High Level input on Assessment Instrument

During the assessment tool discussion I went between tables to collect high level concerns and comments so that I could compare them among the discussions. Below were the comments and concerns by category within the instrument.

**Question 1 Prioritize Transfer**

Some tables felt that the task of making transfer a priority would be benefitted by distribution of more data to the “trenches”. They felt that the following data would be helpful:

* Number and types of degrees are awarded in each area each year
* Number of majors declared by students each year
* Percent of students within each major – that are full or part-time
* Time to completion for each award
* Question 1D – there was concern that transfer data is not commonly reported as disaggregated by all Ed code measures
* There was a desire to see data tracked longitudinally through CSUB

There were many who voiced the need to access the data (specifically Tableau) to be able to answer questions and better inform students about transfer. The group was also interested in Starfish – several said they would think a one day training to track data and analyze should be a high priority to further make transfer and actions an institutional priority.

Another table felt we had plenty of data but needed to operationalize and institute what we need to do. They emphasized breaking down silos with regards to transfer information and responsibility. They suggested a shared network drive to be able to access transfer specific data, dates and information better.

Some wanted to move from a transfer priority to a transfer action and make the transfer center happen.

Some requested more timely information sent to everyone such as announcements, deadlines, meetings for students etc. There was a need to better balance the classroom and counseling. **There was consensus that the shift to October graduation applications is not known, understood or announced (this was confirmed by data of applications at CSUB). We need to make signs and shift timelines to early graduation applications.**

Many felt that the strategic plan “mentions” but does not prioritize transfer. The participants felt that we need to rethink student completion and change the culture reframing discussions. Shift Culture!

Multiple people reported a need to update and educate the BOT about the transfer work and goals.

There was consensus that we need to communicate better with students and collect student voice. **There is a need to have a transfer emphasis in dual enrollment classes, scheduling and enrollment management**. Scheduling was seen as a barrier to implementation and success in transfer.

There was also a concern that only focusing on Kern Promise students for transfer, overlooks those missing the GPA cutoff but intending to transfer as well as those that cannot go full-time. It is expedient to do Finish in 4 and in 15 but this is not the majority of our students. To prioritize transfer we need to provide better communication and services to those students (the next tier of students). This could be done better if we could track the program specific course completion (one of our metrics).

Another issue voiced was that A&R is not reviewing transcripts quickly enough (not a priority).

**Question 2 Create Clear Rigorous Program Pathways**

Mostly people thought we had done a good of working on clarifying pathways. BUT mostly people were upset that the Program Mapper is inaccurate. There were lots of complaints – but Eleonora indicated she had identified inaccuracies, emailed chairs and was not getting responses. Connections were made to specific people within completion coaching teams to try and quickly fix these errors.

Also there was a concern about the fact that the program map is more than just CSU and UC – and there is even variation among these institutions. People wanted to match specific institutions to specific pathways – but who would keep this all updated and accurate?

There were several people advocating taking advantage of Friday classes and monitoring waitlists for student need. The best case is using student Ed Plans for predicting need, but waitlists could provide some information now.

There was advocacy for a General Education momentum point to help schedule courses better to enable completion as well as monitoring courses within a major.

Question 2B There was some acknowledgement of trips to 4 year colleges and extra-curricular activities focused on transfer but there was acknowledgement that this cannot be virtual or at transfer fairs, students need to walk in and around four year universities to feel the difference, the rigor, and get the goal.

Faculty/counselors/ed advisors were concerned that key transfer required courses are not available. They emphasized the need to evaluate the gatekeeping courses.

**Question 3 Provide Tailored Transfer Advising**

This area was scored highly with the new director and hires. However, supporting the need for better communication with students, the feedback suggested that we need to provide specific transfer data info back to students (not just degree completion). We need a SINGLE calendar for students to see all timelines (perhaps by metamajor). Although some students complain about counseling info – counselors describe that students come asking them to solve an immediate problem not counsel them on the full scope of transfer and that would be impossible in 30 minutes. There needs to be more tools, better tools for students to use for transfer (currently ASSIST is not updated).

Question 3A People felt that the website was too many clicks and too unclear for direct transfer information. They spoke again about a single calendar students could reference for meeting transfer deadlines and find out out information about seminars and workshops.

Question 3 B & C The group felt that we should **RE-Invigorate** discussions about the courses for each metamajor area to provide information on jobs and transfer within the fields of study. Also assure students learned about transfer in dual enrollment courses.

There was also a consensus that students needed to learn to self advocate – introduce, and train but help them make their own choices

Question 3F there was concern that NOT ALL students are being served by transfer efforts. We overlook part-time students and students without the incoming GPA. Are returning students served well or is the focus on promise students too narrow?

**Question 4 Strong Partnerships**

We have a remarkably strong relationship with CSUB – much to commend. People worried about our ability to connect to other colleges as strongly.

Question 4B Faculty voiced a concern to beef up the number of faculty collaborating and communicating with students to improve transfer success. The suggestion was made to beef up Student Development information in each metamajor and in courses – and perhaps to create a metamajor specific student development course.

**Question 5 Financial Aid**

Most felt they could not answer the questions on financial aid but felt there was not good information about continuing aid when you transfer.

**Question 6 Mission**

A small percentage of people left at the end of the day felt that our BC mission adequately covered transfer. It is mentioned but not a priority.