A Report from the
Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee, May 6, 2008
Final Draft 5
incorporating all changes made at the
May 6 & May 7, 2008 meeting of the SAS and Affiliate Faculty

Preface

The Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee has deliberated for more than a year on the guidelines for a new SAS Core Curriculum that it now submits for consideration by the Faculty.

Early on, we surveyed what other research universities were doing. It was soon apparent that contemporary core curricula fall into three broad categories:
- No core curriculum (often called the Brown model; it is a model that Harvard came near to adopting before their Dean charged them to think again)
- A core set of broad courses taken by all students (the Columbia model)
- A set of distribution requirements

There were articulate and even passionate proponents of each of these models on our Committee and in the Faculty at large. However, it early on became apparent that sentiment, both on the Committee, and as best we could judge, in the Faculty at large was strongly on the side of distribution requirements that would insure that students had significant exposure to different areas of scholarship and that insured that students acquire some basic skills, such as writing and quantitative reasoning. In this, our Faculty is not alone. To the best of our knowledge, every large state-supported research university has distribution requirements, as do almost all major private universities. On the other hand, our sentiment was equally as strong that we did not want distribution for distribution's sake. We wanted students to take a broad selection of courses because we believed in the ideal that has guided a liberal education for centuries, the belief that a well-educated person should be familiar with a broad range of the fruits of the world's diverse intellectual traditions. In other words, we wanted the distribution requirements to serve broadly articulated goals. We thought that what mattered in the end was not whether students had taken a prescribed set of courses but rather whether the courses that they had taken had promoted the goals of a liberal education in a research university. That is why we have focused on elaborating those goals. And that is why we propose that Rutgers make the promotion of those goals the guiding principle behind the structuring of its core curriculum.

By focusing on the explicit pedagogical goals of the courses they have taken, our proposal will give students more flexibility than they now have, while at the same time insuring that the courses they have taken have made them conversant with diverse intellectual traditions, modes of analysis, and modes of thought. By making the goals of our Core courses explicit, we enable ourselves to assess the extent to which those courses advance their stated goals. We anticipate that these assessments will be a flexible tool by which we can regularly rethink what we really

want for our students, what they want from us, and the extent to which our different pedagogical methods are giving them both what we want for them and what they want from us.

Because we favor an evolutionary Core that responds to the needs of the students and the ideals of the faculty, we propose a planning document under which a new Core can be implemented by a standing committee in deep collaboration with the wider faculty. We propose a structure that leaves great freedom in the details, which will have to be negotiated over the substantial span of time it will take to implement this goal-based approach. Because this is a planning document, we have been concerned to articulate the goals as clearly and carefully as we could, rather than to frame them in inspirational terms. This document is not intended to explain to the students the high ideals behind the general goals of a liberal education. That is a task for another day and a much smaller committee. This proposal is intended to be the broad guidelines that the Faculty gives to the standing Core Requirements Committee.

I am happy to present this draft report, with my thanks to the members of the committee for the considerable time and labor that they contributed to get us this far.

—Randy Gallistel, Chair, Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee

The Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee Membership

Chair:
    Randy Gallistel, Psychology

SAS Faculty Members:
    Dennis Bathory, Political Science
    Harriet Davidson, English and WGS
    Monica Driscoll, MBB
    Frances Egan, Philosophy
    Jane Grimshaw, Linguistics
    Dorothy Hodgson, Anthropology
    Jane Junn, Poli. Science (until March 2008)
    Mohan Kalelkar, Physics and Astronomy
    Elizabeth Leake, Italian
    James Masschaele, History
    Terry McGuire, Genetics
    Lorraine Piroux, French
    Thomas Prusa, Economics (until Jan. 2008)
    Ben Sifuentes-Jáuregui, American Studies
    Kathryn Uhrich, Chemistry
    Andrew Vershon, MBB

Appointed Members from other Units:
    Warren Crown, Learning and Teaching, GSE
    Martin Markowitz, Associate Dean of NB
        Undergraduate Program, RBS
    Patricia Mayer, Dance, MGSA
    Brent Ruben, Communication, SCILS
    Paula Voos, Labor Studies, SMLR

Ex-Officio Members (non-voting):
    Peter Klein, Acting Executive Vice Dean
    Michael Beals, Vice Dean for Undergraduate
        Education
    Susan E. Lawrence, Associate Dean for
        Undergraduate Education
    Vic Tulli, Associate Dean of SAS (staffing)

Student Members (non-voting):
    Chad Kim SAS-LC '09
    Brenna Krieger SAS-DC '09
    Aaron McKay SAS-UC '10 (until Feb. 2008)

Contents

Overview of Resolutions

The Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee recommends that resolutions leading to a new Core Curriculum be divided into component parts, moving from the general to the specific. The proposed components, in summary, are:

1. That degree requirements for the School of Arts and Sciences shall consist of a Core Curriculum, the requirements for at least one Major, the requirements for at least one Minor or second Major, except when the Major requirements equal or exceed 50 credits, and the necessary number of elective credits to reach the full total of credits necessary for graduation (120).
2. That a new Core Curriculum shall be based on learning goals, and that multiple courses or methods should be available for satisfying requirements within the Core.
3. That the standing Core Requirements Committee shall set criteria for reviewing courses, shall review courses, shall make recommendations to the faculty for inclusion of courses in the Core, and shall monitor the effectiveness of the Core, in accordance with the learning goals approved by the faculty.
4. That the Core Curriculum shall be divided into the three broad parts described, and that requirements may overlap from part to part.
5. That the goals for each part, section, and subsection of the Core Curriculum, as recommended by the committee, be set in place.
6. That the structure of course requirements connecting the learning goals of the Core Curriculum with the course/credit requirements, as recommended by the committee, be set in place and that the Core Requirements Committee shall review this structure, and shall propose for approval of the faculty, such changes to it as called for by the experience of implementation.
7. That the Executive Dean of SAS shall charge the standing Core Requirements Committee with developing a plan for implementing the new Core Curriculum, which should be implemented in gradual stages to give time for broad consultation, allocation of resources, and approval by the faculty.

———

Resolution 1: A Core, a Major, a Minor, Electives

Resolution: That degree requirements for the School of Arts and Sciences shall consist of a Core Curriculum, the requirements for at least one Major, the requirements for at least one Minor or second Major, except when the Major requirements equal or exceed 50

credits, and the necessary number of elective credits to reach the full total of credits necessary for graduation (120).

Rationale: This structure is essentially the system now in place under the interim curriculum, with the Liberal Arts Distribution Requirement being replaced by a Core Curriculum as approved by the faculty.

The Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee recommends continuing the requirement of a minor field of study as part of a liberal arts and sciences degree, as a way of encouraging depth of study in some field outside of a major. For students in credit-intensive, highly-structured majors, requiring a minor runs counter to the spirit of breadth and depth that animates the Minor requirement by unduly restricting the range of disciplines and programs they can sample. In general, Majors typically require 33-39 credits and Minors typically require 18 credits, making it reasonable to define "credit-intensive majors" as those whose requirements equal or exceed 50. Students completing such a major are encouraged, but not required, to complete a minor.

The AHCCC recommends that a standing advisory group to the Core Requirements Committee (see Resolution 3) on Non-Traditional Students be appointed. This standing group will address all Core Curriculum issues as they relate to Non-Traditional Students and recommend appropriate policies to the Core Requirements Committee for consideration and vote by the faculty of SAS.

As the requirement is now structured, completing a second major satisfies the requirement for completing a minor, and any credits satisfying major requirements may also satisfy minor requirements and vice versa, unless specifically prohibited by the particular major or minor program. Courses satisfying Core requirements may also satisfy requirements for a major or minor. Although a very limited number of major/minor combinations are not allowed because they are too similar, these are determined in consultation with the departments or programs offering the majors and minors. The Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee recommends that all of those structural practices continue.

Currently, under the SAS interim curriculum, a certificate program may be included on the list of accepted minors, and most certificate programs which require credits in an amount comparable to the typical minor but less than required for a major are so included. The AHCCC intends that this practice be retained and extended when appropriate.

Resolution 2: A Goal-Based Core Curriculum

Resolution: That a new Core Curriculum shall be based on learning goals connected with each and every requirement, and that such a curriculum shall provide for multiple courses or methods for satisfying each goal.

Rationale: A curriculum based on goals rather than in distribution requirements has several advantages that make it a true Core of undergraduate education, rather than merely a set of

connected graduation requirements that may or may not become more than the sum of the parts. Some advantages of a goal-based Core Curriculum are:

- it more clearly communicates its own purpose to students and faculty members alike;
- it puts the focus of Core courses and Core sequences on learning outcomes rather than on the disciplinary categories of courses;
- it is the first step in allowing a standing committee to review potential Core courses, and for the SAS faculty to have approval of courses in the Core; without stated goals connected to requirements, it is difficult to apply consistent standards in such a review (a frequent objection to the interim distribution curriculum now in place);
- it is amenable to ongoing assessment: with defined goals, we as a faculty can review whether our Core Curriculum and the courses satisfying them are actually accomplishing what we hope them to accomplish, and can implement continuous improvements to the Core Curriculum and to sections, subsections, and courses within it.

It cannot be emphasized enough that a **goal-based curriculum is significantly different from a distribution-based curriculum**, even if the resulting menu of requirements may appear similar. A goal-based curriculum is **not** merely a device for sorting current courses into lists; it is instead a declaration of the interconnected principles and values we expect to be a part of the education of every School of Arts and Sciences graduate.

It is the hope of the committee that a goal-based curriculum, with a structure similar to that described later in this report and with resources to match, will encourage the revision of many courses and the creation of many new courses toward fulfilling learning goals in one or several areas of the Core.

The committee debated and rejected the possibility of establishing single courses that every student must take, a model best exemplified by the Columbia core. Aside from the practical difficulty of allocating resources for such approach, the committee felt that both the aspirations and the structure of undergraduate education at Rutgers are and should continue to be based in meaningful student choices, and noted that this approach is entirely consistent across our peer group of top public research universities.

Resolution 3: The Role of the Standing Core Requirements Committee

Resolution: That the standing Core Requirements Committee shall, as described in the bylaws, review courses for inclusion in the Core and monitor the effectiveness of the Core, and that they shall do so in accordance with the set of Learning Goals as approved by the Faculty, and a set of evaluative criteria. Following the model of the standing Curriculum Committee, the Core Requirements Committee shall set up mechanisms for gathering necessary information, shall consult with faculty and shall initiate working groups on particular issues, and then shall make recommendations for approval by the faculty at its biannual meetings.

Rationale: This resolution follows from the previous resolution and from the SAS Bylaws, which describe the committee thus:

> The Core Requirements Committee shall review the effectiveness of the core requirements, monitor assessments of these requirements and recommend appropriate actions to the Executive Dean for consideration by the faculty of SAS. The committee shall recommend revisions to the approved list of courses satisfying core requirements. The committee shall be convened as needed by the Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education, but shall meet at least once each year.

It is included in the list of resolutions here to make explicit the mechanism of implementing and maintaining a goal-based Core Curriculum. Decisions about which courses meet or do not meet the goals of a particular requirement will not be made by individual faculty members teaching the courses, nor will they be made by departments. Instead, a large committee with elected and appointed representatives from all academic areas and several departments and Schools will develop criteria for reviewing courses in each area, review courses, and make recommendations to be approved by the faculty on the whole. Following the model of the Curriculum Committee, this will be a deliberative and consultative process, with the Core Requirements Committee charged to discuss the Core and the parameters of courses with interested parties before bringing recommendations to faculty meetings.

Resolution 4: Broad Overview of Core Goals

Resolution: That the Core Curriculum shall be divided into three broad areas, each with individual sets of goals and corresponding course requirements. The parts shall be:
    Part I: 21st-Century Challenges
    Part II: Areas of Inquiry
    Part III: Cognitive Skills and Processes
In approving these general sections, the general principle shall be that requirements may overlap from part to part: courses that satisfy requirements in one part may also be allowed to satisfy requirements in another.

Rationale: The "Core Curriculum Preliminary Proposal" that begins on page 8 provides a detailed illustration of the possibilities of using these three Parts to organize a goal-based core, though the details are subject to discussion, revision, and approval. In brief:

Part I: This Part delineates a signature set of priorities within the SAS Core, giving primary position to courses that synthesize multiple intellectual approaches and apply them to some of the most pressing issues of our time. It would be an important category for developing new courses and revising existing courses, particularly toward inter- and multi-disciplinary approaches or innovative course experiences (2-course sequences or paired courses, study abroad, service-learning, etc.).

Part II: The courses required by this Part provide undergraduates with opportunities to encounter multiple modes of scholarship, research, analysis, and synthesis. Although this Part may seem similar in general appearance to the current distribution requirements (in "Natural Sciences" and "Social Sciences and the Humanities"), the goal-based foundation of the category makes it very different, and the committee envisions a much more limited set of courses satisfying each individual requirement. Likewise, the committee imagines that no section or subsection will be the exclusive domain of a particular department or set of departments, and courses that satisfy the goals of a section or subsection (as reviewed by the Core Requirements Committee and approved by the faculty) will satisfy the requirements of that section or subsection, regardless of the offering department or program.

Part III: The courses in this Part would focus on skills required for students to succeed, and include requirements that are roughly parallel with the current Writing and Quantitative Reasoning requirements, with additions. Separating them into a section distinct from the other two makes the purpose of this category of requirements more clear: acquiring cognitive skills that should be transportable across fields and disciplines, and which can, in some instances, be taught in multiple contexts including work for a major or for another Part of the Core (a course in psychology or economics might satisfy a quantitative reasoning requirement; a course in genetics or anthropology might satisfy a writing requirement; a course in any/all of those departments might satisfy a requirement based in research and information technology).

Overlaps: The current Liberal Arts Distribution Requirements are based on the assumption that exposure to a single course in a particular area fulfills the distributive goals of the curriculum. This goal-based Core Curriculum imagines instead a true core of learning, and as such welcomes courses that address several sets of goals. By dividing the Core into parts and allowing for overlap from part to part but not within parts, the Core would emphasize and encourage the types of synthesis we aspire to teach our students, while still maintaining a great degree of required breadth in courses and approaches.

•————————————————————————————————————•

Further Resolutions: Adopting the Specifics

The committee further recommends resolutions to adopt the specifics of the curriculum, as described in the "Core Curriculum Preliminary Proposal" on the following pages, and in the following order. The rationale for each resolution is included in the preliminary proposal.

Resolution: That the goals for each section and subsection of the Core Curriculum, as formulated below, be set in place.

Resolution: That the structure of course requirements connecting the learning goals of the Core Curriculum with the course/credit requirements, as formulated below, be set in place and that the Core Requirements Committee shall review this structure, and shall propose for approval of the faculty, such changes to it as called for by the experience of implementation.

Resolution: That the Executive Dean of SAS shall charge the standing Core Requirements Committee with developing a plan for implementing the new Core Curriculum, which should be implemented in gradual stages to give time for broad consultation, allocation of resources, and approval by the faculty.

Core Curriculum Preliminary Proposal
Goals and Course Requirements

————————————————

Part I: 21st-Century Challenges

This Part delineates signature priorities of the SAS Core. It emphasizes courses that synthesize multiple intellectual approaches and apply them to some of the most pressing issues of our time. No single set of courses will be taken by all students, but all students will share the experience of being exposed to these issues in an intellectually challenging and reflective way. Every SAS student will engage in an upper-level comparative, multidisciplinary, or interdisciplinary 6-credit experience to prepare for the challenges of global citizenship.

Over time, new courses will be developed to address the learning goals of this Part. Innovative pedagogical approaches will find a natural home in this Part as well: service learning, study abroad, learning community courses, etc. The composition of the Part will undergo regular review, in the expectation that the issues that are included may change and the list of courses may be expanded.

I. 21st-Century Challenges

Learning Goals – a Rutgers University SAS graduate will be able to:
- **Analyze the degree to which forms of human difference shape a person's experiences of and perspectives on the world.**
- **Analyze a contemporary global issue from a multidisciplinary perspective.**
- **Analyze the relationship that science and technology have to a contemporary social issue.**
- **Analyze issues of social justice across local and global contexts.**

Course Requirements:
Students must take courses totaling 6 credits, with at least one course at the 300 level or higher. Coursework for this section must meet at least two of the learning goals.

Courses in this area may also count toward a major or minor, or toward Part II or Part III requirements.

————————————————

Part II: Areas of Inquiry

This Part allows students to encounter multiple modes of scholarship, research, analysis, and synthesis. Courses that satisfy the requirements of this Part will not merely present disciplinary

approaches, but will highlight the assumptions of these modes of scholarship and put them into broader conversation with other approaches – in ways made concrete in the Goals below.

This Part prepares undergraduates to engage with multidimensional and multimodal problems. It will invigorate the learning goals of every major by giving students opportunities to reflect on and contextualize the modes of scholarship that are prominent in the field of their majors.

This goal-centered program encourages academic work that stretches the boundaries of academic disciplines. It is not based on departmental or course-centered distribution, yet it still re-affirms the intellectual goals that motivated the formation of the disciplines in the first place.

Each section of this Part of the Core provides multiple points of entry for various departments, programs, or interdisciplinary groups interested in providing Core Courses. No section will be the exclusive domain of one or a small number of departments, and faculty from any department, program, or School will be welcome to develop courses meeting the learning goals.

The standing Core Requirements Committee will review courses for inclusion in the Core, paying careful attention to the extent to which courses address the goals. Not all Core courses will satisfy all goals in each section or subsection, nor will they necessarily approach the goals with the same sense of priority and balance. From a practical standpoint, some of this work will overlap with work in a major or minor, and one or more courses should fulfill major and minor requirements.

II. Section A: Natural Sciences

Learning Goals – a Rutgers University SAS graduate will be able to:
- **Understand and apply basic principles and concepts in the physical or biological sciences.**
- **Explain and be able to assess the relationship among assumptions, method, evidence, arguments, and theory in scientific analysis.**
- **Identify and critically assess ethical and societal issues in science.**

Course Requirements:
Students must take two courses for a minimum of 6 credits total.

Courses in this area may also count toward a major or minor, or toward Part I or Part III requirements.

Course Criteria:
Courses in this section must meet the first learning goal, and at least one of the other two.

II. Section B: Social Science and History
Subsection 1: Historical Analysis
Subsection 2: Social Analysis

Overall Learning Goals – a Rutgers University SAS graduate will be able to:

- **Understand the bases and development of human and societal endeavors across time and place.**
- **Explain and be able to assess the relationship among assumptions, method, evidence, arguments, and theory in social and historical analysis.**
- **Identify and critically assess ethical issues in social science and history.**

    Subsection 1. Historical Analysis:
       Learning Goals – a Rutgers University SAS graduate will be able to:
- **Explain the development of some aspect of a society or culture over time, including the history of ideas or history of science.**
- **Employ historical reasoning to study human endeavors.**

    Subsection 2. Social Analysis:
       Learning Goals – a Rutgers University SAS graduate will be able to:
- **Understand different theories about human culture, social identity, economic entities, political systems, and other forms of social organization.**
- **Apply concepts about human and social behavior to particular questions or situations.**

Course Requirements:
Students must take a minimum of 6 credits total, including one course carrying 3 or more credits that satisfies each of the two subsections.

Courses in this area may also count toward a major or minor, or toward Part I or Part III requirements.

II. Section C: Arts and the Humanities

Learning Goals – a Rutgers University SAS graduate will be able to:

- **Examine critically philosophical and other theoretical issues concerning the nature of reality, human experience, knowledge, value, and/or cultural production.**
- **Analyze arts and/or literatures in themselves and in relation to specific histories, values, languages, cultures, and technologies.**
- **Understand the nature of human languages and their speakers.**
- **Engage critically in the process of creative expression**

Course Requirements:
Students must take a minimum of 6 credits total, including two different courses through which they fulfill two of the four learning goals.

Courses in this area may also count toward a major or minor, or toward Part I or Part III requirements.

Part III: Cognitive Skills and Processes

This Part provides SAS undergraduates with a solid foundation in areas that are critical for success in academic study and research. The goals within each section provide for a "vertical" dimension, as several learning goals may (ideally, *should*) be accomplished by upper level courses within a student's major or minor.

Specific criteria for courses intended to fulfill Part III requirements of the Core will be worked out by the standing Core Requirements Committee, in consultation with working groups comprising faculty members from multiple departments and schools, as appropriate.

III. Section A: Writing and Communication

This section requires one course in addition to the current interim requirement (2 courses), but note that neither the second nor the third course in this version maps directly onto the upper-level writing requirement now in place. The committee's intention is to encourage more vertical distribution of writing requirements than the current curriculum requires, while also addressing the need for greater emphasis on both general and specific communication skills.

Learning Goals – a Rutgers University SAS graduate will be able to:
- **Communicate complex ideas effectively, in standard written English, to a general audience.**
- **Communicate effectively in modes appropriate to a discipline or area of inquiry.**
- **Evaluate and critically assess sources and use the conventions of attribution and citation correctly.**
- **Analyze and synthesize information and ideas from multiple sources to generate new insights.**

Course Requirements:
Students must satisfy three requirements:
1. Expository Writing 101 or equivalent.
2. A second course emphasizing written and/or oral communication in English and incorporating ongoing feedback and revision.
3. An upper-level course in any field that focuses on developing the students' skills in writing and other forms of communication, in the modes common to a discipline or area of inquiry.

Courses in this section may also count toward the major, the minor, or Part I or II of the core requirements.

III. Section B: Quantitative and Formal Reasoning

Learning Goals – a Rutgers University SAS graduate will be able to:

- **Formulate, evaluate, and communicate conclusions and inferences from quantitative information.**
- **Apply effective and efficient mathematical or other formal processes to reason and to solve problems.**

Course Requirements:
Students must satisfy two requirements:
1. A course carrying 3 or more credits from the list of acceptable quantitative reasoning courses, including college-credit bearing mathematics courses at the 100 level. This course may also count toward the major or minor.
2. A second, possibly discipline-specific course carrying 3 or more credits in formal reasoning or methods, statistics, or mathematics. This course may also count toward the major or minor, or Part II of the core requirements.

III. Section C: Information Technology and Research

Learning Goals – a Rutgers University SAS graduate will be able to:
- **Employ current technologies to access information, to conduct research, and to communicate findings.**
- **Analyze and critically assess information from traditional and emergent technologies.**
- **Understand the principles that underlie information systems.**

Course Requirements:
One course in any field carrying three or more credits, or equivalent, that provides instruction in current and emerging technologies for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information within the content area of the course. This course may also count toward the major, the minor, or Part I or II of the core requirements.

Statement on the Study of Foreign Languages

A working group composed of faculty members working in foreign languages and related fields advised the Ad Hoc Core Curriculum Committee regarding the study of foreign languages and requirements within the Core. The working group prepared the following statement, which the committee endorses:

In an increasingly globalizing society, and especially in a pluri-lingual state like New Jersey, Rutgers students need to be exposed to languages other than English, and encouraged to reflect on how different languages shape a person's experience and knowledge of the world. Rutgers, in turn, needs to develop multiple paths through which these goals can be pursued.

Accordingly, the Core Curriculum and Rutgers Undergraduate education in general will foster several models of encounter with foreign languages, with various objectives in

mind: different types of proficiency (e.g. reading knowledge and conversation), the professionalization of heritage speakers, translation skills, experiential learning, study abroad, and field-specific usage of languages.

Substantial, content-driven connections need to be created across disciplines. They will involve one aspect of language study or another, in the form of specialized requirements, optional tracks, joint majors, certificates, interdisciplinary courses, and language components for study abroad programs.

An Advisory Committee on Foreign Languages will work closely with the Standing Core Requirements Committee to develop broad-based recommendations to that effect, within the Core Curriculum itself and beyond it.

Members of the working group on the study of foreign languages: Andrea Baldi (Italian); Jose Camacho (Spanish and Portuguese); François Cornilliat (French); Uri Eisenzweig (French, Transliteratures Project); Martha Helfer (German); Jan Kubik (Political Science); Martin Lin (Philosophy); Fran Mascia-Lees (Anthropology); Matt Matsuda (History); Richard Miller (English); Lorraine Piroux (French, member of the AHCCC); Catherine Puglisi (Art History); Paul Schalow (Asian Languages and Cultures); Laura Schneider (Geography); Ben Sifuentes-Jáuregui (American Studies, member of the AHCCC); Richard Simmons (Asian Languages and Cultures).

Analysis of Credit Impact on Students of Proposed Core Requirements

The current "Liberal Arts Distribution Requirement" requires 12 different courses for a minimum of 36 credits. Courses may count toward a major or minor, but no course may count for more than one Distribution Requirement.

The Core Curriculum proposed here also allows coursework in the Core to overlap with coursework for a major or minor. *If each requirement were a unique course,* the proposed Core would represent a minimum of 42 credits. However, there are two important factors to remember:

- The proposed Core endorses courses that fulfill learning goals, and thus requirements, in more than one area. For example, many courses that will fulfill Part II requirements may also satisfy learning goals and thus course/credit requirements for Part I or Part III. This is a significant change from our current Distribution Requirements. The change makes the credit burden of the Core potentially lighter. It also highlights the fundamental commitment of the Core to interconnections among courses and overall learning, instead of the distribution of courses into separate lists.

- The two courses/6 credits that are new to this proposed Core (one additional requirement in writing/communication and one additional requirement in information retrieval, technology, and research) are likely to overlap with work done in a major or minor field, or with requirements in Part I or II of the Core.

The proposed Core represents a reduced credit burden for the majority of our students. Its greatest benefit is that it asks students to make informed decisions about which Core courses they take and why they are taking them, which is one of our explicit objectives in designing a new Core.

Although the Core Curriculum may seem complex, it will be simpler to implement in our degree progress software than the Interim Curriculum. The proposed Core emphasizes overlays rather than rigid distinctions between courses. This will allow student advisers to focus strongly on students' intellectual interests and academic plans in helping them choose courses wisely.

•——•

Recommendations for Implementation of the New Core Curriculum

The new Core Curriculum will be phased in under the guidance of the standing Core Requirements Committee. The Committee will set the schedule for the phasing in and establish the exact criteria and process used to evaluate whether a course should be offered as part of the Core. The Committee will consult with the faculty of the SAS and affiliated undergraduate departments and programs, and may recommend the formation of working groups to aid in the implementation of the Core.

In order for a course to be accepted into the Core, a course overview must clearly articulate how the course promotes the Core Curriculum learning goals. The SAS Core Requirements Committee will insist that every course (1) clearly identify the Core Curriculum learning goals it promotes and (2) provide a method for assessing whether those learning goals are being met. Faculty have primary responsibility for developing their own assessment tools; the SAS Dean's Office will provide assistance when requested. Results of assessment and plans for modification of the courses in light of them will be the responsibility of the offering unit.

This goal-centered Core Curriculum comes with several important recommendations for its implementation:
- Requirements in the Core Curriculum should be founded on Learning Goals, not disciplinary divides. Courses in many disciplines, or in inter- and multidisciplinary areas, may satisfy one or more of the Core Curriculum areas.
- The new Core Curriculum should spur the development of new courses, and the modification of existing courses, to correspond to the Learning Goals.
- All Core Curriculum course syllabi should clearly list the relevant learning goals. Syllabi should provide a plan for assessing achievement of those goals, and for revising the course in light of the assessment results.

- Core Curriculum courses should be designed and taught by our premier faculty teachers and emerging scholars.
- Resources should be made available to faculty for development of Core Curriculum courses and perhaps more importantly, for sustainment of Core Curriculum courses. Core Curriculum teaching should count fully toward the faculty member's departmental teaching load. The administration should clearly communicate to faculty that participation in the Core Curriculum is integral to their professorial role and highly valued by the university.

A Note about the Timeline for Implementation

A new Core will need to be phased in, for many reasons. It will take time to design new courses and revise existing ones, to vet courses for inclusion in the Core, and to reallocate resources to ensure that there are enough Core courses in each Part to satisfy student demand. Phasing in new requirements gradually, and in ways compatible with the current Liberal Arts Distribution Requirements, will be the least disruptive approach to shifting resources while keeping opportunities open for students who will be following earlier requirements.

Accordingly, please note that the earliest that any Part of a newly approved Core could be put into practice would be two years following approval. In a phased implementation plan, several sections would not be implemented even then.