

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, DESIGN, & COMPUTING

BYLAWS

University of Colorado Denver

Approved/Effective Date: 1/14/2016

Table of Contents

ARTICLE I – Definitions	3
ARTICLE II – Standing Committees.....	5
ARTICLE III – Annual Faculty Performance Ratings.....	7
ARTICLE IV – Student Grievance Procedure.....	7
ARTICLE V – College Policies Related to Alleged Faculty Research Misconduct	8
ARTICLE VI – Procedures for Comprehensive, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Reviews	9
ARTICLE VII – Clinical Teaching Track Faculty Titles and Processes	11
ARTICLE VIII – Adoption and Amendment	14
DISCLAIMERS & RATIFICATION	15

ARTICLE I

Definitions

As used throughout these Bylaws, the following definitions shall apply, unless otherwise specified.

1. **The College of Engineering, Design, and Computing:**

The College of Engineering, Design and Computing (CEDC) of the University of Colorado Denver is established by the Laws of the Regents of the University of Colorado. (Laws of the Regents, Article V, Section 1.)

2. **Faculty:**

These Bylaws define only those faculty positions eligible to participate in College governance and/or serve on College Committees. For all other faculty titles refer to *Regent Policy 5.L: Policy on Approved Faculty Titles* (<http://www.cu.edu/regents/Policies/Policy5L.htm>).

Rostered Faculty refers to such faculty positions eligible to participate in College governance and/or serve on College Committees and shall include:

a. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:

Those tenured or tenure-track Faculty who hold academic rank and whose names appear in the annual personnel budget roster. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are rostered.

b. Rostered Non-Tenure-Track Faculty:

Those non-tenure-track and at will Faculty who hold titles such as Senior Instructor, Instructor, or Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor Clinical Teaching Track with appointments of 50% or greater.

Research Faculty, Lecturers, Teaching Assistants, Research Assistants and Associates, Adjoint, and Adjunct Faculty, and Visiting Professors do not serve on College Committees nor enjoy voting rights within the College and are not considered Rostered Faculty.

3. Students:

a. Undergraduate Students:

All students matriculated in baccalaureate-level degree programs within the College.

b. Graduate Students:

All students admitted to the Graduate School of the University of Colorado Denver and matriculated in degree programs taught by graduate faculty within the College.

4. Administrative Staff:

The CEDC Administrative Staff consists of academic counselors, program specialists, program assistants, technical specialists, financial experts, and other administrative assistants employed by the College.

5. Voting Members of the Faculty:

The voting membership of the faculty shall consist of all Rostered Faculty in the CEDC.

6. Departments:

Within the College there are the following departments: Bioengineering, Civil Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering, Electrical Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering.

7. Faculty Member of More than One Department:

This refers to any person who may be assigned simultaneously to more than one department. Consistent with Campus, [*Guidelines and Checklist for Joint Appointments of Faculty*](#), 50%/50% splits are not allowed. The faculty member must have a “primary” department or school/college in which at least 51% of the FTE is assigned. The other department or school/college (with less than 50% FTE) is considered the “secondary” department.

8. The Dean:

The Dean is the Chief Executive Officer of the College. The Dean of the College manages new faculty recruitment and faculty relations (authorizes faculty searches; directs and approves promotion reviews; approves special appointments); leads strategic planning for CEDC (vision; financial needs; represents CEDC to other University of Colorado Denver Deans, as well as the Chancellor and Provost);

coordinates fundraising and alumni relations; determines and implements educational, research, and administrative goals. Refer to *Regent Law Article 4.A.2* (<https://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/article-04.html>), which sets forth the role and responsibilities of the Dean.

The dean shall be responsible for matters at the college or school level including but not limited to enforcement of admission requirements; the efficiency of departments or other divisions within the college; budgetary planning and allocation of funds; fund raising; strategic planning; academic advising; accountability and reporting.

9. The Associate/Assistant Deans:

The Associate/Assistant Deans are those individuals who are appointed by the Dean of the CEDC as Associate or Assistant Deans of the CEDC who serve under the Dean's authority and whose duties and time in office are at the discretion of the Dean.

10. Department Chairs:

The Department Chair serves as the chief executive officer of his/her Department within the CEDC. Refer to *Regent Law Appendix B: Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs* (<http://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/AppendixB.html>), which sets forth the role and responsibilities of department chairs.

11. College Administrator:

The College Administrator is the chief administrative officer for the College overseeing, improving, and optimizing all administrative functions and procedures within the College.

ARTICLE II

Standing Committees

1. CEDC Executive Committee:

There shall be a CEDC Executive Committee, consisting of the Dean, Associate/Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, and the College Administrator. The Executive Committee is the major deliberative and advisory body of the CEDC. The CEDC Executive Committee shall articulate and convey the will of the faculty to the Dean in matters related to the College academic enterprise. The Committee shall advise the Dean in matters of faculty hiring, faculty development, program development and coordination, strategic planning, and such other matters as may properly come before it.

2. Engineering Scholarship Committee:

Members of the Scholarship Committee are recommended by the Chair of each degree-granting department for approval by the Dean of the CEDC. The Committee meets as necessary to award scholarships contributed by industry, organizations, and individuals. The bulk of the awards are made during the spring semester for the following academic year.

3. First-Level Review Committee:

The First Level Review Committee (FLRC) shall consist of at least five full-time tenured faculty members in the CEDC with at least one representative from each CEDC academic department. The Dean shall appoint the members for a one-year term beginning in August each year. One of the committee members will be appointed chair by the Dean. The FLRC serves as a college-level review committee in matters of reappointment, tenure, and promotion and shall follow the procedures detailed in the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement Number 1022. Only members with the rank of Professor may vote on actions involving faculty with the rank of Professor or promotion to the rank of Professor.

4. College Graduate Committee:

The Graduate Committee will consist of the Chairs of each Department Graduate Committee. The Committee Chair will rotate annually. The committee's duties are approval of new or revised graduate courses, approval of college graduate faculty appointments, and approval of new and revised departmental graduate rules.

5. Committee on Accreditation:

The committee consists of one full-time faculty member per department. The committee will review ABET requirements especially as they pertain to changes in ABET policy. The committee will periodically review departmental assessment procedures and recommend best-practice procedures.

6. Ad Hoc Committees

The CEDC Executive Council may create ad hoc committees and prescribe their functions and compositions as needed.

ARTICLE III

Annual Faculty Performance Ratings

Annual faculty performance evaluations are first conducted through peer review consistent with the bylaws of each individual department. The Peer Review Committee indicates a rating of “Outstanding”, “Exceeding Expectations”, “Meeting Expectations”, “Below Expectations”, or “Fails to Meet Expectations” on the front side of the Annual Performance Rating Form. The Chair then conducts an independent review of each faculty member within his/her department. If the Chair agrees with the rating of the Peer Review Committee, the Chair so indicates on the back of the Annual Performance Rating Form. If the Chair disagrees with the rating of the Peer Review Committee, the Chair so indicates on the back of the form, but also provides his/her rating and comments indicating the reasons for the disagreement. Finally, the Dean conducts his/her own evaluation of each faculty member within the College. The Dean indicates his/her agreement or disagreement with the Peer Review Committee on the form. In cases in which the Dean disagrees with the Peer Review Committee rating and/or the Chair’s rating, (s)he indicates his/her rating and provides comments indicating the reasons for the disagreement. The Dean’s rating is forwarded to the Provost’s Office.

Faculty members can appeal their performance evaluation by submitting a written letter of appeal to the Dean within two weeks of receiving his/her evaluation. The Dean will then forward all relevant information including the faculty member’s FRPA to an ad hoc College Performance Review Committee (PRC). The ad hoc PRC will be constituted by a senior elected faculty member from each Department except the home Department of the faculty member submitting the appeal. The PRC will perform an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s record and can recommend a change to the faculty member’s performance evaluation only by majority vote. If the Dean does not accept the PRC’s recommendation to modify the rating, he/she must provide a detailed written response to the PRC’s recommendation that will be included in the faculty member’s file along with the PRC recommendation. The Dean’s decision is final.

ARTICLE IV

Student Grievance Procedure

The CEDC Student Grievance Procedure provides a process for the resolution of disputes between students and faculty of the College.

The first step for students in dealing with a perceived problem is to talk with the involved faculty member about the problem in an informal Conflict Resolution Meeting, which should occur within 30 days. In the event that either party is unavailable to meet within the 30-day requirement, the Assistant Dean for Academic Program Development may be contacted to facilitate the scheduling of the meeting. The discussion should be done one-on-one in the faculty member’s office or in some other agreed upon location on campus.

This dialogue may shed light on the issue or provide the student with an adequate rationale for the decision or action in question. It is anticipated that this type of dialogue between the parties involved can often resolve the issue. If a student or faculty member is hesitant to hold the meeting one-on-one, the College recommends that the student ask their advisor to be present during the meeting with the faculty member or the faculty member ask their respective department Chair to be present during the meeting.

If the dispute is resolved through informal discussion of the Conflict Resolution Meeting, no further steps are required. If the student and faculty member do not resolve the dispute, the student then can file a formal grievance. When this is the case, the student should complete the Statement of Grievance form and obtain a signature from the Assistant Dean for Academic Program Development. Students may obtain the Statement of Grievance form from the Office of the Dean of the CEDC.

The submission of a Grievance/Formal Request form initiates the Formal Grievance Process. The student shall submit the written request to the Assistant Dean for Academic Program Development to initiate a formal review. The statement must include the name of the faculty member involved, a summary stating the specific policies or procedures involved, and an explanation of the events and actions upon which the grievance is based. The College recommends that this summary be kept to one typewritten page. Supplemental materials relevant to the complaint may be attached to support the grievance.

The written grievance must be submitted within 10-days after the Conflict Resolution Meeting has occurred. The Assistant Dean for Academic Program Development will then form a faculty committee that is composed of two faculty members chosen from the five departments and the Assistant Dean for Academic Program Development. No faculty member from the grieved department shall sit on the Grievance Committee. The Assistant Dean or his/her designee and the Grievance Committee will conduct an appropriate investigation into the matter and take whatever steps are appropriate.

The Assistant Dean for Academic Program Development or his/her designee will issue a written statement of resolution promptly. The decision of the Grievance Committee shall be final.

ARTICLE V

College Policies Related to Alleged Faculty Research Misconduct

The College will maintain the highest level of research integrity possible. In particular, the College will abide by University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement (APS) 1007. More information on the policy and procedures can be found at the web site:

<http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/research/AboutUs/regcomp/researchethics/Pages/Scientific-Misconduct.aspx>

The US Office of Science and Technology put forward the following definition of research misconduct:

*“Fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results is defined as research misconduct. **Fabrication** is making up data or results and recording or reporting them. **Falsification** is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. **Plagiarism** is appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.”*

In addition to the above, the University of Colorado APS 1007 discusses failure to comply with established standards regarding author name on publications and retaliation of any kind against a person who, in good faith, reported or provided information about suspected or alleged misconduct in research.

In order to maintain confidence in the integrity of the College’s research enterprises, allegations of misconduct in research must be treated with utmost seriousness and examined carefully and responsibly. All faculty, staff, and students shall adhere to University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement (APS) Number 1007. In particular, all University employees have an obligation to report observed or suspected Misconduct in Research to the designated Research Integrity Officer. The University and the College will take reasonable steps to maintain the confidentiality of allegations, inquiries, and investigations. Once the alleged misconduct has been reported, the procedures in APS 1007 will be followed.

ARTICLE VI

Procedures for Comprehensive, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review

Every eligible faculty member will be reviewed in a timely manner for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure. Generally, recommendations for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and granting of tenure will be concurrent at the end of the mandatory probation period for faculty hired at the rank of Assistant Professor.

Infrequently, faculty members are initially appointed as associate professors or full professors without tenure, depending on their special qualifications and experience. In such instances, the normal procedures governing the award of tenure are followed; candidates must demonstrate the same quality of teaching, research and service that applies to other candidates for tenure.

The Primary Unit is responsible for establishing in its Bylaws a Primary Unit Evaluation Committee to: 1) review the progress of each faculty member, 2) advise each faculty member on their progress and 3) make appropriate recommendations for RTP to the Dean

of the CEDC. In addition, the Primary Unit must have approved written Primary Unit Criteria for RTP actions incorporated in their departmental Bylaws. The recommendations of the Primary Unit must be in writing and must include results of any vote taken.

Extramural evaluation of candidates is required for all cases of comprehensive review, promotion and/or tenure. Written opinions of scholars from outside the University who are qualified to judge the candidates' scholarly, creative and/or research efforts, will be requested by the Primary Unit, not by the candidate. The Dean must approve the letter to the external reviewers. The Candidate will be asked to provide names of scholars who should be considered, but not more than one-third of the external letters included in a dossier may be from scholars suggested by the candidate. The candidate is not to know which external scholars have provided evaluation letters.

All departmental recommendations for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure will be reviewed by the College First Level Review Committee (FLRC). The composition of this committee is described in the standing committees section of this document. The FLRC will evaluate each candidate's dossier and the recommendation of the Primary Unit; all members of the Committee must review all materials in the dossiers of all candidates. The FLRC will then vote on the action and transmit the results in writing to the Dean. The FLRC is responsible for insuring that all criteria and procedures specified in the University policies and directives have been explicitly followed and met. This includes making a specific judgment and stating whether each of the required performance criteria for teaching, research and service have been satisfied by an evaluation of meritorious in all three and excellent in either teaching or research.

When disagreements occur between the Primary Unit, First Level Review Committee, or the Dean, the procedures specified in the University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statement Number 1022 will be followed.

Candidates for RTP action may submit any material or information that he/she believes will be helpful in the evaluation of his/her reappointment, tenure and/or promotion at the first, second and third level review stages. Materials provided at a higher level of the review stage shall also be provided to all other bodies reviewing the candidates, and they may respond, as they deem appropriate.

Each probationary (non-tenured) faculty member will undergo supplemental annual evaluation by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee and independently by the Department Chair to review the faculty member's progress towards tenure in addition to the evaluations that take place during the faculty member's reappointment and tenure year. The results of these annual reviews will be transmitted to the Dean. The purpose of this review is to provide constructive comments to help the probationary faculty's progress towards a successful tenure review.

University policy requires that every tenured faculty undergo post-tenure review every five years. The chair will constitute a post-tenure review committee, consisting of tenured faculty within the department. For reviewing the professor's record, the committee must

consist of full professors. In accordance to the University Post-tenure Review Policy and Procedures, the post-tenure review committee will review the faculty member's professional plans from the past five years, the faculty member's record of achievement (as reported in the annual faculty performance reports, including FCQs, peer reviews of teaching and any other types of teaching evaluations the faculty member wishes to add), the CV and any other documentation the faculty member chooses to provide. The committee will look for evidence of sustained research productivity, quality teaching and effective service. In addition, the committee will evaluate the faculty member's five-year professional plan.

ARTICLE VII

Clinical Teaching Track Faculty Titles and Processes

A. Definitions

Faculty in the clinical teaching track (CTT) hold positions through which they contribute to advancing teaching, service, and research/scholarship at the University of Colorado Denver and the CEDC. They may hold faculty ranks as Instructor, Clinical Teaching Track; Senior Instructor, Clinical Teaching Track; Assistant Professor, Clinical Teaching Track; Associate Professor, Clinical Teaching Track; or Professor, Clinical Teaching Track.

CTT faculty engage in teaching, service and research/scholarship with a negotiable assignment. However, the typical assignment is 80% teaching, 10% service and 10% research/scholarship. Fundamentally, CTT faculty focus on teaching. Primary teaching responsibilities are concentrated on building and/or maintaining programs within the CEDC that provide quality service regarding local, state, national, and international needs in alignment with the mission and strategic plan of the CEDC. Service responsibilities are typically focused on the program to which they are assigned, on CEDC committees, and on other responsibilities as negotiated. CTT faculty are encouraged to approach research/scholarship as the "scholarship of teaching." Taken as a whole, these assignments allow CTT faculty to firmly ground their teaching in current theory and research/scholarship, and to facilitate a climate of inquiry in their classrooms.

CTT faculty participate in the faculty governance process as defined by the CEDC, receive university faculty benefits with the exception of sabbatical assignments, and undergo annual merit reviews of their performance as described in Article III. They are not eligible for tenure.

B. Faculty Titles and Ranks in the Clinical Teaching Track

Although the terminology is similar across tenure track and clinical teaching track, the titles in the clinical teaching track do not parallel the ranks that are available for tenure track professors. For each of the clinical teaching track faculty ranks, the Regents' definition is listed first, with the CEDC's more specific definition listed second.

Instructor, Clinical Teaching Track

Regents' definition: Instructors in the clinical teaching track usually have their master's degree or equivalent in their field and should be well qualified to teach.

CEDC definition: Instructor CTT faculty have an MS in engineering or another closely related field, should have experience teaching, and should have experience in the research, design, or business aspects of contemporary engineering practice.

Senior Instructor, Clinical Teaching Track

Regents' definition: This title permits higher recognition for higher qualifications or experience and, where applicable, salary than that of instructor.

CEDC definition: In addition to the qualifications for Instructor CTT, Senior Instructor CTT faculty have demonstrated success in teaching, and demonstrated experience with the research, design, or business aspects of contemporary engineering practice. In engineering disciplines where professional registration is common practice, Senior Instructor CTT faculty should have a professional engineer (PE) license in a jurisdiction within the U.S.

Assistant Professor, Clinical Teaching Track

Regents' definition: Assistant Professors in the clinical teaching track are expected to have the terminal degree and have some successful teaching experience. They are expected to teach and/or provide clinical care.

CEDC definition: Assistant Professor CTT faculty hold a doctoral degree in a relevant field, have experience in the area in which they will teach, and have evidence of teaching effectiveness at the university level. Assistant Professor CTT faculty must also have potential for service and research/scholarship that supports the program and the CEDC.

Associate Professor, Clinical Teaching Track

Regents' definition: Associate Professors in the clinical teaching track must have the terminal degree, be well qualified to teach and/or provide clinical care with considerable demonstrated evidence of successful teaching and demonstrated service.

CEDC definition: In addition to the qualifications for Assistant Professor CTT, Associate Professor CTT faculty have substantial relevant and successful teaching and professional experience in the field. In addition, they must meet the service and research/scholarship criteria for Associate Professor CTT in their home department's Primary Unit Criteria for Clinical Teaching Track Faculty.

Professor, Clinical Teaching Track

Regents' definition: Professors in the clinical teaching track must have the terminal degree, outstanding accomplishments in teaching, and/or provide clinical care, a record of leadership in the college, and a meritorious service record.

CEDC definition: In addition to the qualifications for Associate Professor CTT, Professor CTT faculty have a record of excellence in teaching and in service, including evidence of leadership. They must also meet the service and research/scholarship criteria for Professor CTT in their home department's Primary Unit Criteria for Clinical Teaching Track Faculty.

C. Appointments and Promotions, Clinical Teaching Track

Appointments are made by each department's Chair with approval from the Dean. The promotion process for CTT faculty is parallel to that for tenure-track faculty including the submission of a dossier for review by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee, by the Dean's First Level Review Committee, and by the Dean. However, CTT faculty do not undergo external reviews for appointments or promotions. The Dean recommends promotions to the Provost. The Provost sends his/her recommendation to the Chancellor, who makes final decisions about promotions. The promotion may be accompanied by a remuneration increase from the CEDC. Benefits such as tenure and sabbatical are not available for CTT faculty. Current senior instructors may apply to convert their positions to clinical teaching track faculty by indicating what rank they are applying for and submitting their dossier for review by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee, the First Level Review Committee, and the Dean.

D. Promotion Criteria and Indicators, Clinical Teaching Track

Specific guidance is provided in the Primary Unit Criteria for Clinical Teaching Track Faculty, which are approved by the Dean and the Provost. These department-specific documents shall comply with the following general guidelines:

Candidates for promotion from Instructor CTT to Senior Instructor CTT, from Assistant Professor CTT to Associate Professor CTT, or from Associate Professor CTT to Professor CTT should document, in their promotion dossier, that (1) they meet the minimum requirements for the higher rank, and that (2) they have demonstrated performance at the level of the higher rank as stated in their department's Primary Unit Criteria for Clinical Teaching Track Faculty.

In the CEDC, teaching performance is evaluated in the following areas:

- A. Curriculum Design/Program Planning
- B. Course Design
- C. Quality of Instruction

D. Student Satisfaction

E. Quality of Student Relationships, Advising, and Mentoring

F. Impact on Local Practice

In the CEDC, leadership and service performance is evaluated in the following areas:

A. University Contribution

B. Professional Recognition

C. Public Service

In the CEDC, research/scholarship performance is evaluated in the following areas:

A. Disciplined Inquiry: Publications and creative products will establish that the member regularly engages in, and places a high value on, research, scholarship, and knowledge dissemination.

B. Sustained and Focused Inquiry: Demonstrates a line of continuing inquiry related to one or more problem areas.

C. Impact on Practice and Professional Thought: Submits scholarly products and participates in the professional community.

ARTICLE VIII

Adoption and Amendment

These bylaws have been written to replace bylaws first proposed on March 8, 1988 and last revised on February 19, 2007. As such a two-thirds approval of the voting members of the faculty of the CEDC present at any regular or special faculty meeting is required for adoption of these bylaws. Similarly, subsequent amendments to the bylaws require approval of a two-thirds vote of the voting members of the faculty of the CEDC present at any regular or special meeting.

Written notice of proposed amendments shall be given to all members of the rostered faculty at least 30 days in advance of any meeting in which an amendment is to be considered. Amendments may be initiated and proposed by any rostered member of the faculty.

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, DESIGN, & COMPUTING

BYLAWS

DISCLAIMERS

These Bylaws are not intended to and do not create any contractual obligations. To the extent that these Bylaws are inconsistent with regent law, policy, or administrative policy statements, or University of Colorado Denver policies, the Regent law, policy, and administrative policy statements and the University of Colorado Denver policies prevail.

Nothing in these Bylaws abrogates the right of any constituency or other duly organized body within the CEDC to organize and meet.

Bylaws enacted by the rostered faculty in the College of Engineering and Applied Science on 1/14/2016.

These bylaws have been accepted and approved by:

Marc Ingber, Dean
College of Engineering and Applied Science

Date

Roderick Nairn, Provost
University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus

Date