

GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE

Meeting Notes

Monday, December 11, 2017

BDC 134

2:00 – 3:30 p.m.

Present:

Jenny Zorn, Vernon Harper, Steve Bacon, Debbie Boschini, Veronica Catalan (for Michael Lukens), John Dirkse, James Drnek, Liora Gubkin, Vikash Lakhani, Justin McKinley (ASI), Jacqueline Mimms, Paul Newberry, Denise Romero, Luis Vega, Kathy Lund, Valari Kirkbride

Absent:

Mariela Gomez, Kris Krishnan, Nyakundi Michieka, Jaime Paschal

Action Items:

Short Term:

- Hold Proposal will be moved forward to the Provost's Council sometime in the spring.
- 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).
- Check in on the Ready to Advise implementation, and the degree audit validation (on next meeting's agenda).

Meeting Notes:

- Meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m. by V. Harper and he reviewed the agenda items.
- **Unit-Level Policy for Registration Update**
V. Harper said there was good conversation at Provost Counsel Meeting regarding this topic. Provost council recommended to not change the units in PeopleSoft, including units from the current semester that count towards when the students enroll, to use "in-progress" units. Provost Zorn indicated that she was going to redraft that as a memo, take that back to ALT and if ALT approves of the switch, from using different units to "in-progress" units, then it will be moved to implementation. Close-out of this item.
- **First Year Retention (Information)**

J. Dirkse expressed concern about the retention rate of the fall 16 cohort of freshmen, and asked if anyone in the group knew what they were. From his calculations it's about 74%. He said that is was not much different, but a little drop. He was expecting a bump up not a drop down. He surmised that because of the Jeopardy situation and their status, he would have thought we would have no new freshmen who would be disqualified after last spring, and the worst they could have done was go on probation after fall. He expected a 3-4% bump because of that program. J. Dirkse expressed concern about those students who were eligible to take Jeopardy and didn't choose to do so. This is the time between fall to fall. There was discussion amongst the group about the qualifications for and the structure of the Jeopardy program. V. Lakhani said students would be placed on probation at the end of fall, so in spring they're on probation. At the end of spring if they get disqualified they're already on disqualification, but they get a chance to come back in the fall. He said there as a category added called Academic Jeopardy, so instead of the system showing "disqualified" it would say "Academic Jeopardy". D. Romero explained the program, that students attend workshops, they can get transcript analysis, told what classes would be beneficial to repeat to boost their GPA. It's a formal contract they understand they have one chance. Jeopardy is a onetime program only. Students can take classes elsewhere, and they are told specific courses they should take. Provost Zorn asked about other programs on campus. J. Mimms mentioned EOP, and that are a few grant funded programs with very small cohorts. V. Harper asked the group if they wanted just to observe the first year retention for a while, or is it something to dive deeper into, to get a better understanding. There was more discussion. V. Harper said he will work with Kris Krishnan for data on first year retention. In the next meeting the group can desegregate the data, and see if they want to take action on first year retention rates.

➤ **Hold Proposal (3rd Reading)**

Group read over the proposal. Group conferred it was ready, and V. Harper said it would be moved forward to the Provost's Council, sometime in the spring.

➤ **Discussion: Campus Grad Ideas**

a. Transfer Credit/GE Certification Issue

V. Harper started by saying that his office has the ability, especially for transfer students, to substitute or waive requirements for students so that they can graduate. Some students have come to the Academic Programs when they're very near to graduate, with a particular problem. The issue is in terms of the way that our curriculum measures with community colleges, in terms of the courses that do not count student's transfer credits and won't satisfy requirements to graduate. They've been told one thing by one person, then told something else by another person in our organization, which has led them to the point of retaking courses, for not understanding the correct path to take. Unfortunately it happens quite often. V. Harper asked for suggestions for solutions. The group discussed and acknowledged

comments regarding the transfer process and articulation between community colleges and university. L. Gubkin said that the “Ready to Advise List” tries to address this problem. The list is about which articulation agreements are to be used for transfer students. This is used before the transfer analysis is done. Courses show up as counting, but the specific category hasn’t necessarily been filled in. L. Vega said a problem is that sometimes analysis doesn’t take place soon enough, in order to give them a more accurate path. The Ready to Advise list goes to all advisors, and ADs. V. Lakhani said they’re working on getting the list onto PeopleSoft. J. Dirkse said Assist.org and TES.org articulates courses. V. Harper asserted that what we can change in the organization is getting them the most accurate information as quickly as possible. If we can do that then they don’t have to retake classes and if they retake classes and they get off their road maps that’s where it impacts our graduation [rates]. J. Dirkse suggested if a student is saying a course is supposed to transfer and it doesn’t, send them to him. V. Harper said that when courses are being put in categories, students should be told where they are deficient in requirements. J. Dirkse said in myCSUB there’s a transfer credit report tab at the top to look at that provides information about what area the courses satisfy, if any. Some of the areas to make progress in are, continuing to develop the “Ready to Advise” process; continue to do the degree chart at OCD meeting and LT to help talk about the places with GE; and campus-wide education and communication about myCSUB.

➤ **Adjournment:**

Dr. Zorn thanked Kathy Lund for her service and commitment to CSUB, and wished her well in her retirement. Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.