

Guided Pathways Leads Meeting

Meeting Notes

Oct. 22, 2018

In Attendance: Kim Harrell, Howard Lewis, Shannon Mills, Julie Olson, Collin Pregliasco, Shannon Cooper, Rhonda Farley, Rick Schubert, Anson Bowens, Tonya Williams, Joel Powell, Dana Wassmer, Alex Casareno, Ed Bush, Dustin Sperling, April Robinson, Teresa Aldredge, Tadael Emiru

Note Taker: Dana Wassmer & Anson Bowens

Item	Discussion/Action Plan	Who's Responsible	Deadline
Update on the WestEd (Kathy Booth) workshop.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to illness, the Oct. 24 WestEd Workshop is canceled. • A workshop with a career perspective will be planned for Spring FLEX week (possibly Jan. 16). • CTE faculty will be invited to attend. • Kathy is wanting to personalize the workshop by interviewing one of our students to highlight the CRC student experience. • Please contact Alex if you have/know of a student who Kathy can interview. • Alex will update as more information becomes available. 	Alex	By Spring Flex
Overall goal of GP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President Bush recognizes that GP work is hard and thanks everyone for the work that has been done. • We need to continue to “make the case” for why we are implementing GP and to promote engagement – the lens through which our institution is going to be evaluated will be through the the lens of GP • Are we aligning our goals with the goals/visions of student success? • Altruistic reasons in adapting to the GP model – the “why?” of Guided Pathways is driving our work; practical and operational reasons do to the work as well. • We have been transparent with our work and yet the work is still hard. • Our current system/structure is not designed to help our students. To solve this systemic/sturctual problem there must be a systemic/structural solution. 	None	None

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “why?” of GP is the best attempt at looking into systemic/structural issues that have created barriers for students in being successful. • We need to redesign our system/structure so that our students can complete on-time. The initiatives we implemented in the past to help our disproportionately represented students have not closed the achievement gaps. Since we have engaged in GP work, many external changes (AB 705, AB 19, AD-T, Funding Formula, etc.) have come into play. • We need to be out in front of these changes and we are mindful of this as we implement GP at the College. • The “why?” of GP is putting our students first and a focus on equity for all our students. 		
<p>Goal for Fall 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President Bush asks if we are keeping to the goal initially outlined – to enroll students into MM houses • Academic Senate President suggests a timeline issue – can we get to the goal by Fall 2019? • Enroll students into meta-majors (MM) or Career and Academic Communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Let students know the options available ○ Current new students are being case-managed ○ We still need efficient career focus within the MM houses and within the program templates. ○ Where do program templates lead in terms of students’ abilities to know they are career ready and the kind of career options available to them in terms of our academic programs? • Student success teams launched within meta-majors to ensure students are staying on the path. • Staying brings up a counseling issue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Counselors are in need of the program maps ○ Currently, there is nothing of substance to give to the students (of their work plan) ○ At least, a draft is needed. Right now, counselors are advising students based on their best assumption of when courses are going to be offered 	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New orientation/on-boarding (Sp 2019) • Continuing implementing/evaluating multiple measures • Continuing implmeneting/evaluating AB 705 changes 		
<p>Review of process and timeline of major GP work</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifying state that we should focus on program course sequencing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Programs need to be making it clear which courses they are offering which semester and this information should be published somewhere. ○ We do not provide our students with information regarding which courses are being offered in the furture. This should have been done already. ○ Major course sequencing work has not been done. It has gotten tied up with program maps as a whole making major course sequencing not available for student consumption. ○ There is no institutional standard for major course sequencing, there is no process for approving them. ○ While that has been the focus, Dana reminds everyone that course sequencing need to be aware of the GE and that GE place holders are consider so not to overload the students in each semester. • Clarifying anticipates recommending the GE Themes (to Academic Senate) by next academic year (F 2019 or possibly Sp 2020) and Program course sequence need a process for approval. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anatomy approach to general education • Staying questions why if the programs are already approved by the Curriculum Committee; what is this (extra?) level of approval in looking at semester-by-semester course sequencing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarifying addresses the issue has to do with (1) an institutional recognition that the task is done and (2) the oversight ○ It is not clear to individual programs who have done major course sequencing work whether or not they have completed the task because there is no institutional recongnition. ○ At minimum there has to be a way for the dept to recognize that it has produced a departmental product. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staying suggests using SOCRATES as a holding place for program maps; a place to house information and approve of program maps where the dept can sign off on it including management ○ Would require SOCRATES development software? ○ Can we use SOCRATES as a holding place to say that the work of program maps have been approved? ○ Staying restates it would be beneficial to have a place to go look for the information, utilize it, and build true student educational plans for students. • Sequencing the courses is ensuring appropriate course scheduling and scheduling is the Dean’s right of assignment; scheduling is not an academic matter. • The President reminds us why we make a map in the first place—so our students can know what courses they need to take and when (they are offered). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Currently, students are trying to formulate maps on their own; they are trying to gauge what courses they can/cannot take in order to attain a degree ○ Enrolling into courses is complicated by not informing students when courses will be offered. ○ We are simply repackaging what we already have (with course sequencing). ○ The map is a necessary tool for counselors and students. Can we create a tool in which students can successfully and easily navigate through what we put out as what students are able to take? • Academic President states that the program course sequence is more complicated than this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students may come in needing basic skills. ○ Identifying the GE courses for a program. ○ Agreeing to a program course sequence. ○ Involving basic skills into the program maps adds another layer of how you have to get through that program map esp. in the first year. ○ It is a difficult task to create a program map that fits for all students when we do not know where they are with their major & GE ○ One student’s map is not going to be the same as another’s and it should not be; we have to consider all (3) factors when creating the tool – and this has not been a part of the discussion. ○ Academic Senate have purview of programs— 	<p>Rick & Shannon to schedule meeting with Leads</p>	<p>Fall 2018</p>
--	---	--	------------------

	<p>including program maps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Academic Senate should approve the process of course sequencing. • Clarifying adds that not all faculty will agree to the same (draft of the) course sequencing for the program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g., faculty may disagree because one believes his/her class should come before another or vice versa. ○ A process for program course sequencing must be approved for the department level. ○ In addition, another process must be approved to present to the Dean. • Alex asks that the faculty leads should meet to come up with these processes so that we can launch the MM by Fall. • If our system is so complex, how do we expect our students to do this on their own? • Catalog—publish when courses will be offered (F, S, &/or Su). • While we wait for the tool that students and counselors need, students will not be served. • Currently, counselors are guiding students on the classes to take—not program faculty; the less that is directed by faculty, the more it becomes a counselor’s pruvview. 		
--	--	--	--

Next Steps:

Discussing implementation next GP Implementation meeting
Draft a process for coming to a consensus regarding major course sequencing draft with faculty chairs and/or faculty leads; need a division level of oversight
Differences between meta-majors and GE themes; rolling out meta-majors first, getting that into the cultural air and then introducing GE themes
Transitioning focus away from GE for right now but remaining conscious to earmark space for the GEs

Next meeting:

Guided Pathways Implementation Meeting, Monday, Oct. 29, 2018, 3:00-4:00 p.m., TBA. Please check your email for any update.

Agenda Items for Oct. 29 Meeting:

- ✓ Continue with the agenda from Oct. 22, 2019 GP Workgroup Leads Meeting.
- ✓ Updates from each Workgroup/Progress Report.