

GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE

Tuesday, March 28, 2017

ADM 101

8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

Present:

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

Absent:

Denise Romero

Guests: Vandana Kohli

Trustee Jane Carney

Action Items:

Short Term

- Resolution of the following issues relative to the 2 Year/4 Year Pledge:
 - GPA ('good standing' vs. 2.3 vs. 2.0)
 - Monetary incentives
 - Name
- Further data to come regarding student pass rates in Fall 2016, the results of the FYS Curriculum Taskforce, and the responses to the student survey sent out through Grades First.
- Long-term plan due to the Chancellor's Office by April 28.

Long Term

- Recognition of California Pledge students at commencement (notation in graduation booklet, distinctive cords, etc.)
- Assessment of the 2 Year/4 Year Pledge and Graduation Initiative Taskforce efforts.

Meeting Notes:

- Meeting called to order at 8:42 a.m. by V. Harper. The minutes of a meeting held on March 14, 2017 were reviewed, with no corrections noted. V. Harper also noted that the meeting agendas and notes were being uploaded to the Graduation Initiative website.
- 4-Year / 2-Year Pledge (discussion resumed)
 - V. Kohli provided an update, noting that she has met with many different people in several different settings. Tuesday, she met with the AAC, and they approved the format, so they've been forwarded to the department chairs. She has compiled a FAQ sheet, of sorts, but isn't quite ready to post it yet. The websites have been created, although they are simplified for now. The forms must be electronically accessible, per the C/O directives. She will be updating the Academic Senate soon. The name "Runners Finish Faster" has been removed at the AAC's request. It is simply referred to as the California Pledge Program at this point. The issues that remain unresolved:

- GPA ('good standing' vs. 2.3 vs. 2.0)
- Monetary incentives
- Name

She then asked if there were any questions she could answer?

- V. Harper asked if there was an opportunity to revisit the name? There were some at the AAC meeting who wanted a name for the program, but there was no conversation about an alternative name. V. Kohli indicated about half of the CSUs have named their program; it is customary outside the CSU system to have a catchy name.
- D. Boschini noted that it would be helpful when talking to faculty to emphasize that we are mandated to do this. It's not a conversation of whether or not we do this, but rather how do we do it. The biggest concern she's heard relates to adding another group with priority registration. Does this disproportionately affect certain students? V. Kohli responded that tracking was integral to the initiative and agreed that they'll need to keep an eye on this.
- V. Harper recapped, noting that there had been much discussion and opportunity for debate, the forms had been approved and have been sent to the department chairs. How many students are currently in the program? V. Kohli replied there were 38 students. When will new students be accepted? Soon, Kohli stated. She will be working with B. Perlado. Priority registration has been released for all these students. As to the size of the program in the next year, that will depend upon the directives given to V. Kohli. Pending resolution of the aforementioned outstanding issues, it was the consensus that this matter has been approved and we are moving forward.
- Further discussion centered around potential funding and how it might be used. Additional sections? Medals? Certificates? J. Zorn suggested a notation in the commencement program and distinctive cords at graduation. This was met with enthusiastic approval.
- S. Bacon asked how we will know if this is effective? What's being done to ascertain that being in the program made a difference? Provost Zorn noted that the research indicates this will work, but how do we assess this program here? A discussion followed with regard to measurement models. J. Paschal suggested using the CSI data to help determine student baseline initiative. S. Bacon agreed that if we can do some data match, this may work. K. Krishnan promised to look into this and thought the CSI data would be helpful. V. Harper agreed that program assessment is always something we strive for, but we should be mindful that the time horizon for this is several years away. S. Bacon thought this would be an excellent idea to assess any new graduation initiative program to ensure that we're getting the best deal for our money. V. Harper agreed, indicating that every initiative should include some sort of assessment in the design. V. Kohli will work with K. Krishnan once program is well underway.
- J. Zorn added a footnote that mid-term grades can be assessed, as well, to measure the success relative to the effort.

➤ FYS Pass Rates

- P. Newberry provided a brief update, noting that several causes for the poor pass rates in Fall 2016 have been identified. He has collected various data from faculty who taught the FYS course. There were three main issues that they're working on:
 - Curriculum
 - Faculty
 - Students

Curriculum - he contacted the faculty who participated in the debriefing and 6-8 have responded affirmatively. Working with V. Lakhani and L. Paris, they are forming a small taskforce to work on this curriculum issue. This will be an ongoing effort.

Faculty – committed faculty that want to teach this course is key to its success.

Student Readiness and Motivation – Don't yet have the data from the students who failed other classes (will have this data next meeting), but V. Lakhani is sending out a short survey to students through Grades First, to provide some student feedback. They are mindful that GECCO is responsible for the curriculum.

- V. Harper recapped that we are waiting for the Spring FYS results, and there is a parallel group working on potential changes, which will continue regardless of the pass rate.

➤ Tactical Flow

- V. Harper distributed some handouts, noting that it is related to the long-term plan, due to the Chancellor's Office by April 28.
- The point is to provide a visual presentation as to how all these variables fit together.
- This is for first year students, not transfer students.
- A detailed review of the first page followed, with V. Harper noting that this is not representative of a specific year. It is a summary of where we are now. This was an attempt to put into context where our students are right now.
- V. Harper noted that when the starting points improve, so do the graduation rates.
- J. Zorn stated that decisions we make at this level will impact the four-year graduation rates down the road.
- Extensive discussion followed with regard to barriers to student continuation, ways to combat or remediate these issues, as well as the historical attrition rates, year by year. V. Harper continued on to page 2, noting that there were 'dials and levers' and when we turn some of the earlier dials, we impact the number at the end. The secret is working upstream, earlier in the process.
- Provost Zorn asked how many of the four year graduates were college ready and how many entered as remedial students? V. Harper noted that was an important factor. As are the students who transfer up and out, as well as stop outs. They work against us in our graduation rates. Stop outs end up (if at all) in our 5-6 year graduation rates.
- A brief discussion followed of the various 'dials and levers' that can impact the final graduation rates.

- A discussion of the effect of increased college-ready students followed, with V. Lakhani providing details of the new agreement with the Kern High School District, working with the district on data sharing, curriculum, improving our outreach into the local high schools to improve the incoming students' readiness for college work. One includes providing an admission guarantee to incoming high school freshmen, available if they graduate from high school as college ready and complete all the admission requirements. Instilling this concept with the parents and the students alike is expected to have an impact on college ready rates.
 - Further review of the second page of the Tactical Concept Flow followed.
- Trustee Jane Carney
- Jane Carney, CSU Trustee, entered the meeting at 9:37 (accompanied by J. Mimms), and introductions were made around the table. Trustee Carney thanked the Taskforce for allowing her to sit in, noting that the Graduation Initiative 2025 Taskforce was a necessary challenge.
 - Taskforce members provided brief reports on the various efforts being made in their area to increase the graduation rate. These included (but are not limited to):
 - College Readiness
 - High School Early Start
 - Service Learning (Student Affairs)
 - Block Course Scheduling
 - Smart Planner implementation
 - Course Match
 - Academic Advising caseload
 - General Education
 - Learning Communities
 - Convocation/Orientations
 - Trustee Carney mentioned the concept of mini-grants/emergency funding, which lead to a discussion of innovative ways to resolve social and financial barriers students sometimes face.
 - In closing, V. Harper stated that the Graduation Initiative 2025 Taskforce has galvanized the campus community and allowed us to set some long term goals. It has had a very positive impact on our campus, pulling various units together and filtering down to the School levels, through the faculty, and to the students. Trustee Carney thanked the Taskforce for the positive attitude with which this was approached here at CSU Bakersfield, and appreciates our understanding of the common goal = how can we do better for our students?

Adjournment:

- 10:30 a.m.