

Chart 12: Linguistics Four-year Map



## University of Hawai'i at Hilo – Four-Year Academic Plan 2018-2019

Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani

Bachelor of Arts (BA) - Linguistics

This is a sample academic plan. Students should meet with an academic advisor prior to registration to formulate their own plan.

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<b>Fall</b>	<b>Fall</b>	<b>Fall</b>	<b>Fall</b>
LING 102 (DH: Humanities) 3	Lang/Aux Lang 1 (GL: LANG ARTS) 4	LING 321 3	GE GCC (Rec: LING 432) 3
DS: SOC SCI I 3	DA or DL: ARTS, LIT II 3	LING Structure (Upper) 3	LING Upper Elective 3
FGA, FGB or FGC: GLOBAL MULTICUL I 3	GQR: QUANT REASONING 3	LING Concentration II 3	Upper Elective 3
Elective 3	DB: BIOL SCI or DP: PHYS SCI 3	Aux Lang 3 4	GE HPP (Rec: LING 442) 3
Elective 3	DY: SCI LAB 1	Upper Elective 3	WI Elective 3
Credits 15	Credits 14	Credits 16	Credits 15
<b>Spring</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Spring</b>
ENG 100 (FW: WRIT COM) 3	LING 311 3	Aux Lang 4 4	LING 490 3
FQ: QUANT REASONING 3	DB: BIOL SCI or DP: PHYS SCI 3	LING Maint Revitaliz (Upper) 3	Upper Elective 3
DS: SOC SCI II 3	Aux Lang 2 4	LING Applied (Upper) 3	Upper Elective 3
FGA, FGB or FGC: GLOBAL MULTICUL II 3	LING Concentration I 3	LING Concentration III 3	WI Elective 3
Elective 3	Elective 3	WI Upper Elective 3	Elective 3
Credits 15	Credits 16	Credits 16	Credits 15
<b>Summer</b>	<b>Summer</b>	<b>Summer</b>	<b>Summer</b>
Credits 0	Credits 0	Credits 0	Credits 0
<b>Total Credits 30</b>	<b>Total Credits 60</b>	<b>Total Credits 92</b>	<b>Total Credits 122</b>

## Notes:

1. Students must earn at least a 2.0 GPA in courses required for the major.
2. At least 45 credits must be earned in courses at the 300- or 400- level.

Rev:  
5/15/18

This map sets out a course of study that includes not just the requirements for the Linguistics major but also general education requirements. While each student is unique, a point which becomes clear through individual advising, these academic maps are important because they include all necessary graduation credits and thus serve as visible evidence that it is possible to finish the Linguistics degree within four years.

*Student Learning Outcomes*

In addition to creating a four-year academic map, the Linguistics Program has worked with the administration to formulate a set of student learning outcomes (SLOs) that can be measured through assessment. These SLOs have been created at the program level as well as for each individual course. Box 3 below displays the SLOs at the program level.

## Box 7: Student Learning Outcomes at the Program level

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Linguistics provides students with a broad introduction to the field. Upon successful completion of their degree, students will be able to:

1. Explain the major academic theories of language with a focus on what they say about the relationship between language and human beings.
2. Through the study of phonetics and phonology, demonstrate knowledge of how sound patterns work and analyze phonological data.
3. Through the study of morphology and syntax, describe the structure of words and sentences and analyze morphological and syntactic data.

4. Demonstrate basic knowledge of the semantic and pragmatic properties of languages and analyze semantic and pragmatic data.
5. Through the study of discourse analysis, analyze data to explain how language works in discourse.
6. Identify structural and cultural features of languages relevant in the Hawai‘i Pan Pacific such as Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, English, and Hawai‘i Creole.
7. Explain the relationship among language, culture, and society and critically evaluate how language plays a central role in social and political issues such as gender and racial discrimination, immigration attitudes and laws, and educational policies.
8. Locate and utilize reliable scholarly information in academic journals and books as a part of engaging in academic linguistic research and write a cohesive research paper of approximately four thousands words on a pertinent linguistic topic that is organized succinctly with at least an introduction, body, and conclusion and that includes foot/endnotes and citations.
9. Employ audiovisual materials and appropriate technology such as PowerPoint as part of a succinctly organized ten-minute presentation of linguistic research findings to an audience.
10. Demonstrate a working knowledge of two languages other than English.

It can be seen that this list of SLOs has an emphasis in numbers 1-5 on what are often considered the core areas of Linguistics, namely, phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. Moreover, outcome 6 indicates the effort made by the program to emphasize the local environment in which the program is embedded with a focus on languages such as Hawaiian and Hawai‘i Creole, as well as languages like Japanese, Chinese, and English that have played an important role in the history of Hawai‘i. Outcome 7 links to both a local and global context with its focus on broader social and political factors that influence language. It is this outcome in particular that is relevant for students specializing in language maintenance and revitalization, including the Hawaiian situation and also minority and endangered languages throughout the world. Outcomes 8 and 9 focus on developing the research skills of students. These are important not just for students preparing for the graduate level but also for students seeking jobs that require research, writing, and presentation skills. Outcome 10 aligns with the language requirement of the program that prompts students to expand their understandings at an international level.

Each individual course in the Linguistics Program has been designed with these ten outcomes in mind. The following chart, Chart 13, offers a sense of how some of the individual courses support these outcomes (this chart only includes the courses, except for the language requirement, taught by Linguistics faculty). It was first created in approximately 2009 and has since been updated to go along with the revisions to the Linguistics Program.



the practice of focusing on one core competency per year, the Linguistics Program has assessed written communication in 2013-2014, information literacy in 2015-2016, oral communication in 2016-2017, and written communication again in 2017-2018. The school year 2014-2015 was reserved by UHH for quantitative reasoning but after discussion with members of the Assessment Support Committee at the campus level, it was determined that the Linguistics Program would not participate given the minimal role of statistics in the Linguistics curriculum.

In order to assess the core competencies, the two full-time faculty in Linguistics, Saft and Ohara, convened at the end of each spring semester to measure the work of students based on the rubric and ranking system developed by the Assessment Support Committee at UHH. The rubrics for the three competencies are shown below in Charts 14-16.

Chart 14: Assessment Rubric for Written Communication

Rubric for Written Communication

	Line of Reasoning	Organization and Structure	Content	Language/Prose/Syntax
4 (Advanced)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Composes a well-defined thesis that is supported by coherent and relevant arguments.</li> <li>Argument is coherent and develops a clear line of logical reasoning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization of ideas/information is well-planned, and organized; structure enhances the message or argument.</li> <li>Paragraphs are well-developed, and paragraph breaks enhance the main points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exhibits original insight into the content</li> <li>Content illuminates the argument and/or message</li> </ul>	Uses grammatically correct prose that is highly appropriate to the audience; paper successfully utilizes complex sentence structures; prose is articulate and sophisticated.
3 (Competent)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constructs an identifiable thesis with some gaps or inconsistencies in reasoning.</li> <li>Minor gaps in logic but the overall argument is linear and coherent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some organizational problems evident.</li> <li>Paragraphs are developed but exhibit a few inappropriate breaks, or transitions between paragraphs are awkward.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content is adequately addressed</li> <li>Content generally supports main argument.</li> </ul>	Minor problems with grammar or punctuation, but sentences generally make sense; sentence structure is simplistic; prose may be conversational or somewhat inappropriate for purpose of the assignment or the audience.
2 (Emerging)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis is weak, unclear or too broad for assignment, but has some relevance to the body of essay or presentation.</li> <li>Paper utilizes only marginally coherent set of ideas; connections between some ideas and arguments are missing or underdeveloped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some attempt at organizing ideas/information but reasoning for that ordering is not apparent.</li> <li>Paragraphs are underdeveloped or and/or transitions between them are problematic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content is only superficially addressed.</li> <li>Content does not fully support main argument.</li> </ul>	Exhibits grammatical problems but overall meaning of sentences is not totally obscured; prose may not reflect an understanding of standard English; may lack an understanding of the purpose of the assignment or the audience.
1 (Beginning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No discernible thesis (unable to construct an argument).</li> <li>The paper is a collection of unrelated ideas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraphs are or appear non-existent.</li> <li>Transitions between paragraphs are non-existent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content is not appropriate to the assignment or minimally used.</li> <li>Content does not relate to the argument being made.</li> </ul>	Prose is largely incomprehensible; major grammatical and punctuation problems; major syntax problems at the sentence level.

\* This column is used to simultaneously assess critical thinking

Chart 15: Assessment Rubric for Information Literacy

## Rubric for Information Literacy

	Document Conventions	Appropriateness of Sources	Evaluating Sources*	Integrating Sources*
4 (Advanced)	Properly documents citations and sources	All sources are relevant, credible and appropriate	Demonstrates a clear understanding of the materials' criteria for inclusion: authority, timeliness, and accuracy	Synthesizes information with a clear sense of direction/purpose
3 (Competent)	Few errors with citation format	Most of the sources are relevant, credible and appropriate	Demonstrates an adequate examination of the information	Adequately synthesizes information but conclusions or interpretations may seem obvious
2 (Emerging)	Incorrect use of required citation format	Most sources are neither relevant nor credible	Reflects an attempt to examine the information	Exhibits problems in synthesizing information
1 (Beginning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No citations and bibliography</li> <li>Note: Any evidence of plagiarism automatically drops the score for this column to a 0.</li> </ul>	No relevant or credible sources	Reflects no effort to examine the information	Reflects no synthesis of information

\*These columns simultaneously assess critical thinking

Chart 16: Assessment Rubric for Oral Communication

## Rubric for Oral Communication

	Organization and Structure*	Content*	Language*	Delivery
4 (Advanced)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation is highly organized, with a logical sequence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content strongly exhibits insight into the subject matter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language choices strongly enhance the effectiveness of the presentation and are also appropriate to the audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery techniques (gestures, eye contact, vocal expressiveness) are highly engaging</li> </ul>
3 (Competent)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation is adequately organized, with a discernible sequence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content adequately exhibits insight into the subject matter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language choices adequately support the effectiveness of the presentation and are also appropriate to the audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery techniques (gestures, eye contact, vocal expressiveness) are adequate</li> </ul>
2 (Emerging)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The organization of the presentation lacks focus, and exhibits major gaps in logic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content is only superficially addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language choices partially support the effectiveness of the presentation and are also appropriate to the audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery techniques (gestures, eye contact, vocal expressiveness) do not engage the audience</li> </ul>
1 (Beginning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization is not evident</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content displays no insight into the subject matter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language choices minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation and/or are not appropriate to the audience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery techniques (gestures, eye contact, vocal expressiveness) detract from the presentation</li> </ul>

\*These two columns simultaneously assess critical thinking

\*Choices need to be both effective and appropriate for 2, 3, & 4

Based on the measuring system of 1-4 employed in these rubrics (shown on the far left column of each rubric), Saft and Ohara chose one graded activity from one upper division 400-level LING course to assess. For Written Assessment in 2013-2014, Saft and Ohara

chose the final research paper for LING 442: Languages in Hawai‘i. For Information Literacy in 2015-2016, they selected the final research paper from LING 490: Resources and Methods in Linguistics, for Oral Communication in 2016-2017, it was the final presentation from the capstone course LING 490, and for Written Communication in 2017-2018, they chose again the final research paper from LING 490. The results of these assessments are show below in charts 17-20. The scores given for each student represent the average of the two ratings from Saft and Ohara. Average scores are shown at the bottom of each chart in yellow highlights.

Chart 17: Results of Assessment of Written Communication 2013-2014

	Reasoning	Organization/ Structure	Content	Language/Prose/ Style
Student 1 M	3	2.5	2.5	3
Student 2 M	2	2	3	3
Student 3 M	3	2	3	3
Student 4 M	2.5	2.5	3.5	3
Student 5 NM	2.5	2.5	2	2
Student 6 NM	2.5	2	1.5	3
Student 7 NM	2.5	2	1.5	2
Student 8 NM	3.5	3	3	3
Student 9 NM	2.5	1.5	1.5	2
Student 10 NM	2	2	2.5	2.5
Student 11 M	3.5	3	3	3
Student 12 NM	3	2.5	3.5	2.5
Student 13 NM	2.5	2	1	2
Student 14 NM	2.5	2	2.5	2
Student 15 M	3.5	2.5	3.5	3
Student 16 NM	2	1.5	2	2
Student 17 M	3	3	3	3
Student 18 M	3	3	3.5	3
Student 19 NM	2	2.5	2	2.5
Student 20 NM	3	3.5	3	2.5
Student 21 NM	3.5	3	3	3
Student 22 M	2.5	3	2.5	2
Student 23 M	3	2.5	3.5	3
Student 24 M	2.5	3	4	3

Student 25	NM	2.5	2	2.5	3
Student 26	M	3	3.5	4	4
Student 27	M	2	2.5	3	2
Student 28	M	3	3	3	3
Student 29	NM	2.5	2	3	3
Student 30	NM	2	2.5	3	3
Student 31	NM	2	2	1.5	3
Majors M		<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>2.92</b>
Non-majors NM		2.53	2.26	2.44	2.5

(M) Majors =14

(NM) Non-majors =17

Chart 18: Results of Assessment of Information Literacy 2015-2016

Student	Document Conventions	Appropriateness of Sources	Evaluating Sources	Integrating Sources
Student 1	3	3	2	3
Student 2	3	4	3	3
Student 3	3	4	4	4
Student 4	4	4	3	4
Student 5	3	2	2	2
Student 6	3	3	2	3
Student 7	3	3	4	3
Student 8	3	3	3	3
Student 9	4	3	4	3
Student 10	4	4	4	4
Student 11	3	3	3	3
Student 12	4	3	3	3
Student 13	3	3	3	3
Student 14	4	3	3	3
Student 15	3	3	3	4
Student 16	2	3	2	3
Student 17	2	3	3	3
Average	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.18</b>

Chart 19: Results of Assessment of Oral Communication 2016-2017

Student	Organization/ Structure	Content	Language	Delivery
Student 1	3	2.5	3	2.5
Student 2	3.5	4	4	3.5
Student 3	3	3.5	3.5	3
Student 4	3.5	4	4	3.5
Student 5	2.5	2	3	3
Student 6	3.5	3	4	3.5
Student 7	3.5	2.5	3	3
Student 8	3	3	3.5	3.5
Student 9	4	3.5	3	4
Student 10	3.5	3	3.5	3
Student 11	2	2.5	2	2
Student 12	3	3.5	3	2.5
Student 13	3.5	4	3	3.5
Student 14	3	2.5	2.5	2.5
Student 15	3	3.5	3.5	3.5
Student 16	3	4	3.5	3
Average	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.10</b>

Chart 20: Results of Assessment of Written Communication 2017-2018

Student	Reasoning	Organization/ Structure	Content	Language/Prose/ Style
Student 1	3.5	3.5	3.5	3
Student 2	4	3.5	4	4
Student 3	3	3	4	3.5
Student 4	4	3	4	3.5
Student 5	3.5	3.5	4	2.5
Student 6	3.5	2	2	3.5
Student 7	3	2	2	3.5
Student 8	4	3.5	4	3
Student 9	3.5	2.5	2	3
Student 10	3.5	3	4	3
Student 11	4	4	3.5	3



---

Average	3.6	3.05	3.36	3.23
---------	-----	------	------	------

---

In general, the average ratings are at or above 3.0, which signifies competence according to the rubrics. The only exception is Chart 17, where the scores for three of the four categories are below 3.0. Still, it can be noted that the competency measured in Chart 17, namely, written communication (in 2013-2014), was also measured four years later in 2017-2018 in the Linguistics capstone course LING 490. The scores in Chart 20 are all above 3.0 and are higher than the scores in Chart 17, a result which suggests that the curricular changes implemented in 2014, including the addition of a capstone course to focus on research and writing, is having a positive effect on the writing skills of the Linguistics majors. To be sure, continued diligence is necessary to foster the competencies of the students in all areas, but the results of the assessments engaged in thus far by the Linguistics faculty indicate that the students are developing academic skills at a level that is competent and in some cases approaching advanced.

### *Student and Faculty Activities*

The maintenance of a high quality of education in any program or department depends greatly on the hard work of the faculty. This effort, first of all, is apparent in the Linguistics Program in the attempts by the faculty to deliver courses through an online format in addition to the traditional classroom approach. Saft typically teaches two online courses every summer, LING 102 and LING 442, Ohara teaches one in the summer, LING 356 (Language and Gender), and Perez teaches one section of LING 102 online every semester. In addition, Saft has also delivered his Ph.D. courses, KLAN 701 and KLAN 702 through an online format. Through such a practice, the program has increased its ability to reach students and, in the process, assisted not only majors in Linguistics but also students in other majors who, due to scheduling conflicts, prefer to take as many of their courses online as possible.

In addition to online courses, the faculty work hard to offer students opportunities to gain experiences related to linguistics outside of the classroom. Ohara, in particular, is in charge of coordinating actual work opportunities, both volunteer and paid positions, for students at different programs within and outside of the University of Hawai‘i System. She sends students to work as tutors, teachers’ assistants, and/or conversation partners at the English Language Institute that is part of UHH, the Learning Center that is also at UHH, the Intensive English Program at Hawai‘i Community College, United Hawai‘i College located in Hilo, Hawai‘i Island Tutoring (a company in Hilo), St. Joseph Junior High and High School (located in Hilo), Waiākea High School in Hilo, and the Mālamalama Waldorf School in Kea‘au on the island of Hawai‘i. At all of these places, students are involved in the teaching and tutoring of either English as a second language or of languages such as English (to other speakers of English) and Japanese. Given that many of our Linguistics majors desire to teach English and other languages in the future, these work opportunities give them valuable experience that builds on their work in the classroom and that they can include in graduate school and job applications.

Furthermore, the faculty also regularly include Linguistics majors in activities they engage in outside of classroom. Ohara, for example, has initiated monthly meetings on