Executive Summary
The committee found the “whereas” statements of Resolution 1112-05R inadequate to recommend the re-activation of any European language degree program. Careful consideration was given to various interpretations of the Resolution, and is detailed below.

Formation of the Committee
University Senate Resolution 1112-05R states, "Be it resolved that the Executive Committee of the Senate immediately establish a subcommittee composed of representatives from UAC, GAC and UPPC, as well as other faculty with relevant expertise, to determine which programs in European Language and Classical Studies should be activated, reactivated, or remain active in accordance with the liberal arts mission of the university, such subcommittee to report back to the Senate by 4/15/12."
This resolution was passed by the University Senate on 2/6/12. The Senate Executive Committee, in its meeting on 2/22/12, “discussed how the committee would be formed; the resolution calls for specific membership. Since forming committees in general falls under the work of the Governance Council, a motion was made that GOV be charged with forming the committee. The motion was seconded and approved by a vote with 7 in favor, 3 opposed and 1 abstention.” (SEC Minutes, 2/22/12).
At the 2/27/12 GOV meeting, “There was a discussion concerning Resolution 1112-05R which the SEC has charged to GOV since GOV is the Council on Committees and the resolution calls for the establishment of a subcommittee to determine which programs in European Language and Classical Studies should be activated, reactivated or remain active. The subcommittee is to report back to the Senate by April 15. Senator Stefl-Mabry recommended contacting the Center for Technology in Government since they could offer resources that can assist. Secretary Leonard referred to a notation from the SEC that the French Program should provide a representative and the committee should include members from the Strategic Plan. Chair Lyons asked Senator Fox if she would take the responsibility for a representative from the French Program and she agreed to do so. Chair Lyons will look into other required representation.” (GOV minutes, 2/27/12).
The minutes from the next GOV meeting, on 3/19/12, read in part, “Chair Lyons sent requests to the chairs of GAC, UAC and UPPC to appoint a representative from each of their councils to be on the subcommittee as outlined in Resolution 1112-05R. Senator Fox responded with the name of a representative from the French Department and Chair Lyons is waiting to hear from the Provost for a representative from the Strategic Plan. A representative will also be needed to address the foreign languages component of the resolution. Once all the names of representatives have been submitted, Chair Lyons will arrange to have them meet.” (GOV minutes, 3/19/12)
UPPC discussed its representation on the committee at its April 20th meeting. The minutes are as follows: "Discussion commenced regarding Senate Resolution 1112-5R (to determine offerings in European Languages and Classical Studies in accordance with UAlbany's mission) relative to whether Dr. Wills' offer to serve as the UPPC rep to this committee is in conflict with his role as sponsor of the bill, as well as a member of an affected department. Dr. Wills asserted that this legislation is in conflict with an administrative decision that has already been made. Chair Lifshin asked Dr. Wills if his personal interest in this committee would compromise his ability to report the activities of this group back to UPPC in terms of resource implications. Dr. Wills replied that it would not. Dr. Fessler asked Mr. Beditz about the conflict of interest definition. Mr. Beditz responded that broadly, we should not use our professional offices for personal gain or in conflict with our duties as officers of the State of New York. Dr. Fessler felt that the result of the committee's decision could directly benefit Dr. Wills in terms of employment. Dr.
Johnson reflected that having a vested interest could influence one’s participation in such a group. Dr. Lifshin issued a renewed call for an alternate volunteer to come forth. As no one came forward, Dr. Lifshin asked for a motion to decline Dr. Wills’ offer to serve on the committee as the UPPC representative based on a perceived conflict of interest. Dr. Johnson asked what UPPC would want the volunteer to this committee focus on. Ms. DiDonna voiced a concern that since Dr. Wills authored the proposal, that there could very well be a perception of conflict within the university community if he also served on the committee, which was echoed by Dr. Wagner. Dr. Wagner requested clarification on the committee’s role. (The committee’s charge is to report back to Senate by 4/15/12 on recommendations for program reinstatement, which would ultimately go back to GAC, UAC and ultimately UPPC). A secret ballot approved Dr. Wills as the UPPC representative to the committee.”

GOV also reached out to the Vice Provost for International Education, but after careful consideration he declined to serve on the committee.

In the end, the committee roster was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation for the purposes of the committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee Bickmore</td>
<td>Languages; Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suraj Commuri</td>
<td>GAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Faerman</td>
<td>Undergraduate Education; Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Fogarty</td>
<td>UAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Groves</td>
<td>GAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudi Jacobson</td>
<td>UAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JoAnne Malatesta</td>
<td>UAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Mancini</td>
<td>GAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Stevens</td>
<td>CAS Office; Classics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wills</td>
<td>UPPC; LLC; Languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee met on 5/11/12. Senate Chair Fessler called the meeting to order, explained the committee’s charge, and asked that the group elect a chair. She then left the meeting. In the end, no committee member was willing to chair the group. There was a general discussion, however, and David Wills followed up on 5/17/12 with an e-mail to the committee members, containing data about UAlbany peer and aspirational peer institutions. (See appendices)

No committee activity happened over the summer months. In late August, with the start of the new school year, Senate officers followed up on the issue. Two members of the original committee were no longer able to serve in Fall 2012: Greg Stevens (retired) and David Wills (on sabbatical). Susanna Fessler agreed to serve as the UPPC representative, and John Monfasani agreed to serve as a representative from the CAS office. In addition, GOV asked Professor Jeanette Altarriba to serve, as someone affiliated with languages. GOV decided that there should also be a representative from Languages, Literature, and Cultures, and asked the dept. chair, Lotfi Sayahi. Chair Sayahi declined to serve, and instead designated Professor Henryk Baran (Russian program) to serve.

The new committee roster was then as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation for the purposes of the committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Altarriba</td>
<td>Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henryk Baran</td>
<td>LLC; Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Bickmore</td>
<td>Languages; Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suraj Commuri</td>
<td>GAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Faerman</td>
<td>Undergraduate Education; Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna Fessler</td>
<td>UPPC; Languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That the committee includes many members who are affiliated with languages was a result of GOV’s interpretation of the resolution language, which indicates that the committee should contain “other faculty with relevant expertise.”

The newly constituted committee met on 10/22/12, and elected Susanna Fessler as chair. This election was held by ballot, and was unanimous except for one abstention.

Articulation of the Committee’s Charge

The language of the resolution states that the “subcommittee [will]… determine which programs in European Language and Classical Studies should be activated, reactivated, or remain active in accordance with the liberal arts mission of the university…”

The committee found this problematic, because UAlbany does not have a “liberal arts mission.” No such mission is in our current Strategic Plan, nor was it in previous iterations. Our current Strategic Plan states our mission as “Expanding knowledge and transforming minds to shape the future of our community and our world.” Our 1992 mission was articulated as follows:

- First, a commitment to the pursuit and advancement of knowledge, for its own sake and for its practical benefits to society.
- Second, a commitment to the teaching of students, to their growth in knowledge, and to that reinforcement of character, through co-curricular experiences, which enables them to develop emotionally, physically, and socially even as they mature intellectually;
- Third, a commitment to the larger interests of society through acts of public service, and by fostering the ideals of social justice;
- Fourth, a commitment to freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression, and to the rights and obligations of faculty and students to pursue knowledge, wherever it may lead;
- Fifth, a commitment to profit intellectually and imaginatively from differences of opinion and of culture.

Again, this does not indicate that UAlbany had (before the current Strategic Plan) a “liberal arts mission.” Nonetheless, the committee returned to the “Whereas” section of the resolution to discern how the UA mission, as articulated in the Strategic Plan, might apply. In other words, how do the “whereas” statements in the resolution map onto arguments for “which programs in European Language and Classical Studies should be activated, reactivated, or remain active” in accordance with our Strategic Plan?

One other area of the resolution was unclear to the committee: whether the resolution asked for a consideration of only undergraduate programs, or both undergraduate and graduate programs. The LLC representative on the committee was asked his opinion, but he did not answer the question. The committee decided that it would focus on undergraduate programs only.

The committee also discussed whether the financial resource implications of the resolution should be addressed. It was agreed that, given the absence of financial considerations in the resolution itself, the committee should keep its report to the issues that did appear in the resolution.

Peer Comparisons

The first two “whereas” clauses of the resolution are:
• Whereas none of UAlbany’s peer institutions offers fewer than 3 baccalaureate programs in European languages,
• Whereas the deactivations of 10/1/10\(^1\) reduce such offerings at UAlbany to 1 (Spanish),

These two points were seen as part of the same argument, that UAlbany should mirror or exceed its peer institutions in terms of European language program offerings. The committee discussed arguments for such “mirroring.” Certainly not all SUNY campuses, or their peers, aim to perfectly duplicate others’ curriculum. Each campus maintains its own identity, to some extent tied to the unique and/or particularly strong programs that it has. Indeed, when a SUNY campus proposes to create a new program, part of the approval process necessitates consultation with other SUNY campuses that have similar programs to ensure that the creation of a new program will not cause a negative impact. The concern there is largely one of supply and demand; if the demand of students does not meet or exceed the supply of programs, then the program does not serve the student body efficiently.

Another possible argument for mirroring our peers is that the programs in question—French, Italian, and Russian—have intrinsic value, and should therefore be part of all schools’ curriculum, as evidenced by programs that our peers have in place. This assumes that our peers, likewise, hold these programs to be intrinsically valuable without concern for viability in terms of enrollments (not majors, but rather FTEs). The Delaware data (see appendix) which compares UA to our peer institutions, however, does not clearly support this idea, nor does it necessarily refute it. Naturally, this does not prevent UA from holding some programs as intrinsically valuable; it simply reduces the strength of the peer comparison argument. The argument that we should have the same programs as our peers or peer institutions, thus, did not sway the committee. There was discussion of how enrollments could tie in to such an argument, but it was quickly agreed that such an approach took us into the finances of program reactivation, and that as previously agreed, we should focus on the arguments of the resolution solely.

**Strategic Plan**

The next two “whereas” clauses read:

• Whereas the Student Experience Objective #4 of the Strategic Plan, which calls for amplifying the ‘World Within Reach’ perspective through a dynamic, rich assemblage of experiences, includes as Action Step 4.5 “to encourage undergraduate student contact with foreign languages and world cultures,”
• Whereas the Strategic Plan charges the Vice Provost for International Education with organizing a group to identify critical languages and ways to build the University’s capacity to deliver instruction in them, such group to be convened immediately following approval of the Strategic Plan, such group not having yet been convened,

The text from Action Step 4.5 above is from the Executive Summary of the Strategic Plan. The full text of Action Step 4.5 is as follows:

*Action Step 4.5: Provide training in the languages that students are most likely to need in an increasingly globalized world, ensure regular course offering at all levels of instruction (including advanced courses) in these critical languages, and focus on student proficiency in these languages for both study abroad and career development; charge the Vice Provost for International Education with organizing a group to identify those languages and ways to build the University’s capacity to deliver instruction in them.*

The language about the timeline above, that “such group [should be] convened immediately” implies an imperative which does not actually exist. Stepping back to look at the implantation of the entire Strategic

\(^1\) As a technical detail, no programs were deactivated on 10/1/10. Rather, admissions to those programs were suspended on that date, pending further budgetary decisions. The president’s official announcement of deactivations of degree programs was delivered to the university community on 3/24/11.
Plan, it is important to note that all mention of timelines in the Strategic Plan is "suggested," not mandated. In presenting the final Strategic Plan document to President Philip, the Strategic Planning Committee recommended that priority be given to a subset of the six major goals and their objectives. President Philip concurred and selected a subset of initiatives across the major goals to take priority in the first two years of implementation. Fully detailed at http://www.albany.edu/strategicplan/files/Strategic_Plan_Implementation_year1_2_priorities.pdf, these included:

1. Undergraduate Academics
2. Student Engagement, Advising, Mentoring, and Support
3. Student Recruitment and Enrollment
4. Graduate Education
5. Research
6. Keeping Pace with Emerging Technologies
7. Faculty and Instructional Development

The following parts of Action Step 4 are given Year 1 & 2 priority:

   Undergraduate/Objective #4: Enhance the international components of undergraduate education...study abroad/intersession...international student enrollment...strategic languages... enhance global course offerings (see also Student Experience/Objective #4 (Amplify the 'World Within Reach' perspective through a dynamic, rich assemblage of experiences)

Of these, "international components of undergraduate education" and "strategic languages" are applicable to Resolution 1112-05R. The committee notes that "international components of undergraduate education" is a broad category, which subsumes most of the other categories. The issue of what is a "strategic language" will be addressed below.

**Measuring "Strategic Languages"

The language of the Strategic Plan indicates that UA should "provide training in the languages that students are most likely to need in an increasingly globalized world, ensure regular course offering at all levels of instruction (including advanced courses) in these critical languages, and focus on student proficiency in these languages for both study abroad and career development." This led the committee to question how one would measure what languages "students are most likely to need in an increasingly globalized world." Suggested metrics were 1) the number of speakers of a language world-wide, 2) The collective GDP of speakers of a language, 3) current demand in the United States for classes in a foreign language, 4) "Critical Language" designation by the U.S. government or 5) a combination of all the above.

1. Number of speakers worldwide. These data are based on the number of speakers worldwide, as opposed to the number of native speakers worldwide.

   [confirmation and citation(s) from Trudi]
   1. Mandarin Chinese (1151 million)
   2. English (1000 million)
   3. Spanish (500 million)
   4. Hindi (490 million) (combined with Urdu 594 million)
   5. Russian (277 million)
   6. Arabic (255 million)
   7. Portuguese (240 million)
   8. Bengali (215 million)
   9. French (200 Million)
10. Malay/Indonesian (175 million)
11. German (166 million)
12. Japanese (132 million)
13. Farsi (Persian) (110 million)
14. Urdu (104 million) (not including Hindi)
15. Punjabi (103 million)

Given these numbers, the order of priority for European Languages would be Spanish, Russian, Portuguese, French, and German.

2. GDP

Although there are many statistical resources available, there is general agreement among them that, based on the gross domestic product, the most important non-English European languages would be German, Spanish, French, Italian, and Russian, in that order.

[info from Trudi]

3. Current demand


The chart below comes from that report.

Percentage of Total Language Course Enrollments, 1968-2009, for the Fourteen Most Commonly Taught Languages in 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, Ancient</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking solely the European Language data from this table (those rows shaded above) and charting it, we find the following trends:
Both French and German have seen significant decline since 1968. Italian, by contrast, has seen a slight increase in enrollments. Latin, Russian, and Greek have also declined, although their numbers were never high to begin with.

4. Critical Language Designation

“Critical language” is a term used in the U.S. to designate languages for which there is large demand for language professionals but little supply. The list of which languages are considered critical changes over time as economic and political situations change and develop, but often these languages are radically different from English in grammatical structures, sound systems and writing systems. The current “critical languages” are:

- Arabic
- Azerbaijani
- Bengali
- Chinese
- Hindi
- Indonesian
- Japanese
- Korean
- Persian
- Punjabi
- Russian
- Turkish
- Urdu

Russian is the only European language currently considered “critical.”

In sum, these four interpretations of “strategic” do not result in a common conclusion. The first two indicate that French is perhaps the most “strategic” language, but the latter two indicate that linguistic trends and needs are shifting away from that.

Language Offerings and Degree Programs

Consideration of this data brought the committee to one more conundrum: concerns about “strategic languages” and consequently which programs should be “activated, reactivated, or remain active” conflate the offering of foreign language classes with the offering of baccalaureate degrees in those languages. Offering language classes is not the same as offering a BA degree in those languages. Of note is that in these area studies units, courses fall into one of three categories: language courses (those that
focus on teaching the language as a second language), content courses taught in the target language (those that focus on other topics, such as history or literature) and content courses taught in English (again, those that focus on other topics, such as history or literature).

A key question is thus whether reactivating a language degree program would address Action Step 4.5 of the Strategic Plan, "Provide training in the languages that students are most likely to need in an increasingly globalized world, ensure regular course offering at all levels of instruction (including advanced courses) in these critical languages, and focus on student proficiency in these languages for both study abroad and career development."

The minors currently in place for French, Italian, and Russian require the following:

**French:** A minimum of 18 graduation credits from course work with an A FRE prefix above A FRE 101 including A FRE 341Z. No more than 3 credits of courses conducted in English may be used to satisfy the requirements of the minor.

**Italian:** A minimum of 18 graduation credits from course work with an A ITA prefix above A ITA 100, including A ITA 206, 207, 301Z.

**Russian:** A minimum of 18 graduation credits in courses with A RUS prefix as advised with at least 9 credits in course work at the 300 level or above and/or in courses requiring at least one prerequisite course.

In comparison, the deactivated majors in these areas require the following:

**French B.A.:** a minimum of 36 credits above A FRE 222. These include: 21 credits of core courses (A FRE 301, 306, 340Z, 341Z, 355, 360, 461Z); 15 credits of elective courses at the 300 level and/or 400 level, including at least 6 credits at the 400 level. A FRE 306, 355, and at least one 400-level course must be taken in residence at the Albany campus. Credits earned through study abroad programs will not fulfill this requirement.

**Italian B.A.:** A minimum of 35 credits including A ITA 103, 104, 206, 207, 223, 301Z, 313, 315 and nine additional credits at or above the 300 level, six of which must be at the 400 level.

**Russian B.A.:** A minimum of 36 credits of Russian language (above A RUS 102), literature, or culture courses. Two alternative tracks lead to the degree: (A) Language, (B) Literature and Culture. Each program consists of a common core of 28 credits plus at least 8 credits in the area of concentration.

**Core Program (28 credits)**

Language (19 credits): A RUS 201, 202, 301, 302, 311.

Literature and Culture (9 credits): Three courses, at least one of which is in literature, from among A RUS 251, 252, 253, 161/Z, 162/Z, 280 or as advised by the Director of Undergraduate Studies.

**Area Concentration: (8 credits)**

(A) Language: A RUS 480 plus 5 credits in Russian language courses or in literature courses taught in Russian at the 300 level or above.
In general, the major requirements put much more emphasis on upper-level courses, a portion (but not all) of which is language courses. How would re-activating the majors in French, Russian, and Italian change our course offerings? Would it significantly increase the language courses being offered at the advanced level, as mentioned in the Strategic Plan? The answer to this question is undoubtedly “yes,” but one must note that it is not necessary to have a BA program in a language in order to offer upper-level language courses in that language. Indeed, UA currently offers upper-level language classes in French. In Italian and Russian, however, we currently only offer Beginning and Intermediate language classes. In any event, re-activating the degree programs in these languages would be an inefficient way to “ensure regular course offerings at all levels of instruction (including advanced courses),” assuming that these languages are determined to be “languages that students are most likely to need in an increasingly globalized world,” because doing so would necessitate offering a larger selection of non-language courses also. A more efficient method would be to focus solely on the language courses, without the attendant content courses that would come with the re-activation of a degree program.

In sum, Strategic Plan Action Step 4.5 calls for “training in the languages that students are most likely to need in an increasingly globalized world, ensure regular course offering at all levels of instruction (including advanced courses) in these critical languages, and focus on student proficiency in these languages for both study abroad and career development,” which argues for upper level language classes but not necessarily for activating, reactivating, or keeping active degree programs.

Role of the Faculty in Initiating Programs
The final “whereas” clause of Resolution 1112-05R states: “Whereas Faculty By-Law 2.2.1 charges the Faculty with initiating, disapproving or approving and recommending for implementation ‘all changes in, additions to, or deletions from the Curriculum.’” The implication here is that the committee’s report could serve in place of a Senate bill proposing changes in the status of the deactivated European languages. However, it cannot. If a member, or members of the faculty, wishes to propose a change in an academic program, he/she/they must submit such a detailed proposal to the appropriate school or college (local committee and dean’s office), and after that the proposal must pass through the appropriate Senate Council and the Senate as a whole. If approved by the Senate AND signed by the president, then the proposal can be enacted.

Conclusion
The committee did not find the arguments of Resolution 1112-05--that peer comparisons and the Strategic Plan Action Step 4.5 called for the reactivation of degree programs in French, Italian, and Russian--compelling. In response to the charge to “determine which programs in European Language and Classical Studies should be activated, reactivated, or remain active,” our conclusion is that none of them should be activated, reactivated, or remain active assuming the arguments given in the resolution. This decision is not meant to be a global decision, one that takes all other arguments into account.

Additionally, there was concern that, should one want to accomplish the “activation or reactivation” of a program, a Senate resolution was not the proper vehicle. Although the committee can and hereby does render an opinion on the matter, the ad hoc committee of Resolution 1112-05R has no power to instigate a proposal to activate or reactivate a program. A proper channel would be for faculty to propose a “faculty initiated major” in French, Italian, and Russian. Although this is not the same as having BA programs in these languages, it would be a first step toward rebuilding these programs in the future.
A remaining, tangential question is “What languages will our students need in an increasingly globalized world?” Although the committee investigated ways in which such a question could be answered, it did not attempt to answer the question definitively. The Strategic Plan does call for such a decision, however, and the committee hopes that it will be made sooner rather than later.
RESOLUTION TO DETERMINE OFFERINGS IN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES & CLASSICAL STUDIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH UALBANY’S MISSION AND STRATEGIC PLAN

Whereas none of UAlbany’s peer institutions offers fewer than 3 baccalaureate programs in European languages,
Whereas the deactivations of 10/1/10 reduce such offerings at UAlbany to 1 (Spanish),
Whereas the Undergraduate Education Objective #4 of the Strategic Plan calls for various initiatives designed to enhance the international components of undergraduate education,
Whereas the Student Experience Objective #4 of the Strategic Plan, which calls for amplifying the ‘World Within Reach’ perspective through a dynamic, rich assemblage of experiences, includes as Action Step 4.5 “to encourage undergraduate student contact with foreign languages and world cultures,”
Whereas the Strategic Plan charges the Vice Provost for International Education with organizing a group to identify critical languages and ways to build the University’s capacity to deliver instruction in them, such group to be convened immediately following approval of the Strategic Plan, such group not having yet been convened,
Whereas Faculty By-Law 2.2.1 charges the Faculty with initiating, disapproving or approving and recommending for implementation “all changes in, additions to, or deletions from the Curriculum,”

Be it resolved that the Executive Committee of the Senate immediately establish a subcommittee composed of representatives from UAC, GAC and UPPC, as well as other faculty with relevant expertise, to determine which programs in European Language and Classical Studies should be activated, reactivated, or remain active in accordance with the liberal arts mission of the university, such subcommittee to report back to the Senate by 4/15/12.