Clarifying the Path Workgroup

Meeting Notes
October 31, 2018

Attendance: Rick Schubert, Celia Samaniego, Kathy Sorenson, Tonya Williams, Julie Olson, Ray Mapeso, Michael Lawlor, Dana Wassmer, Eddie Fagan
Note Taker: Andi Adkins Pogue

Item	Description	Who's Responsible	Deadline
Implementation team meeting report	Implementation team had its first meeting. Leadership from that group is requesting the Clarifying Work Group articulate formal deadlines by which program faculty need to complete major-course sequencing. Two deadlines may be necessary: 1. For programs that are in agreement 2. For programs that are not in agreement Communication to all program faculty is needed to urge them to continue work on major-course sequencing maps while Clarifying continues to formalize a process by which major-course sequencing maps will be approved (see next 3 sections).	Work group	ASAP

Guiding principles for developing major-course sequencing	The work group discussed providing guiding principles to program faculty as they complete their major-course sequencing, including:
	● When possible, courses that satisfy the most IGETC requirements should be first in the sequence. (Reason: Students who do change majors will not have wasted time/money because credit hours will still meet the most rigorous (IGETC) transfer requirements.)
	● When possible, courses that satisfy admission requirements (English, critical thinking, oral communication [CSU only], mathematics or quantitative reasoning) to UC/CSU should be earlier in the sequence. (Reason: Students who do change majors will not have wasted time/money because credit hours will still help fulfill admission requirements to both UC and CSU.)
	● Consider the effects of AB705 on unit load' and when determining how many units in the major should be recommended for a semester (especially the first and second semesters) and consider "total load" (unit load and extent to which courses to be taken at the same time are particularly challenging)
	   ○ With above consideration, it was suggested that program faculty make two separate major-course sequencing maps:
	      i. A "clean" version for college-prepared students.
		Work group	ASAP

	ii. A version for students who will already be impacted by heavy unit and workload associated with co-requisite courses and who may have difficulty doing certain types of college-level work prior to completing their Math and/or English. (This version may also be appropriate for use by part-time students.) Reason: Students who are requiring support for successful completion in English and math might find courses that have a heavy writing (e.g. political science) / math (e.g. chemistry) components daunting and difficult, which could lead to lower success/completion rates and students generally discouraged about college. Work group's ultimate goal with guiding principles is to create complete maps that help students maximize the return on investment (ROI) while at CRC. More discussion is needed to finalize principles and to decide how/when they will be communicated to program faculty.Faculty may need to revisit previously completed draft course sequencing maps to ensure they meet the guidelines.		
Discussion on recommendation for major-course sequencing approval	The work group continued discussion and came to agreement on the first part of the approval process: 1. Program (discipline) faculty work together to come to a majority agreement on major-course sequencing. a. All full-time faculty in a program get one vote on finalizing major-course sequencing. 2. Once in agreement, major-course sequencing maps are sent to division dean for review and approval. There may be extenuating circumstances that would require the dean to ask faculty to make revisions (e.g., available FTE, classroom space, etc.). If no revisions are necessary in the Dean's estimation, Dean signs off. 3. [STILL UNDER DISCUSSION[1]] A final check is made by some body (GP Implementation Team?) to see if guiding principles have been considered in major-course sequencing. If not, and there are courses that meet IGETC and/or admission requirements (see section above), possible revisions could be suggested to help students maximize ROI. After discussion and collaboration, sequencing becomes finalized and shared with counseling.	Work group	By end of 11/7 mtg.

---

[1] This final step was brainstormed at the very end of meeting and work group didn't have time to discuss or flesh out logistics. Still need to: 1) decide who is part of final-check group 2) if changes are suggested, how is this articulated to program faculty or are they part of final-check group? 3) If program faculty are in disagreement, is there a resolution process? - ANYTHING ELSE?

Discussion of major-course sequencing resolution process	There may be situations in which majority agreement cannot be reached in step one (see above) of the approval process (e.g., 4-person program is split 2-2). The work group has finalized the first part of the resolution procedure:
	1. Each full-time faculty in the program should create documentation supporting their recommendations to sequence program courses as they have suggested. This documentation might include:
	   a. Feedback from same-discipline faculty at other Los Rios Colleges
	   b. Program information from transfer institutions
	   c. Program accreditation standards or requirements
	   d. Industry outlook
	   e. Legislation or new regulations
	2. This documentation is forwarded to the Programming Sequencing Resolution Committee (PSRC), which will make the final decision on recommended major-course sequencing. The PSRC is made up of 3 members[2]:
	   a. Counseling department chair (or designee)
	   b. Articulation officer (or designee)
	   c. Previous curriculum chair who was classroom faculty (or designee)
	3. major-course sequencing is sent to division dean for review and sign-off. There may be extenuating circumstances that would require the dean to ask faculty to make revisions (e.g., available FTE, classroom space, etc.). If no revisions are necessary in the Dean's estimation, Dean signs off.
	4. [STILL UNDER DISCUSSION] A final check is made by some body (GP Implementation Team?) to see if guiding principles have been considered in major-course sequencing. If not, and there are courses that meet IGETC and/or admission requirements (see section above), possible revisions could be suggested to help students maximize ROI. After discussion and collaboration, sequencing becomes finalized and shared with counseling.
		Work group	By end of 11/7 mtg.

Presentation of major-course sequencing approval process	Work group hopes to finalize approval processes outlined above @ next meeting (11/7), but Rick will ask now to have it agendized as first read at 11/30 meeting. Feedback and changes could be made and presented for second read and approval at 12/4 senate meeting. Rick will also present to Implementation Team (likely on 11/19)	Rick	To implementation 11/19 First read senate 11/30

---

[2] Note: There was concern expressed that not enough full-time classroom faculty are part of PSRC. The work group discussed that this would be a last-resort option that would hopefully motivate program faculty to resolve issues within their department. The hope is that this committee would rarely, if ever, be called upon.

Foundational / Safe / Default semester	The work group again discussed the idea of a foundational or safe semester. Discussions first began in spring 2018 (see past minutes: 1/31/18, 2/7/18, 2/14/18), which brought the group to a consideration of on INDIS 313, as it could play a role in foundational semesters (see past minutes: 2/28/18, 4/18/18, 4/25/18). An INDIS 313 work group has been formed and has been meeting (Monday mornings, 9:15-10:30am in LRC 125). Many questions still remain: ● Should the foundational/safe semester only be for undecided students? ● Should there be a separate safe semester mapping for each CAC or GE Theme? During implementation team meeting Tadael brought up the idea of a "default" semester, in which students would automatically be assigned a schedule and would have to "opt-out" to deviate.	Work group and/or INDIS 313 Work group	ASAP
Discussion of possible reasons for major changes.	The idea of a foundational / safe/ default semester is tied to statistics that show on average our students change majors three times in our current (non-guided) system. Group discussed possible reasons for this: ● Financial aid won't cover programs that require prerequisite courses (e.g. biology requirement for vet tech. course) so these students often declare something other than e,g, Vet Tech. as a major so they can qualify for financial aid. Once prerequisites are completed, they change to what was their intended major all along. ● Many programs in college are in disciplines students haven't been exposed to in K-12, but are stumbling upon through GE,that piques interest and sparks a major change. Group was also informed that "Entering the Path" work group is exploring CCC MyPath that would be tied to CCC Apply.	N/A	N/A
Discussion of undeclared students	Work group again discussed counseling pilot and case management this semester of 1300 first-time freshman. Each of these students has been coded and placed in their respective CAC. Each CAC has a "student success team" consisting of a Counselor, a Specialist, and classroom faculty. Counseling is completing comprehensive ed plans for each of these students. The research office indicated there are 4400 students of the total student enrollment that is undeclared. Some of these students might be GE transfer students, e.g. students who have decided on their 4-year degree major, but cannot declare it as it is not available at CRC.	N/A	N/A

GE Themes	The work group believes that GE Themes will help make other areas of pathways implementation easier for faculty - but many decisions still need to be made. Discussion included: ● Q- Which courses should be included in themes? Only IGETC? ● A- Suggestion that we include all three possibilities (requirements for CSU, IGETC, and Local AS/AA) and perhaps color-code them to help students/ other stakeholders decipher catalog and online presentation	Work group	Before spring flex workshop
Informational item: overlap in IGETC/CSU transfer requirements	Ray did an analysis of two areas and did find substantial overlap. In the arts: ● 20 courses in common, 11 were offered this fall Area D (CSU)/Area 4 (UC) ● 46 courses in common, all 46 were offered this fall	N/A	N/A
ACTION ITEMS still to be completed:			
Finalize course sequencing procedure	Formalize major-course sequencing procedure to present at Academic Senate and Implementation Team, including whether to include guiding principles.	Work group	ASAP
Finalize P2CAC Alignment	Respond as necessary to Academic Senate feedback on P2CAC recommendation as the recommendation is considered by Senate.	Work group	Fall 2018
GE Themes	Form GE Themes Task Force to decide naming structure for GE Themes	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	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	All pillars	TBA

CAC, P2CAC, mapping, etc.	making changes as necessary (e.g. to improve organizational structures, workflow, etc).		

Next Clarifying Meeting— 11/7 - Note: Andi cannot be at next two meetings to take minutes, Someone needs to take minutes at 11/7 and 11/14 meetings.

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

Next Meeting Agenda/Activity: Decide whether using guiding principles for major-course sequencing work, if yes - decide how to communicate to faculty. Finalize major-course sequencing approval process.

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.