Susan Miller-Cochran comments on some notable features, including some advantages and disadvantages, of different implementation models, 17 September 2024:

Breadth/Depth Model

* Does not increase the overall number of credits for General Education (still 32)
* Gives students significant autonomy to select in-depth courses that are of interest to them (the comprehensive courses would be much more limited)
* Provides a path for a range of departments and colleges to participate in offering in-depth courses, although the comprehensive courses would likely fall to a limited number of departments
* Supports scaffolded learning, especially if students take the comprehensive course first
* Was supported by ABOR when presented in January 2023
* Would require existing EP courses that could fit the comprehensive description to switch to BC
* Requires tracking additional attributes when the attributes become graduation requirements in Fall 2026 (making GE a bit more complicated)

A/B Model

* Does not increase the overall number of credits in General Education if the two courses replace BC courses (yet this reduces the BC course requirement to one, which will require revisiting the overall number of BC courses offered at a time)
* Provides potential for a range of departments and colleges to participate in offering courses (the courses would need to cover 3-4 areas within the defined categories)
* Does not add any new attributes to the General Education requirements[[1]](#footnote-1)
* Gives students some autonomy to select courses of interest to them
* Requires tracking which courses students have taken and which ones would complete the requirement
* Requires significant coordination of which courses are offered in which terms/years so that students can fully complete the requirement (right now, OGE has no authority to require the offering of any department courses)

One-Course Model

* Does not require any additional credits for General Education (the CLCK course would be one of the three required BC courses)
* Would require existing EP courses that could fit this category to switch to BC
* Would still offer some autonomy in selecting which course to take, but the options will be more limited than the Breadth + Depth or A/B models
* Follows the model ASU and NAU have adopted for this area of General Education
* Does not support scaffolded learning within GE (although this could be supported through coordination of civic learning components in other courses across the curriculum)
* \*Might\* feel like a repeat of the US Government requirement in high schools, although that completely depends on the approach of the course

Foundations Model:

* Does not increase the overall number of credits for General Education (if the Foundations course replaces a BC course)
* Would require the comprehensive course(s) to be at the 100-level (or at the most, 200-level, but Foundations courses really should be offered as foundational to everything else in the curriculum)
* Could complicate the first year for some majors that have very tight requirements because of accreditation (e.g., Engineering, Architecture)
* Could potentially place a significant burden on a department or college if there is only one course that can meet the requirement (neither ASU nor NAU have one course that is the only option to meet the requirement)

1. JV note: Another version of the A/B model is possible, in which the Civic Learning-A and Civic Learning-B are attributes attached to BC courses that also meet the requirements for BC (and possibly another attribute) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)