

Tuesday February 9, 2021

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

Present: Chair, Jarrod Hanson, SEHD; Vice Chair, Jimmy Kim, Engineering; Secretary, Rachel Stott, Library; Dennis DeBay, SEHD; Matthew Shea, College of Architecture and Planning; Jing Zhang, Business; Wendy Bolyard, School of Public Affairs; Tod Duncan, CLAS; Christopher Merkner, CLAS; Bryan Wee, CLAS; David Liban, College of Arts and Media

Absent: Inge Wefes, Graduate School

Guests: Peter Anthamatten, Joann Brennan

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from December, 2020
 - a. Motion to Approve: Tod Duncan, Second: Dennis DeBay
 - b. Motion to Approve passes
3. Update on Faculty Evaluations for 2020 and use of FCQs, Remote Day Policy Pilot
 - a. Our comments and discussion were passed along; while some of the things we wanted to do were not possible at a large scale, we hope that the emphasis on flexibility and leaning into the humanity of the year is unfolding in the review process
 - b. Remote Day Policy Pilot – our recommendation to leave the decision to individual faculty was included
4. Review of AIC Bylaws/Policy, specifically with respect to membership composition (main concern over lack of faculty representation or the possibility that faculty would not constitute majority)
 - a. Peter Anthamatten attended to discuss the AIC in regard to:
 - i. Concerns have been raised that in the hearings, some of the people didn't understand the governing principles of academic ethics; discovered majority of the committee weren't teaching faculty
 - ii. Should there be non-faculty representation on this AIC? The bylaws refer to college liaisons, but don't clearly designate faculty standing
 - iii. AIC itself also drives the bylaws revisions, according to the current bylaws
 - b. EPPC Discussion
 - i. Faculty Assembly should be involved in updating faculty committee bylaws? All faculty committees, or select ones, like academic ethics?
 - ii. EPPC does not have the power to change the AIC bylaws, but we can make recommendations, and ask Faculty Assembly to do the same
 - iii. Also critical to have student representation—but the language is vague and doesn't specify what percentage would be comprised of students

- iv. Is AIC taking up the task of revising their bylaws on their own?
 - v. What is EPPC's role/power in this situation? We could write a memo with recommendations about how the AIC should be governed—recommending that the board should be explicitly faculty-focused
- c. EPPC Action
 - i. Proposal to send a memo to the committee with our recommendations regarding clarifying the board membership should be based on faculty status and specifying how many students should be on the board
 - ii. Motion to write the memo: Tod Duncan; Second: Bryan Wee
 - iii. Motion to write the memo: Approved
- 5. Feedback around of Credit and Contact Hour Guidelines (See relevant documents in Teams)
 - a. Consider Dr. Schrader's feedback and get clarification from Joann Brennan and Lee Potter. Key is to identify areas left to campus discretion and provide feedback about appropriate ratios
 - b. Additional concerns raised about codifying contact hours for dissertation and independent research
 - c. Discussion from Joann Brennan
 - i. Joann will bring EPPC comments and feedbacks to the working group tasked with the Credit and Contact Hour Guidelines
 - d. Discussion from EPPC
 - i. Question around Colorado Department of Higher Education definition of certain instruction types and where our documentation deviates
 - 1. The federal and state guidelines are guidelines, and there are places where it's left up to the campus to determine what they want, using the guidelines as a starting point
 - 2. Within the course components, what is in the credit and contact hour guidelines is what we use within the CU Sys; we have flexibility, as long as we have guidelines behind it
 - ii. This document helps instructors understand the amount of in-person contact time and other commitments we have to the course—does this document also set the standard for resources requested (teaching assistants, etc.)?
 - 1. Intention isn't necessarily to assess resources, but the document could be used in this way.
 - iii. Concerns over independent study, theses, dissertations, etc.
 - 1. Indirect/direct supervision could be better clarified in the document; reflective of student work as much as it is faculty contact time
 - iv. Clarify language around studio classes—include all colleges that use studio (for example, Architecture)
 - v. If you're interested in being a faculty assembly representative on this working group, let Jarrod know

6. Should we take up the campus syllabus [policy](#) (Policy 1031) this Spring? It is scheduled for review in 2023, but as we discussed syllabus changes for the Spring in December, the question was raised about whether we should update this policy now.
 - a. Motion to take up policy: Tod Duncan; Second: Dennis DeBay
 - b. Motion to take up policy: Approved
7. Do we want to revisit Facial Recognition use given [new information](#) provided by Shea Swauger?
 - a. There is a study being done through the College of Pharmacy – perhaps we'd want to wait for that study to complete before moving forward.
 - b. Motion to table the issue/wait for further information: Bryan Wee; Second: Dennis DeBay
 - c. Motion to table issue: Approved
8. Adjournment
 - a. Meeting adjourned at 11:57am

EPPC information including agendas and minutes is available on the UCD website at http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/assembly/downtown/committees/Pages/Educational-planning-and-policy.aspx