Fayetteville State University

CORE REVISIONS RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT

C. Edward Watson, Ph.D.

October 31, 2023

Overview

This document follows the conclusion of a site visit by this report's author, C. Edward Watson, to the Fayetteville State University (FSU) campus in Fayetteville, NC on October 2-4, 2023. The site visit was preceded by multiple planning meetings with Core Revision Task Force Chair John Brooks and Dean Marcus Cox. The overarching purpose of this visit and meetings were to discern opportunities for core curriculum revision that

- Recognize FSU's character and mission,
- Capitalize on the strengths and interests of its faculty, and
- Would best position FSU's students for success in life beyond college.

This campus visit also included two presentations: 1) a campus plenary entitled "Models and Practices: The National Conversation Regarding General Education and Integrative Learning" and 2) co-facilitation of a "Core Review Town Hall" conversation regarding possible opportunities for core revision.

In addition to these presentations, the author met separately with five subcommittees consisting of Core Review Task Force members. Those subcommittees are

- Curriculum (~20 invited / 12 attended)
- Teaching (~15 invited / 4 attended)
- Student Support (~17 invited / 9 attended)
- Governance (~9 invited / 7 attended)
- Assessment (~13 invited / 6 attended)

In addition to these subcommittee meetings, there was also an open Q&A opportunity for all Task Force members (20 attended) to interact with the author and a luncheon with students (1 attended). The site visit also included meetings with the Task Force Chair (John Brooks), Dean (Marcus Cox), and the Provost (Monica Leach).

Through these conversations, presentations, and meetings, it became clear that a vision for core revision and reform had not emerged on campus; however, there were key threads that were seen as important to multiple audiences in regard to core revision. At a high level, they included an interest in

- A core that has an identity that could be easily articulated to students;
- A core that emphasized ethical thinking, moral thinking, and/or ethical leadership;
- A core that included an African American studies course or a course focused on student identity;
- A core that might capitalize on or connect to existing initiatives, such as the Gillis Jones Institute for Ethics and Leadership or a pre-existing mentorship academy that resides within the School of Social Work; and

- A core that is designed to positively impact student success rates, such as retention and completion.

At the conclusion of the site visit, the author met with Dean Cox and Dr. Brooks to discuss what was learned during the site visit as well as the format of this report. Through this review and conversation, it was determined that the author would synthesize what was gleaned via the site visit into potential core models/attributes consistent with what was learned on campus as well as evidence-based best practices associated with general education reform. It was also agreed that recommended action steps for forward movement for core reform at FSU would be included as well. That is what follows herein.

Specifically, there are a set of recommendations for a baseline, fundamental, minimal revision of the core that are present in the section entitled "Fundamental Revision: Baseline Recommendations of the Core in Concert with the Development of New Administrative Structures." In addition to a foundational recommendation for core revision, it also includes an array of activities associated with the development of new administrative structures to support and facilitate the core. The author believes this set of recommendations to be a baseline describing a minimal core revision at FSU.

Following that, in the section entitled "À la Carte Additions: Enhancing a Fundamental Revision to FSU's Core", there are a set of additional recommendations that triangulate the following:

- Recommendations and observations that were expressed by faculty, staff, administrator and students during the site visit and other meetings;
- Perceived strengths and interests of its faculty;
- Employer research regarding employer expectations for their new hires who are also recent college graduates;
- Evidence-based teaching and learning practices that result in deep learning and improvements in key student success metrics;
- FSU's character and mission; and
- Intentionally and relevantly expand the impact, purpose, and identity of the core.

This latter section is designed to offer suggestions that would strengthen the baseline, minimal revision that is presented first. Faculty interest and available resources will influence the practical applicability of adopting the recommendations in this section and a faculty-led process should be employed to select and refine options presented.

The author can be contacted at:

- C. Edward Watson, Ph.D.
- watson@aacu.org

Fundamental Revision:
Baseline Recommendations of the Core in Concert with the Development of New Administrative Structures

What is contained within this section are a set of recommendations for the most modest, yet meaningful, core revision model and process FSU might pursue. While this model has been labeled as a "Fundamental Revision", the **work associated with implementing this model is non-trivial,** given current structures at FSU and changes in accreditation expectations in North Carolina. Specifically, it is the author's understanding that previous administrative structures have been decommissioned and the task force exists, in part, to help the institution discern and development new such structures. Core reform provides a key opportunity for any institution to rethink its

- curricular management processes;
- establish new policies and processes for the reaffirmation of courses within the general education curriculum;
- rethink assessment strategies in light of accreditation expectations and course redesign aspirations; and
- develop clear and transparent steps for the removal of courses from said curriculum.

Revisiting current/past policies and practices and establishing new ones as a part of FSU's reform efforts will be essential to the health and longevity of the new core curriculum. A close analysis of current gaps, challenges, and concerns will serve as a guide as you engage in this important work.

Establishment of core learning outcomes is among the first steps in core revision processes. FSU currently has eight core learning outcomes (CLOs) in 4 groups:

Groups	Outcomes
Transitional Studies	Transitional Studies
Essential Skills	Communication Skills
	Reasoning Skills
	Information Literacy
Disciplinary Perspectives	Scientific Literacy
	Humanities and Creative Arts
Global Responsibility	Global Literacy
	Ethics and Civic Engagement

It is recommended, as a minimal step in the revision of the core, that these outcomes be reconsidered and updated in light of

- The mission and identity of the institution;
- The strengths and interests of the faculty; and

- The needs of the students for success in life beyond college.

Given the strengths and interests voiced on campus and the needs articulated in recent employer studies (e.g., Bannon, 2023; Carnevale et al., 2020; Hart Research Associates, 2018; Selingo, 2018), including emerging trends in the world of employment, the following make strong candidates for consideration for new CLOs at FSU:

- AI Literacy
- Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- Integrative Learning
- Leadership
- Teamwork

These would not be in addition to the current core outcomes; rather, the faculty would consider the current CLOs, this list of new CLO candidates, and possibly others, and development consensus on a revised list for the new core. The overarching goal would be to have between six and ten CLOs in FSU's new set, and some of the old set may logically be selected for continuance in the new core. It should also be noted that in the current CLO set, "Transitional Studies" and "Humanities and Creative Arts" are not learning outcomes, per se; however, the "Transitional Studies" concept is likely closely related to the "Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning" learning outcome.

Many campuses engaging in general education reform often desire to retain disciplinary breadth coverage as an attribute of their new curriculum. The current CLOs within the "Disciplinary Perspectives" group could be used as a foundation of sorts and as an organizing structure within a course map or matrix of the new curriculum. The following table provides a generalized example of what that might look like:

	LO#1	LO#2	LO#3	LO#4	LO#5	LO#6	LO#7	LO#8
Writing								
Course #1	X		X					
Course #2	X	X	X					
Humanities and Creative Arts								
Course #1			X	X		X		
Course #2				X	X			
Etc.								
Social Sciences								
Course #1				X	X		X	
Course #2				X			X	
Etc.								
Sciences								
Course #1						X		X
Course #2						X		X
Etc.								

Relatedly, a core revision and adoption of new CLOs would require the following companion initial tasks:

- Hands-on leadership is needed to shepherd forthcoming steps and stages. Ideally, someone from the faculty who possesses opinion leadership on campus and has a successful record of academic program leadership would be selected as the Executive Director of the Core (or similar title). For the first 18 to 24 months, this position would be entirely administrative without teaching or other responsibilities as transition activities would require full-time attention of this leader.
- The Executive Director would facilitate a faculty-inclusive process to
    - Select and adopt a set of new learning outcomes;
    - Determine associated breadth domains and credit requirements; and
    - Design additional programmatic elements of the core.
- The core review governance subcommittee noted that the institution would be "starting from scratch" in terms of governance within a revised core and that governance had not occurred within the current core for approximately two years. As a result, the Executive Director would need to work with faculty and administrators to develop a new governance structure for oversight of the new general education curriculum.
- The Executive Director would then implement the new governance structure and launch associated committee work. This would include
    - Articulating processes and timelines for faculty to submit courses for consideration for the new core;
    - Facilitating the course review process, including a timeline for completion of this process to establish the courses that comprise the new core; and
    - Establishing a reaffirmation timeline for courses accepted into the core.

Upon the conclusion of shared governance processes to determine which core attributes to adopt, it is recommended that a committee be formed to shepherd the transition from the current curriculum and structure to the new model. While budget allocations will determine staffing opportunities, it is crucial to keep in mind that the change processes proposed require significant staffing and/or staff time. A key component of transition activities will be the development of a strategic plan for the core with action items, milestones, and metrics for success. With this strategic roadmap fully developed including a budget designed to support its success, next steps regarding enaction include four additional domains of action for the Executive Director:

1. Advising – The curriculum subcommittee and the governance subcommittee both noted concerns regarding the role advising has played in the past regarding how students valued the core and selected meaningful courses during course registration processes. Effective core reform at FSU must enlist campus advising professionals to assist students in understanding the purpose of the new curriculum and maximize the experiences offered. Core reform is an opportunity to revisit advising structures and processes to ensure that students are receiving messaging that FSU's new core provides learning that is useful, relevant, and purposeful, rather than a checklist to "get out of the way."

2. <u>Communication</u> - It should not be assumed that the rationale for a new core will be immediately understood across stakeholders, especially students. A savvy, strategic, and energetic communications campaign, one with attention to diverse audiences, should be considered in conjunction with the rollout of the new core, regardless of the scope of reform. The communications and marketing effort is an opportunity to highlight why general education matters and what makes it both authentic and distinct to FSU. It is also an opportunity to provide it with a recognizable identity and brand.

3. <u>Professional Development</u> - Any degree of curriculum transformation should incorporate opportunities for professional development for faculty (and, ideally, staff as co-educators). Comprehensive core reform is more than asking faculty to revise courses. It is asking faculty to make a paradigm shift in how they view what the core is intended to do. A movement toward new learning outcomes and a recommitment to some previous ones should be accompanied by structured opportunities for faculty to increase their learning alongside colleagues. The leader of the core at FSU should embrace existing development capacities on campus, such as the center for teaching and learning, and form a meaningful partnership where development opportunities are offered each semester to ensure faculty understand the purpose and value of the core and to increase faculty capacities to teach the specific CLOs that are to be taught in their courses. This is especially important if AI Literacy is selected as a learning outcome as most faculty are just beginning to acquaint themselves with this emerging domain of knowledge.

4. <u>Assessment</u> - In early October 2023, the state of North Carolina passed a new law that requires North Carolina colleges and universities to change accreditors every cycle (Moody, 2023). This is an incredibly labor intensive and expensive requirement that has implications for FSU far beyond the core; however, the Executive Director will be a key partner in this forthcoming work, not only in ensuring core assessment activities are successful but also in preparations as the institution begins to transition to a new accreditor.

The scope and resource needs of these activities will be influenced by selections made from the options described in the following section.

À la Carte Additions:
Enhancing a Fundamental Revision of FSU's Core

The previous section provides a vision for a modest, practical, baseline revision to the Core at FSU. What follows are additional options to consider. These opportunities result from ideas articulated by FSU campus members with an eye toward approaches that would positively impact learning as well as key student success metrics. They are designed to connect to and extend course-based learning opportunities and create a meaningful, recognizable identity for the core. These options are coupled with a scholarly foundation clarifying the student success outcomes that may be improved by the successful adoption of these practices.

<u>High Impact Practices</u>

Though specific educational practices, such as first-year seminars, capstone courses, and service learning are not new to higher education, they have, over the past 15 years, increasingly been referred to as "high-impact practices" (Kuh, 2008). The reason for this is three-fold. First, campuses routinely offer a number of the most common high-impact practices, not just a single experience. Second, the practices themselves tend to have common characteristics that contribute to their efficacy (Kuh & O'Donnell, 2013). And third, while individual practices have been shown to be highly effective across a range of outcomes, these practices have been shown to be particularly effective in aggregate (i.e., when students engage in multiple high-impact practices over time) or when combined (Finley & McNair, 2013). Additionally, high-impact practices have been shown to be particularly promising in supporting student success outcomes, including graduation, retention, and perceived learning gains, among underserved student populations (Finley & McNair, 2013; Kuh, 2008; Kuh & O'Donnell, 2013).

In a study that included thirty-eight public higher education institutions and over twenty-five thousand undergraduate students, it was found that students who had engaged in three to four high-impact experience reported learning gains that were, on average, 24 percentage points higher than students who had not participated in any high-impact practices (Finley & McNair, 2013). An earlier study, conducted in 2010, at California State University-Northridge arrived at similar conclusions. The author noted, for example, that:

> "Among the Latina/o and Pell respondents…significant gains are evident, especially for students participating in more than one HIP. The average GPAs of those Latina/o and Pell students who have not participated in HIPs during their college years are somewhat lower than those of other students. If, however, they have participated in three or more, their average GPAs slightly exceed those of other students" (Huber, 2010).

The empirical arguments for engaging students in a single, as well as multiple, high-impact practices are myriad and well-established. There is ample scholarly, empirical, and national support for FSU to include such practices as components of its core reform efforts. In doing so,

the University has the opportunity to expand its mark of distinctiveness in the state of North Carolina and nationally as an institution of higher education dedicated to providing a holistic and exceptional college education aimed at building a bright future for the entirety of its student body. While the baseline recommendations provided in the previous section will indeed require significant effort and resources, I strongly encourage FSU to consider the following opportunities, possibly in combination with one another, to further strengthen the purpose, impact, and outcomes of its core.

First-Year and Capstone Core Experiences

Both first-year experiences (FYE) and capstone experiences are considered "high-impact practices," and when done well, students benefit as described above. There is an opportunity for FSU to include courses during the first and second year that are designed to offer integrative learning experiences that help students see how the components of the core are in conversation with one another, how the core is cohesive and collectively prepares students for the real world. The purpose of these courses would be to develop integrative knowledge, amplify FSU's programmatic strengths, and address what is seen by employers as the greatest gap in college students knowledge: the ability to transfer and apply knowledge to real world settings (Hart, 2018).

One lens through which to consider how to approach implementing these experiences is via the lens of "strength of treatment." For example, would one logically expect a one-day experience prior to the start of the freshman year to have enough of an influence on students to positively impact, for instance, six-year graduation rates? Probably not. Would one expect a rich, multicourse, multiyear-long experience to influence first-to-second-year retention rates and/or matriculation rates? Most likely, yes. General scope and scale of an FYE engagement, done well, will provide some predictive expectation regarding the type of impact it will have upon students both in terms of learning and in terms of student success metrics. Coupling FYE with a capstone experience for the core could, as the research suggests, magnify this impact.

Of course, there are a wide array of variables that might influence FSU's capacity to adopt an ambitious FYE / core capstone strategy, such as other curricular requirements, credit-hour structures, and more. With that said, thinking specifically about FYE done well, a review of widely recognized, successful FYE programs, such as those at Elon University, Yale University, Williams College, and others reveals the following attributes of such programs:

- They employ cross-disciplinary curricular strategies;
- They use strategies that nest other High-Impact Practices, such as service learning, within broader FYE courses;
- They use specialized and copious mentorship and advising opportunities; and
- They offer rich opportunities for relationship building between peers and / or with faculty.

These best practices mirror ideas voiced by FSU faculty during the site visit and are suggestive of specific attributes of a model that might be employed at FSU.

Another relevant model to consider in terms of FYE can be found at the University of Georgia (UGA). The goals of UGA's First-Year Odyssey program, an FYE program consisting of a single 1-credit course students are required to take and are encouraged to complete during their first semester at the university (University of Georgia, 2013), further highlight the aforementioned attributes:

- **Goal 1**: Introduce first-year students to the importance of learning and academics to engage them in the academic culture of the University;
- **Goal 2**: Give first-year students an opportunity for meaningful dialogue with a faculty member to encourage positive, sustained student-faculty interactions; and
- **Goal 3**: Introduce first-year students to the instruction, research, public service and international missions of the University and how they related to teaching and learning in- and outside the classroom to increase student understanding of and participation in the full mission of the University.

Regarding the UGA model, it should be noted that their First Year Odyssey program began as a SACS COC Quality Enhancement Plan project with a supportive budget. However, there are an array of incentives which have been employed in higher education, beyond or coupled with stipends, to engage faculty in new and ongoing projects. They include teaching load adjustments, graduate assistant or staff support, equipment, travel, and recognition/awards. Adjustment to promotion and tenure expectations have been employed in some contexts as well.

FYEs have also employed a co-teaching model where a faculty member is partnered with an exceptional student who is a junior or senior (e.g., Virginia Tech's Honors College FYE). The more advanced student benefits from close mentorship with the faculty member, while the faculty member has a collaborator who can assume some of the administrative and instructional duties within the course.

So what might an FYE model, coupled with a core capstone experience in the second year, look like at FSU? There are three models which might be considered, and each provides an opportunity to establish an identity for the core associated with ethical leadership and preparation for the world of work. Those are described below with their attributes, benefits, and drawbacks:

Option One: One-credit courses in the fall semester of the freshman year and spring semester of the sophomore year
(Two Credits Total)

Key Attributes
- The freshman-level course might focus on student identity. Students might be provided with course options from which to choose their preferred identity path (African American Studies, Military History, North Carolina History, etc.). Learning outcomes might include fundamental skills with an introduction to ethical leadership and integrative learning.
- The core capstone course might focus specifically on ethical leadership with integrative learning serving as the companion learning outcome.
- Transfer students would be required to take these courses as well as they would serve as anchors to the purpose of core at FSU.

Key Benefits
- This model offers the benefit of the lightest instructional load.
- This model complicates student credit hour load the least.
- One-credit courses, such as those employed at UGA, have been shown to be efficacious in terms of learning and student success metrics.

Key Drawbacks
- This model diminishes the strength of treatment and the scope of possible benefits associated with this curriculum and practices, though, as noted above, single one-credit courses can been shown to have a positive impact on student success metrics.

Option Two: One-credit courses in each semester during the student's first four semesters
(Four Credits Total)

Key Attributes
- This would extend the first semester experience across the freshman year.
- The core capstone would take place across both semesters of the sophomore year and would offer a richer focus on ethical leadership with integrative learning serving as the companion learning outcome.
- Service learning, another high impact practice, might be leveraged as a signature pedagogy of the second and third courses in this four-course sequence.
- Transfer students would be required to take all or part of these courses. Again, they would serve as identity anchors for the core at FSU.

Key Benefits
- This model offers the benefit of additional engagement with FYE and capstone practices, as well as an additional high impact practice (service learning) which suggests additional student success benefits.

Key Drawbacks
- This model may begin to create credit-hour challenges for some students in some majors.

Option Three: ePortfolios coupled with Options 1 or 2
(Four Credits Total)

Key Attributes

- There is an opportunity for FSU to employ richer integrative learning approaches, leveraging an ePortfolio which students would carry forward from one semester to the next across their experiences within the core. ePortfolios were the most recent addition to the list of high impact practices, ased upon the evidence supporting ePortfolio practices (Watson et al., 2016). Courses throughout the core might leverage these tools and pedagogies, and the capstone would then utilize these educational opportunities (as well as the products that resulted from this instruction and placed by students into their ePortfolios) as foundations for the pedagogy within the sophomore-level capstone courses.

Key Benefits
- This experience offers the greatest "strength of treatment" and would likely produce higher achievement of intended outcomes.
- Here, four high impact practices would be experienced by students: ePortfolios, service learning, FYE, and capstones.
- ePortfolio practices and pedagogies introduced at key moments across the core would showcase employer-prized integrative skills, enabling students greater success during the capstone and providing richer examples of their capabilities to share beyond graduation.

Key Drawbacks
- The use of ePortfolios is non-trivial. ePortfolio pedagogies and practices are unfamiliar to most faculty and faculty will thus need support to be successful.
- Additionally, ePortfolios, in service to integrative learning, bridge courses. Significant curricular mapping and faculty development efforts would be required to ensure a meaningful experience for students as they traverse the curriculum, engage in integrative learning assignments, and build their ePortfolios.
- There are also IT support needs associated with ePortfolios and platform selection greatly influences scale of support required for students and faculty.

Structural Considerations for All Three FYE/Capstone Options

As noted above, the evidence supporting the recommended strategies is significant and compelling; however, none of the aforementioned opportunities are silver bullets for student success. For each, there is a foundation of best practice that, when appropriately and successfully applied within higher education contexts, have been shown to result in the desired

student learning and student success outcomes. All of the structural and pedagogical recommendations in this section require copious faculty development and ongoing support to ensure faculty are successful. Without such faculty engagement, it is likely that the adoption of these practices would have little or negative impacts on intended outcomes. Additional recommendations include the following:

- Create and communicate clear and purposeful goals for the FYE/Capstone course sequence.
- Limit course size to no more than 20 students per seminar.
- Integrate community engagement / service learning as a signature pedagogy into two or more of the FYE / capstone courses.
- Ensure faculty development is employed to guarantee FYE seminar expectations are communicated to all who teach FYE seminars. Faculty development would also provide guidance regarding FYE best practices, which would increase the probability that the student success outcomes ascribed to FYEs are enjoyed in FSU's context.
- Consider faculty co-led courses with student affairs staff and/or advanced students serving as course collaborators.
- Consider establishing a university award for teaching excellence recognizing those who have developed and implemented exceptional and effective FYE courses.
- Develop and implement the requisite administrative structure necessary to manage and support an FYE of the size of any of the models described above.

Purposeful, Guided Pathways

Perhaps the most impactful change that might be adopted as part of a core revision would be the development of purposeful pathways for students through their core experiences. Purposeful pathways are ambitious, faculty-led curricular changes that lead to greater intentionality for students as they navigate the core. The belief is that such pathways can guide students to higher levels of learning, intellectual skills development, and practical knowledge. Colleges that have adopted ambitious strategies within this domain include Community College of Philadelphia, University of Houston-Downtown, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and Winston-Salem State University.

A purposeful pathways approach to the core is one where all or a subset of courses within the core are organized within thematic silos. Students could then choose the theme/question that interests them the most. Those teaching a course within a thematic silo would then ensure that their course addresses that theme in some substantive way during the semester. If the core offered, for example, five themes from which students may choose as the focus of their core experience, it is possible that a single course could be leveraged to address all five themes. Examples of pathways might include the following:

- Ethical leadership
- Entrepreneurship

- Innovation
- The Age of AI

Pathways might also be organized in terms of questions of interest to today's world. For example,

- How can you be an ethical leader in a time of political polarization?
- How will we solve global warming?
- What do we do to prepare for the next pandemic?
- What does creativity look like in a post-AI world?

This approach creates an impactful and meaningful core experience, and as a result of the core's clear purpose(s), branding is easy to establish, and students more readily recognize the relevancy of the core experience. A purposeful pathway approach might also be coupled with an FYE/capstone strategy.

Key Benefits
- In a simple distribution model, students are often unaware of the skills they develop via the core curriculum until well after graduation. As a result, students often do not see the purpose of general education as they navigate through it and often view these as courses to "get out of the way." The key promise of a pathways approach is that the core curriculum would take on a clearer purpose for students. A pathway of courses, speaking to a great problem or grand challenge that matches students' interests and choosing, will increase student motivation and engagement with these courses, and the core will assume a clearer, more meaningful purpose for students as a result.
- A pathways approach also offers opportunities to enhance curricular coherence and intentionality for the core. The conceptual and content-related conversations that occur between courses and disciplines will be clearer to students. While students are developing the intellectual skills and practical knowledge they need for life, work, and citizenship, the pathways approach, coupled with high-impact practices, is an ideal strategy for supporting integrative learning.
- While meeting distribution requirements, a pathways model provides an excellent opportunity for reinventing advising in service to the core. Rather than simply helping students find courses to complete the check sheet, opportunities for purposeful advising will emerge, focusing on helping students select courses that match their selected pathway, while also meeting the distribution requirements. This approach provides new opportunities for meaningful discussion and reflection regarding course selection for the core.

Key Drawbacks
- The choice of implementation may create significant challenges to the pathways approach. A key question is whether completion of the pathway should be a graduation requirement or not. A pathway graduation requirement might extend a student's time to

degree in cases where a student decides to change his/her pathway, or is advised, following a change of major, to select a pathway more closely aligned with the new major. Pathway as graduation requirement also creates additional burdens for the registrar's office and related systems. To address these drawbacks, a more flexible approach might be to view the distribution expectations as the graduation requirement; however, the pathways approach would be used in all framings of the core with students to help them make meaningful core course choices and to provide a framework for advisors as they guide students through course-selection decisions.

- A significant core course application process and intentional curricular mapping activities would be required to purposefully build the curriculum of each pathway.
- Professional development would be required for advisors to ensure advising discussions around the core adopt the purposes associated with a pathways approach.
- To ensure integrative learning opportunities are fully realized, professional development is also needed for those teaching general education courses. Minimally, faculty must be aware that they are teaching within a pathway and of the learning outcomes expected of their course. Broad awareness and understanding of the larger curriculum associated with a pathway(s) within which a course is nested will provide opportunities for faculty to build cross-course conversations into their courses. Professional development opportunities for faculty to plan with colleagues across disciplines within a pathway would be essential to ensuring intentional integrative learning occurs across these courses. A key component of this professional development would be course redesign activities to ensure courses indeed speak intentionally to the topic of the pathway.

References

Bannon, M. T. (2023, June 22). How AI is changing the future of work. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/marenbannon/2023/06/22/how-ai-is-changing-the-future-of-work/?sh=10d8bb3c72e0

Carnevale, A. P., Fasules, M. L., & Campbell, K. P. (2020). Workplace basics: The competencies employers want. Georgetown University, Center on Education and the Workforce. https://cew.georgetown.edu/cew-reports/competencies/

Finley, A., & McNair, T. (2013). *Assessing underserved students' engagement in high-impact practices*. American Association of Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.

Hart Research Associates. (2018). *Fulfilling the american dream: Liberal education and the future of work*. Author & American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). https://dgmg81phhvh63.cloudfront.net/content/user-photos/Research/PDFs/2018EmployerResearchReport.pdf

Huber, B. J. (2010). *Does participation in multiple high impact practices affect student success at Cal State Northridge?: Some preliminary insights*. Office of Institutional Research, CSU Northridge.

Kuh, G. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. American Association of Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.

Kuh, G., & O'Donnell, K. (2013). *Ensuring quality and taking high-impact practices to scale*. American Association of Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.

Moody, J. (2023, October 10). North Carolina forces changes to accreditation. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/governance/accreditation/2023/10/10/new-north-carolina-law-forces-changes-accreditation

Selingo, J. (2018, June 2). How the great recession changed the job market forever for college grads. *Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2018/06/01/how-the-great-recession-changed-the-job-market-forever-for-college-grads/

University of Georgia. (2013). *First-year odyssey seminar program*. Author. https://fyo.uga.edu/

Watson, C. E., Kuh, G. D., Rhodes, T., Penny Light, T., & Chen, H. L. (2016). ePortfolios – The eleventh high impact practice. *International Journal of ePortfolio, 6*(2), 65-69. https://www.aacu.org/ijep/archives/volume-6-number-2