GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE (CORRECTED)
Tuesday, February 14, 2017
ADM 101
8:00 – 10:00 a.m.

Present:

Absent:
Jim Drnek

Action Items:
Short Term
- L. Paris will place the following in the Project Plan for possible future action:
  ✓ Presentation at an upcoming DCLC meeting of the Graduation Initiative.
  ✓ A ‘Brown Bag’ event for students to weigh in on student success.
  ✓ Updates to the current student advising holds (graduation holds vs. Senior holds).
  ✓ Departments will be asked to discuss student success in their areas at their department meetings.
- V. Lakhani will work on revisions to the two informal graduation acceleration/progress efforts, to be presented ultimately to the Provost's Council, as a complete initiative.
- L. Paris will update the Graduation Initiative 2025 Task Force spreadsheet, based on today’s discussion.
- The math will be worked out as to the School-level graduation targets and this report will be presented again next meeting.
- Mid-Year student population will be added to a future agenda.

Long Term
- Full implementation of Block Scheduling in two - three years.

Meeting Notes:
- Meeting called to order at 8:05 a.m. by Provost Zorn.
- Faculty Role in Student Success
  - V. Harper led a review of the EAB handout entitled ‘Six Roles for Faculty in Student Success’, noting the importance of faculty having a defined, significant and deliberate roll in student success. This is just the handout of a much larger report, used to start the conversation about what tactics to employ to get faculty to have a greater role in this Initiative. A lengthy discussion followed of ways to support institutional efforts to improve retention and completion. Presentation of the Graduation Initiative will be placed on a future DCLC agenda. There was a brief discussion of a ‘Brown Bag’ initiative on a Friday afternoon and convening a student focus group.
Grad Initiative Budget Discussion
- Provost Zorn reminded the group that CSU received a one-time budget allocation from the state legislature, to focus attention on student retention and graduation rates. CSUB’s portion is $950,000. She then reviewed a handout on the current status of these funds, noting that $733,341 has already been approved, leaving a balance of $216,659. Provost Zorn would like to keep aside $100,000 for things that come up, which leaves about $116,659 still available. A discussion followed as to how best to utilize the remaining funds, and whether it all needs to be spent this calendar year.

Institutionalizing Graduation Acceleration/Informal Degree Progress Review
- Approved last semester ~ Identification of students within a certain number of units to graduation, bring them into specific advising, placing them in classes (in some cases, providing priority registration) and move them through as quickly as possible to graduation. V. Harper views this as a successful venture, raising our retention rates by almost 2 points, about 23 students who were accelerated.
- J. Paschal and V. Lakhani met to institutionalize the project they had done recently, which he titled “Facilitating Graduation”. V. Lakhani reviewed his report and his proposal for institutionalizing this plan. A discussion followed, involving questions and answers. The Taskforce approved moving this proposal to the AAC, with opposition by S. Bacon.
- J. Dirkse reviewed his report entitled “Informal Degree Progress Review”, noting that his priority would be: First-time freshman entering in Fall 14, then juniors with 75-99 units. He has also identified six other categories that could be impacted. He has already started on the first two categories and has generated a draft e-mail (that hasn’t been sent out yet). J. Dirkse noted that these e-mails are more accurate than an actual degree audit because he’s been interfacing with the departments personally. It’s much more specific and lists actual classes necessary. A review of his sample e-mails followed, with discussion as to the merits and possible duplication of efforts. V. Harper suggested an off-line discussion between V. Lakhani, J. Paschal and J. Dirkse, of the two proposed informal grad check processes. Can the plans work together? Is there duplication of efforts? If AARC is doing Priorities #1-4, can J. Dirkse concentrate on priorities 5-8? Do we need a cost/benefit analysis, with opportunity costs identified? Are these efforts sustainable? Nothing will be done at this time, until the Provost’s Council has met next Tuesday (February 22). A decision will be made at that time.

Project Plan/Tactical Flow
- Review of the Task list – identified Direct Initiatives, Indirect Initiatives and removed those things that were processes. Feedback was requested. Is the categorization correct? Winter Session was moved to Direct Initiatives (positive result), Dual Early Enrollment was moved to Direct Initiatives (should be Vandana Kohli), #3 (4 & 2 year pledges) will be split. Separate lines will be added for ADT and California Promise to the Direct Initiatives.

Updates:
- Fall GPA Decline/Probation Increase – tabled
- Block Scheduling Institute
V. Harper reported on the plans for a pilot project, including mostly undeclared students and P. Newberry is working on a Block Scheduling Summer Institute. The purpose of the Summer Institute is to prepare for the Fall of 2018. It is not for the pilot, which will include chairs and program managers to develop the Block Scheduling instructions for the Fall of ’18. Block Scheduling is not a one-year implementation, it’s a 2-3 year implementation. Thanks to the Provost for putting money in for the stipends, which will be part of the Summer Institute.

- School-Level Graduation Targets
  - They brought this to the Dean’s and they agreed that we should increase the school targets by 1.7% per year over the next 10 years.

- Draft GI Report Update
  - K. Krishnan has begun work on the report and will send a draft later this week.

- Edinsights Student Survey
  - J. Mimms alerted that several campuses are being asked if they’d like to participate in this CSU Student Success Network Project. It’s a way to learn from student experiences and they are recruiting campuses to participate. She would recommend CSUB join this project. J. Drnek would be our point of contact. This was approved and Jim will be advised to proceed.

- Brainstorming/Discussion
  - J. Dirkse requested future consideration for the discussion of students who enter mid-year. This will be added to a future agenda.

Adjournment
- 9:48 a.m.