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 going forward with the Guided Pathways Transformation. The initial step included research into other colleges’ construction of meta-majors, the number, type and purpose. Begin by defining what you hope meta-majors will do for your college and your students. Then consider the following questions to create some guidelines for the process of defining meta-majors. The task is grouping programs based on a purpose and college-specific guidelines.

| **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.