Pros

Less than 4/10 of students “complete” their goals in 6 years. Period!

If we broke down silos would synergize all our efforts already happening around campus

Meta-majors show students purpose/context of disciplines and programs

Most needy students least likely to complete

Economy changing – education and programs must change too

MC already has much of this

De-emphasizes online as a solution in itself (for instruction and advising)

We have to integrate advising and instruction more for our students!

(both on our campus and with our high schools)

GP values full “counseling”

Maybe GP could break down our silos?

We could improve – let’s face it

(our onboarding, instruction, counseling . . . )

Equity agenda really supported

We need to reform how students declare their majors – MUST

We are piloting some of the Basic Skills ideas now; we also have Bridges, Multiple Measures, . . . and much else!

More IR very much needed – we still don’t have their help at the program level

Emphasis on completion in financing as an investment

More counselors – students need them!

More full-time faculty as recommended in book

Remote possibility of capped classes for capstone courses?

Even if we implement parts of GP it would still be good for our students.

The more-embedded basic skills approach laid out in the book is great and where Moorpark is

already heading.

Gives emphasis to stackable credentials to help benefit returning students.

Encourages applying Math and English skills within context of programs which allows students

to focus on their strengths and succeed.

Emphasizes more careful and earlier placement into math and English classes.

Brings students’ decision-making processes to the forefront rather than let them happen

subconsciously

Helps provide the big picture for our students.

All four areas of focus Moorpark is currently identifying can very much be improved.

Students often/usually want completion as their goal: a “return on investment” by coming to

why they are at college!

Pathways do NOT make students go in a set direction; they get to choose.

WE at Moorpark College can design this just as we want.

This addresses the “middle” group of our students, the majority who are neither unicorns nor

members of our special populations who are not covered by categorical and other funding.

Most students need this help in choosing their direction.

This is what four-year private universities provide!

Cons

Community colleges are often the first time students are able to explore their interests

Students need to learn how to navigate in their lives

“Legislate it!” doesn’t work

Funding might/will stop

MC already has much of this

Allows less time for content in instruction

It would eliminate real counseling, focusing more on specific educational expertise only

The evidence isn’t in yet!

Will make faculty teach in the high schools

More IR – top-down measuring of “success” vs real mission

Requires us to go beyond our training as faculty, as classified, etc.

Narrow breadth of courses offered

Equity issues really supported at expense of other students

Not allow for enrichment students (not the funding focus)

Focus on one groups of students (disadvantaged) vs another (advantaged)

If discipline not participate in GP discussions they will lose out.

CANNOT BE MANDATORY for our students – must have “exploratory” meta-major

It pushes “earlier is better”; some push good for decision making but not too much!

It’s just not possible to carry out the suggested reforms in book with the huge class sizes

of most of our programs

Will outcomes-based funding come next with this emphasis on completion?

Programs might be cut if they are not considered key for completion.

The emphasis focuses too much on the potential incomes of students.

We must ensure we link all elements of GP to the principles of Moorpark and of effective

Education, not just create a set-in-stone set of rules.

By trying again so hard for our students we are again risking heart-break: we will commit, work

so hard, and love – only to have it all stop with the removal of funding from the state.

Questions

What are our success rates? Are they real?

How do we start this process in high schools? How should we design our outreach?

Can we mandate (college strategies) classes?

How can we expand joint/shared professional development?

(OnCourse, Reading Apprenticeship, etc.)

How should we design our New Student Welcome/orientation sessions for Guided Pathways?

How do we break down our silos? (Yes, we have them!)

How do we communicate effectively between instructional faculty and student services?

How do we fund the extra expenses?

What happens when students fail a class? How do they get back on track?

How do you provide emotional support for our students?

Can I see some examples of meta-majors? Of mapping for disciplines?

From the completion data, which are the groups of students that particularly need guided pathways?

What is our baseline for all this?

How can our mission (to introduce our students to the broad areas of human knowledge) be preserved within the Guided Pathways framework?

How can we focus this more on our re-entry students – those who are coming back to school to

move/advance in their job or career? It seems to emphasize our high-school entrants, a

declining population.

How much will the state require outcomes for funding?

How do we ensure these possibilities are equally available for ACCESS students, etc?

How do we ensure we remember the point of all this? How do we connect all GP work with

our mission/values/this list:

* Help our students become informed, guided agencies
* Ensure integrated education (student support, instruction, across programs . . . )
* Ensure our education is integrated with the real world
* Balance freedom and exploration with guidance and structure
* Focus on a development perspective rather than addidative
* Recognize the need for each student to have one person to talk to (coach, counselor, instructor, student mentor . . . )