

Summary of Stakeholder Analysis Activity – November 10th GAIN Alliance Meeting

The purpose of this activity was to spark conversation and brainstorm stakeholders who we felt we would need to bring into the conversation and keep up-to-date with the Alliance activities. Multi-voting with 5 votes per participant was used to prioritize these stakeholders for further discussion. The table below tallies the results by the overall number of votes received, and also by the number of unique voters for that stakeholder.

These stakeholders' roles span various stages of the Alliance, with some perhaps being more relevant to bring in earlier during grant writing efforts and others later during implantation. With that in mind, we will revisit this list of potential stakeholders again after we move past the grant development phase to ensure that we have cast an appropriately wide net.

| # Votes received | # Unique Voters | Stakeholder or stakeholder group identified |
|------------------|-----------------|--|
| 16 | 14 | Academic advisors from both 2YR and 4YR schools (<i>as teams</i>) to specialize in transfer pathways |
| 14 | 12 | STEM faculty talking to other STEM faculty |
| 10 | 10 | Faculty/staff (<i>especially those involved with gateway courses</i>) |
| 10 | 9 | Transfer students |
| 10 | 6 | University/college executive administration |
| 6 | 4 | Researchers and those who are already doing this (<i>e.g., CCRC at Columbia</i>) |
| 4 | 4 | Early college high school program administrators |
| 4 | 4 | Transfer program and bridge program coordinators |
| 4 | 4 | Department heads |
| 4 | 2 | Support staff |
| 3 | 3 | Community partners with resources to support non-traditional transfer student needs |
| 3 | 3 | Admissions (<i>evaluators of incoming credits</i>) |
| 3 | 3 | Office of Teaching Effectiveness |
| 3 | 3 | Data people/IR and those who work in retention |
| 2 | 2 | Industry partners supporting applied learning opportunities |
| 2 | 2 | Existing programs open to transfer students, but aren't specifically designed for them |
| 2 | 2 | Guidance counselors |
| 2 | 2 | Administrators of transfer articulation programs |
| 2 | 2 | Student groups on campus who are focused on STEM and identity groups (<i>clubs/groups that support BIPOC students, etc.</i>) |
| 2 | 2 | Deans |
| 1 | 1 | Alums |
| 1 | 1 | Parents |
| 1 | 1 | Undergraduate engineering program coordinators |
| 1 | 1 | Legislatures and governing boards |
| 1 | 1 | Student affairs |
| 1 | 1 | APLU Powered by Publics Southeast Cluster and HHMI IE3 learning community |
| 1 | 1 | State technical college systems |
| 1 | 1 | Financial aid offices |

For those identified as “priority stakeholders”, the last ten minutes of the meeting were used to brainstorm both mechanisms by which these stakeholders could be contacted and to gather lingering thoughts to consider for specific stakeholder groups. All responses from this portion of the Mural are transcribed below.

| Priority Stakeholders | Associated Contact Mechanisms or Things to Consider |
|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Academic advisors from 2YR and 4YR institutions</p> | <p><i>Mechanisms:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transfer advisor symposiums (<i>UNCC runs one</i>) ▪ Once FLCs are established, we could bring in the academic advisors to them ▪ Needs to be consistent after implementation begins – could be shared document or Box or regular updates via email. ▪ Suggest meeting at least once a semester via Zoom or hybrid in-person <p><i>Things to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Before/during grant writing, get a realistic picture from the advisors – often what works “on paper” doesn’t work in practice ▪ Once implementation is underway, need a consistent communication pathway. |
| <p style="text-align: center;">STEM faculty</p> | <p><i>Mechanisms:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FLCs ▪ Departmental retreats ▪ Start discussions at faculty welcomes/training ▪ At small institutions, start with more general communications (emails and unit meetings), then have direct discussions with interested individual colleagues <p><i>Things to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Faculty development activities that include students and advisors |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Faculty/staff involved with gateway courses</p> | <p><i>Mechanisms:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See above. <p><i>Things to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transfer status is invisible to faculty at 4YR schools. <i>Could we pilot something where we test faculty assumptions?</i> ▪ Get a realistic picture (“on paper” vs. in practice situation) ▪ Work together with them on pathways |

| Priority Stakeholders | Associated Contact Mechanisms or Things to Consider |
|---|---|
| Transfer students | <p><i>Mechanisms:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engage alumni panels/surveys ▪ Engage current students in surveys ▪ Establish a focus group program to provide safe ways for students to share their experience with transfer without fear of negative outcomes ▪ Student speaker exchanges from 4YR to 2YR, specifically focusing on transfer students in STEM courses <p><i>Things to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Real talk: what happens before and after transfer. <i>What are the barriers, opportunities...?</i> ▪ We need to hear from them about what issues they have. |
| University/college executive administration | <p><i>Mechanisms:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Peer outreach → need a “champion” for the project to recruit others within the administration <p><i>Things to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Somehow put this systemic issue into the budget context to demonstrate to administrators how critical it is to maintain/build transfer programs for both types of institutions ▪ Need to develop some planning for sustainability beyond grant periods |
| Researchers and those who are already doing this (e.g., CCRC at Columbia) | <p><i>Mechanisms:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Email directly to network <p><i>Things to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learn from their body of work before getting priority stakeholders together so discussions are informed ▪ Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) research experts will be essential to this Alliance |
| Early college high school program administrators | <p><i>Mechanisms:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continuing Education credit meetings <p><i>Things to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Once grant is in progress, develop best practices for students pursuing STEM majors in early college course selection ▪ Early college HS program coordinators may be in a different administrative silo than CC faculty |

| Priority Stakeholders | Associated Contact Mechanisms or Things to Consider |
|--|--|
| Transfer program and bridge program coordinators | <p><i>Mechanisms:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reach out directly via email <p><i>Things to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Before grant, get a realistic idea of the process and procedures in these specifically designed transfer/bridge programs (<i>and learn from their challenges</i>) |
| Department heads | <p><i>Mechanisms:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seek out talk time ▪ Use compelling data to get them on board. (<i>i.e. decreasing course DFW rates = less workload down the road. Get students to pass courses the first time.</i>) <p><i>Things to consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enablers of faculty workload |