



March 31, 2016

To: David Eaton, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School
Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean of the Graduate School

From: The Faculty of the Department of French and Italian Studies

Subject: Response to 10-Year Review Committee Report and Recommendations

Introduction

The Department of French and Italian Studies recognizes and is grateful for the efforts of the External Review Committee during its 2-day site visit November 2-3, 2015 and for the report it submitted. We are gratified by the recognition of a number of successes in the past ten years and concur, of course, with the recommendation that the programs be continued for the next ten years. The faculty also enthusiastically welcome the 3-year interim assessment of changes to the graduate programs in French and Italian that the Committee recommended. We recognize the urgency of retooling these programs better to align them with the current needs of graduate students and the present realities of the academic job market. As will be detailed below, this task is already underway.

The Committee presented its recommendations under a variety of headings, but we identify 6 principle areas discussed in the report where action must be taken or a rebuttal to the recommended action is required:

- Graduate programs
- Undergraduate programs: language courses and sequences
- Undergraduate programs: content courses and majors/minors
- Intradepartmental communication
- Staffing
- Outreach and fundraising

We will address these areas in our response in the order in which they will be taken on in the Department, although many efforts will be undertaken simultaneously. In addition to the “mini review” conducted by the Graduate School in 3 years, we are attaching to the end of this document a timeline for the completion of a number of initiatives within the 6 areas of concern, to which we will hold ourselves accountable with oversight from the Dean of the Humanities.

A few final remarks to set the stage for our response: The Committee refers to FIS as a “small department,” but, with the 3,266 undergraduate and graduate students who took our classes in AY 2014-2015, we prefer to think of ourselves as a department of medium-

sized programs with a small faculty. It is no longer *de rigueur* for external reviews to recommend hiring within departments, but many of the problems identified in the graduate programs, particularly in the French Ph.D., are the result of persistently low numbers—namely, 5—of tenure-stream faculty in French (so persistent, in fact, that this situation was already identified as a threat to the French Ph.D. program in the previous ten-year review!). The same limits on the development and staffing of new courses in French at the undergraduate level also exist (see the “Undergraduate Programs: Content Courses and Majors/Minors” section below). We are willing to make great individual and collective efforts to implement the Committee’s and our own recommendations for improving programs, but the current staffing levels in French ultimately limit what we can do.

What we are not lacking in our relatively small research faculty in both French and Italian is research quality. As the self study detailed, this is manifested in the number of national and institutional fellowships and grants the faculty receive, in the national and international recognition indicated by invited lectures, publication awards, and high-profile reviews of our work, and the recent announcement of the promotion of Associate Professor Densye Delcourt to Professor. This emphasis on research quality—which, by the way, is not to the exclusion of *quantity*—received virtually no attention in the Committee’s report, an oversight that is likely symptomatic of an era when student credit hours garner the most attention as measures of productivity. The University of Washington is a research institution, and the cutting-edge humanities research culture of FIS faculty is a significant benefit to the University’s overall mission. Furthermore, that cutting-edge research drives the consistent creation of new and exciting courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels and substantially contributes, we believe, to the relevancy of questions of values, ethics, and aesthetics into the STEM-dominated culture of the University (immediately visible to anyone who peruses in the institution’s communications: UW Today, Columns, etc.). This focus on humanities research will remain a core value in FIS, but the lack of broader institutional support for and recognition of research excellence in the humanities is dispiriting.

Graduate Programs

The Committee encourages FIS to “**redraft requirements and programs**” to improve graduate study. This consists of three recommendations: “streamlining” and reducing requirements; better reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of the fields and faculty research; and revisiting and no longer teaching to “lists” of canonical, century- or period-defined lists.

We feel these recommendations make sense, though they lack precision. In reality, there are relatively few official requirements in all our graduate programs; in particular, Italian, which is perceived to be the most rigid, is the freest of all with just a general overall credit requirement. The committee’s recommendations will necessitate adding to requirements in Italian rather than streamlining them: adding a pedagogy and methods course requirement and perhaps requiring some coursework outside the department. These recommendations will be relatively easy to implement, since a multi-department pedagogy course already exists, and we are planning shortly to offer a cross-listed methods course. In

the French MA, there is currently a period requirement (4 periods out of 7) and it would be good to simplify this, maybe in line with the revised undergraduate major: requiring instead at least 2 courses in each of two periods: pre and post-1800. As for overall credits, they are not especially onerous in the MA programs, at 55 overall for French and 60 overall for Italian, of which 45 and 50, respectively, are taken as courses (the remaining 10 are 600-level reading credits taken when the student is studying for the MA exams). Both programs might align their credit requirements, but whether at 55 or 60, we're talking about 2 courses/quarter over 5 quarters plus reading credits in the 6th quarter (when preparing the MA).

The rigidity of the MA programs that the external review committee perceived comes not from requirements (as written in the catalog) but from the reading lists and the structure of the MA exams, which the report directs us to reconsider. The lists exist in both French and Italian MA programs, more or less in similar forms: as bibliographies of canonical primary works (with a smattering of secondary texts) covering all the key periods/centuries; and the MA exams are conceived as tests of the student's mastery of this material. They are obviously relics of a time when the MA was more narrowly oriented towards preparing students for a doctoral dissertation, whether here at the UW or elsewhere. And they need to be revisited – both the lists and the MA exams. One option might be to replace the examinations with a mixed portfolio of academic work (research paper, or, where appropriate, research project) and teaching work. There would be a lot of positive effects with such a move, including eliminating the curricular rigidities associated with the list and the exam and offering a final project better suited to students who do not plan to continue beyond the MA that becomes an 'artefact' more relevant to their own personal and professional interests. A possible benefit of moving away from the lists would be the option to broaden the curriculum by creating a combined pedagogical/culture track, which would give students a broad preparation and utilize resources both within the department and shared (e.g., more explicitly connecting with the Second and Foreign Language Teaching certificate program), and a culture/literature/critical thinking track which would include in-house courses and courses in conjunction with other departments/programs.

The PhD level is where requirements do indeed need to be streamlined. We currently require about 50 credits of additional coursework beyond the MA, which comes to an additional 2 years. We agree that this should be reduced to 1 year, with the General Exams perhaps expected in AU quarter of the 2nd year of the PhD program, rather than SP (thus cutting back overall PhD course requirements to 30 credits from 50). The models of new interdisciplinary PhD programs provided by the report are helpful. On a smaller and probably more immediately doable scale, we can also continue to think about the role of the graduate certificates in the PhD. The certificates are largely designed with the idea of improving job prospects of PhDs, with an additional credential highlighting in-demand expertise in areas such as pedagogy, digital humanities, or public scholarship. Thus unlike some of the models in the report, which increase efficiency but maybe at the cost of the student's employability, this more modest model might in fact help students become more competitive.

“Interdisciplinarity” refers throughout the report both to an intellectual disposition and to the more nuts-and-bolts administrative task of sharing courses across departments. Both are advisable, though questions have come up about the feasibility of the latter, especially in the absence of any directive from above. One clear starting point for course-sharing, though, is *within* the department; and requiring, across both programs, a pedagogy course and a methods course to be taken by all incoming graduate students in French and Italian seems like a good place to begin. Moreover, another avenue for course-sharing that’s already in place is coordinating with graduate certificates, of which there are about 6 on the books now (or will be very soon) that would be of relevance to FIS students, including two with strong representation within the department (Second and Foreign Language Teaching and Textual and Digital Studies; the others are Cinema and Media Studies; Feminist Studies; Sexuality and Queer Studies, and Public Scholarship). We continue to encourage faculty to get involved in such extra-departmental curricular initiatives; this brings more options into the department, raises the viability of FIS graduate studies in the long term, and also makes it easier for faculty to offer graduate courses, should they wish to.

One strongly worded—though, from our perspective, questionable—imperative in the report is to **“replenish the numbers”** of graduate students in both programs. There is something disconcerting about the urgency of this recommendation in the report, accompanied moreover by a short timeline (a critical mass in one year; and the recommendation of a mini-review in three years is mostly predicated on wanting to see a “rise in numbers”). Like the requirements above, the issue of “numbers” is actually a fairly complicated one, with a history (or histories, since on this point, it is important to distinguish between the situations in French and Italian), and we feel that it might instead behoove us to make curricular reforms first, before opening the floodgates.

Graduate enrollment numbers cannot be understood without reference to the broader context. They have certainly come down in recent years, as a result of a range of factors: the first, in 2008, was the dramatic cut to TA-funding (by our reckoning, the cut to FIS’s budget was *the* largest in the College of Arts & Sciences at 19%) followed by several years of budget crisis. This was what we might call an exogenous cut, the large majority of which was borne by French, which entailed, for instance, pulling back French 100-level AU sections (101, 102, 103, and 110) almost in half, from 15 to 8 between 2008-2010, not, it should be stressed, because the demand wasn’t there (denials skyrocketed: 99 denials across the 5 sections of FR101 in AU 2010; as sections were subsequently restored in the past few years, the numbers in French quickly returned more or less to where they had been, as the self study showed). More recently, Italian has also cut back graduate admissions due to a shortage of 101 sections. This, however, is now a demand-side shock rather than a supply-side one, driven by a stark drop in language program enrollments over the past 7 years. These contrasting contexts are important to differentiate, and the report was not especially attuned to the distinction. FIS apparently could have admitted as many as 8 new French graduate students for next year, since there is now a glut of 101-level TA slots to offer, although doing so would have provoked other problems (e.g., shortage of faculty mentors for graduate students). In Italian, however, we can only rebuild viable cohorts by figuring out how to deal with the chronic contraction of 100-level

sections. The report spells things out quite clearly here: in rebuilding the Italian MA program, with IT101 enrollments today about 28% of what they were in AU 2008 but staffing more or less unchanged, we need to figure out how and where graduate TAs meaningfully fit in.

Factor 2 is the applicant pool. In French, this has varied quite a bit over the years, from 12 to 20+, though without any clear pattern (this year, there were 20 applications; last year, it was 15). The swings are, though, significant enough that the pool of 1st tier and wait-listed students, from which to draw an incoming class, might vary from 2-3 one year to 5-6 the next. Moreover, the belt-tightening after 2008, along with other factors, did lead to rising standards, or rather a more pronounced reluctance to bend them in order to fill TA slots when applicants from the first tier turned us down. Last year, French didn't go to the waitlist after the 3 top choices turned us down since the faculty didn't feel strongly enough about the quality of the remaining applicants. In Italian, the pool has diminished significantly in recent years, and recruitment is an area in which we will need to make concerted efforts going forward. One idea on this front is to designate an Italian faculty member to serve as liaison with potential Italian MA students.

Which brings us to factor 3: **recruitment**. No doubt, any plan to rebuild the programs will hinge on a plan for recruiting qualified and appropriate applicants, and this is especially urgent in Italian. One idea raised is to recruit more via contacts in Italy. In any case, more active applicant recruitment would need to be built on repurposed programs that offered a compelling and relevant experience: what that is and to whom this is targeted are questions we still need to answer. But there is a growing consensus in French to shift focus onto terminal MAs and the professional and educational outcomes they might lead to – this goes back a few years now, and it is always easier said than done. Yet we have been more rigorous about screening MAs who want to continue into the PhD program, but aren't quite up to standards. Several have been steered in other directions in recent years.

Here again, the challenge is that one obvious MA-level outcome—teaching in high school—is not a clear option in WA state (state public schools typically require a Master in Teaching [MIT]), so we will have to think more creatively about the ways our students plan to use their MAs. Most MAs probably go on, eventually, to do graduate work, sometimes in literary studies, but more often in the social sciences or the law, with French or Italian remaining a central interest. This is certainly another argument for a more interdisciplinary MA program, and perhaps one that not only does not teach to MA reading lists, but replaces the MA exam with a different kind of final project that would be of greater interest to the kinds of programs the students might be applying to.

The report encourages the faculty to point graduate students toward “**positive employment opportunities**” **outside of R1 institutions**. This comment is a mischaracterization of uncertainties among faculty about professional outcomes for PhD (not MA) students, since we have sent graduate students off with our strongest support to administrative jobs, high schools, and teaching-intensive institutions, among other professional outcomes.

For recruitment of accepted students, we've been limited by generally scant resources relative to the programs we compete with for our top choices; at the UW, FIS is not an especially well-supported department, compared with Classics, Linguistics, and Germanics, each of which have large endowments to recruit and support students. That said, we do have incentives to offer to students considering our program: Top Scholar RAships, smaller funds from endowments, which can be offered for books, supplies or travel, the intellectual resources of an R1 university, and probably our most effective recruitment tool historically: the city of Seattle. We also effectively offer more time-to-degree support to incoming grad students than the report recommends (i.e., 5 years of TAsip: we typically support students for 6 + 1 years [this is, of course, not something we cannot and do not guarantee], and if anything, might want to consider cutting that back, not to discourage anyone from coming, but to shorten time to degree, in accordance with the reduction in PhD level coursework). This means that recruitment is a complicated issue, involving many elements including reaching out, as the report advises. The report is right to state that it is something we have not done effectively, no doubt as a function of our ambivalence regarding the professional prospects of all but the top graduate students.

Making some of the changes recommended by the Committee will go a long way toward reducing that ambivalence, allowing us to take on the recommended **rebranding** effort in earnest. The reconfiguration of our programs will not be a particularly complicated task, nor will it take long. It hinges on a small number of relatively minor changes to requirements (compared with our recent reforms of the undergrad programs: a Pedagogy course in IT; Methods for both IT and FR; changes to period requirements, etc.) and the articulation of clear guidelines about what kinds of courses we will need to offer each year, as well as updated copy to the website (which in any case will need to be spruced up for recruitment purposes). We can begin now and have the paperwork in by the SP. We can update the website and send out recruitment materials in AU 2016; and have the new programs up and running by AU 2017.

Undergraduate Programs: Language Courses and Sequences

The Committee report lauds many aspects of the language programs, but rightly points to declining enrollments, especially in Italian, as a source of serious concern. The strategies mentioned to counter downward enrollment trends—offering hybrid/online courses and courses in medical and/or business French and Italian—are the standard ones, and, as the self study clearly indicates, FIS is already pursuing the former. In the interim, we have committed to teaching language for business purposes in 2017 in both French and Italian. Medical French is also an offering that we may introduce in the future.

The more compelling recommendation, from our perspective, is to **devote resources to developing innovative pedagogies** and support the professional development of language instructors. Currently, the Department is sponsoring any French faculty (or graduate student) wanting to participate in a series of webinars co-conducted by the Centre de Linguistique Appliquée (CLA) of the University of Franche-Comté, the University of Utah, and the University of Louisiana, Lafayette. Topics covered up to this point have included designing French language courses for “specific objectives” (Français sur objectifs

spécifiques - FOS), targeted at but not limited to future business, technical, and medical professionals. The University of Utah is awarding a continuing-education credit to any faculty who 1) participate in all 6 webinars offered in 2015-16, 2) implement the strategies covered in one webinar in one of their own classes, 3) video-record the class, and 4) write a self-evaluation. The Department encourages full-time language instructors to participate in such programs. This effort in professional development in the French language program has been largely instructor-driven, and FIS will encourage Italian language instructors to pursue similar opportunities.

We are also confident that we can boost enrollments by aligning our language program objectives with those of the Common European Framework of Reference and, more importantly, offering proficiency testing (ideally, subsidized by external funding) using the DELF/DALF and PLIDA testing protocols in French 203 and Italian 203 respectively, which will allow our students to complete a language sequence with a globally recognized proficiency certificate (e.g., CEFR B2). Vilavella-Collins will be trained and certified in Autumn 2016 with other faculty to follow (Meyer and Giachetti) once she becomes certified as a trainer for examiners. A training workshop for FIS language instructors is projected for Winter 2017 in cooperation with the Alliance française de Seattle. FIS aims eventually to become accredited as “Centre d’Examen” for the DELF/DALF (levels B1, B2 and C1). Italian language program coordinator Giuseppe Tassone is already certified for PLIDA. Once these protocols are in place, we will widely advertise these certification options to students.

Undergraduate Programs: Content Courses and Majors/Minors

The distinction between “language” courses and “content” courses is, of course, a specious one: language courses transmit cultural content, and content courses deepen students’ grasp of the language. Still, for the purposes of defining a course of study in a major or minor, the distinction is still operative.

The Committee report mentions the recent **revisions** of the French and Italian majors only in passing, which is surprising, since they represent a signal collective effort on the part of FIS faculty to better serve the interests of undergraduate students and increase enrollments. Although each has only been offered once, the new French 304 and Italian 304 “Issues and Perspectives” courses, which serve as introductions to the majors—proseminars, if you will, for undergraduates—have generated positive feedback and set the stage for more meaningful undergraduate study. In fact, what FIS has done in the undergraduate curriculum is essentially the “streamlining” called for at the graduate level. (We will continue to discuss whether further streamlining of the Italian major makes sense, in light of the distribution of a small number of students over a relatively large number of courses, as French has done by removing the 303 requirement and effectively replacing it with the first bridge course, French 304).

What’s also missing from the Committee report is an acknowledgement of **course enrollments and diversity of offerings** in the undergraduate upper-level courses that predate the revisions to the majors. French and Italian both regularly offer large 200-level outreach content courses that attract 50 to 150 students each, as was documented in the

self study. French is seemingly the only foreign language major at the UW to offer 300- and 400-level classes in the target language to 20-40 students per class. These courses, it is worth noting, are typically taught by faculty, not lecturers, as is the case in many other departments. The range of topics and the flexibility shown in teaching new material is also exceptional when compared to peer departments, most of whom have a static core of courses and are losing enrollments. French and Italian tenure-line faculty have all taught one or two new courses per year for the past few years, usually in areas well outside their research, and have been innovative with technology in and out of the classroom. All of this is of particular relevance to the issue of understaffing in French, where the 5 tenure-stream faculty are pulled in many different directions. (Note that USC, which is cited extensively in the Committee report, has 19 undergraduate majors, 8 tenure lines, and 8 full-time lecturers in French, nearly a 1:1 major-to-instructor ratio. There are, of course, significant differences of institutional context, but a bolstering of the ranks in French would help render the efforts currently underway *sustainable*).

We agree with the Committee report that **course development** should be funded, even at the upper level of undergraduate study. Especially with the loss of the Center for West European Studies course development grants, most new courses are developed on a “volunteer” basis during the summer. Faculty should have access to support to travel to different campuses to interview colleagues and witness the results they are having with curricular change. UC Berkeley, for instance, could be a good resource. They are active in coming up with new courses—translation is emerging as a compelling track there—and ways for undergraduates to explore professional opportunities.

The Committee report did not address the role of **minors** and any plan to develop a choice of possible minors. The report does mention the big drop in majors, but without a lot of context (especially the change in overall credits allowed by the University, which is, as the self study showed, a major factor). One way to address this structural change at the UW might be to offer a broader range of French and Italian minors, including language-intensive and English-only options. It is clear that FIS will need to pursue these options.

Finally, we believe that we are already doing more than many other departments to develop professional opportunities for our majors and minors, primarily via our Student Adviser, Sabrina Tatta, although individual faculty also make important efforts in this regard. For instance, we advertise and host internship workshops, including a 2-hour workshop offered this past fall and again in February. These initiatives are complemented by workshops that we ask the Career Center to tailor to French and Italian majors that aim to educate undergraduates regarding the sorts of jobs for which they are qualified to apply with their BA in Italian or French (e.g., by studying currently advertised positions).

Our student adviser has also been instrumental in encouraging and preparing students to apply for all relevant scholarships and fellowships, efforts that have met with great success. For instance, of the 6 Foreign Language and Area Studies awards offered to UW undergraduates each year, we usually have at least 2 awarded to students of Italian, even though there are over 40 qualified languages. Likewise, there were fewer than 30 undergraduates at the UW last year who submitted a research paper to the Undergraduate

Research Award committee: of those students, one was a French major. We also strongly support student participation in the undergrad research symposium and have French majors participate every year (11 of our students took part last year). All of this speaks to a culture of inciting students to go further with their studies and seek the relevant scholarly opportunities and awards for which they are uniquely qualified.

Intradepartmental Communication

The collaboration of French and Italian faculty on, for instance, hiring committees in the past few years has been exemplary. Still, the range of faculty responses regarding the issue of the "apparent lack of communication" among FIS's various constituencies suggests that there is much work to be done in this area. To wit: there is the sense that the Italian wing currently has the lowest amount of autonomy than at any other time in recent memory. Many of the "reforms" to the undergraduate programs undertaken in the last two years had the appearance of being imposed on the Italian wing at the behest of a few French faculty. It is important for a minority wing that a sense of empowerment and self-determination be maintained, and this is not presently the case. Some areas that could be addressed in this regard: course assignments and curriculum planning. Currently, Italian faculty attend a general meeting at which the majority of courses and times are already in place. An alternative would be an initial meeting with the Italian faculty (which is how planning was done in the past) at which there would be a collective discussion of planning for the following year. These could be a more integral part of the separate wing meetings, and there might be ways to open those up to more creative brainstorming (with increased follow-up on that brainstorming). These measures, of course, do not address the problem of lack of communication within the respective wings. Unfortunately, in Italian there is often a divide between the goals of tenure-stream faculty and those of the senior lecturers (especially regarding the graduate program), and this can make constructive dialogue within the wing difficult. In French, there is at times a disconnect between the language program and the research faculty, especially as it concerns the objectives of study abroad. We simply need to strive to address these differences openly and without personalizing the issues at hand. The chair can contribute to this effort by meeting individually with each faculty member from both wings in AU 16 to take stock of their ideas and vision for the future, which would be a constructive, personalized follow-up to the 10-year review process.

Staffing

We strongly disagree with the Committee's assessment that FIS could function with a 50% student adviser position. It is regrettable that the External Review Committee chose to cancel its meeting with FIS's student adviser Sabrina Tatta, since some of the confusion regarding her roles and how they articulate with the Graduate Program Coordinator and the Undergraduate Program Coordinators might have been avoided. The Undergraduate Program Coordinators, Assistant Professor Beatrice Arduini (Italian) and Professor Denyse Delcourt (French), organize cultural programming for students and serve as a faculty liaison. All other aspects of undergraduate advising—recruiting students into the majors and minors (of which there are currently 134), guiding students through their course of

study, study abroad advising, degree audits, among many other tasks—are handled by Student Adviser Sabrina Tatta. This is of great value to the Department and to the institution, creating, as it does, a more worldly, culturally flexible student body. Likewise, Tatta serves as Graduate Program Assistant, meeting with graduate students at least once per year in order to help them plan exams, navigate the Graduate School’s administrative processes, and serve as a resource to them as TAs, and provide counsel when they encounter difficulties in the classroom. This level of careful attention to student advising is crucial to the success of our programs, and it seems reckless to suggest that we reduce it.

Outreach and Fundraising

In the report, specifically in the paragraph labeled “Community outreach,” the Committee noted that during the previous ten years the FIS department enjoyed strong ties and enthusiastic support within the greater Seattle area community. Committee members underscored that many students benefited from the financial support in the form of endowments established during that period in French and especially Italian that were the result of strong and collaborative relationships. The cessation of the positive energy and activities of the French and Italian Advisory Boards resulted not only in the loss of new financial support, but also in a consequent loss in the visibility of, participation in, and contribution to cultural activities taking place in the area. These activities are key to our intellectual mission as well as to our students’ cultural growth.

In recognition of all this, FIS is prepared to revamp relationships with the community in order to reproduce the appropriate conditions to grant our students further financial support as well as create fertile ground for experiential learning opportunities. In order to accomplish these goals, FIS will need to identify within the local and not-so-local community supporters of French and Italian culture, community leaders, and volunteers willing to actively serve as board members or simply as collaborators to help the Department to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Creation of new endowments aimed at supporting both graduate and undergraduate students
2. Propose and support lecture series inviting prominent guest lecturers within and outside of the UW campus
3. Sustained promotion of our study abroad programs, which are central to FIS’s sustained success
4. Film festival series aimed at attracting new enthusiasm for our two cultures
5. Creation of internships and other experiential learning opportunities for our students in conjunction to the local Italian and French business and not-for-profit community
6. Connecting with Italian and French government agencies in order to more actively collaborate with them on funding student and faculty projects
7. Create and connect with existing campus programs to help students see the link between the work they do in our department and their professional prospects

Incidentally, all of these efforts will tie into the University’s current capital campaign.

Conclusion

What follows is a timeline for undertaking the major initiatives outlined in this response. We recognize that the future success of the Department and the undergraduate and graduate students who work with and learn from our faculty will come from a combination of the timely implementation of the reforms outlined above and meaningful support from the College of Arts and Sciences. We will work closely with the Dean of the Humanities to ensure the successful completion of these initiatives.

FIS Response to 10-Year Review Committee Report and Recommendations

Timeline for completion of proposed changes

Area:	Task:	Deadline:	Actual:
Graduate (MA)	Harmonize credits in Fr/It MA programs	SP 16	
Graduate (MA)	Create new “methods” core course	SP 16	
Graduate (MA)	Revise/replace MA exam (Fr/It)	SP 16	
Graduate (PhD)	Streamline course requirements, integrate certificate programs (for AU 17 start)	SP 16	
Graduate (MA/Phd)	Improve cooperation with allied grad programs	Ongoing	
Graduate (MA/Phd)	Rebranding of grad programs	AU 16	
Graduate (MA/Phd)	Implementation of new recruiting program	AU 16	
Graduate (MA)	Discuss creation of MA liaison role	AU 16	
U/g language	DELF/DALF certification for Fr instructors	AU 16	
U/g language	Aligning Fr/It language syllabi (101-303) with CEFR objectives	WI 17	
U/g language	Implement DELF/DALF and PLIDA testing in Fr/It 203	SP 17	
U/g content	Develop plan for funding course development	WI 17	
U/g content	Develop and introduce new Fr/It targeted minors	WI 17	
U/g content	Discuss further streamlining of Italian major (e.g., removing 303 as requirement)	WI 17	
Intradepartmental Communication	Chair conducts individual feedback sessions with all FIS faculty/staff	AU 16	
Outreach and Fundraising	Discuss plan and assign roles for renewed outreach efforts	AU 16	