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

November 3, 2011

TO: Reed Dasenbrock
              Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

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

SUBJECT: Program Review Three-year Progress Report

In fall 2009, Joseph O'Mealy, then Dean of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature, submitted to you a one-year progress report in response to the program review of fall 2008. In fall 2010, I submitted a two-year progress report. This memorandum is the three-year progress report—an updated account of our efforts to respond in areas previously identified. It concentrates on the matters that were specifically raised in our discussions of the two-year progress report last year, and in your memorandum of November 5, 2011, in which you identified several areas of continuing concern.

1. Faculty workload policy.

At the time of the last program review, LLL's faculty members had differing course workloads depending on what department they were in. There were "2-2" departments, where I3+ faculty had a basic load of two courses per semester, "3-2" departments, and "3-3" departments. And, there was no college-level policy that gave any rationale for these disparities. There was no written college-level policy, and not all departments themselves had policies.

Now, we have developed a written college policy and also written policies for each department. All these will be approved before the end of this semester. (The IPLL policy is just now being finalized—hence the delay; the problems were complex because of the diversity in size and character of the programs with IPLL.)

The new college implementation of workload policy has the following important characteristics:

a. **Single basic course workload for the college.** The college-wide basic course workload is 3-2.

b. **Mechanisms for going up and down.** All departments have mechanisms in place both for increasing the number of courses taught for faculty who are less productive in other areas (specifically research), and for releasing faculty from course teaching if they are especially productive in other areas. This means, for practical purposes, that faculty can go from 3-2 up to 3-3 or down to 3-2.

c. **Possibility of 2-2.** A department may expect, as a matter of departmental culture and policy, sustained research productivity from ALL members of the department. A department with such an expectation is likely to be one in which graduate education and research is at the center of the department's mission. Such a department may seek approval from the dean for a system of "blanket" reductions to 2-2. Such a department must present an internal mechanism for ensuring that, without exception, all faculty members are research-active. If a department can meet this requirement of universal productivity, it is, in effect, a "2-2" department. However, this "2-2" designation does not inhere in the department itself, but is contingent on research productivity of all members of the department. If not all department members are productive, the department loses its "blanket 2-2" status, effectively "reverting to 3-2," with a case-by-case mechanism for reductions. Linguistics and SLS are the departments most likely to qualify for universal reductions to 2-2.

d. **Possibility of 3-3.** It may happen that average class size in a program housed within a department is very small, while the number of classes that must be offered is large compared to the number of faculty. IPLL is such a department. Under the newly proposed IPLL policy, basic course workload for a faculty member will be increased from 3-2 to 3-3 if the total number of student semesters hours per year falls below a thresh-hold (60 SSH in the current draft— arguably too low). This permits us to make the right distinctions within IPLL without having to make IPLL a "3-3" department as before.

e. **Monitoring of workload.** Beginning this fall, we have instituted annual workload reporting requirements for all departments and all faculty. The LLL office offered to prepare a uniform form and collect the data for departments. All department have signed on to this uniform system. Data has already been collected and organized for some departments, and the reports for all departments will be complete by the end of November. The workload report of one department (EALL) is attached as an example. Department chairs can use this information to make duty assignments and evaluate requests for reductions. Early in spring semester, the dean and associate dean will meet individually with each department chair to consider the following matters: whether disparities seems to exist; what plans there are to deal with the disparities; what other uses the department is making of the reports; and how the reporting system can be improved.

2. Supporting research, especially in strong programs such as SLS and Linguistics.

We continue to make efforts to improve support for graduate students. Departments are now encouraged to consider using graduate teaching assistants instead of lecturers in teaching (despite the additional cost—and in contrast to earlier policy). English has expanded GA use somewhat, but may have reached a practical limit. There may be possibilities for EALL to expand the use of GAs, but a long-standing instructor-based teaching system in lower division, especially in Japanese, is a constraining factor. LLEA has very limited graduate programs, and increasing support there is not as high a priority. There are likely to be possibilities in SLS and Linguistics, where expansion of undergraduate enrollment will probably provide an opportunity for increased use of graduate teaching assistants. We will also encourage programs that have no graduate programs (such as those in IPLL, or some programs in LLEA) to employ students in other

departments as GAs in their programs (these graduate students will most likely be in SLS or Linguistics, but they might be in other departments, as for example, a graduate student in French teaching in Tahitian).

We have raised the salary level of all GAs in the college by one step.

The private Bilinski Foundation grant, which we said last year we were hoping to obtain, has come through and has already supported four students in SLS and Linguistics, in the final stage of the graduate careers, with grants of $25,000 each. We just received approval of an expansion of the Bilinksi fellowships, now to support students at a slightly earlier stage of the graduate study—just before the dissertation begins.

The LLL Research Support Committee continues to work well; we have managed to fund every travel application that has been submitted. LLL faculty know that if they cannot be funded from URC, they will almost certainly be funded by LLL. This has permitted some to present second papers in one year. It has also permitted faculty who are lower on the URC priority lists (because they are senior full professors, for example), to obtain funding.

We have expanded the Language Acquisition and Research Laboratory, with new equipment.

One possibility is still being explored: the idea of having some sort of grant-getting or grants-support personnel associated with the college, or perhaps shared with another college, such as SPAS. We are still at an early stage of our discussions with SPAS.

3. Redistributing resources in response to enrollment.

We think the College is doing very well in this regard. The program review mentioned Samoan and Korean, particularly as perhaps needing additional resources. We have added faculty in both these areas. This year, we will add another instructor (I2) in Samoan; this instructor replaces a reliance on lecturers for about 24 credits of Samoan courses per year, giving greater stability to the program.

We have also made very good progress in ensuring that high-demand courses, especially in English, Spanish, and Japanese, have sufficient numbers of sections to accommodate demand. Partly in response to pressure from the VCAA's office, we are streamlining placement testing in LLEA and EALL so that required placement testing does not interfere with the students' use of the "pre-registration" system. Required placement testing has been eliminated in EALL. Spanish is now experimentally eliminating placement testing requirements this semester, in order to identify possible problems, with the intent of getting rid of this obstacle before pre-registration begins in the spring 2012 for the following fall.

4. Developing a strategic sense of languages across the campus, especially those of the Asia-Pacific region.

The efforts that we described last year have borne fruit, especially the orientation of LLEA more toward Europe. Our new hires in German and French/Francophone Pacific are on board. We hope to build strength in Okinawan language and culture in EALL—an area of importance across UH and in the Hawaiʻi community. Problems with the search procedure delayed a faculty hire in EALL in precisely this area. We will re-describe the position and re-launch the search later this year. It is not clear whether we can get someone on board fall 2012. We must try to solve these problems as quickly as possible.

In the English Department, we continue to emphasize the Asia-Pacific connection. We are now seeking a new faculty member with a special interest in Pacific literatures, including oral traditions, ideally with proficiency in a Pacific language.

The plan to develop programs with the professional schools (specifically Engineering), which would combine a professional decree with a language major, has not moved nearly as quickly as I had hoped. However, I am convinced that the obstacles can be overcome.

5. Assessment.

We are generally doing well in assessment, as we noted in our previous progress report. Dr. Kimi Kondo-Brown has now returned to the LLL dean's office as Associate Dean. She is an expert in this assessment and has this area as a major responsibility; especially, she will work to make sure that the results of assessment are used to improve programs. One specific area that clearly needed improvement last year was the development of curriculum maps. We were below the campus average of 46% of programs with maps. Now, we are at 76%—well above average. All LLL programs currently without a curriculum map are on track to develop them during spring 2012, so we will soon be at 100%.

6. Advising.

All undergraduate programs in LLL now have mandatory advising systems in place. There are differences among programs in the way this is done, and in the function that early advising seems to play in the programs. In part, these differences relate to the nature of the programs. For example, in some LLL programs, there is a sense that "real" work in the major doesn't begin until after the freshman year, or even not until upper-division courses. In fact, majors may not even be declared until late. Or, early major declarations may be placeholders (students who put down "English", because it's something they know about but do not think of themselves as English majors). This may mean that contact between faculty and students (as between advisor and major-advisee) in the early semesters may be minimal or pro-forma. In other cases, especially in some of the smaller programs, there is extensive contact, and in these cases, advising happens naturally and "mandatory" systems are hardly necessary. These are not problems, per se. Certainly, they are not insuperable obstacles to effective advising, but they are differences that must be considered.

In Arts and Sciences, advising responsibilities are partly fulfilled at the department level (especially as regards specifics of the major) and partly at Arts and Sciences level (especially as

regards navigating the UH undergraduate requirements). We are making progress in this articulation, but challenges remain, especially with respect to staffing levels and leadership in Arts and Sciences Student Academic Services. Also, the fact that advising of undeclared Arts and Sciences majors ("general" A&S) is done in a different unit may be a source of confusion. The membership of the Council of Deans is changing, and we will address these matters as a priority.

Attachment: 2011 EALL Workload Report