GI 2025 Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes

Location: AD-103

Date: June 12, 2017

Time: 11:30 a.m.-1 p.m.

Attendees: Brian Haynes, Shari McMahan, Muriel Lopez-Wagner, Ryan Keating, Samuel
                    Sudhakar, Lisa Root, Chris Lindfelt, Davida Fischman, Olivia Rosas, Karen
                    Kolehmainen, Doug Freer, Ron Fremont, Sandy Bennett

_____

Updates were provided by each committee/subcommittee chair(s) and a discussion followed.

1. **Overall Update (Steering Committee Chairs Shari McMahan and Brian Haynes)**
    - GI 2025 Initiative is moving forward at both the system and campus level.
    - VPs Haynes and McMahan will be attending a GI 2025-related meeting, led by the Chancellor's Office, June 20-21 at the Los Angeles Airport.
    - The CSU GI 2025 Symposium will be held Oct. 11 and 12 in Long Beach. A CSUSB team will be participating.
    - Funding could potentially be affected if CUSB and other CSU campuses do not meet target graduation rates.
    - Subcommittee chairs were asked to provide status reports to be posted on the GI-2025 website. It was recommended that brief/bullet point updates be provided monthly and a more detailed report be provided quarterly.
    - Student advising is occurring at the community college level.
    - Steering Committee meetings will not occur in the summer; the group will reconvene in September.

2. **Progressive Pedagogy / Chair Davida Fischman**
    - The Instructional Quality Committee was expanded to include additional committee members.
    - The committee met and discussed ways to contribute in the advancement of the GI 2025 Initiative. Ideas included: (1) outreach to part-time/adjunct faculty, (2) support to faculty who teach large lecture courses; (3) support for UGS; and (4) curriculum that supports bottleneck courses. The committee will meet in the fall to solidify plans.

3. **Rapid Data Analytics / Co-Chairs Muriel Lopez-Wagner and Samuel Sudhakar**
    - Committee members and invited guests met on June 1 to discuss the following the questions.

1. Why do bottlenecks occur in departments? What are our recommendations to reduce bottlenecks?
2. Determine which metrics to put on dashboard first.
3. How do we best communicate the intelligence to decision-makers?

Discussion:

- Department chairs of bottleneck Golden Four requirements were invited to the meeting so they could provide a perspective on bottleneck courses.
- They indicated that they needed a better dashboard or tracking system that shows bottlenecks for the Golden Four categories, rather than courses.
- How many students have yet to complete their Golden Fours by the end of their second year?
- They also asked that these bottleneck courses be presented yearly, rather than term-to-term. They might minimize the front-loading of fall, for instance, but maximize winter and spring. This means that the bottlenecks during the fall quarter might be artificial.
- At the end of each year, how many students did not get into any Golden Four class they attempted to register (instead of term by term)?
- Department chairs need to see how many classes they need given the number of anticipated students. For example, the Department of Mathematics needs to know how many students took Math 90 that will be going into Math 110.
- Enrollment targets by departments have been disconnected with reality. Department chairs are being asked to stay below targets, and at the same time, also told to open more classes to reduce bottlenecks. An alignment between enrollment management, bottleneck courses, and allocation needs to occur.
- Just like the registration report, department chairs would like to see the total number of registrations by college and department in comparison with the same time last year.
- A metric of faculty (full time and part time) and student counts, SFR, and bottlenecks.
- At the end of the year, department chairs would like to know the number of lecturers hired for Golden Four courses to cover bottlenecks.
- Can we predict the number of classes needed for the number of students? (Connecting projections with planning for classes.)
- Number of full time and part-time faculty, students, SFR
- Share information to the community by doing something like a Did You Know infographic on SFR, tenure track faculty, bottleneck courses, or even the number of students in the end of their second year needing the Golden Fours.

4. **Informed Enrollment Management / Co-Chairs Rachel Beech and Olivia Rosas**
   - The committee is currently looking at the incoming class and has been focusing on fall 2017. Moving forward, they will be looking at the registration process, the dismissal process impacted majors and how to move students forward (e.g. health science instead of nursing) and priority registration.
   - Enrollment management includes all students, not just incoming students.
   - Twenty-nine percent of students have priority 1 registration. The committee is examining this process to determine the following. (1) What is the impact of priority registration? (2) What is the definition of priority 1 registration? (2) Can we do away it (except for veteran

and students with disabilities)? How should the process be reviewed (e.g. should there be a separate oversight group)? The committee will look at models across the nation to see what other campuses are doing.

5. **Nurturing Student Engagement & Advising / Chair Alysson Satterlund**
   - The committee met in April, May and June. Dr. Satterlund provided a report from the most recent meetings, May 19 and June 5 (see Attachment A).
   - Committee efforts began with a targeted literature review of research on student engagement to frame their work, and they created a resource binder for the committee.
   - During their May meeting, they had a presentation from Institutional Research on campus engagement using NSSE *(National Survey of Student Engagement)* and CIRP *(Cooperative Institutional Research Program)* data. They used this data to help identify gaps in engagement, which Dr. Satterlund has outlined in her summary. Based on their discussion, they also added two new members to the committee to help add important perspectives on bridging these gaps.
   - In their June meeting, the subcommittee developed a working definitions of engagement and advising, for your review. Dr. Satterlund is asking for your feedback, and if you feel the committee has missed anything; she will take it back to the committee.
   - Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 17 from 2-4pm.
   - See attached handout/report for additional details.

6. **Transparent Policies and Procedures / Co-chairs Ryan Keating and Chris Lindfelt**
   - Subcommittee held today; small group attended.
   - Advisors are directing students to majors.
   - A draft written policy was submitted to the Educational Policy and Resources Committee (EPRC); Mary Boland provided feedback. Once finalized, it will be forwarded for approval. The goal of the policy is to:
     o Capture outlying students and move forward
     o Address items that impact graduation (e.g. implement graduation checks earlier and declare majors earlier).
     o Establish more checks and balances (it is not intended to restrict students)
     o Put in place an advising structure and automatic graduation check once students reach a certain number of credits.
   - Additional policies will be developed, including one surrounding repeat courses.

     VP Sudhakar: The grad check process is being automated.

     - It will tell students where they will be if they change their major.
     - It will be pushed through a mobile app.
     - Messages will appear when students log in.
     - Next generation portal will be launched next spring.
   - A new GI 2025 Communications Plan will provide key messages to students. The campaign, which dovetails with Q2S messages, will include 15-second videos, emails and Web and social media postings. The campaign will be rolled out in the summer, starting with "Think 15" which encourages students to take 15 units and to see an advisor before registering. The official kickoff will be in early fall and continue through June.

Attachment A

Subcommittee for Student Engagement and Advising – Report to the Steering Committee:

May 19, 2017 – The subcommittee had a presentation by Institutional Research to review the CSUSB Student Engagement NSSE and CIRP data and also identified the following barriers to engagement:

CSUSB Student Communications are not as strategically coordinated as they could be given that there is limited knowledge of and use of the current systems in place: OrgSync (which hasn't been properly rolled out and maintained), Peoplesoft (which has a function for tracking student club and organization involvement) and EAB (which professional advisors are having difficulty keeping updated). Students do not have accurate, timely and up-to-date information on engagement opportunities and the value of participation as it relates to timely graduation, career development, mentorship and a high quality educational experiences.

CSUSB does not have 1) pathways to engagement, 2) a University Hour, 3) facilities needed to ensure enough engagement spaces are available; 4) shared definitions of student engagement and advising; 5) flexible and short-term engagement opportunities are not well known and this limits the ways that students can add engagement opportunities into their lives and 6) a strategic plan for engagement.
The subcommittee agreed to add two new members: the Director of the Career Center and the Director of EOP to the subcommittee and to spend the June meeting drafting shared definitions for student engagement and advising to guide the committee's efforts.

June 5, 2017 – The subcommittee worked to craft the following draft definitions (and welcomes your feedback), agreed to meet once in both July and August and transitioned the current ASI EVP to the incoming ASI EVP at this meeting.

Student Engagement Potential Definitions
Student engagement is defined as sustained behavioral involvement in intentional learning activities (inside and outside of the classroom) that are supported by the institution, engender positive diverse educational experiences to support equity and lifelong success.

GI 2025 Subcommittee defines student engagement as the application of students' attention, curiosity, interest, drive and skills to intentional cultural, academic, research, social and professional experiences that are measurable and impactful.

Educationally purposeful actions that sustain and enhance behavioral involvement and the commitment students have toward their academic success and CSUSB. Examples: service learning, orientation, academic advising, student orgs/clubs, work-study/student employment, volunteering, LLCs, community engagement, capstone courses, diversity, faculty interactions, time spent on campus

Student engagement happens when students are well informed of a wide variety of opportunities, developed based on best practices and student interest data. Students understand the reasons behind the importance of engagement and are motivated to participate through school spirit, faculty and staff encouragement, and an internal drive for success. Barriers to engagement are well researched and addressed through student, faculty and staff education, opportunities offered in multiple timeframes and locations, and with the acknowledgement of different learning styles.

Advising Potential Definitions
Good academic advising is a reciprocal relationship that assists students in clarifying personal and professional goals, developing consistent educational goals, and evaluating the progress toward established goals.

Academic advising utilizes the resources of the University and the community and connects students to the appropriate academic and social engagement opportunities. It is a decision-making process in which the sharing of information between student and advisor promotes responsible and appropriate choices and facilitates a successful academic experience.

Formal and informal interactions that facilitate academic pathways, an academic plan, facilitate academic success, a plan for post-college planning and the utilization of academic/campus resources.