

Clarifying the Path Workgroup

Meeting Notes November 28, 2018

Attendance: Tonya Williams, Celia Samaniego, Eddie Fagin, Rick Schubert, Julie Olson,

Note Taker: Andi Adkins Pogue

Item	Description	Who's Responsible	Deadline
<p>Discussion of Major Course Sequence Draft</p>	<p>Rick will present draft for first read at 11/30 Academic Senate meeting.</p> <p>In anticipation of that meeting, the draft was sent to all faculty for review. Rick received some feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There are concerns with proposed role of curriculum committee, primarily the wording in 2-a: "Once the Implementation Team sunsets, some other body (TBD) either current (e.g., Curriculum) or to be developed, will play Implementation's role in the process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Curriculum members say the legally mandated work the committee already does leaves little time to do a substantive review - which means curriculum will likely be deferring to program faculty. ○ Rick suggests it's better to at least have a body that could make changes, but we should not expect robust oversight from Curriculum Committee ○ Group feels like this is a detail that can be worked out but it shouldn't prevent movement of the approval process through the senate. Course-major sequencing needs to begin ASAP so it's crucial this process be approved in a timely manner. ● It was noted that SOCRATES does allow major-course sequencing through headings, but system allows for only one sequence, and there are many disciplines that will have more than one sequence (e.g. anthropology, architecture). Further discussion needs to take place to decide where "official" major-course sequencing maps will be housed (i.e., accessible for others to view). ● There are concerns over the language that tasks tenure-track program (discipline) faculty with developing major-course sequencing because there are some programs that do not have a tenure-track faculty member. Group had lengthy discussion, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed 3-level scaffold to catch all possible situations: 1) tenure-track faculty create major-course sequencing, 2) if no tenure-track 	<p>Rick</p>	<p>11/30/18</p>

	<p>in the program, then preferenced adjunct faculty create major-course sequencing, 3) if no preferenced adjunct faculty then Department Chair creates major-course sequencing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The pitfall with above scenario is that adjunct faculty can't contractually be tasked with this type of work <p>Group agreed on the following amendment to be presented 11/30 at first read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In cases in which there are not tenure-track faculty in a program, the Department Chair, in consultation with adjunct program faculty, will determine the draft major course sequence. <p>Group agreed this amendment includes the needed flexibility to accommodate the college's diverse programs and department structures.</p>		
P2CAC alignment draft	Rick will also present P2CAC alignment draft at Academic Senate meeting for first read.	Rick	11/30/18
ACTION ITEMS still to be completed:			
Finalize P2CAC Alignment	Respond as necessary to Academic Senate feedback on P2CAC recommendation as the recommendation is considered by Senate.	Work group	Fall 2018 / Spring 2019
GE Themes	Form GE Themes Task Force to decide naming structure for GE Themes. (note: getting feedback from faculty at spring PD institute)	GE task force	Fall 2018 / spring 2019
GE Mapping Process	Seek guidance from all stakeholders and Make final recommendations on GE Mapping to themes to Academic Senate	Work group in coordination with Learning work group	TBA
INDIS 313	Recommendations and/or collaboration with Staying Workgroup for INDIS 313.	INDIS 313 Task Force	Meets Mondays 9:15-10:30 am in LRC 125
Revision process for program templates	Finalize recommendations	Work group	Fall 2018

Curriculum mapping	Work group agrees focus should be on major-course sequencing. Dana is available to work with individual programs.	Dana	Fall 2018-Spring 2019
Review/revision process for CAC, P2CAC, mapping, etc.	Committee agrees work should begin now to create a 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).	All pillars	TBA

Next Clarifying Meeting— 12/5/18

Clarifying meets every Wednesday (during fall/spring semester) from 1:30-3:00 p.m. (in SOC Conference Room).

Next Meeting Agenda/Activity: Debrief from 11/30 Academic Senate meeting and spring goals.

Future Meeting Agenda/Activity:

Finalize P2CAC alignment recommendation. Create GE Themes task force and determine GE Themes. Finalize recommended process for including GE courses into our TBD structure. Finalize recommendation for revision process for program templates.