

Academic Planning, Assessment, & Resources Committee

Date: October 11, 2016

Time: 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Place: Academic Affairs Conference Room

Present: Tim Wandling (acting chair), Laura Krier, Kathy Morris, Mark Perri, Suzanne Rivoire, Daniel Soto, Ricky Albanese, Karen Moranski, Laura Lupei, Justin Lipp, Shawn Kilat

Minutes: Suzanne Rivoire, with lots of help from Laura on the metrics section

Agenda approved.

Chair Report:

No items from the Chair, but Karen Moranski gave a report on the Graduation Initiative and our plan to use the \$1M in one-time academic success funds. The CSU liked two of our proposals: (1) intrusive advising; and (2) improving WEPT pass rates and substituting writing-intensive courses for the WEPT.

The next hurdle is how to implement these proposals, which the committee discussed. A major challenge is the short time horizon: the funds are available this year and are supposed to address graduation rates this year by legislative requirement.

Intrusive advising:

- The Graduation Initiative Group has developed a draft plan.
- Not practical to hire new advisors given the short amount of time; instead, plan to reach out to people with advising experience and support faculty.
- Sean Johnson has identified 800 students with fewer than 30 units left to graduation who “may have roadblocks in place” (e.g. WEPT). The goal is to get them to finish in May.
- To do this, will probably need departments’ help – will ask departments if they can contact these students and what support they need.

Other obstacles to graduation discussed:

- Students who fail bottleneck courses that are only offered yearly
- Students with time-consuming work commitments
- Financial issues in general:
 - Is it possible to use funds for books or financial aid?
 - Chancellor’s office says it’s OK to spend up to \$1500/student if money is the main obstacle, but it’s not clear what we can actually spend that on.

- Improving affordability of Intersession classes: SEIE now has \$200K of scholarships
- Would be good to collect data on why students delay graduation, although this is a longer-term issue and probably not what the providers of these funds have in mind.

Staggered terms:

Decision: Members' terms will be staggered as follows:

- Ending in 2017: Library (Laura), Science & Technology (Suzanne)
- Ending in 2018: Arts & Humanities (Tim), Education (Kathy)
- Ending in 2019: Business & Economics (Mike), Social Sciences (Daniel), At-Large (Mark)

Holistic view of curriculum and metrics to gather:

Jumping-off point was a 2006 document presented to the Senate: "Core Academic Priorities Require University-Wide Solution," which listed a number of metrics for academic program quality; faculty development; GE quality; and diversity. Members brainstormed other institution-wide metrics that may be of use:

- *Graduation and retention:*
 - Number of students enrolled (undergraduate, graduate, credential programs)
 - Number of transfer students
 - First- and second-year retention rates
 - Four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates
 - Number of students within 30 units of graduating
 - Number of students enrolled in intersession courses that fulfill graduation requirements
 - Ratio of full-time to part-time students
 - Retention rates of students enrolled in FYE/SYE courses vs. not
- *General academic quality:*
 - Amount spent on instructional equipment/software
 - Academic Affairs budget as percent of total budget
 - Number of students in each major/program
 - Ratio of Assistant, Associate, and Full Faculty
 - Number of students who enroll in a capstone/senior research project before graduation
 - Amount spent on academic support per FTES
 - Amount spent on instruction per FTES
 - Students enrolled in internships, service learning, research and creative experience
 - Student-faculty ratio for undergrad vs. grad/credential
 - Number of FTEF
 - Ratio of lecturer to tenured/tenure-track faculty

- Percent of courses integrating information literacy instruction
 - Percent of students receiving information literacy instruction
 - Percent of students enrolled in writing-intensive courses
- *Faculty development:*
 - Amount spent on faculty start-up funds
 - Amount spent funding research
 - Amount spent on faculty travel
 - Number of faculty within each salary range (compared to other CSUs)
 - Number of faculty below SSI max (compared to other CSUs)
 - Number of software packages purchased outside of IT
 - Number of or amount of money spent on upgrading workstations beyond IT's provisions
 - Percent reassigned time for faculty to engage in scholarship and professional development
- *GE:*
 - Student-faculty ratio in GE courses
 - GE class sizes vs. courses in majors/programs
 - GE courses taught by lecturers vs. tenured/tenure-track faculty
 - GE enrollment across first, second, third, fourth year students
- *Diversity:*
 - Should explicitly link these metrics to the President's pursuit of HSI status
 - Student, faculty, and staff demographics (compared to service area?)
 - Retention rates across diversity categories
 - Number of students receiving financial aid and need-based scholarships
 - Number of students eligible for Pell grants vs. Pell grant recipients
 - Number of workshops offered for professional education in cultural competency
 - Number of faculty and staff enrolled in workshops in cultural competency
 - Percent of students who complete the FAFSA (broken down by diversity category)
 - Percent of first-generation college students
 - Percent of student across ranges of Expected Family Contribution
 -
- *Other possible sources:*
 - WAGS (Western Association of Graduate Schools) may have a set of metrics
 - Educause ECAR survey, which is mostly about technology
 - NSSE (which we already do), which covers student engagement and campus climate
- Committee also brainstormed the single most useful metric of investment in academics: e.g. instruction \$ / FTES or academic support \$ / FTES, especially over time. These numbers have jumped in the last two years, largely due to tenure-track hiring.