

GRADUATION INITIATIVE 2025 TASKFORCE

Meeting Notes

Monday, October 29, 2018
UA Conference Room

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Present:

Jenny J. Zorn, Vernon Harper, Steve Bacon, Michael Lukens, James Drnek, Liora Gubkin, Vikash Lakhani, Luis Vega, Denise Romero, Kris Krishnan, Nyakundi Michieka, Jaime Paschal, Lisa Zuzarte, Markel Quarles, Ashely Schmidt, Debra Mascarinas (Admin Support)

Absent:

Debbie Boschini, Jaqueline Mimms,

Action Items:

- ¾ Kris will look further into data as to what is causing the equity gaps associated with gender, URM, and Pell.
- ¾ Consider starting initiatives for 4 subgroups such as URM, Pell, Gender, and Schools. Schools should develop school based approaches that improve both their retention and graduation rates. As well as having initiatives targeted to each URM, Pell, and Gender.
- ¾ Develop research, tactics, and strategies related to URM, Pell, and Gender. Individuals can go back in our interest to research strategies in one of those 3 areas and take leadership or be joined by individuals. We can evaluate the best practices on the table and work on implementing those practices as we move towards a more targeted approach on groups and what we are going to do.
 - o URM: J. Paschal & J. Drnek
 - o Pell: K. Krishnan
 - o Gender: M. Quarles

Meeting Notes:

Meeting was called to order at 3:31 p.m.

- ¾ V. Harper reviews the GI 2025 goal trajectory chart from 6 years ago which shows some improvement statistically after the wave of 2017. The students did not have the treatment until 2017 and it is a decline that we don't want to minimize but we are just getting started.
- ¾ J. Zorn talks about the President's first 3 month review with the Chancellor and how he raised the GI 2025 trajectory issue with her and has charged her with changing that trajectory. The President is very interested in how we (GI Taskforce) can move forward and what ideas we have. At the Cabinet level there were groups that went to the GI 2025 conference and they will be debriefing so the President really wants us to attack this.
- ¾ V. Harper states that there is an expected effect from 2017 but it won't show up until 2020. In the Fall 2016 student's had lower GPA's than prior terms which means more students had provision, more students were in jeopardy, which means more students left.
- ¾ Transfer goal is 48%. The challenges in graduation retention is a lag between the data and when you make a move you don't see the effects of that move for at least 6 years.

Current Tactics and Targets

- ¾ V. Harper presented the GI 2025: Cohort Path Analysis: Tactics and Targets. The intention of this analysis is to give you an impression of the process in which we are trying to alter and not specifying a particular year. The example given is for full time students only, using an average number of 1500 incoming students. Between the 1st and 2nd Fall we have a 73% retention rate, which means about 1100 students between one fall to the next fall will leave the University. From the 2nd fall to the 3rd fall there is a drop in 525 additional students who have left. From the 3rd to the 4th Fall there are 825 students who remain out of the 1500 incoming students which means 675 left that cohort. V. Harper has contacted some of these students to get them to come back and it hasn't been effective. Usually they have exceedingly low GPAs. They may have used up their eligibility and over the system works against them. What we want to do is prevent them from leaving.

