

EPUS Committee Report
December 2017

- EPUS did not meet in November but did submit comments regarding the changes being considered for Regent Article and Policy 5 via the online Feedback Form. A copy of the comments is included below.
- The next EPUS meeting will be held at the end of January.

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: November 10, 2017
RE: Feedback on Changes Being Considered for 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 proposed changes to Article/Policy 5. We provide the following questions, comments and feedback on the proposed changes:

- 1) We encourage the committee to ensure that clarity regarding the whether an individual faculty member has a right to override an academic unit's criteria with respect to course syllabi and text be provided. The outline of changes states that the academic unit's criteria would be faculty-driven, and we believe it is essential that this distinction, that the syllabus and text were chosen by the faculty and not the administration (e.g., department chair), be carried through in the Laws, Policy and any subsequent Administrative Policy Statements. We also believe it is important to clarify that although the faculty member is expected to use the faculty-agreed upon course syllabi and text in these situations, the individual faculty member still has the academic freedom to determine how the content is taught in their section of the course providing the course objectives are met.
- 2) We request clarity regarding the information contained in the last paragraph under the section titled *Academic Freedom* as the revisions move forward. We are unclear regarding the point of this paragraph. What aspects of this statement are not already encompassed in the Retention, Promotion and Tenure, annual merit and non-tenure track faculty evaluations that currently exist?
- 3) We are unclear if the section titled *Tenure Home* is meant to apply only to the internal transfer of faculty from one department to another or if this also has implications for external hires, such as hires at the administrative level when coming to the CU system with tenure is part of the hire process and contract. If this section was

written with the intent of applying only to internal transfers of faculty, we encourage the committee to consider standardizing a process of tenure consideration for external hires as well (at the administrative levels of dean and above). This process should include tenure evaluation by the department where the administrator would be housed if they left their administrative position and became a part of the UCCS faculty.

4) We strongly support allowing senior NTT faculty to apply for professional development time with a reduced course load. We request that policies developed around this revision parallel those that currently exist for tenured and tenure-track faculty who take sabbatical leave. Specifically, NTT faculty provided professional development time should continue to receive full compensation from the university during that time and should not experience a pay reduction due to their reduced course load.

5) This committee joins the UCCS NTT Faculty Committee in supporting any proposed legislation to extend the maximum allowable NTT faculty contracts from 3 to 5 years. However, we note that UCCS has implemented very few multiyear contracts with their faculty due to fiscal concerns related to those contracts. We encourage university-wide support of an increased adoption of these contracts to achieve the desired impact.

6) We support the discussion and eventual revision of the “descriptive term for the full-time long-term non-tenure track faculty.” The UCCS NTT Faculty Committee suggested consideration of the terms “Teaching Faculty”, “Teaching Track Faculty” or “Career-Track Teaching Faculty” for those whose primary duties are to teach and our committee supports those suggestions. Furthermore, we suggest that an additional level of promotion be included for non-tenure track faculty, with an accompanying and commensurate salary increase, to parallel the three promotions available to tenure-track and tenured faculty. We encourage the exploration of titles for this additional promotion and support the suggestion of “Master Instructor” provided by the UCCS NTT Faculty Committee with the recognition that other titles may be considered.

7) In the third paragraph of the section titled *Tenure and Non-tenure track Faculty* the statement is made that “there is an expectation that tenure-track faculty impact their field outside the university”. We are concerned about the proposal to add “one clause to the tenure criteria that states that a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in teaching or research must include external evidence of impact beyond the institution”. Even though the nature of the evidence is to be “left to the primary unit” and can be “quite broad”, we believe this will disproportionately have a negative impact on certain disciplines, such as librarians. When many librarians apply for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, they are doing so based on excellence in teaching with meritorious ratings in scholarship, service and professional practice. While demonstrating external evidence of impact beyond the institution can be accomplished through several types of evidence for scholarly work, it is more problematic for

teaching. Therefore, we request that the committee reconsider adding this clause to the tenure criteria due to the discriminatory impact that may result.

8) Also in the third paragraph of the section titled *Tenure and Non-tenure track Faculty* the statement is made that tenure-track and tenured faculty “are provided a workload that requires equal concentration on scholarly work and teaching”. While the 40/40/20 workload implies equal time be spent on teaching and scholarly work, the reality of that equality differs across the CU campuses due to different base teaching loads. At UCCS, the base teaching load for tenure-track and tenured faculty is 15 credits per academic year, higher than the credit load expected of tenure-track and tenured faculty on the other CU campuses. Therefore the ‘equality’ of the time spent on teaching and scholarly work differs across the campuses. We request that this inequity in teaching expectations be considered and addressed.

Thank you for considering our comments and questions.