

# GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE

## Meeting Notes

Tuesday, February 20, 2018

ADM 101

9:00a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

### **Present:**

Jenny Zorn, D. Schecter, Vernon Harper, Steve Bacon, Debbie Boschini, Michael Lukens, John Dirkse, James Drnek, Liora Gubkin, Vikash Lakhani, Jacqueline Mimms, Denise Romero, Luis Vega, Kathy Lund, Valari Kirkbride, Kris Krishnan, Jaime Paschal, ASI Representative.

### **Absent:**

Paul Newberry, Mariela Gomez, Nyakundi Michieka

### **Action Items:**

#### **Short Term:**

- ALT in conjunction with Advisors to draft an “Informed Self-Placement Consent.”
- 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 9:03 a.m. by V. Harper and he reviewed the agenda items.
- V. Harper met with runner reporter regarding Grad Initiative; are we conducting it in the way we should; how the Grad Initiative Task Force may/may not need to change reflecting in our one-year anniversary. Achievements/tasks being implemented; Roadmap template; Two and Four-year pledge; Facilitating Graduation; Implementing Math to Your Future Website. Two items pending/awaiting approval by Provost Council: Hold Proposal and Policy for Registration. How can we approach or make things better going forward?
- Provost informed that M. Lukens would be taking the talking points regarding CSU and Graduation Initiative during Advocacy Day in Washington, DC.
- Provost advised the preliminary budget proposal requested from the Governor was 260 million. In return, we were given a preliminary budget of 90 million to be earmarked towards Graduation Initiative. The 260 million requested was to cover all raises negotiated during union agreements, benefit changes and other mandatory

changes. Governor response was that we already have enough money. Alternative measures to make up the proposed difference is to increase tuition, fees, etc. The Governor said whatever money we receive with these tuition increases will be deducted from the 90 million dollar preliminary budget leaving us without an increase to our funds at all. Hoping with May revise in Sacramento to advocate, negotiate and make an argument with Legislator to fund the CSU.

- M. Lukens said the Governor is being stingy. We cannot even perform the basics let alone look at Graduation Initiative or other sort of areas.
- Provost stated when actual tax dollars come out; we will see what the budget will be. Any other thoughts on what we could be doing different with GTIF format?

### **EO1110 Update**

V. Lakhani informs the Subgroup met to look at pass rates. There are challenges in hiring process of FYS instructors. As the new FYS courses are created, the instructors are then selected from the Schools and then the Schools are asked to fill in the instructors for the sections. Hiring process not smooth so talks on redesigning the complete hiring process. Working on open application/interest process across the Schools (General Instructor First Year Interest Application – Handout) being ran through GECCO. Determining how the process would work. Where it would reside either GE or AP Office. Once approved there will be open call for FYS Instructors. Working with D. Schechter and D. Rengil to ensure it follows bargaining agreements and evaluation processes.

- V. Harper stated there are 30 sections (1009 and 1019 combined) of FYS offered each term. As the FYS individuals were hired across different departments and did not have a home department it became difficult from CBA prospective to conduct evaluations and funding mechanism was dispersed. D. Schechter approached Subgroup and indicated in order for process to be CBA compliant it would make sense for it to have a home department. Workflow would be for FYS Job Description to go out with Interest Form and then in GE, P. Newberry will work with GECCO to determine candidates and place in sections built by AP Office.
- S. Bacon indicated no idea of a separate evaluation process. Assigned School should evaluate FYS Instructors. A centralized hiring/assignment process is unnecessary as the current process could be fixed with minor adjustments.
- Provost stated there was no coordination, as P. Newberry had no involvement in the training, hiring or evaluation process. Therefore, no voice in what FYS Instructor was teaching what course.
- S. Bacon stated the training experience would be lost with a centralized process. Should an instructor be hired outside the major it becomes a much less useful class.
- Provost indicated her understanding is there is no longer Tenure-track Faculty teaching FYS its all Staff.
- S. Bacon states there is variability as it is being held out there as what some departments wanted. Deans were brought in the planning too late.
- Provost indicates future meeting regarding the invention of new process with herself, Dean's and P. Newberry on his return.
- S. Bacon would like more problem solving within Schools.

- D. Schecter states the process is now a haphazard. More Staff started teaching as TT's dropped out and we were hoping it was a one Semester thing but ballooned in spring. They come in as Instructor's and responsibilities as such. It has created a snowball effect requiring more people. Thus, requiring a Chair, Dean, etc. to make decisions such as, Order of Assignment, Personal Action File (PAF) and the keeping of the files and processes.
- S. Bacon stated he feels DCLC could come up with some conclusions and help decide on processes and give input on curriculum. Does not feel a solution should be made without the Dean's input. Had the belief there was a training component for the teaching curriculum.
- Provost states P. Newberry has no control in the process and curriculum. The concerns are that balance needs to be maintained during evaluation process.
- D. Schecter states the process is more contractual not administrative.
- Provost proposes future discussion with Deans and P. Newberry at DCLC.
- D. Schecter questions as to if the structure and the purpose of the courses.
- V. Harper reiterates that current process was functioning okay but contractually difficult to deploy. Explains there is a severe time crunch for Fall Semester.

#### **Pass Rates**

- Tabled until next meeting for explanation by P. Newberry.
- **EO1110**
- V. Harper conveys the tremendous amount of work by the Faculty (Handout) to reach this point (Version 24). Major pieces of EO1110 are that current 900 level classes are no longer compliant; Enrollment Categories (formerly College Ready Remedial 1 & 2) have been replaced with Categories 1 through 4. Senate requested AAC to review the Version 24 Document. We are closer to being done then when we started. Category I is broken up into English and Math. Math has several more paths in terms of get students prepared for their Major Degree Coursework. There are Major Courses called GEMS (General Education Modifications) in which students can enroll and will be counted as GE Courses and still satisfy A4.

#### **CATEGORY 1**

- S. Bacon to clarify with Kinesiology Dept. as to math requirements.

#### **CATEGORY 2**

- "Informed Self Placement" is a new construct from the CSU. Quote from the CO's Office: "The final enrollment placement is up to the student," meaning anything from Early Start to or supported courses the student can choose not to take it without adverse effects.
- J. Paschal questioned as to training for Advisors as they will be directing students into their courses. Therefore, language needs to be determined for Advisor's so there is no blame in return should a student fail.
- Provost suggest language such as, "We highly recommend you take this to as this is how you are going to be successful but it is your choice."
- Provost informs that Self-placement in English became popular across the nation. The students could choose which Remedial English to be placed in and typically chose the one that was right for them.

- V. Lakhani suggest with the right information the students would make the right choice for themselves. ALT in conjunction with Advisors could discuss the issue and bring back to the group.
- J. Paschal notes that whatever ALT drafts that language is appropriate and documentation is being done in Grades First.
- Provost states there are many variables in where students place themselves.
- D. Foschini indicates there may be problems as there is no mechanism in bringing Faculty together to be on board with the plan.
- Provost states Faculty will have less roll than Advisors being these are first time freshman.
- V. Harper indicates the Informed Self-Placement is not in the Executive Order as it came after in guidance. Further conversation will be held with the CO's and any information received will be passed on.

### **Category 3 & 4**

- V. Harper informs the CO's Office advised that they be treated as one group.
- **English**
- Stretch courses are compliant with the Executive Order. A number has been issued to the new course English 1100 and will now have an English one pre-baccalaureate unit. The EO states we can have one unit of pre-baccalaureate content when in the past it could be up six pre-baccalaureate units. English 1100 will lead into English 1109 in the Spring.
- J. Dirkse questions is the one unit course Co-req? Dr. Harper indicates he anticipates it to be a Co-req and has requested the document associated with the course.
- Dr. Harper informs that he has questioned if a student drops a pre-baccalaureate do they have to drop the support course as well. He indicates the CO's Office is still studying the response.
- J. Paschal asked is pre-baccalaureate credit/no credit, if they pass the Pre-req. do the still move on.
- Dr. Harper responds with yes.
- **Math**
- The customized yellow bubbles indicate one-unit pre-baccalaureate courses. Another policy guidance came across indicating that under no circumstances should a student including pre-baccalaureate units should be required to take eight units to satisfy A4. Early Start to be included as it could possibly be another two to three units in the summer.
- J. Dirkse states Math 1010 should be placed in the blue category.

### **Block Scheduling Ramifications**

- All SSE Category 3 & 4 students were blocked into English 1100 with the one unit pre-baccalaureate. Students forecasted to be Category 2 were blocked into their respective courses as well. Category 3 & 4 students blocked into English 1100 were also blocked into 15-16 units so if they were to drop that course they should be appropriately advised.
- Provost states this is assuming everyone passes all these. What happens to students who do not pass Math 1009 in the fall? Do the Chair's know to offer it again in the consecutive term?
- V. Harper indicates yes and they know how to build them.

- J. Mimms, can you explain why there is no support for 2200? Dr. Harper indicates that per Dr. Gove, there is current conversation regarding this point but it has not been resolved.
- V. Lakhani states there is talk between A. Duran and D. Anderson-Facile of possible supplemental instructions.
- Provost questions asks as to the next step.
- V. Harper indicates the documents went to AAC and reported as incomplete. They will report to the Senate that it is still in planning. The problem is there is no date in which we can say this is the dole plan.
- Provost states these courses need to get on the books.
- J. Dirkse says by April 23<sup>rd</sup> which is registration day.
- V. Harper states Math Department has sent over a draft and English Department is done.
- Provost indicates we need to evaluate and see what changes can be made and determine a finish date.
- J. Dirkse informs A4 Courses will have no pre-req's.
- V. Harper - FYI on the "Get me from Point A to Point B" Handout. It relates to graduation and current initiatives on campus. First point on page 7, Table 1 indicates expectations of FTF Students to graduate in 4-6 years is 85%. As to our campus only 15-18% do. Table 2 indicates the concern as to running out of financial aid as to the reasoning behind this. Table 3 is significant to Block Scheduling indicates that about 80% of FTF Students were willing to enroll in about 30 units a year to meet their expectations for graduating. On our campus, the data shows only 26-27 units per year. Our goal with Block Scheduling and 15 to Finish was to bring the average of the entire campus to 30 units a year.
- V. Lakhani says we need to talk about how to best utilize Summer Courses for GI.
- Provost indicates this year it is being done through Student Ed. The call has went out to Faculty through the Deans. They are being encouraged to look at the bottleneck courses and get them into summer. We could possibly expand weekend courses some. Marketing will emphasize graduating quicker.
- V. Lakhani states if the push came from the Chairs to approach Faculty to identify courses.
- Provost states the push needs to come from the Chairs. It is not about the money but about getting students through in a timely manner.
- V. Harper states that on page 11 it indicates that one of the real barriers to students not graduating on time is the lack of courses in which students can enroll.
- Provost says in our defense, I am not disowning the fact we have long waiting list for courses. However, many times it has to do with student's own scheduling conflicts (workloads, etc.)
- S. Bacon states that to address this issue we would need more resources for more Faculty as it is not that we have limited courses or courses going unfilled. We could have more education as to student expectations. How could we shift our offerings as opposed to adding them?
- Provost states when the Dean's find courses with long waiting lists they can ask for more an extra Section for it. We are meeting those needs when they come up. We cannot satisfy everyone's particular periods due to Faculty or expertise availability. It

is a balance and choice we have to make and we need to be able to shift resources to meet demand. We need to be able to address class courses with long waiting list may it be resources, expertise or timeframes, etc.

- J. Dirkse states he is impressed as in Table 5 it indicates there are only 4% of students that do not know what they need, as this is not the case as to our students. All Transfer Evaluations need to be in by April 30<sup>th</sup> as this is the first day of registration for new students. There has not been a forceful effort in the past to get this done. It is more critical now in Semester as they will only have 3 terms to pick things up rather than the 5 terms in Quarters. Courses still in progress will come through the credit transfer report as RD report (grade in progress) and the assumption is the student will pass the course and that's how they are placed.
- Provost indicates we need to be more closely monitor this issue. J. Mimms will provide these reports on Grad Checks and Transcript Evaluations.
- V Harper states there are two other areas that stand out. On page 20 as it deals with advising. Campus Conversation on Advising is underway. K. Krishnan's area sent out three surveys: Student, Faculty and Advising. The supplemental will be presented to DLC. We met with the Senator, K. Ziegler-Lopez she has indicated the Advisors had an issue with one of the surveys. K. Krishnan indicates their concerns were that they survey did not let the address certain issues adequately. We decided and open ended essay question for Advisors, Faculty would give them a chance to address more deeply, and this will be presented at DLC. Should it be acceptable, a supplemental survey will be created.
- V. Harper on page 24, the students indicated they wanted a clear plan on what they need to know and what they need to graduate. I think we have made a great stride as we now have a centralized place, which contain all the roadmaps. Undergraduate Roadmaps went up first and the Graduate Roadmaps will uploaded to the database this week.
- J. Paschal questions as the Transfer Roadmaps. V. Harper states they will be in the development process when they are done by BC and CSUB. He indicates he will be in contact with J. Mimms. Dr. Dirkse's Office will be given access to the Graduate Roadmaps to respond with guidance.
- ASI Representative indicates positive feedback as to Student Survey, as it was easily accessible and questions if we have the data. K. Krishnan says we do have the data, it will be analyzed, and a report will be out soon. Over 2,400 students have taken the survey.
- K. Krishnan informs that all Faculty was survey including full time and part time. Overall response of all Faculty was 16%. Only including full time Faculty, it goes up to 35%. The student's response rate was 24% as 2,465 students responded. Total overall response was 66%.
- S. Bacon states the conclusions proved the students preferred Decentralized as opposed to Centralized Advising.
- Provost updates that EAB Representative will write report after his visit to campus to provide feedback. We will take the report along with the survey results and will have the Campus Conversation will be held March 16<sup>th</sup>. The survey will not be used as a voting instrument. At the end of the Academic Year, we should have the roles of advisors and what advising models should look like.

- V. Harper states there is a website being created, it will contain all of the EAB Consultation meeting transcriptions joined by data and results from surveys along with EAB Consultation Report. We will be redacting names and titles from notes and transcription of meetings. We will leave in units.
- Provost confers we will take out names, titles and identifiers from transcription and notes.
- V. Harper states remaining agenda items to be addressed at next meeting.
- K. Krishnan states from his experience E01110 will bring positive results and help down the line.
- Provost expressed good comment from K. Krishnan as Remedial Education held students back, unfairly classified and labeled them. It is about student's self-advocacy and self-image. It is good that Remedial Education is out and students will now be receiving credit for the college courses they are taking. This will be much better for our students. It will be an incentive for students to take four years of math in high school.
- V. Lakhani indicates the high schools are excited and on board to help get students prepared and enrolled in the Math and English Courses that are most appropriate.
- V. Lakhani spoke with D. Gove and math is considering piloting 1010 in summer.

**Adjournment:**

Dr. Zorn thanked the team. Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.