

GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE

Tuesday, March 14, 2017

ADM 101

8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

Present:

Vernon Harper, Kris Krishnan, Paul Newberry, John Dirkse, Denise Romero, Jaimi Paschal, Vikash Lakhani, Luis Vega, Nyakundi Michieka, Jacqueline Mimms, Steve Bacon, Debbie Boschini, Jim Drnek, Kathy Lund

Absent:

Provost Zorn, Lori Paris

Action Items:

Short Term

- Priority Registration, particularly related to gateway courses, will be added to a future agenda.
- V. Lakhani and P. Newberry will review the FYS data to see if there is any correlation between probation/remediation to determine if the high failure rates in F17 is an issue with the course itself, or perhaps an early indicator of student problems.
- P. Newberry will check with Annie Duran with regard to a student survey she did in Fall 2017 for CSUB 1019, and will return on March 28 with recommendations based on conversations between now and then.
- An update will be presented to this Committee soon (March 28 meeting?) on the Hold Modification Proposal.
- A proposal from the Math faculty is expected with regard to the pass rates for developmental and lower division math courses.
- Update with regard to the Facilitating Graduation/Progress Review expected once the AAC has had an opportunity to review the matter.
- A sub-committee to be formed soon to assist K. Krishnan with the April 28 report.
- Tactical Flow will be first on the March 28 agenda.

Meeting Notes:

- Meeting called to order at 8:30 a.m. by V. Harper. Dr. Zorn is off campus today.
- 4-Year / 2-Year Pledge (tabled)
 - V. Harper indicated that this issue was tabled for today, but he will share that V. Kohli went to the Provost's Council for the second time and reviewed the progress. As for Academic Programs, he believes the website is up, or ready to go live, and the job for the Pledge Coordinator has been posted. This person will work closely with the school advisors on customized pledges for the students entering the University that are considering the 2/4 year pledge. There was some discussion regarding the classification of the Pledge Coordinator. Did the number of students involved warrant an ASC1 position? V. Harper pointed out that this was a

workload that he had no staffing for, and this is a temporary position paid by the Provost with Graduation Initiative funds.

- V. Harper advised that the pending issue on this matter is the form. Dr. Kohli continues to field questions, and she will return to the Provost's Council with an updated form, based on previous discussions, for review. There was also a question of using money as an incentive through the Pledge program. Example: \$100/year as the student reaches milestone achievements. He will be talking with the Provost to see if she feels this is an appropriate use of the Initiative funds.
- J. Paschal thinks the issue regarding how ADT and Two Year Pledge students will be handled deserves some discussion. Also, how priority registration will affect gateway courses, i.e., pre-nursing students. This issue will be added to a future agenda.

➤ FTS Pass Rates

- P. Newberry distributed and reviewed a recap of the FYS Debriefing Responses, noting that he worked with V. Lakhani and L. Paris on this project. The consensus from the faculty that attended the three feedback meetings is that nobody thought the course was a mess or that it couldn't be fixed; there were things they liked and things they'd like to see changed. There was some disagreement with regard to where the emphasis of the course should be, the grading methodology, emphasis on skills vs. orientation to the campus, but they were generally optimistic. Some common themes emerged, such as Curriculum (which is new), new faculty, and the students themselves.
- V. Lakhani added that they met with Anne Duran to design a student survey to get their impression of the course. They will check to see if there is any correlation between probation and remediation. Is it a course issue, or an early indicator of student success issues? The data will be reviewed with this possibility in mind. P. Newberry also noted that we will have data from Spring 17 soon, which will also be helpful in determining any necessary changes.
- The results of a survey Annie Duran and Amanda Taggart deployed with regard to CSUB 1009 in Fall 2017 will be sought.
- Further discussion of the course timing and perhaps incorporating life skills followed.
- Discussion followed with regard to the grading policies, issues concerning course assignment ('voluntold' vs. volunteers), faculty buy-in, curriculum review, and possible solutions to faculty assignments. P. Newberry noted that it will require an institutional commitment that these courses matter.
- V. Harper noted that our window for changes relative to Fall 2017 is quickly evaporating. He would like to see a recommendation go to Provost's Council, then on to immediate implementation. V. Harper voiced his opinion that these courses affect the students' GPA and students then end up on probation, and when that happens, only 10% of those students go on to graduate (nationally). So we should do everything in our power to keep those students in good standing.
- The course is currently CR/NC. GECCO just approved a grading change of A to D/NC last Friday. P. Newberry thinks this will solve the F affecting the GPA issue.

➤ Hold Modification Proposal

- J. Paschal distributed a handout entitled “Hold Modification Proposal”. This proposal is based on units vs. student standing.
- V. Lakhani advised that students achieve class levels (standing) at different points.
- They are awaiting additional data from S. Miller, which will help establish set points, and help balance out the work load on faculty and advisors.
- Further discussion followed, including the current practice whereby many faculty lift holds en masse to facilitate enrollment into necessary classes. Are the holds effective? Good point. Are there other ways to satisfy the goal to get students in to see their advisors to keep them on track?
- Once the data has been received from S. Miller, the updated proposal will be forwarded to the Advisor Leadership Team (ALT), then back to the Graduation Initiative Taskforce.

➤ Updates

- Math Remedial - Data from the CO with regard to the pass rates for the developmental and lower division math courses was very disappointing, and the Provost called a meeting with the Math faculty last week. It was a robust and productive discussion, wherein the Math faculty felt they had no control over the curriculum choice and they were looking forward to the remedial program getting some attention. The Math faculty endorsed and supported face-to-face instruction, not the current online mode of instruction. The proposal from the Math faculty should come to this body soon.
- Facilitating Graduation/Progress Review – there has been an online discussion, but timing has been difficult as far as vetting with the AAC. It was confirmed that this matter has not yet been vetted with the AAC. J. Dirkse provided an update on his efforts with the seniors who have not applied for graduation. These are freshmen (no transfers) from the Fall 2012 or Fall 2013 cohort, and the goal is to get these students out within six years. Almost all the GPAs are low. He said there were more than enough attempted units, but these students wasted units between withdrawals, and repeated courses, etc. Surprisingly, many of these students have AP credit. He has about 50 more to finish. It’s been a good exercise, especially as it relates to how many departments have not considered their pre-16-18 offerings, as they are now aware that there are still students who need required classes no longer offered. K. Krishnan shared with the Provost that CSU Bakersfield four-year graduation rate trumps many other campuses at 14-15%. However, by the time we get to the five/six-year rate, we are at the bottom of the pack. San Jose State and Long Beach had much better rates, but they’ve had a committee like this for many years, and we haven’t. They are not doing anything different than we are, but they have had a structure in place longer. This was encouraging news. The Progress Meter was discussed and the challenges it presents to both students and advisors. The meter is turned off for all 16-18 catalog freshmen, and J. Paschal advocated removing it for all students. This will be presented to all advisors on Thursday.
- Fall GPA Decline/Probation Increase – No update.
- Block Scheduling – V. Harper stated that this is moving ahead strongly, and reviewed the current progress. A model has been established and iterative

schedules have been built for the pilot. They also met with J. Paschal and T. McBride to ensure there's no overlap with the grant NMSE is facilitating and to see if there are opportunities to integrate. They will return to this committee with a summary at some point in the near future. S. Bacon expressed concern that other schools will be at a disadvantage due to the reserved seats for A&H. V. Harper agreed that there will be a period of negotiation, and that's the purpose of the pilot program. Should the reservation blocks be reduced or expanded? How will this interface with the deans/chairs? J. Paschal pointed out that the goal of the pilot is for every incoming freshman student to have a block schedule following the pilot year. So this inequity would be short-term. P. Newberry was glad to hear these comments, and noted that there are many sections of these classes, so the effect of 100 A&H students with reserved seats should be minimal. J. Paschal stated NMSE's concern is that any positive outcomes may be wrongly attributed to block scheduling, as there are many other initiatives being implemented. It will be interesting to compare the data from the Block Scheduling pilot and the data from the NSME grant. Discussion of the anticipated procedural progress followed as well as effective control methods.

- GI 2025 Long-Range Plan – K. Krishnan advised that this report is due on April 28. It is different from the previous report in that this report will not be made public.

He solicited some ideas on the following:

- Closing Achievement Gaps
 - Improving Advisement
 - Rethinking the Support and Delivery of Developmental Education
- Note: He is *not* soliciting any updates to 'Optimizing Enrollment Management!

A subcommittee will be formed at a future meeting.

- Tactical Flow will be first on the next agenda.

Adjournment:

- 9:54 a.m.