

Tuesday September 8, 2020

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

Present: Chair, Jarrod Hanson, SEHD; Vice Chair, Jimmy Kim, Engineering; Wendy Bolyard, School of Public Affairs; Matthew Shea, College of Architecture and Planning; Tod Duncan, CLAS; Bryan Wee, CLAS; David Liban, College of Arts and Media.

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from May, 2020 – Tod Duncan moved to approve; Wendy Bolyard seconded; 5 approved; 1 abstention
3. Introductions/Welcome of new members
4. Discussion of use of Microsoft Teams to facilitate policy review process – Agreed to use Microsoft Teams to facilitate policy review process and communication of committee
5. Identification of policy issues to take up in the 2020-21 academic year –
 - a. Grading policy this semester and for Spring 2021 – Looking for a statement around that for planning purposes. When can it be expected? What role should we play?
 - b. Faculty evaluation for 2020 – Consider whether it is needed and, if so, what it should involve. Contact APC to see what they are doing.
 - c. Late add policy issues – Do we need to review late add deadline policies at the university level and across colleges to ensure that there are not inequities
 - d. Policies around Disabilities Resources and Services Office--Is there/should there be policy in collaboration with Disabilities Committee to establish policy around interaction with office and faculty;
6. Other business/announcements
7. Adjournment

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

Tuesday October 13, 2020

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

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

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from September, 2020
3. Facial Recognition Technology
 - a. Shea Swauger will present/answer questions.
 - b. See letter in this month's documents
4. Credit Hour and Contact Hour Guidelines
 - a. See proposed guidelines in this month's documents
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?
6. Possibilities for work with Disability Committee on policy
7. Anyone from CAP, CAM, SPA or Engineering interested in serving on the Online Education Committee?
8. Other business/announcement
9. Adjournment

Commented [BW1]: I approve.

Commented [BW2]: Yes! Last time I checked, there is still a pandemic. WE are engaged in pandemic teaching. There is nothing normal about this. Tensions, anxiety, demands are at an all time high. We should once again leave to an individual faculty's discretion whether or not to use FCQs from fall 2020 in their annual evaluation.

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

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

Tuesday November 10, 2020

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

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

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from October, 2020
3. Discussion of Faculty Evaluations for 2020 and use of FCQs
 - a. President Kennedy on 11/5/20 extended the suspensions of APS 1025 (Uniform Grading) and APS 1009 (Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation) through June 30, 2021, which frees campuses to make decisions about grading policies and use of FCQs through Spring 2021. We should consider this committee's recommendations for Spring 2021 (and perhaps calendar year 2021).
4. Other business/announcements
5. Adjournment

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

Tuesday November 10, 2020

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

Present: Chair, Jarrod Hanson, SEHD; Secretary, Rachel Stott, Library; Tod Duncan, CLAS; Dennis DeBay, SEHD; Jing Zhang; Business; Wendy Bolyard, School of Public Affairs; David Liban, College of Arts and Media

Absent: Vice Chair, Jimmy Kim, Engineering; Inge Wefes, Graduate School; Matthew Shea, College of Architecture and Planning; Bryan Wee, CLAS; Christopher Merkner, CLAS

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from October, 2020
 - a. Motion to approve: Dennis DeBay; Second: Wendy Bolyard
 - b. Motion to approve passes
3. Discussion of Faculty Evaluations for 2020 and use of FCQs
 - a. President Kennedy on 11/5/20 extended the suspensions of APS 1025 (Uniform Grading) and APS 1009 (Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation) through June 30, 2021, which frees campuses to make decisions about grading policies and use of FCQs through Spring 2021. We should consider this committee's recommendations for Spring 2021 (and perhaps calendar year 2021).
 - b. EPPC Discussion: Faculty evaluations on the traditional rating (1-5) or switching to binary?
 - i. Allow faculty to make the decision how they are evaluated (similar to students choosing sliding grade scale); question over whether or not faculty members should have to explain their decision – potential concern about faculty members feeling obligated to share personal situations
 - ii. If we don't expect justification from students when they select P/F, we shouldn't need to have justification from faculty – would it be possible to look into rolling system (i.e. rolling over something major like a book publication into the following year)
 - iii. What does the faculty evaluation rating get faculty members outside of a piece of paper in their file?
 - iv. Some discussion in schools about letting faculty choose what year they're evaluated for the work they're doing this year. How many years would this transcend?
 - v. Difficult to make decisions when we don't know what's going to happen in the future.

- vi. Would be most equitable to have one system (all ratings or all binary)
 - vii. Is there a way to give faculty who want to go up for awards/need ranking for promotions to submit additional information if we were to switch to a binary (meets/doesn't meet) ranking for this year?
 - viii. If evaluations are binary, can they be holistic, rather than breaking out percentage times?
- c. EPPC Discussion: FCQs
- i. What is the Provost's rationale for using them this semester? Is there a significant advantage to using them that offsets the harm?
 - ii. There is a need to hear students voices – they could still be administered to gather feedback from students, but not used in the faculty evaluation process
 - iii. We are still in a pandemic, which means we are pandemic teaching; students are in crisis, so we can't move forward as if it's business as usual. Students may be mourning the changes in the college experience expectations, and faculty may not be able to meet those shifting expectations (nor should they expected to be)
 - iv. FCQs already discriminate against certain groups on campus, and given our current situations, they may magnify the inequities that they normally manifest
 - v. Using FCQs as part of the faculty's evaluation feels punitive in this situation
 - vi. Would like to project a message that we can trust faculty to take student feedback seriously without using FCQs as part of the formal faculty evaluation, at least through spring (or as long as the University President allows campuses to choose to do so)
 - vii. SPA using a strengths-based approach to celebrate what people have done and to permit holistic evaluation around meeting expectations. It also limits the demoralizing impact of evaluations during a pandemic.
 - viii. Question about protection for clinical faculty, whose "clocks" aren't paused with respect to research expectations, etc.? Is there any way to provide protection to them.

4. Other business/announcements

5. Adjournment

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

Tuesday December 8, 2020

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

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

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from November, 2020
3. Update on Faculty Evaluations for 2020 and use of FCQs
4. Review of AIC Bylaws/Policy, specifically with respect to membership composition (main concern over lack of faculty representation)
5. Feedback on Spring Syllabus Addendum
6. Feedback on Remote Day Policy Pilot
7. Feedback on revised Credit Hour and Contact Hours Guidelines
8. Do we want to revisit Facial Recognition use given new information provided by Shea Swauger?
9. Adjournment

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

Tuesday December 8, 2020

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

Present: Chair, Jarrod Hanson, SEHD; Secretary, Rachel Stott, Library; Tod Duncan, CLAS; Inge Wefes, Graduate School; Wendy Bolyard, School of Public Affairs; Bryan Wee, CLAS;

Absent: Vice Chair, Jimmy Kim, Engineering; Dennis DeBay, SEHD; Matthew Shea, College of Architecture and Planning; Christopher Merkner, CLAS; Jing Zhang, Business; David Liban, College of Arts and Media

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from November, 2020
 - a. Motion to Approve: Tod Duncan; Second: Bryan Wee
 - b. Motion to approve passes
3. Update on Faculty Evaluations for 2020 and use of FCQs
 - a. Faculty Assembly passed a resolution making recommendations for modifying evaluating system to a binary ranking system and taking a holistic approach and not requiring FCQs to be part of evaluation
 - b. It's unclear what will happen next at this point, but there was a meeting with the Provost
4. Feedback on Remote Day Policy Pilot
 - a. Joann Brennan joined meeting to discuss this policy pilot
 - i. Some context: there may be more closures on campus this spring than normal due to campus-level issues (snow removal)
 - b. Discussion from EPPC
 - i. Is spring the best time to pilot, as we're still in a pandemic and things are chaotic
 - ii. Faculty already had to decide how to deal with a weather closure – is this policy suggesting that faculty will have to then hop on Zoom? If students are already on campus, this could create equity issues for access to online classes
 - iii. Are these specific expectations beyond faculty needing to have a contingency plan, which most already do already?
 - iv. Feels like micromanaging from administration
 - v. Being forced into a quick Zoom turnaround for content might actually make the learning less meaningful compared to having more time to make up the activities in other modalities
 - vi. Making up content for a snow day really should be left to the autonomy of the faculty/instructor

- vii. The syllabus addendum could be more inclusive of making conversations with students at the beginning of the semester a priority to make a plan for snow days
 - viii. This pilot is mandating to faculty how they have to meet their contact hours, and it gets into the discussion around what is faculty-driven and what is administration-driven
5. Feedback on Spring Syllabus Addendum
- a. Joann Brennan joined meeting to discuss this syllabus addendum
 - i. Some context: this was developed to try to create an additional frame for faculty to think about the pandemic and finding a balance between suggestions and some things that admin would like faculty to do
 - b. Discussion from EPPC:
 - i. It's a burden to record Zoom onto a hard drive and then convert for Canvas because of HIPPA restrictions at Anschutz, CU Denver faculty are unable to record to the cloud. Has a solution to this moved forward?
 - 1. JB answer: some of the documentation that was created over the summer helps address the ease of recording; but the technology/licensing issue has not been solved
 - ii. Question: does the syllabus need to be posted four weeks in advance or first Monday of January date? Four weeks might work better for fall, but spring is maybe more practical for two weeks
 - 1. JB answer: A recommendation out of the T&L implementation team; we asked faculty to create a welcome page four weeks in advance; but we are in a better place to go two weeks in advance at this point (for fall, it was really necessary for student understanding of format)
 - iii. It would be good for student support services and CFDA to communicate this widely (for students and faculty)
 - iv. How will faculty become aware of these policies in time for spring 2021?
 - 1. JB answer: worked with Deans/Associate Deans to communicate the syllabus addenda to faculty; as soon as we have clarity of the addenda, Joann will be asking Deans/ADs to communicate it to faculty/dept chairs
 - v. Some colleges have already had syllabus deadlines at this point, making it more difficult to add things now
 - vi. Syllabi are already really long—maybe when the whole policy is revisited, there can be a way to wordsmith or provide a template to make it easier for students to digest/more impactful; faculty may need to create their own diversity statement so that students aren't re-reading the same one over in all of their major courses

- vii. One nice thing about the policy is the suggestions for support, rather than dictating what needs to be in; would maybe be great to add ways to support faculty and staff to creating syllabi
 - viii. Suggestion to require rubrics for grade expectations
 - 1. JB: the policy statement requires rubrics; so it's not in the addendum (but maybe EPPC should look at the entire policy to make suggestions for a future working group); more pre-populated pages that address some of the syllabi content could be made for Canvas shells
 - 2. Maybe other permanent links to student services could be added to the Canvas menu (similar to links to Writing Center and Library)
 - ix. What are the means for collecting anonymous feedback related to the diversity statement?
 - x. Suggestion to add a faculty health and wellness statement in addition to the student statement to reinforce that we're all humans and we're all doing our best. (note: the student wellness statement was created by student gov't and approved by fac assembly)
6. Feedback on revised Credit Hour and Contact Hours Guidelines
- a. Joann Brennan joined meeting to discuss this revision
 - i. Some context: the instructional contact hour—many faculty are looking at the ratios and thinking they mean direct instruction time:credit hour. The intention is that the “oversight” is meant to include direct contact, indirect contact, communication, idea of time on project – it's not meant to represent hours in direct contact with students
 - b. Discussion by EPPC
 - i. Has the word supervising/supervisory been considered? That might suggestion “under my purview” rather than direct contact.
 - ii. Overall time expectation vs. actual contact hours
 - iii. How is this used for faculty expectations compared to student expectations
 - iv. On page 4: talks about credit hours guidelines – is it correct to say 1 credit hour = 1 contact hour
 - v. JB: intention is not to overburden with info keeping, but developing guidelines for moving forward
7. Review of AIC Bylaws/Policy, specifically with respect to membership composition (main concern over lack of faculty representation)
- a. Saved for February
8. Do we want to revisit Facial Recognition use given new information provided by Shea Swauger?
- a. Saved for February
9. Adjournment: 12:05pm

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

Tuesday February 9, 2021

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

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

1. Call to order
2. Approval of minutes from December, 2020
3. Update on Faculty Evaluations for 2020 and use of FCQs, Remote Day Policy Pilot
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)
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
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.
7. Do we want to revisit Facial Recognition use given new information provided by Shea Swauger?
8. Adjournment

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

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

Tuesday March 9, 2021

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

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

1. Call to order
2. Approval of [minutes from February 2021](#)
3. Updates
 - a. Passed on comments and suggestions regarding Pass/Fail policy
 - b. Work will continue on Credit Hour Guidelines document in a working group. Feedback can be passed on through Inge Wefes or Dennis DeBay.
4. Campus syllabus policy ([Policy 1031](#)) Begin discussion and divide work
 - a. Determine various purposes the syllabus serves – informative, contractual, pedagogical, etc. Consider whether certain aspects should be separated out into different documents?
 - b. Identify innovative campus syllabus policies (or creative folks rebelling against campus policies through their syllabi). What can we learn?
 - c. Identify ways that technology can serve to streamline syllabi.
 - d. Other ideas moving forward?
5. Adjournment

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

Tuesday March 9, 2021

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

Present: Chair, Jarrod Hanson, SEHD; Secretary, Rachel Stott, Library; Dennis DeBay, SEHD; Inge Wefes, Graduate School; Matthew Shea, College of Architecture and Planning; Wendy Bolyard, School of Public Affairs; Bryan Wee, CLAS

Absent: Vice Chair, Jimmy Kim, Engineering; Tod Duncan, CLAS; Christopher Merkner, CLAS; Jing Zhang; Business; David Liban, College of Arts and Media.

1. Call to order
2. Approval of [minutes from February 2021](#)
 - a. Motion to Approve: Dennis DeBay motions to approve; Matt Shea seconds
 - b. Minutes Approved
3. Updates
 - a. Passed on comments and suggestions regarding Pass/Fail policy
 - b. Work will continue on Credit Hour Guidelines document in a working group.
Feedback can be passed on through Inge Wefes or Dennis DeBay.
 - i. Important to indicate if it's for all students or undergrad only, as graduate courses typically have no pass/fail options
4. Campus syllabus policy ([Policy 1031](#)) Begin discussion and divide work
 - a. Tasks for EPPC:
 - i. Determine various purposes the syllabus serves – informative, contractual, pedagogical, etc. Consider whether certain aspects should be separated out into different documents?
 1. What can be taken out? What can be linked to in a different spot (like campus-wide policy pages)
 2. Talk to others in your department/unit who work with syllabi often or examples of creative syllabi that might be “breaking the rules”
 - ii. Identify innovative campus syllabus policies (or creative folks rebelling against campus policies through their syllabi). What can we learn?
 - iii. Identify ways that technology can serve to streamline syllabi.
 - b. EPPC in-meeting discussion about syllabi:**
 - i. Some of the minimums for syllabi:
 1. Some syllabi are nothing more than course schedule/calendar -- important, but isn't the full picture
 2. Learning outcomes also important feature of syllabi
 3. LOs need to be in close alignment with the assessment
 4. Consistent grading scales

5. Info about chances for make-up work/extra credit
 6. Use syllabi to prevent potential unethical behaviors of students.
- ii. Challenges and other things to consider:
1. Syllabi are a collection of other policies – linking out to existing policies could maybe mitigate this – but some challenges come when faculty interpret these campus-wide policies for their own purposes
 - a. Example: observance of religious holidays
 2. Syllabi review for larger schools/colleges are more difficult to complete.
 3. Gradient of boiler plate material that needs to be included—some policies are non-negotiable and that content could be jettisoned. The policies that are more up for interpretation could be emphasized in the syllabus with guidance for students.
 4. How has the pandemic helped us rethink the contractual obligations that the syllabus represents? Expectations for students, but also for instructors.
 5. The syllabus can help provide context for why students are doing what they're doing in the course (tell the story of the course). If students don't feel connected to why they're in this course, they may not care as much.
 6. The policy includes submitting paper copies ahead of course—can this be adapted to include Canvas as well?
 - a. Creating a syllabus template for Canvas to help make it easier to include.
 - b. CETL could be a partner here – they have helped create info that was important to include in Canvas landing pages; could be translated to syllabi template.
 - c. How we deliver it matters.
 7. Is the syllabus one way that students determine whether or not they take a course? Maybe they enroll and then once they see the syllabus, they make a decision. What if students got a page that tells the story of the course up front, before they had access to the full syllabus?
 - a. This would go beyond the course descriptions in the catalog.
 - b. Could include the major learning outcomes.
 - c. Opportunity for course instructors to be creative with their language and humanize their course and why they're passionate about teaching it.
 - d. Creating short videos (“commercials”) for your course could be an option—they could be linked to the student shopping carts when they are looking at course catalog.

8. Tying syllabi to strategic plan around student success.
 9. What infrastructure is in place to help course instructors make these changes to their syllabi?
 - a. Templates and student workers could help with this?
 10. Concerns around over-standardization.
 11. Is there a way to get student feedback on the syllabus? Things they might appreciate/like/dislike that we aren't thinking about?
 - a. Lead some student focus groups to get feedback on general thoughts on syllabus; do students use them? What info has been especially useful, etc?
 - b. Involve student body president/student government.
 - c. Adding standardized questions to FCQs.
 12. Creative ways to engage students with a course syllabus.
 - a. Annotation exercises (Hyphes.is, for example)
 - b. Discussion/reflection questions that help identify pain points/things that are unclear or stressful for students early on in the course.
 13. Syllabi review process—course instructor responsibility? Individual schools/colleges/departments with their own review process? Should there be a formalized standard process. Is it a minimum expectation that a course faculty should be reviewing the syllabi for any courses they are teaching every year?
 14. Lecturers and adjuncts teaching a high number of courses that are just given a syllabus—those folks are probably not in a position to do a full-on syllabus review. Those responsibilities should fall to a course lead(s).
 - c. Other ideas moving forward?
 - i. Create a skeleton of a basic syllabus with all the required elements, plus guidance on how to accommodate exceptions/add additional context or information to syllabi as necessary
 - ii. Jarrod will put a folder in Teams to collect syllabi examples.
5. Adjournment

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

Tuesday April 13, 2021

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

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

1. Call to order
2. Approval of [minutes from March 2021](#)
3. Updates
4. Consider what policies should be revisited (either short term or long term) as we move to next phase of COVID.
 - a. What were the experiences around faculty evaluation/merit review? Use of FCQs? Differentiated work loads? What changes do we need to advocate for now related to next year's review cycle? What changes need to be considered on a more permanent basis?
 - b. What other policies under the purview of EPPC should be examined and possibly adjusted as we consider what the 2021-2022 academic year will look like?
5. Campus syllabus policy ([Policy 1031](#))
 - a. Consider the points raised in the opening discussion at last month's meeting (see minutes for details)
 - b. Discuss what is non-negotiable in the syllabus policy. There are no apparent system restraints nor requirements related to HLC accreditations. At this point, waiting to hear from the Provost's office what they view as essential.
 - c. Consider variation in syllabus function and the different policies across units. To what extent does that require flexibility
 - d. In what ways should the syllabus policy be informed by diversity, equity and inclusion.
6. Looking ahead to elections at our next meeting
7. Adjournment

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

Tuesday April 13, 2021

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

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

Absent: David Liban, College of Arts and Media.

1. Call to order
2. Approval of [minutes from March 2021](#)
 - a. Motion to Approve: Dennis DeBay motions to approve; Wendy Bolyard seconds
 - b. Minutes Approved (with two abstentions)
3. Updates
4. Consider what policies should be revisited (either short term or long term) as we move to next phase of COVID.
5. What were the experiences around faculty evaluation/merit review? Use of FCQs? Differentiated workloads? What changes do we need to advocate for now related to next year's review cycle? What changes need to be considered on a more permanent basis?
 - a. Shared our experiences with COVID-related changes to evaluation process and possible implications for future evaluation cycles.
 - b. Concern for Fall 2021 around how course formats (in-person, hybrid/hy-flex, online) decisions are being made (individual faculty members or departments or Colleges, etc.)
 - c. Fall 2021 will be another transitional period (from mostly online to mostly in-person); transitions present challenges for students and course instructors
 - d. Broader supports need to be in place for return to campus (not necessarily related to the pandemic)
 - e. Would it be useful to look into a process that would make workload differential adjustments easier?
 - i. A lot of service burden has been placed on IRC faculty.
 - ii. Does workload differential just represent how your evaluation should be weighted, or should it also be a reflection of your time?
6. What other policies under the purview of EPPC should be examined and possibly adjusted as we consider what the 2021-2022 academic year will look like?
 - a. Educational policy around requiring students to be vaccinated to return

- b. The extent to which faculty will be asked to make accommodations for students who don't want to come to campus for an in-person/hybrid course
 - c. Are faculty expected to be back on campus for the day-to-day activities (meetings, outreach, etc.) outside of teaching responsibilities
 - i. If we're doing hy-flex models for students, that should be a consideration for faculty, as well
 - ii. Possibility of an official remote work policy coming (there is a working group through faculty assembly addressing this for the Denver campus)
7. Campus syllabus policy ([Policy 1031](#))
- a. Syllabus Requirements
 - i. Include modality
 - ii. Do all instructors have a university-supplied phone number? If not, should this be required?
 - iii. Standing office hour link that remains static through semester
 - iv. Accessibility requirements around file format of syllabus itself
 - v. Is "overall" the best word to describe course learning outcomes? Some are written with accreditation requirements in mind.
 - vi. The specificity of what's under Course Goals/Outcomes could be better defined
 - vii. General language gives flexibility to course instructors
 - viii. Should some of the standard campus policies that are listed in a syllabus (boiler plate stuff) be kept in a separate place (accessible to all) rather than being in every syllabus?
8. Consider the points raised in the opening discussion at last month's meeting (see minutes for details)
9. Discuss what is non-negotiable in the syllabus policy. There are no apparent system restraints nor requirements related to HLC accreditations. At this point, waiting to hear from the Provost's office what they view as essential.
10. Consider variation in syllabus function and the different policies across units. To what extent does that require flexibility
11. In what ways should the syllabus policy be informed by diversity, equity and inclusion.
- a. Consider having someone from CETL or Accessibility Office come to meeting to talk about ways to format things for accessibility/best practices
 - b. It does not currently include a Diversity Statement
12. Looking ahead to elections at our next meeting
13. Adjournment

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

Tuesday May 11, 2021

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

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

1. Call to order
2. Approval of [minutes from April 2021](#)
3. Campus syllabus policy ([Policy 1031](#))
 - a. Lindsey Hamilton from the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will join us to discuss ways to work with CETL to revise the policy and create resources to help faculty make syllabi useful for teaching and learning
 - b. Propose two working groups
 - i. Group 1 – Draft new policy, reducing scope of current policy and updating language.
 - ii. Group 2 – Work with CETL to discuss resources to support faculty in creating syllabi
4. Review [proposed revisions to APS 7030 – Student Attendance and Absences](#)
5. Review APS #1025 – Grading policy
 - a. [Draft Policy](#)
 - b. Justification
6. Election of officers for AY 2021-22
7. Adjournment

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

Tuesday May 11, 2021

Educational Policy and Planning Committee Meeting

Present: Chair, Jarrod Hanson, SEHD; Vice Chair, Jimmy Kim, Engineering; Secretary, Rachel Stott, Library; Wendy Bolyard, School of Public Affairs; Bryan Wee, CLAS; Jing Zhang, Business; Christopher Merkner, CLAS; Inge Wefes, Graduate School;

Absent: Dennis DeBay, SEHD; Matthew Shea, College of Architecture and Planning; Tod Duncan, CLAS; David Liban, College of Arts and Media.

1. Call to order
2. Approval of [minutes from April 2021](#)
 - a. Motion to approve: Wendy motions to approve; Bryan seconds
 - b. Minutes are approved
3. Campus syllabus policy ([Policy 1031](#))
 - a. Lindsey Hamilton from the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will join us to discuss ways to work with CETL to revise the policy and create resources to help faculty make syllabi useful for teaching and learning
 - b. Discussion with Lindsey
 - i. Focus on equity and making it more user-friendly
 - ii. In favor of a pared down policy with resources and examples connected to it
 1. CETL could potentially have a repository with examples and checklists
 2. One complexity is that the syllabus policy links out to a bunch of other policies (attendance policy, grading policy, etc.)
 3. Equity issues: language that faculty use in the syllabus may not make sense to all students; some language is deficit-based thinking with a focus on consequences/legalese (this language can discourages first-gen and minoritized students for asking for flexibility)
 4. Joann Brennan's office as agreed to maintain a website that can serve as a holding space for all the policies that can then be linked to from syllabi
 - a. Keeping the policies separate allow the syllabus to serve more as an extension of the instructor, letting it be more of a tool that charts the journey of the course
 5. How do we support departments who have their own templates that reflect accreditation?
 6. Goal: have a syllabus policy that would be ready to move through faculty assembly by the end of fall 2021

- c. Propose two working groups
 - i. Group 1 – Draft new policy, reducing scope of current policy and updating language.
 - 1. Volunteers: Chris (will run point on communication), Jing
 - ii. Group 2 – Work with CETL to discuss resources to support faculty in creating syllabi
 - 1. Volunteers: Rachel, Bryan (Lindsey will run point on communication)
- 4. Review [proposed revisions to APS 7030 – Student Attendance and Absences](#)
 - a. Some examples needed clarified (religious absences); looking at clarifying language around excused and unexcused absences; participation grades being tied to absences; etc.
 - b. Looking for ways to give faculty guidance but flexibility
 - c. Could add language to faculty responsibilities section to address how faculty will acknowledge student understanding of how they’re implementing the policy
 - d. In the future, will policies need to take into account how attendance in synchronous spaces equates to participation in asynchronous spaces
- 5. Review APS #1025 – Grading policy
 - a. [Draft Policy](#)
 - b. Justification
 - c. Discussion:
 - i. Student advising on how P+/P/F may impact graduate school/medical school/etc. needs to continue, as some of these grades could potentially hurt them down the road if programs they want to apply to don’t accept those grades for certain classes
 - ii. How does having a grading policy effect the trend of ungrading?
 - iii. Some faculty use different number scales to equate to the letter (92-100 for an A compared to 93-100). How does the policy impact the scales?
 - iv. Does alternate grading impact pre-reqs when students need to have passed certain classes before registering?
- 6. Election of officers for AY 2021-22
 - a. Chair: Nomination: Dennis DeBay (nominated by Jarrod; seconded by Wendy)
 - b. Vice Chair: Nomination: Rachel Stott (nominated by Jarrod; seconded by Wendy)
 - c. Secretary: Nomination: Wendy Bolyard (nominated by Jarrod; seconded by Wendy)
 - d. All nominations approved
- 7. Adjournment

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

