

EPUS Committee Report
April 2018

- EPUS met on March 16.
- The committee reviewed
 - the second draft of Regent Law Article 5 and Policy 5 and prepared a response outlining our concerns related to the recent revision. The response was submitted to the Regent Laws and Policy Review Steering Committee on 4/7/18 and is attached to this report.
 - the first draft of Regent Law Article 7 and Policy 7 and prepared a response outlining our concerns related to the proposed revision. The response was submitted to the Regent Laws and Policy Review Steering Committee on 3/28/18 and is attached to this report.
 - the Final Examination Policy found in the Academic Catalog (<http://catalog.uccs.edu/content.php?catoid=13&navoid=883>).
- The committee's next meeting (and last meeting of the academic year) is on Wednesday, April 18 from 11 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Submitted
Andrea Hutchins
EPUS Chair 2017-2018

TO: Regent Laws and Policy Review Steering Committee
FROM: UCCS Committee on Educational Policy and University Standards (EPUS)
(Andrea Hutchins, James Ma, Scott Trimboli, Grant Clayton, Karen Livesey, Norah Mazel, Barbara Prinari, Henriikka Weir)
DATE: April 7, 2018
RE: Feedback on Draft 2 of Regent Article and Policy 5

As members of the committee that is responsible for considering and reviewing policies on academic and procedural standards for the UCCS Faculty Assembly, we reviewed and discussed the current draft of Article/Policy 5. We appreciate the Review Steering Committee's attention to the feedback from faculty and the changes incorporated to address that feedback. We provide the following questions, comments and feedback on the current draft (all page and line numbers refer to those in the red-lined version of the document):

- 1) Article 5.A.1.C, page 2, lines 17-20: The revisions leave course scheduling as the only internal operation that is specified. We recommend including course scheduling as a function that should be addressed in collaboration with the faculty so this section would read: *"The administration has the principal responsibility for the internal operations and external relations of the university. Issues concerning the academic calendar, course scheduling, and appropriate teaching modality shall be addressed in collaboration with the faculty."*
- 2) Article 5.A.2.A.2, page 2, lines 34-35: We support the voting membership for all faculty with 0.5 or greater FTE, regardless of job title and recommend adding a 0 prior to the decimal so that the sentence reads *"Voting membership in the Faculty Senate shall include those faculty members who have a faculty appointment of 0.5 FTE or greater."*
- 3) Article 5.A.2.C, page 3, lines 41-44: We support the revisions to this section allowing the Faculty Senate to assign a spokesperson based on the issue.
- 4) Policy 5.A.1.C, page 7, lines 179-180: Rather than striking these lines from the document, we suggest replacing them with the following: *"The process for reviewing budget policies and plans for resource allocation shall provide for faculty input in an advisory capacity."*
- 5) Policy 5.B.1.A, page 8, lines 200-201: We believe the sentence "The fullest exposure to conflicting opinions is the best insurance against error." is a philosophy or opinion, but not policy, and as such should not be placed in a policy document. We recommend deleting this sentence.
- 6) Policy 5.B.2.C, page 8, line 224: We recommend replacing the word "may" with the word *"shall"* so that the sentence reads: "Faculty members *shall* be responsible...".
- 7) Policy 5.C.2.J, page 10, lines 299-300: Based on the timing related to applying for a sabbatical and actually taking a sabbatical we recommend using the following sentence *"Any sabbatical period may not begin any earlier than six years following the conclusion of a previous sabbatical."* rather than "A sabbatical assignment shall not be granted more than once every seven years."
- 8) Policy 5.D.1.A.1, page 16, lines 462-465: This section appears to be inconsistent with the current Administrative Policy Statement 5019 – Parental Leave for Faculty and University Staff. This APS states that parental leave "does not count as part of the tenure

probationary period. Parental leave results in a “stop” on the tenure clock; such “stops” must be taken in one-year increments.” Based on this policy, the one-year stop in the tenure probationary clock is automatic and does not require approval by the Provost. Instead, Dean and Chancellor approval is required if the faculty member elects “to have the leave time count as part of the tenure probationary period”.

We realize that the APS may be updated subsequent to approval of the revised Policy 5, but we recommend this section of the policy continue to honor the automatic one-year stop of the probationary clock associated with parental leave and suggest the following addition as 5.D.1.A.2: *“A faculty member who utilizes parental leave during the tenure probationary period will be granted a one-year extension of the tenure probationary period. A faculty member may irrevocably elect, no later than six months following his or her return to full-time service, to have the leave time count as part of the tenure probationary period. Such an election shall be made in writing and must be approved by the dean and the chancellor.”*

- 9) Policy 5.1.C, page 16, lines 492-493: We question whether the sentence “The comprehensive review typically occurs during the fourth year of full-time service” is a guideline or policy. As written, this appears to be a guideline which would be more appropriate to place in an Administrative Policy Statement related to retention, promotion and tenure rather than in a Regent Policy.
- 10) Policy 5.D.4.A, page 18, lines 544-548: We strongly support the availability of mentoring opportunities for instructional, research and clinical faculty in addition to tenure track faculty since they are also eligible for promotion in their positions. We realize that this section of the policy addresses reappointment (to a tenure track position), tenure and promotion so adding the availability of mentoring opportunities for instructional, research and clinical faculty does not fit. However, we encourage the committee to consider adding the following to an appropriate section of the Regents Policy or the associated Administrative Policy Statement that addressed mentoring: *“While the instructional, research or clinical candidate is responsible for developing a professional record that warrants promotion, the department/unit and administration have a certain obligation to mentor instructional, research and clinical faculty and to help them navigate the processes of promotion. Mentoring opportunities will be provided by primary units and/or colleges/schools.”*
- 11) Policy 5.F.1.E, page 24, lines 794-796: While we appreciate that this version of the policy includes one year’s formal notice to long-serving full-time instructional faculty, we believe that further revisions to this section are needed. We recommend the following change: *“One year’s formal notice will be provided to 0.5 FTE or greater instructional, research, and clinical faculty members whose appointments are to be terminated.”* This change reflects respect for the faculty who would find their life disrupted if their position, regardless of how long they had been in that position, would be terminated under these circumstances.

We also recommend the following addition: *“Every effort will be made to provide instructional, research or clinical faculty in <0.5 FTE appointments appropriate notice that their appointments are to be terminated.”*

- 12) Policy 5.G.2.5, page 27, line 899: We recommend replacing the word “unless” with “except for” in this sentence.

Thank you for considering our comments, suggestions and questions.

TO: Regent Laws and Policy Review Steering Committee
FROM: UCCS Committee on Educational Policy and University Standards (EPUS)
(Andrea Hutchins, James Ma, Scott Trimboli, Grant Clayton, Karen Livesey, Norah Mazel, Barbara Prinari, Henriikka Weir)
DATE: March 28, 2018
RE: Feedback on the Draft of Regent Article and Policy 7

As members of the committee that is responsible for considering and reviewing policies on academic and procedural standards for the UCCS Faculty Assembly, we reviewed and discussed the current draft of Article/Policy 7. We provide the following comment and feedback on the current draft:

We appreciate the attention given to the academic freedom of students in this Article and Policy and support the establishment of both the rights and responsibilities of students as they relate to open inquiry and discussion in the classroom. However, we have one concern with the wording in Policy 7.C(A)(3). The current wording states “Students shall be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study.” While we support the principle behind the statement, we are concerned with the phrase “to the data” in the sentence. Students can take reasoned exception to the way data was collected, analyzed, interpreted, etc. but data are data and we believe it is important to help students understand that difference.

We suggest the following wording for this section:
Students shall be free to take reasoned exception to the views or the methods of collection, analysis and/or interpretation of data offered in any course of study.

Thank you for considering our comments, suggestions and questions.

Addendum:

Article 7: We recommend that the wording in Part D.7.D.3 be amended to reflect the modifications made to Article 5.A.2.C which allows the Faculty Senate to select an appropriate spokesperson to address the Board or Regents based on the topic at hand. We believe that the Intercampus Student Forum should also be able to select an appropriate spokesperson (who may or may not be the chair of the Intercampus Student Forum) and suggest the following change to the second sentence in this section “The Intercampus Student Forum shall assign a spokesperson to address the Board of Regents on matters of concern to the students on all campuses.”

Policy 7.C.: Will the scale of balance between Associated Rights and Associated Responsibilities for students’ academic freedom be addressed in an Administrative Policy Statement or should it be addressed here?

We offer the following example to illustrate our concern: A student in a biology class takes exception to the validity of the theory of evolution. If the student is asked to explain the evidence for evolution on a test and refuses to do so citing a religious viewpoint - or even “evidence” - could the student claim that a low score for their response to that question is a “prejudiced” academic evaluation (7.C.A.4) based on their religion or religious beliefs? Or would the student be viewed as not honoring section 7.C.B.1 – that they must learn the content of any course? We believe the student has the responsibility of demonstrating they have learned the content (whether they believe it or not), but is that the intent of this section of the policy?

The revision of Policy 5 (section 5.B.1.D 214-215) states that faculty are afforded freedom in achieving course goals “subject to the responsibilities” in section 5.B.2.C (on requirements specified for courses). Should there be similar language in Policy 7 to explicitly state that students’ rights to take a “reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study” are still subject to their responsibility to *learn* that content and maintain the standards of academic performance in each course?

We suggest adding the following as Policy 7.C.B.3 and renumbering the subsequent responsibilities to reflect this insertion:

“A student’s right to take reasoned exception to the views or the methods of collection, analysis and/or interpretation of data offered in any course of study is subject to the student’s responsibility to learn the content presented and maintain the standards of academic performance in each course.”