

Education Policies and Programs Committee  
Meeting Minutes – November 17, 2022

Attendance: Kralj, Ellis, Ford, Cline, Grassian, Smith, Calhoun, Salehi, Gray, Yeager-Struter, Huang, Person, Son, Magnus, Maas, Adamian, Gibson, Zeichick, Ferrari, Miller, Nichols

Gina O'Neal (guest), Holly Ferguson (guest), Marianne Paiva (guest)

- 1) Approve Minutes for November 3, 2022 - Approved
- 2) Approve Agenda for November 17, 2022 - Approved
- 3) Discussion Item: EPPC Charge to develop a new EM on Equity Gap

**Paiva:** Here as a guess in providing context in equity data related to faculty grade data from 2019. University developed dashboard on faculty development website for faculty to review individual and aggregate classes related to their teaching/grade information. There is not a policy in who has access to this information and how it can be used. Some on campus, for research or administrator purposes, have been inquiring about accessing this equity gap data. AVP Grassian and Dean McCarthy have suggested a policy be developed to guide how, when, and who can access this information.

**Grassian:** An EM wasn't developed earlier, so tackling it now. There have been some concerns about how this information may impact RTP, which delayed prior efforts to develop EM.

**Paiva:** FERPA limits access to individual student data. To frame Chico State's policy, the CO's Equity Dashboard and Faculty Grade Access Policy highlights three scenarios: 1) faculty access info for educational interest, ie. self-knowledge to diminish their own equity gaps; 2) grade distribution for research (requiring IRB protocols), data is still protected FERPA information; and 3) administrator wants to access course-level grade information for 4-and 6-year graduation rates. "Course-level" would be same course within a single department, ex. SOCI-100 classes, not individual section level.

**Kralj:** This will be moved to an EPPC sub-committee, but Kralj would like to have a brief conversation with the all EPPC first.

**Grassian:** Unsure if FERPA is as much of a concern as the CO's policy indicates.

**Zeichick:** Do we know how the Registrar views this policy? Are they the data custodian for data? Does it fall under their purview? Recommends consulting that office.

**Smith:** Was provided additional student support via tutors for own class with a higher DFW rate.

**Grassian:** Concerns still remain that data should not be used for RTP and administrators having accessing by course-section. Those have been the biggest concerns and will need to be addressed within the policy before moving to Senate.

**Ford:** The policy is addressing a very narrow piece of data. Hopes this isn't the beginning of policies that need to form a new EM each time. Still questions who owns this data? Seems both CO and University own this information. Hard to control at the local campus-level if everything must be routed and guided by the CO.

**Paiva:** Registrar has been contacted but waiting on consultation. Registrar is custodian of raw grade data, but Institutional Research is custodian of equity gap data.

**Grassian:** There is general confusion about data on campus and who owns data and has access to data. Between IT, IR, and the Registrar's Office, it isn't always clear.

**Yeager-Struthers:** CO's dashboard already provides course-level DFW data. Not always hard to figure out who the instructor is, if it's a single section or single instructor who teaches a particular course. Melody found the dashboard and related FLC especially helpful.

**Ferrari:** Most important is what is done with the data vs. who has access to it. Data tells us a problem, but we need to be able to respond. Would like to ensure 1) we are improving student learning; and 2) faculty aren't punished for things that may be out of their control. We are paying so much attention to the data, but we need to provide more inclusive learning environments.

**Ford:** Statewide academic senate has discussed this issue. They believe only individual faculty members should have access and nobody else. If we mirrored that here, would we need a policy?

**Adamian:** An important layer of equity gaps starts in K-12, and the University inherits and reinforces these equity gaps. The institution could lower class sizes, hire more TT faculty, provide safe spaces for students, but we know that won't happen. The grade data is problematic when the focus is on instruction alone, and not the larger systems at play that contribute to equity gaps.

**Grassian:** In favor of moving this into an ad-hoc committee to provide more time and space to discuss the issue.

**Ford:** Believes we should have the same policy as statewide senate, ie. that individual faculty have access and no others.

Various names were suggested for possible involvement in sub-committee.

**Miller:** Would like to ensure the sub-committee is diverse in scope, experience, roles, etc.

#### 4. Announcements & Other

Remaining time available for ad hoc sub-committees:

- a) EM-21-029: Use of Digital Technology in Teaching and Learning

**Ferrari:** Group is meeting in the coming weeks. More details forthcoming.

- b) EM 02-010: Revisions to Certificate Programs

**Gray:** Tried to look at other CSU campuses for other certificate program policies. Working with Admissions on who can enroll in certificate programs, non-degree seeking students, Open University? Can certificate units be transferred to a graduate program? There are updates to the EM addressing these areas. Unit load for certificates has been lowered, as Chico's requirements were high relative to other CSUs.

- c) EM on Equity Gap Data Policy

**Grassian:** will lead the effort in getting the sub-committee organized.

#### 5. Meeting adjourned at 3:38pm