

Educational Policy and Planning Committee (EPPC)

**MINUTES**

April 2, 2024 | 9:30 am

via Zoom: <https://ucdenver.zoom.us/j/97522609238>

**In attendance:** Chair, Wendy Bolyard, School of Public Affairs; Jing Zhang, School of Business; Jefferson Knight, CLAS; Stephan Harke, CLAS; Matthew Shea, College of Architecture and Planning; Margaret Woodhull, CLAS.

**1. Call to Order:** Wendy called the meeting at 9:31am.

**2. Approval of Minutes from February and March**

**Jeff:** Errors in March minutes. Graduate school is now called graduate education. The handbook/manual does have a statement on how members are selected. Revised March minutes is approved.

**3. Faculty conflict of interest question** (read pp. 2-3)

**Wendy:** the fundamental issue here is whether the faculty can assign their textbook to the course.

**Margaret:** Is this a separate issue from Article 5?

**Wendy:** This is a separate issue.

**Margaret:** This often happens in the school of architecture. This issue is kind of epidemic in the school.

**Matt:** There are multiple issues brought up by this person.

**Wendy:** There are policies that adjunct professors must be reviewed annually.

**Magret:** It seems that the self-published studies did meet the academic standards.

**Jeff:** We have lots of faculty who write teaching materials to help students save money. The lab manual I wrote is free for all students.

**Jeff:** Some lectures are not reviewed annually.

**Margaret:** It seems the Chair is not actively reviewing the quality of the lecture. The textbook assignment issue is an ethical issue.

**Magret:** The lecture gets 100% profit from self-published book.

**Jing:** The university should set a standard for how much profit a professor can get from assigning their own textbooks.

**Jeff:** Another issue here is this college requires all textbooks to be available in the library, and this book is not.

**Lori:** Is this a choice class? This will be a bigger issue for classes that are required.

**Wendy:** it is not clear how this issue will be addressed. There are many issues raised here: academic rigor, academic freedom, evaluation of faculty, curriculum review. I can raise this issue in faculty assembly.

**Margaret:** Maybe we should have policies on textbooks used in required courses.

**Jeff:** The issue here is that the faculty chose the textbook, but the lecture hired by the chair is not using this textbook.

**Jeff:** The increased reliance on lectures is also a problem here.

**Lori:** In our school, we have the lead instructor who oversees curriculum and chooses textbooks.

**Jeff:** We have a committee who decides what will be taught.

**Matt:** We also have a lead instructor for each required course. Is the problem being this lecture not fulfilling the curriculum outcomes?

**Stephen:** Just because this is a conflict of interest does not mean this should not happen. The conflict interest should be reviewed probably by the chair.

**Jeff:** In this case, they are not allowed to review the course/textbook.

**Margaret:** In some colleges, we have rules/regulations/policies set to guide curriculum and course evaluations. We can suggest this person consider those policies for their college.

#### **4. Latin Honors – policy suggestions**

**Wendy:** The provost wants to know do we need a policy on how we award Latin Honors.

**Margaret:** If there are very different standards across schools, there could be some incentives to switch schools/department.

**Jeff:** If this is just an administrative issue, then I would say there is no need to standardize the requirement across colleges.

**Jing:** I think we just need a minimum standard for awarding Latin Honors.

**Matt:** what would be the downfall for setting a universal criterion?

**Jeff:** Students will probably ask this after they choose the college. So, it is good to have a clear standard.

**Margaret:** I like the idea of setting a minimum standard.

**Stephen:** We compared our standards to other departments. The consideration is how many students are getting this. We want to distinguish the strong students, but we don't want 50% of students getting the award.

#### **5. Graduate 'School' Review (see p. 4)**

- Selection of members on the graduate council
- Vetting the handbook (who approves, implements, and holds programs accountable)
- Communication (which has been lacking)

**Jeff:** it was the first time I heard the provost call it "a new graduate school".

#### **6. Academic Transformation Working Groups - updates**

#### **7. Other business/announcements**

- Two students were selected for the Pam Laird scholarship. Big thanks to the committee for reviewing student essays.

#### **8. Next meeting [May 7]**

- DEI in annual evaluation
- FCQ data mining

- Academic Transformation Working Groups - updates

**9. Adjournment: Meeting ends on 10:31am.**

Documents can also be found in [Microsoft Teams](#).