



UNIVERSITY
of HAWAII®
MĀNOA

Colleges of Arts and Sciences
College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature
Office of the Dean

April 25, 2014

MEMORANDUM

TO: Reed Dasenbrock
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

FROM: Robert Bley-Vroman *Robert Bley-Vroman*
Dean, College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature

SUBJECT: Response to external review

Attached is the College's response to the external review conducted November 2013. Based on the observations of the review team, I propose five areas of action, ordered by importance. These are areas that are of the high priority, that require a concentrated long-term effort, and where changes are within the dean's power and responsibility to effect.

In addition to these five major areas, we also addresses, in an appendix, each of the 48 individual recommendations made in the report of the review team. Some of these are subsumed within the five major areas, and some require separate treatment.

2545 McCarthy Mall, Bilger Hall 101
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822
Telephone: (808) 956-8516
Fax: (808) 956-9879
An Equal Opportunity/Affirmation Action Institution

Final Report of the Review of the College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, conducted November, 2013

**College Response
April, 2014**

The College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature has reviewed the final report and recommendations of the November 2013 review of the College by the external review team (the Report). Copies of the Report were forwarded to department chairs, who discussed it with their departments. The Dean and Associate Dean met with each department chair individually to discuss the recommendations as they related to the department. In addition, the chairs and center directors, the Dean, and the Associate Dean had a half-day retreat off campus on January 12, 2014. The present response by the Dean has been shaped by those College-internal discussions. During February and March, additional discussions were held

Overall, the College found the review process very helpful. The team members were well chosen: they had subject-matter expertise, an understanding of higher education organization, and an ability to get to the heart of the matter during the visit. They quickly discovered the strengths and weaknesses of the College, and their recommendations are insightful. In general, the Dean, department chairs and faculty agree with the assessments and endorse the recommendations.

This response is organized as follows. First, we identify five major areas of actions that the College must address. These are areas that are of the highest priority, that require a concentrated long-term effort, and where changes are within the dean's power and responsibility to effect.

Then, in an appendix we also comment on all of the individual recommendations of the review team. Some of these are lower-level matters (staffing in the LAE labs, or things that are relatively quickly dealt with (a defective sound booth), or problems that cannot readily be dealt with given the constraints under which the College operates (the recommendation that the State pay 100% of the medical insurance premiums), or matters which, though important and needing of attention, do not rise to the level of highest priority.

The five major areas themselves are ordered the need for action to effect change. As such, the dean will need to pay special attention to the areas early in the list. For example, while it is important to consider restructuring the graduate degrees in English in (a part of priority area #5), these do not require urgent action, and they can mostly be handled by the usual mechanisms of program approval. In contrast, #1 on the list requires a response to uneven scholarly productivity: this will probably require changes in workload policy, higher performance expectations, and new systems of accountability. These complex and potentially contentious matters will require energetic leadership by the Dean.

1. Address unevenness of scholarly productivity and inequity in workload

The reviewers note that there is unevenness in the level of scholarly performance among faculty, with respect to research productivity, faculty service, and leadership in the profession. While this

is naturally true to some extent in any academic unit, in some LLL departments there are a number of faculty members whose work falls below the high standards of scholarly achievement that ought to characterize the faculty of a major research university. The review notes that these often include mid-rank faculty, who, after getting tenure, had little published research, and have also not taken on significant leadership responsibilities. In teaching, they often have the reputation of being at least competent, and sometimes very good. Despite lower research accomplishments, their teaching loads are the same as those with significantly greater accomplishments. This situation is unacceptable from the point of view both of productivity and or equity. First, the lack of research lowers the overall reputation of the department. Second, the fact that different faculty members, in effect, work harder than others is inequitable and undermines morale. A system is required that has favorable conditions for research, service, and teaching; that holds faculty to high standards of accomplishment; and that ensures effective workload parity across faculty members.

Many of the pieces are in place to address this problem in the departments where it exists; however, it will be necessary to strengthen some. First, we now have a uniform annual workload survey, administered by the Dean and made available to department chairs. Nearly everyone fills this out regularly, and we have records since the beginning of the present dean's term. While this could be tweaked, it's fundamentally satisfactory and now widely accepted. Second, the Office of Graduate Education now has a regular review of research productivity as part of a larger review of graduate faculty status. Third, periodic review ("post-tenure review") provides a context for a rigorous assessment of scholarly work and teaching competence. This still must be strengthened, and taken more seriously. Fourth, two departments, with the encouragement of the Dean, are considering what would be required, especially in terms of curricular reform, to institute a "default" 2-2 teaching load. The current system fosters a culture where department service and research productivity "extras," that are rewarded by course releases for those who are willing to undertake them. The Dean has made it clear that if a default 2-2 teaching load is adopted, it must be understood that its purpose is not to lighten overall workload, but to provide the context to develop a culture of high research productivity, significant departmental service by all, and excellent teaching. This means that the department needs to define these high expectations and have mechanisms in place to assess whether they are being met, and to adjust duty assignments when they are not being met, typically by assigning additional courses (up to 3-3) or other duties. In the case of the Department of English, it is possible that a workload policy can be implemented on a trial basis in AY 2014–2015, with criteria and "escalator" mechanisms that can be fine-tuned during the year. EALL is a bit farther behind, but it is to be noted that the external review team made particular mention of the uneven productivity in English, so that department is a reasonable place to begin the first efforts.¹

In addition to workload policy reform, periodic review should be strengthened to correspond to more rigorous productivity requirements. In addition, teaching quality of tenured faculty needs to

¹ The other two PhD-granting departments of the College—SLS and Linguistics—already have workload policies in place that require ongoing productivity (variations of a minimum "something every year" principle). In these departments, the productivity requirement is built into their 2-2 workload policy, and it reflects a department culture that expects research accomplishments and significant service from all. Seldom is anyone in these units at risk of failing to meet the requirement. (If it does happen, it causes a crisis, since the policy does not make provision for failure.)

be monitored more closely in periodic review. The Dean of LLL, together with the other deans of Arts and Sciences, was particularly impressed with systems discussed at the recent PAC-12+3 deans' conference, especially the system of the University of Colorado, that requires three types of assessment, chosen by the faculty member from a menu of options.

2. **Build bridges** across disciplines and organizational units

The review noted that there is a tendency toward “silozation” within certain departments. They note: “In some departments there is little interaction across faculty members and across faculty sub-groups; this is especially true of some language programs. These isolated “silos” result in lost opportunities for engagement and overall improvement.” The review team calls special attention to the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures, where they call attention to “a general tendency towards “silozation” that is evident in the Department as a whole.”

Two aspects of silozation must be addressed: those embedded in governance structures and those associated with curriculum and interdisciplinary cooperation.

The governance structures of departments must be reviewed with an eye toward eliminating silo-friendly provisions. Governance in some departments seems designed to draw boundaries around and to balance power among competing subgroups: this reinforces silozation. In EALL, each section (Chinese, Japanese, and Korean), faculty are partitioned into two “disciplines”: linguistics (more accurately language) and literature. Every faculty member is categorized as linguistics or literature. This results in six subunits from the point of view of governance and curriculum. Department policies and procedures make reference to these six groups, some of which are very small. The requirements for committee membership often make use of the crossing of “discipline” and language, sometimes making it difficult to staff committees and hold elections (this is especially the case when there are also rank restrictions).

As to curriculum, the review team points out the opportunity (again, notably in EALL) for courses that cut across language sections, addressing East Asia as a whole. (The Report suggests, for example, pre-modern literatures of East Asia, women's literature, language and cultures of East Asia, writing systems of East Asia), as well as courses that articulate with units outside of the Department. Of course, existing silo-based decision-making systems make such initiatives more difficult, so reform on the governance side needs to go hand-in-hand with reform on the curricular side.

The Department of Language and Literatures of Europe and the Americas (LLEA) and the Department of Indo-Pacific Languages and Literatures have made some progress in working across sections and across departments. There are LLEA courses that are not tied to a particular language. There is cross-departmental (even cross-college) initiative on Germany in the Pacific and Asia. Also, the French Division of LLEA is working with the Tahitian Program in IPLL on an initiative on French and the Pacific.

Other cross-disciplinary initiatives should continue be supported as well. IPLL has taken the lead in cooperation with various units across Mānoa on Pacific Islanders in the Arts (the PACITA project, with an annual three-day festival). The Report advocates continued support for the

concept of a Center for Biocultural Studies. A small group of recently hired junior faculty have expressed great interest in fostering comparative studies as part of curricula at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. This is of special interest to faculty in programs without existing degrees, or with only undergraduate degrees and certificates.

3. Take action to address inadequate space and facilities

The review team observed that the most serious concerns involve severe overcrowding, “with unacceptably large numbers of faculty, staff, and graduate student assistants sharing single offices.” The worst problems are in EALL and in IPLL. Overcrowding in EALL will become an even more serious concern as we now need to accommodate our new Chinese Flagship.

The Report also notes, “The physical condition of the buildings we visited range from adequate to extremely poor.” Again, the most serious problems are in IPLL (Spaulding Hall), and in the temporary buildings that house many EALL faculty, the National Foreign Language Resource Center, the Center for Interpretation and Translation Studies, the Sato Center for Pidgin and Creole Studies, and a portion of the Language Acquisition and Experimentation Laboratories. Though the review did not visit the Center for Biographical Research, in Henke Hall, that building, too, is in very poor condition (and slated for demolition, exacerbating the space problem). The College’s attitude in the past has been to try to make do with the poor facilities. This clearly must change, and the Dean should make it priority to work for adequate space and up-to-date facilities.

4. Continue program excellence in specific thematic areas.

The review supports the LLL’s focus on Asia and the Pacific, and the College’s desire to develop a special character to all our programs—something that distinguishes us from the pack and that makes us “like no place else on earth.” The College will continue this general thematic-niche strategy, continuing to strengthen these particular existing unique initiatives: European connections to the Pacific and Asia, post-colonial and Pacific literature, and language documentation and conservation. To say that we emphasize these special initiatives is not to suggest that we neglect more “standard” areas. For example, although we do provide a specific focus on German in the Pacific, we of course also provide a strong standard German curriculum; while the English Department may have a special emphasis on Pacific literatures, we do not neglect Shakespeare.

5. Consider program restructuring and innovation.

In three areas, the review team noted that existed programs might be upgraded or restructured, and that new programs might be considered that cross sub-department boundaries.

a. An undergraduate **BA in Linguistics** is presently offered through the Interdisciplinary Studies program. The Report recommends that the Linguistics Department considering “upgrading” this to a regular BA. The program has been housed in Interdisciplinary Studies for many years, and it is time to consider having it stand on its own. The Vice Chancellor has also noted that this

possibility should be explored. It is notable that the BA in Second Language Studies quickly more than doubled the number of majors when it was moved from IS to “regular” status.

b. The English Department’s present graduate creative writing program is implemented as a track in the MA. Increasingly, the **MFA in Creative Writing** is considered the appropriate terminal graduate degree in this area, rather than the MA (or the more research-focused PhD). The Report states “Among the most exciting opportunities for the Department are the potential establishment of a Creative Writing MFA, drawing on the unique foci in Pacific cultures, life writing, and identity studies, as well as on the appointment of some excellent new faculty in the area.” Note that what is required is not so much the creation of an entirely new program, but restructuring and somewhat expanding the existing MA. The faculty strength is in place. This is largely a work of curricular reform.

c. The Reports observes that in IPLL suffers from a degree of siloization. (As noted above, EALL also suffers from this problem, but for somewhat different reasons.) In IPLL, there are many geographically and linguistically defined programs, usually with only very small number of faculty (often with only one tenure-track faculty member). The Report notes, “Articulation among these groups is weak and there is little sense of an overarching common sense of departmental mission or purpose. Developing such a sense will not be easy, but attempts need to be made to do so. One way is through increased attention to the development of courses and curricula that are thematically based and that span language and geographical divides.” The Department of IPLL has, partly prompted by the external review, begun to consider ways that the potential synergies might be realized. The Dean has encouraged this discussion. In the most far-reaching proposal, the department would create a common set of intellectual agenda for the department as a whole or for larger segments of the department, which could be reflected in a common undergraduate major with several individual tracks. A first step might be a set of team-taught core courses. A core course in South, Southeast Asian, and Near Eastern Language and Literature with emphasis on interconnections has been argued to be eminently doable, as would be a core course in Language and Literatures of Polynesia.

Appendix

Recommendations in the Report

The wording of the recommendations in the Report is abbreviated here in **boldface**. The Dean's observations follow. The recommendation is commented on in *italics*.

In some cases, the Report breaks out particular recommendations; sometimes these are numbered; sometimes these are embedded in a more discursive presentation; some are implicit. For ease of comment, all have been broken out and numbered, often following the Report's own wording, but in some cases recommendations have been paraphrased or shortened. The numbering does not always correspond exactly to the Report's.

College-level recommendations

1. **Double the resources available for startup packages.** This can only be done with an increased allocation of the campus to the college, or through additional RTRF "earned" by College. RTRF is unlikely to increase in the near term. *This recommendation probably cannot be implemented under the present circumstances.*
2. **Institute regular merit salary increases.** The review proposes that this be worked out with the UHPA. A systematic approach to this requires a different approach to setting salary levels, and cannot be decided by LLL itself. However, the existing system of special salary adjustments could be used to correct the most glaring anomalies, if additional resources could be made available. LLL already has good system for annual reporting of scholarly productivity, teaching, and service endeavors. *The College should continue with its existing system of annual productivity reporting. The College should make the correction of salary anomalies a priority if funding becomes available. At present, the College should explore methods other than salary increases to incentivize and recognize scholarly productivity and teaching excellence.*
3. **Strengthen evaluation of teaching.** The review advocates a campus- or university-wide evaluation system. *A campus-wide system is beyond LLL's ability to implement. However, the College should explore ways to strengthen evaluation within the College and increase uniformity in evaluation across departments.*
4. **Promote conversation and research interaction around themes of common interest and incentivize faculty participation.** *The College should make this a very high priority, taking advantage especially of the new generation of faculty, who express a great interest in this kind of cooperation, both within the College and across the campus's organizational structures. If the context for such interaction is created, the faculty will take advantage of it. Concrete incentives should be provided.*
5. **Provide leadership training for future faculty leaders.** *The President's Office has now re-started its program for training academic leaders. The Dean should develop training opportunities for potential leaders with the College. Workshops and reading groups have*

been suggested by faculty. Funding could be made available (given resources) to these efforts.

6. **Increase stipends and provide low-cost housing for graduate students.** *This is a recommendation for the University, and must be implemented at the Mānoa or System level. It cannot be effected by the College.*
7. **Make fundraising for graduate fellowships a campus priority.** *Although the report makes this recommendation at the campus level, LLL should itself adopt this priority as well (we have had some modest success.)*
8. **Allocate campus visit funds annually to each department.** *At the January 2014 LLL chairs' retreat, chairs felt that campus visits were not particularly useful, and that funds would be better spent in other ways. Instead, the Dean will make funds available on a case-by-case basis if the campus visit seems to be crucial. Linguistics has requested some campus visit money for spring 2014 to bring top-ranked PhD students to Hawai'i who are being invited for campus visits by our competitors.*
9. **Provide fully paid health insurance to GAs.** *This recommendation cannot be implemented in the foreseeable future.*
10. **Make a potential list of health and safety violations to send to VCAFO.** *This list has been prepared and submitted to the VCAFO.*
11. **Institute a campus-wide student fee to support instructional technology.** *This is a recommendation for Mānoa, not for LLL.*
12. **Consider funding an APT with a half-time commitment to Linguistics/SLS labs.** *The Center for Language and Technology has already begun to work with Linguistics and SLS to provide adequate staff support for the Language Acquisition and Experimentation Labs. The Dean has, partly in response to the review, indicated that a dedicated part-time position might be considered. A full analysis of needs must be undertaken first.*
13. **Instill an ideology of administrative staff as partners.** *The College might provide an orientation to new faculty to encourage them to treat staff with respect. Also, the Dean's office can attempt to bring staffing levels to a reasonable level, so that staff are less harried and are able to be more responsive to faculty needs. The Dean is investigating the specific instances that may have prompted this recommendation. To some extent, these require individual responses rather than College-level actions.*
14. **Hire a dedicated UHF development officer for LLL.** *The College agrees with this recommendation and expects that this will be possible very soon. In addition, the College itself should immediately bring on board its own community and alumni relations specialist. At the LLL chairs' retreat in January, this was determined to be a priority, and an action has been taken to transfer a community relations expert from another unit, so serve as Director of Community Relations for LLL.*

Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures

The review notes that EALL is a first-ranked unit with national and international reputation. The report's recommendations primarily relate to the internal structure of the Department. These are, to a great extent, folded into our action plan for Major Area #2, "**Build bridges** across disciplines and organizational units."

1. The review noted that it may be necessary to "**rebalance**" the allocation of faculty lines, with attention given to future trends, especially as Korean and Chinese will probably grow while Japanese remains stable. It is unlikely that faculty size in Japanese can be decreased without compromising the program. Therefore, if more resources are needed in Korean and Japanese, these resources will have to come from other sources. If the College succeeds in obtaining the Flagship grant for Chinese, then, in the near term, resources will come from these external sources to expand Chinese (as has happened for Korean). In the longer term, additional resources will be needed. *The College should consider adjusting the staffing model in EALL in response to future trends.*
2. There is a **lack of integration and articulation across the programs**. The review notes a degree of "silozation." The Dean has long felt that the multiplicity of degree subprograms and tracks contributes to this silozation. Also, the elaborate EALL governance structure is built around three languages crossed with two disciplines (language/linguistics and literature): six constituencies. The large goal is, as the report advocates, is to build a sense of departmental, as opposed to individual program, identity. *The Department should consider simplifying both the curriculum and the governance structure. The Department should consider the creation of courses that bridge the compartments.*
3. There is a **relatively low number of majors in Chinese**. The number may increase as new staff in Chinese comes on board, when internal problems within the section are addressed, with advances in the curriculum, and (possibly) with a Chinese Flagship. *The College should pay special attention to hiring and faculty development in Chinese, and to establishing the conditions for a well-functioning Chinese section. The Chinese Flagship has now been secured.*
4. **The physical facilities, especially the faculty offices in Lincoln Annex, are deplorable.** *The College should address, and urge the VCAFO to address, the most urgent problems (broken railings, defective air conditioners, smelly carpets, insecure windows). However, the long-term solution really requires a new building. These matters are discussed in more detail in Major Area #3 "Take action to address inadequate space and facilities."*
5. Although specifically noted in the Report, **enrollment in some of the doctoral programs in EALL is not satisfactory**. This is especially true of the literature specializations, and especially in Chinese and in Korean literature. *Methods should be explored to increase the number of applicants, and there should be greater selectivity in graduate programs in Chinese. A curricular reform may be appropriate. At the least, a concerted recruiting program is required.*

Department of English

The English Department is strong, and recent hires have greatly contributed to this strength. The review team encourages the Department's focus on Pacific literary and cultural studies, creative writing, and biography (life writing). The recommendation that the Department consider a Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing will have implications for many areas of Department structure and function, and would perhaps impact PhD enrollment as well. The Dean has long urged the Department to consider establishing an MFA and supports this move.

The review makes the following recommendations:

1. **The Department should be a site of genuine and original research and teaching—more than a service unit.** The review team observes and approves the Department's emphasis on the broader areas of Pacific literary and cultural studies, and distinctive forms of creative and life writing. *The College should continue to support the Department as it strengthens these areas.*
2. **Resources should support active competitive faculty.** *The Department should develop ways to encourage faculty to apply for grants and fellowships. The College should continue to provide travel support to conferences.*
3. **Start-up funds should be focused on research and professional support.** *The College should continue and, if possible, increase its startup packages, currently at about \$10,000 over three years.*
4. **Explore the establishment of an MFA in Creative Writing.** *The Dean supports this recommendation. The Department should move forward on the MFA. A draft request for permission to plan is in the works.*
5. **Facilities must be renovated.** We anticipate that Kuykendall will be renovated. *In the meantime small-scale site-specific renovations should be undertaken.*
6. **The uneven level of scholarly accomplishment within the Department should be addressed.** *See Major Area #2 for discussion.*

Department of Indo-Pacific Languages and Literatures

As the review teams correctly points out, the strength of IPLLL is its large collection of language and culture programs relevant to an area of strategic importance to the University: the Pacific, and Southeast Asia into South Asia. The greatest challenge is that many of the language courses have very small enrollments and the programs attract few majors.

1. **Offer remote and online learning opportunities.** *The Department should encourage faculty to develop remote and online courses. The Dean should provide resources to the Center for Language and Technology to help the Department expand such offerings.*

2. **Develop course and curricula that are thematically based and span language and geographical divides.** *The College should increase its support for joint activities, conferences, symposia, and the like. The College could consider creating majors, minors, and certificates that span different language programs, as, for example, in Polynesian languages.*
3. **Consider majors or minors in other languages besides Filipino and Ilokano.** *This recommendation, in contrast to the suggestion of majors that span languages, is not practical: the demand is not there for degrees in programs for which there is barely enough enrollment to offer single classes.*
4. **Address the intolerable situation with regard to physical space.** *A solution to the space problem will require a completely new space, or, if the graduate division were to move out of Spaulding, a renovation of Spaulding could be undertaken. The College should continue to work with the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Physical Environmental and Long Range Planning to find a permanent solution. In the meantime, efforts should be undertaken to address the most urgently needed repairs.*
5. **Build enrollment in IPLL courses.** *The review team report did not mention, except by implication, that faculty in IPLL need to be concerned about the low enrollments, since it is difficult to justify the cost of offering courses with very small numbers of students. There are also serious consequences for cross-College workload equity when some faculty in some departments teach very large classes while an IPLL faculty member may teach a class of two or three. There is some evidence that more vigorous recruiting efforts can help. It has done so in Filipino, Ilokano, and Persian. Faculty members should take responsibility for recruiting students for classes. The Mānoa Advising Center and the Humanities Advising Office should encourage students to select a small-enrollment Indo-Pacific language to fulfill the language requirement.*

Department of Languages and Literatures of Europe and the Americas

The review team's specific recommendations for LLEA all are related to faculty hiring and faculty support. The Department will see resignations in key areas in the immediate future, and they want to be assured that faculty size will not erode. This is a less serious problem in Spanish than in the other divisions of LLEA. Of course, retirements offer the possibility of new blood, and the Department is also concerned that new faculty are given the support that they need to thrive. Retention can be a challenge.

1. **The timetable for filling positions should be made clear.** *Given the current financial straits, the Dean has been unwilling to give a definite assurance about what positions can be filled next year, given the projected retirements and resignations. The faculty would like to have a promise now, even in advance of the vacancies. The Dean should communicate as transparently as possible the present situation, and as soon as the budget situation becomes clear, decisions should be made about searches. However, it would be irresponsible of the Dean to make particular promises at this time, given the uncertainty of the budget.*

2. **Academic leadership should be coming from academically successful, professionally ambitious faculty.** *Incentives and support should be offered encourage young faculty to take leadership.*
3. **Startup funds for new faculty should be increased.** *The College agrees that this is a priority. However, unless additional resources can be made available to the College, this probably cannot be done in the immediate future.*

Department of Linguistics

The review team notes with approval the decision of the Department of Linguistics to develop a special strength in language documentation and conservation. Among the recommendations, the most far-reaching is the proposal to consider an undergraduate major.

1. **Retirements should be replaced.** *The College agrees with this recommendation but notes that the present financial uncertainty makes definite promises irresponsible.*
2. **Innovative interdisciplinary initiatives should be supported.** *The College should continue its support for such initiatives, in particular for the work in biocultural studies, which can bridge (at least) language, art, literature, biology, and geography.*
3. **Funding for campus visits should be restored.** *The Dean should provide funding on a case-by-case basis for campus visits of the top applicants to the PhD program. This has been done on an experimental basis during the 2013-2014 recruiting season. The Department has proposed a “recruitment incentive” system whereby top applicants will either get a visit to campus, or, if they are willing to commit to coming, get a payment equivalent to the trip. It may be difficult to implement this idea.*
4. **Look into issues with time-to-degree for the MA.** *The College should encourage the Department to investigate the reasons for the rather long time-to-degree in the MA and to explore actions that might be taken to shorten it.*
5. **The possibility of an undergraduate major should be explored.** *The Department should review the earlier proposal for the undergraduate major in Linguistics (which foundered during the approval process). The Dean believes that an undergraduate major might be advantageous, and the College would support a proposal for a BA if the Department decided to make such a proposal.*
6. **The lab APT position should be full time.** *The Dean has asked the Director of the Center for Language and Technology to work with the Linguistics and SLS Departments to analyze the support needs of the Language Acquisition and Experimentation Labs. The Dean is prepared to consider additional APT support if needed.*
7. **The sound booths in the phonetics lab should be replaced.** *The College will explore whether the replacement is required and how it can be paid for.*

8. **Facilities problems in the temporary buildings should be addressed.** As long as the research facilities must be housed in old temporary buildings, problems will be continue. *The Dean should work with the Vice Chancellor on a long-term solution that would move essential research labs into more appropriate facilities.*
9. **An effective development agenda for the Department should be developed.** *The College should hire its own specialist in community and alumni relations and the UH Foundation should have a dedicated development office for LLL, to work with departments to establish development plans.*

Department of Second Language Studies

The review team concurs that Second Language Studies is a very strong, world-class department. The report does not note significant problems with faculty or programs. The reputation of the Department depends on the faculty, and the report does note that there have been some important losses in faculty recently. Because the faculty are generally leaders in their fields, there will often be attempts to lure them away to positions of higher salary and at universities of higher overall prestige. It is therefore important to create and maintain excellent working conditions for them here in LLL.

1. **Maintain the present 2–2 teaching load.** *The College intends to do so.*
2. **Department should provide clear information about degree requirements.** *The Department should strengthen its internal advising system and work with the newly created Humanities Advising office to improve information to students.*
3. **Library holdings should be strengthened, and access improved.** The Dean was unaware of these problems. *The College should work with the Library to ensure electronic access to key journals and to permit scholars to access the stacks during construction.*
4. **A new staff member should be appointed to aid with the advising in the undergraduate program.** The undergraduate program has achieved a much greater enrollment than was anticipated when the program was established. It is unreasonable to expect the ELI Director to continue to double as undergraduate advisor. *The College should make the appointment of an advisor for SLS a high priority.*
5. **The facilities for the Hawai‘i English Language Program are deplorable; new facilities are required.** (The National Foreign Language Resource Center is also housed in an old temporary building, but they can manage.) This problem of facilities for HELP is a part of the larger problem of adequate facilities for international programs and services. Because it is integral to the mission of SLS, HELP’s location far from Moore Hall is also a problem. *The University should find a new location for HELP, with modern classrooms, on upper campus, and close to other facilities for international students.*

6. **Some improvements are needed in the administrative staffing in SLS.** *The Dean and the LLL Chief Administrative Officer have met with the Department Chair to discuss the staffing situation in the Department. A job description is being developed. Much depends on funding.*