This document is a collection of various considerations colleges have used to guide their construction of meta-majors. No college has used all of these, but rather a combination that suited their ability to move forward consistent with their college mission, vision, and values, while providing assurances of iterative review and data analysis in implementing a guided pathways transformation. Initial steps in implementation often consist of research into other colleges’ construction of meta-majors, including the number, type and purpose. Then, it is helpful to determine what you hope meta-majors will do for your college and your students. Consider and respond to the following questions to create guidelines for the process of defining meta-majors at your college.

| **C:\Users\Janet\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\IE\WTVA0MA0\finish[1].png** | **Questions/ Considerations for developing Meta-major Guidelines** | **Examples of how this may affect implementation & decision making** | **1. Is this question relevant for your college?** **2. Who should attend these discussions?** **3. Who makes the final decision?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Beginning with the end in mind** | * How will the organizers begin with the end in mind, focus on career goals, and group majors based on the end result?
 | Transfer may be the end of a pathway, but for many students, employment is the target. Will transfer requirements and post-baccalaureate employment influence meta-major groupings?  |  |
| * How will student voice be integrated into the planning?
 | The current structure of departments and divisions is unclear to students. Meta-majors must be clearly designed and described so students and institutions can unambiguously describe the pathways and groupings. |  |
| * Will meta-major organization include minimizing time to completion?
 | Guided pathways should reduce time to completion, but this intersects with many areas e.g. scheduling & programs |  |
| * Will meta-majors provide opportunity for exploration?
 | What will happen to students who do not have a major or goal yet? |  |
| * Will meta-major organization maximize transfer and employment connections? If so, how?
 | How will increasing completion and employment influence re-organization? Will technical courses provide short- term employment and transfer options? |  |
| **C:\Users\Janet\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\IE\PF8HBOS8\15170-illustration-of-a-magnifying-glass-pv[1].png** | **Questions/ Considerations for developing Meta-major Guidelines** | **Examples of how this may affect implementation & decision making** | **1. Is this question relevant for your college?** **2. Who should attend these discussions?** **3. Who makes the final decision?** |
| **Meta-majors and Clarity** | * Will a guiding framework (e.g. four pillars, CCCCO design principles, equity, or a unique college-specific concept) unify re-design?
 | Using a college-specific framework or overarching design will link the meta-majors to a goal and vision. It also helps support messaging and outreach. |  |
| * Will meta-major construction sustain status quo, be thoughtfully and incrementally creative, or use agile innovation with rapid change and evaluation?
 | Colleges have various schema for creating departments, divisions, dean areas, etc. But these were usually NOT constructed based on pathways. Will the college reorganize leadership or add a GP layer? |  |
| * How will meta-major groupings foster the use of data, inquiry, and evidence and encourage participants to take ownership of goals and performance?
 | Deciding early what data is needed and how to communicate timely data is advantageous in successfully understanding the different supports and messaging needed for meta-major students and faculty. |  |
| * What does it mean to be a discipline or program in a meta-major?
 | Reorganizing, after decades of static cultural organization, will require rationale, understanding, and identity. Creating meta-majors because that is what you do in guided pathways – is not a sustainable rationale for change. |  |
| * Will meta-majors be constructed with the math pathways as a driver?
 | The appropriate math pathway is the first step in identifying pathways for students and affects the way programs are clustered in meta-majors. Are these already mapped across programs? |  |
| C:\Users\Janet\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\IE\WTVA0MA0\collaborate_share[1].jpg | **Questions/ Considerations for developing Meta-major Guidelines** | **Examples of how this may affect implementation & decision making** | **1. Is this question relevant for your college?** **2. Who should attend these discussions?** **3. Who makes the final decision?** |
| **Meta-majors and Collaboration** | * Who needs to be part of the discussions and how will decisions be made as to final structure?
 | Participants must include discipline faculty but should also include experts from financial aid, admissions and records, counseling and advising, student support etc. Groupings may affect financial aid and ability to declare a major as well as registration and application processes. |  |
| * How will faculty from disciplines within the meta-majors work together? And to what end?
 | Something new with guided pathways is the connection between disciplines. This is essential to make general education clear and relevant and to allow and plan for exploration.  |  |
| * How will CTE programs of study will be included? Will CTE be integrated with majors or kept in separate meta-majors, or integrated?
 | Some CTE programs are very specific and coursework does not overlap much. Other programs are scaffolded allowing further educational advancement. Should the meta-majors be developed to enhance this? |  |
| * How will counseling and advising be represented in the meta-majors?
 | One point of conflict can develop between counseling and advising by discipline faculty. How will this be coordinated to ensure integration? |  |
| * How will partners across systems, CSU, K-12 & the CCCCO, be included in the meta-major discussion?
 | Communicating pathways to high schoolers so that they can make informed decisions is important. Transfer institution requirements inform GE selection. |  |
|  | **Questions/ Considerations for developing Meta-major Guidelines** | **Examples of how this may affect implementation & decision making** | **1. Is this question relevant for your college?** **2. Who should attend these discussions?** **3. Who makes the final decision?** |
| **Meta-majors and Integration** | * Are meta-majors designed around a framework integrating initiatives and funding sources?
 | Equity, SSSP, Basic Skills, Title 5 – these have all been siloed in areas of the colleges. Will the funding be integrated, flow to all meta-majors or remain separate? |  |
| * How will remediation and basic skills progression fit within each meta-major?
 | Determining the role of remediation in each metamajor or as a separate unit is important. Remember, additional work falls on English, ESL, Reading and Math. |  |
| * What organizational structures are necessary to support the meta-majors?
 | Typically, colleges structure organization around people (deans & VPs), budgets, or buildings. Guided pathways structures are based on the end goals and student needs. |  |
| * How/Will meta-majors affect scheduling of classes?
 | How does independent departmental scheduling influence institutional and collaborative effort? |  |
| * What is the cycle or calendar to assure meta-major construction is reviewed and iterative?
 | Calendaring review of the decisions make it easier to move forward with drafts or first versions and transparency. |  |
| * Will meta-majors be constructed based on overlapping coursework to reduce unit loss?
 | What overlaps in course work and general education exist. Students will change majors; does the overlap save potentially lost units? |  |
| * Will the groupings (meta-majors) be inclusive or exclusive or will they follow a set of rules?
 | Some programs will want to exclude others and other programs will feel they belong in multiple meta-majors. |  |
| C:\Users\Janet\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\IE\J38KXPRD\juggle[1].jpg | **Questions/ Considerations for developing Meta-major Guidelines** | **Examples of how this may affect implementation & decision making** | **1. Is this question relevant for your college?** **2. Who should attend these discussions?** **3. Who makes the final decision?** |
| **Meta-majors and Manageability** | * Will existing data be used to determine what programs belong in what meta-majors? Will the planning examine the overlap of required and elective courses within meta-majors?
 | The college will need to create a database of the programs and component courses. Some curriculum programs may be able to download this for colleges. |  |
| * Would planning for future data collection clarify initial organizational structure?
 | Currently most colleges have these data by course, but not by program.  |  |
| * Will classification into meta-majors split departments based on outcomes (e.g. Biology was split with majors in STEM and Allied Health Pre-requisites in a Health Sciences meta-major)?
 | When looking at the end of a program, certain traditional departments may find themselves split into two meta-majors, will this work for the college? In many cases divisions will be split based on math requirements and common courses. |  |
| * Will the meta-majors create new metrics like the KPI’s?
* 15 units first semester
* 30 units first year
* Completion of transfer level math and English in first year
* Units to complete a degree
* Time to complete a degree
* Completions – Transfer and awards
 | New metrics that are current (semesterly) help colleges understand whether the reorganization is benefitting students. These examples of mileposts or metrics are new and not reported as a usual part of the CCCCO Scorecard. Would new metrics be considered for the required Accreditation ISS Institution Set Standards? |  |
| C:\Users\Janet\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\IE\J38KXPRD\juggle[1].jpg | * **Questions/ Considerations for developing Meta-major Guidelines**
 | **Examples of how this may affect implementation & decision making** | **1. Is this question relevant for your college?** **2. Who should attend these discussions?** **3. Who makes the final decision?** |
| **Meta-majors and Manageability** | * Will the groupings consider numbers of students or faculty within each of the declared majors within a meta-major so that they are similar in size; no extra-large and no super small?
 | When some meta-majors are very large and others small, the maintenance and data analysis within individual meta-majors becomes more complicated. Also assigning people to these meta-majors for support may inequitably impact certain programs. |  |
| * Will the organization of meta-majors include, cross over or create new dean positions? Department Chair?
 | How will the leadership role for meta-majors be constructed? These leaders must be part of the conversation in the grouping. |  |
| * What are the responsibilities of the faculty, staff and administrators associated with the meta-major? Are these new or different from prior responsibilities within a discipline, department or division?
 | This work cannot be added to the work faculty have done in the past. It must replace work that was not effectively benefitting students. Committee structures, goals, or purposes may change. Office hours may change in content as discipline advising becomes important. Counseling hours and activities, location and interactions may change. |  |
| **Messaging** | * What structure will the college use to educate others about the metamajors?
 | This reorganization must be clearly communicated to the college, students, community and partners if it is to have any effect. Plan early on how to communicate and to get out the iterative nature of this process. |  |

This document is a collection of various considerations colleges have used to map programs. No college has used all of these, but rather a combination that suited their ability to move forward consistent with their college mission vision and values, while providing assurances of iterative review and data analysis going forward with the Guided Pathways Transformation.

| **Questions/ Considerations for developing** | **Examples of how this may affect implementation & decision making** | **1. Is this question relevant for your college?** **2. Who should attend these discussions?** **3. Who makes the final decision?** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Will general education be considered while mapping programs?
 | 60-75% of any program may be general education courses. Are the courses selected or completely open with no advice or identified with regards to beneficial GE for employment or transfer within fields or a combination of recommended but not required? |  |
| * What is the cycle or calendar to assure programs are reviewed and iterative?
 | Colleges that regular and substantive program review create more sustainable change and improvement. |  |
| * What is the process if questions of program or course cancellation arise? Is their agreement to review all courses and programs using current shared governance structures and policies – no loss of programs without a program discontinuance review & no loss of courses without a Curriculum Committee review?
 | Existing program review and curriculum processes should be used, no ad hoc or temporary decisions should overtake these processes as these kinds of processes are not sustainable. Use standards and participants currently key to your governance process to build sustainability and to communicate college-wide. |  |
| * How will programs be mapped to the correct quantitative reasoning pathways?
 | Discussions about the appropriate math for each program are key to constructing an adequate schedule of classes and a map. |  |
| * Will programs be allowed to exist in multiple metamajors?
 | Some programs feel they belong in multiple meta-majors (this makes data analysis and involvement by meta-major difficult). |  |
| * How will programs be mapped to the correct GE pathways e.g. local, CSU Breadth and IGETC?
 | GE options include local, CSU breadth and IGETC. Where do most students transfer within each program? |  |
| * How will student voice be included in program mapping?
 | Incorporating student voice, at the beginning, strengthens decision and communication. Use students that are connected & will report back. |  |
| * How will remediation and basic skills progression fit within programs?
 | Determining the role of remediation in each metamajor or as a separate unit is important. The additional work falls on English, ESL, Reading and Math. |  |
| * How will program mapping focus on employment and/or transfer?
 | Mapping with the end in mind has been loudly supported by students; how will this be accomplished? |  |
| * How will programs address minimizing time and units to completion?
 | Clear pathways should reduce time to completion but this intersects with scheduling. How will scheduling be handled for meta-majors? |  |
| * How will programs be mapped that require pre-requisite coursework?
 | Some programs require only a course or two while others require a certificate or degree. For example nursing requires almost 60 pre-requisite units.  |  |
| * Are pathways for part-time students going to be mapped?
 | If so, within what time-frame (i.e. three-year paths, four-year paths, etc.)? |  |
| * Considering some students try to transfer with local degrees, are local degrees going to include maps following CSU and/or IGETC GE pattern?
 |  |  |

Quote from a program mapping veteran 2 years into the work:

“It is very easy to get carried away with the mapper, especially when one starts to consider all of the intricate paths that can be created.  Key is to start with a manageable plan which balances clarity and detail - easier said than done 😊” Dr. Eleonora Hicks, Sociology Professor at Bakersfield College

Example of program mapping situation:

At one college the Culinary Arts program suggested they should be in the STEM metamajor because cooking is all about chemistry. After a review of the program coursework, the mapping team discovered that there were no STEM courses required or suggested in the program. The GPIT (Guided Pathways Implementation Team) suggested the CSU general education area B3 for physical science could suggest this area be fulfilled with a chemistry course and lab but that the outcomes and content of the program were not consistent with STEM.