**Survey Responses from Pathways Work Sessions Jan 12/13**

**19 Responses**

|  |
| --- |
| **3. Please list any other valuable aspects of the work session(s) that were not listed above.** |
| Having and advisor and Math faculty there was particularly helpful. Found the "Part time" part of the new flowchart very helpful. |
| Got a better handle on the big picture of all this. |
| It was mostly time and opportunity. Hearing the opinions of others in AOS was interesting. I was more concerned about Gen Ed course offerings strategically at our campuses. |
| Patti Schlosberg was available to answer questions regarding DegreeWorks. |
| Collaboration with my colleagues was really important. I became more familiar with my area of study! |
| It was most helpful for our faculty to all be together to choose the most relevant gen eds for our programs. |
| Ability to communicate with others outside my discipline. |
| Having the Deans Present |
| It was just good practice to re-evaluate my program. |
| It was excellent and identified areas that I had missed. Very valuable. |
| The conversations between program faculty, gen ed faculty and advisors were great. These don't happen enough here and I hope that they continue. |
| Having Patti Schlosberg there to help make changes. |

|  |
| --- |
| **4. What are some questions/concerns/ideas you have about the process after you have completed the "Flowchart 2.0" activity?** |
| None. We need to move from talkinig to implementation. |
| We found issues and know that we have some updating to do. |
| After much discussion with other faculty members, the majority of us did not actually change anything from the first flowchart. The idea of having gen ed faculty available was nice, but they weren't actually able to help us-- not sure I understand how a set of English faculty members could not answer a single question about other courses that could be used for the gen ed language requirement (BSA English, or communications classes), but then again, I'm not a gen ed faculty... |
| I hope we do a college wide mock- up of the courses selected. I would love to see enrollment data tied to those selections. We could then create a practice YC schedule that offers the Gen ed courses selected by number, need, and tie to a location or on-line. If you back-fill in faculty for these classes, where do we stand? |
| I did not see the other science flowcharts, so I am curious about the common semester piece. |
| There seemed to be a few different visions for the Flowchart. Our understanding was web site buttons guide the students from interest level to specific programs. Others on the pathways committee seemed to think that the first two to three courses on the flowchart should be designed to give student an overview of topics and help guide them into a specific program. |
| Couldn't we help our students by hiring more advisors and mandating advising? Instead of a bunch of pathway spreadsheets? |
| Who's responsible for the flowcharts? What happens when curriculum is updated? Who updates the flowcharts? |
| The flow chart is not as intuitive as many believe it to be. Bring some students in to review a few different styles. |
| I think I need to submit some program modifications, but they won't be approved until 2018-2019. How will that work with the implementation of the flowcharts next year? |
| I feel there is a blurring of the AAS/terminal degree goals and the AA/transfer goals. This is not a new occurrence but became more emphasized during these working sessions. This is a good thing! I believe we need to reassess the differences and be clear in our own minds about the students our specific degrees and certificates are serving. Most programs of study at YC are not transfer and never intended to be transfer but CTE regardless if a certificate or degree. However, the majority of the work we are doing is focused on transfer degrees and students. This worries me...  I believe the emphasis being placed on transfer over CTE without considering the goals of our students as opposed to what the Feds want us to measure leads many to ignore the great majority of our students and their needs. In my opinion, in order for Pathways to really be successful in the long run, we need to re-identify our intentions and goals for the various programs we have. Once we do that, the 'blur' will dissipate and we can then help our students complete what THEY want to complete. |
| I am concerned about the use of the word "recommended". Our Convocation table remarked that students interpret the word as "required." I think we have a real strong possibility to have larger programs unintentionally directing the courses YC can offer. I do not think this is the goal of our small college. I would be happy to discuss this further if anyone would like. Joani |
| Even though we only have three state universities it is still very challenging to determine best paths for transfer because they are often very different. I hope that some of our ATF groups can work on making these paths easier, especially if all or most of the community colleges have the same goals. |

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Please provide any additional comments or questions about the workshops themselves or the Pathways process.** |
| This work can (and has been) done effectively in Department Meetings. Not sure we need to spend first week back time to do it again. |
| The introduction went too fast. Hard for the less-connected and less-grounded to keep up. Hard to see the text on the screen. I really was not even sure what we were to do next. I benefited from the small group I was in that included an advisor. |
| After the first twenty minutes, the gen ed faculty drifted away from the AOS faculty, and unless we had a direct question, they seemed uninterested in participating in the discussion, with the exception of the pathways flowchart committee members. |
| I applaud the committee members for their excellent organization and preparation of materials.   I don't think we'll really see what happened with Gen Ed courses until a year or two down the road, when our enrollments start changing. Should be interesting. |
| Thank you for doing that! I bet it was a long day! |
| Very organized and informational. |
| These sessions were extremely productive. Another positive step toward the goal. |
| Collaborating with the Verde Campus was tricky :-) |
| Don't discount our current progression plans. Our faculty provided those to students on first day of classes this week and students were amazed at the information and several students used the info to adjust their course enrollments. |
| Big kudos to the organizers of the 2-day event. The Flowchart 2.0 Pathways Committee really organized the workshops very well. You really thought of everything to make this a smooth process. Nicely done. |
| n/a |
| We had done this before, and could have done this more adequately within our area. Too much time was taken away for prepping for the upcoming semester. Student success depends on us being ready as well. |
| Though I was pleased that there were Gen Ed folks at our session, I was disappointed that they wanted to sell their transfer classes for use in CTE degrees/certs while ignoring the market/type of student and their goals in favor of those transfer classes.  I was hoping they would be there to give information about what would be useful for our students- instead I felt as if they were trying to fill their sections... :-( |
| I thought the organization and productivity of the workshops were excellent! |
| This has been a great review of our degrees and certificates and I look forward to continuing the work. |
| Nice format for getting the work done. |