

GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE

Meeting Notes

Thursday, February 20, 2020

ADM Room 101

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Present:

Vikash Lakhani, Debra Jackson, Claudia Catota, Denise Romero, Dwayne Cantrell, Jim Drnek, Lisa Zuzarte, Luis Vega, Michael Lukens, Kris Krishnan, Jaimi Paschal, Liora Gubkin, Aaron Wan, and Deisy Mascarinas (Administrative Support).

Absent:

Deborah Boschini, Doreen Anderson-Facile, Nyakundi Michieka, David Schecter, Faust Gorham, Jennifer McCune, and Tanya Boone-Holladay.

Action Items:

- When the sub-committees have drafts, we will spend a meeting going over the drafts so everybody can get a chance to provide comments.
- If the sub-committees have notes from their meetings, they may send them to the rest of the group.
- Sub-committees may be able to cross-collaborate and eventually have the full committees come together and get input from everyone.

GI Taskforce Subgroups (updates)

- **J. McCune (Academic Support/Success/Advising) updates:** The team has met twice and had great discussions regarding challenges that students face. They have 10 members on their team including herself. Among them JR (EOP), Jisel (AARC), Adrienne (BPA), Dr. Han (Communications Faculty), Adrianna (A&H), Yvette (SSE), Melissa (Admissions), Kris Grappendorf (Kinesiology), Mary Slaughter (Communications). They have narrowed it down to focus on lack of framework for all care units and academic support service areas on campus. When they say framework, they are referring to unclear policies and procedures. Some folks don't know what each other do, in terms of the care units. Examples are tutoring services hours do not meet the needs of the students. They will continue to meet bi-weekly to go through a root cause analysis and then update us more the next time.
- **D. Jackson and L. Zuzarte (Academic/Degree Progress) updates:** There are a total of 16 members in this committee. They had a very productive meeting and one of the challenges in starting to identify some of the areas where there are problems is the jump to propose solutions. They were able to identify a number of challenges and create a separate parking lot for proposed solutions. A summary document is going out to the committee members for them to all see the work that has been done. They may need to spend another meeting where they can continue to identify all of the problems, as there are a lot of barriers to students progressing towards degree completion. They want to make sure they get everything on the table to prioritize what is going to have the most impact on making a difference. They are using their problem of practice in the broadest sense which is that students are not progressing towards degree completion at an acceptable rate.
- **D. Cantrell (Administrative/Policy Barriers) updates:** They've had 2 meetings so far and D. Cantrell provided the group with some notes coming directly from the committee members. Some of the issues pointed out was the lack of communication, hierarchy and barriers (will the supervisor be upset if staff speaks to someone who is above them), creating a sharing culture of policies and practices and how it goes out to campus, information not being relayed to Faculty, standard operating procedures, lack of or clear policies and procedures, information less clear on websites that need updated information, flow charts not updated on site, payment plans, academic requirement screen, lack of collaboration between departments on campus, thorough service to students, along with other challenges. Students are often told they should be fine, but they leave without the confidence that

everything is ok. Some things they came up with for theory of action includes, improving communication culture and practice on campus, enhance the to do list process (Admissions), revise payment plans for students, establish administrative barriers clearing house, and enhance services for students with disabilities.

- **N. Michieka, D. Schecter, and V. Lakhani (Financial Literacy/ Well-being) updates:** They have not had a chance to put their group together. D. Schecter is leaving and V. Lakhani will be helping N. Michieka with getting it started. If anybody else wants to get on this committee as a co-lead, please let them know.
- **J. Drnek and D. Boschini (Health and Wellness) updates:** Sub-committee is comprised of Miriam Hauney, Feliza Sanchez, and Michael. Ault. They are working on coordinating meetings. The wellness committee meets monthly and it was suggested for this committee to get on the agenda for those meetings and discuss GI 2025. They may be able to provide data from their surveys.
- **Claudia Catota, T. Boone-Holladay, and L. Vega (Pell/URM Students) updates:** Steve Walsh, Mercro, and Gilverto Herrera, are also a part of this committee. They've had 2 meeting so far and have discussed issues as well as some proposals that came forward. T. Boone-Holladay had mentioned satellite support groups, and this is something that is put on the table as many of the Pell/URM students could benefit from this. They have discussed what existing resources the Pell/URM students have on campus and how we are supporting them. It has been variable given that sometimes grants have come and disappeared. They have questioned whether evaluations have been done, as they have been done before for programs such as CAMP. They would like to have an inventory of how the campus has assisted the students, as a first step. The second step would be to consult the different constituents here on campus that serve the students and get insight from them. They would like to gather the pivot points to help maximize whatever intervention they come up with. As well as, collect data in terms of the support Pell/URM students are receiving and how they do. The bulk of the conversation was what programs already exist on campus that are working and that we need to support. V. Lakhani shared that he can send some information to the committee from a previous meeting that revolved around Pell/URM students.
- **V. Lakhani (Student Engagement) updates:** They just had their first meeting that involved much brainstorming and they talked a lot about student engagement. As a draft they are working on the issue of the lack of sense of belonging at CSUB. Based on the wake forest survey, the sense of belonging at CSUB is below the national average. They used the survey as their baseline for their problem of practice. They all feel that all the other issues in terms of engagement and participation stems from a sense of belonging. If students don't have a sense of belonging on campus, then the engagement piece really suffers. Areas they are looking at include first-year seminar, new student and orientation programs, high impact practices, administrative barriers (overlap with subcommittee), engagement outside of the classroom, and academic engagement. These are broad areas that were discussed, as well as other areas within them such as athletics, clubs, fraternities, red tape for students to put events together, runner hour, academic hour, lack of space on campus for students to socialize and get together, CAMP, Summer Bridge, student employment, and internship service learning. V. Lakhani will put this structure together for the group for the next time that we meet to discuss.
 - A. Wan shared that last year they didn't get as many students to participate in the wake survey (less than 300 students). It's not a clear representation of the entire University, but if that small sample size shows that data in terms of the sense of belonging, then there is a correlation within the school and it is pretty accurate when compared to other Universities.
- **J. Paschal and Denise Romero (College Success) updates:** The committee has met twice. They have a good representation in the committee which includes Valari Kirkbride, Rocio Sanchez, Luz Ramirez, Olivia, Maureen Anderson, Andrea Medina, Emily Callahan, Carmen Padilla, Sara Hendricks, Markel Quarles, and Sonya Gaitan. Their first meeting was for brainstorming and deciding what their root cause analysis was going to be. After looking at everything they realized there are a lot of mentoring programs on campus and the lack of communication that exists within the mentoring programs. There may be an overlapping of services. After the

first meeting they decided to gather more information about the various mentoring programs. For the next meeting they shared what each mentoring program does, how they collect data on their programs, their training, student mentors and how they are matched, and assessment. There are about 6-7 mentoring programs they are still waiting to get information from, but they currently have information on 11 mentoring programs. Some of the information they have is: who owns/runs the program, when it started, a description, is there a dedicated staff member, how many peer mentors (it could be Alumni or Faculty mentors), how many students, are mentors provided with training, any training documents we're linking, is there mentor matching, is there assessment we're linking, and funding. They have realized there are a lot of mentoring programs working in silos and we're not collecting data like we should. Some programs don't have assessments, so how do we know its effective? There is a lack of mentoring training as well. They are still working on identifying the issues and will be meeting bi-weekly.

- **K. Krishnan and F. Gorham (Data/Assessment) updates:** There are 6 committee members, 2 faculty and 1 staff member. They had a brainstorming session in their first meeting. They discussed courses that could be offered by the programs so that students could have the ability to access the program. Many students are on a waitlist and they questioned how they can use the waitlist to meet the demand. K. Krishnan brought up an idea he is developing of graduation tracking dashboard with different categories. He will be able to flag if they applied for a grad check and also if they changed their major. They looked at the DFW rates from the Chancellor's Office dashboard and there are courses that have a high DFW, which there is a concern about. They would like to highlight and address the issue about students changing majors in different schools. V. Lakhani pointed out that the idea about the data/assessment piece was to talk about problems of practice around data. For instance, what sort of data or assessment does the campus need to inform our work.
 - D. Jackson brought up that during the WASC visit the expression by many individuals was that they don't have the data they need, they don't know where to find it, or the data they are getting is not useful for what they want it for, or it's not accurate. She mentions there may be an access and facility issue, in terms of how to read the data and be able to do something with it. On the assessment piece there are concerns about do people really understand how to do assessment, implement it, and use those findings and turn it into useable information. It would be beneficial to consider some of these issues, so that when we are working with whatever piece around the graduation initiative, we have the data to inform our action.
- **Graduation Initiative Mini Grants:** The proposals are due March 13. We had 2 information sessions. For the first session there were about 5-6 folks that showed up and for the second one there was 1 Faculty member that showed up. Online submission is preferred but if someone has to email it, the maximum amount of pages should be 4-5 pages.
- **EVC Lauren Blanchard Visit (recap):** They really focused on URM/Pell gaps. V. Lakhani shared a handout (Achievement Gaps by Gender), and one thing they discovered was the bigger gender gap. In Fall 2013, we had 13.6% gap between male and female students. If we break it down by URM males and URM females we had a 15.7 % gap. URM male vs. Non-URM male is a 7.5% gap. URM female and Non-URM female is a 2% gap. Males are not succeeding at the same level as females, regardless if they are URM or not. We may need to look at retention rate by gender. They also focused on DFW rates. They had a specific list of courses that had high DFW's and was sent to the Provost. The DFW rates may be something that a sub-committee can focus on.