

## How many classes of students should be under the new curriculum next year?

Next fall, the entering class of 2005 will be under the new curriculum. The question then is whether to include next year's sophomore, juniors and/or seniors. The main arguments CEPP has considered on either side of this question are summarized below.

Arguments Against Inclusiveness	Arguments In Support of Inclusiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The old curriculum is in the Catalogue and should be considered a "contract," which should not be changed in the middle of college.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Catalogue has no binding requirements are being reduced will not mind.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requiring new classes of students to adopt a curriculum (or giving them the choice to do so) is the main precedent we have for this sort of transition.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some precedents from the past simply because they represent students a choice between one probably not worth the trouble.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students who have finished all of the core requirements may resent a system that allows their classmates who have not completed requirements to end up with a lighter set of requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students who have fulfilled all requirements are sympathetic to classmates for reduced requirements because they understand the system has been.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Next year's seniors did not face the constraints of Reconfiguration during their first two years, the period during which most all-college requirements should be completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More than half of the senior class did not take a junior class (in all likelihood) fewer courses under the new curriculum.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The juniors and seniors who have outstanding requirements have probably been negligent along the way. It makes no sense to reward them at this late stage in their college careers for such procrastination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The spirit of the new curriculum is that the old curriculum was too lenient on seniors with outstanding requirements as negligent procrastinators. Pressures have victimized them.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departments need more time to figure out how many sections of different kinds of courses under the new curriculum they will have to offer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Departments are going to have a hard way that is consistent with the old curriculum as well as scramble around and reorganize in the coming months.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be no new Catalogue with all of the changed requirements before students have to register for next fall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong and informed advising that serve their needs and interests if course descriptions are not available.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If a number of juniors and seniors do not have to take previously required courses next fall, they may seek out other classes that</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students who do not seek out other courses next fall will take courses that</li> </ul>

are already full and assert more pressure on instructors of those classes.

experimenting with elective c  
might not have taken if there