

FINISHED COPY

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE (AAAS)

CONFERENCE 2 OF 4

PLENARY 2: STEM PATHWAYS: BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN 2-YEAR AND  
4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

JUNE 2ND, 2022:  
7:00 AM TO 8:45 AM CST

Services provided by:  
Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
1-877-825-5234  
+001-719-481-9835  
www.captionfirst.com

\*\*\*

This text document, or file, is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

\*\*\*

(Computer Technical Issues.)

>> How students actually access and experience the structural so instead of thinking about, oh, what about the equity implications of X, Y, Z, center equity when we conceptualize the X, Y, Z in terms of the structural?

>> And then finally I want to use this final slide to capture some

of my current or more current thinking about what a viable pathway should look like based on years of researching with the students and also the writing of the online book, a few larger picture considerations.

First, when we think about a transfer traditionally community college have carried a lot of responsibility and burden in kind of advocating for their students but students are deeply impacted by both ends of the process.

So here I'm calling on colleagues, including myself, my own institution, a transfer receiving end we must step up among the transfer process to be equal, proactive and equitable partners way before even the point of transfer.

And then the second consideration I want to mention is that when we talk about structural issues such as articulation or individual aspect such as relationship-building with students we also must account for the multiple, multiple realities of community college students, so that they didn't have to make the difficult choices between school transfer community family and work. Oftentimes, because of narrow or limited access to academic and individualizing opportunities or sometimes it's just the lack of cultural awareness on their well-intended resources for support.

And finally, when we think about anything student-support, all limits -- you know, whenever little coming from the places of rendering the most meaningful support for students, we must really ask very hard questions and be extremely careful in order to ensure

that all students but particularly historical minority high school students have easy, immediate and equitable access to all of it.

I know here we're talking about partnership work and in partnership research we have institution leaders, faculty and other colleagues, but, ultimately, it has to transpire, and it will transpire in the experiences of students so their experiences should always be the way.

With that, I'm turning our conversation into this, hopefully, spirited dialog.

(Laugh.)

>> Guided by this one overarching question around equitable transfer or some partnerships between two on-year and 4-year institutions.

(Applause.)

>> So how this works I will just pretend I have many questions.

(Laugh.)

>> And actually -- and then I'll pose questions to our panelists. I might chime in from time to time and when there is about 15 minutes left for our session, we'll open this up for questions from audience members.

>> I went too far -- that's the second question; right? That's the second question, isn't it?

>> The first one is a guiding question.

>> Okay.

>> And we dissect the guiding question in numbered questions here.

La of laugh

>> So our first question is really taking on this issue of power and norms around inequities and partnerships head on, so my questions -- my first question for our panelists, how do we address or disrupt norms and power structures to ensure more equitable partnerships between two-year and 4-year institutions?

>> So I think -- so just based on the work that I do -- so I specifically work on two ranks, so I work one on transforming institutions, how to accelerate change. I think a lot of our really -- we append a social uprising, and we exacerbate how we think about change but also on another grant that I work with -- the 42 institutions that are considered urban-serve because where they sit within the community we specifically work on workforce everything, right, when we talk about workforce we're not only talking specifically talking about pathways. We're talking about partnerships with partners. What does it mean to redistribute power?

And I think that goes into the equity work with respect to partnerships between 2 years and 4 years, and this idea, us versus them -- the 2 years and 4 years, who's better who's not better. That doesn't exist anymore; right? That should not no longer exist especially after the pandemic happened, it's still going on and the social uprisings really forced higher education to rethink how they support learners and that, like, we don't need to have 10 policies to have a student drop a class; right?

When we're talking about true equity work it really is about

the redistribution of power, how are we supporting students to get to the end goal versus how are we making sure our students are coming in and coming out because their experience as a whole, prior to them coming in, has a really big signal to them and how the institution will support them in an equitable way.

When we ask learners what they need and how they need it, that's the equity work. We can't solely assume what they need what they want based on our experiences because that's long gone; right? A lot of learners now -- they don't have time to spend 4, 6, 7, 8 years to get a degree. People are going on TikTok to learn about science. My niece taught me about science on TikTok.

(Laugh.)

>> You know, this idea of microlearning, this idea of microcredentials and badging, so the ideas of partnerships isn't to prolong all learners journey into earning a degree. It's to show two types of institutions can come together to support them in order to make sure that when they come in, they have the access and the resources to be successful because when we say student success, we're not only talking about a student being able to graduate, we're talking about prior to them to a higher education system the experience when they're there from the 2-year and to the 4-year, and then what happens after that?

And a lot of KPIs -- when we talk KPIs retention that's what we're doing with our language what are we doing with the KPIs 1, 2, 3, 4 years after the student has dropped out, stepped out or

graduated? Are we just collecting data -- what are we doing with that so a lot of that information, a lot of that really pulls into how we're identifying and better thinking what does it mean to develop the input to supported these types of partnerships, so the work that I do really focuses on pushing 42 urban-serving institutions to not only support the learners but also the communities?

I'll give you an example. There was an institution who a lot of the curriculum -- they had a large population of students as single parents. They're working full-time and a lot of folks don't have access to reliable transportation, so they're taking a bus to come in to the institution.

The bus schedule did not align with the evening course schedule. What do they do? They worked with the local 2-year institutions to figure it's a way can they provide those courses at the local 2 years, and they actually worked with the transportation company to align the course schedule with when they offer the bus route for the students. That's true equity work. You're not only thinking about the institution, you're thinking about the student what he, she or they need.

>> And when I think about this question -- you'll probably hear a lot about guided pathways today just because it's an important concept that's going on let me ask a question to the audience yet. How many have articulation agreements between the college and the university? How many of you have articulated the degree pathways between those same institutions? There's where you make disruption

right there because articulation agreements don't ensure students get to the institution without excess credits that hinder them from completing on the timeline that Andrea was talking about. We need to disrupt the way we do things.

Students view higher education is a smorgasbord. They don't view as we do where there's a proscribed pathway that we're going to take. They need to engage those students to determine what they need to do to do there so a lot of the disruption has to do with rethinking how we deliver content, how we organize content-delivery and how we make it seamless as possible for those students not for the faculty, not for the administrators, for the students, and if we start thinking of a student-centered centered environment we're going to start moving towards a more equitable peace.

One of the things they're looking at -- and this speaks to what Xueli was talking about earlier was the importance of onboarding students. At the college onboarding those students. What does that mean? How many of you have orientation for incoming students, how many have orientation for incoming transfer students? That's a good sign 'cause oftentimes that doesn't happen. We see that these students come in without that.

But when we look at orientation for the students how do to do this in an equitable way. One of the challenges a student coming from a disadvantaged background doesn't know what education is about don't know what the career path is about and if you want to get them into STEM, that seems like a really high hurdle for them they doesn't

know what that is, and it scares them. The important thing is to find out early on what their interests are, get them exposed to think that they might be interested in.

If STEM is something that's a value to them, they can get on that pathway. That's usually done in the guided pathway work through the concept of metamajors. It's not a concept of: You're entering into this program, looking at an area where you can do this sort of work.

The community college research center came out with an interesting thing where they said ask, connect, inspire, plan what does that mean? When a student first comes to the institution ask what they're interested in. Find out what their interests are get them connected to that, and then you can get them connected one of those types of things. Then you want them to inspire to them so generally we say students, get your dev ed -- your general ed courses out of the way early on.

If I'm a student and I'm taking general education courses that aren't related to what I want to do for a career, that turns me off. We need to get them inspired early on. If you want to get them into a STEM program, that first year they should have some science course that gets them engaged and interested into doing that work, so they're on that path way to complete a bachelor degree in the STEM field if we don't get them connected and gauged early that doesn't work.

The important thing when you're onboarding students doing that. You have to disrupt the way you're doing advising, the work you're



doing input or really getting them engaged early. Getting them connected, asking what they do, and, so you have advisors who are in these metamajors instead of general advisors. They know what those on or about and the general concept are, but they can help them explore in those and get other students interested in that. It doesn't mean you have to stay in with that but early on connect with a pathway that leads to the successful outcome going down the road, so that's one way we can think of doing this it's really disrupting the way we're doing this.

The other way what does it mean to enroll in a degree-credentialed pathway.

When I enroll at a community college, if I'm interested in this degree, maybe I need to think about how early I'm exposed to the 4-year institution I'm going on. There's others to say you can go to the orientation at the next institution or should the four-year institution have advisors helping understand what the programs are what their career pathways are worth what the courses are that they need when they get there so when I get to that four-year institution I don't have to get rid of 16 credits because they don't transfer.

A lot of this is really doing a lot of changes.

I'll talk a little more about some of the other things later, but this is kind of initial overview I want to bring up and talk about the importance of that.

One other piece that I think addresses to one of the points that Xueli brought up is financial aid. I heard a story of a student who

applied to a four-year institution and got a financial aid pack at the start of the community college they, therefore, to the 4-year institution they no longer had financial aid? Why? We need to revisit transfer financial aid policies as well. If you want students to come in to your institutions to succeed, particularly if you're working with community colleges there's a real good source of students of diverse populations that are coming in there, and those are the students who are oftentimes under-resourced financially. We need to make sure they have those finances, but also as mentioned sometimes it's little microgrants for those students to make them succeed so rethinking financial aid that is not just about this big package, sometimes a student can't make it to class because they don't have money for gas or their car broke down, and they need to get there. Sometimes these microgrants can really have an empowering ability to make students get over that small hump to be successful in the long-term, so those are just some of the real changes -- some simple changes that can be done to disrupt the changes in the transfer pathway.

>> Your insights.

(Laugh.)

(Applause.)

>> Both of your insights actually inspire me to think about discretionary space where there's a lot of norms and power structures especially centering articulation.

Transferability of credits, and this covers a set of policies

for any simple move on the part of students, so as a follow-up, I'm curious to hear you say a little bit from your experience about what does it take for -- especially for your faculty to recognize the value or the equal value of a community college education and the rigor of their coursework not just faculty, *per se*, but really thinking about on the part of four-year institution to really take on that power issue head on?

>> Yes.

>> So --

>> Go ahead.

>> So the other word you'll probably hear a lot about today is data. Pathways and data. Oftentimes, faculty have a perception that is not backed up by data, so oftentimes the best way to counteract some of that is to show how successful those students actually are that come into those classrooms.

I think that oftentimes looking at the data particularly disaggregated data with a different race ethnicity by student background and different things can oftentimes have a very powerful effect on the outcomes.

But the other thing I think is important to ask yourself -- if students aren't failing is that the student's fault or the faculty's fault and oftentimes it's very easy to put the blame on the under-prepared students. But if you have a student who comes to the university who didn't have an orientation session, who suddenly is in a different sort of setting in a classroom with different types

of students whom they're not used to -- sometimes it's less about the students' ability and more about the situation with which he or she shows up.

So I think understanding what those students need, where they're coming from is an important part of that as well but oftentimes when you look at the data, you'll find that those students coming from the community college do better than some of those Native students, so I think data is an important piece of that conversation to having those conversations.

The other piece we're talking about conversations. When we're talking about partnerships, it should be a partnership between the institutions that are doing the transfer. If the faculty of the four-year institutions aren't having conversation the faculty at the community college to understand what's being taught at the community college and how they're teaching that, then their assumptions are based on just that assumptions not the on fact, and it's important to have those dialogs one of those organizations particularly good you're planning to articulate a degree pathway. You need to know what's happening there to make sure that you're confident the students coming to you you think will have coming to you to the community college and if there's misalignments to what those programs are, have those conversations with the faculty of the different areas. Do you need this particular thing taught at the community college or not? Is it important to have a specifically taught that way or not is it a theory or concept or fact that's wrong? And have

those conversations that are important to understand, so that when students come in, and you're having those students at your campus, the faculty are more confident in the fact that they have had some exposure to think they need to have exposure to.

>> Yeah, I think to add to Kent's point, I think we're guilty -- when I say "we" higher education we're guilty from coming in from a deficit lens when we're thinking about learners.

We're very much he or she. They can't do this especially when we're talking about students coming in from a 2-year I'm a first-generation college graduate, and I'm going to be walking next Thursday in my hoodie ceremony did I think I was going to make it this far.

I'm also a product of a pathway program. Was it easy? No. Did I get lost? A lot of times not only -- I don't mean talking about physically.

(Laugh.)

>> I'm talking about in terms of the articulation agreement discussion and talking about English 101 and why can't it match to English 101 at the local 4-year institution. I remember asking -- I'll never forget I remember asking, and this has always been done. This isn't a message that's been that's still there that conversation that I still have with the institutions that I work for and work with -- that's still what they say. They say this is what traditionally what we've done. Well, that shouldn't exist and that shouldn't be the norm with respect to language when we're talking

to learners who are trying to come in and trying to find a way to better themselves because a lot of learners who enter that 2-year space it's funding, money, life, you know, opportunities, not knowing how to manage and how to navigate.

Higher education is not an easy system to navigate at all; right? When we're talking about systems and power dynamics and power structures, a lot of it -- I mean, from the very beginning, higher education was not meant to provide learning for a lot of groups. Acknowledging that is the first part of being aware of how we can sort of take a step back, dismantle what already has been done and what's inherent in higher education and start from the beginning, and that's sort of the disruption. That's the transformation and acknowledging all those changes really take into account and should include the learner voice, and that's -- that's a big push happening right now. It's capturing student voice, yes, however what are you doing with the voice and is that voice and input being used to actually make change?

Don't just ask a student to be in a room to provide feedback as a performative or performance based. Find a way in what he or she they are providing can move the needle with respect to what you're all developing when we're talking about those 2-years and 4-years, especially with articulation agreements and putting papers in front of students and trying to get them to translate all that -- and we're talking about orientation. It shouldn't only be happening at first year. It should happen every year because every year after you start

especially first-generation students -- and that's who's going to be coming into institutions. Every year it gets harder. It doesn't get easier, and when you go to graduate school, that's also another thing. That's a conversation for after, like, 5:00 PM.

(Laugh.)

>> Over wine.

>> Yes.

(Laugh.)

>> Knowing this community is very much doing work on the ground, so this next question is very practically oriented in the spirit of disrupting norm this is more of a joke I'll go to Andrea first taking on this question particularly because of the work you're doing across so many institutions so what are some of the effective approaches for developing or streamlining the logistics involved in building partnerships? Which takes forever.

>> It takes forever when you're working with presidents and chancellors who like to say no.

(Laugh.)

>> But it's a good thing that they say right? Because they are far removed from what the learners are experiencing; right? I step in -- it's interesting some of the institutions will send me emails, you know, the president doesn't agree. I'm like I get you; right? Because they have grants with us, so I can push back and challenge their thinking and how they're understanding what it means to streamline a process does it necessarily have to have 10 steps? Can

we cut that down to 3? And there are -- it's going to take more opportunity for folks to have discussions about it -- to determine what committees we should be on. We shouldn't do that.

(Laugh.)

>> Those small things people don't do with respect to building partnerships, who are building partnerships for and who's not being included in the conversations; right?

When I think about that, we also talk about what happens after, and that's where we engage employers, so we work with national employers, but we also work with regional employers because what institutions like Florida International University in Miami, Florida -- the regional employers there are significantly different than the University Wisconsin-Milwaukee where I work with the chancellor there the regional -- but also the articulation with respect to the building of the partnerships and that type of stuff, and they slowly started to move there. It takes time. If someone -- somebody would share it but a lot of the external factors and what's happening outside of a learner's life really should take into account not only that, but the people on the ground who are working with the staff, are on the frontlines - faculty, you're all student committees you're all doing the work you're all trying to rationalize and make the case why we need more of X, why we need more of Y and Z for these specific populations, so that doesn't go unnoticed.

I think it's just trying to find a way to sort of funnel that



down and to support the learners and including them into that design of how we're understanding building partnerships.

It's not just the academic. It's how they experience that journey, and then what happens afterwards, and that's sort of the true partnership work that really gets the learner and have -- re-enforce that idea lifelong learning because -- that's what people want. You're always going to want to go to the library. You're always going to want to learn more and do more, so why don't we just build something that gets them to get there sooner and in a more equitable way again everyone wins.

>> I want to take a step back before I answer this specific question because I think Andrea brought up a very important part. The work of transfer, equitable transfer particularly doesn't happen unless you have engaged leadership. If you don't have engaged leadership, you can do a lot of work in the trenches, but it's not going to have institutional change impact, and that's going to be critical to engage leadership at the institutions, and Andrea is just talking pointed out, I think, very importantly.

But how do you engage that leadership? Simple: Demographics.

Enrollments are going down the student populations at institutions aren't going to go up unless we get a more diverse set of students coming into the institutions and to be effective as universities, bring students into community colleges can easily get that demographic diversity that's important for your institutions because that's where a lot of those students start, so I think that's

an important part of framing the work of why transferrable, equitable transfer is an important piece.

The community college plays a good role, important role of getting those students early, but there's an important part of the partnership, and there's logistics that has to happen and creating dual enrollment -- dual enrollment programs.

If I'm coming to community college of X and my nearby university is X, Y university, and we have a lot of students that do this traditional pathway, why not create a dual enrollment pathway for that program? If not that degree -- if not a broader set of programs.

When I enroll in a community college, I'll get a badge and say: I'm also enrolled at University X, they get a sense of both the community college and the university but also it helps them understand what courses I need to take at the community college. So when I transfer to the 4-year college, I don't need to take any extra courses. I'm on the path to that credit already, and that's where that earlier conversation between faculty and ironing out those programs is critical, why it's important.

Another thing that's important to do is, would with the university to create major specific transfer guidance for students. Those might be student guidance at the community college from the community college.

It might be guiding transfer advisors from the university sitting at the community college. There's some models that do that. Those are the things that can really help for streamlining the

partnership to make sure it's there.

But it's also helping to advise early on those traditionally underserved students what pathways they do and what they need to do 'cause they don't -- like Andrea is saying, the first-generation students -- they don't have a parent telling them how is to get to the university, and they also don't know how to navigate all these challenges things so advising is very important -- is very important for logistic purposes.

And the third thing is transfer support, making sure the transfer support along the way for these students. Making sure that they understand what's going on there, and that can really help provide that assistance along the way. Whether it's a community of transfer students that's developed, whether you have a cadre of students at the university that comes back to the community college and help them understand what these pathways are exposing them to those things, but we're getting early on engage with the careers and people who work in those fields to do that.

The other piece that's important to do and for guided pathways piece they call it backwards mapping is looking at what career these people are going into and mapping your program of student to that career.

I know many in higher educations -- well, they're going to go on and get a graduate degree well, how many of them really do? Let's be honest about that and say we want to prepare them for graduate education if that's an important pathway but if they're going is

brought workforce let's make sure the courses we're doing to get them to a job that has life-supporting wages from when they exit.

And then the STEM field, that's a challenge because sometimes these credentials are both designed to go on to further educate but also into the workforce and making sure those options are there and the student understands what all of the different pathways are for these credentials.

>> You also reminded me of a very interesting state context in Wisconsin where transfer from the technical college system to the university system is starting to gain traction. And when I ask the technical college system president, Dr. Mona Foy, about why at DOC this is happening in the positive direction, and then she shared her insight that was really helpful.

She said it is the convergence of stakeholder interest because when the state legislators are seeing support from not just the tech college for -- you know, to take our students but K-12, the community the industry. So when both of you talk about engaged leadership, and I was really thinking about this engaged leadership more expansively, so I wanted to offer that context but also speaking of engaged leadership, a lot of this really comes down to the faculty role as they're key institutional change agents as well so practically what are some of the concrete approaches that you observe in your work or work with your partners in terms of supporting and empowering faculty in partnership work?

>> Oh, supported faculty.

(Laugh.)

>> So I -- there was a grant that was funded to the Lumina Foundation when I had first started to do sort of the scaling work at APU, and it was to go around the country and hold convenings with different institutions, specifically only faculty and accrediting bodies, because the idea was like let's get a pulse check on institutions across the United States that would be interested or curious about the possibility of embedding a certification into a 4-year degree.

Okay, how can I put this so when I was in the room with the faculty and the certified body sort of like having these conversations and bringing these -- the questions up, there were so much push-back -- I remember leaving and going back hotel maybe if I stay in a hotel room maybe nobody will remember I am here.

(Laugh.)

>> And I think a lot of that is they're on both sides, but most on the faculty side there isn't a lot of opportunity to listen to faculty, and that's what I realized. We don't really hold listening sessions for faculty because when they were pushing back, it wasn't because they didn't want to try to better understand what -- what could the -- what would it look like if we were to embed a certification into a four-year degree curriculum, right, it was really about, like -- there's 1,000 other things we're doing and trying to do to even conceptualize to try to take this on, and embark on this long journey. It would take a lot of manpower; right? And that shouldn't fall on the faculty. That isn't the faculty

responsibility to try to figure out what should gender should look like.

Going with respect to this question: How do we support define faculty roles and -- when I mentioned earlier about learner-centered I want to actually change that language a little bit and go -- and change it and shift to human-centered; right? This isn't -- we don't do this because just the learners don't get to graduate by themselves. That isn't like a one-person journey. It does take family, staff, community, and it takes faculty. Faculty are a big part of that equation; right? So providing the opportunity to better understand the faculty role in how they -- he or she understand and conceptualize partnerships, advising, career support, interest into the class. What does it mean because a lot of faculty don't know because they're not given the information because how siloed the systems is? Well, faculty is meant to do this. They want need to do anything about career advisement or articulation agreements because they're not part of that conversation. Well, why are they not part of that conversation; right? If they're talking about supporting learners as a whole they should be included.

What tends to happen -- they find out much later that things are happening over email, and then there's a lot of anger, which I understand because I would be upset too.

But I think moving and reframing a lot of the work -- work about learning-centered.

I do a lot of work with the institutions with the presidents

and chancellors using design thinking, and that's using the foundation of design thinking release using empathy and a lot of people are like, why are we talking about empathy? There's push back to strategy, disrupting norms and building partnerships because empathy is about people, and I think that gets lost when we talk about workforce and advisement.

We're people. We're trying to do the best we can given everything that's happened these last 2 or 3 years in the world, you know, we've lost people, and I think a big part of that really sort of transforms how we function. With ourselves but also with the people that we work with. What does that mean; right? So I think empowering faculty isn't only about giving them the opportunity to push back because you should always have the opportunity and give faculty the opportunity to push back. It should not just be sent in an email or memo but also providing the opportunity to push design.

We did a design-thinking session with Portland State University. We brought the staff, we brought the students, we brought the -- who now is President Percy in there, and we put a bunch of white paper on the wall, and we just like -- let's just figure out what resigning and advising curriculum could potentially look like, and they all were part of it, and there's just something beautiful about bringing everyone together at that point no one is better than someone else. Those power dynamics and power structures -- those were eliminated. It really is about pulling it all together and what they do did we helped pitch this to the

legislation because they're extremely under-resourced, but they're an emerging HSI. I'm very excited about that.

A lot of that work is really about pulling them together and finding ways for faculty to push back, to challenge, to question but also to come up with opportunities for they themselves to help design versus the institution designing for them to them having to teach and provide to the learners.

>> So a number of thoughts with this, and I think that sometimes faculty are -- well, lying shall we say by administrators by other people, but I think the challenge is faculty are overwhelmed. They have a lot of work to do, and they're very dedicated to what they're doing, and I think that in order to support faculty to do this work, once again, it goes back to leadership and developing the space for them and the ability for them to sit back and step outside of their normal role and say: How do we need to look at how we're doing, what we're doing to better serve students from diverse backgrounds to be successful? It's that learning-centered approach to doing things?

So how do we support that effort if faculty are currently doing a lot of things and particularly the last couple of years where they suddenly had to learn to teach remotely and doing a lot of things that they weren't used to doing? Then they don't have time to sit down with a faculty curriculum with different colleges to do this conversation without some support to do that in a way that they feel like they're not going to be burning the candle at 6 ends rather than both ends.



It's important for leadership to do this. And keep comes back to why are we doing this? What's the reason for doing this? And if it's about making sure that we can serve students from diverse areas and make sure we have students coming into our program and completing our program, then let's make sure we develop these sorts of partnerships with those institutions where we have significant relationships to make sure we're doing this in a way that's valuable, meaningful and useful.

We know that students don't want to take extra credits. We know the federal government doesn't want to pay Pell grants for extra credits. Students don't want to take out loans for extra credit, so you're serving the students in multiple ways by having these conversations, but it's important to talk about why these are -- why these are doing that? And so if you don't have the leadership saying we're going to invest in student success, not just incoming first year freshman coming in a 4-year institution not students going to the workforce from a community college, but this is whole mission from transfer from my institution to another institution to be successful and getting them interested in the STEM, high paid wage, well received occupations for particularly underserved populations. It's a win-win for everyone to do this work, but it's the level of effort to get that work started that's very challenging, and that's where leadership is very important.

>> I'm going to skip the next question because I thought our panelists addressed various aspects to this question already because I really

also wanted to get to this data question.

(Laugh.)

>> I know this community is very data-driven. And as a researcher, I love data, but I think both of your insights and when you're talking about human-centered approach helped me think before data more broadly than we originally conceptualized this question. So this question is about: What types of data are needed to assess partnership efforts? How can we share, use and interrogate the data to improve our partnerships and student success?

>> Oh, data questions.

(Laugh.)

>> They're always fun.

So you know when we're watching -- I like to watch TV, you know, when I'm not writing other things and my bunny, I have to get a shout-out to a bunny. There's a question that comes on. It's two things. The first part question is like 76% of people in this country don't have insurance. Da-da-da; right? And then the next -- it cuts to the next screen, and it's usually people; right? It's usually attached to a family or a person or individual so here's the thing, when it comes to data, people always want to have it connected to somebody because when we talk about connection, and it resonating, it always is talking about that human connection. The quantitative data is important with respect to demonstrating -- making the case, the rationalization of, like, when we talk about 85% of students -- there's a retention rate has increased significantly,

that's key. When you attach lived experiences to it, to help make the case and to help demonstrate why that 85% is there or why that percentage has increased or decreased, there's more attention put on that, and that's why commercials do extremely well. There's a connection to be made to numbers, and that is not only specific to the partnerships. That's a lot, and that's we're writing grants, and we're talking to employers, and we're talking to stakeholders, and we're talking to leadership, we usually always have a student panel for that specific reason; right? We always like to include backgrounds on specific students, student X did this because people connect, and that's why when I mentioned I'm a first-generation high school graduate, I'm a first generation college graduate. I'm a product of pathway, right, my first language is not English. You all connected with it. There are a lot of you -- okay, can we see this?

I'm one of thousands of students so when we talk about data, I'm a big fan of both. I'm more -- I like to lean to the qualitative because that's one dissertation -- I used call of data for my dissertation. There's strengths to both and making the case when we're talking about interrogating data, this is sort of like -- I like holding -- I like the mixed methods in terms of the survey, collective survey but also listening sessions. I'm a big believer in listening sessions, focus groups, one-on-one, different opportunities because we like to collect data, but we can't always assume that the other person that we're trying to gather data from

likes to get -- provide that information the way that we think that we want it; right? And I think when we're trying to gather all that information to make the articulation and the case with respect -- especially around partnerships it can't only be one specific method that we're using. There has to be different -- because when we're talking about learner-centered, we can't conflate the identities, right, that's where the intersectionality comes in.

You will have a first-generation low income black, undocumented single parent that's one student that has all those identities. That learner may not feel comfortable sharing one-on-one, but may do a lot better survey.

So I think when we talk about interrogating data I think it's interrogating the form and how that capture the data I think should be part of the conversation too when we talk about student success. >> So as someone who's been working with data my whole life the answer to this question is lots.

(Laugh.)

>> And I say that somewhat jokingly, but it's a lot of different kinds of data for a lot of different purposes, and I think too often we get tied into one specific type of data or the -- the need for perfect data. The analysis paralysis is the death of any good of any institutional change, so we need to do is figure out what data we can do to help you -- a lot of times you get people talking about a culture of evidence. I prefer the term culture of inquiry. The

data should lead us to the next question, not necessarily answering the last question, so when we get data that says: African-American males aren't succeeding in this course, what we do? We do a focus group of African American males saying why aren't you successful? What's getting in the way? So that's where you start putting these data together.

If you have a program of study where everybody is doing well but one certain population isn't doing well, then we need to look into that and doing that that's why it's important to disaggregate that data by very important different types of ways. It's not just about race ethnicity; it's also about age. Age is a very important variable for students particularly for community colleges. If you have students with different ages groups that's important to know.

What are the life aspects of those people? You know, what's their home like -- what's getting in the way for those students -- those sorts of nontraditional students that's getting in the way? Those data are important to look at.

There's also the kind of data you can look at the student experiences. One very valuable experience you can do -- if you're looking at transfer is walk through what a student coming from your local community college has to go through to take their first class at your institution. What is every single step they have to do? They have to go to the birth czar. What's a birth czar. Students don't know what a birth czar is. How many steps does it take for this student to get into their first class? That's some data that

you can look at as well. Different kind of data, but those are important data to look at.

But then broadly speaking what is the service area you're servicing if you're a national institution is different than if you're a local institution what's the workforce you're training for? What are the needs for those students? What are those things? How do we make sure our programs of student are addressing the needs of our local workforce community or national workforce community as appropriate and that data is important for making sure that your curriculum is aligning with the needs of those individuals going into the workforce or the graduate programs that they choose to go into, so I think that's another type of data that I think is important to look at?

The other thing to look at is KPIs. If we're looking at student success, we're looking at 2, 4, 6 years down the line before earning their credentials what's the leading indicators that suggest they're doing well. Community college did a good job first year, second year leading indicators. What are the leading indicators for transfer success? Have you worked with your local community college for those students who are on path towards a bachelor of degree and on the pathway of getting into your institutions? What are the leading institutions of your transfer institution to make sure those students will be prepared and on the path of being successful once they get there and once they start at your institution, what are the KPIs, the first term and second term, towards completing those credentials

those are important data points how well you're serving your students coming a first year as a community college or a transfer student -- what are those KPIs, and they may not be the same for every institution. They may not be disaggregated for every institution because different institutions serve different populations.

It's important to understand your population to understand what data are important for knowing your populations and how you best serve them.

>> I wanted to add something about this, okay?

When I first started this work, this scaling work I started to realize when I was going to different institutions and doing visits and speaking with presidents and chancellors and their board and faculty staff and getting an understanding, it's all of the institutions function very differently it's very clear, but also with respect to data, not everyone has the opportunity to see it, and I'm a big --

>> Yes.

>> In democratizing data; right? I don't think it should live with the IR office. IR does fantastic work, but I remember asking for, like -- why aren't people getting this? Well, the person doesn't work in IR. Well, aren't we all here for kind of the same thing?

(Laugh.)

>> Trying to support learners in our different ways? And I don't think necessarily that -- that it's not -- it's not bad to share it, but I think trying to find a way to democratize the data, so that

people who are on the ground working, faculty and staff are understanding how their scope of work is helping move the needle because what tends to happen is they get an email before -- these are the students in your class okay. Can we have a little bit more background on this; right? Just having more context, having more information, and I'm a big believer in, like, make information frame, can really support folks because a lot of people usually don't know how their scope of work is really helping the university change and move, and I think that's a big part of, like, helping share and, like, moving that across.

>> And to that point, sharing data in a nonpunitive way.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Exploring the data that's where the culture of inquiry is important. Let's look at these data to see what's happening at our institution, so sharing the data is critical making everybody aware of the data but doing it in a way where you're not putting it -- someone is saying, oh, you're doing this? How can we as an organization improve the outcome for these students.

>> Yeah. I do want to ask this final question of a visionary nature. You each only have 24 seconds to answer

(Laugh.)

>> Visionarily speaking, what do equity-centered partnerships look like in action? How do we define the success of these partnerships?

>> 24 seconds, huh?

>> Now, 234



(Laugh.)

>> So I'm a big believer not assuming what people want let's just ask people what people want and what they need their experts in their own experience they know what they're trying to get to so let's try to figure out what that means with respect to success, and when I say success it's not only about, like, having them complete -- it's like how we understand how they enter the system. In an equity way because it really is about redistribution of that power.

>> What she said and --

(Laugh.)

>> No, I think it's important that the institutions are always aware of the different populations which we're serving, how they're increasing the success of all those different populations across-the-board and that they're understanding what those populations and students want and need and making sure that they've had the opportunity to explore what they want and need and truly what they want and need and getting what they want and need.

And so particularly the underserved population we can't assume what they think they need is where they're going to end up being and helping -- that's why that early onboarding exploring part is very critical to the populations. We may not have the experience from their other generations or friends or families that do that.

>> What they said.

(Laugh.)

>> Again, partnership continues to be all this work. It's going to

be really hard. A lot of efforts. But in the spirit of everything transpiring of the experiences of the students, a student partnership transfers, all of these efforts would be invisible to the students. They would do their share in terms of their academic studies; that they feel effortless, weightless when they need to navigate and transfer.

>> So with that we're going to turn to audience questions.

(Laugh.)

>> The two microphones, one there and one there.

(Laugh.)

>> Okay,

>> Hi, I kind of live in hopes my course credits are as transferrable as my driver's license. When I moved from Florida to Virginia my driver's license did not become a learner's permit, and I would hope by my chemistry class, my gen chem would not be an elective when it transfers to another institution. That's just a general institution.

One other thing I'm curious transfer experiences that other students are bringing to us when they arrive, community college we see a lot with foreign transcripts and with military service and if transfer guidelines are tricky between, you know, going from a 2-year college to 4-year college, they're more tricky with college credit that came from a lot of different places, so I'm wondering if you can express some of the student barriers addressed there.

>> So I think the question of credit for prior learning and all of

those things are very important part of the higher education experience, and I think one of the challenges we come in to is the intersection of credits and credentials and accreditation, and we oftentimes equate courses with competencies, and they're not the same thing, and I think that more and more we start thinking about the competencies we're teaching rather than the courses we're teaching we're going to start speaking a language that's more consistent and more able to do that. The challenge is that one has to determine -- if you're awarding credit for that work, you're putting your reputation as an institution on that to some extent, and so you need to make sure you can document what's going on, but I think there are some approaches particularly in the military that translate in approaches for doing the military experience and other community colleges are working ways in doing that credit for prior learning. It's an important question, and it is something that I think is tied up with the accreditation tie-ins as well.

>> Yes.

>> So thank you for your comment about the importance of the people on the ground having access to the data 'cause that's a battle I'm fighting at my institution right now.

However, one of the push-backs that I don't necessarily have an answer for right now from the IR office is that if they give us that data, it de-identifies the student because we have such low numbers of traditionally marginalized groups because they're marginalized in STEM that if they give us retention and progression

numbers for -- by demographic, that that inherently de-identifies that student, and so they can't give us that data, but I don't have an argument to counter that, right, because I also want the faculty to not target students.

>> Uh-huh.

>> If they know that information; right? Because we have such low numbers in those areas so what are your thoughts on -- protecting the data in that way?

>> Yeah, I think that's -- I mean, that's a really great question. It's -- I have heard many times where IR pushes back unlike trying to, you know, provide data. Acknowledging -- we all know the numbers. I think everyone knows the numbers in terms of the first generation, low income, black, indigenous learners that are lacking in STEM. That's not a surprise, and that's, you know -- it's only going to change if we are honest and transparent with the information; right?

So I think a way to sort of -- I don't want to go around IR because I know they can be. They scare me sometimes.

(Laugh.)

>> It's -- what faculty to do at one institution they started to ask students -- like just -- there was like a simple survey and asking them, like, who they are -- if they were comfortable sharing information like who they are is a simple survey. Talking about what they want and simple questions, like, that because the numbers were extremely low it gives the faculty to engage with the learners more

closely and the learners to feel engaged with that, and at that point what the faculty did at that point -- they all came together and built a coalition and said we already started to do this and since IR didn't want to share that with us, we wanted to be -- to serve the students well, so we started to gather information with their permission in making sure that what they needed, how they needed it, the resources -- what we asked them we were able to provide that for them because I think --

To Kent's point earlier, a lot of them don't know where the office is and asking that already singles the faculty likely first generation, just asking them -- and I think what they did was just -- they sent the memo to the IR office, and then that pushed it to the president's office, and then democratizing data became more of a conversation with the institution, and then that sort of, like, when they started opening up that door and the possibility of, like: Let's get data out in front of folks and trying to figure out how to protect and make sure that the learner is still protected by making sure that everyone has access to it because if we're trying to move the needle, we need to know where the needle is at first if we're trying to get there.

>> And I think also data policy at the institution is critical here. People use FERPA as an excuse for that, but FERPA says it can be used for institutional improvement, and so if they're saying they can't do it because of FERPA, well, you created data policy that says we're going to use these data for institutional improvement and create

policy about how that data are used, not that -- not that you can use just any purpose, but if there's institutional privilege for what it is for then that is certainly a legal use for that student-identifiable data.

>> I'll just add one quick nuance coming from an institutional researcher background in my previous professional life, you know, everybody was right in terms of the reason you were provided was not entirely valid especially using the data evaluation for institutional purposes, and I think this is a conversation-starter for us when and how to engage institutional research colleagues not after everything is said and done that the grant is here, and then this work, but I found it to be extremely helpful to engage institutional research colleagues in my community college, you know, partnership, so that they're at the table and knowing what data work is to be engaged from the get-go. I'm not saying you won't do that, but that's inspiring me to offer that particular insight, thank you.

>> Good morning. Thanks to the summit for this very engaging and really -- for me, exciting session. I want to ask what experiences, suggestions, strategies that you all have to really disrupt the traditional tenure and promotion values that exist at 2-year and 4-year institutions, which are very different, so that we can engage faculty in -- in collaboration on things like course innovations like many of the things that we're going to hear about at this -- at this summit, things that we're doing in our courses, how do we work to get them involved in it like we're doing when that kind of work may

not have -- may have limited value for our -- for our colleagues in different places?

>> That's above my pay grade.

(Laugh.)

>> Okay. Just basically --

(Laugh.)

>> It's a really great question.

>> Yes.

>> There was -- 'cause the institutions that we work with go through so much and they've accelerated, and they just transformed so much in the last couple years and experienced so much, and I think the pandemic really started to urban that people to ask those sorts of tenured questions; right? In trying to figure out -- there was one institution, and they have an external-facing document on their website where they started to realize that they were actually perpetuating the idea of increasing tenured faculty of a specific identity; right? And I think that made them go back to the drawing board, and they are rewriting the entire tenured policy from the beginning.

(Laugh.)

>> I don't know how long it's going to take them but did fact that that -- they were -- they became aware of that because of what happened during the pandemic and the social uprisings, and there was a lot of push-back. You're only promoting this one identity or you're promoting this faculty or these specific types of faculty who

do a lot of -- you know, they're able to publish and travel and do talks and, of course, they're going to get tenured 'cause they have an opportunity to do that.

It's similar to a student if you want to sort of put it in the same -- in the same circle if students are given access to resources, of course, they're going to perform better and faster and more than others and given more opportunities to continue to do that.

In that same vein and using that same model thinking why wouldn't we translate that and move that over to the faculty Rowlett? A lot of it is because they're faculty already, and they should already know how to do it.

(Laugh.)

>> The idea of reinforcing lifelong learning; right? So I think -- the -- the way to sort of start those conversations is just building coalition. The institution who did that -- their document is online they did the external facing document because they wanted to hold themselves accountable in trying to be like let's start from the beginning and rewriting these tenured policies and not making sure that we continue to award the same people who are continuously awarded and just try to figure out what's an equitable way to make this way to happen. I hope that can answer your question.

>> But I also think institutions need to look at their mission statement and their strategic plan and how often is the role of faculty and tenured included as part of that strategic plan for serving the students they serve.



>> I just want to address the idea behind the guided pathways and the metamajors here's. I work at a community college it's an early adopter of the pathways program, and one of the things that's happening on the ground on the front lines is that students walk onto campus, and they're being asked to pick a metamajor. The idea is that we get them on this pathway as soon as possible. The problem with that is when you are from an underrepresented group, and you're being asked to pick a metamajor --

>> Right.

>> If you're from an underrepresented group, the chances are that you have a family member or relative or neighbor that is actually part of a STEM field greatly reduced, And so you don't get into that metamajor, so the question is isn't it developing a systemic system for ensuring underrepresented groups remain underrepresented in STEM fields?

>> The answer to that question is it depends what question you ask with and what metamajor -- when you pick a metamajor when you come on campus. That's different -- asking the student what their interests are, what people like to do and what people need to do, and so doing that exploration before they choose a metamajor is important to doing that. The challenge that's a lot of up front effort on the institution to create the people that do that work, but I think that the challenge is that there are a lot of students who may not go into those pathways by self-choice without that more-guided exploration of what there is at the end, and it is a

potential challenge, but I think that the importance of doing this -- you know, every student is engaged in experiential stuff early on even maybe before they get there to understand what their interest areas are and what they like to do, and so when they choose a metamajor they can do that but also understanding that metamajor isn't written in stone. They need to get those early experiences to figure out what they're interested in and what people like to do, and so if they need to switch areas they can.

It's not perfect, but I think that the more exploration upfront the less the -- they decrease the likelihood of that sort of perpetuating the standard pathways.

>> I changing my major 6 times.

(Laugh.)

>> Because I didn't know I was given the information, and I didn't know, and I think in my mind -- I'm the first -- the first the first the first, and I want to -- I want to buy my family a house. What can get me money sooner --

(Laugh.)

>> And I'm, like, I want to be an engineer. They make a lot of money; right? Not realizing that there's a lot of math that goes into, and I'm not great at math, and I failed courses, and that's definitely held my career significantly back, but I think to Kent's point asking the learner what he or she they want but also recognizing where there strengths are versus trying to figure that out, right, because it will -- I had to take an English lit class, and it was just required,

and I completely did amazing in it because my first language is Spanish, and I can easily understand Shakespeare more than others, and I feel the like I can -- and I felt like I can rock this out, and I did versus trying to stick with a major -- well, you want to be an engineer, these are the courses you're going to take. Here's your paper and go ahead and take your courses, right, and I think that's sort of like perpetuates this idea we're still keeping underrepresented, but that's a really great question.

>> And thank you on that note, and we're wrapping this portion up, and we'll be waiting around for additional thoughts and questions. Thank you all for your attention.

(Applause.)

>> Thank you, Xueli, Andrea, and Kent for your conversation and insights during this panel.

Our next session for the summit is the concurrent workshop sessions which start at 10:00 AM.

I did want to note that the workshops as well as the locations are in the app but there will be three levels that the workshops will be on, so the Rock Creek rooms are on this level right next door to us. The meeting rooms and River Birch are one level above us, and then the Red Bud room is on the lobby level, and you have to go across the lobby, and it's under the red chandelier.

I also wanted to note for future meals, like, lunch today and breakfast tomorrow, that if you have special dietary requests that you made, that you can hand the ticket you received during

registration to one of the attendants they can get you your meal.

With that I look forward to seeing you in some of the workshops.

(Applause.)