**Guided Pathways Leadership Taskforce**

Meeting Notes

February 5, 2018

2:00 – 3:30 p.m.

1. **Follow up on previous commitments**

Previous commitments were reviewed. Sue followed up with Elizabeth Cox Brand regarding Rob Johnstone’s presentation. It has been posted to Moodle. David arranged a meeting with the workgroup leads and Lori to discuss communications. Dawn presented on guided pathways at the department chairs and directors meeting. Dawn also touched base with Leslie, who said that the most effective way to communicate with the part-time faculty would be for Dawn to send her some information, which Leslie would pass along. Brittany, a part-time faculty member, notes that she hadn’t received any guided pathways communication from Leslie. Dawn will loop back to Leslie. Lisa R. and Sue did a presentation to the curriculum committee, discussing the ways their work will eventually overlap. Lisa will post the presentation to Moodle.

Sue shared a summary of the meta-majors survey that went out to faculty, staff, and students. They received 696 responses, including 418 students, 110 classified, 138 faculty, and 30 admin/confidential. The two that rose to the top were Educational Focus and Area of Interest. The final name may end up being mash-up, such as Focus Area, as that is easier to pluralize that Education Focus would be.

1. **GP & IR presentations**

Lisa Anh joined the meeting to discuss her thoughts on communication and how Institutional Research (IR) could help. She shared that we (the taskforce) know what we’re doing, but that she isn’t sure that everyone else is understanding the scope of guided pathways and why we’re doing it. At Fall Inservice, we discussed what guided pathways is and why we need it – the board game activity helped people understand. However, we need to continuously build on that.

IR would like to create a one-page sheet, providing a high-level understanding of guided pathways– something easy to understand, with a blurb about what guided pathways is, includes key statistics, and provides a brief update on the College’s status with implementing guided pathways. This high-level document could be shared with advisory committees and other stakeholders.

In addition to this, IR would create an infographic with statistics on our students. David suggested using data from our strategic priority indicators, including information such as out of 10 students, X number graduated in 2 years, X number graduate in 6 years, etc. In addition to tying in strategic priority indicators, data collected for Mission Fulfillment can also be included.

Lisa Anh will bring a sample infographic to the March taskforce meeting. Eboni suggested that Lisa Anh also be invited to future guided pathways communication plan meetings with Lori.

Lisa Anh asked if there were any key data points or areas of interest that the taskforce members would like to see to support their discussions. Specific conversations around data points haven’t yet been covered by the taskforce. Dawn said that the taskforce will rely on Lisa Anh, as she knows the data better than anyone else. Dustin shared that he would like to see something that shows how many credits students actually have when they graduate. David asked if we could use some of the data that emerges from our new interactions with students through Navigate. Dustin and Tara agreed that this will be possible – from the advising side, length of time and number of times a student has met with an advisor are tracked. We should also be able to know where students are at credit-wise and GPA-wise. Tara said that we will also be able to track usage of Navigate and learn about students’ interests through Major Explorer. Currently, through Student Planning, we can tell how many students have a plan and how many don’t. Jil suggested that we use data such as that to share key best practices, such as “we know that students who have a plan do better with … vs. those that don’t have a plan.” Tara suggested revisiting some data points introduced at Fall Inservice (from the EYES survey).

**Commitments:**

* Sara committed to inviting Lisa Anh to the March 5 Guided Pathways Taskforce meeting.
* Lisa Anh committed to sharing an example infographic at the March 5 meeting.
1. **Follow-up/Take-away from SSRC conference from those who attended the GP session**

Several CCC folks attended the Student Success and Retention Conference (SSRC) on February 1–2. Tara shared that there was a lot of buzz around guided pathways and that sessions were well-attended. There were two dynamic keynote presenters – Claude Steele and Aisha Fukushima. Tara and Lisa Anh did a presentation, sharing the guided pathways board game. They had 49 participants play the game and it was very well-received.

There was a Friday afternoon session specifically on engaging faculty in guided pathways led by Dr. Nicole Matos. Dr. Matos described herself as a “guided pathways convert” – someone who valued choice and freedom, but when she saw how students struggled after working in Student Services for a summer, had an a-ha moment. Dawn and Jil agreed that Dr. Matos was engaging, with a message that was particularly useful for the transfer faculty. She spoke to traditional education values, the shift in what it means to be a faculty member. Jil also shared that bringing someone in to discuss resistance with faculty could make people who aren’t feeling resistant start to worry. People may not know about guided pathways to resist.

There was some discussion regarding whether Dr. Matos would be good to bring in for Fall Inservice. This lead to a conversation around building small groups of people that are champions for the message – Dr. Matos could help rally those champions. Jil shared that Dr. Matos had thoughtful, convincing responses that will appear to places where resistance might pop up.

Dawn shared a strategy that she learned – invite a faculty member to have a discussion about guided pathways, and ask them to bring two other people. In those smaller groups of four, have a dynamic discussion regarding their thoughts on guided pathways. David thought this and the champion ideas are great strategies but shared that, before having conversations such as these, we need to agree on the message. We need everyone to be in the same ballpark, as opposed to tailgating outside for the wrong team.

Jil shared that Mary Jean Williams attended the earlier sessions on Thursday. She suggested that it might be worth checking in with her to see what she learned.

1. **Oregon Pathways Project application submission and communication timeline**

David shared an update regarding the submission of our application to the Oregon Pathways Project. Dawn submitted the online self-assessment. The application was submitted on February 1. The completed application is saved on the Moodle for those that would like to read it. Casey pointed out that Faculty Senate supported the application. There are four other colleges that we know submitted applications: Mt. Hood, Chemeketa, Southwestern, and Rogue. We are unsure when they’ll make their announcement. David thanked everyone who participated in the self-assessment and writing the application. The process took a lot of this group’s time.

Next, David discussed the communication plan. He met with the subgroup leads, Jil, and Lori, discussing three main topics:

1. **Common definitions**, language, talking points around pieces of guided pathways that we all agree on so that as we move forward. This way we’re saying the same things to different audiences. David created a draft. He would like taskforce members to provide their feedback, by no later than Friday, February 9.



1. A **master project timeline**, which includes phases, built out at least five years.
2. A **communication plan** – Lori can help with this, as she has a matrix of all of the formal meetings. In addition to formal meetings, informal Q&As, open houses, department meetings, division meetings – moving from an all staff email approach to more intimate conversations.

Nora discussed the importance of communicating our progress. We’ve submitted the Oregon Pathways grant (and received Faculty Senate approval). We surveyed staff and students on what they want to call meta-majors. We’ve developed different timelines and are honing in on what’s the best timeline. The Guided Pathways Taskforce meets on a monthly basis and subgroups meet regularly. David liked the idea of sharing progress in small bites, more regularly sending small updates, making small presentations.

Tara shared that College Relations & Marketing created a logo:



Please send your feedback on the proposed logo to Tara.

**Commitments:**

* Subgroup leads committed to reporting updates at the March 5 taskforce meeting.
* Everyone committed to reviewing David’s common definitions document (attached above) and sending him revisions or definitions for terms by Friday, February 9.
* David committed to sending out a short, succinct Guided Pathways progress update by the end of Friday, February 9.
* Max committed to pulling together the subgroup leads for a meeting.
* David committed to sending Max the mashup of his definitions document, to be reviewed at the subgroup leads’ meeting that Max is organizing.
* David committed to scheduling a communication meeting and inviting Lisa Anh to participate.
1. **Review commitments and next steps**

The next Guided Pathways Taskforce Meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 5, 2:00–3:30 p.m. Lisa Anh will be invited to this meeting to share an example infographic.