Pathways - Convocation 2017

Summary of Question 1 Responses

1. Institutions that have implemented Guided Pathways have provided very deliberate directions for program completion, including which general education courses to take as part of that degree. Should YC be this prescriptive? Why or why not? What are the consequences of either decision? What should be considered as part of this decision?

Depends upon your degree: terminal or not?

Depends upon the course/Gen Ed category?

Prescribe front end, not prescriptive after.

Should be prescriptive and make recommendations based on the need. If a student should take a particular Gen ed. class, then we should prescribe and recommend it. However, if there is no need we should leave options open for the student. Perhaps a drop down menu with the recommended courses on top and emphasized but list all courses under the recommended to leave options open.

We should have a pathway or sub pathway for each discipline. Example would be one for sports medicine versus coaching versus pre physical therapy etc. All have similar content but may have variables within each pathway.

Also talked about having a pathway for each individual institution for each pathway or sub-pathway.

To implement a Pathways program, as described by Dr. Johnstone, would require a significant investment in both personnel and financial resources. To try to do this on the cheap by piecing out the tasks among existing staff and faculty would not be sufficient and most certainly lead to poor success. Clearly many new advisors would be needed if nothing else. People who have been through this at other institutions can attest to this fact.

Consensus was that prescriptive is okay, as long as other options are available. Some favored suggestions over prescriptions. Everyone was in favor of narrowing the range of options.

Prescriptive with choices and with information that supports the student’s intent/goal. And with a couple of “sample” prescriptions.

If not prescriptive, students get off track. If too prescriptive, YC may not appeal to them.

How to make this work for different groups of students is the tough part.

Prescriptive focus should be based on the program providing or or two recommended options.

If you become too prescriptive, other courses suffer and may gut other programs.

If offering a program specific course that is not transferable is not meeting the need of our students that may want to transfer later.

Recommend is often perceived as required.

Need to know about the classes being recommended. Faculty input from those areas is necessary to make sure the chosen class is the best for program (i.e. if group communication is important for program then interpersonal should not be recommended. Subject area faculty need to be part of program pathway discussion.

To a degree – in the best interest of the student – we endorse the recommendation of a limited list of options to meet Gen Ed area studies requirements.

Yes, it should be prescriptive (it depends on the program).

Students are either degree seeking or not.

Advisors should be specialized in different degree programs.

Need to reassign teachers that lose their classes. Commitment from YC to retain current faculty.

Have students already have their structured pathway laid out for them for their entire program.

Is there a possibility of auto enrollment if the student is already in a specific degree pathway?

Box for transfer students/non-degree/degree seeking.

Yes, we should limit Gen Ed options and in some cases we should prescribe a specific Gen Ed course.

Transfer: Gen Ed classes should be limited or prescribed based on what meets degree requirements at a transfer institution (not for elective credit).

AAS: If it could lead to transfer then see above. If terminal, then, the Gen Ed courses must meet career requirements.

Prescriptive in certain programs.

CTE, years ago, had specific Gen Ed courses for cohort – worked.

Stopped being prescriptive and students lost “cohort,” took online, if failed, never completed Gen Ed just program requirements.

Art – not prescriptive – allow flexibility in taking courses.

The level of prescriptiveness within programs related on Gen Ed courses should be determined by the program faculty. Collaboration among course description/outcomes needs to occur among Gen Ed and program faculty.

Three to five choices.

Recommended.

Input on transferability within the degree.

Yes, prescriptive. Less confusion, easier scheduling.

If yes, less student freedom, greater chance of success.

If no, student free for all; transfer requirements not met.

Should be recommended not absolute.

What we do now from catalog, if we know something is more helpful Gen Eds are afterthought, best if they are related (viticulture).

Some programs should be more prescriptive.

Applied degrees have more latitude.

Students may be protected from “hard” classes.

AAS degree – do we intend students to stop at AAS or prepare them to transfer? Prevent backtracking.

Early advising is key.

Consequences will be limiting student experience. Students miss out; shallow education.

Website improvement – need to be more transparent.

Do not be prescriptive for the sake of being prescriptive. If there is a good reason, recommend or require. If too prescriptive, student may miss out.

|  |
| --- |
| Prescriptive |
| Pro | Con |
| Transferability | Broken down by semester may not be helpful for the working adult student |
| Promotes earlier goal setting | To make it work, the support services require manpower and money |
| Creating a check sheet or easily understood program flow chart would be easy | Results in difficulty if students want to change degree paths |
| Could be motivating to students |  |
| AZ transfer would prevail |  |
| Consensus Statement: We, as the college community, need to determine if the challenge is with students not knowing what to major in or if students are struggling to navigate the system.Flexibility will be required to meet the needs of the varied certificates; degree programs. |

Much groundwork needs to be done prior to making this decision: what transfers, who’s applicable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Implied vs. Actual | Suggestive |
| Pro – Keeps students on track | Accountability by students gives some autonomy |
| Con – Who decides what students take when | More students will take recommended classes |
|  | Pro – Gives opportunities to explore things they may not have thought of |
| Consensus re prescriptive vs. suggestiveNarrow choices of Gen Ed courses to fewer options based on what articulates well to what career choice is chosen. |

Other things equal, give students choice. Give students all the options but use better design (technology) to flag courses as ”recommended” for certain purposes (e.g., we could allow pop ups when you “hover” over a particular course).

Will YC make money to support this cause through increased enrollment & completers? No.

Get rid of /flag transferable courses

Cost effective?

Faculty advisor not counselor or need training

If very prescriptive, some courses lose enrollment; some gain enrollment.

Why do we have broad elective Gen Ed? The benefit is to broaden without prescriptive.

Give student as much choice as possible. Use articulation agreement as a guide.

Some courses that YC offers do not count for transfer and/or do not even count for YC.

If our YC-Gen Ed courses that transfer or articulate are clearly identified, may be best to give them a choice on all the other areas.

We are prescribing for courses that are guarantee transfer to all three AZ universities. Anything University prescribed we should align and prescribe if possible.