

# ASF Monthly Zoom Meeting

February 11, 2021 ~ 12pm

Present: Tracy Rahim, Lori Wynia, Kristy Modrow, Joshua Lease, Paul Stern, Jim Anderson, Amanda Weister, Tim Alcorn, Layne Anderson, Sami Gabriel, Stephanie Bard, Thomas Boylan, Victor Cole, Jami Koivisto, Erin Kline, Nate Hallenger, Kaitlyn Giles, David Tolliver

Meeting called to order at 12:02pm

1. Meeting minute approval of Jan. 22 quarterly board meeting (Rachel Sherlock)
  - a. Motioned by Kristy, seconded by Layne. Meeting minutes approved.
2. 2021-2022 strategic plan approval
  - a. Motioned by Tim, seconded by Paul. 2021-2022 Strategic Plan Approved.
3. Victor asked which campuses get time to meet with the search candidates during the search process.
  - a. St. Cloud does not get ASF representation for most searches, especially if the search is not chaired by an ASF member. Mankato is working towards getting an ASF representative connecting with all candidates.
  - b. Sami noted that we may need to add contract language to allow this across the board. Stephanie added that Bemidji meets with all new hires during the onboarding process as well, which is something to consider including in future contract language.
  - c. Mandy will send out the email to the board of what Mankato ASF search representatives sends out to candidates.
4. GUEST SPEAKER: NATE HALLENGER on Guided Learning Pathways (12:15-12:45pm)
  - a. Guided Learning Pathways is a student success framework for the entire system. The system leadership council looked at practices across the nation that we can adopt into our system. Guided Learning Pathways came out of the community college sector. The Community College Research Center published a book in 2015 that student success was being hindered with the traditional approach that students should be making the choices. However, the level of choice and lack of clarity or direction is detrimental to student persistence and success. We need to look at what the student needs and make our institutions student-ready instead viewing students as college-ready.
  - b. Guided Learning Pathways looks at entry-points for students and student advising. A fundamental mindset shift that is needed. Research shows that a piecemeal approach does not have the same impact as a system-wide approach. Re-designing developmental curriculum alone creates a minimal impact so we instead have to look at student intake, career advising, faculty advising, curriculum structures, and end goals to have the greatest impact.
  - c. There are four key elements of Guided Learning Pathways from the Community College Research Center. These elements are durable principles that apply at the university level. Many of these principles our departments and programs are already working on, they just may be under a different name. The first is mapping pathways with the end goal in mind. This is primarily about curriculum and how you advise prospective students and how you think of a student's career or academic goals to provide greater clarity to the student. The second is providing clear guidance for students on how they enter a pathway. Intake advising is key as well as reviewing our enrollment and advising policies. Third is figuring out how students are making progress. Technology is an

important part of this element with the Degree Audit Systems and UAchieve as a way to facilitate and provide for greater engagement. The fourth element is to ensure students are learning and that the program goals and curricula are set up to achieve these goals. Assessment of student learning is a large piece of this.

- d. Doing something this comprehensive as a student success approach spans multiple years and needs sustained attention. There are a lot of initiatives at the system level and that there is a lot of work we need to do to provide clarity. Guided learning pathways is a tool or roadmap to get to the 2030 goal.
- e. Stephanie Bard asked if they are using a program planner like UAchieve to direct students on how they are registering, especially regarding registering for courses at other MinnState schools that are not required for their degree. Stephanie also asked whether we are moving towards a one-bill system at Minnesota State since students are often confused when they have bills at multiple schools. Nate answered that we need to comprehensively look at the barriers in place, so these questions are not tangential to the student success framework since they are integral to student success. Nate knows a little on the implementation and piloting of the gradplanner and UAchieve and that they are expanding the program more broadly. Nate notes that technology needs to be a part of the solution and that the situation Stephanie mentioned should be a part of faculty or advising conversations. Students are creative and find solutions, and what they think of as a solution may not work out. We need to provide technology, but also provide an educational component. NextGen implementation is a part of this and single billing may be a part of that.
- f. Lori Wynia noted that most of the presentation has been heavy on the advising portion. IFO does most of the advising and many of them are comfortable with doing advising and planning for their own discipline, but once liberal arts requirements are added, how do these fit with the end goal in mind? How will we roll this advising training out? Will there be training/workshops? Nate answered that the initial step is that they are asking senior academic officers to fill out a diagnostic tool to assess where the campus is with keeping students on the pathway. The goal is to engage with campuses and ask what their focus areas are to improve the entry and/or persistence part of Guided Learning Pathways. Some campuses may be well down the path whereas others might need more training. Lori also asked if these trainings will be student-population specific (grad, undergrad, on-campus, etc.). Nate answered that he is hoping we can disaggregate our data to inform the response to provide targeting trainings at the campus or system levels.
- g. Tracy asked if the diagnostic tool has been released. Nate answered that the response is due April 1<sup>st</sup>. Senior academic leaders were originally supposed to engage in broad and deep conversations with faculty and staff on campus. However, there was too much going on with pandemic planning and responses to feel like they could do the thoughtful engagement well. The initial diagnostic was then transitioned for just the senior academic officers to complete and give their thoughts.
- h. Nate received a question anonymously that the person had not heard about Guided Learning Pathways on their campus. The person asked what groups have been involved. Nate answered that different campuses have different branding, but they are philosophically in the same ballpark of supporting student success. The initiative was primarily at the leadership council level which is why it has not been broadly talked about on campus.
- i. Nate will join into statewide ASF meetings with our members.

- j. Nate noted that one of the challenges is trying to recognize the balance between putting an umbrella over the student success work we've already been doing while recognizing that what we've been doing as a system has not been closing the gaps. We need to strike a balance between noting that this is not a new initiative but also needing to meet the metrics so we can meet the 2030 goal since both are true.
  - k. Tracy asked the board if this would be beneficial to bring to members, potentially in May. Joshua agreed that this would be a good idea to increase communication channels across campuses.
5. Fixed Term Extensions
- a. Layne asked the board if they have a process for the third year of fixed-term extensions since Layne is currently being asked to approve these which is not necessary because they are allowed by the contract.
  - b. Mandy recommended responding with a neutral response and asking what their plans are for a future search.
6. BOT Excellence in Service Award update/discussion on large award alternate ideas
- a. The committee is recommending one from IFO, one from ASF, and two from MSCF.
  - b. The plan is to go from 8 awards to 4 awards. Tracy asked them what their budget target is, but she did not get a public response. The award would be reduced from \$5,000 to \$2,500 with campus nominees still receiving \$1,000. Sami recommended a sunset clause to allow for a potential to move it forward. IFO and MSCF are unlikely to argue with the award change.