Educational Policy and Planning Committee (EPPC)
MINUTES
November 7, 2023 | 10-11 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; Lori Elliott, School of Education; Stephen Hartke, CLAS; Matthew Shea, College of Architecture and Planning; Margaret Woodhull, CLAS; Kodi Saylor, Library.

Absent: None.

1. **Call to order**: Wendy called the meeting at 10:01am.

2. **CORE Initiative update** (Beth Myers) –
   a. Fact Sheet
   b. Regents approval

   Beth Myers gave an update about CORE. The proposal was approved by the Regents in the summer. Only about 170 students are eligible for CORE. About 30 students opted in.
   Stephen: The grant is tied to COVID. Is it still the case?
   Beth: I will double check on this.
   Beth: Each year we will have new students become eligible.

3. **Approval of Minutes from October**: Minutes approved (Stephen called the motion, Margaret seconded).

4. **Elect EPPC Vice Chair**

   Jeff is willing to serve. Unanimous vote in favor of Jeff being the Vice Chair.

5. **External review of academic programs**[i]
   a. Regent Policy 4.B.1 - https://www.cu.edu/regents/policy-4
   b. APS 1019 - https://www.cu.edu/sites/default/files/1019.pdf
   c. CAP 1000 – Degree Program Review

   Wendy: Do we need a requirement of an external review in addition to the 7-year review process?

   Jeff: I have gone through 2 cycles of review. The first one was in 2015 and we did get an external review on our degree program. The most recent view was in 2022 and we did not get any external component. It mostly focused on degree and certificate programs. It did not review the research part. The external review we got in the past is more forward-thinking and gave us many suggestions about how we can grow in the future. We don't have this in the 2022 review. So, I think having the external review is beneficial.

Margret: I had a similar experience to Jeff. I have been through two external reviews and one internal review. I think the most important question is what constitutes the program, what is the definition and how we manage it.
Jeff: A lot of recommendations were not implemented due to fund restrictions. There is lots of work for external review compared to internal review.
Stephen: External review is a huge amount of work. Many recommendations were not implemented. We have put in lots of effort but not much came out of it. In the future we need to think more before spending too much effort in the review process.
Lori: What constitutes a program? We need more clarification on that. If our program gets the program of distinction certificate, does that count?
Wendy: I will not recommend requiring external review. We should leave it to the unit to decide.
Matthew: Who will bear the financial cost?
Margaret: It was funded by the college.
Matthew: If it is the college which bears this cost, then it is the college's decision on whether or not to get the external review.
Margaret: How many programs would choose to do an external review? Where does the pressure come from?
Jeff: The desire to launch a new program. Get feedback and guidance from external review.
Wendy: There are concerns about how a Dean reviews the program. Having the external review can provide unbiased feedback.
Margaret: the burden was on the department to show due diligence. The Dean's office did not give much response/feedback.
Jeff: If the money does come from the unit, then this is conflict of interest issue. The department could just pay money to get good feedback.
Margaret: Does HLC have language addressing this?
Matthew: Are other campuses requiring external reviews?
Wendy: Boulder and UCCS both recommend two external reviewers. They both require an external review component.
Wendy: Reviews need to be consistent over years.

6. **Grade forgiveness**
    a. CAP 7037 – Grade Forgiveness
    b. CAP 7040 – Fresh Start

Stephen: The fresh start is for former students who left the university. One important effect of grade forgiveness is on GPA.
Jeff: there is a retroactive withdraw process, which could be relevant to this.

7. **FYI: Academic Transformation Working Groups** – Faculty Assembly representatives
    - Reimagining the Core Curriculum – Vivian Shyu, David Hildebrand (BPC), Kaiya Schoreder (UCDALI)
    - Academic Program Viability and Curricular Innovation – Wendy Bolyard, Joanne Addison, Lori Elliott (UCDALI), Margaret Woodhull, Fernando Mancilla-David

- Academic Personnel Workload Parity and Class Size Variability – Sasha Breger Bush, Carol Golemboski, Amy Hasinoff, Marta Maron, Devin Jenkins & Katherine Gunny (BPC), Beth Pugliano (UCDALI)
- Time Use and Academic Calendar Review – Stephen Hartke, Robyn Mobbs & Sarah Woodward (UCDALI), e.j. Yoder, Dennis Debay

8. Artificial Intelligence (AI)

a. CLAS document
b. CAP 7050 – Academic Integrity
c. Are revisions necessary to CAP 7050 to address AI?

9. Other business/announcements

None.

10. Next meeting

Scheduled on Dec. 5, 2023.

11. Adjournment –Meeting ends at 11:00am.

Documents can also be found in Microsoft Teams.

---

[i] Under Regent Policy 4.B.1 and APS 1019, all academic programs are required to undergo reviews on a 7-year rotation. At the campus level, academic program reviews on the CU Denver campus are guided by CAP 1000 (created in 2018, and scheduled for review on July 1, 2023).

UCD is the only campus that does not require external reviews. It seems to be best practice for programs to draw on the expertise of scholars who work within the disciplinary area of review. Consistent with the overarching Regent policy and APS, the insights of external reviewers who can offer an objective external perspective rooted in disciplinary standards within their field should be invaluable in ensuring that programs are meeting established standards, where applicable, or at least keeping up with the current state of education within the discipline. Perhaps more importantly, such reviews can be tremendously useful in identifying areas where administrative over-reach, local or economic concerns and pressures have co-opted and eroded academic programs.

Thus, Faculty Assembly is being asked to consider changes to the existing policy which would be more in alignment with the other CU campuses, and require the input of neutral external faculty reviewers, with established reputations within their discipline, who are selected through a faculty-involved process.