

Rules and Regulations
of the
School of Engineering
University of Kansas

Engineering Senate

Revised September 5, 2017

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	18
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	20
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	23
Section 1	Introduction	
Section 2	Procedures of the Evaluation Process	
Section 3	General Criteria for Promotion	
Section 4	Categories of Evaluation	
Section 5	Documentation of the Evaluation	
Section 6	Documentation of Teaching, Research, and Service Performance	
Section 7	Relative Percent Effort of the Categories of Evaluation	

ARTICLE VIIr	SABBATICAL LEAVES	42
Section 1	Policy					
Section 2	Procedure					
ARTICLE VIIIr	GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE	43
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 II ACADEMIC SCHEDULES

Section 1 Class Schedules

2r.1.1 Each of the departments and other academic programs of the School of Engineering shall prepare appropriate schedules of the courses they plan to offer, and then representatives of each of the departments and programs shall meet as a group 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 classes. “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 classes. “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.
- 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 by 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 Programs that he or she has been administratively disenrolled from the course, or if the student has completed the course, that any grade obtained has been changed to a "W" by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs.
- 3r.1.4 Retroactive Withdrawal: Students may petition to retroactively withdrawal 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 faculty voted to implement the option of applying plus/minus grading in all School of Engineering courses starting Fall 2017. While faculty will have the option to use this grading

system, they are not required to do so. Faculty will be able to assign an A through D- grade. There will be no plus/minus on a grade of F. Faculty are strongly encouraged to clearly explain in their syllabi starting Fall 2017 whether they will be using plus/minus when assigning their final grades, and if so, how that will be done. Final grades will still be assigned through Enroll & Pay, but the options will look a little different. The plus/minus grading system will not be applied retroactively.

- 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 of 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 its members. If, in the opinion of the Associate Dean chairing the committee, any of the 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 shall be completed 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 may 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 counted toward his or her degree and the student earned a "C" or better in all mathematics, science, and engineering courses. 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 Programs. A student does not automatically become eligible to re-enroll after a certain period of time.

3r.3.5 A First-Year General Engineering non-degree student will be placed on probation after the first semester completed if she or he does not meet the admission criteria for a KU School of Engineering degree program. A First-Year General Engineering student will be dismissed from the School of Engineering after one academic year (two semesters and one summer session) if he or she does not meet the admission criteria for a KU School of Engineering degree program.

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 KU's 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 credit-hours per semester, or nine credit-hours during the summer session, except by permission of the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs.

3r.5.2 The School of Engineering reserves the right to deny enrollment in courses offered by the School to any student who is officially admitted to 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 enrollment of students in another division to a course to provide enough space for regularly-admitted 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 another's work; violation of regulations or ethical codes for the treatment of human and animal subjects; or otherwise acting dishonestly in research.

Other forms of academic misconduct as defined by University Rules and Regulations and Codes are also included in this definition. Charges filed alleging dishonesty in research or the ethical treatment of human or animal subjects will be communicated to the Office of the Dean of the School of Engineering and the Research Integrity unit of the KU Office of Research.

In addition to these policies, certain forms of misconduct including sexual harassment are also addressed by University Senate Rules and Regulations and Codes of Conduct.

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. Instructors must proceed in accordance with Processing Details, 3r.6.12.

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. However, should the student request hearing, any previously-imposed sanctions shall be suspended and a hearing will 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 University 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 will be held in accordance with appropriate University Senate and Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations.

- 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 XII, 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 of the panel 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, or 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.

3r.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 academic misconduct form available from the Dean's Office. The instructor must complete and submit the form 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 completed form.
2. To complete academic misconduct form, briefly document the alleged academic misconduct, and review the case with your department or program 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/program chair must sign and date the academic misconduct form. The signature of the department/program chair indicates awareness of the charging instructor's charge, not necessarily agreement with the charging instructor's recommendations. If the department/program chair is also the charging instructor, the undergraduate or graduate coordinator in the department or program reviews and signs on behalf of the department/program. If a course is cross-listed, the department/program 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 or program 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 or Program 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 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 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 Programs in the School of Engineering if the student is an undergraduate and the Office of the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs if the student is a graduate student. All evidence presented by the charging instructor should be included.
 4. Upon receiving the signed academic misconduct form, the appropriate Associate Dean will review the student's record which shall include contacting the Provost (785-864-4904) 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 or program 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 Chair of the department or program to which the student has been admitted and the Chair of the charging department or program will each retain a copy of the academic misconduct form. . Copies of the charge will be sent to the appropriate Associate Dean of the School of Engineering. The Associate Dean will send a copy to the student, and shall retain any remaining copies or scans (including the original) in accordance with FERPA. All evidence presented by the charging instructor will be included.
 2. Upon receiving the signed academic misconduct form, the Associate Dean of Engineering will review the student's record which shall include contacting the Provost (785-864-4904) 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 or program 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 785-864-4422.

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 IV, Section 5 of the University Faculty 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 Kansas 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 the 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 first-year students and Article II, Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations for transfer students. The general regulations for readmission to the University of Kansas are given 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 directly the School of Engineering, but all admissions -- in-state, out-of-state, and international -- 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

A student will be considered for admission to the School of Engineering, and into directly one of its degree programs or into the First-Year General Engineering non-degree program, based on the following minimum standards:

- a) A first-year non-transfer student must have at least a 3.00 GPA on a 4.00 scale (weighted or unweighted) from an accredited high school or the equivalent.
- b) A first-year non-transfer student must also meet the eligibility requirements for MATH 125, or have a minimum Math ACT of 26 or Math SAT score of 600, for direct admission to a School of Engineering degree program.
- c) A first-year non-transfer student must meet the eligibility requirements for MATH 104, or have a minimum Math ACT of 22 or Math SAT score of 540, for admission to the First-Year General Engineering non-degree program. After the first semester at KU, a First-Year General Engineering student

must have completed at least 12 credit-hours, earned a “B” or better in MATH 104, earned a “C” or better in all science and engineering courses, and have a semester University grade-point average of 2.50 for admission to a School of Engineering degree program. Each First-Year General Engineering student has one academic year (two semesters and one summer session) to earn a “C” or better in MATH 125, a “C” or better in all science and engineering courses, and have a cumulative University grade-point average of at least 2.5 for admission to a School of Engineering degree program.

- d) A student transferring from within KU shall have an overall college GPA of at least 2.50. A student transferring from outside KU shall have a transferable college GPA of at least 2.50. All transfer students must have earned grades of “C” or better in their KU School of Engineering degree-applicable courses in mathematics (must include MATH 125 or equivalent), science, and engineering.
- e) Transfers between School of Engineering undergraduate degree programs, including changes from “undecided,” must be approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs.

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 foreign institutions, or from vocational-technical programs in the United States. Before any 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 (a.k.a. The College Board) Advanced Placement (AP) tests.
 - b) KU's own credit by examination program.
 - c) The College Level Examination Program (CLEP).
 - d) Other methods approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs.
- 5r.2.5 A course from another college or university will apply toward a KU 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 upper-level engineering sciences and design normally will not transfer as credit toward the degree unless these courses were taken in an engineering degree program accredited by the Engineering Accreditation Commission of the ABET (EAC/ABET; formerly 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 KU 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 successful 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 Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. 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.

- 6r.1.4 Criteria for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees beyond criteria common to all School of Engineering departments specified herein are the responsibility of individual Departments. All Departments must establish Departmental Guidelines as specified in section 6r.2.2.10.
- 6r.1.5 All candidates for promotion and tenure are entitled to academic freedom. Additionally, all candidates are obligated to exercise that freedom responsibly.

- 6r.1.6 Consideration and evaluation of a candidate's record is a confidential personnel matter. The School and Department procedures shall comply with relevant University regulations and policies to ensure confidentiality.

Section 2 Procedures of the Evaluation Process

- 6r.2.1 Constitution of Promotion and Tenure Committees

Department Promotion and Tenure Committees are constituted in the same fashion by all School of Engineering Departments. They are subject to the same Conflict of Interest Management Plan, Membership and Voting restrictions as the Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee. Any additional requirements for Department Committees are defined by individual Departments and must satisfy University requirements.

The Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee is constituted by the Departments. It is subject to the Conflict of Interest Management Plan, Membership and Voting restrictions described below.

- 6r.2.1.1 Department Promotion and Tenure Committee Membership

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 at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

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 at the rank of Professor.

- 6r.2.1.2 Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee Membership

The Engineering Senate 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.2.1.3 Committee Membership and Voting Restrictions

No students or untenured faculty members with the exception of unclassified academic staff with rank equivalent or higher than associate professor, shall serve on any promotion and tenure committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and tenure. Furthermore, all committee members voting on any recommendation for a candidate must be at or above the rank to which candidate is aspiring.

6r.2.1.4 Committee Conflict of Interest Management

No person shall participate in any aspect of the promotion and tenure process concerning a candidate when participation would create a conflict of interest or compromise the impartiality of an evaluation or recommendation.

A faculty member with a potential conflict of interest shall disclose the potential conflict of interest to both the Departmental and the Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure committees. If either committee decides by majority vote that a conflict of interest exists for a particular candidate, the faculty member will not be allowed to participate in promotion and tenure decisions for that candidate.

If a candidate believes that there is a potential for conflict of interest, the candidate may petition to have that faculty member recuse him/herself. The petition will be considered by both the Departmental and the Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure committees. If either committee decides by majority vote that the petition is valid and a conflict of interest exists, the faculty member will not be allowed to participate in promotion and tenure decisions for the candidate.

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

6r.2.2.1 Chronology

The Chronology defines the sequence of events taken by Department Promotion and Tenure Committees and the Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee leading to a Promotion and Tenure recommendation by The School of Engineering. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee requirements are defined here only in so much as they initiate the Promotion and Tenure process and interact with the Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee. All other requirements are defined by the Department Committees and must meet University requirements.

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

The Department Committee shall contact each potential candidate for promotion and/or tenure 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 mandatory tenure review year, which is recorded and maintained by the Provost's Office.

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, it is the candidate's responsibility to work with their Department to assemble a dossier meeting all University requirements.

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 in accordance with departmental criteria. If the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, by majority vote of its members, gives an affirmative recommendation, it shall via the Department Chair, automatically 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, shall forward its recommendations as required by the University to the Department Chair for his/her concurrence. The Department Chair shall provide written feedback to all candidates on the committee's recommendation, ratings, and rationale for ratings.

6r.2.2.6 Engineering Senate P&T Committee Recommendations

Upon receiving the recommendation from the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure committee shall independently evaluate the dossier according to these School of Engineering criteria and criteria established by the candidate's department to establish whether the candidate's teaching, research and service are "excellent", "very good", "good", "marginal" or "poor", 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 Engineering Senate Committee, shall forward its recommendations as required by the University to the Dean for his/her concurrence. The Dean shall provide written feedback to all candidates on the committee's recommendation, 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 Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee, he or she shall be promptly informed in writing by that Chair or Dean that their dossier will be forwarded for consideration to, respectively, the Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee or the Dean and subsequently the UCPT only if the nominee specifically so requests except in the case of the mandatory review year for tenure. Even in a case of affirmative recommendation by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee or the Engineering Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee, the nominee may at any time request that the nomination be withdrawn except in the case of the mandatory review year for tenure. In the mandatory review year for tenure, the dossier will be automatically forwarded to the next level of review.

6r.2.2.8 Request for Information from a Higher Committee

Should the Engineering Senate or Department Promotion and Tenure Committee receive a request for information letter (formerly “checkback”) from a higher level committee, the committee shall provide a copy of the request to the candidate and invite the candidate to assist with the response and to include his or her own response. This request for information should be specific about the information sought and the reasons for the request.

In the event of a negative recommendation at the intermediate level or a recommendation that differs from the recommendation of the department or administrative unit, a request for information is required. The request shall state the reasons for the negative recommendation.

6r.2.2.9 Additional Information

No new information may be added to the initial review except for the inclusion of a written statement by the candidate and/or in response to a request for information from the intermediate review committee.

If a candidate receives a negative recommendation or a final rating of teaching, research or service below the level of “good”, the candidate can submit a written response to the next level of review to be added to the dossier.

6r.2.2.10 Departmental Criteria

All departments shall develop and distribute to their faculty criteria for promotion and tenure specific to that department. Department criteria shall be evaluated and approved by Engineering Senate or its designate and the Dean of the School of Engineering.

Departmental criteria may add to School of Engineering criteria, but may not replace or otherwise weaken School of Engineering criteria specified herein. Furthermore, Departmental criteria must satisfy University requirements.

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 a successful, developing scholarly career 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. The research capability and potential for continued growth may be demonstrated in collaborative disciplinary, interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary scholarship as well as in individual scholarship.

Further, for promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate should have demonstrated successful 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 significant research may be evident in collaborative disciplinary, interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary research accomplishments as well as in individual accomplishments.

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.

6r.3.4 Time in Academic Rank

General guidelines for time in academic rank are 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 Engineering Senate 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.

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.

Each candidate shall receive a rating of “excellent”, “very good”, “good”, “marginal”, or “poor” in each evaluation category. Absent exceptional circumstances, successful candidates for promotion and tenure will meet disciplinary expectations in all categories while strong candidates are likely to exceed expectations in one or more categories.

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 Example Teaching Activities

Teaching activities considered in the evaluation may include, but are not limited to:

- a) Teaching of undergraduate courses.
- b) Teaching of graduate courses.
- c) Direction of graduate students' non-thesis 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.
- n) Doctoral and master's committee membership.
- o) Participation in oral examinations.
- p) Preparation and grading of special graduate examinations.
- q) Attending teaching effectiveness seminars and/or short courses.

6r.4.3 Research and Scholarship Activities

6r.4.3.1 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. When the research activities are the result of collaborative disciplinary, interdisciplinary or trans- disciplinary efforts, the record should document the faculty member's unique contribution to those efforts and its significance

6r.4.3.2 Extramural Funding

The candidate shall demonstrate the ability to obtain extramural funding to sustain and grow their research activities. All candidates seeking promotion must demonstrate identifiable, independent, and essential research contributions to funded projects. Evidence for such contributions include but are not limited to:

- a) Serving as a Principal Investigator or Co-PI
- b) Significant contributions to research publications
- c) Advising and graduating PhD students
- d) Supporting statements from collaborating investigators
- e) Supporting statements in external review letters.

Candidates seeking promotion to professor must additionally demonstrate the ability to independently obtain extramural funding.

Collaborative and interdisciplinary research is strongly encouraged with the candidate clearly identifying their contributions to projects in the dossier.

6r.4.3.3 Research Publication Practices

Publication practices vary widely among engineering disciplines and sub-disciplines. Thus, Departmental P&T Guidelines shall describe research publication practices for disciplines represented by their departments. Additional detail and clarification may be provided in individual dossiers by the candidate, by those responsible for the initial review, and in external review letters. Candidates are encouraged to describe their role in major publications in their dossier as they deem necessary.

Collaborative and interdisciplinary research is strongly encouraged with the candidate clearly identifying their contributions to publications in the dossier.

6r.4.3.4 Example Research and Scholarship Activities.

Research and scholarly activities considered in the evaluation may include, but are not limited to:

- a) Preparation and submission of research project proposals to funding agencies.
- b) Supervision of funded and/or unsponsored research projects.
- c) Advising graduate students, completed or in progress.
- d) Contributions to research publications
- e) Presentation of papers and seminars at national or international professional conferences.
- f) Presentation of invited lectures.
- g) Receipt of special honors, fellowships, lectureships, etc.
- h) Receipt of patents.
- i) Publication of external technical reports.
- j) Research development through professional practice, sabbaticals, participation in courses, schools, etc.
- k) Presentation of papers and seminars at local meetings.

6r.4.4 Service and Administration

6r.4.4.1 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.4.4.2 Example Service and Administration Activities

Service and Administration Activities considered in the evaluation may include, but are not limited to:

- 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
- j) Service on minor committees.
- k) Service in professional and academic societies
- l) Participation in KU Speaker's Bureau
- m) Speak at civic organization meetings
- n) Reviews of others' books, articles, reports and proposals.

Section 5 Documentation of the Evaluation

6r.5.1 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 6 Documentation of Teaching, Research, and Service Performance

6r.6.1 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.6.1.1 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.6.1.2 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.6.1.3 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.6.2 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.6.2.4 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.6.2.5 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.6.2.6 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.6.2.7 Patents

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

6r.6.2.8 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.6.2.9 Awards

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

6r.6.2.10 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.6.2.11 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.6.3 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.6.3.1 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.6.3.2 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.6.3.3 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 7 Relative Percent Effort of the Categories of Evaluation

6r.7.1 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.7.2 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.7.2 provides guidance for the expected range of Percent Effort for promotion to each rank.

Table 6r.7.2 Typical 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 application shall be performed 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 application 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 applications and send them together with the Departmental or Program Chairs' and Engineering Senate committee's evaluations to the Provost. The file on each applicant will then be evaluated by the University Committee on Sabbatical Leaves and its recommendations made to the Chancellor.

ARTICLE VIIIr GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Pursuant to Article XI 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 its 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 notify the faculty of the School of Engineering. Unless the General Counsel determines that the procedures or changes or amendments as submitted are in conflict with existing law, rules of the Kansas 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.

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 8r.2.6, 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 the FRPR committee 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. The FRPR committee 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 Grievance 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's 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.