

Guided Pathways Update to Academic Senate

18 October 2023

Written by: John Stover (Parts Three / Four & Conclusion) and Matthew Long (Parts One / Two)

Contributors (alpha by last name): Anne Donegan, Ann Foster, Andrew Gratto-Bachman, Michael Hale, Tara Johnson, Roam Romagnoli, Nancy Persons, Katrina Smith.

Outline	Pages
Part One: Recent Town Halls	1
Part Two: GP Plan and Workgroup	1 – 2
Part Three: Status Update on Existing GP Projects	2 – 7
Part Four: Addressing Recently Raised Concerns	8 – 12
Part Five: Conclusion	13

Part One: Recent Town Halls

The District held five Guided Pathways (GP) town halls in September/October (three in Santa Rosa, one in Petaluma, and one on Zoom). The interactive gatherings focused on 1) examining student barriers through SRJC student outcome data and the lens of students, 2) gaining a shared understanding of the GP framework and key components, 3) making participants aware of the GP projects at SRJC, and 4) contributing to the District GP Work Plan by identifying barriers our students face and solutions The District could implement to address them.

The input given at town hall sessions is being utilized by the GP plan workgroup to draft the required work plan.

If you were unable to attend, you are encouraged to review the Town Hall materials at the [Guided Pathways website](#).

Part Two: GP Plan and Workgroup

Santa Rosa Junior College (SRJC) is actively engaged in a comprehensive effort to develop a Guided Pathways work plan due to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO). The District is dedicated to completing this strategic plan by the end of the Fall

semester, signaling a commitment to achieving the Guided Pathways objective of creating a student-centered college.

Guided Pathways implementation is a priority for the District in order to create a framework to improve the outcomes of students and address the disproportionate impact experienced by various identifiable groups at the college. To ensure a thorough and informed approach, the District is leveraging the expertise and knowledge of the previous Guided Pathways organizational structure workgroup, whose members were appointed by various constituent groups in the prior academic year.

Recognizing the importance of transparency and collaboration, The District plans to provide updates on the progress of the Guided Pathways plan to various shared governance bodies. This approach ensures that all relevant stakeholders within the institution have a voice and are kept well-informed throughout the planning and execution stages.

Part Three: Status Update on Existing GP Projects

(contributors for each section are noted below, and each report was lightly edited for clarity and shared with the contributors before publishing)

Academic Backpack... has been integrated with the various versions of Student Support Services already in place and that were in the process of simultaneous development. Faculty members Jessy Paisley, Michael Hale, and Elizabeth Dale partnered with Beatriz Camargo, Director, Student Outreach, Onboarding & ISP, and Michelle Vidaurri, Director, Student Engagement & Support Services. Their work will be integrated with the efforts of the Website Redesign group as well.

Thanks to Michael Hale and Michelle Vidaurri for the following update:

- GP Workgroup incorporated efforts of SRJC Connect Project and the [Student Support Guide](#) as the foundation of the entry point to the Academic Backpack. However, the language used to categorize support services was not in alignment with the goal to have easily understood and student-friendly labels. The group informally surveyed students in 8 classes across a range of disciplines for feedback to learn what resonates best for them.
- The group also met at least twice in Summer 2023 with the Website Redesign group to ensure alignment with entry points to the Academic Backpack as well as alignment in the language used for categorizing supports.
- The development of the GP solution with SRJC Connect through use of the AwardSpring software program that matches student attributes and interests with student supports is still underway. While there are some resource constraints with the Ellucian Banner Implementation progress is still being made.

-
- The Ellucian Banner project includes the CRM Advise Module which will bring the Academic Backpack aspect of the project to fruition as it will be fully integrated with student info, and includes a Student Success Dashboard with the ability for alerts to be raised. There is continuity between members of this workgroup and the Ellucian Banner Implementation Team - Michelle Vidaurri and Beatriz Camargo - and this will ensure this effort will be on the front-end of go-live dates.
 - Maintaining focus on academic and student support via faculty input and review is the continuing practice.

FYE Course: College Skills (CSKLS 51) Discovering College Pathways ...cleared Curriculum Tech Review on Wednesday, September 14th, and was approved by the Curriculum Review Committee on Monday, October 9th. The course was fully developed this past summer with the input of faculty Anne Donegan, Regina Guerra, and John Stover, with Ann Foster providing important guidance as well. Kudos also to the Curriculum Office for their expertise in helping us address multiple “minimum qualifications” for faculty, and to Jessica Melvin and May Walker for their help in getting us to CTR on short notice. Involved faculty will continue the work of promoting and scheduling sections for Fall 2024 in partnership with College Skills. I know from my work with the group (J. Stover) that some actions we have been discussing include but are not limited to:

1. Whether to make this course a local requirement.
2. Promoting the course across the college.
3. Monitoring the removal of Lifelong Learning from CCCs mission and the impact on the course.
4. Reaching out to faculty and staff at CCCs/CSUs/UCs who teach similar courses.
5. Continued development of CSKL 51 as related to specific Pathways.

Many thanks to Ann Foster and Anne Donegan for the following update:

The colleagues who envisioned and created the course considered existing models at Pasadena City College and City College of San Francisco, and the CSU comparables include:

- SFSU (AMST 200): Self, Place, and Knowing: Introduction to Interdisciplinary Inquiry
- CSU Fullerton (UNIV 100): Foundations for College Success and Lifelong Learning.

Expected Next Steps and Senate Support. We know from the GP townhall that transparent integration of what already exists and what has been built via GP work is a major goal, and we ask for the Senate to take the next steps to integrate CSKLS 51 into existing structures as well as newly envisioned GP work. Integration of the FYE course - which is now CSKLS 51 - was

originally envisioned in the [Workgroup Descriptions](#) voted on by the Senate in November 2020 as follows:

"This course would be anchored in SRJC's FYE program to connect students with interdisciplinary learning experiences, learning support, and engagement activities across the district. Multiple sections of this course could be integrated through a common read and/or shared community intellectual experiences."

If the report could also include the steps Senate, Senate GP workgroups, and GP leads are taking to integrate this FYE CSKLS 51 course into the broader FYE Program envisioned via the Senate Workgroups in November 2020, that would be great. [Editor's note: See also Part Five – Conclusion].

This course can be taught in so many ways and open doors for some excellent cross-disciplinary collaboration, exploration, and learning.

FYE Experience... Arising from both recommendations from the Academic Senate GP FYE team (see [2022](#) and [2023](#) AS reports) and an FYE Action Team of the Integrated Student Success Committee, there is one cohort of students currently in a pilot of a First Year Experience Program. The pilot is hosted by EOPS and includes thirty, first generation, undecided students in alignment with the goals with the Student Equity Plan 2.0. The program includes three components: 1) a summer bridge program; 2) shared classes, with at least one as a “home room” and one a counseling class; and, 3) an out-of-class engagement program. Members of the FYE Action Team include long-term GP faculty workgroup contributors Roam Romagnoli and Chris Cullen, and significant past contributors include Michael Hale and Byron Reaves (prior to his departure from the college). [The ISSC Action Team meeting materials are available here.](#)

Thanks to Roam Romagnoli and Michael Hale for the following update:

Current Status of Implementation/Integration Activities: The FYE workgroup engaged in deep research, inquiry, and design before piloting a summer bridge and FYE this fall. The FYE workgroup decided against creating an FYE course so as not to increase students' unit burden. While stand-alone FYE courses are common in 4-year First Year Experience programs, we chose (in correlation with Dr. Smotherman's Fa23 PDA on equity and unit burdens [SESSION #: S1:06 Defining Equity]) that requiring these additional courses of our students who are mostly part-time would exacerbate disproportionate impact on hyper-marginalized students—the very students we are designing this program to support.

The majority of our first-generation students are LatinX and Foster Youth as one of groups most consistently marked as disproportionately impacted in our state and local data. Current research demonstrates that identity-based courses can help students navigate a critical process of identity formation in their first year and is a key retention strategy. With this in mind,

the FYE workgroup is committed to having Ethnic Studies serve as the cornerstone course for FYE programs, which has the double positive impact of fulfilling a state-mandated requirement.

After finishing their inquiry and design phases, the action team drafted a proposal and sent it to the VP of Student Services as a recommendation. Robert Ethington funded the project with retention money from the state in alignment with lessons learned from the strategic enrollment management conference.

Expected Next Steps and Goals: We are designing processes and metrics for ongoing program review and continued improvement, as well as looking at opportunities to scale-up this pilot.

Requests for Senate Support: The support of senate has been critical in getting this work off the ground, and now it is time for a districtwide and cross-constituency approach to this work. It makes great sense for Guided Pathways to be partnered with ISSC if we do not create a separate district wide structure to continue to scale this work. [Editor's note: See also Part Five – Conclusion].

Mapping [and Scheduling]... Faculty from the workgroup continue to be updated by the Curriculum Office regarding [program maps as related to the new software solution, which are available here](#). Additional work will be needed to support program maps, particularly in creating part-time paths and supplemental materials. In addition, the Program Mapper is pending implementation with the roll-out of the student journey website redesign project. The last update from Curriculum occurred in August 2023. Faculty Tara Johnson, Catherine Williams, Monica Ohkubo, Tara Jacobson, Summer Winston, and John Stover have all been key contributors, and Chas Crocker and Josh Adams from Curriculum have been invaluable contributors as well.

[Scheduling] is in brackets because up to the present day, the group has been unable to address this part of the charge. The work group will continue to seek ways to promote positive change on both Mapping and Scheduling going forward.

Thanks to Tara Johnson and Chas Crocker for the following update, and also include carry over objectives from [the Senate GP Spring 2023 report](#):

- In follow up to concerns expressed in Spring, the GP Mapping Workgroup solicited feedback from the Counseling Department, specific disciplines, and students for input on the Program Mapper setup which has been implemented.
- Areas of study descriptors and specific degree pathways were refined but we were not able to have consistent alphabetized listing order due to software limitations.
- The workgroup would also like to discuss the creation of recommended course sequences for part-time students.
- *Other questions to be resolved going forward remain [carried over from [Spring 2023](#)*

[report](#)]...

- o As the Ellucian SIS is brought in, can the new software make program mapper more adaptable/useful for students?*
 - o The integration of Guided Pathways goals within the Curriculum Office is an important part of the implementation process still unfolding.*
 - o How do we make the most of the Program Mapper solution in reaching the GP goals of “a dynamic, interactive solution that would allow students to investigate all their possible academic options?”*
- *Other goals and projects should include [also carried over [from Spring 2023 report](#)]:*
 - o Ongoing mapping and scheduling projects (multi-year projects) require involvement of DCC, faculty, and department level planning and execution going forward.*
 - o Student-facing explanations of academics and the relationship of knowledge and its relation to majors, programs, degrees, careers, and future work and learning opportunities are needed across all activities.*
 - o Work on language/descriptions/ways in which to help students understand the different ways of thinking about topics a la artistic, psychological, economical, sociological, political, philosophical, (ad infinitum) and the integration of their coursework as it relates to future opportunities of work and career.*
 - o The highlighting and integration of topics not on students’ radars will be of benefit to both students and departments, programs, and courses.*

Unbracketing Scheduling

[Scheduling was included in the initial Guided Pathways recommendations from the Academic Senate](#). The work group had proposed a robust query and discussion on all facets of scheduling including current and past practices and more forward thinking, IDEAA-focused processes that may be investigated and proposed. However, this recommendation was tabled by the past Academic Senate President and the past Vice President, with Academic Affairs stating that a new scheduling software would meet these needs. The GP Scheduling and Mapping Workgroup was not in agreement with this decision as the software is only one component of scheduling and does not address many common practices that do not fully appreciate IDEAA ideals. [Editor’s note: See also Part Five – Conclusion].

Website Redesign... Leila Rand, Web Developer in IT, and Faculty Members Katrina Smith and April Oliver [currently on sabbatical] are/have been key contributors. They have all done a tremendous amount of work on making our websites more student-friendly as supported by their inquiry and research with students over the years of the project. None of the efforts in this

work would have been possible without the unflappable vision of Emeritus Faculty Terri Frongia throughout the Inquiry and Design phases; and, Leila Rand, Web Developer in IT, who has been leading the charge with her web expertise during the integration efforts more recently. Many thanks, also, to Associate Counselor and Student Success Team Coordinator Andrew Gratto-Bachman for his ongoing service and commitment. We are deeply grateful for each of their contributions!

Thanks to Katrina Smith, Leila Rand, and Andrew Gratto Brachman for the following update:

Student Journey Website Workgroup Update Fall 2023

Student Journey Web Group includes Andrew Gratto-Bachman, Leila Rand, Katrina Smith, and April Oliver (on sabbatical).

The Web Task Force team is building a module, housed on the District home page, that will direct five student types (new, current, returning, high school dual enrollment, and ESL) through the steps needed to help students thrive in a strong community that supports their academic goals. The emphasis is to center student needs and perspectives by simplifying the academic journey and highlighting student supports that will help students to get the most out of their time at the college.

This is not a website redesign but a module for a student-centered pathway by eliminating silos.

The work group has nearly finished builds for four of the five student types; the last one should be completed by the end of October 2023. Each student type will have a pathway with specific tasks itemized from the student perspective to connect them to resources necessary to complete their goals.

At that point the work group will need to add finishing touches and complete testing to ensure that all elements are working as intended. The goal is to unveil the work by early/mid November.

Requests from Senate:

1. To provide leadership and support to integrate all GP workgroups & goals into the structure of the college
2. To Identify stakeholder groups for roadshows and to recognize the role research and student input played in this work
3. To facilitate consistency of GP goals (i.e, a STUDENT FOCUS) and to encourage the same focus for department websites
4. To be aware of changes that will be needed in the future when updating based on ESL department rebranding
5. To be aware and recognize Andrew Gratto-Bachman's name as part of the GP workgroup, as he has contributed a student services perspective since 2020.
[Editor's note: See also Part Five – Conclusion].

Part Four: Addressing Recently Raised Concerns

On October 11, 2023 the Academic Senate Executive Committee received *the following questions and concerns from a Senator [copied verbatim and without attribution]*

I have some questions and concerns about GP, and this timeline might be helpful:

2020

As you know that Senate voted in November of 2020, to approve all of the recommendations of the GP task force; Webpage Redesign, Academic Backpack, FYE Experience, including an interdisciplinary course, and Schedule and Mapping.

2021

Job Descriptions were put together for each project, the District negotiated with the union agreeing on how many hours would be paid for each project, and then job announcements went out in 2021. Attached is the document clearly defining these special assignments for faculty in May of 2021.

This document and many others said that these projects needed to be completed or near completed by June of 2022. Well over 1,000 work hours were allotted for the faculty members working on these projects.

2022

In May of 2022, Workgroups reported to the Senate, this document is also attached. Here's a quick summary:

Webpage: *This is a huge project and original funding insufficient for the faculty to do the work, more funds were requested and approved by the District.*

Academic Backpack: *Did a lot of work, used all of the hours allotted. Asks for more hours for summer and fall 2022 work faculty and \$10,000 plus for technical and STNC support. Goal is for Academic Backpacks for all students.*

FYE interdisciplinary course on academic discovery: *50 hours of work was predicted for summer and fall work. Goal was to complete COR and get it to CRC in the fall of 2022. Report states that stages 3 & 4 will be completed by the end of the Fall 2022 semester.*

Scheduling and Mapping: *Worked on Student Journey Mapping, which will be linked directly on the SRJC main homepage and represented over an image of the iconic SRJC oak tree; reported on consolidated areas of study into eight "branches" or categories; noted student support programs are all listed with drop down and links at the "root" of tree; pointed out student affinity groups and communities. Reported that this work is completed and that they didn't need any more hours. Ready to hand over to district for implementation in Fall of 2022. The group recommends faculty consultation through Fall of 2022.*

FYE Program: *Worked on gathering all current programs related to FYE and put in one place with supporting links in the website. Used all of allotted hours, more were requested for summer work. Goal by end of Fall of 2022: to research how other schools package FYE, and a pilot program using current classes and programs.*

*The minutes of the November 2nd Senate meeting states: the Senate recommend to the District the establishment of a **short-term**, high priority, multi-constituent workgroup whose purpose is to propose a structure for a Guided Pathways as soon as possible.*

At this meeting the Senate also approved the creation of a GP Faculty Coordinator. The motion includes language that the specifics of this position would need to be negotiated.

2023

The short-term multi-constituent workgroup which will propose a structure was created. In February of 2023, Dean Long gave an update to the Senate on all of the above projects. It is important to note that in Dean Long's report he omits the word, "short-term" yet adds the word "future" GP work, which isn't what the Senate voted on.. The document that he shared with the Senate describes the group's charge this way:

Charge: "At its November 2 meeting, the Academic Senate voted to make a recommendation to develop a multi constituent workgroup to develop recommendations for a structure for future GP work. President Chong agreed and believed that the success of the GP initiatives will require an institution wide commitment and contributions from all groups, [and as such,] formed a GP Planning Workgroup to begin meeting in spring 2023, with a goal of bringing recommendations forward by March 6."

This document states that the workgroups were continuing to make progress, but because of the size of these projects more time and money were needed.

Questions:

- 1. Were recommendations forwarded by March 6th, 2023? If so, to whom, and what were they?*
- 2. Was the GP Faculty Coordinator position ever created?*
- 3. What does short-term mean about this multi-constituency group recommending structure?*
- 4. I was told that certain people have dropped off groups and that new people joined. How were these new people chosen? Was there a call for applicants?*
- 5. In regards to future work, who decides what it will be? Is this going to be under the Senate anymore?*

Concerns:

- 1. A number of faculty members who were working on the Mapping and Backpack groups say that the groups stopped meeting mid-way through Spring of 2023. One colleague states, "I just stopped getting emails about attending meetings." Another told me, "The workgroups stopped meeting, I am sure there will be an update soon." Does this mean that the work is completed?*
- 2. The Senate voted in November of 2022, to create a multi-constituency group that would make recommendations about structure, not future GP work. The February document presented to the Senate is misleading.*
- 3. Matthew's document talks about moving FYE work over to ISSC, which is not mentioned in the original plan back in 2020. If people on ISSC want to work on any project, they need to apply for the positions like the rest of us.*
- 4. Looking at the current list of workgroups in an email sent by Senator Stover on October 10th, 2023, there are two workgroups with no faculty members.*

[end of email inquiry]

Senator Stover has prepared the following statements in consultation with Senate President Persons and GP Administrator Matthew Long ...

Re Q#1: Were recommendations forwarded by March 6th, 2023? If so, to whom, and what were they?

Answer: Yes, the final report, dated 6 March 2023, was brought forward via email to then-President Chong on 7 March 2023; shared as an information item at the 3 May 2023 Academic Senate Meeting [[the recommendations](#), [in the Senate President’s Report](#), and [a brief summary report from Senator Stover](#)]; and presented to President Garcia upon her arrival at the college.

Re Q#2: Was the GP Faculty Coordinator position ever created?

Answer: Good point. The GP Faculty Coordinator was included in the plan presented to President Chong, and later to President Garcia, but has not yet been brought forward for negotiation or formalization due to the lack of overall structure across the District and specific to GP. John Stover serves as the GP Liaison for the Academic Senate Executive Committee (as first established by past President J. Thompson), which has involved communication and coordination efforts specific to the integration of existing GP projects. In 2017-2018 the ASCCC suggested the following specific to a Liaison role for faculty, which may or may not be still useful locally depending on the next steps the college takes:

Guided Pathways Liaison Expectations

- Consult with the senate leaders to create a mechanism for the most effective communication with faculty at the local campus about issues of common concern and/or support for Guided Pathways;
- Monitor local and regional Guided Pathway discussions and act as a resource for local inquiries;
- Identify local issues of particular concern around a Guided Pathway approach and convey those to the ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force;
- Communicate opportunities for faculty to participate through the ASCCC in statewide workgroups, committees and taskforces in relation to Guided Pathways;
- Serve as a conduit between the local faculty and the ASCCC Guided Pathways Taskforce representatives;
- As local funding permits, attend statewide events related to Guided Pathways.

Re Q#3: What does short-term mean about this multi-constituency group recommending structure?

Answer: There’s never been any formalization up to this point, as far as we are aware, when it comes to length of duration as specific to workgroups, task forces, or even “short-term” as referenced above. This is an area in which the District would benefit by establishing shared definitions and related processes that support a universal understanding of these and other terms specific to how Senates, Bargaining Units, and all constituencies conduct business at the

college. The ASEC has been moving in this direction already as specific to the application of DEIAA principles when making faculty appointments, and continued improvement is sought.

Re Q#4: I was told that certain people have dropped off groups and that new people joined. How were these new people chosen? Was there a call for applicants?

Answer: College personnel and resources were sought out based on the implementation and integration needs of each GP project and specific to pre-existing District structures and personnel best equipped to support the projects long-term. Strategies for implementation were discussed at Academic Senate on [October 5th](#) and [October 19th](#), 2022 and based on consultation with [ASCCC on September 29th 2022](#). There has not been a new call for applicants during the implementation and integration phase (since Spring 2023). Because integration and implementation required targeted strategies supported by knowledgeable personnel, a general call for applicants was not appropriate. See also Part Five – Conclusion.

Re: Q#5: In regards to future work, who decides what it will be? Is this going to be under the Senate anymore?

We would expect the Academic Senate to be consulted on any 10+1 matters related to Guided Pathways. During Phase One of Guided Pathways, the District tasked the Academic Senate with the Inquiry and Design phases of the work, which the Senate did and continues to carry out. The District is leading Phase Two of GP, and commitments from our College President, Vice President of Academic Affairs, and Vice President of Student Services have assured us of the Senate's continued role in all 10 + 1 matters specific to GP at SRJC.

Re: C#1: A number of faculty members who were working on the Mapping and Backpack groups say that the groups stopped meeting mid-way through Spring of 2023. One colleague states, "I just stopped getting emails about attending meetings." Another told me, "The workgroups stopped meeting, I am sure there will be an update soon." Does this mean that the work is completed?

Answer (also stated in answer to Q#4): College personnel and resources were sought out based on the implementation and integration needs of each GP project and specific to pre-existing District structures and personnel best equipped to support the projects long-term. Strategies for implementation were discussed at Academic Senate on [October 5th](#) and [October 19th](#), 2022 and based on consultation with [ASCCC on September 29th 2022](#). There has not been a new call for applicants during the implementation and integration phase (since Spring 2023). Because integration and implementation required targeted strategies supported by knowledgeable personnel, a general call for applicants was not appropriate. See also Part Five – Conclusion.

Re: C#2: The Senate voted in November of 2022, to create a multi-constituency group that would make recommendations about structure, not future GP work. The February document presented to the Senate is misleading.

Answer: It is not clear in this concern what is misleading about the February document. As stated in Part Two of this report:

Guided Pathways implementation is a priority for the District in order to create a framework to improve the outcomes of students and address the disproportionate impact experienced by various identifiable groups at the college. To ensure a thorough and informed approach, the District is leveraging the expertise and knowledge of the previous Guided Pathways organizational structure workgroup, whose members were appointed by various constituent groups in the prior academic year.

Re: C#3: Matthew's document talks about moving FYE work over to ISSC, which is not mentioned in the original plan back in 2020. If people on ISSC want to work on any project, they need to apply for the positions like the rest of us.

Answer (also stated in answer to Q#4): College personnel and resources were sought out based on the implementation and integration needs of each GP project and specific to pre-existing District structures and personnel best equipped to support the projects long-term. Strategies for implementation were discussed at Academic Senate on [October 5th](#) and [October 19th](#), 2022 and based on consultation with [ASCCC on September 29th 2022](#). There has not been a new call for applicants during the implementation and integration phase (since Spring 2023). Because integration and implementation required targeted strategies supported by knowledgeable personnel, a general call for applicants was not appropriate. See also Part Five – Conclusion.

Re: C#4: Looking at the current list of workgroups in an email sent by Senator Stover on October 10th, 2023, there are two workgroups with no faculty members.

Answer: All workgroups have always had faculty involvement and continue to include faculty where applicable to the implementation of the project. **(And as also stated above in Q#4):** College personnel and resources were sought out based on the implementation and integration needs of each GP project and specific to pre-existing District structures and personnel best equipped to support the projects long-term. Strategies for implementation were discussed at Academic Senate on [October 5th](#) and [October 19th](#), 2022 and based on consultation with [ASCCC on September 29th 2022](#). There has not been a new call for applicants during the implementation and integration phase (since Spring 2023). Because integration and implementation required targeted strategies supported by knowledgeable personnel, a general call for applicants was not appropriate. See also Part Five – Conclusion.

Part Five: Conclusion

- As highlighted in the recent Town Halls, “Guided Pathways is a holistic, systemic approach to make the educational journey more transparent, manageable, and goal-oriented for students. By providing a program roadmap, proactive support, and clear communication, Guided Pathways institutions aim to increase student retention, completion rates, and overall satisfaction with the educational experience.”
- The Academic Senate initiated several projects using the Guided Pathways framework during the first five years of the state-wide initiative (2017-23), has done, and continues to do a tremendous job in carrying out the will of the Senate as each project is integrated throughout the college.
- Due to a lack of institutional adoption, structure, and leadership, the Senate has been doing the work of the District as specific to the integration and implementation of Guided Pathways at SRJC. This needs to change as soon as possible.
 - Reading through the Projects updates as they have evolved from Spring 23 to Fall 23, it is very clear – as based on the many requests and evidence presented by our faculty, classified, and administrator contributors throughout this report – that the work of the Senate can, should, and must – as soon as possible – be taken up by the District.
 - Our College President, Vice President of Academic Affairs, and Vice President of Student Services have all indicated that Guided Pathways is a priority for the District. It is time for that commitment to be reflected in the District-wide deployment of resources and personnel as Guided Pathways is integrated and implemented across the college.
 - The Academic Senate is not a program, not a department, and not a project management entity. We have served our role in supporting the Inquiry, Design, and (start of) Guided Pathways across the District and beyond our resources, scope, and budget.
- With this in mind, the needs identified in Part Three should be organized as specific to the correct constituencies, shared governance structures, and personnel best suited to support GP across the District.
 - The Academic Senate, in its recommendation and consultation roles, can, should, and will be involved in that work.
 - To that end and in continued support of Guided Pathways, an “easy start” is to reframe “Requests for Senate Support” to “Requests for District Support” as quickly as possible.
- To date and despite the limitations described above, the Academic Senate and their colleagues across the college – classified, students, administrators, and community members – have been successful in advancing the goals of Guided Pathways as represented in the projects described in Part Three.
- More regular updates will follow this semester as we all work with the District to support the integration and implementation of Guided Pathways across the college.