Clarifying the Path Workgroup

Meeting Notes March 13, 2019

Attendance: Rick Schubert, Julie Olson, Dana Wassmer, Kathy Sorenson

Note Taker: Julie Olson

Item	Description	Who's Responsible	Deadline
From The Academic Senate GE Themes	Reported on the Academic Senate meeting and the responses that Clarifying received regarding GE Themes. Good questions from senate including if Clarifying will be assigning single courses to each area within the GE themes. That is not the intention of the work group, but it is The Senate which determines how many courses would be aligned to each GE area within each GE theme.	Rick	
Brainstorming GE Themes and the amount of GE units.	Clarifying started to discuss options and different strategies for GE Themes and course within the themes. • Possibility of 6-12 GE courses per GE Area within a Theme Question: Would the GE themes and the CACs be aligned? Answer: No. That is not the intention of the work group. The choice of themes would be the student's and independent of their choice of major or CAC. Discussion and Questions Would it be confusing to students if not all GE classes are aligned with the theme, example: ENGWR 300? -The intervention (GE Themes) could be tailored to address only those GE areas in which there is choice paralysis (e.g. IGETC Areas 3 & 4). -In particular ENGWR would not necessarily be focused on a GE theme, since it is a required class. Example: IGETC Area 5A and 5B Natural Science-the courses you would take seem to be major-dependent, depending on if you are a STEM major or not. However, there are still about 10 different courses in this area that may be appropriate for non-STEM GE Themes (to meet Area 5). If students are not a STEM major and want to take the STEM-focused GE classes, they will need to meet the pre-requisites to take those STEM classes. If the GE Themes only list courses for IGETC Area 3 and 4, it could be misleading to students because they think they only need to take those GE areas, and not the rest of the GE areas in order to complete IGETC. This could be addressed in a variety of ways e.g. clearly presenting GE Themes as addressing only a portion of IGETC (See CSU Chico's		

approach to GE as GE Foundations + GE Pathway) or e.g. by listing non-themed GE areas/courses across all themes (e.g. the way Chico lists language courses as a non-thematic choice within Humanities)

The idea of developing themes is to avoid decision paralysis by providing students a small number of course options. What is the number of courses in GE Themes at other campus?

What is the number of courses in GE Themes at other campus? -Varies

We need to look at our courses and where they may sit in a theme before we can talk about how many courses will be under each theme.

-Everyone will take Area A- ENGWR Area 2- major specific etc.

We need to get more feedback from people regarding the direction in which we should development GE themes. We, as a workgroup, do not have the authority to make these decisions alone, there needs to be more faculty input—as per the workgroup's standing plan to solicit feedback from Academic Senate, Department Chairs, GP Forums, etc.

Strategic orientation: The more that we, as a committee, talk about this, the better prepared we will be to address particular questions (e.g. from Academic Senate) regarding GE themes and the alignment of courses to themes.

Exploring possible approaches to GE themes is doing groundwork, not making final decisions. As a work group we still should see what the primary choices are for Area 3 and 4. And we should explore approaching GE themes both as a targeted intervention/heuristic for specific GE areas only, and for all GE areas.

3/22- we will get a decision from Academic Senate regarding GE themes.

- 1. Does it please the Senate to have the Clarifying Workgroup continue developing a thematic approach to GE?
- 2a. If the answer to the above is affirmative, does the body find the "straw-man" themes a promising first step in defining the themes?
- 2b. If the answer to #1 is negative, would the Senate recommend that the Clarifying Workgroup continue working on GE? If so, in what direction?

Strategic interests in further groundwork notwithstanding, we, as a committee, need to wait to hear back from the Senate before we continue with the work.

After feedback and directives from Academic Senate, we can entertain the options to:

- have another forum about the GE courses
- take this on a road show to all the constituents.

Workgroup will stop meeting until after receiving Academic

	Senate approval and directives on GE Themes. Senate approval and directives on GE Themes. Senate to start working on GE Themes and courses we see the start working on GE Themes and Courses we see the start working on GE Themes and Course we see the start working on GE Themes and Course we see the start working on GE Themes and Course we see the start working on GE Themes and Course we see the start working on GE Themes and Course we see the start working on GE Themes and Course we see the start working on GE Themes and Course we see the start working on GE Themes are considered to the start working on GE Themes are considered to the start working on GE Themes are considered to the start working on GE Themes are considered to the start working on GE Themes and Course we can also considered to the start working on GE Themes and Course we can also considered to the start working of th	ithin the themes.	
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	spring 2019
GE Mapping Process	Seek guidance from all stakeholders and Make final recommendations on GE Mapping to themes to Academic Senate	Workgroup in coordination with Learning workgroup	ТВА
Major course sequencing mapping	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.	Dana	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	ТВА

Next Clarifying Meeting—

Will not meet on Wednesday, March 20, 2019

Will not meet on Wednesday, April 10, 2019

Meeting on Wednesday, April 25, will be 1:45-2:30

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

Next Meeting Agenda/Activity:

Decision from Senate on going forward with GE themes.

If approved from Senate, start discussing strategies regarding GE courses in GE Themes

Future Meeting Agenda/Activity:

Finalize recommended process for including GE courses into our GE Themes structure.