

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE D R A F T

FACULTY SENATE EDUCATIONAL EQUITY COMMITTEE (EEC)

Minutes of Meeting February 14, 2022 Approved by Committee: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub.to Exec.Comm. \_\_\_\_\_ Approved by Exec.Comm. \_\_\_\_\_

Sub.to Acad.Senate \_\_\_\_\_ Approved by Acad.Senate \_\_\_\_\_

POLICY ITEMS \_\_\_\_\_

**Members Present:** Martha Escobar (Chair); Marquita Gamage; William Garrow; Jinah Kim; Shiva Parsa (Secretary); Suzi Spears; Teri Todd

**Members Absent:** Anwar Alroomi; Xochitl Flores-Marcial; John Valdovinos; Lissa Stapleton; Teresa White.

**Guest(s):**

**I. Meeting was called to Order at: 11:07am**

**II. Check-in**

**III. Approval of Minutes**

- A. November 8, 2021 – tabled until next meeting

**IV. Agenda Items**

**A. Teaching Evaluations**

- a. S. Spears – We have a sub-committee
  - i. We have submitted a statement of purpose for the task force.
  - ii. We are reaching out to San Francisco State for their evaluation model.
  - iii. Cal State Fullerton did a ‘white paper’ about racism in processes.
  - iv. Examine frameworks for teaching effectiveness.
  - v. Survey departments about the practices they use for evaluations.
  - vi. Identify a protocol for teaching effectiveness.
  - vii. Identify strengths instead of only weaknesses.
  - viii. Evaluations should be more supportive instead of punitive.
  - ix. There should be formative evaluations instead of summative.
- b. M. Escobar – We put together a brief survey and sent it to all departments and there were 16 replies.
  - i. There were 5 departments that made changes to their process.
  - ii. Only 2 departments said that they look for bias in their process.
  - iii. There seems to be a lot of interest in looking at biased practices.
  - iv. We should initiate a Zoom call with Cal-State Fullerton and San Francisco State along with interested parties and committees on campus.
  - v. Everyone can hear what other campuses are doing.
- c. J. Kim – Her department recently re-did their evaluations.
  - i. This was important to junior faculty not so much for senior and tenured faculty.

- ii. There is no standard for evaluations.
  - iii. Can the evaluation be decoupled from RTP in a productive way?
  - iv. Lecturers/faculty are more concerned about not getting bad evaluations than what the students are learning.
  - v. Evaluations are not student-centered.
  - d. M. Escobar – Do we think it is a good idea to meet with Cal-State Fullerton and San Francisco State to share best case practices?
  - e. S. Spears – The meeting should ideally be around March 7<sup>th</sup> before the next EEC meeting.
  - f. J. Kim – Associated Student representatives should be at the meeting.
  - g. M. Gammage – We want to make sure students have space to air their concerns.
    - i. How do we use the information that students submit about their issues?
  - h. S. Spears – How do you balance students' needs and supporting faculty?
  - i. S. Parsa – Frequently nothing happens with the evaluations, even when the evaluations are positive.
  - j. M. Gammage – The evaluations are only used when they are bad.
    - i. We must change how we deal with student evaluations.
  - k. S. Parsa – The evaluations should not be a punishment, but instead, how can we help you grow?
  - l. M. Gammage – There are so many questions that allow students to attack minority and female faculty.
  - m. S. Spears – There should be student feedback, faculty, and peer input for the evaluations.
  - n. S. Parsa – Did the student attend most of the class lectures? Can this be one of the last questions?
  - o. M. Gammage – Why can't the students evaluate the University?
- B. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**
- a. M. Escobar – EEC should produce a statement about how the committee defines Educational Equity.
  - b. M. Escobar – We will check-in with Cal-State Fullerton and San Francisco State to see if they are available for a March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.
  - c. J. Kim – We should have our own mission statement as to who EEC is on campus.
  - d. M. Escobar - Will put together a Google Doc so everyone can contribute to, how the EEC defines Educational Equity.
    - i. This statement may be ready by March to be submitted to the Road Mapping Committee.

## **V. Updates and Announcements**

### **A. Caregiving Organizing –**

- a. Tabled until next meeting

### **B. Understanding Faculty Additional Pay and the 125% Rule, Transparency on 125% policy, Thursday, February 10<sup>th</sup> from 11am-12:30pm**

- a. M. Escobar – Sent out Power Points and recordings of the February 10<sup>th</sup> meeting

### **C. Other**

- a. M. Escobar – We should reach out to folks doing Social Justice work on campus. We can get something started for next year.
- b. J. Kim – We should invite junior faculty of color to EEC events.

- c. S. Spears – We can invite them to the Cal-State Fullerton and San Francisco State meeting.

#### **VI. Agenda and/or Action Items for Next Meeting**

A. M. Escobar – We will move the March 14<sup>th</sup> EEC meeting to the alternate date March 28<sup>th</sup>, due to the President's event.

C. M. Escobar – We will be nominating and voting for a new EEC chair for next semester

#### **VII. Adjournment 12:25pm**