This document is a collection of various considerations colleges have used to guide their mapping of 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 in implementing a guided pathways transformation. It is helpful to determine what you hope program maps will do for your college and your students. Consider and respond to the following questions to create guidelines for the process of mapping programs at your college.

| **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 complete 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? Will there be 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 since it is not a sustainable practice. Use policies, 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. |  |
| * 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. Include students that are connected to other students and will report back. |  |
| * How will remediation and basic skills progression fit within programs? | Determining the role of remediation and basic skills in each program 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? |  |