Frank Hugus, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, called the 771st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on October 12, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I have the pleasure of introducing two new Senators. We’ve had special elections in districts which lost elected Senators because of the Deans’ habit of recruiting good people to be Associate Deans often means drawing on the same pool of people we recruit for the Faculty Senate. From the Libraries, we welcome Naka Ishii. She is a Science Librarian and she deals with things like data management, collaboration with faculty on teaching materials for sustainability, producing study guides for students in a range of sciences from Microbiology to Food Science to Environmental Science. We also welcome our second new Senator, Graciela Monteagudo, who is a lecturer in the Social Thought and Political Economy program. She has a Ph. D. in Anthropology and her research focuses on the role of women in various societies and the social impacts of economic policy. Now, on to an announcement mandated in the Bylaws. You all probably saw the notice that Farshid Hajir has become a Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. This creates a vacancy in the office of Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees. We do need to have a Faculty Delegate. We have an excellent Associate Delegate but she will be the first to admit that this takes a team, and she very much hopes for a teammate, so, we will proceed at the November meeting to an election. People interested in this position can contact me or talk to Associate Delegate Marilyn Billings. Then, we will close the large gap in our roster caused by Provost McCarthy hiring Farshid.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

David Gross, Chair of the Rules Committee: For those of you who are new or don’t often come to these meetings, I like to keep everyone updated as to what your Rules Committee has been doing. Since the last Senate meeting, we met face-to-face one time and exchanged a fair number of emails. We did a lot of routine business, but there were two things that were somewhat out of the ordinary that we worked on during that time. One thing was about this meeting itself, trying to make it as fair and inclusive as possible, to have discussions about the various things that will get quite a bit of discussion today; we thought about that a lot. And, as our Secretary said, we exchanged a lot of emails back and forth about the person to replace Farshid as the Delegate to the Board of Trustees. We also meet with the Administration, generally about once a month, and we met last on September 18. We got reports on the move-in that happened over Labor Day weekend and also on the demographics of our incoming first-year class as well as the transfer students coming in this year. Then, we got a report from Vice Chancellor Michael Malone about federal funding outlooks for now and in the near future in light of the politics going on in Washington, D.C.

B. QUESTION PERIOD – no questions or comments were raised

C. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – REVISION OF DEGREE REQUIREMENTS IN THE COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Julie Caswell, Associate Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences: I am also a Professor of Resource Economics and I chair the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS). The set of nine proposals, that we are going to be discussing this afternoon, to transform international and intercultural education in SBS are the result of a comprehensive curriculum review that has been going in SBS starting in 2013. These proposals were submitted in the academic proposal system in March of 2016. The purpose of these proposals is to deepen international and intercultural education within SBS and for SBS students. We want to do that by integrating international and intercultural education into the major requirements with courses taken across campus. These proposals
signal to students that international and intercultural education is a key part of their core study and not a separate college-level requirement. These proposals also recognize that students can build international and intercultural understanding and competency in different ways: through language study, through topical courses taken across campus, or through study abroad. International and intercultural study is supported by a comprehensive advising system under SBS Pathways. We value language study and we work with colleagues across campus to ensure that opportunities for SBS students to study languages effectively are enhanced. At the same time, this proposal is intended to address problems with the current global education requirement. That requirement that we have in place now inhibits students’ opportunities to build international and intercultural competencies, it does not support holistic advising in the majors, it disadvantages internal and external transfer students, and it affects graduation rates for our students. The faculty of SBS makes these proposals after comprehensive consideration of a curriculum that deepens international and intercultural education, that supports the excellence of the B.A. degrees offered by SBS, and that best supports student success. Thank you.

**Professor Jim Hicks, Comparative Literature:** I was recently either anointed or conned into chairing the International Studies Council (ISC). We provided a memo to the Faculty Senate before this meeting but that was before I had my first council meeting and I thought that it was necessary to follow up that memo with a statement. We believe that no undergraduate at UMass should leave this institution without proficiency in, at minimum, two languages. We believe that, in fact, no one really learns their first language until they study another. We believe that any institution committed to internationalization must require deep study of other languages and cultures since the alternative would reflect a will to impose a will to impose one’s own language and culture everywhere. Moreover, we strongly believe that learning and improving proficiency in two languages promotes tolerance and inclusion. For these reasons, at the first meeting of the ISC this fall, we established a subcommittee to research, develop, and propose a campus-wide requirement for world language proficiency, which we see as essential just like literacy, a background in history, competence in math and statistics, critical thinking, and other widely accepted measures of what university education ought to require. We hope that the Faculty Senate will welcome this initiative and support its work by convening an ad-hoc committee to help in the development of the campus-wide proposal. As I said, ISC met for the first time in 2017 only last week and the memo submitted by some of its members in advance of this meeting had yet to be discussed by our full council. At that opening meeting, much of our discussion focused on what we assumed would be a forthcoming motion in the Faculty Senate to remove from the table the SBS proposal, which ISC supported tabling last spring. Several ISC members expressed strong reservations about whether ISC should continue to recommend the tabling of the proposal, for many reasons, but especially in regard to the difficulties of completing the current requirements as discussed in the SBS proposal, as well as in regard to the time that would be necessary to develop a fully realized proposal for a campus-wide world language proficiency requirement. Given these reservations, ISC decided to move forward on establishing the subcommittee, but decided not to make any recommendation as to whether the SBS proposal should or should not go forward. Many of our members, myself included, do not support the SBS proposal, but we also understand that the proposal is the result of years of efforts by SBS and that it intends to address the real problems of SBS students, problems that need real solutions. It is our hope, in the proposal that our subcommittee will begin to draft this semester, to address these problems fully but to do so in a manner that will increase the language proficiencies of our graduates rather than reduce them. Let me conclude by saying the obvious: the members of the ISC share the commitment of SBS towards the goal of internationalization that our campus has pledged itself to. We also appreciate that the members of SBS intend to strongly advise their students about the value of language study. We worry that advice is often given and rarely taken and that other requirements or obligations may prevent many or most students from heeding the recommendations of their advisors. For that reason, while the ISC develops its world language proposal, we would strongly urge that the University Administration not cut lines nor downsize departments based on the temporary reductions in enrollments envisaged in the SBS proposal. If our longterm campus-wide goal is indeed true internationalization, we will need both new and innovative strategies as well as increased resources to support this goal rather than reductions in the very departments and programs that will eventually need to step up to meet this challenge.

**Senator Frank Sleegers, Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning:** At first, this proposal was confusing to me, too. The SBS proposal is really about integrating the global education requirements into
the programs’ curricula. It is not single-mindedly about dropping the language requirements but more so about addressing global education more specifically in the programs themselves. That is why we in SBS support this proposal. Thank you.

**Carolyn Bassett, Assistant Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences:** Hello. I am an Academic Dean in SBS, a lecturer, and the Executive Director of the SBS Advising Resource Center. We are the unit that oversees all of the advising for the Global Education requirement. We partner with advisors in academic departments. This means that we have hundreds of appointments every year with students who are obliged to complete the Global Education requirement as it currently stands. For several years, advisors, both in our unit and in departments, have seen themes that represent real problems with the Global Education requirement as it has existed since it was written in 1999. We definitely see that this requirement impedes students’ progress toward degree. It can extend students’ time toward degree completion. We also see that, as Dean Caswell mentioned, sometimes the Global Education requirement results in a lack of cohesion in student decision-making as to the kinds of paths that they are able to follow. Therefore, I strongly support the new Intercultural and International program that SBS will use to replace the pre-existing Global Education requirement. With the time allotted, I do want to focus on a particular population that I have great concerns about and that we’ve seen concerns about repeatedly: that is our transfer students. In SBS, we have a very large population of transfer students. Right now, we have roughly 3,000 students who are obliged to complete Global Education as B.A. students in SBS. Of those students, 21% are transfer students from outside the University. We know that transfer students often face additional complexities with scheduling and their path development, but we see that the pre-existing Global Education requirement disproportionally affects those students. We also know that the transfer population includes many first-generation college students, often students from low-income families and households. We recognize that these are specifically the students that we want to be working with under the new requirement so that we can help them carve out pathways that are really cohesive and that reflect their academic goals. In particular, when working with first-generation college students and students from low-income households, we want those students to have opportunities to earn credit for research and opportunities to study abroad; the emphasis on study abroad in SBS Advising really pervades every one of our departments. Again, I just want to articulate that there is strong advisor support for the new Intercultural and International requirement that SBS is putting forward. Thank you.

**Professor Paul Collins, Legal Studies:** Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I spearheaded the development of the major requirements for the Legal Studies major and I sit on the SBS Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. There are many reasons why we in Legal Studies support this series of proposals; in the interest of time, I just want to focus on two of them. First, we believe that the current Global Education requirement is not sufficiently tailored to meet the demands of the Legal Studies major. We are very proud in Legal Studies to have a diverse faculty, the majority of whom teach courses that approach Legal Studies from an international and intercultural perspective. We believe that the SBS proposals will allow us to more thoroughly expose all of our majors to international and intercultural study by integrated it directly into the major requirements. Second, we have been working very hard to encourage students to study abroad as part of the effort to expose them to the diverse array of approaches to Legal Studies throughout the globe. Our experience is that the current requirements can create an impediment to doing so as they fail to recognize that students can build international and intercultural competencies through various means. With that, I reiterate that we are very happy to support this proposal and I thank you for your time.

**Senator Ina Ganguli, Economics:** Hi. I am a very new Faculty Senator; this is my second meeting. I have a statement that I will make on behalf of the Economics Department that was developed in collaboration with Professor Gerald Friedman and our undergraduate education committee. To summarize some of the sentiment in the Economics Department, the SBS proposal has been discussed by the Economics faculty members and there is broad consensus to accept the proposed changes to the SBS curriculum. Our faculty have been provided detailed information about the proposed changes and anticipated impacts. Economics faculty have had an opportunity to voice our questions and concerns. And faculty have been assured that changes will not involve increases in faculty workload but only a minimal impact on department staff work particularly in relation to advising.
**Professor Lynn Phillips, Communication:** I’ve been on our undergraduate studies committee for the last nine years. I want to note that in Communication 40% of our incoming direct admit students are external transfer students, a very high percentage. I was the Chief Undergraduate Advisor in the Department for the last nine years, where I’ve held thousands of advising appointments. I’m currently the Director of Academic Engagement and Student Success. I taught in the Oxford study abroad program two years ago and will be returning next summer. I’m also a member of the SBS advising taskforce, which is comprised of faculty and professional advisors from across the College who have worked on the SBS Pathways proposal and framework for the last three years. So, I’m speaking from an intersection of all those vantage points. I’d like to speak briefly to both the problems that I’ve seen in the Global Education requirement, the problems that it poses for our students, and the benefits of the new Pathways approach. I think that it’s been very easy for the conversation about SBS Pathways to get mired in the specifics of the language courses themselves, both the access to and approach within some of those classes, and the impact on our students, and that is a substantial concern that I echo. Like others, I’ve had more advising sessions than I could possibly count in which students who cannot afford to pay more than they already do are finding themselves in situations in which the only viable option is to take summer courses at their own expense, students who had failed a class and needed to retake it only to find that they cannot retake it until the following fall, setting back their progress. I’ve worked with students who have failed a class and had their GPA fall below 3.0 after trying very hard to get help and they lost their scholarship and were unable to afford to continue; that is not hypothetical but has actually happened to students that I’ve worked with. Also, many students entering as transfer students either need to forego other opportunities or delay their graduation in order to fit in the fifteen-credit Global Education requirement. For me, this is very much a social class issue. Our transfer students very often attend a community college to have a more affordable start to their education and then finish here. Others are often students who couldn’t afford to finish their educations where they started; if they were out-of-state, paying high tuition and family circumstances required them to come home to Massachusetts to finish at UMass. They are very often first-generation students and face a lot of challenges. So, to add the possibility of a delayed graduation or to render them unable to pursue an internship or other opportunity that would help them later is very much a social class issue. But, I don’t want that concern to eclipse other aspects of this proposal that warrant our attention. Most importantly, it puts international and intercultural study in the majors where it belongs. Whether we like it or not, students tend to see the Global Education requirement as an add-on and something that is separate from their real studies; putting it in the majors communicates to them that this is integral to any Social Science discipline. It also encourages study abroad and enables students to pursue other high impact practices like community service learning, research, internships, and volunteer and leadership positions. So, it really strengthens the B.A. by enabling students to develop a robust portfolio of curricular and co-curricular high impact practices while pursuing a curriculum that emphasizes international and intercultural studies and encourages study abroad as well as language study. Thank you.

**Senator Graciela Monteagudo, Social Thought and Political Economy:** Hi. I grew up in Argentina listening to U.S. citizens butchering Spanish, so when I heard that we might get rid of the Global Education requirement I was very concerned. I experienced people coming to my country and being disrespectful to the point that they don’t even learn how to say “hola” or “hello.” So, it took me a while to understand why the SBS proposal is a good proposal for our students because I was really concerned that we might lose something in the exchange. What convinced me that this is something that we need to do at this point is the fact that most of my transfer students, who make up over 20% of the students in the major, are students who come from impacted communities, low-income communities, and they have a very hard time getting into the Spanish classes that we teach here at UMass. Many of them cannot get into the class. Some of them can get into the class but don’t pass the class, which impacts their GPA and their ability to remain as full-time students as well as their scholarships. We used to send our students to Amherst College to take Spanish courses, which is not ideal for anybody, and, this summer, the B-43 bus schedule changed, so many of our students cannot take the bus in the afternoons to Amherst College to take those classes. We also have a semester abroad in Argentina and most of our students arrive in Argentina without a word of Spanish although we have the requirement in place. All of these things made me reflect on whether the requirement was really serving the purposes that I thought it should serve, for people born in the United States to learn a second language as a sign of respect for other cultures, especially considering our current political situation.
So, I support the SBS proposal for a new way of thinking about globalizing our education, but I do want to make a strong case to the administration that we need increased funding in language. This is not a problem of SBS or Humanities and Fine Arts (HFA). It is a problem that we don’t honor the fact that we want to internationalize our programs. So, we need more funding for languages and we also need for Spanish to no longer be considered a foreign language as it is almost the first language in some areas of the United States. I strongly urge the administration to not construe the SBS proposal as a lack of interest in the learning of foreign languages but as a way to support our students, especially our low-income students, in terms of their ability to graduate on time, and, at the same time, to continue to honor the fact that a second language is very necessary in a country like the United States. Thank you.

**Professor Benjamin Bailey, Communication:** Hi. I’m the Undergraduate Program Director in Communication. First, I’d like to say that we value foreign languages in the Communication Department and we will continue to encourage our students to take them; for some students, that might be one course, for some it might be four, for some it might be none. When our undergraduate studies committee talked about our proposal for changing requirements in the major, there was great excitement about the flexibility that it would allow: a student could go to South Africa on an exchange program, speaking English, and have an incredible intercultural experience that is transforming. We think that things like that can be much more meaningful than a simple requirement to go through two languages courses at UMass or elsewhere.

**Senator Anthony Paik, Sociology:** Hi. I’m also the Director of the Bachelor’s Degree with an Individual Concentration. I’m here to support the revisions to the Global Education requirements, but I do want to say a couple of things in response to what has been said. One, I think that the idea of pursuing a second-language requirement on a larger scale, perhaps for all B.A. degrees or as a university-wide requirement, is an important discussion to have and I do hope that it gets picked up. I personally support the idea of having a university-wide or B.A. requirement associated with a second language. That being said, the place for that debate is not in the context of the Global Education requirement; I hope that we can decouple the two things and think about what the Global Education requirement means for SBS students. It’s important to remember that there are fifteen credit-hours: six credit-hours associated with a second language beyond current competency and nine credit-hours associated, basically, with regional studies or additional language acquisition. In that context, we heard from a number of speakers who have stated the negative impacts of these somewhat onerous requirements on SBS students. Given that the faculty and the units involved have withdrawn support for the Global Education requirement, we are in a peculiar place where there is no faculty support or limited faculty support for these requirements, which raises questions as to the educational purpose of these requirements in this context. Thank you.

**Matthew Werth, Graduate Student:** Hello. I am very concerned about this proposal sending a strong message to students, faculty, and the administration that languages are simply not valued or important here at UMass. As someone who has lived abroad for three years, both as a student and as a Fulbright recipient, I can say that the first step to understanding, engaging with, and appreciating another culture was absolutely through the language. I think that all this talk about multicultural requirements and intercultural experiences, in the absence of a language requirement, is very lacking and shortsighted. I am worried that students will be less prepared for a world that is increasingly small if they don’t have this firsthand ability to engage and interact with people in their own native languages. There’s a very common joke that my international friends like to say. What do you call someone who speaks three languages? Trilingual. Two languages? Bilingual. Someone who speaks only one language is an American. Sadly, that is all too often the truth and I’m worried that this proposal is going to make that a little bit more real. I think that a Liberal Arts education is absolutely essential and that its greatest value is in creating well-rounded people who genuinely understand the world. Without a strong foundation in other languages, I’m worried that that will be very lacking. Thank you.

**Jackie Brousseau-Pereira, Academic Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences:** I am also a lecturer. I think that a lot of really excellent points have been made here about why we want to use this new proposal to deepen our students’ understanding of intercultural and international experiences. I also want to point out something that I think we have not hit upon yet. As Academic Dean, I see a lot of students who are struggling to make it through their requirements, for any number of reasons, many of them already
mentioned. One of the groups we have not talked much about, though, are international students, and, as you know, the percentage of international students is growing in our University and in SBS. And, as we’ve discussed in the advising task force and in curriculum committee meetings, these students come here and are already having an intercultural experience. This is their intercultural experience, coming to UMass, so to add the fifteen-credit requirement on for them feels like a burden that they probably don’t really need, and they could find other things to pursue that would be more in line with the pathways that they are setting forward. I’m hoping that one of my other colleagues will talk a little more about our new Pathways program, but that is a way for us to really help our students figure out from the beginning the kinds of things that they want to study, what they’re interested in, where they want to go, and for sure, through that, through their advising, through their curriculum, through their first-year seminar, we’re helping those students to figure out where they can study abroad and how they can do an internship, those kinds of things that are meaningful experiences to them. And, now, through the majors, with these new proposals, they’ll have a more deep understanding of intercultural content. I do believe that the Global Education requirement that we have had in place since 1999 with no changes really does not meet the needs of our students in 2017. Thank you.

Senator Bruce Baird, Japanese Studies: I’m hearing a lot of remarks, having to do with the difficulty of meeting requirements, which are causing me to want to put my notes aside. I’m put in mind of an anecdote that was relayed in the “Metropolitan Diary” in The New York Times some number of years ago in which a person told about going into a Jewish deli. The person was nervous about ordering and therefore ordered the same kind of lox as the person in front of them. The gentleman behind the counter said, “Do you really want that?” The customer said, “Yeah, that’s what I really want,” and he said, “Why don’t you try a little bit of it?” As it turns out, it was a particularly strong kind of lox, so the customer said, “Actually, that wasn’t what I wanted.” He gave her a different kind of lox and she said, “Ah, that’s the kind that I want.” He said, “Other people give you what you ask for; we give you what you want.” That’s stuck with me for a long time. Are we going to give the students what they’re asking for and involve ourselves in a kind of race to the bottom where each department feels that they should dumb down their requirements? Or, are we going to give the students what they don’t yet know they want? I think that we need to not do this proposal. We need to be talking about strengthening language. We need to be talking about strengthening global education and that doesn’t mean that you get to go to England and speak English all the time. It means that you go to a country where, yes, you have to be uncomfortable and have a bad accent but learn something new about the world. Thank you.

Senator Marinos Vouvakis, Electrical and Computer Engineering: I will have to vote on this. What I see so far is that just about everybody from SBS is in support of this proposal. Now, the underlying issue that we have here – and I’m trying to make up my mind about how to vote – is that we have a sound proposal from a College that has a right to set its own requirements, and we have forces outside of the College saying that this might not be the right idea and that all students should know at least two languages, and I certainly agree with that, but, I’m wondering, if we have a sound proposal from a College that affects its own students and has the support of the faculty in the College, why should we turn this proposal down? If our issue is a language requirement for all of our students, I think that is a separate issue. Thank you.

Senator Marta Calás, Management: I wasn’t going to say a word because I basically agree and disagree with everything that has been said, but I don’t want to lose this opportunity. First of all, let me say that, since we tabled the proposal, I’ve been thinking a lot about it and meeting with people and having conversations. One of the things that is clear to me is that it is definitely the case that the SBS proposal has a lot of merit in several ways; in fact, the SBS Pathways program is the type of thing that every College should have for their students because the most important aspect of it is to work closely with the students to advise them in directions that they may not otherwise think about. So, it has a lot of merits. At the same time, this is not just about SBS; this is a much larger picture, having to do with multiple programs that get affected. Oftentimes, by discussing these things in terms of so-called disciplines, we forget the merit of interdisciplinarity and what it does. One of the things that we are talking about is making sure that the language department doesn’t lose funding because one of the impacts of the SBS proposal would be that fewer students would enroll in those courses because they are no longer required. So, this is not just about SBS; there is a much larger picture of interdisciplinarity that will play out as we are talking about
international, transnational, or global education. I am in Isenberg, I teach international management, and, this semester, I am teaching one of the undergraduate courses, a senior course; the course has a peculiarly in that we use the concept of diversity to explore different regions of the world and to observe different notions of diversity, which change dramatically over time. In doing that, the students need to read other languages if they want to really know what is being said in some of those regions. So, each semester I ask, “How many of you know more than one language?” This semester, I had three students who raised their hands. One of them is a transfer student. Two of them speak Portuguese; one of them is from Brazil and the other one is the daughter of a family originally from Portugal. The third is a Puerto Rican student. All three, I would say, are lower-income students, and they are the ones who actually have two languages. So, I think that we make stereotypes oftentimes in this way, and at this point, I am almost thinking that many students who don’t have two languages are the privileged ones, looking down on the students who actually have the two languages. We oftentimes do not make that observation. Finally, I question the idea of going abroad and speaking English, not only in England but also in Spain, where there are programs that are basically taught in English, with the exception maybe of language courses. Thank you.

**Jack Rabinovitch, Undergraduate Student:** Hi, everybody. I’ve worked as a teaching assistant for the conversational Chinese class in Thatcher, so I think that I have an interesting perspective as I’ve had to struggle with financial issues as a student; I’m sure many of you are very familiar with this predicament. At the same time, I also teach a language, so, I’d like to give my perspective. I think that for the people who are arguing to have this policy go through on the behalf of students who are of lower income, that’s a very noble thing. I think that, with regard to the cultural opportunities of going to South Africa, students going to South Africa should take Zulu or Afrikaans. If students are going to London, they should take French and go to France on the weekends. There is a larger place than the English-speaking world. You can go to Australia or New Zealand, but that’s not the entire world. I think that, if you’re going to make an argument on the side of the cost of attending and looking out for lower-income people, why don’t we change the policy for people who are foreign students and already have those languages? If you are really hoping to look out for those people who really can’t make it and are going to fail those classes, you should remember that SBS has a responsibility to keep HFA afloat. As a student and as somebody who works in the Thatcher program, I have been the funds being constantly taken out of the language program, year after year. I am upset and angry, but I can’t talk to anybody because, whenever I try to talk to somebody, they say, “We’ll bring it up to the next person and to the next person.” I can’t take that. That is not acceptable. We have no dialogue with you. I’m angry that the Thatcher program is being cut down. Many of you don’t know what that is. It is one of the best opportunities for language that students have. It is a dormitory where we all live together and speak the languages that we are trying to learn. I speak Chinese. I learned Chinese for four years and am now in a 500-level course. I know that it’s not for everybody, but, if I didn’t have that opportunity, I don’t know where I’d be today. Thank you.

**Associate Dean Caswell:** In case you’re wondering, I am now speaking for myself and not as the representative of SBS. I wanted to just address the idea that many of the supporters of the proposal have talked about: problems students have fulfilling the current requirements. That’s been a main theme in the conversation today, but it’s only a starting point. As SBS reviewed our Global Education requirement, it was the starting point that we had problems with students having difficulty fulfilling it in different circumstances, but, really, the underlying reason that we were reviewing the Global Education requirement in the first place is that it was not doing what it was intended to do; it is not supporting the international and intercultural competencies of our students in a way that SBS aspires to. So, we want to change the requirement to integrate it into the majors, in the ways that were spoken about today, because we believe that that is the best way to bring international and intercultural competencies and knowledge to our students. So, it’s really about the opportunity to do international and intercultural education better in SBS. We are supporting that with SBS Pathways, which helps students to think about what languages to put together with what classes to get ready to do which study abroad or which type of internship to ultimately do what they want to do. So, from the SBS perspective, this is all about a better curriculum that better serves our students. Thank you.
**Senator Monika Schmitter, History of Art and Architecture:** I, like the Senator from Engineering, am rather torn about this issue. On the one hand, I think that learning languages is essential and I definitely support the idea of going ahead with thinking about a university-wide requirement for everyone. But, very clearly, this proposal has been thought through and SBS knows best what is best for their students; I can’t really argue with that. But, I think, for me, there is a bigger issue here of a climate that has been created on campus where we’re pitting the Colleges against each other. So, when the social scientists want to do something to improve their situation, it feels like they have to be taking away from the people in the Humanities. Why do we have to have that climate? Isn’t there something that we could do, from up on high, to think about this in a different way? I’m not sure what the answer is exactly, but I think that this idea of pitting the colleges against each other is very problematic.

**Amena Moinfar, Graduate Student:** I am a graduate student in the French Department and I teach French. I’ve been teaching for three semesters and am dedicated to my students. I don’t leave any student behind; if I know that a student is having trouble, I have extra office hours. I am half-Iranian and half-French, so I try to bring diversity into the classroom, as well. I feel that learning a foreign language in a global world and in a global curriculum makes sense. You cannot function as a global citizen without being exposed to a diversity of culture and of language. The social class issue that has been brought up I see in the opposite way. For students who come from underprivileged areas, college may be their first opportunity to take a foreign language or to see someone like me, or an American colleague who lived abroad. We’re depriving those students of this opportunity. If you come from a privileged background, you probably went abroad already. Who can afford to study abroad? Students study abroad every single time that they step into my classroom. I’m not paid like a faculty member, but I do my job with my whole heart and I feel bad for those students. So, please think about them and about what you’re doing if you take this opportunity from them. The super-privileged will always get opportunities, but those kids who come to college for the first time, who might already have a foreign language at home, might not have a chance to take French, or Japanese, or Chinese unless those languages are offered to them and are not a waste of time for their programs.

**Senator Ernest May, Music and Dance:** The ISC made some interesting points in their comments. I do support the desire of SBS to make things better for their students, and I think there are many positive aspects of the revisions that they have proposed, but there are some concerning factors. If we’re aiming to be a top-twenty university, there are hardly any top-twenty universities that don’t have some kind of language proficiency requirement if not a language requirement like the one we have; Rutgers is the only one indicated in this report. Virtually all of our peer public institutions have a language proficiency requirement. So, I suggest that the Faculty Senate set up an ad-hoc committee to explore the possibility of a language proficiency requirement. I’d also like to point out that there’s a difference between the professional degrees, which have never had language requirements on this campus, such as in Engineering or Business Administration. The B.A. degree has a more complicated history because the language requirement originated when there was a single College of Arts and Sciences, that comprised what are currently HFA, SBS, and the College of Natural Sciences (CNS), and it applied equally to all the B.A. degrees. When the Colleges split up, the requirements became the properties of individual Colleges and, at that point, became rather complicated. I think we need to have a holistic reassessment of what internationalization means and how languages are integrated across the whole campus. Perhaps it should be a language proficiency requirement rather than a language requirement such as the current one in SBS which, I would agree, is a very onerous and unwieldy requirement.

**Senator Richard Bogartz, Psychological and Brain Sciences:** I have two brief points. I’m open-minded so far as a language proficiency idea is concerned, but I don’t think that that should hold up the SBS proposal; these are separate issues as has already been pointed out. Secondly, it makes no educational sense, to me, to have the programs of SBS students determined by the need to support lines in HFA; that’s a separate need, but it shouldn’t function to determine what SBS students do or do not do.

**Hannah Doucette, Undergraduate Student:** I am a senior and I am graduating this year but this is still very concerning to me. There are separate issues involved, but, at the same time, learning language teaches you to respect people in ways that you wouldn’t know otherwise. I was at work the other day and someone made a joke about “ching chong.” I speak Chinese; it’s my major. Why would anyone say that? I think that people
who don’t know a second language don’t necessarily realize that they are disrespecting people sometimes. There are many ways of respecting people, but learning a language helps in terms of learning about cultures that you don’t understand, which I think is important the disciplines in SBS and its programs. Thank you.

**Jack Rabinovitch, Undergraduate Student:** I think that there are really two separate issues here. One is that HFA is not doing as well as it should be doing. A lot of that has to do with money allocation, not with the students; our students are extremely passionate. There is a chance to have more, but a lot of the information that we have isn’t distributed among our students. People don’t know what opportunities they have. The other issue is SBS students being able to choose the courses that they want to take and not having to do things that they think are unnecessary. I understand both sides of that. I think that, after this vote, regardless of what the outcome is, it is very important that everybody in SBS understand that we can’t do this alone. Regardless of whether or not your students have the sort of outcome where they get to choose, we still need to be a united front and demand that we still get the funding that we need. What is happening is ridiculous. I’m a student and there are all these administrative barriers to keep us from seeing what is happening and I can still see what is happening; it is obvious to me. The administration really needs to be held accountable and it’s hard to do that when, every time you talk to somebody, they say, “I’ll say that to my manager…I’ll say that to my supervisor.” I think everybody understands where I’m going with this. Again, regardless of what happens, I hope that that solidarity will be there, and that’s what I’m asking for. Thank you.

**Anne Moore, Undergraduate Student:** I’m a sophomore in the Languages, Literatures, and Cultures department. French was not offered at my high school, so my first opportunity to learn the language was at college. It’s really changed my life. My major is Comparative Literature now. I’m very passionate about French, but I’ve also struggled a lot to be able to fit it into my schedule because of the limited classes that are offered, and I see that, if less students are required to take the language courses, the availability of the classes will go down. That makes me very upset because this is my first opportunity to learn a language and I would hate to think of people losing this opportunity that is life-changing. I want to go into translation now and my whole track in college has been changed because I decided to study French and I think that it would be a real shame to deprive students of that opportunity.

### D. NEW COURSES

**(CONSENT AGENDA)**

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 230</td>
<td>Design Engagement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBHLTH 427</td>
<td>Seminars in Environmental Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCANDIN 250</td>
<td>Hans Christian Andersen and His World</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTCOMM 333</td>
<td>Introduction to Community Economic Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICROBIO 557</td>
<td>Advanced Topics in Biotechnology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 576</td>
<td>Hydric Soils</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 577</td>
<td>Advanced Hydric Soils</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOSTATS 743</td>
<td>Analysis of Categorical Data in Public Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP 662</td>
<td>Emerging Infectious Diseases</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING 775</td>
<td>Measurement in Health Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONPL 645</td>
<td>Growth Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOTION:** That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ARCH 230, PUBHLTH 427, SCANDIN 250, SUSTCOMM 333, MICROBIO 557, STOCKSCH 576, STOCKSCH 577, BIOSTATS 743, HPP 662, NURSING 775, and REGIONPL 645, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.
Senator Marinos Vouvakis: “Design Engagement,” to me, doesn’t sound like the right title for Architecture 230. In Engineering, there is a lot of design, and there is a lot of design in other areas. I think that it should be more specific if this is architectural design as opposed to another type of design. There’s a lot of design in many other areas. It just doesn’t make sense to me. I teach antenna design, for example, and I call the course “Antenna Design,” not just “Design.”

At the request of Senator Vouvakis, the course ARCH 230 was removed from the consent agenda. Presiding Officer Hugus announced that approval of ARCH 230 would be postponed to a future meeting.

The motion, excluding ARCH 230, was adopted.

E. NEW BUSINESS

(CONSENT AGENDA)

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda].


MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve 1) the Revision of the Commonwealth Honors College Requirements, 2) Name Change of the Certificate in Social Service and Social Work and 3) The creation of an Undergraduate Certificate in Business Analytics, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 18-001, 18-002 and 18-003, respectively.

Senator Nancy Cohen: The report presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-003, which I’ve printed, suggests that the certificate was approved by the Academic Matters Council, Academic Priorities Council, and Program and Budget Council. I don’t know if there were any comments. Maybe they were online but not printed.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: Either the Program and Budget Council indicated approval but did not make any particular comments or we lost something in the Faculty Senate Office. We will find out tomorrow morning. Sometimes Councils don’t put any comments in. I’ll have to go back and look.

Presiding Officer Hugus determined that, in light of these remarks, Item 3 would be removed from the consent agenda and consideration of the item postponed to a future meeting.

The motion, excluding Item 3, was adopted.

F. OLD BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Special Report of the Nominating Committee concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-068B.

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amendment to the Special Report of the Nominating Committee concerning Nominations to the Academic Advisory Board, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-068B.
Senator Richard Bogartz: I think that all of these recommendations are wonderful except for this fellow who is listed on the first line for the Commonwealth Honors College Council. I know him, at least, as a passing acquaintance, and I’m quite certain that he did not volunteer to be a member of that Council. So, I would like to amend the motion to remove Richard Bogartz.

The amendment was amended.

The motion was adopted as amended.

The 771st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:42 p.m. on October 12, 2017.