

## Learning on the Path Meeting

2-8-19

10:30 AM – 12:00 PM

In attendance: Rhonda Farley, Kim Harrell, Stephen McGloughlin, Rick Schubert

**The Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) drafting and vetting process:** The ILOs should apply to at least some extent to every student at CRC. All ILO's will apply to any student completing a degree program at CRC. The 1<sup>st</sup> draft ILO's were distributed to the CRC faculty last semester and discussed during a faculty forum in November. Based on feedback from faculty and input from the faculty forum, the draft ILOs were revised. The ILOs were also reviewed in conjunction with the development of possible GE themes drafted at the Professional Development Institute this January. These revised ILOs have also been reviewed by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Curriculum Committee. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft ILOs were again distributed to the CRC faculty in advance of the February 8 Academic Senate meeting. Considerable feedback has been provided by the CVPA division faculty and concerns from COMM have been resolved with the addition of the inclusive term, "verbal communication," to an ILO. A new ILO termed "creativity" has been added to accommodate feedback from the field. These revised ILOs will go to the Senate meeting today. Feedback will be incorporated and then the final draft will go to the student and classified senates. The goal is to have the ILOs approved by the Academic Senate at the first meeting in March.

**Assessing the ILOs:** The College will revise the graduation survey to include the ILOs and students will rate their perceived proficiency under each ILO. The topic of non-degree seeking transfer students was discussed. This cohort is the single largest group of students we have at CRC. We need a mechanism for identifying this group and surveying them. We should incentivize survey completion.

**Institutionalizing Learning and Clarifying:** Learning on the Path activities and responsibilities naturally align with our Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Clarifying has some natural alignment with the Curriculum Committee. We may need a subcommittee of Curriculum to look at major course sequencing, especially prerequisites once the Implementation Team sunsets. Stephen is going to look into whether Ad Astra can be used to sequence. The recently revised Pharmacy Technology program is a good example of how major course sequencing and prerequisites have been institutionalized in SOCRATES and the college catalog. We need to look at how programs that currently take longer than 2 years to complete can be pitched to students. For example, highlighting which courses can be taken without the prerequisites could help reduce a student's time to completion.

**Overlapping responsibilities of Clarifying and Learning:** There should be some connection between the GE Themes we develop, the courses assigned to them and the ILOs. The committee discussed whether we can have one intersegmental GE pattern to cover all students' options. Although some courses might not meet a GE requirement if we go this route, the courses may still serve the multiple missions of CRC as a community college. There needs to be a discussion about adhering to the spirit of Guided Pathways to avoid students' choice paralysis, while maintaining the full array of courses that serve a function for our students (e.g. courses required for certificate completion).

**Aligning the work with 4-year colleges:** We need to know the latest developments CSU's are putting into place that might disadvantage CRC students choosing to take a GE theme that has been less than

carefully constructed. For example, Bakersfield College has reported that CSUs give students who did not complete the Golden 4 for GE (oral communication, written communication, critical thinking, and mathematics) the lowest level of admissions priority.