

# GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE

## Meeting Notes

Monday, October 29, 2018

UA Conference Room

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

### Present:

Jenny J. Zorn, Vernon Harper, Steve Bacon, Michael Lukens, James Drnek, Liora Gubkin, Vikash Lakhani, Luis Vega, Denise Romero, Kris Krishnan, Nyakundi Michieka, Jaime Paschal, Lisa Zuzarte, Markel Quarles, Ashely Schmidt, Deisy Mascarinas

### Absent:

Debbie Boschini, Jaqueline Mimms, Valari Kirkbride

### Action Items:

- Kris will look further into data as to what is causing the equity gaps associated with gender, URM, and Pell.
- Consider starting initiatives for 4 sub-groups such as URM, Pell, Gender, and Schools. Schools should develop school based approaches that improve both their retention and graduation rates. As well as having initiatives targeted to each URM, Pell, and Gender.
- Develop research, tactics, and strategies related to URM, Pell, and Gender. Individuals can go back in our interim to research strategies in one of those 3 areas and take leadership or be joined by individuals. We can evaluate the best practices on the table and work on implementing those practices as we move towards a more targeted approach on groups and what we are going to do.
  - **URM:** J. Paschal & J. Drnek
  - **Pell:** K. Krishnan
  - **Gender:** M. Quarles

### Meeting Notes:

Meeting was called to order at 3:31 p.m.

- V. Harper reviews the GI 2025 goal trajectory chart from 2-3 years ago which shows some improvement statistically after the wave of 2017. The students did not have the treatment until 2017 and it is a decline that we don't want to minimize but we are just getting started.
- J. Zorn talks about the President's first 3 month review with the Chancellor and how he raised the GI 2025 trajectory issue with her and has charged her with changing that trajectory. The President is very interested in how we (GI Taskforce) can move forward and what ideas we have. At the Cabinet level there were groups that went to the GI 2025 conference and they will be debriefing so the President really wants us to attack this.
- V. Harper states that there is an expected effect from Q2S but it won't show up until 2020. In the Fall 2016 student's had lower GPA's than prior terms which means more students had provision, more students were in jeopardy, which means more students left.

- Transfer goal is 48%. The challenges in graduation retention is a lag between the data and when you make a move you don't see the effects of that move for at least 3-4 years.

### **Current Tactics and Targets**

- V. Harper presented the GI 2025: Cohort Path Analysis: Tactics and Targets. The intention of this analysis is to give you an impression of the process in which we are trying to alter and not specifying a particular year. The example given is for full time students only, using an average number of 1500 incoming students. Between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Fall we have a 73% retention rate, which means about 405 students between one fall to the next fall will leave the University. From the 2<sup>nd</sup> fall to the 3<sup>rd</sup> fall there is a drop in 525 additional students who have left. From the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 4<sup>th</sup> Fall there are 825 students who remain out of the 1500 incoming students which means 675 left that cohort. V. Harper has contacted some of these students to get them to come back and it hasn't been effective. Usually they have exceedingly low GPA's, they may have used up their eligibility and overall the system works against them. What we want to do is prevent them from leaving.
- At the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> year and 4<sup>th</sup> Fall, 240 students of 1500 or 16% of students will be able to graduate that year. Our goal from the Chancellor's office is to move the 16% to 30%, which means an additional 250 students would be able to graduate with those 240 students. For the 6<sup>th</sup> year term, 600 of 1500 or 40% of students will graduate and our goal is to move the 40% to 50%. It doesn't grow much past the 8-10 year mark.
- It is important that we focus on the first year. In order to turn this around we can raise the amount of units enrolled. For incoming population to increase their enrolled units from 25 to about 28 or near 30 units per year, and for those students to return with greater numbers than they have in the past. If we can get our 2<sup>nd</sup> Fall retention rate to over 85% then we will see change.
- Clarification was made that when a student comes in as a full time student they are accounted for as a full time student in data even though some may change to part-time students. They just don't graduate on time. Also, students who start in Spring don't count in the GI data.
- V. Lakhani shows CSU dashboard where students leave before graduating and how 61% of those students enrolled at another CCC or University. Those who left received 2.7 times more DFW Grades in year 1 and first 4 courses are remedial. That in itself will help.

### **Grad and Retention Walkthrough**

- K. Krishnan presented a Cohort Count Retained 1 Yr. FT Freshman percentage chart from Fall 2004 - 2017 and a table with Fall 2018 FT Freshman Cohort- 1<sup>st</sup> year retention rates by Race/Ethnicity. The majority of the students are Hispanic at 79%. We need improvement in the retention rate for African-American students at 75%. Data is from students in Junior standing and even if they change majors, it is still accounted for.
- If you got to the 4<sup>th</sup> fall cohort and gap jumped up what that means is that more of a disproportionate number of URM students left the cohort than Non-URM students. If it happens between this fall to the next fall that means we are going to disproportionately lose URM students between the first 2 falls than we are to lose Non-URM students.

Which is the point of measuring the statistic, which should encourage us to develop strategies to retain URM students much more ardently than we have.

- The Black Faculty Staff Association has student mentoring programs and they are taking a look at it and how it can work effectively. Some mentors have reached out to students and receive no response back. The question then needs to be addressed as to who wants a mentor and then assign a mentor.
- K. Krishnan presented tables of Graduation and Retention Rates for full time freshman students, broken down by all students, all Male students, all African American students, and African-American Male students. As well as tables for all transfers, all Male transfers, all African-American transfer students and Male African-American transfer students.

### **African-American Male Initiatives**

- M. Quarles states that they are in the early stages of AA initiatives and at this point they are taking a look at what students are really needing. They need to dive more into what students are saying, asking students more questions as to what's their perception of what's going on, on campus, their experience, and they are looking into the recruitment process orientation and learning communities. Possibly do focus groups so they can support them best.
- The initiatives will be on Latino students as well as African-American students.

### **Other Items**

- L. Gubkin states that when discussing who gets priority registration, it's almost about not having enough classes of the classes that you need for all the people that need them. If you prioritize all people in all the classes they need to get out, you delay others. When talking about tactics we don't seem to have anything that focuses on scheduling.
  - Need Department Chair.
- J. Zorn questions how can faculty help with this and what is their role in this? Why are students not getting the classes they need or what is slowing down the process? Why are they leaving? Class availability, GPA, work, etc.?
  - Suggestion by faculty was made to tying it to employment on campus, as we would be much more flexible with students than other employers. Creating options for assistantship and work during the week and that way we would be able to check on them.
  - S. Bacon states that CSU dashboard is a great way to review bottleneck courses by department. Faculty members can compare content, or the way class is being taught, or what is affecting the bottleneck. That visual will make for interesting discussions. Being able to see the bottleneck at a department level is more helpful than the gross University level.
  - K. Krishnan points that in Fall 2016-2017 data shows that some of the reasons Freshman students left was because they transferred to other institutions, for academic reasons, and affordability.

### **Quick Updates**

- The hold proposal approved by Provost Council, went to Senate, then Senate AAC, and will be sent to Chairs as FYI unless Chairs don't like it, then were moving to implementation for Fall 2019.
- EO 1110 is being implemented.
- Remediation has been eliminated.
- 700 students in block scheduling. Going to Senate Exec to talk about the evaluation of blocking.
- 15 to Finish has increased our numbers on enrolled units.
- Advising Changes. ALT has been restructured and working on policy changes to help Advisors.

**Adjournment: 5:01 p.m.**