceeding shall receive prompt, written notice of the decision and any recommendation of the Grievance Committee and of the decision of the Dean of the School of Engineering concerning the Committee's recommendation. FRPR shall be notified by the Dean of Engineering that a final decision has been made concerning the recommendation of the Grievance Committee.
- 8r.2.13 Appeals of the decision of the Dean of the School of Engineering concerning the Committee's recommendation shall be made in writing to the University Senate's Judicial Board no more than 30 days after the aggrieved party has been advised in writing of the decision of the Dean of the School of Engineering.

8r.2.14 If either party believes the grievance was not handled in accordance with the School of Engineering Grievance Procedures, an appeal concerning the procedure shall be made in writing to the University Judicial Board no more than 30 days after the parties have been advised in writing of the decision of the Dean of the School of Engineering.