

GE Pathways:

Selections and Moving Forward

GE Implementation Team

William Loker, Co-Chair

Lori Beth Way, Co Chair

Cindy Bumgarner

Ken Chapman

Jennifer Lillibridge

Kate McCarthy

Chela Patterson

Thia Wolf

Charles Zartman

GE Advisory Committee

Charles Turner, Chair

Kathryn Barth

Matthew Blake

Chris Fosen

William Loker

London Long

John Mahoney

Jason Nice

James Sager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. Background: EM 10-01 and the Implementation Process 3**
- 2. Review of GEAC/GEIT Actions4**
- 3. Summary of Pathway Campus Feedback4**
- 4. Summary of Pathway Selection Criteria and Processes 9**
- 5. Pathway Selections 11**
- 6. Next Steps 28**

1. Background: EM 10-01 and the Implementation Process

[EM 10-01](#), passed by the Academic Senate on February 11, 2010, mandated the formation of a GE Implementation Team (GEIT) to work closely with the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) to accomplish the curricular changes to GE specified in the Executive Memorandum. GEIT was formed and given its charge by Provost Flake on March 5 after extensive consultation with campus leadership (Academic Senate, Deans and others). [The charge](#) to the GEIT and GEAC included:

1. Communicating and consulting with faculty and other campus stakeholders on the characteristics of the new General Education Program and the types of curricular and pedagogical changes anticipated in the new program;
2. Organizing forums – both face-to-face and virtual – where faculty can interact to discuss and create new or revised courses for General Education;
3. Facilitating faculty-to-faculty contact in the design of Foundation, American Institutions, and Pathway courses and the interaction among these courses;
4. Clearly articulating criteria for new/revised courses and Pathways;
5. Creating a straightforward and reasonable process for the initial review of courses and Pathways that is fair, transparent, and not overly onerous for the proposers or the reviewers;
6. Exploring and facilitating the formation of faculty learning communities (FLCs) or other mechanisms focused on course revision and Pathway establishment;
7. Identifying sources of financial and other support for FLCs and other mechanisms and articulating criteria for allocation of those resources;
8. Supporting the subsequent curricular approval processes called for in the EM (assessment processes for the new program, establishment of interdisciplinary minors, etc), through the appropriate shared governance processes;
9. Recommending a name for the new General Education program; and
10. Outlining the key elements of an assessment plan that addresses the program elements individually and the program as a whole.

GEAC and the GEIT also took direction from EM 10-01 and the addendum to that document on implementation. Particularly important guidance from the EM included:

- Continual reference to the GE program SLOs in all of our work with faculty;
- Making extensive use of the definition of Pathways in guiding faculty Pathway development efforts and our own evaluation of Pathway proposals;
- Emphasizing the multiple criteria articulated in the EM for selection of Pathways (quality of proposals, multidisciplinary, intellectual cohesion, balance among Pathways, meeting student demand, etc)
- Adhering closely to the desire for an open, consultative and transparent process for the selection of Pathway themes, and;
- A reasonable timeline and support for the development of Pathway concepts.

2. Review of GEAC/GEIT Actions

GEIT and GEAC are coordinating actions throughout the implementation period. Beginning in Fall 2010 the two committees have basically functioned as one “super team” meeting for three hours per week (8-9 am on Mondays and 3-5 pm on Fridays). The timeline of activities (see appendix) undertaken by GEAC and GEIT, either in partnership or as separate groups, includes:

- a. Ten public forums in the period March-May and August-October 2010;
- b. Two weeks of office hours for open consultation on GE curriculum issues;
- c. The funding of 16 “faculty learning communities” – working groups focused on course re-design or Pathway concept development – at amounts ranging from \$500-\$1500;
- d. The creation of a Google docs site for posting and sharing GE curriculum development efforts, supplemented by a continuously updated website;
- e. Consultations with Pathway developers in organized feedback sessions, and;
- f. On-line surveys of student and faculty-staff opinions regarding the Pathway concepts proposed by faculty teams.

3. Summary of Pathway Campus Feedback

To gather feedback on the proposed Pathways and get an indication of student demand, GEIT and GEAC administered two online surveys. One was administered to students, the other to faculty and staff.

The student survey was sent by email to all students enrolled (15,987). One-hundred seventy-five (175) emails were returned generating a final invitation list of 15,812. Nine-hundred sixty (960) students completed the survey for a response rate of 6.1%. Although the survey had a rather low response rate, a response rate of less than 10% is common for online surveys administered in this fashion. An analysis of the profile of the students sampled (e.g. class standing, gender, college, and major) suggest that the sample was similar to the campus population and that the survey represents a broad spectrum of students on campus. The survey asked respondents to:

- Rank order the seventeen proposed Pathways based on which the student would prefer to take.
- Respond to a five-point Strongly Disagree-Strongly Agree question regarding whether or not the student would likely pursue the Pathway as a GE minor.
- Decide how likely, if given the opportunity, the student would have taken this Pathway (using a five-point Definitely Would – Definitely Would Not scale).
- Write comments about the Pathways.

The faculty-staff survey was sent by email to all faculty and staff (2,069). Sixty-five (65) emails were returned for a final invitation list of 2,004. Two-hundred sixty-one (261) faculty and staff completed the survey for a response rate of 13.0%. Of those returned, 179 (68.6%) were faculty and 46 (17.6%) were administrators/staff (thirty-six respondents didn’t respond to this question).

The survey asked respondents to:

- Rank order the seventeen Pathways.

- Respond to a five-point Strongly Disagree-Strongly Agree question regarding whether or not the Pathway would facilitate the study, reflection, synthesis, and action related to knowledge from varied historical, cultural, scientific, and political perspectives.
- Decide if the Pathway should be included in the final set of GE Pathways (using a four-point Definitely Not – Definitely scale).
- Write comments about the Pathways.

The following table presents the overall rankings for students and faculty/staff.

Table 1. Overall Rankings of Pathways, Students and Faculty/Staff

Ranking	Students	Faculty and Staff
1	Health and Wellness	International Studies
2	Mindfulness, Self and Society	Sustainability
3	Sustainability	Science, Technologies, and Values
4	International Studies	Global Development Studies
5	Leadership	Ethics, Justice, and Social Policy
6	Ethics, Justice and Social Policy	Health and Wellness
7	Mind Brain Studies	Great Books and Ideas
8	Science, Technology and Values	Human Diversity and Inclusion
9	Food	Conflict and Cooperation Studies
10	Human Diversity and Inclusion	Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution
11	Sexuality and Gender	Leadership
12	Global Development	Mind Brain Studies
13	Peace and Conflict	Sexuality and Gender
14	Conflict and Cooperation	Peace and Conflict Studies
15	Natural and Cultural Diversity	Food
16	Visual Media	Mindfulness, Self and Society
17	Great Books and Ideas	Visual Media

In addition, we analyzed the pattern of responses for respondents "top three" and "bottom three" choices by both faculty/staff and students. This enabled us to identify Pathway concepts with strong support (and very weak support) among faculty/staff and students. That data is presented in the following tables (2-5):

Table 2. Student Rankings: Top Three Choices

Ranking	Pathway	Percent Ranked as Top Three
1	Health & Wellness	29.19%
2	Science, Technologies & Values	22.71%
3	Sustainability	22.23%
4	Food	21.85%
5	Leadership	21.65%
6	International Studies	20.79%
7	Mindfulness, Self, and Society	20.02%
8	Mind-Brain Studies	19.24%
9	Sexuality and Gender	18.76%
10	Ethics, Justice and Social Policy	16.34%
11	Great Books and Ideas	16.14%
12	Visual Media	15.37%
13	Human Diversity & Inclusion	12.57%
14	Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution	12.38%
15	Global Development Studies	11.70%
16	Peace and Conflict Studies	9.58%
17	Conflict and Cooperation Studies	9.48%

Table 3. Faculty/Staff Rankings: Top Three Choices

Ranking	Pathway	Percent Ranked as Top Three
1	Sustainability	34.59%
2	International Studies	31.90%
3	Science, Technologies & Values	29.71%
4	Ethics, Justice and Social Policy	24.82%
5	Global Development Studies	24.39%
6	Great Books and Ideas	22.55%
7	Human Diversity & Inclusion	16.42%
8	Health & Wellness	15.50%
9	Mind-Brain Studies	14.63%
10	Leadership	13.29%
11	Sexuality and Gender	13.29%
12	Conflict and Cooperation Studies	12.85%
13	Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution	11.50%
14	Mindfulness, Self, and Society	10.63%
15	Visual Media	9.29%
16	Peace and Conflict Studies	7.98%
17	Food	6.63%

Table 4. Student Rankings: Bottom Three Choices

Ranking	Pathway	Percent Ranked as Bottom Three
1	Health & Wellness	8.66%
2	Mindfulness, Self, and Society	10.26%
3	Ethics, Justice and Social Policy	12.75%
4	International Studies	12.95%
5	Sustainability	14.54%
6	Human Diversity & Inclusion	14.64%
7	Mind-Brain Studies	15.63%
8	Peace and Conflict Studies	15.83%
9	Conflict and Cooperation Studies	16.13%
10	Global Development Studies	16.23%
11	Leadership	16.83%
12	Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution	17.13%
13	Science, Technologies & Values	20.81%
14	Food	23.40%
15	Sexuality and Gender	25.19%
16	Visual Media	28.37%
17	Great Books and Ideas	30.66%

Table 5. Faculty/Staff Rankings: Bottom Three Choices

Ranking	Pathway	Percent Ranked as Bottom Three
1	Global Development Studies	6.71%
2	Science, Technologies & Values	6.71%
3	Ethics, Justice and Social Policy	8.27%
4	Human Diversity & Inclusion	8.78%
5	Health & Wellness	9.30%
6	International Studies	9.82%
7	Sustainability	10.84%
8	Conflict and Cooperation Studies	11.36%
9	Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution	13.95%
10	Peace and Conflict Studies	20.15%
11	Great Books and Ideas	21.15%
12	Leadership	21.18%
13	Mind-Brain Studies	23.77%
14	Sexuality and Gender	26.84%
15	Mindfulness, Self, and Society	30.46%
16	Food	33.54%
17	Visual Media	37.15%

Both surveys included a question that allowed the respondents to write in comments. Three hundred ninety-six (396, 41.3%) students elected to make a comment. The comments were clustered according to whether or not the comment was generally positive (214/396 = 54.0%), neutral (148/396 = 37.4%) or negative (34/396 = 8.6%). The negative comments from

students often articulated concerns about the program adding too much structure. A few representative comments include:

“I don't think that requiring students to take up a major as part of their GE courses would be a good idea. From my perspective the purpose of GE courses is to make sure students graduate with a broader range of knowledge and basics concepts to better suit them for the independent world. Focusing GE courses into narrow Pathways limits the range of education students earn here at CSU Chico. Many freshmen students would probably be lured by the idea of picking up a minor from GE, but I feel it would probably do them little good in the long run since minor degrees aren't really helpful in developing a degree.”

“The idea of 'Pathways' feels too restrictive for a student pursuing a college degree. It reduces the freedom of students to choose their own minor, and this plan will invariably produce college graduates that are not nearly as well-rounded as their academic predecessors. After reading the abstracts, I have to admit they sound interesting and well thought out, but this dose not compensate for the severe and obvious drawbacks this plan creates. I am thankful to have completed my general education, and the minor of my choice before this system comes into effect.”

“Why don't you just let us choose something to minor in that already exists and get rid of upper division GE. GE is to explore what you want to do, not pick a topic to focus on. I don't really think anyone will get as much out of these themes as they would a real minor in something.”

In most cases, the positive comments revolved around students feeling some regret that they didn't get to be part of the new GE program. A few representative positive comments include:

“Brilliant idea! I would have enjoyed having an integrated program.”

“I actually think this would be a really cool program. Right now GE requirements are just set up to be hoops you need to jump through to graduate. These Pathways could really help students become interested in what they're learning. I wish I have gone through a GE system like this.”

“I really appreciate that CSU Chico is working towards a more focused GE program. I believe this method will help students graduate with a better understanding of themselves, and the world they live in. I believe I would have enjoyed my GE classes more if I would have been given a focus, like this Pathways method offers.”

Seventy-five (75, 28.7%) faculty-staff respondents elected to make a comment. Faculty and staff comments focused primarily on the need to combine Pathway ideas (29/75 = 38.7%). A handful of comments were positive (6/75 = 8%) or negative (9/75 = 12%) evaluations of the process and idea. Most of the comments (31/75 = 41.3%) didn't clearly fit into a category and were pretty broad. A few representative comments include:

“Combine some of these, for example, the Health one and the Mindfulness one, as well as the 2 that have the word 'conflict' in the title, and I believe there are also a international studies and developing world that could be combined, that would get us just about down to 10 or 11 and I am sure there are two more that could be combined, like, maybe the visual media and the cognition & brain one. Food could go together with the health, wellness and mindfulness paths.”

“Several of these Pathways should be combined. There is duplicative effort. It seems there are only 8-10 unique Pathways.

“There seems to be a lot of duplication. I think, for example, 'Global Development' and 'International Studies' could be merged, as could 'Conflict and Cooperation' with 'Peace Studies' and 'Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution' with 'Human Diversity.' (Perhaps 'Food' with 'Health and Wellness,' as well.”

“GE program must reflect primarily the contemporary needs of our students as they mature into citizens, professionals, and parents. We should ask ourselves, what Pathways (and courses) would further an individual's ability to make wise and informed decisions that affect our country, society, family, and the future.”

For more detailed survey results, please see the [GEIT](#) webpage.

4. Summary of Pathway Selection Criteria and Processes

GEAC and the Implementation Team used multiple criteria and protracted face-to-face discussions in reviewing Pathway concept proposals and choosing Pathway themes. To avoid conflicts of interest, members of GEAC or the Implementation Team who were involved in the development of Pathway concepts recused themselves from the discussion whenever necessary. In all cases, we were guided by EM 10-01, especially the following paragraph:

The number and thematic content of Pathways will be determined by the Implementation Team and GEAC in consultation with the Senate (i.e. a discussion item) according to the following criteria: the need to meet student demand; the need to maintain coherence by limiting the total number of courses in GE; the quality of proposed Pathways; and their ability to meet the values of GE. Pathway approval will be informed by comparisons among proposed Pathways and by attempting to balance Pathways so they reflect the diverse disciplines of the campus. (EM 10-01:5)

Criteria used in reviewing proposals and choosing Pathway themes:

- I. Quality of the Pathway concept proposal: [A rubric](#) for assessing proposals was created and widely shared with faculty. This rubric was used to assess proposals and to guide subsequent discussions. Important qualities included intellectual coherence and appropriateness for a GE minor, the latter of which (being a new feature in GE) was subject to much discussion, including at the public forum held on October 11.

- II. Student interest was assessed through the campus-wide survey discussed above, supplemented by examining enrollments in existing GE upper division themes.
- III. Faculty support was assessed through the campus-wide survey and public forum feedback.
- IV. Balance included such qualities as:
 - The weight of various disciplinary perspectives: some proposals and themes being more “science-heavy” than others, some more “social science-heavy” and other more weighted toward the humanities – though all Pathways had to have significant representation from all disciplinary areas;
 - A broad selection of thematic areas reflecting the diversity of disciplines, majors and student interest on campus. We wanted Pathways in which a variety of majors, and broad groupings of like-minded faculty, could find a home for themselves and their interests;
 - Within the Pathway, the ease and “natural fit” of the various disciplines involved, and;
 - Lack of duplication among Pathways, given their limited number.
- V. Breadth: Deliberations during the design phase frequently surfaced comments about the importance of a broad, liberal education as the essential mark of a GE program, an opinion reflected in the program’s final design. Pathways had to be sufficiently broad – while maintaining coherence – to provide students the breadth of a liberal education.
- VI. Combining and infusing: After reviewing the Pathway proposals and considering the feedback from students and faculty and staff, it was apparent that some Pathway concepts had thematic and/or conceptual overlaps with each other. However, GEIT and GEAC were concerned about whether or not related proposals could be productively combined without sacrificing the original proposers’ intentions. This led the team to look for ways to integrate elements of Pathways deemed too narrow or otherwise inappropriate as a “stand alone” Pathway. Therefore it was decided that, where appropriate, a selected Pathway could be infused with concepts or ideas from non-selected Pathways. We believe the Pathways moving forward will witness quality improvements and better meet the needs of students and the campus with the infusion of some concepts (and possibly courses) from non-selected Pathways.
- VII. Overlap with existing minors: Assessing overlap was essential to avoid redundancy in curricular offerings.
- VIII. University and GE Values: In our deliberations, we considered how (and how much) Pathways should reflect the particular values our university has chosen to emphasize through its Strategic Plan, and the Mission and Values of the GE Program as articulated in EM 10-01. We also discussed the extent to which each Pathway appeared to meet the GE student learning outcomes in a logical, straightforward manner.

5. Pathway Selections

The following ten Pathways, listed here in alphabetical order, will continue on in the Implementation process:

Diversity Studies

Ethics, Justice, and Policy

Food Studies

Gender and Sexuality

Global Development Studies

Great Books & Ideas

Health and Wellness

International Studies

Science, Technology and Values

Sustainability

Diversity Studies

- I. Quality of the Pathway concept proposal: Two diversity-related Pathway concept proposals were submitted: Human Diversity and Inclusion, and Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution. We were concerned that the Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution concept seemed so broad that it might lack coherence. The Human Diversity and Inclusion proposal needed additional conceptual work regarding theories of diversity and academic contributions to the study of diversity. We pulled from the strengths of both proposals to create the following Diversity Studies Pathway concept, which is focused in the United States but attentive to global contexts and comparisons:

Description: The United States has always been a nation of diverse peoples and perspectives, whether that diversity is celebrated as a creative melting pot or decried as divisive multiculturalism. The sources of this diversity are complex: the cultural pluralism established by successive waves of immigrant groups, minority racial and ethnic groups' demands for inclusion and equity, unique religious arrangements and ideas that have made the United States one of the most religiously diverse nations in the world, and the distinctive (and often invisible) mechanisms of the American class system, among other factors. Successful participation in contemporary life—in both employment and civic contexts—demands a high level of competency in understanding and engaging this complexity. This Pathway offers students (1) insight into the historical processes that have shaped these diverse perspectives, (2) analysis of current markers of human diversity, including race, ethnicity, class, religion, language, and ability/disability, and the ways these markers differentially affect social experience; and (3) the development of skills and practices for conscientious participation in and transformation of diverse contexts.

The diversity that characterizes contemporary experience is obviously a globally interconnected phenomenon, and courses in this Pathway should attend both historically and comparatively to international contexts. It is impossible to understand the experience of Haitian communities in New York, for instance, without knowing something about West African cultures and religions, and understanding of U.S. immigrant experience can be helpfully informed by comparison with the immigrant experiences of, say, Muslims in Europe or Southeast Asian domestic workers in the Middle East. Nonetheless, this Pathway, in contrast with the International Studies and

Global Development Pathways, will offer students an opportunity to focus especially on the experience of diversity in the United States. Because diversity is also a feature of the natural world, we anticipate that science courses on evolution and biological diversity, adaptation, and change will make important contributions to the Pathway. Throughout the Pathway, students will not only gather valuable information about the varied constituencies of their society, but will also be challenged to ask and answer important (and hard) questions about the nature and value of diversity itself.

Note: We expect that discussions of gender and sexuality will take place in this Pathway. But because there is a Pathway dedicated to these subjects, we hope that other aspects of diversity receive greater attention here. As this Pathway concept moves forward, faculty involved should widely consult with those across campus who teach and research issues of diversity in the contexts of race, ethnicity, culture, class, religion, language, and ability.

- II. Student interest: Survey support for this Pathway is a bit difficult to determine because it is really a combination of two concept proposals. Human Diversity and Inclusion was ranked 10th by students and Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution was ranked 15th. This Pathway concept will cover many of the same topics as GE Theme C, Cross Cultural Explorations, which has consistently been in the top three in terms of enrollment over the past five years. It also correlates significantly with Theme A, American Identities, which has also seen consistently robust enrollments. We see this Pathway as a place in the curriculum where the campus' commitment to diversity can be instantiated, and where students of color, non-native English speakers, those of minority religions, those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, and the disabled, among others, might see their experiences as valuable components of academic inquiry.
- III. Faculty support: Given the faculty commitment to diversity as illustrated by the University Strategic Plan and the proposed Diversity Action Plan, we expect there to be a good deal of support for this Pathway concept. The two related Pathway proposals combined indicated that over 30 faculty members, representing more than 18 disciplines, were interested in working to develop this GE minor. There are also currently 67 courses that are designated U.S. Diversity in the course catalog, which illustrates wide faculty interest in teaching courses that will likely populate the minor.
- IV. Balance: As noted above, this Pathway concept allows students to explore social difference in a multidisciplinary way that is focused on but not limited to expressions and dynamics of diversity in the United States. All CSU, Chico students will have at least some exposure to global diversity, via the global cultures requirement, and to diversity in the United States, via the U.S. diversity requirement. As the International Studies and Global Development Pathways allow students to pursue interest in international cultures and interconnections in greater depth, so this Pathway will engage those with a deep interest in the history and current reality of diversity in the U.S.
- V. Breadth: The study of diversity in the U.S. opens for analysis a wealth of perspectives, historical processes, challenging questions, and opportunities for critical civic engagement. Diversity as seen through the lens of the humanities, arts, social sciences,

and sciences will provide Chico State students with a well rounded general education experience and the competency in engaging diverse populations that employers increasingly seek.

- VI. Combining and infusing: We have created a Diversity Studies Pathway that essentially combines many of the elements of the two diversity-related proposals, while seeking a particular niche within the overall spectrum of Pathway themes recommended for initial establishment. The innovative framing of diversity and science in the Natural and Cultural Diversity and Evolution proposal and the focus on community participation in Human Diversity and Inclusion are both strong contributions to the Diversity Studies Pathway.
- VII. Overlap with existing minors: As this Pathway develops, faculty involved should take special care to make sure the Pathway GE minor is significantly different from the minor in Multicultural Studies. This difference will be formally guaranteed by the necessary inclusion of courses from disciplines across the campus, while MCGS is located within the college of Behavioral and Social Sciences, but conceptual differentiation will need to be further clarified as the Pathway moves forward.
- VIII. University and GE Values: Diversity has been a university value since the revision of the University Strategic Plan in 2006. The campus is about to embark on implementing a Diversity Action Plan. There is clearly a university commitment to creating a welcoming environment that not only has its doors open to all students, but also deals seriously in an academic manner with theories, perspectives, and research on diversity issues. EM 10-01 also included diversity as a value of the new General Education curriculum. A GE curriculum that includes a Diversity Pathway would in alignment with the values and commitments of Chico State. This Pathway will be able to address all GE SLOs. For example, as students develop the skills and practices for conscientious participation in and transformation of diverse contexts, they will also develop their own sense of Personal and Social Responsibility. The Sustainability SLO may be met by a focus on how sustainability measures can affect classes and other social groups differently.

Ethics, Justice, and Policy

As stated in the Initial Pathway Concept Proposal, “The central goal of this Pathway is to prepare students to participate knowledgeably and thoughtfully in the public policy process: locally, nationally and internationally.” In order to achieve this goal, a wide range of courses will give students the tools to understand both their own ethical positions on policy matters and the ethical impact of policy options and decisions. The GE program aims to provide “the education necessary for success as a ... civically engaged individual in the twenty-first century” (EM 10-01) and the Ethics, Justice and Policy Pathway will absolutely fulfill this aspect of our mission. The Initial Pathway Concept Proposal offered the name Ethics, Justice and Social Policy. The range of topics the Pathway will explore led us to use the more broad title of Ethics, Justice and Policy.

- I. Quality of the Pathway concept proposal: The Ethics, Justice and Social Policy proposal rated high on the assessment rubric for intellectual cohesion, multi-disciplinary approach, and appropriateness for a GE minor. The proposal was commended for blending two initial concepts (Social Policy combined with Justice Issues) and for the suggestion that many existing GE courses could be included in this Pathway.
- II. Student interest: In the campus student survey, Ethics, Justice and Social Policy Pathway was ranked sixth by all students and third by seniors. Additionally, the enrollments in at least three upper division themes suggest a solid student interest: Theme N (War and Peace in the Nuclear Age), Theme E (Ethics and Social Policy), and Theme S (Wealth, Power and Inequality) all have connections to this Pathway.
- III. Faculty support: The Pathway was ranked fifth by faculty and staff. Additionally, the Pathway proposal listed nineteen faculty members across three colleges. Of the 24 sample courses listed for possible inclusion in this Pathway, all but one course had confirmed participation approval.
- IV. Balance: This Pathway has roots in both HFA and BSS and requires students to think outside of any particular disciplinary perspective. The initial Pathway proposal mentioned two policy issues, punishments for crack possession and the introduction of genetically engineered salmon into nature, which students might approach in any number of courses from all colleges on campus.
- V. Breadth: As noted, the Ethics, Justice and Policy Pathway incorporates a breadth of disciplinary perspectives. This Pathway seeks to provide students with the information they need to analyze the various facets involved in current policy making and determine how these policies reflect their own senses of ethics and justice. This development of critical thought and reflection is one of the primary goals of general education.
- VI. Combining and infusing: Above we indicated the advantage of the more inclusive title of Ethics, Justice and Policy. We also changed the name of this Pathway so that concepts from the proposals of the Conflict and Cooperation and Peace and Conflict Pathways might contribute to the further development of this Pathway. For example, the Peace and Conflict proposal's emphasis upon peaceful resolution of conflict could greatly benefit the Ethics, Justice and Policy Pathway. Similarly, the Conflict and Cooperation proposal's focus upon the dynamics of conflict and the theories of cooperation will further enhance the Ethics, Justice and Policy Pathway.
- VII. Overlap with existing minors: There is the possibility for some slight course overlap with our current Ethics minor. The breadth of this Pathway as a potential General Education minor minimizes this overlap.
- VIII. University and GE Values: This Pathway proposal addressed how each University and GE Value was incorporated. For example, the main goal of this Pathway is identified as "to prepare students to participate knowledgably and thoughtfully in the policy process: locally, nationally, and internationally," which specifically addresses the GE values of social responsibility and global engagement. As noted in the proposal, topics of ethics, justice, and policy are "rife with diversity concerns" which support the GE value of diversity. The GE value of sustainability is replete with issues of ethics and justice as illustrated by this Pathway proposal. By encouraging students to generate new ideas

and novel approaches to policy issues, this Pathway meets the definition of creativity as a GE value.

Food Studies

The Food Studies Pathway focuses on a multidisciplinary field of study and will provide a valuable contribution to the General Education minors. We changed the name from “Food” to “Food Studies” so that its status as a field of study would be highlighted. As indicated in the proposal, the reference books on Food Studies, professional organizations that exist for the academic study of food, and scholarly journals about Food Studies justify its existence as an interdisciplinary project appropriate for GE.

- I. Quality of the Pathway Concept Proposal: The Food Studies Pathway was well developed. This Pathway was very intellectually cohesive and well thought out. Food Studies is a solid model of what GE minors should do. As an interdisciplinary academic field of study, Food Studies is an instantly recognizable term and set of concepts for organizing knowledge, and will be a distinctive mark on student transcripts.
- II. Student Interest: In the survey we conducted, Food Studies placed ninth overall among students. But taking into consideration only their top three choices, Food Studies placed much higher; it was ranked in the top three choices almost 22% of the time. We’re therefore confident that the interdisciplinary study of food will be popular with students and as students learn more about this Pathway, it will only gain in popularity.
- III. Faculty Support: Food Studies placed second from the bottom in overall rankings among faculty, and either at the bottom or close to it when we took into consideration only the top three or bottom three choices by faculty. By contrast, it was the most popular overall among GEAC and GEIT members. The Food Studies proposal did an excellent job articulating its place in GE, working from a coherent and theoretically informed set of principles, and demonstrating integration among potential courses and activities in the Pathway. We believe the difference in these rankings is in part due to our having read and worked from the entire proposal, not just the abstract. As the Food Studies Pathway moves forward in the GE redesign process, it will be important that it be better articulated to faculty. We encourage Pathway proposers to continue dialogue with faculty who may be interested in but not understand Food Studies so that the goals and approaches of the Pathway are broadly accepted.
- IV. Balance: Food Studies seems well balanced among other Pathway offerings, especially in bringing interdisciplinary perspectives to food both as a cultural artifact and as part of the “physical universe of food.” Agriculture in particular is well linked to Food Studies. The Pathway presents a unique perspective on something that binds us all (food) and so it lends a specificity of purpose to the Pathway offerings that constitute our program. The Food Studies Pathway does not overlap with other Pathway ideas/themes, thus contributing to Pathway balance.

- V. Breadth: The Food Studies Pathway shows tight integration among GE Areas and Sub-Areas, and draws equally from potential courses, questions, and perspectives in Agriculture, the Humanities, the Sciences, and the Behavioral and Social Sciences. This is demonstrated in reviewing the Food Studies Pathway objectives, which state that students should “discuss the many roles that food plays in our lives;” “show how food transmits culture;” “understand the social, cultural, and historical contexts of food;” “articulate the role of food in constituting national, gender, and ethnic identity;” “contextualize agricultural issues;” “identify the environmental challenges;” and so on.
- VI. Combining and Infusing: We saw no compelling need to formally infuse other Pathway themes or concepts into Food Studies. Food Studies, as outlined in the initial Pathway proposal, can stand alone in its present form.
- VII. Overlap with existing minors: There are no overlaps with existing minors.
- VIII. University and GE Values: Food Studies amply covers all of the overarching GE values. The Pathway proposal did especially well discussing the role of Active Inquiry, as students could (for example) undertake extended projects that trace “the path of a multi-ingredient food product [or dish] from field to fork”; Personal and Social Responsibility, as they explore their personal food choices in terms of local and global economies; and Global Engagement, as students learn and “understand how food circulates in global capitalism”. We encourage the Pathway to further explore ways in which students can meet the value of Creativity by not just studying artistic representations but by making and sharing these creations themselves.

Gender and Sexuality

This Pathway offers students the opportunity to explore a set of issues at the center of human experience in a broad but intellectually cohesive way. As the proposers note, this Pathway is well suited to the campus’ renewed commitment to diversity, and will foster critical and creative thinking in an area in which false assumptions still abound and around which vibrant academic disciplines have grown. The Gender and Sexuality Pathway will integrate the fields of women’s studies, gay, lesbian and transgender studies, queer theory, and masculinity studies. It explores such multidisciplinary topics as physical sexual differentiation, the psychological dimensions of sexual identity and orientation, social and cultural conceptions of gender and systems of sexual regulation, and creative literary, artistic, and theatrical expressions on themes of sex and gender.

- I. Quality of Pathway Proposal: The proposal for this Pathway was clear, thorough, and persuasive. Proposers effectively articulated the breadth of academic fields encompassed by this subject as well as the ways in which such a Pathway could meet the objectives of the new GE program in a unique way. Moving forward, faculty involved in the development of this Pathway are encouraged to seek out diverse perspectives on gender and sexuality, highlighting points of intellectual divergence in this field of study. To highlight the breadth of this Pathway's scope and to avoid real or

- perceived overlap with the minor in Sexual Diversity Studies, we changed the title from Sexuality and Gender to Gender and Sexuality (see section 7 below).
- II. Student Interest: This Pathway grows out of two successful Upper Division Themes, Theme F, Gender Perspectives, and Theme O, Women's Issues. Over the past 5 years, these Themes rank numbers 5 and 9 by percentage of total Theme enrollment; when combined, they rank second only to Theme B, Contemporary Health issues. While we acknowledge that there are many factors that drive student Theme selections, it is clear that gender and women's issues are subjects with significant appeal to students. On the GEIT/GEAC survey of student views of the proposed Pathways, the Sexuality and Gender proposal landed in the middle, but the commitment of a dedicated group of students is demonstrated by the 19% who ranked this proposal in their top three, and by a petition generated by the AS Women's Center and submitted by the proposers that garnered 390 signatures.
 - III. Faculty Support: The proposers of this Pathway connected successfully with a large number of faculty members from a wide range of departments. In addition to the nine proposers, 34 faculty members representing 18 departments or programs have expressed interest in participating in this Pathway. This breadth of support was facilitated by consistent outreach and sustained conversation supported by a Faculty Learning Community grant.
 - IV. Balance: The theme of this Pathway is distinctive; no other Pathway concept deals significantly with issues of gender and sexuality. We believe it will attract students with broad curiosity about the range of these experiences as well as those with political commitments to sexual and gender equity. We expect that discussions of other aspects of diversity will take place in this Pathway. But because there is a Diversity Studies Pathway, gender and sexuality will be the primary focus here.
 - V. Breadth: The multidisciplinary quality of this concept is one of its particular strengths. Because they are so central to human experience, the categories of gender and sexuality invite analysis from multiple perspectives—biological, psychological, political, sociological, anthropological, religious, philosophical, and artistic. It will be especially important for this Pathway to integrate developments in scientific understandings of gender and sexuality, so those who move forward with this Pathway are encouraged to pursue the proposal's recommendation of a new upper division course in the biology of sex and gender. Combined with the wealth of existing courses in gender, sexuality, and women's studies, this will allow students to do the kind of university-wide exploration that General Education promotes while earning a minor in an exciting new academic area.
 - VI. Combining/Infusing: Gender and Sexuality stands well on its own as a rich and coherent Pathway. While other diversity-related proposals prompted consideration of combining and infusing, ultimately we concluded that issues of sexuality and gender would be diluted in a more generic diversity Pathway.
 - VII. Overlap with Existing Minors: Because of concern for overlap between this Pathway as proposed and the Sexual Diversity Studies minor, we encourage those moving forward with the Pathway to enhance attention to women's issues. If the Pathway draws evenly from courses focused on women's experiences and courses on GLBTQ and masculinity

studies, it will serve the constituencies of both current gender-related Upper Division Themes, and distinguish itself more clearly from the Sexual Diversity Studies Minor. As indicated above, this is also the motivation behind the inversion of the terms in the Pathway's title from how they appear in the proposal. As the proposers note, no current minor attempts to look systematically at *both* sexuality and gender across all disciplines; this will be the distinctive appeal of this Pathway.

- VIII. University and GE Values: The proposers of this Pathway offered a thorough and thoughtful analysis of the ways in which it would meet the values and student learning outcomes of the new GE program as outlined in EM 10-01. Diversity is one of six core values of the General Education program, and certainly one this Pathway stands to foster. The infinitely varied ways in which people around the world and in our communities inhabit sexually differentiated bodies, experience their sexuality, and negotiate complex social gender systems is certainly a vital element of human diversity. We also note the high level of intellectual creativity that characterizes the disciplines that inform this Pathway; thinking beyond conventional sex and gender binaries involves just the kind of intellectual risk-taking that General Education aims to stimulate.

Global Development Studies

The Global Development Studies Pathway will make an important contribution to the new GE program. As stated in the proposal abstract, “This Pathway can help our university prepare students for global citizenship and responsibility in a 21st century in which exchange, interdependence, and vulnerability are intensifying across borders through new and revolutionary technologies. Specific issues that students will consider include public health, food, security, conflict, population, education, environmental protection, migration, and political mobilization.”

- I. Quality of the Pathway concept proposal: The proposal is outstanding and explains the concept of global citizenship in a thoughtful yet practical way. We encourage the campus to remain as faithful as possible to the Pathway proposal during the next phase of the implementation process.
- II. Student Interest: While the GEIT and GEAC agree that this is an excellent offering in GE, and while students generally seem interested in international/global issues, the Pathway could have difficulty in attracting students. Students overall ranked this proposed Pathway 12th; seniors ranked it 11th, but first year students—a large part of the intended audience for Pathways—ranked it 15th. This suggests that the Pathway faculty will need to do innovative, effective outreach to students, probably through multiple means in several venues. A strong relationship between this Pathway and one or more Foundation courses will be important to the Pathway's success. We ask that faculty working on developing this Pathway consider ways of improving the Pathway's appeal to *lower division students*; the current “Global Issues” upper division theme shows a healthy enrollment, so it may be of use to survey the students in this theme in order to learn why they chose it.

- III. Faculty Support: Faculty support for this theme is high; in the campus survey, faculty and staff place “Global Development” in the top tier of all Pathway proposals, ranking it fifth. The ranking, as well as the listed possible courses in the proposal with confirmed interest by faculty, indicates strong buy-in from faculty in multiple disciplines. The proposers note that they have identified “over 150 interested faculty and staff” and that they have “gathered names and suggestions of more than 100 existing courses from many . . . faculty members.”
- IV. Balance: After careful deliberation, GEAC and the GEIT concluded that a Global Development Studies Pathway *and* an International Studies Pathway would offer substantially different choices for students, in terms of both individual classes and in terms of Pathway concepts, and that together they would greatly enrich GE. As the Global Development Pathway moves forward in the GE redesign process, it will be important that it maintain its distinctiveness. The developers of the International Studies Pathway and the Global Development Pathways should make an effort to minimize the overlap of courses and conceptual themes.
- V. Breadth: From History to Nursing and Political Science to Biology, this Pathway will include a broad range of disciplinary perspectives upon “the world's most fateful problems – political, economic, and ecological....” Indeed, the proposal went out of its way to meaningfully include all colleges in the Pathway’s concept, and admirably integrated the fine arts and natural sciences.
- VI. Combining and infusing: Global Development Studies, as outlined in the initial Pathway proposal, can stand alone in its present form.
- VII. Overlap with existing minors: Besides the International Relations minor, developers should make an effort to minimize duplicating area studies minors. Additionally, the developers of the International Studies and the Global Development Pathways should make an effort to minimize the overlap of courses and conceptual themes.
- VIII. University GE Values: The proposal indicates that nine out of the ten required SLOs, including three of the four skills SLOs and all of the Values SLOs are “integral” to the “Global Development” Pathway. The SLO not addressed is quantitative reasoning, but it would seem that the use of statistical reasoning and an understanding of economics would be applicable to this Pathway and could be more fully developed than it currently is in lower division classes. *Active Inquiry* is described in the proposal as a question set that must be used to “interrogate” the concept of “development.” The SLO requires some emphasis on research methods; faculty involved in developing this Pathway should consider which courses will provide students with research experiences. The Pathway addresses *Personal and Social Responsibility* through a focus on “global citizenship” and through an insistent thematic thread that asks students to consider both our responsibility for “development of other parts of the world” and the means available to us for “learn[ing] from other people’s experiences and knowledge.” *Sustainability, Diversity, Creativity and Global Engagement* are all briefly but explicitly addressed in the proposal. The least obvious of these, *Creativity*, is summed up as an exploration of “creative, alternative development programs.”

Great Books & Ideas

The Great Books & Ideas Pathway concept is a new perspective on a classic approach to General Education and to liberal education broadly. It focuses on the big ideas and texts that have helped shape the world. By applying the great books concept across many fields of study and all of the required disciplinary areas of GE, this Pathway encourages students to reflect on the concept of greatness itself and what makes words and ideas influential in the world.

- I. Quality of the Pathway concept proposal: We found this proposal to be well-developed. In particular, we found persuasive the proposal's discussion of its appropriateness as a GE minor and its uniqueness as a minoring opportunity for Chico State students. Similar programs are employed successfully at other campuses and the idea of a Great Books curriculum has a broad and rich history.
- II. Student interest: Overall, this was not one of the most popular Pathway proposals among students, but it fared well when we examined the number of students who ranked this Pathway as their top choice. In other words, we suspect that this Pathway will be sought out by a dedicated, if somewhat smaller, contingent of students.
- III. Faculty support: Through both surveys and written comments faculty expressed strong support for this Pathway concept. Much of the input on this Pathway thus far has come from faculty within HFA. We encourage those involved in the future development of this Pathway to reach out to faculty from other colleges in further designing this Pathway.
- IV. Balance: Great Books & Ideas helps balance the slate of Pathway concepts through its lack of overlap with other recommended concepts and by speaking to a specific subset of student interests. We suspect that students who are already drawn to books and intellectual puzzles will seek out this Pathway and, in doing so, have their eyes opened to the great contributions of a wide range of academic disciplines.
- V. Breadth: When taking a "bird's eye" view of the range and variety of Pathway proposals, many commented that Great Books & Ideas was the type of Pathway that was definitely necessary to provide a breadth of options across GE.
- VI. Combining and infusing: Though we believe this concept can successfully stand-alone in its present form, we also believe it could be strengthened still further by infusing some ideas and concepts from the (unselected) Leadership Pathway proposal. There is an affinity between the concepts of leadership and greatness that bears consideration. We encourage those involved in the future development of this Pathway to think through ways of connecting these concepts.
- VII. Overlap with existing minors: This Pathway would have virtually no overlap with existing minors. However, we note that it may be an attractive Pathway option to those students seeking Honors in GE and we encourage those involved in the future development of this Pathway to consult with the Honors coordinator regarding the best ways to capitalize on this possible overlap of intellectual interests.
- VIII. University and GE Values: Many of the university's GE goals – open inquiry, civic responsibility and democratic participation, cultural and artistic production of humanity, understanding the world around us – are reinforced by education as specified by the Great Books & Ideas Pathway. We found the university's values concerning academic

excellence to be supported when GE curriculum is supported by celebrated literature of many disciplines.

In addition to the suggestions noted above, as those involved in the future development of this Pathway move forward in populating it with courses, we encourage them to develop a more comprehensive definition of “greatness” in order to better convey the Pathway’s content to students and the campus community broadly. This definition could also provide an opportunity to better convey the role diversity will play in this Pathway. We also encourage the further development of connections between the Pathways stated goals and the campus’s GE Values and SLOs.

Health and Wellness

The Health and Wellness Pathway concept embodied many of the key factors considered in the selection of a Pathway concept. The Health and Wellness Pathway concept and proposal was consistent with the manner in which the GE program and Pathways were defined in EM 10-01. The magnitude of student support, the cohesiveness and consistency of an underlying intellectual theme, the balance provided to the slate of Pathways, and the ability of the Pathway to be multidisciplinary weighed heavily in the selection of this Pathway to move forward in the GE redesign process.

- I. Quality of the Pathway concept proposal: The Health and Wellness Pathway proposal was consistent with EM 10-01’s vision that Pathways “connect courses structurally in an intellectually cohesive course of study that explores an issue or an area from a multi-disciplinary perspective.” The Pathway concept proposal noted that “Pathway courses will examine cross-cultural, global, political, economic, spiritual, ethical, philosophical, historical, and/or scientific affects on Health and Wellness to ensure that students understand the interdependent relationships between these factors and Health and Wellness.” The Pathway proposal presented a vision in which students could get a well rounded perspective on health and wellness, while maintaining a reasonable degree of intellectual cohesiveness, a multidisciplinary orientation, and achievement of GE student learning outcomes. As the Pathway moves forward in the GE redesign process, it will be important for the Pathway to define *Health*, define *Wellness*, and further clarify the distinctions between them, as well as to clearly align itself with the GE values and student learning outcomes articulated in EM 10-01.
- II. Student interest: Nine-hundred sixty (n = 960) students responded to a survey asking them to express their preferences amongst the seventeen Pathway concepts. Students overwhelmingly ranked the Health and Wellness Pathway concept as their most preferred. Although ranked #1 by all students, an analysis of the data by class standing showed that freshman preferred the Pathway even more than seniors. This stronger preference by freshman may be more indicative of the thinking and selection process of students beginning their University studies. Furthermore, over the last five years, GE

- theme B, Contemporary Health Issues has had the highest enrollments of any theme. Clearly, the Health and Wellness Pathway concept has strong appeal to students.
- III. Faculty support: Based upon the responses from 261 faculty and staff, the Pathway was ranked #6 of the seventeen proposed Pathways. Furthermore, the Chico State Wellness Initiative was launched this year, indicating campus-wide support for promoting wellness, especially among first year students.
 - IV. Balance: Although all Pathways must have courses representing the disciplinary areas, a number of the Pathways concepts have a humanities and social science orientation. The Health and Wellness Pathway concept readily bridges the life sciences, social sciences, and humanities. Furthermore, the Health and Wellness Pathway will offer students a choice for those who desire a Pathway that has a practical and life-long learning orientation.
 - V. Breadth: The Health and Wellness Pathway concept finds a nice balance between being cohesive enough to give students a broad understanding of health and wellness, while allowing students to sample courses from a breadth of areas. The Health and Wellness Pathway readily incorporates courses from multiple disciplines (14 departments are noted in the Pathway concept proposal). Even though it is quite multidisciplinary, a strength of the Pathway concept is its ability to cogently tie the courses and disciplines together.
 - VI. Combining and infusing: The Health and Wellness concept would be enhanced by discussions with individuals involved in the Mindfulness, Self and Society proposal, which was highly ranked by students. By infusing ideas and some courses from this proposal, the Health and Wellness Pathway will better serve students and the campus community.
 - VII. Overlap with existing minors: The Health and Wellness Pathway has some duplication with the Health Science minor, but according to the Pathway proposal, the Department of Health and Community Services is replacing the Health Science minor with a minor in Health Promotion. The Health Promotion minor will have no duplication with the Health and Wellness Pathway.
 - VIII. University and GE Values: The mission of the GE program is to prepare “students for continual learning and application of knowledge to career as well as personal life. It provides the education necessary for success as a lifelong learner and civically engaged individual in the twenty-first century.” (EM 10-01) Facilitating students’ development into more rigorous and systematic thinkers regarding health and wellness will not only improve students’ own lives, but also the lives of those around them. Students following the Health and Wellness Pathway will have the opportunity to embrace the GE values of active inquiry, personal and social responsibility, sustainability, diversity, creativity, and global engagement. As noted by the Pathway proposers, students will learn to evaluate the credibility of health and wellness information and practices, recognize questionable assumptions and identify important issues related to health and wellness for their selves and others. Furthermore, the students in the Health and Wellness Pathway will have a global perspective about health, healthcare, and wellness.

International Studies

As described in its proposal, the International Studies Pathway focuses on “preparing students to make informed and meaningful contributions in an interconnected world.” This is not only consistent with GE values and student learning outcomes, but will enable students to explore and achieve many aspects of the mission of the University and the CSU system. The International Studies Pathway concept was well liked by students, garnered extremely enthusiastic support from faculty and staff, is quite multidisciplinary, and has the ability to allow students to efficiently and effectively experience all the GE values and student learning outcomes.

- I. Quality of the proposal: The International Studies Pathway proposal was consistent with EM 10-01’s vision that Pathways “connect courses structurally in an intellectually cohesive course of study that explores an issue or an area from a multi-disciplinary perspective.” The Pathway proposal articulated a number of unifying intellectual principles such as the “examination of global issues, processes, trends and systems including war and peace, global interdependence, geopolitics and macroeconomics” and “offering opportunities for students to study abroad to gain first-hand experience in particular cultural contexts, while earning general education credit abroad”. The unifying principles listed are well reflected in the set of proposed sample courses. Furthermore, the proposal clearly demonstrated that the Pathway will draw on a breadth of diverse disciplinary perspectives from across departments and colleges in a logical and creative manner. The proposed sample of courses represents all colleges on campus and 22 programs. In particular, we felt the focus on facilitating students’ “appreciation of the language, art, religion, philosophy, and history of world cultures” and encouraging students to “explore the global interconnectedness of political, economic, and environmental systems” to be vital concepts of the Pathway.
- II. Student interest: The student survey (n = 960) demonstrated strong student interest in the International Studies Pathway, with students ranking it fourth overall with a ranking of sixth when only considering students’ top three choices. Additionally, enrollment figures for upper division themes that compare to the International Studies concept indicate that such a theme consistently has high enrollment, coming in at number two in enrollment numbers for the 2010-2011 academic year. Finally, the Pathway supports CSU, Chico’s institutional commitment and large student interest in study abroad. The International Studies Pathway concept is clearly of great interest to students.
- III. Faculty Support: Faculty support of the International Studies Pathway was even stronger than student support, with it receiving a number one ranking overall and number two when only considering the top three choices of faculty.
- IV. Balance: The issue of balance was thoroughly examined with respect to the International Studies and Global Development Pathways. Many faculty survey comments recommended combining the two, as there was a perception of conceptual overlap. And, with only a limited number of Pathway slots available, a concern that two concepts examining global issues might create a thematic imbalance. The counter argument, which in the end tipped the scales in favor of keeping both Pathways, was

that the differences between the two were greater than their similarities. In particular, the Global Development Pathway “gives significant attention to a vast range of societies and groups who are underrepresented or unrepresented in US curricula...Specific issues that students will consider include public health, food, security, conflict, population, education, environmental protection, migration, and political mobilization” (Global Development Pathway proposal, fall 2010). These issues are not widely represented in the International Studies Pathway. An additional argument for keeping both Pathways was that a combined Pathway would create a “mega Pathway” that pulled in huge student enrollments and simultaneously over-taxed particular courses. This lopsided demand for a single global/international Pathway was a very real potentiality that could not be ignored. Additionally, it was felt that a single Pathway of this size would create an area of study so large that the balance of robust intellectual cohesion presented in the two separate concept proposals would be watered down to the point of losing focus.

- V. Breadth: The conceptual proposal demonstrated breadth across disciplinary areas, while maintaining coherence. This was one of the strengths of this Pathway concept as it readily encompasses a large variety of courses and disciplines across the campus.
- VI. Combining and infusing: International Studies, as outlined in the initial Pathway proposal, could stand alone in its present form. However, given the emphasis in the Pathway on the institutional contexts of international issues, faculty should consider entering into dialogue with those interested in leadership studies to consider coursework or other approaches to understanding global leadership.
- VII. Overlap with existing minors: As the International Studies Pathway moves forward in the GE redesign process it will be important that it maintain its distinctiveness. Though minors with an international focus currently exist, this conceptual proposal does not overlap with the content or focus of those existing minors. The developers of the International Studies Pathway and the Global Development Pathways should also make an effort to minimize the overlap of courses and conceptual themes.
- VIII. University and GE Values: The conceptual proposal most obviously matches the value of Global Engagement in EM 10-01, but it also readily addresses the other GE values and student learning outcomes. Additionally, the International Studies concept matches the vision statement of the University Strategic Plan where it states, “We aim to create a vital and collaborative living and learning experience for students, who will appreciate and embrace the local, regional, and global communities of which we are all a part.”

In summary, the International Studies Pathway concept was well received by students, faculty and staff and will offer students a broad general education with an international orientation. The Pathway can readily incorporate aspects of the mission and values of the CSU system, the University, and the GE program.

Science, Technology, and Values

The Science, Technology, and Values Pathway concept draws on a well-developed multidisciplinary field of study and provides a valuable minor in the General Education program.

The Pathway focuses on the exponential pace of advancement in both science and technology and the challenges such advancement poses to our values. Several strong points of this Pathway are: an intense focus on the development of critical thinking regarding complex issues, the development of scientific literacy, and the integration of disciplines which are not often taught together.

- I. Quality of the Pathway concept proposal: The proposal's discussion of its appropriateness as a GE minor and its uniqueness as an opportunity for Chico State students was persuasive. Programs of study with labels such as "Science, Technology and Society" are well established at colleges and universities across North America and the UK and thus this GE minor will be recognizable beyond our campus. There are over 43 such programs in the US alone, and at least five US PhD programs in Science, Technology, and Society-related fields.
- II. Student interest: Overall, this was one of the most popular Pathway proposals among students, ranking 2nd (22% of respondents) when considering only students' top three choices among the 17 proposals listed in the survey. Also, it is likely that this Pathway will attract students who have traditionally been drawn to Theme M, "Science, Technology, and Society."
- III. Faculty support: Through both surveys and written comments faculty expressed strong support for this Pathway concept. This Pathway ranked 3rd (30% of respondents) when considering the faculty's top three choices.
- IV. Balance: The Science, Technology, and Values Pathway draws heavily from coursework in Colleges of Natural Sciences and Engineering, Computer Sciences, and Construction Management. It thereby contributes greatly to the balance of student opportunities available in the GE program. Students who exhibit a particular affinity for the scientific and technical disciplines may seek out this Pathway, yet anyone who does so will equally enjoy the opportunity to examine, from a wide range of academic perspectives, the role of science and technology in shaping the course of human affairs.
- V. Breadth: As the proposal states, the Pathway has the potential to look at the effects of science and technology on values as well as the reverse. By its very nature, the study of science, technology and values must be approached from multiple disciplines. Understanding the role of science in our society requires the tools of social science, and making sense of science and technology and determining how to evaluate it requires utilizing the approaches of the humanities. Thus, to really address a complex topic such as human cloning, embryonic stem cell harvesting, protections for endangered species, global warming, etc., multiple perspectives must be considered. We encourage the population of this Pathway with courses that provide rigorous theoretical frameworks with which to examine values. We further encourage the informed discussion of values to be a thread throughout the Pathway.
- VI. Combining and infusing: Though we believe the Science, Technology, and Values concept can successfully stand-alone in its present form, we also believe that it might benefit from an infusion of ideas and concepts from the (unselected) Mind-Brain Pathway proposal. We encourage the future Pathway Coordinator to peruse the Mind-

Brain Pathway proposal and consider incorporating components of Mind-Brain that might enhance discussion of Science, Technology, and Values.

- VII. Overlap with existing minors: This Pathway has virtually no overlap with existing minors.
- VIII. University and GE Values: While this Pathway places particular emphasis on scientific literacy, students are also charged with employing active inquiry and critical thinking in the exploration of a variety of controversial topics. As stated in the proposal, a primary goal will be to prepare students to deal creatively with the many complex and difficult issues caused by increasingly rapid advances in scientific knowledge and the many new technologies that emerge from this. Students in Science, Technology, and Values will not only evaluate global impacts of technology adoption, but will also evaluate the consequences of their personal use of technology. In so doing, the GE Values of Global Engagement, Sustainability, Diversity, and Personal and Social Responsibility will be considerably reinforced.

Sustainability

Sustainability as a field of study is well established with roots in the natural and social sciences, as well as the humanities. This area of study deals with the complex interrelationships between human activities and the ecological systems upon which human well-being and all life ultimately depends. As an integrative and multi-disciplinary field of study, sustainability is well-positioned to serve as the focus of a general education minor, especially on our campus, which has seen an intense interest among faculty, students, staff and the broader community in this topic.

- I. Quality of the Pathway concept proposal: The Sustainability Pathway proposal drew on many years of work among faculty from across the university who have been meeting and discussing the integration of Sustainability into the curriculum. This turned out to be both a strength and weakness for the Sustainability GE Pathway proposal. Conceptually the Sustainability proposal reflects the deep thinking about the overall concept of sustainability. Perhaps due to this long background discussion, the authors of the proposal appeared to pay little attention to the mission and values articulated for the General Education program. In other words, the concept of sustainability was clearly articulated in the proposal, but integrating that thinking into the curricular structure of the new GE program was neglected. For example the proposal contained clearly stated student learning outcomes, but little serious consideration was given to the GE student learning outcomes laid out in EM 10-01, that are, themselves, the product of protracted and deep campus-wide discussion. Sustainability is clearly an inherently multidisciplinary field, yet the proposal could have more clearly conveyed how sustainability as a concept, and this proposal in particular, supports the goals of a liberal education. We urge the faculty interested in sustainability to more actively participate in the dialogues around the goals of the GE program and incorporate these more clearly in the Sustainability Pathway as the proposal is developed in the months ahead.

- II. Student interest: One of the main strengths of the Sustainability Pathway is the clear expression of student interest in this topic, both in the survey conducted in October (where Sustainability was ranked third overall in student preferences), enrollment in environmentally-related upper division theme courses and in the many activities, clubs and related efforts of students on our campus over the past several years. Clearly there is student demand for coursework, research and other co-curricular activities in this area. We anticipate that a significant number of students will pursue the GE minor in Sustainability. Student enthusiasm and demand was a major factor in moving this proposal forward.
- III. Faculty support: Sustainability also has strong support among faculty. The faculty ranked Sustainability second in the October survey. Faculty have also been working for many years on raising the profile of sustainability studies in a variety of disciplines and colleges across the campus. The Sustainability Pathway stands out as a Pathway supported with equal enthusiasm by students and faculty alike. This support of sustainability weighed heavily in the decision to move this Pathway forward.
- IV. Balance: Sustainability has great potential for bringing balance to the GE Pathways both in the disciplines represented within the Pathway and across the set of proposed Pathways for the GE program. Sustainability has clear roots in the natural sciences, but is equally relevant and at home in the social sciences. The humanities have much to contribute to a full understanding of sustainability: historically, philosophically, in literature and in a variety of belief systems. The weakest disciplinary links appear to be to the arts. We urge the faculty involved in bringing this Pathway to fruition to seek out partners in the arts to round out the interdisciplinary focus and contribute to the full breadth of a liberal education.
- V. Breadth: The GEIT and GEAC recognize that sustainability can contribute to the breadth of intellectual experience associated with a liberal education. It is up to the organizers of this Pathway to ensure that this happens by inclusion of varied perspectives in the Pathway. The Pathway will be strengthened not only by the inclusion of varied disciplines, but by a breadth of perspectives within the intellectual debates around sustainability. Again, outreach to colleagues from diverse disciplines and with diverse perspectives is essential to the future health and success of this Pathway.
- VI. Combining and infusing: Sustainability clearly has the potential to be a broad, yet coherent, area of study drawing on varied disciplines and perspectives. There are interesting overlaps between sustainability and the study of science, technology and values, ethics and justice issues, diversity, globalization, leadership studies and mindfulness. Efforts at constructing the curriculum for the Sustainability Pathway will be enriched by remaining in dialogue with colleagues who have a variety of intellectual interests and looking for complementarities, points of convergence, as well as areas of friction that can spark compelling intellectual debates -- all to the benefit of students pursuing this area of study.
- VII. Overlap with existing minors: The Sustainability Pathway has overlaps with existing minors in Managing for Sustainability and Environmental Studies. The Pathway needs to carve out its own intellectual space to avoid excessive overlap with these minors as well as any anticipated future curricular moves incorporating sustainability as an idea or field

of study at our university, e.g., a sustainability major. Faculty moving forward will be challenged to create a Sustainability Pathway appropriate for a *liberal arts education*.

- VIII. University and GE Values: This is another area where the Sustainability Pathway exhibits great strength. Sustainability is one of the University's strategic priorities and an area of emerging distinction for Chico State. During the public forum held on October 11, several of those present -- faculty and students -- indicated that our GE program, and the Pathways that form an important dimension of that program, must "reflect university values." Sustainability is a cornerstone of Chico State's values and priorities. This is a strong justification for endorsing a Sustainability Pathway.

6. Next Steps

Now that the campus has come to a final decision on which Pathways will comprise the new GE program, the hard work of realizing the vision laid out in EM 10-01 begins. These tasks include curricular, pedagogical and organizational tasks. Prominent in the minds of many faculty is "populating" the Pathways with courses, which is clearly an important task. But there is also the curricular work of revising and/or creating courses for the Foundation area and creating the "associations" between Foundation courses and the Pathways. EM 10-01 also calls for a number of curricular and pedagogical innovations: so-called High Impact Practices. GEAC and GEIT view this juncture as a critical moment for re-thinking pedagogy in our general education courses and program. The GE Values highlight aspects of pedagogy such as active learning, a renewed effort at teaching writing through writing intensive courses and the creation of capstone courses to help students integrate the strands of their general education experience. As we create the GE curriculum moving forward, we must keep these pedagogical goals in the forefront of our thinking. Another goal embraced by the campus in the design phase was the creation of a means of assessing the GE program *as a program*. The GE student learning outcomes will guide that process, but faculty teaching in the program must help elaborate a plan, or series of plans, for gathering valid, reliable assessment data. Finally, the EM stipulates a number of features in the new program such as advanced course substitutions, and allowing major courses to fulfill selected GE requirements, which must be worked out in practical terms.

Clearly there are many steps from the present conceptual phase to fully implementing the new GE program in Fall 2012. GEAC and the GEIT will continue to work energetically with faculty to ensure the success of this effort.

Pathways Moving Forward

In many ways the Pathways are the backbone of the new GE program. Now that the themes for the Pathways have been selected, GEAC and GEIT will facilitate the process of populating them during the Spring 2011 semester. For those who want to begin thinking about the various requirements of the Pathways and how they will be met (e.g. writing intensives, meeting GE SLOs), GEAC and GEIT will be holding two forums on December 9th and 10th. The focus will be the same in both sessions. We'll be guiding interested parties through the expectations of the new GE program and strategies for how they may meet those expectations. Of course, finding

time at the end of the semester is often difficult for faculty and staff. These sessions will be just the first of more to come, continuing into the Spring semester. Specifically, we plan to convene meetings for each Pathway so that interested faculty, staff, and students can all meet to discuss their collective vision for the future of the Pathway and its course contents.

As is well known, the Pathways lead to interdisciplinary minors for students who take 18 units, including 9 upper division units, in a Pathway. Hence each Pathway must be approved by EPPC and Senate as a minor. This approval process is one of the main quality control points in the development of Pathways. The Spring semester is the time for Departments, Chairs, and Deans to also be considering their commitments to Pathway courses because their approval will be necessary for a course to be included in any given Pathway.

Given the importance of Pathways, EM 10-01 provides for the election of Pathway coordinators: a faculty member who teaches in the Pathway that will oversee the course offerings to ensure that the Pathway maintains its coherence and who will lead assessment efforts. Pathway coordinators will play a key role in the initial organization of Pathways, working with colleagues to create or select existing courses that best reflect the Pathway's intellectual focus and that best serve students. We propose that Pathway coordinators be elected by the Academic Senate in Spring 2011 to advance the work of Pathway creation. GEAC and GEIT will work with coordinators and other faculty interested in teaching in Pathways to ensure that courses support GE and Pathway goals, and that departments and colleges (a) have their disciplinary voices represented in GE, and (b) are fully committed to delivering the GE courses each semester so students can progress toward their degrees. The EM states that the Pathway Coordinator will receive release time for this work.

Foundation Courses and Pathway "Associations"

Foundation courses (current Area A & B) will play a critical role in meeting GE student learning outcomes and in introducing students to the Pathways. EM 10-01 indicates that all GE courses help students achieve one or more program SLOs. The EM also stipulates that Pathways create "associations" with one or more Foundation courses which can count toward the GE minor. Foundation courses will play a very important role in introducing students to Pathways, both in terms of their rather novel role in the GE program and as areas of intellectual inquiry that students can explore. The GE curricular revision provides an immense opportunity to re-think how we teach Foundation courses and how these courses can both advance GE values and SLOs and assist students as they explore the rich intellectual terrain of the GE program.

Pedagogical Innovation

A series of pedagogical innovations are mandated by EM 10-01: writing intensive courses, capstone courses and active learning. GEAC and the GEIT will work intensively with faculty in designing appropriate pedagogical practices that help faculty realize their goals for their courses, while at the same time enhancing student writing (in the case of WI courses) or creating capstone experiences that can, for example, advance students' sense of "personal and social responsibility" (a GE value and SLO). Incorporating high impact practices that enhance student engagement, such as inquiry-based pedagogies or the creation of learning

communities, and expanding innovative approaches such as inter-disciplinary team-teaching are all practices that will help contribute to a more vibrant, meaningful GE program that is more satisfying to students and faculty alike.

Assessment

Assessment has been built into the new GE program through defining a set of learning outcomes for all students. EM 10-01 mandates *programmatic assessment* of GE learning outcomes, with Pathways and Pathway coordinators playing a critical role in that process. The EM does not specify one particular assessment methodology or technique. This task falls to the faculty teaching in the Pathway in dialogue with the yet-to-be-created GE Curriculum Advisory Board (CAB). During the implementation phase, and until the full implementation of the program in Fall 2012, GEAC (with the assistance of GEIT) will work with Pathway coordinators and other interested parties to create assessment plans and procedures to meet the goal for clear, evidence-based assessment of student learning.

Exceptions, Substitutions

GEAC and GEIT will work with departments and major programs so that advanced course substitutions can be established, and proposals for fulfilling GE requirements through major courses can be put forward, evaluated and approved where appropriate.

Over the next calendar year many faculty will be engaged in the creative and difficult work of constructing a new GE curriculum that brings distinction to our university and provides a sound liberal education for our students. This work represents the culmination of a multi-year, campus-wide effort on behalf of our students that represents our collective vision of a sound educational foundation for "success as a lifelong learner and civically engaged individual in the twenty-first century." Along the way, we will have many opportunities to engage with colleagues across campus, discuss important issues of disciplinary and cross-disciplinary importance and to engage in that complex but satisfying task of creating a curriculum and set of pedagogical processes that brings out the best in ourselves, in our students and in our university. GEAC and GEIT remain committed to maintaining an open and transparent process throughout this endeavor and will support faculty in this important work.

GE Implementation Team/GEAC: Timeline of Implementation Activities

- February 11, 2010: [EM 10-01](#) passed unanimously by Academic Senate. EM includes an addendum instructing a yet-to-be-formed GE Implementation Team and the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) to work closely together in the implementation process.
- March 5, 2010: Provost formally selects and gives charge to [GE Implementation Team](#).
- March 9, 10, 2010: GE Implementation Team and GEAC hold campus-wide forum to discuss Implementation process.
- March 12, 2010: [Google docs site](#) created for campus-wide sharing of GE curriculum development documents.
- March 22-May 21, 2010: GEAC organizes a GE Program Assessment FLC that meets weekly to discuss strategies for assessing the new GE program.
- April 5, 2010: GE I-Team and GEAC hold “GE Mixer” in BMU auditorium. More than 150 faculty, staff and students attend to discuss GE curriculum revision.
- April 8, 2010: Funding announced for GE Curriculum Development Faculty Learning Communities. Rubrics to guide Pathway, foundation and American Institutions curriculum development posted to GE Implementation Team [website](#).
- April 13-23, 2010: GE I-Team and GEAC hold “office hours” for faculty interested in developing Pathway proposals.
- April 23, 2010: GE I-Team and GEAC hold Pathway development workshop for faculty interested in developing Pathway proposals.
- May 7, 2010: GE I-Team and GEAC hold Foundation course development workshop for faculty interested in developing Pathway proposals.
- April-May 2010: Sixteen FLCs funded for GE curriculum development; over \$18,000 allocated for this purpose.
- August 30-September 3, 2010: GE I-Team and GEAC hold Pathway Outreach forums for Pathway developers to share ideas with campus.
- September 13, 2010: Draft Pathway proposals due to GE I-Team and GEAC for feedback
- September 17, 2010: GE I-Team and GEAC hold Pathway feedback sessions with all proposers who submitted draft proposals
- September 30, 2010: Final Pathway concept proposals due. Eighteen proposals received. Abstracts as well as complete descriptions posted to GE Implementation Team website.
- October 5-13, 2010: GE I-Team and GEAC distribute student and faculty-staff survey to gauge campus opinion on proposed Pathway concepts.
- October 11, 2010: GE I-Team and GEAC hold campus-wide forum to discuss Pathway deliberation process and obtain feedback on Pathway qualities most valued by faculty, staff and students.
- October 12-November 15, 2010: GE I-Team and GEAC deliberate on Pathway selection, culminating in the release of the report, “GE Pathways: selections and moving forward.”