GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE

Meeting Notes
Thursday, November 15, 2018
Provost's Conference Room ADM 101
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Present:
Jenny J. Zorn, Vernon Harper, Steve Bacon, Liora Gubkin, Nyakundi Michieka, Jaime Paschal
Denise Romero, Ashely Schmidt, Luis Vega, Lisa Zuzarte, Valari Kirkbride
Absent:
Debbie Boschini, James Drnek, Kris Krishnan, Vikash Lakhani, Michael Lukens, Jaqueline
Mimms, Markel Quarles

Action Items:
  ➢ J. Zorn spoke to the President who wants to hold a CSUB half-day Student Success
    Conference in spring. Planning includes Jeff Gold and James Minor from CSU to attend
    to provide an overview of the Data Dashboard; a faculty panel to showcase their efforts
    related to student success, and a student panel on their views and experiences on what
    helped them to succeed; and a keynote speaker address. Harper to take the lead on
    organizing, reaching out to Markel Quarles to assist, as he has experience organizing the
    Student Success Conference at Fresno State.
  ➢ After discussion about the viability of extending the ability to withdraw from courses past
    the census date, V. Harper will research California law on withdrawal deadlines.

Meeting Notes:

Meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.

Equity Gaps and Tactics

  ➢ V. Harper recapped last meeting where the group addressed increase in equity gaps,
    which led to subcommittees to look at URMs, Pell and Gender areas, create tactics and
    gather data or implementation to increase equity gaps.

URM – J. Paschal
  ➢ J. Paschal addressed retention of URM students by summarizing several articles (handed
    out a list of articles) on Pell eligibility; peer support and faculty support particularly with
    HIS; prescriptive advising-professional and academic where URMs have the greatest
    gains; students in learning communities show higher grad and retention gains; the higher
    the first term GPA the more likely to graduate as a URM student; if URM instructor is
    like them, drop-out rates fell; campus involvement, acclimation to campus culture, and
    use of resources, finding like peers, all contributed to higher retention and grad rates for
    URM students. Target interventions are different depending on factors such as ethnicity,
    cultural and socioeconomic factors, and family support. Paschal said that a question
    would be resources to help learning communities, and campus engagement. There are

many factors regarding students retaining, but pre-college variables have the most impact. 65-83% of success is due to what happened before college. What we can do is support and help them get past that gap, and it's not necessarily an academic gap. Student success is a collective effort on campus.

➢ L. Gubkin-Malicdem wanted to know who is not being reached now, what each student is involved in, strategies that they are engaged in, and knowing who are the ones falling in the cracks, and are they being connected where they need to be. Do we need new programs or are they already on campus and we just need to get students connected to where they need to be.

➢ J. Zorn said that we could identify programs to expand. J. Paschal said it would be interesting to have meetings on campus where faculty, staff and administrators could come together monthly to highlight programs on campus relative to student retention, and could be adapted or replicated elsewhere.

➢ S. Bacon said that dismantling the "kitchen sink" and scaling up from there, reins in costs and is more trackable to identify where interventions can be made.

➢ V. Harper shared that we have been working with the Wonderful Scholars where they have access to tutors, teachers, counselors, and a dedicated space, however, some fail first semester math. His analysis was that those who went on probation were those who failed first semester math. Graduation was slightly higher, but not dramatically more since the "kitchen sink" approach was provided, is disheartening.

➢ J. Paschal brought up if a change in drop policy so that students would be able to drop right up to finals would make a difference. Could they be allowed to drop with a W if they are getting a D or F. It was discussed that if they just took a lower grade, they wouldn't have to take the course again, which slows them down.

➢ V. Harper suggested that after discussions, if there is anything we could do to keep students off probation would be a good thing. Would widening the window to drop prevent students from entering probation.

➢ N. Michieka said that some students could see it as unfair if some students were given more chances.

➢ V. Harper said reinstalling mid-term progress reporting would be good. He will check if there is any California law on withdrawal deadlines.

Gender – N. Michieka

➢ N. Michieka passed out a spreadsheet "Student Success Support by Gender", programs by CSU, and summarized each program.

➢ V. Harper asked if there were programs that we could potentially implement that are different than what we are currently doing.

➢ At CSUN the Sistahood Community has an elaborate website that provides resources of programs and support for the campus. Some programs were funded by the schools, and some were funded externally.

➢ V. Harper said that a small team has been formed through GE, and is pursing grants to fund a First-generation Center. At other institutions centers were built where students came to get information about resources, mentorships and programs, housed under one roof. He's seeing on the edge of this work, that they are being funded by large grant-making enterprises, and it would be a potential tactic for us to use.

- ➢ J. Zorn suggested working with C. Catota as she is working with faculty and students on first-generation initiative on campus.
- ➢ Could fold into the conference, a panel on what departments are doing towards first-generation initiatives.

Possible Block Scheduling Expansion
- ➢ V. Harper provided a summary of meetings with Executive and DCLC. Faculty questioned if the university should put all freshmen in the block. There was not much resistance from DCLC.
- ➢ Block scheduling stats: 20% of F2017 BS cohort got probation vs. 30%, and they earned 11.4 units vs. 10.2. In the F2018 81% returned vs. 73%, and enrolled in 14.15 units in their 2nd year, vs. 13.4.
- ➢ There was concern about the workload for advisors. Boutique building of schedules cannot be sustained. With key people in the discussion, it can be modified and automated. Provost will go to Exec and ask if they want everyone in the block, then everything will be on the table to make it happen. Concern was expressed about taking away students' choice.

Adjournment: 4:22 p.m.