

Tuesday October 13, 2020

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

Present: Chair, Jarrod Hanson, SEHD; Secretary, Rachel Stott, Library; Jing Zhang; Business; Inge Wefes, Graduate School; Dennis DeBay, SEHD; Christopher Merkner, CLAS; David Liban, College of Arts and Media; Matthew Shea, College of Architecture and Planning; Tod Duncan, CLAS;

Absent: Vice Chair, Jimmy Kim, Engineering; Wendy Bolyard, School of Public Affairs; Bryan Wee, CLAS

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from September, 2020
 - a. Motion to approve: Dennis DeBay; Second: David Liban
 - b. Vote to approve September minutes passes
3. Facial Recognition Technology
 - a. Shea Swauger from Auraria Library attended to answer questions
 - b. Discussion with Shea:
 - i. Letter asks University to ban using facial recognition software
 - ii. Would not impact research (faculty that are studying the development of facial recognition)
 - iii. This speaks directly to classroom, LMS, etc. use with students
 - iv. Shea is asking EPPC to endorse the letter and sign it as a committee, setting that we agree banning this technology in the classroom is the right thing to do
 - v. Question: disadvantages of facial recognition software apparent, but can we completely disregard it/ignore it in terms of student behavior?
 1. Other strategies to maintain academic integrity are available
 2. Not a matter of swapping out one facial recognition software for another

3. Several resources on campus to help support faculty in creating assessments that make it less likely students would cheat without employing something like Proctorio
 - a. Redesigning assessments/assignments may be major pedagogical shifts for some faculty/courses -- what this actually looks like is a bigger conversation than the letter itself
 - b. Should some of these larger conversations be addressed in this letter, or is that a separate conversation
- vi. Question: Privacy is not a pillar in the strategic plan—where do we get our right to privacy from, and how do we determine if that right stands up to being inviolable?
 1. All of the ways this software discriminate require that student's privacy be taken away—would be difficult to uncouple them to ensure equity
 2. Some technology is by designed inherently harmful – Proctorio is a category of technology that is harmful to some degree regardless of which settings are applied
- vii. Question: What data do we have about the proportions between discrimination and assessments in Proctorio?
 1. No—not at CU Denver. Proctorio is used, but it does not run reports that show evidence of discrimination; however, FRT is inherently discriminatory, so there's no reason to think it's not happening here
- viii. Question: Are you saying that no assessment should ever be proctored because it is inherently discriminatory?
 1. Shea would agree with that, though recognizes that's a much larger discussion
 2. Proctorio normalizes surveillance as a best practice; could lead to technology that measures faculty engagement and contact hours, etc. Faculty are not necessarily safe from this type of surveillance in future higher ed conversation

- ix. We have to solve the greater trust issue in higher ed—FRT is possibly a short-term solution
 - c. Discussion with just EPPC:
 - i. Completely banning a technology may be too much of a knee-jerk reaction—there is a fundamental difference between facial recognition technology and facial detection technology (the latter is what is used by Proctorio)
 - ii. There are trust issues on campus, but we also have Honor Codes
 - iii. What discrimination actually happens and how serious is it? Experience with Proctorio only captures their screen and movements
 - iv. Need more information and data at this point about how using these software are impacting students
 - d. Action: We're not ready to sign this letter, but we'd liked to be kept apprised as more information becomes available
- 4. Credit Hour and Contact Hour Guidelines
 - a. Guidance that is being redone because of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) work that is being done
 - i. There is CO state guidance, there is federal guidance, and this document is CU Denver's attempt to provide guidance that draws on both
 - b. Action: go through the document and think about how credit hours and contact hours look in your department's respective contexts and think about ways this document needs to change to better reflect that
- 5. Faculty Evaluations for 2020 including FCQ Use
 - a. Currently, the plan is to administer and utilize FCQs as normal in Fall. No anticipated changes to the evaluation process at the University Level. According to the document in this month's folder, the authority to modify around FCQs extends through Fall 2020. Do we want to act?
 - b. Discussion with EPPC:
 - i. If this is a COVID-related adjustment, would we want to make any changes before instruction returns to more traditional formats?
 - ii. How is this impacting folks on tenure track?

- iii. This topic came up at Faculty Assembly last week and the Provost received a lot of feedback on this decision—that feedback may lead to a change
 - iv. Concern to send back: there was no faculty consultation at all (expression of how the decision rolled out more than anything)
 - v. If faculty still have a choice to use FCQs or not, should students still have the choice to receive a letter grade or not?
 - c. Action: Will send feedback that faculty involvement needs to be a part of FCQ decisions
6. Possibilities for work with Disability Committee on policy
- a. Disability Committee would like to look into how these committees are administered on other campuses
 - b. The Chair of this committee can come to our next meeting to discuss further
7. Other business/announcement
- a. We will meet via Zoom instead of Teams in November
8. Adjournment
- a. Meeting adjourned at 11:58am

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