

Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) Meeting

Friday, October 6, 2017

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

College Heights Conference Room, B10-468

In Attendance:

Members: Sandra Stefani-Comerford, Ludmila Prisecar, Jan Roecks, Alicia Frangos, Katrina Relos, Jeramy Wallace, Jia Chung, Sarah Mangin, Elnora Kelly Tayag, Laura Demsetz, Teresa Morris, Fi Tovo, Mike Claire, Jeremiah Sims, John Sewart, Sarah Mangin

MEETING SUMMARY

Next Meeting: October 20, 2017

Welcome and Introductions

Jeramy oversaw the meeting as Chair Kim Lopez was out. New member Sarah Mangin introduced herself. Everyone else introduced themselves as well.

Review of the Agenda

Approved by consensus.

Review Summary Notes from the September 15, 2017 meeting

Laura said Lifelong earning should be lifelong learning (correct). No other objections were made.

Review Guided Pathway Self-Assessment

Sandra presented the Guided Pathways Self-Assessment Tool. This has to go to the Board of Trustees next Wednesday, so she asked for approval from IPC today (see handout). Sandra explained workshops, and the presentation was on self-assessment tools. Sandra presented a list of names who make up the design team, comprised of faculty, since Guided Pathways is faculty-driven. These faculty come from different disciplines and will be the ones leading the workshops.

The process begins with the self-assessment. Sandra explained the Key Elements, 1-14. The design team have put indicated in all of the element whether they are in pre-adoption, early adoption, in progress, or full scale. Most of them will be in early adoption. Based on input, the team feels as a whole, the program is in early adoption.

Sandra asked people to contact Anniqua Rana with any questions, concerns or comments. Anniqua needs to receive any feedback by Monday or Tuesday, because Wednesday is the deadline to present the program to the Board.

Sandra requested action on this. Jeramy asked if anyone had any objections to presenting this to the Board of Trustees. No one had an objection. Jeramy announced the consensus was that it should go.

Presentations from Umoja, Mana

CSM Mana Program presentation by Fi Tovo (handout)

Fi thanked PRIE for quantitative data used in her presentation. Fi talked about the high rate of previous drop-out rates and spoke about how the retention rates had increased in Mana. She said she forgotten to account for students who graduated (where the asterisks are). (See handout). She explained that Pacific Island and Oceania studies program is a new certificate and asked IPC to look at the success rate of the program, especially the retention. Her push is for the success rate.

Regarding Mana Goals – the first cohort was 2017 Mana graduation. They decided to go above and beyond the classroom with specialized programs, utilizing the village resources and working strategically with the learning center and ethnic studies department. They are also happy with the specialization certificate. She is also collaborating with San Diego and are bringing them up for a site visit. Mana preview day is their program’s outreach for high school students. This is the third year doing Earth Day outreach as well. They have a certificate of achievement as well. Colleges are reaching out to ask them how our AA degrees guided pathways resource outside of 2-year work. Another accomplishment is the 30 student cohort. Mana has made curricular shifts in the classroom, collaborating with learning center. Fi spoke about Pacific Islanders identifying as a learning community and how many don’t realize this. It opened up the discussion about identity, such as “first generation, ‘marginalized’ ‘culture capital.’ The challenges are that student population (Mana are around 50) need support to scale up. There is also a need for research materials and dedicated space to support the Mana certificate program; she suggested using the library since she feels it already has what they need. She believes CSM has opened up more opportunities for students. She read the end statement, it takes a village, collaborating, etc. and offers to collaborate across campuses. She asked all faculty to embrace it and the institution as well.

Mike pointed out that data he had predated it, and just the course success rate was 50% but the numbers have improved 10%. He also liked what she said about collaboration, and as the programs are built, he appreciated Fi mentioning the learning centers, math/science, STEM, etc. since those are also part of the identity. He added that it would be great if the student transfers could be captured, since it seemed like a lot were at the transfer ceremony. He asked what action IPC plans to take. John added that he hadn't previously had time to do some of the data, but it will be added at a later time.

Fi pointed out that she is a collaborator not by choice but the new opportunities have given her that resource.

Laura thanked her for her leadership and commended her for working as a team and pointed out the reasons for lower cohort now.

Jan complimented her on her thorough job on her report and said it helped IPC and the college that she has put it together for us moving forward and reiterated collaboration.

Jeremiah wanted clarification on what that collaboration looked like.

Fi responded that to make a reformed changed means to attack the instructional cohort. She spoke about shaping the curriculum to the students. Culturally-relevant curriculum should be addressed; students go home to gentrification. She spoke of articulating that to her students and the Mana program continues to use that. She added that when students are given that space, change will happen.

Jeremy talked about Sparkpoint as relevant. Mike said we got outreach from United Way to start a Sparkpoint program. The tough part of it to solve is housing the program.

Umoja Presentation – Annual Review

Jeremy Wallace presented the review. Umoja is a learning community mainly for the AA community, it's an afro-centric program, all African, and African American culture. There are currently 32 students and 34 continuing from the previous 3 cohorts. Many of them are in the Umoja club for an active number of 66 on campus. 24 have graduated and/or transferred, 13 have left CSM for another CC (often because of housing). 6 students were dismissed (grades or withdrawals). 25 students are untracked, etc (we don't know about them, probably dropped out) (Unknown status). 4 faculty support the program. 18 units of reassigned time for the entire year. (see handout).

Quantitative data came from PRIE.

John explained the retention data. All retention means is that a grade was received, no matter the grade, and not success rates, but since following state metrics, that's what was used. John clarified it was all courses, because Laura asked if it was just Umoja courses or all courses.

Jeremy explained the Quantitative data (see handout). Jeremy was happy with the 54 degrees awarded.

Alicia asked about the six students who were dismissed. Almost always students can be reinstated, so she wondered if Jeremy knew they were gone, and wanted to talk with Jeremy later about it.

This year is the first Escalation Workshop (by One Love).

A lot of the Umoja students are speaking at conferences. State-wide conference in LA we had 3 students speaking there last November for example.

Most of the rest of the activities are the same as previous years.

Goals – would like to extend the cohort and touch all African American students.

He wants to create a second year Umoja program. Dr. Gaines & Jeremy are developing a Black Leadership course resulting in a community based services.

Expanding the mentoring program to the community is another particular aspiration, which includes reaching out to the community (Genentech, etc.). This is one of the biggest goals of the coming year.

Jeremy went on to talk about the Accomplishments and Challenges (see handout).

Students are more likely to graduate and transfer through Umoja than not. He would like to double CSU numbers. He believes Umoja is becoming more known throughout the student body and also attracting more non-African American students to the clubs and cohorts. A lot of black student leaders are talking about Umoja, but still he'd like to get more students involved to increase retention.

PRIE data shows cohorts are getting better and better, and Jeremy said that the program is getting stronger every year.

Jeremiah offered to be involved.

Ludmilla asked if all the coordinators of the different programs ever get together to discuss common issues. Jeremy said that they do and that they also want to work with a retention specialist.

For the first 3 years of Umoja, the time was split between he and Dr. Gaines and the reassigned time gets used up by student crises which made it hard to manage the program.

Jeremy believes a retention specialist can devote 100% to student needs.

Mike said it's tough to work in a learning community and put yourself out there to the students, and he wanted to personally thank Jeremy Wallace, Dr. Gaines, Jeremiah Sims and Fi Tovo as the kind of people CSM needs and wants. Jeremy responded he was happy CSM gives them a platform.

Review Integrated BSI, SE/SSSP Plan

Jeremiah discussed the integrated plan. They have met in small subgroups to complete the plan (shown up on the projector). He presented the executive plan (see handout).

Jeremiah said that the cohort model is working well for the learning communities and that's something we need to iron out at scale, but the efficacy of marginalized students working together as minorities is good. He spoke about a study that was done with same test scores coming into Berkeley. That study has been used to support the strength of cohort learning for marginalized students, and what is taking place in our learning communities supports that.

Laura talked about separating features of the learning community between cohorts and additional resources. Jeremiah said he thought that students working together is more successful even than the other resources.

Jeremiah wants to implement learning community programs campus-wide.

Jeremiah added that a student asked him about microaggression, and he is planning on addressing it.

Jeremiah said the summary is addressing issues campus-wide. Systemic structuralized barriers students face need to be addressed.

He went on to say that he reframed the conversation and instead of paying attention myopically to achievement gaps, he looks at opportunity gaps instead, basically addressing the disease and not the symptom. The opportunity gaps are from structuralized inequity.

Jan said a comprehensive report like this has not been done before and this is the result of that, for three different programs together.

Teresa asked about guided pathways being foundational and wanted to know how it's woven in later, as an initiative or home-grown ideas. Jeremy offered that Anniqua was the one that designed that part of it.

Jan added the team was talking a lot about pathways which is a recurring thing and Jeremiah added that exemplified the kind of collaboration we can do on the CSM campus.

Teresa added that the pathways is a fundamental necessity for success.

Jeremiah says the highlight is on equity.

Jan mentioned there is an intermix throughout Guided Pathways.

Laura had concern about the two-year plan aspect and said she would ask Anniqua.

Update on Board of Trustees, Strategic Goals and Metrics

Mike presented a document that the Board of Trustees will need to adopt, and which will be finalized in a month (see handout).

Mike said that although he's a numbers guy, it's the students behind the numbers that actually matter, and it's anecdotes, stories, etc. that have an effect on the numbers. If we do our jobs well and put programs in place and connect students with the resources they need, the numbers will follow.

Regarding learning communities, there are things CSM learns that help our hypermarginalized students, but the most significant professional development thing he discovered a few years ago was that some students had no resources.

Mike stressed the need to reach out to students in high school, even reach down to the middle school level. Every one that come to CSM needs a sense of connection, and we need to give them direction and momentum. He realizes they change majors, etc. but students coming to us realize they need a diploma to make it in this part of the world.

Mike brought up Year One and has a sense of what we can offer, such as Umoja or Mana, but some way they should be connected to us significantly and if we do our jobs right and make a curriculum culture the numbers should improve, and the students behind the numbers will find success.

He referred to the metrics across the district and said that they were trying to break down the metrics to one page that everyone could refer to. They are tied to strategic goals that the Board of Trustees has set. He mentioned that after having attended board meetings for 12 years, out of all those meetings, the last 24 are the first time they spoke about equity, student success, student achievement in a significant way. CSM has these programs because we got innovation programs from the board, and they are where the funds come from. So it's reasonable for them to expect us to report back on how we're doing.

On the Board's site, there's a link to the strategic plan and anyone can see this report and disaggregate it further by other criteria.

All 3 colleges have innovative programs, and every couple of Board of Trustee meetings, CSM is doing as well if not better than the other 2 colleges. We could be doing worse but we also can be doing better. He asked that we take the document back to our constituents and look at the targets that have been established, and use the best professional assessment and be realistic. He says there are some nuances (e.g., metric 1.4). He said that he appreciated programs for changing based on the information.

Mike said the numbers are lower than the other 2 colleges is because we have a higher number of international students, etc. You can actually change the dashboard on it by clicking down and finding the reasons behind the data.

He asked that constituency groups report back and let him know if they are in the ballpark, and will ask us to look at it again before it's adopted by the Board. The Board has seen this first draft, which is a work in progress. He wants to get it done by the end of the semester.

Jeremy asked when he wants us to bring it back to IPC. Mike said by the end of November, if that's possible depending on whether people can fit it on their agendas.

John said the definitions are also on the dashboard.

Mike asked that groups have their questions ready when John comes to visit their group.