

**Humanities and Natural Sciences College Assembly**  
**February 16, 2012**

**MINUTES**

---

**I. Call to Order**

The assembly was called to at 12:30 PM by Dean JoAnn Cruz in Bobet Hall 332.

Attended: Adams, Altschul, B. Anderson, Bell, Biguenet, Birdwhistell, Bouzigard, Brice, Brungardt, Butler, Cahill, Calzada, Chambers, Clark, Corbin, Corprew, Dorrill, Duggar, Durocher, Eklund, Eskine, Farge (Dewell's proxy/sabbatical), Fernandez, Gerlich, Gossiaux, Hauber, Henne (L. Ranner's proxy), Hymel, Kametani-Rider (L&C student rep), Kargol, Kornovich (Salmon's proxy), Li, Mabe, Mabe (Wrightington's proxy), McCay, McHugh, Melancon, Mozami, Moore, Murphy, Nielsen, Nystrom, Peterson, Philip (Rodriguez's proxy), Quesada (Doll's proxy), Rosenbecker (O. Ranner's proxy), Saxton, Schaberg, Shanata, Spence, Stephenson, Tan, Thum, Tucci, Underwood (R. Anderson's proxy), Welsh, Willems, and Associate Dean Hunt.

**II. Invocation**

Rev. William J. Farge, S.J., delivered the invocation.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

Minutes of January 19, 2012 were accepted as written. Approval was by voice vote.

**IV. Announcements**

1. Dr. Spence reported progress on improving new student orientation. He said that he and representatives from business, music, and social sciences met with Dr. Melanie McKay, which precipitated a meeting with Heather Roundtree, Director of Co-Curricular Programs and Roberta Kaskel, Director of Career Development. He said that Heather responded via email with a draft schedule for summer orientation, to include an hour-long meeting on the first full day (Day 2) for students to meet with departments/advisors and discuss DPCLs, and Day 3 for refining schedules based on test results. He reported that they seemed amenable to suggestions for a more effective new student convocation, that they want more faculty involvement, and that the issue of an honor code briefly came up.
2. "CLAVE: A Rhythmic Journey from Africa to the New World" concert and lecture by
3. Bobby Sanabria is March 7<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 pm in Nunemaker Auditorium.
4. The Provost Search Committee invites responses during the window of opportunity between each candidate's presentation.

**V. Old Business / Motions**

Dean Cruz recognized a request from the floor to reverse the sequence of the two motions given in the agenda, so that Motion 2, "Language Requirement," would be heard first. The requester explained that the will of the college was needed by the college's representative on the university's subcommittee. The assembly agreed to the change in sequence. The motion was considered along with the "Report on a Revised Language Requirement," (attached) as previously distributed via email and available in hard copy at the assembly.

Language Requirement (Rev. William Farge, S.J.):

**Motion:** *Move to support the implementation of a foreign language requirement as described generally in the draft report with the proviso that other colleges also support this implementation.*

Discussion followed the introduction of the motion. An amendment to the motion was proposed: “*have 201 across the board.*” The amendment was seconded and discussed. Following the discussion, the maker asked to withdraw the amendment. In accord with Dr. Karen Rosebecker, Parliamentarian, Dean Cruz asked whether there were any objections. Hearing no objections, she said the amendment was withdrawn and the floor returned to the original motion.

Another amendment was proposed: “*that majors that are labeled borderline be Category II.*” The amendment was seconded, to include insertion into the report on page 9.

**Amended Motion:** *Move to support the implementation of a foreign language requirement as described generally in the draft report with the proviso that other colleges also support this implementation and majors that are labelled borderline in the report be Category II.*

Move to call the question was made and seconded. An objection was heard, so it was put to a vote by a show of hands; vote to call the question was 37 in favor, 3 opposed, and 13 abstained. Vote on the amended motion commenced by paper ballot. The collected ballots were counted by Dr. Judith Hunt and Mr. Rich Wilson. Dean Cruz read the results as 39.5 in favor, 21 opposed, and 5 abstentions. Dean Cruz announced that the amended motion carried.

The allotted time for the assembly was at end. The remaining business will be on the next agenda:

**Old Business / Motion:** Composition of the Council of Chairs (Dean JoAnn Cruz and CPT)

Motion: *The voting membership of the Council consists of the dean and all chairpersons.*

*Assistant/Associate Deans are non-voting and ex-officio members.*

**New Business / Motion:** Program Reviews - SCAP (Dr. Timothy Cahill and Council of Chairs)

Motion: *HNS faculty request that SCAP restrict program reviews to what is required in the Handbook.*

## **VII. Move to Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

[p. 9 amended in Feb. 16, 2012 Assembly: “that majors that are labeled borderline be Category II.”]

## REPORT ON A REVISED LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT

December 18, 2011 (revised January 9, 2012)

### Preface

This report has been compiled by a sub-group of the Foreign Language subcommittee of the SCCC.<sup>1</sup> It derives from the original recommendation of the ad hoc Committee on the Common Curriculum, which was approved and forwarded to the Common Curriculum Implementation Task Force. That recommendation, to implement a 201 language proficiency requirement across the campus with due consideration of those degree programs that are electively challenged,<sup>2</sup> was not acted on by the CCITF, which postponed the issue for the SCCC to take up.

In response to a charge from the Provost, this report first addresses the role of language learning in a liberal arts curriculum. It then addresses implementation and responds to the need for data in order for the sub-committee and the SCCC to move forward toward a decision on the foreign language requirement. It divides degree programs into those that are not electively challenged, those that are moderately electively challenged (and could probably only accommodate placement plus one), and those that are severely electively challenged. It also projects student enrollments, based on data from student placement exams and enrollment figures over several years, for both placement plus one and a 201 requirement across the entire campus. It estimates the faculty resources that would be needed for either one or the other, or for a combination of the two, and it explores a variety of options for introducing a 201 language requirement into the curriculum. Additionally it looks at language requirements across other Jesuit universities and colleges, at language requirements among Loyola’s reference group and with regard to doctoral programs in selected areas.

### I. Recommendation for Language Learning as a goal of a liberal education

This report’s recommendation is the same recommendation made and approved by SCAP twenty-five years ago and the same recommendation that was made by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Common Curriculum, viz. implementation of a 201 language proficiency requirement

<sup>1</sup> Eileen Doll, Nathan Henne, Blanca Anderson, Uriel Quesada, Jo Ann H. Cruz

<sup>2</sup> Votes in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Common Curriculum were as follows. We have added other votes to put the language vote into context:

65% in favor of 2 English courses

63% in favor of a 2nd Science plus lab

63% in favor of 1 Social Science class

69% in favor of a Language up to the 201 level

across the campus with due consideration of those degree programs that are electively challenged. Students at that level of proficiency will be expected to demonstrate a modest ability to communicate usefully in a foreign language.

### II. Justification for language learning at the intermediate level within a liberal and Jesuit education:

In keeping with the Loyola Strategic Plan and the 2-year language requirement passed by SCAP more than 25 years ago—but never implemented—the goal for all Loyola students should be to achieve language proficiency in a second language. Two major components of Loyola’s current Strategic Plan are: 1) emphasizing our Jesuit identity and; 2) internationalizing the university, its students and its curriculum. A language requirement of 201 (intermediate-low proficiency level) for as many of our students as possible will go a long way toward achieving these major components of the Strategic Plan. For example, it is difficult to imagine how Loyola can meet its target of 70% of its undergraduates participating in Study Abroad without an increased language component in the curriculum. Without a central role for languages, the Plan’s emphasis on moving Loyola students and curricula toward internationalization through a Jesuit understanding of the world rings hollow.

While in some contexts, “internationalization” may be possible without secondary language training, our Jesuit context does not allow such a shallow vision of the world. The Ignatian mission includes a global education, and generations of Jesuits have lived it—traveling around the world and learning the languages of their hosts. It anchors the identity Loyola seeks and the goals it espouses. As William Byron, S.J. puts it, “the Jesuit educational enterprise, dedicated as it is to human progress, will always emphasize communication and will systematically promote the ability to communicate in more than one language.” In addition, the Jesuit ideal of holding a preferential option for the poor points to people who do not speak, read or write English. Activists know that we cannot wait for all the poor and disenfranchised to learn English. Our students should be able to use foreign language to understand the perspectives of traditionally disadvantaged peoples in a meaningful way. A 201 language requirement allows this level of involvement. However, even some exposure to language has importance benefits in exposing students to the structure of a language and to language learning. Hence, even for electively challenged programs, some language learning is better than none.

What is more, language training enhances a student’s critical capacity, making it possible for a student to recognize the degree to which his/her native language constructs the world and the values around him/her when forced to step outside of his/her native language.

A 201 language requirement also yields important benefits in other, less direct ways. Perhaps most importantly, learning the grammatical structures of other languages makes a big difference in students’ writing abilities in English. We have all seen the quality of students’ writing in English steadily fall over the last decades; the comparative context of a second language grammar helps students reverse that fall. Students improve their understanding of English grammar as they are forced to review and compare their own language structures to that of the new language. It also improves students’ vocabulary and oral and written expression, by

examining the ways they approach language, by exploring assumptions about meaning and cultural equivalence, and the connections between English and other languages.

Furthermore, the capacity to learn additional languages is enhanced by learning a second language at a level beyond survival skills; subsequent language learning becomes easier. Asking our students to wait until their post-graduate years to learn a language, as needed, makes it all the more difficult for them.

In the 2009 survey of our student body's attitudes toward internationalization, 71% of Loyola students surveyed in all colleges either agreed or strongly agreed "that knowing a second language is important in order to successfully compete in the job market." Most recently, Alden Woodhull, student at Loyola, has put this video up on YouTube:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YTynXly9cvE> In the fall of 2001, The US Department of Education's Office of Postsecondary Education concluded that "American postsecondary institutions are not graduating sufficient numbers of students with foreign language and culture expertise to meet the needs of business, government, and universities." Not attaining intermediate proficiency in a language in college places students at a disadvantage for entering any number of professional programs, in applying for many post-graduate programs,<sup>3</sup> and in the global job market.

Much of the justification for a 201-level intermediate competency was already articulated in a 1985 SCAP-approved "Report of the Task Force on Second Language Competency."<sup>4</sup> That report recommended that an intermediate-mid level of language learning "is minimal if Loyola is to have a truly meaningful requirement in keeping with our goals of liberal education....If language learning is to be an integral part of a liberalizing education, then it must relate to the real world and to the rest of the curriculum. Students should be encouraged to read Spanish-language newspapers in journalism courses, French poetry in English courses, German articles for seminars in chemistry. This kind of atmosphere at Loyola is possible only if students have some ability to communicate usefully."

ACTFL (the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) sets the standard in the industry in terms of defining proficiency; its definition is derived in large part from US government mandates. ACTFL defines proficiency as:

Speaking and listening – The ability to handle with confidence, accuracy, clarity and precision a large number of communicative tasks; to participate in most informal and some formal exchanges on a variety of

<sup>3</sup> Briefly surveying the requirements for the Ph.D. in Philosophy, Political Science/Government and History at Boston College, Loyola (Chicago), Fordham, Catholic University of America, Georgetown, Berkeley, Yale, Harvard and Princeton tells us that programs in Philosophy generally require one or more languages (usually French, German, Latin or Greek), that Ph.D. programs in Political Science/Government require at least one foreign language, and Ph.D. programs in History require two and sometimes three foreign languages, depending upon the area of research. Competency in a foreign language, in these cases, is generally described in terms of passing a written comprehension test or, alternatively, two years of undergraduate work.

<sup>4</sup> Members of this Task Force were: Robert Dewell (chair), Ed Kvet, Larry Lorenz, Claire Paolini, Peter Rogers, S.J., Michael Saliba and Lydia Voigt

concrete and familiar topics; to narrate and describe in all major tenses, by providing a full account with good control of aspect; to handle successfully and with relative ease the linguistic challenges presented by a complication or unexpected turn of events within a routine communicative task; and to be readily understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives.

Reading – The ability to understand all essential points in texts within areas of personal interest or knowledge and to understand parts of unfamiliar or conceptually abstract and linguistically complex texts; and a sensitivity to the target language's aesthetic properties and literary styles.

Writing – The ability to write about a variety of topics with precision and detail, including most social and informal correspondence, summaries, reports, and research papers; to write extensively about topics relating to areas of personal interest or knowledge; to narrate and describe in all major tenses with good control of aspect; and to support ideas with various degrees of control depending on the topic.

While 201 Intermediate-low level does not achieve all these goals, it does allow students generally to be understood by native speakers unaccustomed to dealing with non-natives. It allows them to understand long stretches of connected discourse on a number of topics, to read consistently with full understanding texts dealing with basic personal and social needs, and to take notes in some detail on familiar topics and to respond in writing to personal questions in a way that is generally comprehensible to natives used to the writing of non-natives.

The goals of language instruction at Loyola, however, are not only ends-based; in our immersion model the foreign language is both the means of instruction and the end because this pedagogical approach leads to proficiency faster. The first few months of language instruction, in fact, may actually move more slowly because the goal is not to give the students a set of data in the most efficient way possible (which would be in English) because that does not lead as readily to proficiency. Instead, our primary goal is to immerse our students in the language and culture from the very beginning so that they end up learning holistically, which leads to proficient engagement with the language. This means that even our 100 level courses are taught in the target language (except for Latin and Greek). Of course, proficiency is not fluency, but the 201 requirement will create a generation of Loyola graduates who stand out from their peers because they are able to engage peoples of all walks in their own languages on several meaningful levels.

### III. Options for fulfilling the recommended requirement:

1. Students take up to 12 hours, to complete the 201-level requirement in any language offered at Loyola. Some of these hours can be taken through 3 credit courses or through intensive 4 credit or 6 credit courses and also through summer language courses.<sup>5</sup>
2. Student places into a higher level of a language studied in high school and takes the appropriate classes to complete the 201 requirement.
3. In programs with accreditation requirements that have fewer than 19 hours of general electives, a student may be required to take "Placement +1" rather than fulfilling the 201 requirement. This means a student continues in a language taken in high school, taking 6 hours maximum. After taking the language placement exam, the student would begin

<sup>5</sup> Some students are language-learning challenged. Those students will be identified at the 100 level and will not be required to meet these criteria.

where placed, plus one more class, up to and including 201 (i.e., if placed in 101, the student takes 101 and 200; if placed in 200, the student takes 200 and 201; if placed in 201, the student only takes 201; if placed at the 300-level, the student has fulfilled the requirement). Students with no prior language, or who place in the 100 level, may take 2 consecutive classes in any language (100 and 101).

4. On a case-by-case/major-by-major basis, a student may select to use the Language Requirement to fulfill the Advanced Common Curriculum rather than other options provided. This would be allowed for severely “electively challenged” programs (programs with accreditation requirements that have fewer than 9 hours of general electives) that do not have room for all the ACC course options. The Language Requirement would be the “Placement +1” option, as described in #3 above, but as part of a slate of options (e.g., the student takes courses in the Common Curriculum required by the major, plus selects 3 or 4 courses from a slate of options at the Advanced level).
5. Student fulfills the requirement by alternate methods, such as AP credits from high school, or placement into the 300-level.
6. Native speakers of languages other than English, who attended high school in that other language, are not required to fulfill this requirement.

Our recommendations are based on a crucial principle that underlies the Loyola Strategic Plan: that as many Loyola students as possible should be proficient in a second language. These statements are motivated by that principle, not by territoriality. We recognize the reality that some electively challenged majors may be able to allow only for placement + one, while some severely electively challenged majors may not be able to add a language requirement at all without sacrificing other aspects of the Common Curriculum. We are encouraged, however, by the growing expansion of study abroad programs and the goal of 70% of Loyola students studying abroad. This can make it possible for a student to reach 201 language proficiency more quickly and with additional options. Some students may also choose to take their language courses in the summer while some students may benefit from more accelerated 4 or 6 credit courses. Many Loyola students enter the university already proficient or fluent in another language, and some students will test out of languages altogether because of learning difficulties.

#### **IV. Language Requirements in other Jesuit universities and colleges and among our Reference Group:**

There is a range of language requirements among Jesuit colleges and universities. Boston College, Fairfield, Fordham, Georgetown, St. Louis, Santa Clara, University of San Francisco, Seattle and Xavier all require 3-4 courses in Languages or intermediate proficiency. It is difficult to know whether, when 3 courses are required, these are 3 or 4 credit courses. (See appendix A for the range of language requirements in Jesuit colleges and universities.

There is an even greater range of language requirements among our reference group, with some schools requiring no language study at all. Those that require 3-4 language courses or intermediate level proficiency include Butler University, Fairfield, James Madison, Loyola University (Maryland), Rollins, Santa Clara, College of New Jersey, Trinity College (Texas), University of Mary Washington, Villanova and Xavier (Ohio). (See appendix A)

### **V. Implementation of Language Requirement**

#### **Student Placement Levels**

A time series analysis of the past 11 years shows that 37% of each incoming freshman class is placed at the 100 level, which means no proficiency at all, while 20% is placed at the 101 level. At the next proficiency levels, we find 14% at the 200 level and 14% placing at 201. About 15% of each freshman class is placed at 300 or above. That means that 15% of each class would not need to take any language class to fulfill the requirement, and those hours would move to General Electives. If, however, one excludes those students choosing to major in the electively challenged programs (roughly 39% of the entering class in 2011 would not necessarily be able to move to intermediate language proficiency), a rough estimate of the entering class that would need to complete all levels leading to 201 would be 22%.<sup>6</sup> (Appendix B)

#### **Analysis of Degree Programs and Available Electives**

Based on a survey of undergraduate degree programs in the University, and based on the agreed-upon criteria that majors with 18 hours or less of general electives (12 hours + 6 hours of language) are considered electively challenged, we recommend the following language requirements for our undergraduate students, always keeping in mind that only 22% of all freshmen (not including those in electively challenged programs) would need to complete all four semesters of a language, and that many of them can complete their language with study abroad, with intensive courses or with summer courses. Any student with AP exams in high school that score 4 or 5 or IB scores of 5, 6 or 7 would receive automatic credit for 201, and any native speakers who come from high schools in their native countries would have the requirement waived.

Based on the above, we recommend that students in degree programs with 18 or less hours of general electives in the new Common Curriculum configuration be required to complete the 201 requirement. We further recommend that those students with electively challenged degree plans take the language placement exam and then complete the class into which they are placed plus one more, up to and including 201. We further recommend that for some electively challenged programs, particularly in the sciences, departments may petition that a student’s language requirement be completed with the completion of courses in computer language. And finally, for

<sup>6</sup> This percentage does not exclude those who may be language challenged, those who could opt for computer language courses instead, or those who would fulfill the language requirement through study abroad. Twenty-two percent is therefore a conservative estimate.

those few electively challenged programs with 9 or fewer general electives (mostly in Business, Music and Physics pre-engineering), we ask the colleges and the departments to consider whether some students who would prefer to take a language be allowed to substitute the language for other required components on the Common Curriculum or that the students be offered a 'cafeteria' of options from the Common Curriculum.

#### Addressing the Electively-challenged programs for Language Requirement

In order to more evenly and equitably determine which majors on campus could accept the new Language Requirement of 201 (a fourth-semester course), our subcommittee met with the Deans of each college and held a general discussion, followed by another discussion with the whole committee and Provost Kvet. As is clear from the deans of Business and Music/Fine Arts, in Social Sciences with regard to the Nursing Program and in HNS with regard to some of the Science programs, some majors, in particular those with accreditation standards, have no space for a 201 language requirement. Each electively challenged program has been required by the SCCC to submit its accreditation requirements.

Simultaneous with these discussions, we went over all the Degree Program Course Lists (DPCL) for each major to see how the change in the Common Curriculum might impact the existing course requirements, allowing more space—or not—for additional courses in the new Advanced CC. The idea was to see what might work for each major, and what we should propose to the SCCC, in order to work for the benefit of our students.

For programs already requiring 48 hours of the current CC, some relief occurs when we apply the new, proposed CC—down from 48 credits to either 45 or 42 credits. We also felt that there should be a reduction across the board for majors who also have a course in the CC:

General assumption:

Each major should eliminate its slot in the Advanced CC (e.g., the B.A. Visual Arts/Studio major would not include the Creative Arts requirement in the Advanced CC).

This would prevent the current complication with students not being allowed to take a CC course in their own major, as well as freeing up 3 hours for many majors.

#### i. Programs with absolutely no space (0-8 hours of electives only)

##### Possible “cafeteria” solution (see below)

- #Bachelor of Music Education Instrumental (128 hrs., no elec.) [no Hist II, Phil II, Rels II, Soc. Sci, Ethics, LR]
- #BME Vocal (currently has 3 semesters of Diction, but not language classes per se) (128 hrs., no elec.) [no Science II + Lab, Soc. Sci., Phil II, Rels II, Ethics, LR]
- #Bachelor of Music Jazz Studies (121 hrs., no elec.) [no Hist II, Science II + Lab, LR]
- #Bachelor of Music Therapy (121 hrs., no elec.) [no Hist I, Hist II, Science II + Lab, LR]
- #Bachelor of Music with Emphasis in Music Business (121 hrs., no elec.) [no Hist II, Science II + Lab, LR]
- #BS Music Industry (121 hrs., 5 hrs. elec.) [no LR? Accreditation requires that 55-70% of the curriculum be CC or General Studies. Currently 38% of the curriculum is in cc/General Studies. Under accrediting guidelines, a LR is possible.]

- #Bachelor of Music Composition (121 hrs., no elec.) [no Hist II, Science II + Lab, LR]
- #Bachelor of Music Guitar Perf (121 hrs., no elec.) [no Hist II, Science II + Lab, LR]
- #Bachelor of Music Keyboard Performance (121 hrs., no elec.) [no Hist II, Science II + Lab, LR]
- #Bachelor of Music Instrumental (121 hrs., no elec.)
- # Bachelor of Music with Elective Studies (18 hrs. assigned to a non-designated minor—req. for accreditation) (121 hrs., no elec.)
- #Contract Major—Film & Visual Arts (120 hrs. with 2 hrs. elec, unless the 15 hrs. Gen Elec. are an accreditation thing—total 132 hrs.?)
- # B.F.A. Visual Arts (121 hrs., 6 hrs. elec., but DPCL lists 3 hrs. LR + 9 elec. for 132 hrs. total??)
- #Bachelor of Arts in Music (120 hrs., 8 hours elec.—must take minor for accred? Accreditation requires 55-70% in CC/General Studies credits. Currently the program has 38% of its courses in CC/General Studies. Under accrediting guidelines, a LR is possible.)
- \*CBA—Accounting (120 hrs., 3 hrs. elec.) [no Science II + Lab, LR]
- \*Economics (120 hrs., 6 hrs. elec.) [no Science II + Lab, LR]
- \*Finance (120 hrs., 6 hrs. elec.) [no Science II + Lab, LR]
- \*Management (120 hrs., 6 hrs. elec.) [no Science II + Lab, LR]
- \*Marketing (120 hrs., 6 hrs. elec.) [no Science II + Lab, LR]

B.S. Physics-PHYE (Pre-Engineering) (94 hrs., 7 hrs. elec.) [This does not exclude the Science II CC class, but it does exclude LR, and offers a cafeteria of Arts, Soc. Sci. and Ethics—include Placement + 1 as an option with a cafeteria model?]

#The above programs in Music seem to have selected certain portions of the Advanced CC in the past, so we propose they be given a “cafeteria” option in the new Advanced CC (with the possible exceptions of the BS Music Industry and the BA in Music):

For example, choose 8 (or whatever number fits the DPCL) of the following:

Writing About Literature  
Philosophy II  
RELS II  
Ethics  
Social Science  
Science II + Lab  
History II  
Foreign Language (Placement + 1)

This could also be structured with certain classes in the group required, but X number of the remaining classes to offer some selection. Since some of the programs (e.g., BME programs) have accreditation requirements, this may or may not be feasible, but it would better serve our students.

\*A similar proposal could hold for Business, which requires only certain CC courses now. Some of the new courses may be included in their major curriculum, but the Adv CC might offer a

choice between Hist II, Science II + Lab, Arts, and Foreign Language (Placement + 1), for instance.

**ii. Programs with little space (9-18 hours of electives before Placement + 1 applied)—Placement + one class (i.e., 0-6 hours of a language, up to 201)**

Bachelor of Music in Voice—(124 hrs., no elec.)—already has 6 hrs. for LR [no Hist. II, Science II + Lab]

B.A. Theatre Arts/Mass Commn (THCM)—(120 hrs., 9 hrs. elec.)

B.S. Chemistry-CHFS (Forensic Science) (16 hrs. elec.)—new revision may have to go to category I

B.S. Physics-PHYP (Pre-Health) (7 hrs. elec.—this is with Placement + 1 applied. With no LR, they have 13 hrs. elec.)

Bachelor of Science in Nursing (121 hrs., 9+ hrs. elec.)

The following majors are borderline—16-19 elec. hrs. before LR, but with 4 LR classes, that drops them to 4-7 elec. hrs. Majors labeled borderline in the report are to be Category II.

B.A. Theatre Arts (120 hrs., at least 16 hrs. elec.)

B.A. Theatre Arts with Business Minor (120 hrs., 14 hrs. elec. after changes)

B.A. Graphic Design (120 hrs., at least 16 hrs. elec.)

B.A. Visual Arts/Studio (120 hrs., 17 hrs. elec.), although 55-70% of the courses in the BA for Visual Arts should be in CC/General Studies in order to meet accreditation standards. Currently the BA/Visual Arts has 42% of its credits in CC/General Arts. It is possible that this program could move out of the electively challenged category.

Biological Sciences (120 hrs., 19 hrs. elec.)

Chemistry (120 hrs., 17 hrs. elec.)

B.S. Biochemistry-CHEB (Pre-Med) (16 hrs. elec.)

B.S. Physics (19 hrs. elec.)

B.S. Psychology (Pre-Health) (124 hrs., 19 hrs. elec.)

**iii. These majors have sufficient general electives (20+)**

International Business—already has requirement of 1-300 level class

B.A. General Studies (Social Sciences) (at least 23 hrs. elec.)

B.A. Sociology (at least 26 hrs. elec.)

B.A. Mass Communication—Journalism, Public Relations, Advertising (at least 30 hrs. elec.; new accreditation standards require that 65% of all credits be in the Liberal Arts)

B.A. Political Science (at least 30 hrs. elec.)

B.A. Criminal Justice (at least 32 hrs. elec.)

B.A. Economics (120 hrs., 20 hrs. elec.)

English—all concentrations (120 hrs., 33+ hrs. elec.)

History—all concentrations (120 hrs., 38 hrs. elec.)

Mathematical Sciences (120 hrs., 24 hrs. elec.)

Computational Mathematics (120 hrs., 21 hrs. elec.)

Philosophy—all concentrations (120 hrs., 39 hrs. elec.)

Psychological Sciences (121 hrs., 36 hrs. elec.)

Religious Studies—all concentrations (120 hrs., 39 hrs. elec.)

B.S. Environmental Science—all concentrations (120 hrs., 24+ hrs. elec.)

Contract Majors

Possibly BA Visual Arts, BA Music and BS Music Industry, if they move toward accreditation (see above)

**\*Alternatives for accomplishing the Language Requirement**

- AP exams in high school that score 4 or 5—automatic credit for 201
- IB degree—score of 5, 6 or 7 on the A2 or B language exam (French, German, Greek, Italian, Latin, Russian, Spanish)—credit for 201
- Sciences may petition on a case-by-case basis for substitution of the requirement by a Computer Science requirement
- Study Abroad with a language component
- Native speakers who studied in another country in the home language for high school—automatic waiver
- Placement at the 300-level
- Case-by-case substitution of culture courses in English for students who are deemed by the L & C instructor, in concert with Sarah M. Smith of the Academic Resource Center, to be incapable of continuing and finishing the requirement in the target language
- Case-by-case solutions for students who wish to double major. Currently there are 163 students who are double majoring across the university. Since it is estimated that 17% of the student body is not in electively challenged programs and has placed at the 100 level of language proficiency, this would involve approximately 28 students. Within HNS there are currently 22 students who are double majors and who have placed at the beginning 100 level, five of whom are double majoring in languages. This leaves 17 students who are currently doing double majors, have placed at the 100 level in language, and are not majoring in languages. By looking at several of them, e.g. a double major in English and Philosophy pre-law, a double major in Physics pre-health and Religious Studies, a Philosophy pre-law and Economics major, a Psychology and VISA major, an Honors student with a Philosophy and English Writing major, and a Philosophy and Sociology major, most could fit in a 201 requirement, although this would leave virtually no free credit hours. Some of these double majors could not fit in a 201 requirement (e.g. Psychology and VISA); therefore, it would appear that Placement plus One would be the most appropriate language requirement for those students who choose to double major.

**VI. Rough Estimate of Faculty Resources Needed and Costs (Nota Bene that the tables in Appendix C assume that the Common Curriculum would be implemented in 2012. All calculations below that refer to 2012-2013 need to be pushed back to 2013-2014, and references to 2013-2014 need to be pushed back to 2014-2015.)**

Currently between 140 and 150 students take 100 level courses in Arabic, Chinese, German, Italian, Japanese, Greek or Latin. In the fall of 2010, the number was 144; in the fall of 2011 the number was 142. There is ample seating capacity in the 200 and 201 level courses in these languages—approximately 80 seats across the seven languages. In the fall of 2011 only Italian exceeded 25 students in the introductory 100 level course, although Arabic had 25 and German 22 students. Assuming that only one of these languages would need an extra section each semester, *with placement plus one, these languages would need 2 additional sections at a cost of \$8,000, while, with the 201 requirement these languages would need 4 additional courses, at the cost of \$16,000 annually.*

With regard to French and Spanish, we have results from the placement exams to work with. (See tables in Appendix C for the numbers of sections required in French and Spanish based upon the results of placement exams over more than a decade.) If we deduct 144 students from those taking the placement exams, i.e. those students who shifted over to one of the languages other than French or Spanish, this results in 544 students in French or Spanish in the fall of 2012 and 372 in classes in the spring of 2013; if the language requirement were placement plus one across the board in the fall of 2013 and spring of 2014 and moving forward there would then be 584 students in French or Spanish classes. For the spring the French and Spanish faculty already offer more sections (23) than would be needed (19 and then 20), but in the fall 27 and then 29 sections would be needed, 1-3 more than the 26 currently being offered. With some shifting of resources and by filling up the 73 empty seats currently in the 200 and 201 French and Spanish courses, there should be no additional resources needed.

*With regard to a 201 requirement with French and Spanish, by 2013-2014, if every degree program in the university were to require proficiency at the 201 level, we would need 3 additional extraordinary hires, one in French and two in Spanish. If course enrollments were capped at 22, rather than 20, we would need 2 additional extraordinary faculty, but given that a number of programs will not be able to accommodate the 201 requirement, and given that there are currently (2011 spring and fall) 73 available seats at the 200 level in Spanish and French, a rough estimate is that one additional extraordinary faculty member will be needed in Spanish by 2013-2014. This calculation is derived from the number of 1100 students who would be taking language courses in the in 2013—2014, reducing that number by the 144 students in other languages both at the 100 and at the 101 levels,<sup>7</sup> resulting in a figure of 812. With an enrollment of 20, 41 sections would be needed. Currently there are 26 sections taught in French and Spanish in the fall, for a total of 520 students at 20 per section or 572 for 22 per section. With 812 minus 520, we would need 14-15 new sections; with 812 minus 572, we would need 11 additional sections in the fall. This can be reduced by 3 if the current empty seats are filled, resulting in a need for 8 additional sections in the fall or 2 new full-time hires. With not every program in the university, however, taking the 201 requirement it is estimated that, by the fall of 2013-2014, with a 201 requirement in place for those programs that are not electively challenged, there will be a need for one additional full-time hire in languages—most probably in Spanish. Although we have already deducted 5% for students with fluency or gaining language*

<sup>7</sup> This is a very rough calculation since most students take 101 in the spring.

with study abroad or testing with language disabilities, it is possible that the numbers might be lower than is suggested by this very rough analysis.

Supporting this analysis are the attached tables in Appendix C that show the number of sections needed for languages with placement plus one and with a 201 requirement. For placement plus one, the other languages (excluding, in this analysis Latin and Greek) would be adding no additional sections. Taking into account the number of sections of French and Spanish currently being offered, as well as 73 seats that were empty in spring and fall of 2011, no additional sections in French would be needed and 5 in Spanish, for a cost of \$20,000 in part-time faculty by 2013-2014. These costs would be completely absorbed by raising enrollment caps to 22.

With regard to the 201 requirement, only 2 additional sections would be needed in 2012-2013, and these can be absorbed by the 73 empty seats currently in the French and Spanish classes or the 80 seats currently available in the other languages. In 2013-2014 we would need to add sections at the 200-201 levels. The languages other than French and Spanish would need to add at least one section, probably in Italian at a cost of \$4,000. If every student were to be required to take 201, we would need eight additional sections in French at the 200 level. This can be cut by one filling the 28 seats currently empty in the 200 level courses, requiring 7 additional sections in French. With regard to the Spanish language courses, if every student were to be required to complete proficiency at the 201 level, we would need 18 additional sections of Spanish, two of which can be absorbed in the current empty seats. Of these 23 (7 + 16) additional sections needed, if roughly 1/3 of all students at Loyola are taking placement plus one or are even more severely challenged, the number of needed sections is reduced to around 15. Retaining current enrollment caps would result in needing two additional full-time faculty at a cost of approximately \$80,000. Moving enrollments up to 22 would reduce this by 6 sections, resulting in a need for 9 additional sections. *Thus, a rough estimate of needs would be for the equivalent of one full-time faculty member plus one additional section. The total estimated cost would be \$40,000 in part-time salaries, or \$48,000 if it includes one full-time adjunct.*

The Department of Languages and Cultures has agreed with the following:

1. An increased enrollment cap in language courses to 22, if needed.
2. To put in place one sequence of 4 credit courses in Spanish and one in French
3. To consider implementing a selection of 6 credit intensive courses. Greek has already been taught in this format
4. To offer summer courses as needed. Dr. Rodriguez is currently planning to offer a 6 credit Latin course in the summer of 2012, and plans are underway to offer both intensive Latin and Greek over the summer semesters in the future.
5. Michael Rachal has calculated the capacity of the university to offer more intensive 4 and 6 credit courses in terms of classroom space. (See Appendix D)

Jo Ann Cruz, Dean, HNS  
 Dr. Eileen Doll  
 Dr. Nathan Henne  
 Dr. Uriel Quesada, statistical consultant  
 Blanca Anderson, Member, SCCC