

Comments related to Stem Resolution 2017.10.13

From Rick Hogrefe:

I completely support this resolution. I have a few recommendations regarding the language (yellow) and concerns with a few statements that I don't know one can say unequivocally or that are altogether pertinent (green) .

WHEREAS, The **STEM Program** was a successful STEM grant initiative that provided STEM students with STEM-related activities, STEM-related skill building workshops, STEM mentoring from **an experts** in the field, research internships, **STEM specific field trips**, **priority B registration**, **STEM seminars**, **and a college based culture focused on STEM as its foundation**

WHEREAS, in spring 2017 **an administrative decision was made to discontinue the STEM program**, displacing approximately 90 students, **with no program discontinuance plan**, notice to students, or consultation with faculty, and

1. Defining the 'STEM Program' is a bit difficult to do because we never officially called anything 'the STEM program.' In the original resolution, it said it was one of two programs. I would imagine that Patricia wrote the resolution but I am not entirely sure what she sees as the two things. My guess would be first, the program for students (STEM Trek and STEM Academy) and second, counseling and student services support for STEM students. In reality, we never differentiated between the two---it was all one big thing. I think it is reasonable to say those two things are one and that one without the other isn't a program at all.
2. Yes, the program provided Priority B registration, but that in itself is not what I believe should be included in the resolution. Rather the program allowed students to complete their requirements more expeditiously, allowing them to transfer in less time. That, in part, was accomplished using Priority B registration among other things.
3. I don't find the phrase "college based culture focused on STEM as its foundation" to be entirely clear nor is it altogether valid to say that culture established was the result of the STEM program which is the subject of the resolution alone. The grant in its entirety created a 'culture of STEM' on the campus...to say it was college-wide is probably hyperbole but it can be said that all the grant activities collectively created a STEM-focused culture in those programs, among STEM faculty and among students whereby they all had confidence that the college was equipped to help students navigate through Crafton and ultimately transfer in a STEM field. Certainly the number of students, number of degrees and number of transfers in STEM majors speak to that culture having been created.
4. Can it be said without any qualification that a "administrative decision was made." That language to me means we can provide evidence that the program

was ended by a decision of an administrator. I have not involved myself with this issue since stepping away from the dean's position, but it seems to me that any end was more a lack of a decision and an indefinite delay without resources or direction. I would also be very careful not to equate any changes in Patricia work responsibilities or load assignment with 'the end of the program.'

5. I don't know to what extent no program discontinuance plan is pertinent here. This goes back to my questions as to what exactly defines the program.

What is missing that I believe would strengthen the resolution is a statement about the fact that provisions of any Title III or Title V grant are that the institution will institutionalize the functions of the grant at the end of the term of the grant. The portion of the grant activities that we call the 'STEM program' were an integral part of the grant's success and the college's lack of support for the program whether just not devoting resources to it or an actual decision to end it, are a violation of one of the most basic, on-going responsibilities the college agrees to when accepting a federal HSI grant.

From Jodi Hanley:
Like it.