Committee Meetings - 9/23/03, 10/2/03, 10/28/03, 11/18/03 - meeting of all the subcommittee members, 12/17/03 - meeting of all the subcommittee members, 1/29/03, 2/23/04 - meeting of all the subcommittee members, 3/19/04 - Core Conversations I, 3/31/04 - Core Conversations II, 4/27/04. It should be noted that much of the committee's work was performed via e-mail.

Actions - The committee has responded to the mandate given to us by Faculty Council. We participated in the creation of eight subcommittees who worked on developing the expectations and requirements for a new or revised Core Curriculum in the Fall, 2003 semester. In the Spring, 2004 semester, the faculty on the subcommittees reorganized themselves to work on Core Curriculum proposals. The proposals are attached to this document.

In recognition that further development of the Core curriculum proposals will be performed by a committee elected by Faculty Council, we would like to present a series of questions that we request that the elected committee address.

Questions for the elected committee (a random ordering, not in order of importance to the present committee):

1. Will there be any discipline-related courses that are pre-requisites for the proposed interdisciplinary courses?

2. How should transfer students navigate the new Core Curriculum? Should we differentiate between lower and upper division transfer students, or students who transfer from within CUNY or from outside of CUNY?

3. How will the Core Curriculum proposals handle the total number of credits and credits per course? Will substitutions be allowed?

4. What are the administrative support structures needed for the Core Curriculum proposals and is it practical to implement them?

5. What are the counseling and advisement needs of the Core Curriculum proposals?
6. What would the role of the Faculty Council Core Curriculum Committee be in reviewing courses, requirements, etc. in the new Core Curriculum models?

7. How can the structure of the Core Curriculum administration be changed so that courses can be reviewed and reformed, if required, in a timely fashion?

8. Do the proposals take into account student concerns?

Respectively Submitted,

Stephen Brumberg, Education
David Corey, English
Wendy Fairey, English (Chairperson, Fall 2003; on sabbatical, Spring 2004)
Paula Massood, Film
Gunja Sen-Gupta, History
Russell Sharman, Anthropology
Micha Tomkiewicz, Physics
Paula Whitlock, CIS (Chairperson, Spring 2004)
Okenfe Aigbe, CLAS representative
Daniel Lerer, SGS representative
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Updated Core with Choice - 4-credit Courses I
April 12, 2004

Group members:
Roberta Satow, Sociology
Margaret King, History

Rationale
This proposal keeps all fourteen existing Core classes (some with slight modifications), and adds others, raising the total number to twenty-two. Courses would carry four credits (except for 2-credit math/science modules). Students would choose courses totaling 32 credits, including at least four credits from each of four areas (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Non-Western) and eight credits from math/science. It would further entail:

*Full transparency.* To facilitate the process of choosing courses and sections, all course syllabi – not just generic syllabi, but the ones that individual professors actually offer – would be posted on the web, with full disclosure of purpose, requirements, and assigned readings.

**ADVANTAGES:** The proposed program is simple and addresses most of the problems associated with the current Core. In brief:

- Students have the power to choose and craft their own liberal arts program.
- Full transparency gives students the resources to do so.
- No existing courses are lost.
- Includes both existing and new discipline-based and interdisciplinary courses.
- No mind-boggling patchwork of 4, 3, 2, and 1.5-credit courses; 2-credit modules retained for science field.
- Departments are included that have not previously been able to participate in the core.
- Four-credit courses permit in-depth exploration and allow for problem-based or active learning components
- Increased workload credit (4 instead of 3) for most core sections benefits participating full-time faculty and lowers the reliance on adjuncts.
- Reducing the number of sections in each department, the consequence of student choice, permits more courses to be taught by full-time faculty and lowers the reliance on adjuncts.
- Academic rigor is maintained
The Program:
22 Core courses from which students choose a total of 32 credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students would choose at least ONE of these four 4-credit courses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students would choose at least ONE of these four 4-credit courses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: The Bible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>People, Power, and Politics (sociology and political science; current Core 3, unchanged)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shaping of the Modern World (Europe/US in global perspective; current Core 4, expanded)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>New discipline-based course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>New interdisciplinary course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Quantitative Reasoning (not open to students scoring above minimum assessment score; 2 credits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Computer Science (current Core 5.1, expanded to 2 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Math (current Core 5.2, expanded to 2 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chemistry (current Core 7.1, a 2-credit module)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Physics (current Core 7.2, a 2-credit module)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Biology (current Core 8.1, a 2-credit module)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Geology (current Core 8.2, a 2-credit module)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>New interdisciplinary course (4 credits):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples: Health and Society or Environmental Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Western/Area Studies</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>Two new courses, expanding current Core 9:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-Western Cultures: Literature, Arts, and Thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-Western Cultures: History and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Core 3 or Core 4 or both could be modified, if necessary, to fulfill any mandated requirement in US history.
Updated Core with Choice - 4-credit Courses II

Group members:
Roberta Satow, Sociology
Margaret King, History

Rationale
This proposal keeps all fourteen existing Core classes (some with slight modifications), and adds others, raising the total number to twenty-two. Courses would carry four credits (except for 2-credit math/science modules). Students would choose courses totaling 32 credits, including at least four credits from each of four areas (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Non-Western) and eight credits from math/science. It would further entail:

Full transparency. To facilitate the process of choosing courses and sections, all course syllabi – not just generic syllabi, but the ones that individual professors actually offer – would be posted on the web, with full disclosure of purpose, requirements, and assigned readings.

Quantitative reasoning. To support the revised Core, a course in Quantitative Reasoning would be added to college-wide Basic Skills requirements for students that fail to pass an entry assessment in Quantitative Reasoning.

ADVANTAGES: The proposed program is simple and addresses most of the problems associated with the current Core. In brief:

• Students have the power to choose and craft their own liberal arts program.
• Full transparency gives students the resources to do so.
• Addresses present difficulties in the Sciences and Social Sciences of including quantitative material across the curriculum
• No existing courses are lost.
• Includes both existing and new discipline-based and interdisciplinary courses.
• No mind-boggling patchwork of 4, 3, 2, and 1.5-credit courses; 2-credit modules retained for science field.
• Departments are included that have not previously been able to participate in the core.
• Four-credit courses permit in-depth exploration and allow for problem-based or active learning components
• Increased workload credit (4 instead of 3) for most core sections benefits participating full-time faculty and lowers the reliance on adjuncts.
• Reducing the number of sections in each department, the consequence of student choice, permits more courses to be taught by full-time faculty and lowers the reliance on adjuncts.
• Academic rigor is maintained
The Program:
21 Core courses from which students choose a total of 32 credits

| Arts | 1 | Art (current Core 2.1, expanded) |
|      | 2 | Music (current Core 2.1, expanded) |
|      | 3 | New discipline-based course |
|      | 4 | New interdisciplinary course |
| Humanities | 5 | Classics (current Core 1, expanded) |
|          | 6 | Landmarks of Literature (current Core 6, expanded) |
|          | 7 | Philosophy (current Core 10, expanded) |
|          | 8 | New interdisciplinary course |
|          |    | Example: The Bible |
| Social Sciences | 9 | People, Power, and Politics (sociology and political science; current Core 3, unchanged)* |
|          | 10 | Shaping of the Modern World (Europe/US in global perspective; current Core 4, expanded)* |
|          | 11 | New discipline-based course |
|          | 12 | New interdisciplinary course |
| Sciences | 13 | Computer Science (current Core 5.1, expanded to 2 credits) |
|          | 14 | Math (current Core 5.2, expanded to 2 credits) |
|          | 15 | Chemistry (current Core 7.1, a 2-credit module) |
|          | 16 | Physics (current Core 7.2, a 2-credit module) |
|          | 17 | Biology (current Core 8.1, a 2-credit module) |
|          | 18 | Geology (current Core 8.2, a 2-credit module) |
|          | 19 | New interdisciplinary course (4 credits): |
|          |    | Examples: Health and Society or Environmental Studies |
| Non-Western/Area Studies | 20-21 | Two new courses, expanding current Core 9: |
|          |     | 3. Non-Western Cultures: Literature, Arts, and Thought |
|          |     | 4. Non-Western Cultures: History and Social Sciences |

*Core 3 or Core 4 or both could be modified, if necessary, to fulfill any mandated requirement in US history.
**GENERAL EDUCATION MODEL**

Committee members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOUNDATIONAL COURSES</th>
<th>CULMINATING COURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no pre-requisites)</td>
<td>(junior standing or 60 credits; courses are proposed and taught by a variety of departments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE HUMAN WORLD

- Core 3.1: Knowledge Existence & Values
- Core 3.2: Shaping of the Modern World
- Core 3.3: People, Power and Politics
- Core 3.4: Non-Western Cultures

### THE WORLD OF DISCOVERY

- Core 2.1: Foundations of Mathematics (perhaps a set theoretic course)
- Core 2.2: Lab Science (Suggestion: One of Biology or Chemistry)
- Core 2.3: Lab Science (Suggestion: One of Physics or Geology)
- Core 2.4: Non-Lab Science Course (e.g. The Development of Scientific Theories; Scientific Discoveries; Frontiers of Science)

### WORLD – MAKING

- Core 1.1: Classical Origins
- Core 1.2: Art
- Core 1.3: Music
- Core 1.4: World Literature (Suggestion: Thematically organized)
JUSTIFICATION

The model proposed is a product of:
I. The principles and goals recommended, at the December 17th General Education Task Force meeting, by the Task Force Sub-Committee on Principles and Goals for General Education at Brooklyn College; and
II. Discussions of a Core Model Planning sub-committee that met during the Spring semester, and discussions with a variety of faculty members.

I. Principles and Goals

The following goals were recommended by the Task Force Committee on Principles and Goals for General Education at Brooklyn College and accepted as general goals for Brooklyn College general education requirements:

Brooklyn College, a public institution of higher education and one of eleven senior colleges of the City University of New York, offers access to a superior education in the liberal arts and sciences. The rigorous foundation provided by its general education program enables students:

1. To develop the ability to think critically, to reason logically, to reason quantitatively, and to express their thoughts with clarity and precision;
2. To develop a strong sense of individual responsibility and the ability to make sound moral judgments;
3. To understand and appreciate individual human and social diversity and the necessity for tolerance;
4. To understand the art, histories, and cultures of the past as a foundation for those of the present and the development and workings of modern societies in an interdependent world;
5. To understand and appreciate the natural and life sciences and the scientific method.
6. To become life-long learners capable of acquiring, retaining, and applying knowledge and skills that further their intellectual growth and fulfillment and the good of the community;

The current 27 goals for a Core Curriculum spell out these general education goals in some detail, and they were generally accepted by members of our committee as serving this role.

The following pedagogic principles were recommended:
Principle 1. Nature of General Education Courses:
A general education program should be a well-rounded program of courses that provide a foundation for intellectual development and enrichment and future learning.

Principle 2. Credits in the general education requirement:
(2a) Majority view: General education courses should be 3 credits each.
(2b) Majority view: The total number of credits in the general education requirement should be no more than 36 credits.

Principle 3. Commonality or Choice
It was generally agreed that this should depend on the eventual structure of the general education curriculum, as it turns out.

Principle 4. Level of Courses in the General Education Requirement
Suggestion for consideration: There should be at least one [possibly more than one] general education course taken by students in their junior or senior year. This might be interdisciplinary in nature.
Principle 5. Disciplinary, Interdisciplinary, Multidisciplinary Courses
Ideally, with adequate support, it would be desirable that general education requirements introduce students to these different kinds of courses (disciplinary, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary) so that they are exposed to various ways of learning.

Principle 6. Teaching of General Education Courses
Ideally a majority of general education courses should be taught by full-time faculty.

Principle 7. Administration and Supervision of General Education Courses
There should be an administrator who has as a principal role the supervision of the general education program. A committee with oversight responsibility should be established.

There should be substantial and enduring administrative support for any general education program.

II. CRITERIA OF THE MODEL
The principles and goals above, the general group discussion at the December General Education Task Force meeting, and subsequent discussions of the Core model planning sub-committee and interviews with various faculty members support the following general criteria for a General Education model:

1. The current Core provides the starting point and general model for discussion.
2. Core courses that have proven to be successful are retained. Remedies for problems or gaps in current core courses are suggested.
3. Each course is 3 credits.
4. Students are offered choice as dictated by the general education program.
5. Second level courses are added.
6. A clearly articulated rational and coherent structure of foundational and upper level courses is built into the model itself.
7. Students are offered an experience of different modes of learning, disciplinary, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and students are introduced to the distinct methodologies of different disciplines and approaches.
8. Students are introduced to non-Western cultures and issues of diversity in a variety of courses.
9. Every Brooklyn College graduate, including transfer students, shares a common experience of upper level courses.

DISCUSSION OF CRITERIA:

1. The current Core provides the starting point and general model for discussion.

Discussion: The current Brooklyn College Core has achieved national renown. It serves our students well by providing a high quality and well rounded foundation for future learning. (Principle 1 above).

2. Courses that have proven to be successful are retained. Remedies for problems or gaps in current core courses are suggested.

Discussion: Some courses have received little or no criticism over the years from students or from faculty teaching the course. Problems have been noted in others.
3. Each course is 3 credits.

Discussion: Current one and half credit and two credit courses provide inadequate time for development of material and do not provide students with credit appropriate to the investment of their time. Uniform three credit courses provide sufficient time and equal credit recognition for each course. Reasonable limits on the total number of credits in the general education requirement are necessary to permit completion of often demanding major requirements and to leave students some space for choice of electives. (Principle 2 above)

4. Students are offered choice as dictated by the general education program.

Discussion: A common set of Core courses has proven to provide students with an excellent general education program throughout most of the history of Brooklyn College. In earlier years, there was a choice among laboratory science courses to provide all students with laboratory science experience, though not necessarily in the same sciences for each. Discontent with four laboratory science courses, each only two credits, has led, in the proposed model, to a proposal of choice of two (three credit) laboratory science courses and a proposed upper level (3 credit) non-laboratory science course. (Principle 3 above)

5. Second level courses are added.

Discussion: A second level of courses would enable students to build upon and further enhance writing, reading, and critical thinking skills acquired in foundational courses. Second level courses would also provide a recognizable and high quality Brooklyn College general education experience that is common to all students, those who begin at the College and our many transfer students. Second level courses in the proposed model are each developed and offered by a variety of departments (contingent upon the approval of each course by Faculty Council). (Principle 4 above)

6. A clearly articulated rational and coherent structure of foundational and upper level courses is built into the model itself.

Discussion: A model should be designed so that its rationale is clear. The structure should follow from an inter-relation of courses and should reflect the level of courses offered. The structure of the model proposed and the numbering of courses aims at accomplishing this goal.

7. Students are offered an experience of different modes of learning, disciplinary, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and students are introduced to the distinct methodologies of different disciplines and approaches.

Discussion: In the proposed model, students continue to be offered an interdisciplinary experience in “People, Power, and Politics” (current Core Studies 3) and students are offered multi-disciplinary courses. The College has found it extremely difficult to support team taught courses, and, for this reason, our current Core Studies 9 has had serious problems over the years. In addition, for the most part, students must first acquire a foundation in and must build upon disciplinary courses, before they can benefit from interdisciplinary courses. In the proposed model, students continue to be exposed to a variety of methodologies and approaches of different disciplines (arts, humanities, science, social science). Second level courses, in the proposed model, are multi-disciplinary. (Principle 5 above)

8. Students are introduced to non-Western cultures and issues of diversity in a variety of courses.

Discussion: The College community has long indicated a commitment to include the study non-Western cultures in the general education curriculum. In the proposed model, a course devoted to this subject, Core 3.4
(corresponding to our current Core Studies 9) is an upper level course for all students (including transfer students). In addition, the exploration of introducing non-Western material in a variety of general education courses is recommended (in particular, Cores 1.1., 1.2, 1.3 (those corresponding to our current Core Studies 1, and to our current Core Studies 2.1 and 2.2, each with an added credit that would allow for the introduction of this material). (Goals 3 and 4 above).

9. Every Brooklyn College graduate, including transfer students, shares a common experience of upper level courses.

See discussion of 5 above.

Finally, it should be added that, in light of a likely CUNY-wide requirement of an American experience component in the general education curriculum, American experience content is provided in three courses in the proposed model (Cores 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 (corresponding to our current Core Studies 10, 3, and 4)). These courses provide, respectively, some experience of American philosophy, American history, American political theory and relevant sociological study. It is also suggested that some American literature be presented in Core 1.4 (which corresponds to the current Core Studies 6).

STRUCTURE OF A MODEL CONSISTENT WITH THESE CRITERIA:
(for further discussion of foundational and culminating courses see E below)

A. Foundational Courses: No pre-requisite, a common foundation required of all students who begin their undergraduate education at Brooklyn College.

These courses are organized in three groups of inter-related courses. The first group, World-Making, includes ancient origins, literature, and the arts. The second group, The World of Discovery, includes mathematical foundations and the sciences. The third group, The Human World, includes philosophic foundations (knowledge, existence, and values), history, political science/sociology.

B. Culminating Courses:

Pre-requisite:
1. One foundational course in the same group or completion of an A.A. or A.S. degree or its equivalent.
2. Junior standing (or completion of 60 credits).

These are upper level courses in each of the three groups above, as follows:

- World – Making: World Literature;
- The World of Discovery: Scientific Discovery (Scientific Discoveries);
- The Human World: Non-western Cultures.

A variety of different departments or programs can develop these upper level courses. Courses must be approved by faculty council as serving this core purpose, must have junior standing, and are included in a list from which students can select courses.

C. Writing across the core:

Foundational courses require several short writing assignments. Second level courses have a research paper or a suitably advanced writing assignment as a writing requirement.

D. Recommendations in relation to the current core courses:

Courses changed only as decided by the offering department(s): Core Studies 4, 10.

The following changes are recommended:
Core Studies 1: a broader consideration of ancient origins (western and non-western);
Core Studies 2.1, 2.2: 3 credits, modified accordingly; recommendation that these courses include non-western material;
Core Studies 3: 3 credits;
Core Studies 5: a fundamental 3 credit course that can be taught by both Mathematics & CIS, e.g., a set theoretic course;
Core Studies 6: upper level (this course currently requires English 2 as a pre-requisite, and, therefore, would be an appropriate second level course); Suggestion: This course would have, as its subject matter, world literature, including (where appropriate) a representation of American literature, courses would be developed and taught by various literature departments, and would be thematically organized;
Core Studies 7, 8: choice of two lab sciences; and an upper level non-lab science course (9 credits); appropriate upper level courses could be developed by science departments and by other relevant departments as well.
Core Studies 9: upper level; courses developed by a variety of departments.

E. Suggestions in relation to the proposed model
Each course is three credits

Foundational Courses
- Core 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 each have some non-western content. In Core 1.1 (ancient origins), this can involve a consideration of the origins of civilization (including consideration, e.g., of Mesopotamia, as well as ancient Greece and Rome), or some non-western classic literature.
- Core 2.1 is a foundational three credit course to be developed and taught by both mathematics and computer science faculty. One suggestion is a foundations of mathematics course that has set theoretic subject matter.
- Students choose two three credit laboratory science courses, Core 2.2 (a choice of one of Biology or Chemistry) and Core 2.3 (a choice of Physics or Geology).
- Core 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 each have American experience content.

Culminating Courses
Culminating courses are multi-disciplinary. They can be developed and taught by members of a variety of departments, and, with the approval of Faculty Council, listed for student choice.

The following are suggestions, in relation to these upper level courses:
- Core 1.4 is a thematically organized literature course.
- Core 2.4 is a course that provides insight into scientific method and scientific discovery.
- Core 3.4 explores non-western cultures from a variety of perspectives of different disciplines.

Further, if there is sufficient administrative support and faculty interest, interdisciplinary sections of these courses can be proposed and taught.

BASIC SKILLS: There is no recommendation of changes in the basic skills requirements. Writing skills would be enhanced by writing requirements in two levels of general education courses.
“Tier” Model Committee

Committee Members:
Kathleen Axen (Health and Nutrition), Sally Bermanzohn (Political Science) Joseph Entin (English), Sharon Flatto (Judaic Studies), Glen Hass (Psychology), Dan Gurskis (Film), Paula Massood (Film), Eleanor Miele (Education), Kelly Moore (Sociology), Ellen Tremper (English), Fredrick Wasser (TV/Radio)

Assignment of Credits:

• The General Education sequence would be based on the areas corresponding to the College’s academic divisions: Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences and Fine Arts.

• Each division would offer a minimum of three courses: 2, 3-credit, discipline-based courses, like those in our present Core; 1, 4-credit, interdisciplinary course.

• The two discipline-based courses would be either compulsory (no choice) or chosen from a “short list” (List A courses). Each division would decide its priorities and choice/no choice structure for List A. For example, the Arts division might choose to offer only music and art courses (modified, 3-credit versions of the present 2.1 and 2.2) as the List A courses. Students would take 24 credits of List A courses (two courses, each division).

• The third course created by each division (List B) would be an interdisciplinary course. All departments within the division would have the opportunity to develop courses for this group. These courses would not necessarily be team-taught but would be created by departments working in collaboration with other departments in the division and/or those in other divisions (as Core 3 was the collaborative effort of Political Science and Sociology). For example, List B courses across divisions might be: Modernism in Film, Art, Literature, and Music (Arts and Humanities); Perception in Music (Arts, Social Science, Science); Adaptation of Novels into Film (Arts and Humanities); "The Politics of Environmental Health" (Social Science and Science). List B courses would be taken after a student had achieved 60 credits. They would be "upper level" but not "capstone" courses. A student would take 2 courses (8 credits) from List B.

• Both List A and List B courses would be offered on a rotating basis so that after a course were offered for a certain number of semesters it would (or could) be retired and replaced by another course. The original course might also be revised or up-dated and offered again at a later time.

• General Education courses (both List A and List B) would all have to address at least one of the following seven proficiency and/or content “target areas”:
  1. Quantitative Reasoning
  2. Intensive Writing
  3. Scientific Inquiry
  4. Social Science Inquiry
  5. The American Experience
  6. Non-western Culture and History
  7. Laboratory Experience
   A course would be flagged (by the course’s developers and then certified by the General Education committee) as addressing one or more of these areas. Students would have to choose their General Education courses so that all seven of the objectives were addressed; they would need to show completion of these "target areas" at Senior Check.

Choice: For Divisions; For Students:
• Divisions would have considerable autonomy in deciding if they desired to offer no-choice or choice models for List A courses.

• Students who transferred from other colleges or universities, where they had completed a general education program, would be required to take only two courses, both from List B--the "upper division" courses.

• Students could waive General Education courses by exam and/or could substitute higher-level courses in a department for courses from list A.

• The total number of credits in the General Education Program would be a maximum of 32 (2 fewer than in the present program), but individual students might well lower that number through waivers and substitution.

**Insuring Department Participation:**
- The General Education Committee, working with the Dean's Office and Registrar, would specify numbers of sections to be offered for each course (as departments do now), insuring enrollment in all General Education courses.

**“Tier” Model Committee: Rationale for a General Education Program**

1. **Divisional committees and their roles:**
   Each division would establish a committee to plan course offerings. Note that actual courses would not be finally approved by this committee (although the committee might have a role in developing the courses). The division would evaluate courses for the target areas (e.g., intensive writing, quantitative reasoning) that they addressed. The division would assemble the A and B Lists and decide on the number of offerings for the cycle (three to five years).

2. **General Education Committee (College-wide):** would be responsible for: insuring courses address "target areas"; recommendation of courses; rules for scheduling of sections; negotiations with departments and with the administration for resources. As mentioned above, the Committee, in consultation with the Dean’s Office and Registrar, would specify the number of sections offered for each course. (A student might specify first, second, and third choice for each List A requirement but would not be guaranteed a place in the first, or even second choice, course.) The same process of enrollment, ensuring representation of all departments, according to their ability to staff such courses, would be in place for Interdisciplinary courses in List B.

3. **Course revisions and revivals:**
   To insure that courses do not get stale (a problem for teachers’ engagement) and that they are current in relation to developments in their methodologies and content, we must insure a mechanism which permits their updating and rotation in and out of the program. The General Education committee should be responsible for reviewing content and methodology of standing courses every three to five years. Courses should be rotated into the program as they are developed and as there is room for them. There should be a reasonable limit (based on staffing and projected student enrollment) in each area (approved by the division) to the number of courses in List A and List B.

4. **Desire of students for choice in this big-credit program:**
   Students should have some control over their course of study--not only in their majors but in a General Education Program. Choice is important for their development as independent thinkers and citizens. Of course, we must insure the suitability of their choices through a careful process of vetting that would be
the responsibility of the General Education Committee. After approval by the General Education Committee, courses would be submitted for approval to the College Curriculum Committee and then to Faculty Council.

5. Need to ensure that a number of mandated or otherwise desirable target areas are addressed without adding credits to the current Core (Intensive Writing, Quantitative Reasoning, etc.):
We should think of these courses not only in their relation to important fields of knowledge but also as they develop competence in mandated areas. Courses presented for approval must demonstrate the way(s) in which they would further the students’ writing skills and/or quantitative reasoning, laboratory skills, inquiry-based education, study of non-western cultures and history, American history and culture, etc. (see list of seven, above). Each course must demonstrate attention to at least one of the target areas and/or proficiencies and would be flagged, accordingly. Transcripts would be evaluated for satisfaction of these areas at Senior Check.

We believe that substantial inclusion of non-western and American material in a variety of courses will insure our students’ knowledge of history and culture of the United States and of other parts of the world. We do not believe in the segregation of such studies, say, in a single American history course. Because so many of our students are not native-born and haven’t spent the majority of their school years in American classrooms, their study of American culture should extend beyond a course in U. S. history to comprehend American art traditions, music, and literature, etc. In addition, it is important for all students to be exposed to various aspects (aesthetic, social, historical) of societies and cultures other than ours through a variety of disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches.

6. Difficulties in scheduling 1.5-, 2-, 3-, and 4-credit Core courses:
A uniform 3-credit value for discipline-based courses in List A would make scheduling less problematic for departments, and the College and would honor students’ requests for equality between credits and hours.

7. High total number of credits:
Because students in certain majors—those, in particular, accredited by an outside agency (e.g., Education, Health and Nutrition)—must take a very large number of credits to satisfy the requirements of the concentration, we believe that the maximum credits in the General Education program for each student should be no more than 32. Each division (Arts, Sciences, etc.) would be required to devise at least two (ideally more) 3-credit courses through which students would satisfy their List A requirement and at least one List B Interdisciplinary course of 4 credits that would draw on the talents and perspectives of a number of departments in the division or across divisions (e.g., “Literature and Psychology,” “Social and Physiological Aspects of Obesity”). Those courses in the current Core Studies Program deemed successful or in need of minor modification (e.g., Core 1, 2.1, 2.2, 3, 4, and 10) would become part of the new General Education Program. However, departments and divisions would be encouraged to develop new courses so that students could choose from among a richer and more diverse set of offerings than afforded by the “non-alternative” structure of the present Core Studies Program.

8. Desire of Science faculty for 3-credit courses:
Science faculty have expressed the need for time for adequate explanations and laboratory exercises in their Core courses. Science departments could limit their List A to, for example, six courses (Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Biology, CIS, Math), offering three each semester. The B List courses would be interdisciplinary (intra- and inter-divisional), designed by these six departments, as well by Health & Nutrition Sciences and Physical Education & Exercise Science.

9. Inclusion of departments in the General Education Program:
A number of departments, not represented in the present structure, have expressed a desire to participate in the new program. Certainly, the decision as to which disciplines are necessary to a liberal arts education is an arbitrary exercise. But merely adding courses and credits to the current Core would raise the already high number of credits prohibitively. List B, from which students choose two courses, would make practical the participation of additional departments. Importantly, List B courses would include an array of interdisciplinary courses, drawing on the perspectives of more than one department or division (e.g., "The Environment" [which can be taught from the perspectives of chemistry, biology, geology, health and nutrition, psychology, physics, and exercise science]; "The Nature of Nature" [from the perspectives of science, sociology, philosophy, literature]. "Consciousness" [from the perspectives of biology, psychology, philosophy, literature]). The importance to students of understanding the interconnectedness of knowledge in the real world and of real-world problem solving is an equally compelling reason for the inclusion of multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary courses in the General Education Program.

10. Transfer Students:
A growing percentage of our student body enters as transfers in the second, third, even fourth, year of study; these students cannot be compelled to take the entire General Education Program. Such students would be required to take only two 4-credit courses from List B, in two different divisions. Although Brooklyn College can no longer attempt, or claim, to guarantee a common (that is, subject area) experience for students who graduate with our degree, we can require students to sample the scholarship in courses in List B, the higher tier. The List B courses, flagged to address subject areas and competencies, will help to insure the development of skills we demand of those students who begin as Brooklyn College freshmen.

We believe that the distinctiveness of a Brooklyn College education, now and in the future, is not a uniformity of courses but the excellence of preparation in all our courses for further graduate study, careers, and citizenship.

We also believe that this new model, which takes into account current thinking in education and psychology about the need to address learning modalities as well as subject areas, will redound to the credit of Brooklyn College. We will be demonstrating anew our courage in addressing changes in higher education beyond our control, but also our shortfalls and our commitment to excellence in education--just as we did when we inaugurated the Core Studies Program in the early 1980s.

The “Tier” Model Committee proposes that the College “seed” the process through offering reassigned time to three faculty members who would be responsible for writing grants to supplement College-funding for this program. The moneys would help to defray the costs of:

a. **Active counseling** of students in the selection of their General Education courses
b. **Faculty development**: every three years, faculty would assemble to discuss the state-of-the-program and develop new courses, particularly those that are interdisciplinary and require joint efforts in and across divisions.
c. **Administration of the Program**: reassigned time to the Chair of the General Education Committee, responsible for course selection, approval and de-selection, if deemed appropriate, of those courses that have been in the program for three years or more.
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Committee Members:

Martha J. Bell - SEEK
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Mona Hadler - Art
Ed Harris - Classics
George Shapiro - Mathematics

General Principles:

The committee reaffirms its belief in the strength of the current Core curriculum and its proven success. Modifications are recommended for particular courses, credits, and to provide some vertical sequencing.

We believe that having required specified Core courses guarantees a common base of knowledge of quality and breath that benefits all Brooklyn College students.

We believe that students taking the same courses provides “the groundwork for everything else.”

We believe that the Core should cover a wide range of disciplines in the arts, humanities, sciences, and social sciences with materials which are part of the western canon as well as those, which are multicultural or nonwestern in scope. We believe that the current disciplinary and interdisciplinary aspects to the Core should be maintained.

We believe the Core should be a starting point in a student’s education providing a common intellectual experience for all Brooklyn College graduates.

We believe that the Core should apply not only to the freshman and sophomore experience but be spread over the student’s college-going career and have both lower and upper level courses for students to experience.

We believe that the Core courses should be primarily discipline-based courses.

We recommend that all Core courses be three credits to provide sufficient depth and breadth and to fit into both student and faculty programming needs and to remove current obstacles created by variable credit courses.

We believe that transfer students should participate in the core experience and that the core should provide for at least a three course (9 credits including 2 Core courses and a Capstone course) upper class core requirement that both native and transfer students would be required to take. Thus, all students would have the benefit of a Brooklyn College liberal arts experience added to a Brooklyn College major.

We believe that along the way the Core has lost its focus on basic skills and we believe that all Core courses should include a strengthened writing component.

We believe that a program of faculty development to include non-western material in the core should be undertaken.
Review of Core Courses:

a. All current Core courses should be reviewed and updated especially to include more intensive writing, multicultural perspectives, and more linkages to current core courses. In addition, the Core courses should seek to incorporate technology into their instructional strategies.

b. All alternatives to Core courses should be approved anew and limited to classes in which the student is majoring in the subject or to cases in which the student based on prior experience requires a more in-depth course in the subject. There should not be a range or multiple alternatives to core classes except for students who can demonstrate higher knowledge. For example, a student who has completed AP calculus with a score of 5 on the exam should be placed in the appropriate math course and not in core math.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course and Division</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Change from current Core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core 1 (Lower Division)</td>
<td>No substantive changes are suggested for this course. It should be the prerequisite for Core 2.1 and 10.</td>
<td>Recommended for freshmen prerequisite. for 2.1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 2.1 and 2.2 (Upper Division)</td>
<td>These courses should each be three credit courses. It is suggested that they could be moved to a more advanced level by having Core 1 and Core 4 as prerequisites.</td>
<td>Become 3 credit courses. Possible move to upper division with prerequisites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 3 (Lower Division)</td>
<td>This course should be a 3-credit course, which focuses on People, Power, and Politics in America, in answer to the University concern about students studying the country in which they live.</td>
<td>Reduce to 3 credits. Change title to emphasize American studies. Lower division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 4 (Lower Division)</td>
<td>No substantive changes suggested.</td>
<td>Serve as prerequisite for upper division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 5.2 (Lower Division)</td>
<td>This course should be a course in mathematical thinking for students who are not planning on going on to studies in technical areas, which require higher mathematical skills. (Computer skills should be moved out of this aspect of the core and students with computer skills should be allowed to test out of the subject in the same way that they do in language.)</td>
<td>Increase to 3 credits. Focus on mathematical thinking. Recommended for freshmen so that they can continue to build on their high school math background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 6 (Lower Division)</td>
<td>This course should not be changed in the wide range of genres covered, but it does need a strong organizing principle for each section taught based on either theme or period. The organizing structure decided upon by each instructor can be announced to</td>
<td>Needs new organizing principle. Could be upper or lower division. Recommended for sophomore year. Possible prerequisite Core 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 7.1, 7.2, 8.1, 8.2 (Lower Division)</td>
<td>These courses should each be three credits, retaining essentially the current laboratory structure. We would suggest adding a fifth course to this list combining psychology and health that would explore the issues of cognitive and physical health. Students should be required to take two of these five classes based on their high school experience. In this way they would be able to round out their exposure to the sciences.</td>
<td>2 sciences instead of 4 required. Courses increased to 3 credits. Students assigned based on high school record. Add a fifth interdisciplinary option (Psych/HNS/?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 9 (Lower Division)</td>
<td>Core 9 should be changed to increase the focus on the variety of cultures which students experience as they come into the Brooklyn College environment, and develop the skills to become part of the global community. Exposure to the variety and diversity of cultures is the strong point of Core 9, and as such it is an important experience for new college students. It should be part of the freshman experience and should require a comparison between cultures in addition to their presentation.</td>
<td>Recommended for freshmen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 10 (Upper Division)</td>
<td>This course should have Core1 as a prerequisite.</td>
<td>Could be upper division. Core 1, possible prerequisite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Core (Upper Division)</td>
<td>Each student should have the experience of seeing how their own discipline relates to the broader aspects of knowledge that are part of the Core. These courses could be developed or designated in the major or the divisional area. The department would determine whether the students must complete a capstone in their own major, an cognate major, or in the division. Departments should require that students have completed 90 credits, and at least eight of the core classes before enrollment. Transfer students enroll in their senior year.</td>
<td>New course for each department and/or division.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee members:
John Blamire, Constantin Cranganu, Betsy Eastwood, Todd Holden, Aaron Kozbelt, Dominick Labianca, & Ian Spatz.

Rationale

This proposal favors a total of 32 credits for the central “core” of classes offered. Courses would carry either four credits (the humanities and social sciences) or two credits (the math-cis/science modules) at the discretion of the specific departments involved. Students would be allowed to choose between humanities and social science courses for a total 20 credits, including at least four credits from each of four areas (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Non-Western) and be required to take 12 credits from the math-cis/science modules.

It would further entail:

- **Full transparency.** To facilitate the process of choosing courses and sections, all course syllabi – not just generic syllabi, but the ones that individual professors actually offer – would be posted on the web, with full disclosure of purpose, requirements, and assigned readings.

- **Quantitative reasoning.** To support the revised Core, a course in Quantitative Reasoning would be added to college-wide Basic Skills requirements.

Advantages: The proposed program is simple and addresses almost all of the problems associated with the current Core. In brief:

- Students have the power to choose between some of the courses in the humanities and social sciences, craft at least part of their own liberal arts program, but are required to take a serious and reasonably rigorous coverage of all the major sciences and science disciplines.

- Full transparency gives students the resources to do so.

- No existing courses are lost.

- Both existing and new discipline-based and interdisciplinary courses are included.

- A simple series of choices among the credit mix within some areas, and an even simpler mix of required courses in the science/math modules

- Departments that have not been able to participate in the core are now included.

- Four-credit courses permit in-depth exploration in the humanities, where time is needed for discussion and group learning but allow the sciences to continue with their proven record of problem-based or active learning approaches using many new and innovative components.

- Increased workload credit (4 instead of 3) for most core sections benefits participating full-time faculty and lowers the reliance on adjuncts.

- Reducing the number of sections in each department, the consequence of student choice, permits more courses to be taught by full-time faculty and lowers the reliance on adjuncts.

- Academic rigor is maintained within the sciences, which is a vital component in these days of falling standards, grade inflation and credit inflation.
### The Program:  
20 Core courses from which students take a total of 32 credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students would choose at least <strong>ONE</strong> of these four 4-credit courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Art</strong> (current Core 2.1, expanded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Music</strong> (current Core 2.1, expanded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>New discipline-based course</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>New interdisciplinary course</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students would choose at least <strong>ONE</strong> of these four 4-credit courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Classics</strong> (current Core 1, expanded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Landmarks of Literature</strong> (current Core 6, expanded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Philosophy</strong> (current Core 10, expanded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>New interdisciplinary course</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Example: The Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students would choose at least <strong>ONE</strong> of these four 4-credit courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>People, Power, and Politics</strong> (sociology and political science; current Core 3, unchanged)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Shaping of the Modern World</strong> (Europe/US in global perspective; current Core 4, expanded)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>New discipline-based course</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <strong>New interdisciplinary course</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students would take <strong>12 CREDITS</strong> of these 6, 2-credit modules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>Computer Science</strong> (current Core 5.1, expanded to 2 credits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <strong>Math</strong> (current Core 5.2, expanded to 2 credits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. <strong>Chemistry</strong> (current Core 7.1, a 2-credit module)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. <strong>Physics</strong> (current Core 7.2, a 2-credit module)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. <strong>Biology</strong> (current Core 8.1, a 2-credit module)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. <strong>Geology</strong> (current Core 8.2, a 2-credit module)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Western/Area Studies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[drawing on faculty in all Area Studies plus history, literature, anthropology/archeology, etc.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students would choose at least <strong>ONE</strong> of these two 4-credit courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20. <strong>Two new courses, expanding current Core 9:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Non-Western Cultures: Literature, Arts, and Thought</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Non-Western Cultures: History and Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Either Core 3 or Core 4 or both could be modified, if necessary, to fulfill any mandated requirement in US history.*
The Program:
14 core courses from which students choose a total of 36 or 37 credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Art (current Core 2.1, 3-credits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students would take both courses Now three credits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Music (current Core 2.1, 3-credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Classics (current Core 1, 3-credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 6&amp; 10 to include African, Caribbean and Asian literatures and philosophers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Landmarks of Literature (current Core 6, # of credits unchanged, but expanded to reflect global perspectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philosophy (current Core 10, # of credits unchanged but expanded to include more global perspectives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>People, Power, and Politics (sociology and political science; current Core 3, unchanged)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will choose three science courses between physics, chemistry, biology, and geology out of a possible four. Meaning only take physics, chemistry, or geology. Or physics, chemistry or biology. Math 2.5 or higher which is 3-credits can be taken to substitute for core 5.2 and CIS 1.0(3-credits) or higher can be taken to substitute for core 5.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shaping of the Modern World (to included global perspectives . current Core 4, expanded)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Computer Science (current Core 5.1, expanded to 2 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Math (current Core 5.2, expanded to 2 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chemistry (current Core 7.1, expanded to 3-credit )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Physics (current Core 7.2, expanded to 3-credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Biology (current Core 8.1, expanded to 3-credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Geology (current Core 8.2, expanded to 3-credits) students will only take physics, chemistry, or geology. Or physics, chemistry or biology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western/Area Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Core Nine Remains unchanged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this proposal, the number of core classes remains unchanged from the current system (14) however, the number of credits where increased to reflect the needs and desire of the students body and most faculty members. Also due to the Eurocentric nature of Core 6, 10, though unchanged include a reasonable number of African American, Latinos and Asian Authors and philosophers respectively, the underlying factor is that students wants choice and fair number of credits. The biggest concern from the students is that the Sciences should be increased to three credits each, which choice of taking three courses out of a possible four.
BROOKLYN COLLEGE CORE CURRICULUM - “CORE 9" MODEL PROPOSAL

Contributors: Lynda Day, María E. Pérez y González, Virginia Sánchez Korrol, Antonio O. Nadal, Sara Reguer, Anthony M. Stevens-Arroyo

With input from: Stuart Schaar, Russell L. Sharman, Regine Latortue, Mojubaolu Okome

Discussion and Rationale:

This model addresses “Core 9” as part of the new general education requirements at Brooklyn College. Faculty members who have taught or who actively teach in Core 9 herein suggest proposals based on their experience and current pedagogical trends in their respective fields. We are convinced that in a globally interconnected environment, it is more crucial now than it was in 1980 that students at the undergraduate level be educated about the world they live in. It is particularly important that they learn about the peoples of two-thirds of the world, those of the “third world” or developing nations, that are oft invisible in the U.S.A. K through 12 curriculum. Because “first world” decisions have such far-reaching effects on the two-thirds world countries it is imperative that students gain knowledge of regions of the world that are non-European/U.S.A./Canadian.

What remains vitally relevant about the original conceptualization of Core 9 is the use of a multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary approach that has a strong comparative component. However, Core 9 has evolved since 1980 and no longer focuses solely on culture. Generally, in the current Core 9, students learn about the culture(s), history, colonization, gender issues, politics, social movements, race and ethnic relations, north-south/east-west, religion, nationalism, geography, diasporic communities, core-periphery, globalization, and transnationalism of a minimum of two regions of the world. They should continue to do so, though in a more focused and intentional manner. This will allow for students to learn on three different levels. They will be learning about their neighbors in this shrinking world, about their new American neighbors that come in the form of immigrants to the U.S.A., and ultimately be learning about themselves in relation to others by gaining insight into new perspectives and world views that focus on the core and the periphery. This course could possibly be called “Global Studies of the Two-Thirds World” or “Two-Thirds World Studies.” The term non-western is inconsistent with the reality of the geographic locations and modern history of many of the countries that have traditionally been included in this term. Any term used should stand on its own and be proactive.

In light of the above, we offer the following:

At all levels, in every course, throughout the Core, there should be an inclusion of/references to global themes and issues, including the culture(s), history, colonization, gender issues, politics, social movements, race and ethnic relations, north-south/east-west, religion, nationalism, geography, diasporic communities, core-periphery, globalization, and transnationalism of non-European/U.S.A./Canadian areas of the world. These themes and issues should not necessarily be isolated into one Core course. This will allow students to begin to see the interconnectedness of peoples and places on a global scale and make for a well-rounded and well-grounded educated person. It would also prepare students for the “Global Studies” course.

I. A “Global Studies” course should be an upper-tier course that includes the themes mentioned above, including the use of a multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary approach with a strong comparative component.

II. Team-teaching continues to be the preferred method of teaching such a “Global Studies” course. Because the student should be exposed to at least two distinct regions of the world using the comparative approach, and many professors do not have that expertise, team-teaching is the way to go.
This would entail at least one or two pre-planning sessions involving the two instructors prior to the beginning of the semester for which they are scheduled. The obstacles faced by the current Core 9 course, can be addressed in the following manner:

A. Team-teaching is not more expensive. In Core 9 you have two instructors teaching a distinct region of the world, receiving three workload credits each. The number of students ranges from 75 (the “maximum limit”) to 110 in each course. Team-teaching is actually less expensive than having two separate courses with maximum limits of 35 for each course. It is very important that the course be kept to a maximum limit of 70-75 students so that it does not become a burden to the instructor nor a disservice to the students.

B. The above statement is contingent upon having full-time faculty teach the “Global Studies” course. The Core should be taught by full-time faculty. This would resolve much of the administrative problems regarding staffing the 13 to 17 sections of Core 9, which affects 1,200-1,500 students every semester and grades–appeals, incompletes, final exam absences, etc. The use of full-time faculty would also release approximately $100,000 used toward adjunct funding into the BC budget that could be used toward enabling instructors to teach an overload or hiring some adjuncts at the departmental level and for “Global Studies” training/teaching seminars similar to those held during past summers for the Core.

C. Because the “Global Studies” core course would be without a particular department due to its multi-and inter-disciplinary nature, this course requires a firm commitment from the administration and from the chairpersons who have faculty members with “Global Studies” expertise. When hiring, preference can be given to those who have “Global Studies” expertise. This course could also be used as a recruitment tool for the departments involved; they could showcase their disciplines and make that an explicit part of the course to attract majors.

D. A “Global Studies” council could be established with rotating coordinators among the Departments of Africana, Judaic, Puerto Rican and Latino Studies, and Anthropology. The primary mission of each of these departments includes “Global Studies.” In addition, unlike the current situation, the coordinator would receive released time for the administrative responsibilities involved with such a course. However, the administrative responsibilities would be greatly reduced if full-time faculty were to be used.

While a team-taught “Global Studies” course is preferable, it does not have to be exclusively taught that way. One instructor could teach it with a maximum limit of 35-40 students in the course; however, it should meet the global themes/issues noted above and it should be comparative in nature.

If the final Core is to have a wide distribution of lower-level courses or non-tiered courses, among the choices should be already-existing (but modified, if necessary) courses that include the “Global Studies” themes and meet the “Global Studies” criteria, with the exception that it could focus on one region of the non-European/U.S.A./Canadian world and would not need to be comparative in nature. The comparative “Global Studies” course described above would be part of the new Core, but students could take an additional departmentally-based “Global Studies” course.