Clarifying the Path Workgroup

Meeting Notes
February 6, 2019

Attendance: Megan Neves, Kim Harrell, Alex Casareno, Rick Schubert, Ray Mapeso, Julie Olson, LaTonya Williams, Dana Wassmer

Note Taker: Julie Olson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who's Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Discussion of Pathways Institute | Rick went over the Pathways Institute PowerPoint that was presented during Spring 2019 PD. See PowerPoint. Examined the different themes that other institutions currently have (CSU Chico, Northridge).  

-Alex: Some faculty fear GE themes may negatively affect small instructional programs. Alex was glad that it was brought up during the PowerPoint. GE themes may never include all courses across the campus, but we can mitigate potential problems by being up front about which themes we'll have and the impact themes may have on enrollment and we can try to make sure every GE-satisfying course will be in a theme.

Rick- As we do the work developing the themes, it is worth keeping in mind why we are backing away from program recommendations.  
Kim- In the institutions that broke up by theme, is every GE course represented in one of the themes?  
Alex: Spoke about Title 5 and how changes are going to happen and we need to be aware of those changes, and how fast those changes are happening. Right now it is just English and Math, but that could change.

Rick- The idea here is to not necessarily to use other institutions themes and how GE is arranged in Themes, just giving CRC an idea of how we want to arrange our GE into our own themes. Students can allow "opt out" of the themes or our transfer themes might not apply (e.g. to students who seek only certificates).  
Big political decision, are we going to paint a Guided Pathways façade on what we are currently doing by coming up with a large number of themes, or are we going to look at cleaning house?  
Looking at revising SLO process, ILOs, and aligning program outcomes?  
College is looking at developing IGTC and CSU certificates, development of GE themes, for Spring 2019 term., |                      |          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|             |        | At this point we can look at other institutions’ Themes. Rick re-presented PowerPoint that Dana presented at the Institute. Rick: We are going to have to get students to understand majors, GE, and GE themes. Hope that it will be easier to have students understand GE and the value of GE when it is in a Theme. Also the hope is that GE themes will help give undecided students a better idea of what their major will be. Is this reality based? Ray: Sounds good. Rick: With the different GE themes we might be seeing that there are courses that we don’t offer that we need too. We might not have a theme that a student is very passionate about. We don’t want to give the student the impression that they won’t be able to complete their GE if they don’t do it via one of our college’s themes. Maybe we have an Individualized Theme option. Problem, issues, challenges regarding themes- See PowerPoint. Dana: The problem will be aligning the courses with the GE themes. This is going to be challenging and we will need to include faculty in this discussion. Don’t know how we are going to do this. We need to hear this from the students. Kim: Could we start with seeing where they fit into the GE patterns (local, CSU, IGETC) Rick: Completely agree with Dana; real problem… Main argument that I keep hearing in favor of focusing on CSU breath for CSU-bound students. 1. CSU breath more options then IGTC (because there are more course options). Rick: What if we just did IGTC themes instead of CSU? IGETC is the “Intersegmental GE Transfer Curriculum” and serves all students whether they transfer to UC or CSU. Ray: IGTC is more rigorous than CSU and not all our students are at that level. Dana: Then why do we have a CRC associate Degree? Don’t think that we should only do IGTC. Megan: There are a lot of different variables that go into it. Example about the student who didn’t see a counselor when first started taking classes, and come to counseling with a bunch of courses. As a counselor see what GE Pattner, CSU or IGTC, their courses fit. Think this is going to be trial and error. Ray: Thinks that we should do a student forum. Dana: What if we looked at Canada College pathways and how they have it set up with CSU and IGTC, and Associate’s? Rick: Laying out the options, and then getting the pros and cons
for those options. I get it that we might just lay it out and see how it works. Understanding we will have to tolerate mistakes, but, not all people have the tolerance for all the options. True, let’s try stuff and it might not work, but some of it is timing and who we are trying this out on, because it is our students who we will be trying this out on. Believes that we need to have this strategically mapped out.

Megan: Don’t want us to keep circling all these ideas and not get anywhere. But what if we throw out a few ideas as bread crumbs and see what the comments are.

Dana: Let’s take a look at the concerns that people have, and address the concerns first.
Ray: We need students thoughts and that can be very telling.
Dana: Have a student focus group that we can bounce ideas off of.
Ray: Let’s do a survey and focus groups.

Rick: Focus groups, discussion form, survey- see if Paul can help with the selection, time frame 1-6 weeks
Feb. 22nd I will be presenting PowerPoint, exploring GE themes to the Academic Senate.

Tonya: We need to communicate the strategic narrative to the campus at large.

Dana: Agrees, but doesn’t know what else regarding communication can we do.

Tonya: What method of communication would work best for the faculty getting the communication to them?

Ray: Would department meetings be a place to talk about GP, the work has been done and what we are doing?

Tonya: Feels that we use multiple means of communication, What about having a once a month newsletter on what is going in GP? How are we going to assess the positive and failures to GP and how can we move the work forward?

### ACTION ITEMS still to be completed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Themes</th>
<th>Form GE Themes Task Force to decide naming structure for GE Themes. (note: getting feedback from faculty at spring PD institute)</th>
<th>GE task force</th>
<th>Spring 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE Mapping Process</td>
<td>Seek guidance from all stakeholders and make final recommendations on GE themes (and mapping of courses to themes) Academic Senate</td>
<td>Workgroup in coordination with Learning workgroup</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major course sequencing mapping</td>
<td>With approval process finalized, all programs should be working to create major-course sequencing maps with goal of 100% completion by end of Spring 19. Dana is available to work with individual programs.</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/revision process for CAC, P2CAC, mapping, etc.</td>
<td>Committee agrees work should begin now to create an approve/review/revise cycle for Pathways structures so that all stakeholders know that the college is committed to making changes as necessary (e.g. to improve organizational structures, workflow, etc.).</td>
<td>All pillars</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Clarifying Meeting—
Clarifying meets every Wednesday (during fall/spring semester) from 1:45-3:00 p.m. (in SOC Conference Room).

Next Meeting Agenda/Activity:
Developing short-list of possible GE themes out of the PD Institute Brainstorm List.

Future Meeting Agenda/Activity:
Create GE Themes task force and determine GE Themes. Finalize recommended process for including GE courses into our TBD structure.