

# GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE

## Meeting Notes

Wednesday April 18, 2018

EDUC 242

2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

### Present:

Jenny Zorn, , Vernon Harper, Steve Bacon, Debbie Boschini, Michael Lukens, John Dirkse, Liora Gubkin, Vikash Lakhani, Denise Romero, Luis Vega, Kris Krishnan, Paul Newberry, Jaime Paschal, ASI Representative, Mariela Gomez.

### Absent:

David Schecter, James Drnek, Jacqueline Mimms, Kathy Lund, Nyakundi Michieka.

### Action Items:

#### Short Term:

- ALT in conjunction with Advisors to draft an “Informed Self-Placement Consent.”
- V. Harper will work with Kris Krishnan for data on first year retention for discussion (on next meeting’s agenda).

#### Long Term:

- Discuss strategies to better help students with myCSUB (on next meeting’s agenda).
- 

### Meeting Notes:

- Meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. by V. Harper and he reviewed the agenda items.
- F. Gorham discusses Student Engagement Dashboard/Blackboard and wanting to bring in more systems in which students interact such as One Card, Grades 1<sup>st</sup>, Smart Planner, etc. to provide more data to determine if student engagement relates to success. SLO contracted with Amazon to move their data center in which 2 million dollars in Amazon credits was obtained. Proposal was then written to take all the intelligence Amazon has to study the data and determine if this is a worthwhile project to move forward. In return awarded 30 thousand dollars to do so. Next step is determining how to obtain approval to push student data into Amazon. We want to continue to add more systems to capture more student data.
- V. Harper indicates at the Academic/Student Affairs joint meeting the CO Taskforce was looking for this data in terms of how you relate student engagement to success.
- F. Gorham informs the next step is working with K. Krishnan on obtaining the Amazon credits and the mechanism in which to obtain approval on building GPA data and correlate.
- V. Harper states this will be a challenge to make this data interpretable yet actionable and once we have the data how do we harness and disseminate it.

- F. Gorham states should this all work out with Amazon the next step is determining whom will act on an event once a student is determined to need intervention.
- V. Harper indicates this is a remarkable and powerful tool.
- F. Gorham informs that we have been allowed us to enter level one data and that is what the CO's office has approved. We would then determine the Amazon's artificial intelligence capabilities in regards to data. We would then need to inform students as to the data and obtain approval.
- V. Harper clarifies the data is being moved to Amazon's Web Service and using their tools. The Amazon store cannot access the data.
- F. Gorham states the Amazon contract specifies we are using their services but they cannot use our data. In the there is opportunity for future proposals to obtain Amazon credits. Every service (CPU) cost is different.
- V. Harper questions are you looking for this committee to recommend to Provost Council to use these services.
- F. Gorham indicates that is the direction he is looking for.
- J. Dirkse asked wouldn't that be a Cabinet decision.
- F. Gorham states we already have the mechanism in saying yes or no in using certain types of data. We are using student usage of system data in order to action to benefit the student.
- J. Dirkse indicates concern as the data contains more confidential information such as gender, ethnicity, etc. and not just GPA.
- V. Harper informs of same concerns as to data.
- J. Zorn questions as to why Amazon needs our data.
- F. Gorham reiterates we are just using Amazon's "I" tool, our data and it is our staff doing the work.
- J. Zorn states the decision you are asking for is whether we want to use the data.
- F. Gorham indicates whether we are okay using the GPA data and joining on how the student is using the system and signing the contract with Amazon in the case of a breach. In phase one we will only be piecing together patterns of a student and GPA the individual will not be identified. That information will come with future phases.
- P. Newberry states as long as the information remains aggregate no future guidelines will be necessary.
- G. Faust reiterates the CO's Office has handled the confidentiality issues contractually with Amazon. In phase one we would only have anonymized data.
- J. Zorn indicates the necessity for further consulting and consideration.

### **Campus Conversation on Advising:**

- J. Zorn informs the committee as to the update on Campus Conversation on Advising. Debriefing has been done with some of the groups as to their thoughts and feedback. All Advising group still needs to be met with. It was beneficial to have an entire conversation and not as individual groups.
- V. Harper confirms all the notes from the table meetings have been posted to website.
- J. Zorn indicates next step is to meet with the all Advising group for consultation. No further action will happen until we return from Fall Commencements. I received a lot of feedback as have some understanding from the report of the Consultant as to where issues are. The all Advisors meeting is scheduled for May 23<sup>rd</sup> @ 9:00 a.m.

### **Student Affairs/Academic Affairs Joint Meeting**

- D. Boschini indicates concerns following meeting. I observed some missed opportunities during the talk regarding GITF activities. The groups indicated their thoughts as to room for improvement. The answers concerning this were informational. However, a legitimate point was made and we missed the opportunity for feedback. Ex., ASI representative indicated grad checks were delayed and therefore students missed better decision regarding what courses to take. I do not feel concerns were being addressed for the students. I feel we can do a better effort in hearing the concerns and addressing them.
- J. Paschal agrees. I feel those questions are asked around campus and they are not being addressed.
- L. Gubkin indicates grad apps are disappearing even when internally tracked. We are at that basic level trying to implement from using all this paper to using the Academic Requirements Page. I have requested Advisors to copy me when they send over items to Evaluations so I can determine if there is patterns. It is at so many levels that I do not feel the questions could be answered appropriately in the moment.
- D. Boschini states at the least we could have taken clearer action. The validation part is what I could have offered.
- L. Gubkin indicates as the taskforce there are many pieces being worked with. Is there a way to provide information on what we are spearheading?
- J. Dirkse is in agreement that the concerns should have been dealt with.
- V. Harper indicates the point is well taken. We are an incubator of ideas in which Provost Council makes to decision to implement.
- D. Boschini recommends working on our culture sharing and channels are open both in/out of our committee. We really want Student Affairs to feel their work is of value. We need to work on process improvement procedures and follow up be conducted.
- P. Newberry states people tend to generalize situations. We need to take steps to validate concerns.
- V. Harper states the information is noted.
- J. Zorn agrees with D. Boschini.

### **EO1110**

- J. Dirkse updates it goes effect on Monday. There are categories in which the new freshman are placed. The functionality will be in People Soft until May 7<sup>th</sup>. Enrollment Management is holding registration until at least May 14<sup>th</sup> giving us time to determine the new categories and build them in as new requisites. New transfers are still good for May 30<sup>th</sup>.
- V. Harper confirms it is for all categories. We do not have the capacity to receive information from CO and link to curriculum and then to students.
- J. Dirkse states seventy percent of freshman will be block enrolled so it should be a small glitch.
- V. Lakhani has requested all appointments be set beyond the 21<sup>st</sup>. We have approved the language regarding categories. Training will be provided next week and information will then be provided.

- J. Paschal questions as to who will approve whether or not a student can “self-place.” As Advisors, we will recommend students into the math/English course in which they are leveled. Do we override/have the student fill out a petition should the student disagree?
- V. Harper indicates this issue arose at the CO’s Office. They are processing their own communications through multiple channels. We have been instructed us to build a structure that will determine what is beneficial to the student should their placement be challenged. We currently have no structure and no definitive answer.
- J. Dirkse indicates there is no recourse but to override. Math is putting departmental consent on all the courses and want them to see an Advisor or themselves. A list of those students is not required.
- J. Paschal suggest a comment be placed in Gradesfirst so we can refer back.
- V. Harper assures there will be a structure placed in PeopleSoft.
- L. Gubkin informs that English may be building it differently than math. The support courses is being entered as part of the grade in the main course syllabus.
- V. Harper questions so they will get the same grade in the two classes? This is something we have to address.
- D. Boschini indicates concerns of the model and the different directions being given as it puts Faculty Staff and Advisors in a situation.
- J. Dirkse states Math Faculty have been informed.
- V. Harper reiterates this is a complex implementation and there will be uncertainty but we will make adjustments and move forward.

### **Categories 3 & 4**

- V. Harper informs that although the first Executive Order indicated early start is optional the CO’s Office has indicated it will no longer be optional. We are not to use language presented in the first Executive order. However, a student may challenge early start and there is not consequences.
- V. Lakhani indicates to follow same process of explaining the reasoning behind the student’s decision. Math 950 will be offered in summer online with an instructor but Math 1010 will be offered to students who need it in the fall. In essence, Math 1010 could go away in the summer.
- J. Dirkse states for the record 1010 in the summer will be credit/no credit, in the fall it will be letter grade.

### **Graduation and Retention Rates**

- K. Krishnan indicates the current graduation rate for 4-Yr is 16.5% with a goal of 30% in 2025. The 6-YR rate is 40.2% with a goal of 56% in 2025. The retention rate is much more complex as there is different goal expectations for each School.
- J. Dirkse indicates graduation rates are different and the same expectations cannot be compared throughout each schools. Retention rates do not necessarily mean higher graduation rates as requirements are complicated.
- L. Gubkin questions when you say tripling, what is that NSME students cannot graduate in four years but graduate in six years. The answer is math.
- J. Paschal states that is correct because the majority of NSME students are required to come in at Calculus ready in order to graduate in four years and that is not the case.
- K. Krishnan states in comparing other CSU’s there is a tremendous jump from the 4-YR to the 6-YR rate. Collectively other CSU’s are doing better.

- J. Dirkse states you have to take into account the level of preparation of our students. With the new program the CO's Office has implemented of cutting out the remedial programs, I am hopeful our percentages will increase.
- J. Paschal indicates in this committee we have determined many of our students are at the level of intermediation. Has any thought been looked at as to Donor/Acceptor Majors? This could be helpful with graduating our students earlier.
- J. Boschini indicates Department Chairs should be better informed or there is not room for substantial change.
- V. Harper states there will be further discussion as to the remaining handouts at the next meeting

**Adjournment:**

V. Harper thanked the team. Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.