

FINAL  
SAS All Faculty Meeting  
December 14, 2017  
Roster and Minutes

1. Peter March, Executive Dean of SAS, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.
2. Acceptance of the agenda. Agenda was accepted with no discussion.
3. Acceptance of the minutes from the SAS Faculty Meeting of May 3, 2017. Text of minutes can be viewed at: <http://sas.rutgers.edu/for-faculty/25-faculty-a-staff/1611-sas-faculty-meeting-minutes>

Minutes were accepted.

4. Report from the Curriculum Committee—Dennis Bathory, Committee Chair

Dennis Bathory presented highlights from the committee's report: 1) The committee approved 10 online or hybrid courses; several facilitate instruction of infrequently taught language courses; 2) approved realignment of series of courses in Film Studies and Cinema Studies; 3) helped English Department tweak a major in technical and business writing; (4) a new first year course for international students and a new honors course were approved.

A question was raised as to where we stand in SAS relative to other units in Internet courses. Do we have more, less? Enrollment? How does that affect our revenue? The response was that SAS offers more classes that are hybrid and online, but for pedagogical reasons keeps the enrollments smaller. This semester SAS launched an ad campaign to feature our online courses, grouped in topical areas (rather than by department). In terms of the revenue flow, there is no longer any difference between the tuition flow from on-line and in-classroom courses.

Report from the Curriculum Committee was approved.

5. Report from the Core Requirements Committee—Kathleen Scott, Committee Chair

Kathleen Scott directed attention to the changes in the core requirements. The committee recommended 13 new courses be added to the core: most in the Contemporary Challenges area. Four courses are now permanently cross-listed: two placed on hold awaiting further information. One was not certified for the core (see list). She noted that in determining which courses are accepted the relevance to the core must be up front and significant.

CRC Report was approved.

## 6. Report from the Core Evaluation Committee—led by Kathleen Scott

Last year this committee changed the faculty facing aspects of the core. This year the committee is looking at changing how students see and progress through the core. Can the committee add a diversity requirement to the core? The committee met with student groups, who talked about what they thought a diversity requirement should entail. The committee is also considering the amount of goals the core courses should certify. They do not want to add to the core. It is already challenging for students to fit in requirements for major, minor, and the core. They are also looking at how often courses are offered. This is a student concern.

The plan is to have a report for faculty in March, a town meeting in April to discuss, and then they will bring a proposal to this body to vote on at spring meeting.

Two questions were raised: what goals are underrepresented in our current course offerings? The second concerned the ways the core forces students to ignore other courses they would like to take: it is very influential in course selection. Kathleen Scott replied that the committee would like to put together lists of courses from across departments that would be especially interesting to students in certain majors. She also stated that we can remind students that after they fulfill their major, minor, core they still have room for electives, and they should choose them wisely.

CEC Report was approved.

## 7. Discussion of the Language Requirement Task Force Report—Francois Cornilliat, Chair

The Language Requirement Task Force Report can be found at URL:  
[http://sas.rutgers.edu/custom/ltf/Language\\_Requirement\\_Task\\_Force\\_Report\\_and\\_Proposal\\_Full.pdf](http://sas.rutgers.edu/custom/ltf/Language_Requirement_Task_Force_Report_and_Proposal_Full.pdf)

François Cornilliat described this as an update and an opportunity for conversation. There is a proposal on the table, which was submitted to the chancellor in April and is now in discussion in the various schools of Rutgers New Brunswick. SAS held a faculty forum in September; there will be another one in February. SAS will sponsor discussion on the four areas of the proposal. We are also talking to other schools. Departments need to take this up: ideally every department in SAS will do this: then they send the committee their report.

There is a one-credit requirement on the table, to be adopted campus wide. Responses range from cautious to excited. The key here is the question of how to fit extra credits into the curriculum? If they are adopted they should be by programs for their own reasons and intellectual rationale.

The task force proposes a one-credit add on to specific existing courses. Cornilliat asked faculty to think of how to grow from the one-credit add on to a 3-credit course. This is really about taking this opportunity to determine whether language competencies of any kind are relevant to your field.

The floor was then opened for questions. They included: (1) The Business School's plans, to which Cornilliat responded that they were still unclear. He was not certain if the faculty in the Business School had met to discuss the proposal yet. (2) Whether the task force is looking at the idea of One Rutgers (rather than the individual goals of schools and majors). Shouldn't familiarity with world languages be a goal that every school and major embrace? Cornilliat agreed, but stated that it is technically hard to create one general requirement. How do you design something that would give our huge population of heritage speakers opportunities to continue to push their language fluency and application? Even to add one credit is a huge undertaking but there is great good will. (3) How to incorporate language into the classes that we already teach, and how to keep heritage speakers from checking the box to say they already met this requirement? (4) How much is it language you are talking about, or language into a cognitive view of the world or into culture, into seeing the world through different eyes? Cornilliat responded that we do want a high cultural content in language learning at Rutgers: yes, language as window into other things.

The final speaker complimented the task force on an imaginative proposal which will stimulate long discussions in departments. Cornilliat closed by saying that it is tremendously important that each and every department have this discussion. It is absolutely clear that deans and the chancellor's support is dependent on faculty taking this and using it for their own purposes.

## 8. Dean's Report

Peter March described the changes that are happening, both externally to SAS, and then internally.

External changes: we have a new chancellor, Debba Dutta, who started in July. As a chancellor he is deferential to deans in the area of curriculum and research. He has a goal to differentiate RU-New Brunswick from Rutgers University writ large. The chancellor will take over some of the decision-making and authority that has until the recent past resided with the university president. Dutta's first decision was to create a true provost's position and a VP of research and innovation position.

The chancellor is also thinking very hard about principles (that translate into practices) for allocating the state funding that comes to NB. This is an aspect of RCM. The state funding comes in two pieces: the monetary benefit of certain lines; and then block grants. He is thinking about articulating practices for the chancellor's allocation.

Peter March described Internal Changes that include: A new operational model for the schools that is being driven by RCM. RCM pushes budgets down the org chart. In his judgment the new budget model needs to be pushed down from the executive dean to the area deans to department chairs. Test budgets have been developed that are based on history, shared with departments. Staff is meeting one by one with departments on their budgets to make sure that people on the ground understand their budgets. One aspect of RCM is to make everything transparent. It will take several years until people understand and are confident with the new budget model. In spring, budget will be based on annual academic plans (strategic plan): he expects budgets to be updated annually. Working together with the deans, the school will make decisions and give departments an updated budget in the summer. This will be an agreed upon plan for spending.

Dean March then opened the floor for questions. They included: (1) A concern about the ease of hiring people at the executive level, yet it being so hard to hire faculty. Is RCM going to make it easier for us to hire new faculty, and decrease lines of PTLs? Is there any way that departments can have greater control in hiring? Dean March responded that what RCM will help do is provide clarity about how the huge bowl of money is allocated. It will become clear what kind of resources are available to do certain things: in the new budgeting system departments can make decisions about the proportion of funding to tenure-track faculty, for example. Departments will create a strategy for how they will use their resources. Deans have to exercise some level of control over personnel flow. That is a very large fraction of the department's budget.

(2) A question was raised about SAS's debt and the austerity plan that had been put in place to reduce that debt. Where do we stand today? Dean March responded that over five years (during the austerity plan) debt was reduced from \$15 million to \$5 million. Cost savings were achieved by not hiring as many faculty members and reducing the number of graduate students in SAS. He has asked whether the university could assume some of the school's remaining debt. He and the chancellor are in discussions about this.

(3) The third question had to do with reserves of money and what those reserves are spent on. Peter March responded that no institution can fail to have some kind of operational reserve, and that the university has well over a billion dollars of deferred maintenance. For the first time, RU is going to build a systematic capital plan—new buildings that need to be built, old buildings that need to be replaced.

Dean March called for New Business and none was raised.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Trigg, Secretary of SAS