

## Diverse Perspectives ESLO Committee Feedback on Policy Questions

### 1. Will we mandate prerequisites for foundation -> practicing pathways?

There was a lot of concern about how additional or different prerequisites would effect programs' curriculum maps, as well as how creating additional or different prerequisites might result in the need to hire more faculty to make those prerequisite courses available more often for students.

A potential way around this, which I've mentioned at GEAC before, would be to give Practicing-level courses a prerequisite of "Must have taken any Foundational course in X outcome" instead of specifying a particular class. The group pointed out that this could make things difficult in the case where, for example, a COM professor might be teaching a Practicing-level course based on the assumption that students have taken a *particular* Foundational-level course already when they've taken a different one instead and aren't as prepared as they might be.

In short, using outcomes levels as a prerequisite is more flexible in terms of the problems I mentioned above, but also doesn't allow us to be as directed in preparing our Practicing courses for incoming students.

In the end, though, the group agreed that students *shouldn't* be able to bypass the structure of Foundation > Practice > Capstone. This is one of the few "big ideas" that's hung on throughout the Essential Studies development process and, we believe, one of the few absolutely clear improvements that this model makes on the existing General Education model. To toss it out at this point seems to be tossing out the justification for Essential Studies in the first place.

### 2. Related to prerequisites: Can Essential Practice be a subset of Foundation?

We agreed that this is something that should be decided on a case-by-case basis, not an overarching policy. In general, though, the division between Foundation and Practice courses should be made immediately clear (perhaps through course numbers, as per #4 below?) and that structure should be maintained except in particular circumstances where students can clearly be shown to be covering the required Foundational skills in the Practicing class as well. DP does require that all Practicing classes continue to develop the skills taught in a Foundational course, but the idea behind our criteria from the beginning has been that students get an *introduction* to these skills in a first course before expanding upon them in a second course. There might occasionally be an extenuating circumstance that makes it worth overriding this, but it shouldn't be a blanket policy.

### 3. Will we mandate prerequisites for program-integrated courses?

Foundation courses should be required for sure (for reasons explained in #1), but Essential Practicing courses, as we understand it through our outcome anyway, don't necessarily have to come before Practicing in the program. Ideally, it would happen like Foundation > Essential Practice > Program Practice, but since we didn't begin this process way back when with this progression in mind in particular, I don't know that it's worth it or even possible to build that intentionality back into the structure at this point. Ultimately, we decided that, at least from our outcome's perspective, Foundation should come before *all* Practice, but otherwise there shouldn't be particular order requirements.

### 4. Do we want to mandate that foundation or practicing courses fall in certain numerical ranges?

Yes. However, we had some disagreement over whether it should go:

- Foundation: 100-level only

- Practicing: 200-400 level

or

- Foundation: 100-200 level
- Practicing: 300-400 level

In either case, we agreed that it will likely take some serious CPC work to get all courses at the university (with tags, at least) to adhere to this requirement, but that it's probably worth it to make the practical effects of the new model more easily comprehensible.

5. The Essential Practices block for the IA-Sciences was described in the GERTF final report as allowing courses "outside of areas that traditionally support the major." How can we more clearly define this?

We didn't address this concern because we didn't see how it affected our particular group.

6. Can we solicit:
  - ANTH 452 (many engineering programs require this)
  - SOC 325/335 (wanted by Dental Hygiene)
  - PSCI 326 (wanted by Operations Management).

We all agreed that the first three courses on this list should be solicited for applications. PSCI 326 doesn't seem to exist in the catalog, and so we weren't sure if this course still existed or where the request to tag it even came from. Should my group be contacting the appropriate sources to solicit these applications? Or is it best to, as you said before, wait until next fall when the new leadership is in place?