

**Site-visit Report**  
**on**  
**Doctorate in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization**  
**Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani (College of Hawaiian Language)**  
**University of Hawai‘i at Hilo**

**Submitted to Vice Chancellor Dr. Philip D. Castille**  
**by Akira and Kimiko (Fumiko) Yamamoto**  
**December 16, 2008**

**Background**

The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges described its concerns and recommendations in the letter of 30 June 2008 to Chancellor Tseng. Some of the concerns are of the university level, such as the University’s funding base expansion, the University’s governance structures, the need for increasing the diversity of the faculty and staff, and campus-wide engagement in the assessment of student learning, and some are at the specific program level, such as the doctoral programs in Pharmacy and in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization.

The Commission letter states that “[w]hile the Pharmacy doctorate appears to be functioning well, the new doctorate in Hawaiian and Indigenous Languages (sic) and Culture revitalization is the subject of serious concern” (p. 3). The first and foremost concern stems from the fact that “4 of the 5 doctoral students in the program also hold professional rank in the program’s college” (p. 3). This is summarized as the “serious concerns about the quality and integrity” of the doctorate program. It strongly recommends for the doctoral program to function with “the highest standards of quality and integrity” so that the program’s credibility and viability are ensured (pp. 3~4).

The Commission letter also emphasizes the importance of clarifying the organizational structures and decision-making processes that will formalize and codify “determination of the roles, responsibilities, and authority of the Cabinet, the Deans, the Faculty Congress, and the college Senates” (p. 3).

**Introduction**

We, Akira Yamamoto (PhD in Linguistic Anthropology, Emeritus, University of Kansas) and Kimiko (Fumiko) Yamamoto (PhD in Comparative Literature, Emeritus, University of Kansas), made a site-visit to the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo (UHH) during the period of 18<sup>th</sup> ~ 21<sup>st</sup> of November, 2008. The purpose of this visit was to address the specific issues that had been described in the June 30 Commission Action letter concerning the doctoral program in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization (DHILCR) in Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani, the College of Hawaiian Language. In addition, we have also looked into the issues related to the position of the Dean of Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani.

During the 3 and a half day visit with the UHH, we interviewed and met with the following individuals:

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Dr. Philip D. Castille  
 Dr. Dan Brown, Chair, Graduate Division

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Dr. April Komenaka  
Dr. David K. Sing, Director, Center for gifted & Talented Native Hawaiian  
Children  
Ms. Gail Makuakāne-Lundin, Director, Kīpuka-Native Hawaiian Student Center

Dr. Kalena Silva, Head, Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani  
Dr. William Wilson, Program Leader, Doctor of Philosophy in Hawaiian and  
Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization, Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani  
Dr. Charles (Kale) Langlas, Program Leader, Master of Arts in Hawaiian  
Language and Literature, Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani  
Ms. Kauanoē Kamana, Faculty, Principal of Laboratory School and also doctoral  
student, Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani  
Ms. Lei Kapono, Assistant to Dean, Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani  
Mr. Larry Kimura, faculty and also doctoral student, Ka Haka ‘Ula O  
Ke‘elikōlani  
Mr. Hiapo Perriera, faculty and also doctoral student, Ka Haka ‘Ula O  
Ke‘elikōlani  
Dr. Yumiko Ohara, faculty, Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani  
Dr. Scott Saft, faculty, Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani  
Ms. and officially soon-to-be Dr. Catherine (Katarina) Anne Edmonds, doctoral  
student from New Zealand, Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani

During the meetings, information on the state of DHILCR in specific and the graduate program of Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani in general was gathered. Open-ended questions and discussions also ensued. These are summarized in each of the sections below as “Observations” followed by “Recommendations.” Recommendations are intended to respond to the issues raised by the June 30, 2008 Accrediting Commission Action Letter of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

On Thursday, 20<sup>th</sup> November, we were able to attend the dissertation defense by the first doctoral candidate of the DHILCR Program Katherine Ann Edmonds. This was a very special and important event for several reasons that will be discussed below under Item 4 “Conflict of interest.”

### **General Observations**

The position and role of Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani at the University of Hawai‘i Hilo (UHH):

The College seems to have performed well in expanding the mission of UHH and in contributing to the campus-wide diversity enhancing efforts, as evidenced in:

- a. having created the advanced academic degree programs to be more competitive with other higher education institutions, thus raising the visibility of UHH in the global community;
- b. contributing to the campus-wide diversity efforts by
  - increasing the enrollment of Native Hawaiian students at the undergraduate level as well as at the graduate level

- increasing the Native Hawaiian faculty towards increasing the under-represented population
- increasing the course offerings that satisfy the general education requirements

Thus, strengthening the capacity of Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani will further enhance the education of and services to the UHH students, bring the visibility of UHH in the UH System and beyond, and, importantly, reach out to and involve the Native Hawaiian and other indigenous communities that satisfy some of the goals of the UHH missions.

We will now look at specific issues raised by WASC Accrediting Commission letter of June 30, 2008:

## 1. Clarifying admissions requirements for the PhD

### Observations:

Admission Requirements (Addendum page 17): It should be noted that the College has worked on and is continuing to refine the doctoral program admission requirements. The statement of admission requirements is generally clear and it shows the difference between the requirements for the master’s and doctoral students.

### Recommendations:

#### a. Requirement #2

Language fluency itself is difficult to standardize. “Exceptional level fluency” is even more difficult to demonstrate. Perhaps something like: “Competence and academic knowledge of the applicant’s indigenous language of focus as demonstrated by a taped speech and written essay with English translation.”

#### b. Requirement #4

Add: “when the sample is in the applicant’s indigenous language of focus, English translation must accompany the original”

#### c. Requirements #5, #6 and #7

Delete these from here, but add at the very beginning of the Admission Requirements. Thus, in place of Requirements 5, 6, and 7, we suggest the following:

**Suggested Requirement 5** (note that this replaces requirements 5, 6, and 7).

An applicant’s letter that clearly states her/his academic objectives and that clearly indicates diversity experience concerning the contemporary status of an indigenous or threatened language and culture, experience in educational service to the community of the applicant’s indigenous language of focus, research interest, and the applicant’s plans for future occupation or profession. Also include any additional information that may assist the selection of the applicant’s graduate adviser. In summary, the letter should include the following:

1. Statement of academic objects

2. Statement of diversity experience
3. Statement of community service experience, if any
4. Statement of research interest
5. Statement of the future plan

**The letter should be written in the applicant’s language of focus with an accompanying translation in English.**

**Suggested Requirement 6. A copy of the curriculum vitae or resumé**

**d. Requirement #10:**

The UHH Graduate admission policies has a paragraph on GRE: “... Applicants who have completed a graduate program at a regionally-accredited U.S. institution or its equivalent from a recognized non-U.S. institution are not required to submit GRE scores” (page 2).

**So, either (1) still require GRE scores or (2) change the wording to:**

“Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores. Submission of GRE scores is not required for those applicants who obtained a graduate degree from a regionally-accredited U.S. institution or its equivalent from a recognized non-U.S. institution.”

**e. Second column, first sentence of page 17:**

Delete “Such details take into account the status of different endangered languages relative to community use, level of revitalization, and stage of academic study.”

**2. Delineating the curriculum of the PhD vis-à-vis that of the MA and publishing a curriculum showing the differentiation between the two**

**Observations:**

At the time of the WASK Special Team’s visit on March 18-20, 2008, the UHH 2008-2009 Catalog was missing the description of graduate programs, both Masters as well as Doctorate. Upon examining the University Catalog Addendum (Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani Graduate/Certificate Programs) provided by Dr. Charles Langlas, we found that the curricular distinction between the MA and PhD programs was clear.

**Recommendations:**

**a. Master of Arts in Indigenous Language and Culture Education**

Program Description: it is intended to explain the Master’s Degree in Indigenous Language and Culture Education, but the description and the admission requirements virtually prohibit non-Hawaiian indigenous applicants from applying. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of the description (p. 15), we find the statement: “The M.A. in Indigenous Language and Culture Education currently offers only a non-thesis Practicing Track, which requires students to simultaneously pursue the Kahuawaiola Indigenous Teacher’s Education Certificate. The Certificate Program, however, is designed “to prepare Maui Ola Hawai‘i (Hawaiian identity

nurturing) teachers of the highest quality to teach in Hawaiian language medium schools, ..." (p. 13; emphasis added). Furthermore, the admission requirements for this Certificate Program include four years of Hawaiian language with a minimum GPA of 2.75 for the third and fourth years (p. 14, item #4) or passing HAW 490 Base-level fluency for Hawaiian medium education (p. 15, item #9). If the master's degree is to be targeted for "indigenous language and culture education practitioners such as teachers, administrators, and culture resource specialists" (p. 15, Program Description first paragraph), then the program needs a careful review and changes in the Program Title, Design, and its description.

### **Admission Requirements:**

**a.1.** The Admission Requirements #9 virtually denies any non-Hawaiian applicants to even think of applying:

- The Kahuawaiola Indigenous Teacher Education Program is in reality "the Kahuawaiola Hawaiian Teacher Education Program."
- Admission to the Kahuawaiola Indigenous Teacher Education Program requires 4 years of Hawaiian language, etc.

Thus, this master's degree program must be either (1) changed to Master of Arts in Hawaiian Language and Culture Education or (2) delete or re-formulate the requirement #9 (Addendum page 15).

Subsequently, the graduation requirements must be streamlined according to the change of admission requirements.

**a.2.** Requirement #3. What is a "metropolitan language"? At the college level, there are only a few places where indigenous language courses are offered. The requirement option of "30 credits of study in a chosen indigenous language of focus" would be next to impossible.

**a.3.** The College, as far as we know, has not set the **passing score**. Make this "Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores," without specifying "what score."

### **b. Master of Arts in Hawaiian Language and Literature**

#### **Entrance Requirements:**

**Change** "Entrance Requirements" to Admission Requirements

**b.1.** Requirement #4. What is an "examination in Hawaiian language and culture"? Is this given prior to the application for admission? Who administers the examination, when and where? Who is going to score it? How is the "passing" of the examination decided? How is it going to be communicated to the applicant?

**b.2.** Change the order of #5 and #6.

**b.3.** Requirement #6 (now #5): Change the wording to:

"In addition to courses taken to satisfy graduation requirements 1~ 4, earn 9 more semester hours in upper division and graduate Hawaiian Language or Hawaiian Studies courses from the following list, ..."

**c.** Doctor of Philosophy in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization (**See #1 above**)

### 3. Assessing student learning at both the master's level and the doctoral level

#### General Observations:

Prior to the visit by WASC Special Team in March 18-20, 2008, the College had assessed its doctoral students through their course work and observations of their activities. Since the visit, however, it has tirelessly worked to formalize the ways the graduate students (both master's and doctoral levels) be assessed their progress in their programs by a committee that involves at least one qualified member from the outside the College. First, their efforts to date have served and will continue to serve the graduate students concerning their progress and, thus, enable the faculty to guide their students and mentor them to become professionals. Second, these efforts will eliminate much of the issues surrounding the "conflict of interest." The mechanism of assessing the student learning is described below.

**Documentation of doctoral students' progress** [This is especially required by WASC for EACH of the current doctoral students.]

#### Observations:

- 3.1. admissions records (how evaluated): each doctoral (as well as MA) student's file should contain such records; need to prepare a clean file for each.
  - 3.2. graduate committee formation: need to update the information on timing, process of selection of committee members.
  - 3.3. comprehensive exam: need to have a concise statement on who postulate questions, who read the responses, form of exam (take-home, on-site, written, oral, electronic, etc.), how evaluated.
  - 3.4. dissertation project prospectus: need to have a clear guideline on the contents, length, timing of the prospectus submission, to whom (adviser, graduate committee, etc.), etc.
  - 3.5. annual progress review: need to have a statement on timing, how, by whom.
- By the way, on page 7 of the University Catalog Addendum, we read:

#### Annual Review Form

The primary academic advisor will submit an annual review form for each graduate student .... This form will include data concerning number of credits earned; progress toward meeting other requirements such as papers, projects, or theses; GPA; and other specific requirements for the graduate degree.

#### Recommendation:

This section, along with Section 4 below, addresses the issues surrounding "conflict of interest." It is important to show WASC Commission that students are evaluated from the time of admission to the time of their completing the doctoral dissertation defense, and that the evaluation enlists specialists from outside the College.

- a. Develop a checklist for admission:
  - Graduate division's general requirements (indicate when received)
  - College's own requirements

- Date when the full application completed (so that the evaluation can begin)
- b. Develop a checklist for fulfilling the graduate requirements of the College (including the date when a specific requirement is completed and how – e.g. taking a course, submitting a paper; who the instructor/evaluator is – esp. noting the outside faculty citing her/his institution, degree, specialization, etc.)
- Course work (such as those listed on page 17) – when completed, with whom (instructor, esp. note if the instructor is an outside expert)
  - Two areas of specialization: date chosen, specific faculty (outside College expert must be clearly indicated), how each specialization is fulfilled.
  - Graduate Committee: names of the members, date formed, etc.
  - Comprehensive examination: date taken, how (oral, written, projects), with whom (an individual expert, committee, etc.)
  - Dissertation Committee: date formed, members (highlight the outside experts), attach the approved dissertation proposal
  - Dissertation project prospectus/proposal: date presented, who evaluated (highlight the outside experts) and how (individual, committee, written, interview, etc.)
- c. Develop a form for annual progress review (the adviser of the student presents an overview of the student’s progress, any issues involved, etc.)
- Date of the review
  - Names of faculty who participated in the review (DO include members outside of the College)
  - Issues/problems if any
  - Nature of the student’s work
  - Comments: (progress satisfactory, needs to do XXX, excellence in doing YYY, grants received, honors, etc.)
- d. Develop a statement on forming a committee that undertake assessment of students at all levels described above (3.1~3.5).

#### **4. Developing a conflict of interest policy covering individuals serving simultaneously as students and faculty**

The issues surrounding the conflict of interest will be addressed below by reviewing how the performance of each faculty member’s activities is assessed in the College.

##### **General Observations:**

##### **Documentation of faculty responsibilities and performance**

In many higher education institutions, three areas of the faculty efforts, “teaching,” “research/publications,” “services,” are allocated in the ratio of 30%:40%:30%; etc.

Note that there seems a lack of understanding on the part of the University administration why the College needs 16 lecturers while the tenured faculty’s teaching load **APPEARS** light. The deficit in the College’s budget (that the Academic Affairs provides) may be

relieved by hiring less number of lecturers – this has implications on the hiring of the new members of the College (Dean, faculty).

Note: in many colleges and universities, “lecturers” are different from “graduate teaching assistants.” It may be necessary why they are called “lecturers” here in the College. Usually, the lectureship could be a tenure-track position, while “instructorship” or “graduate teaching assistantship” is not a tenure-track position.

The College prepared and approved on the 2 August, 2007 a detailed guidelines for its faculty, and the document is entitled “Evaluation Criteria for Faculty of Ka Haka ‘Ula o Ke‘elikōlani. The document is being edited for the final version.

### **General Recommendations:**

Change the rating criteria “high quality, excellence” for teaching, “competence, high quality” for research and service to “satisfactory, excellent” or something that are a little more “concrete” and “measurable.” Reorganizing the category descriptions would be needed – the document will become a part of the College’s **Faculty Handbook**, and it will be viewed and reviewed by the university’s colleagues and administrators as well as by others such as WASC Visiting team. For each subcategory or perhaps at the beginning of each category (Teaching, Research, and Service), there must be a description on how evaluation is going to be carried out, by whom, when, and how the results will be reported (to whom) and how they are going to be used, etc. Each category is discussed below.

#### **a. Category 1 “Teaching” (pp. 7~8)**

##### **Observations:**

Successful teaching is explained in terms of success in five categories:

(1) P~20 level teaching success. What is unique here is that teaching responsibility of the faculty is not restricted to the college (undergraduate and graduate) level teaching. Faculty is required to demonstrate successful teaching in:

- a. no less than 3 levels with at least one level taught over three semesters. The levels are defined as (i) preschool, (ii) elementary school, (iii) middle/high school, (iv) lower division undergraduate college, (v) upper division undergraduate college, (vi) distance education, (vii) teacher certification, in-service, or professional development, (viii) other graduate level teaching.
- b. no less than 5 levels with at least 4 semesters in one level and 2 semesters in another.

(2) Community teaching success. This is defined as the faculty participation, using Hawaiian all the time, in one or more *honua* where the community revitalization of Hawaiian language and culture is carried out.

(3) Student mentoring success. Faculty mentors students, as a member of a team or as a leader, in such occasions as (i) field experience for students,

(ii) thesis or dissertation committees, (iii) student recruitment and advising, (iv) preparing students for a higher level of education, (v) special events with visitors.

(4) College community coordinated teaching success. Faculty, following *Kumu Honua Mauli Ola Hawaiian* teaching philosophy, works cooperatively and selflessly with other faculty members of the college.

(5) Observed success in application of teaching skills.

### **Recommendations:**

Description here is fine, but there is no indication of how “high quality” and “excellence” are assessed, by whom, when, etc. If it is possible to develop an evaluation form (as universities and colleges are required to do in Mainland and students do the evaluation of their instructors toward the end of each semester), that need to be developed with the kinds of questions that address the fundamental philosophy of the College.

If, on the other hand, the College cannot or does not want to develop such an evaluation mechanism, then it is necessary to spell out how each instructor’s teaching will be evaluated for all five subcategories (A ~ E) . WASC and University require that the course syllabus describe its outcome (expected results/objectives), although the university does not seem to have a “standard” teaching evaluation mechanism. These objectives (or outcomes) can easily be included as evaluation items in the evaluation form and students in the course can assess if the objectives (or outcomes) have been attained. Or, toward the end of each semester, someone interviews students in Instructor X’s class (instead of a paper evaluation by students), each instructor’s reflective report on the teaching whether or not the goal and objectives stated in the syllabus have been achieved, how successfully achieved, how the success is assessed, etc. etc. So,

a. develop an evaluation mechanism

- a written evaluation form for each of the upperlevels (see page 7, I, A, 1; d~h) which may be administered at the end of each term/semester

- an observation form: peer observation (**this is particularly important in relation to the WASC question of “Conflict of Interest”** – Develop, for example, a rotating observation schedule of half of the faculty in Fall Semester and the other half in Spring Semester. The observation may be carried out by one faculty, or a team of 2 ~ 3 faculty members. Those who are also students must be observed by the regular faculty.)

- pay a special attention to the way “success” and “excellence” are rated – must be concrete!

b. Re-visit the statement in each subcategory and make sure that the statement says what is considered success or excellence, by what criteria, when the evaluation will be done, by whom, and how.

## **b. Category II “Research and Artistic Contributions” (pp. 8~10)**

### **Observations:**

The core product of the College is language and culture revitalization, that is, the new generations of speakers of Hawaiian with competency in Hawaiian culture. Thus, “Research and Artistic Contributions” are presented in terms of competence in five (5) categories.

- (1) Materials for Hawaiian language and culture teaching and use within the College and within Hawaiian language and culture teaching. Faculty is expected to develop quality original materials and resources for use in P ~ 20 education within the College. Materials may include (i) readers or workbooks, (ii) technological resources, (iii) new courses, (iv) a new domain of Hawaiian vocabulary; or faculty demonstrate (v) leadership in an overall coordinated effort in curriculum and materials development, (vi) a new *honua*, or (vii) provide leadership in grants development related to the broad teaching mission of the College.
- (2) Artistic creations and scholarly writing within the Hawaiian language and culture. Artistic creations may include (i) Hawaiian song, (ii) *hula*, (iii) arrangement, (iv) play, (v) an artistic translation into Hawaiian, (vi) material work of art within the context of Hawaiian language and culture, or (vii) scholarly writing.
- (3) Presentation to the Hawaiian community. Faculty presents the results of his/her research and artistic contributions at conferences attended primarily by members of the Hawaiian community not affiliated with the College
- (4) Presentation to indigenous community (i) at conferences or workshops focusing on indigenous issues and attended primarily by indigenous peoples other than Hawaiians; (ii) writing articles in an indigenous oriented journal or publication, (iii) writing or providing primary support for articles for indigenous or national newspapers about his/her research and artistic contributions, or (iv) combinations of above.
- (5) Presentation to the national and international community of scholars. Presentations at national and international conferences outside the indigenous community or publishing articles in refereed journals.

### **Recommendations:**

#### **Subcategory A (p. 8~9)**

Develop ways to determine the quality of the materials developed by a faculty, and therefore reflects the faculty member’s “competence.” For example, develop a checklist that includes:

- original or not (including revisions of existing materials, etc.)
- readers: specify the nature of the readers, levels, etc.
- workbooks: specify the nature of the workbooks, levels, etc.
- technological resources: specify for what purposes

- new courses: specify the nature of the courses, levels, etc.
- new vocabulary: specify

Then, identify how each is evaluated as to its quality and “usefulness”.

### **Subcategory B (p. 9)**

Why limit the artistic creations and scholarly writing to “within the Hawaiian language and culture”? If this is to be retained, then add another Subcategory that says “Artistic creations and scholarly writing beyond Hawaiian language and culture.” The doctoral level training will and SHOULD be global – it is important to remember that the degree is not JUST Hawaiian BUT Indigenous Languages and Cultures! Doctoral students must examine the situations of not only Hawaiian people but also indigenous peoples elsewhere and they must explore what they can contribute to revitalizing the languages and cultures of those peoples. Or rephrase Category E to something like: “Artistic creations and scholarly writing for national and international audience.”

The question of how to assess a scholarly article or an artistic creation must be addressed in concrete terms so that the evaluation of sufficient merit (again both within the College and also “globally”) is fairly delivered.

Develop a method to determine, when a faculty is a co-author of an article, how much s/he has contributed to the article. When a faculty has a series of co-authored articles, there must be a way to decide that the faculty has published an equivalent of one article as the primary author.

It is also important to be able to determine whether a faculty has produced “a combination of artistic creations and scholarly writing equivalent in quality and quantity to fulfilling the requirements of artistic creations or scholarly writing alone.”

Thus, develop ways to determine the quality of the materials created by a faculty, and therefore reflects the faculty member’s “competence.” For example, develop a checklist that includes:

- artistic creations: specify what, for whom, etc.
- translation into Hawaiian: specify what is translated, for what purpose, etc.
- creation of Hawaiian names & vocabulary: nature of the terms created, for what purpose(s)
- material work of art: specify what
- scholarly writing: the nature of writing, presented and/or published, etc.

Then, identify how each is evaluated as to its quality and “usefulness”.

### **Subcategories C and D (page 9)**

It is necessary to assess whether the faculty's presentations "competence" and "high quality." Develop a checklist and explanation as to the ways each presentation/publication is evaluated and rated.

Develop ways to determine the quality of the materials created by a faculty, and therefore reflects the faculty member's "competence." For example, develop a checklist that includes:

- conference presentations: specify the nature of the presentation, at what conference, when, primary or team presenter, etc.
- contribution in a newspaper, journal: the nature of contribution, where, when, etc.
- **Add:** appearance in media (radio, TV, etc.): specify what media, on what topic, when, etc.

### **Subcategory E (pp. 9 – 10)**

Develop ways to determine the quality of the materials created by a faculty, and therefore reflects the faculty member's "competence." For example, develop a checklist that includes:

- conference presentations: specify the nature of the presentation, at what conference, when, primary or team presenter, etc.
- contribution in a newspaper, journal: the nature of contribution, where, when, etc.
- **Add:** appearance in media (radio, TV, etc.): specify what media, on what topic, when, etc.
- publication: specify in non-refereed journals, refereed journals
- grant proposals submitted, both successful and unsuccessful ones
- research reports
- participation in professional associations

## **C. Category III "Service"**

### **Observations:**

Services are discussed in terms of five (5) areas.

- (1) Service to Hawaiian speaking families and communities. Faculty provides basic assistance to Hawaiian speaking families and communities in their efforts to further develop the Hawaiian language and culture within their lives. Such service may be realized through the faculty's (i) service to the community organizations, (ii) providing assistance in addressing challenges, and (iii) assisting special events within this community.
- (2) Service to the non-Hawaiian speaking communities of Hawai'i and those of Hawai'i origin outside Hawai'i. Such service may include (i) providing explanations of pronunciation, (ii) assisting with understanding of Hawaiian culture and history, (iii) giving Hawaiian language and culture service on committees, (iv) ??provision of reference to experts, (v) providing information on programs leading to participation in the Hawaiian speaking community, (vi) providing

assistance that leads to major advances in political and demographic support for the Hawaiian language and culture (local and state levels).

- (3) Service to the indigenous language and culture revitalization community. This includes assisting a broader movement to support indigenous languages and cultures on a national and international level: (i) explanations of the Hawaiian situation, (ii) service on committees for conferences, (iii) hosting visitors, (iv) provision of reference to experts.
- (4) Standard Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani college-internal service including (i) committees, (ii) governing bodies, (iii) events, (iv) needs outside the classroom, (v) leadership role (chair major committees; serve as director of a division, a department, or the College; the primary planner or writer of a major initiative of the College).
- (5) Standard Hilo campus and university of Hawai'i system service.

### Recommendations:

It is needed to delineate how “competence” and “high quality” of services are assessed, although this is not an easy task to accomplish.

This requires a special attention because the “results” or “products” may not be immediately available – for example, many academic professionals including us have worked with different indigenous communities, but often we are not sure if we have been effective or useful for those communities because many of them have not reached where we had set out to accomplish. Change of governing bodies, change of staff of a language program, running out of fund, conflicting and competing group emerging, and many other factors prevent our initial goals to be achieved. Considering the possible difficulty of obtaining objective assessment of some work, we recommend the following:

- It is advisable to record the service activities in terms of quality and load, and also state clearly why they are considered as service rather than research. How about student advising activities? Mentoring junior faculty? Are these considered a part of teaching activities or of service activities?
- Institute an annual peer evaluation system – some faculty may be reviewed in Fall and others in Spring. Spread the timing so that evaluating faculty are not feeling “burdened.” It may be good to have a committee of three (each focusing on teaching, research, service; or each look at all three and come up with a synthesized review statement). Important is demonstrating the way this is done to avoid the “conflict of interest.” So, the College may consider recruiting a review member from outside (such as Dan Brown) – **for the next few years until the college build a strong pool of Hawaiian speaking faculty, it may have to accept non-Hawaiian speaking member(s) for this purpose!** This process will further guarantee, in addition to the doctoral student/faculty’s progress review, that there is very little “conflict of interest.”

**Note: add another item “service to professional organizations and societies: names of organizations, office held, the nature of contribution, etc.”**

#### **4.2 College Policy on Faculty Qualification**

##### **Observations:**

The draft statement “Evaluation Criteria for Faculty of Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke ‘elikōlani can be further refined to make it easy to read. Faculty qualifications must be accompanied by the “how” of assessing the quality and effectiveness of the activities. Can the criteria be the same for all faculty and staff (lecturers, instructors, tenure-track assistant professors, non-tenure-track assistant professors, tenured associate professors, tenured full professors, temporary visiting faculty, etc.)?

- Tenure process
- Promotion process
- Annual reviews
- Mentoring system for junior faculty

##### **Recommendations:**

With the doctoral program in place, spell out clearly and succinctly what is required of faculty who participate in the doctoral program.

- If doctoral students remain in Hawaiian Programs/Hawaiian communities, current practice would be fine.
- If, however, the degree is “Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization,” then re-visiting the qualifications of faculty is a “must.”
- First, prepare a statement of the “philosophy” of the College that can be read and understood by readers outside of the College.
- Refine the criteria and the method(s) of evaluation (see 4.1 above)

#### **4.3 Developing a conflict of interest policy covering individuals serving simultaneously as students and faculty**

##### **Observations:**

Our understanding is that the College has already begun (after meeting with Graduate Dean Peter Garrod) to draft such a statement on “conflict of interest policy.” It needs to continue working on this document and finalize it within next couple of months.

##### **Recommendations:**

Describe (or review) the “leadership” roles of the College including the College Senate – the head of the college (would this be replaced by Dean?), head of the division, head of the program, etc. This may be also a part of the College structure that will ensure there won’t be any issues of conflict of interest. The role may include dealing with:

- Personnel matters (hiring, discontinuing, salary, etc.)
- Tenure and Promotion evaluation
- Curricular matters (reviewing, recommending changes, etc.)
- Performance assessment of faculty
- Scheduled review of various programs

- Undergraduate linguistics program (even if not budgeted, annual review of faculty, promotion/tenure, etc. would be necessary)
- Recommendations to the Dean of the College

## 5. Building faculty capacity

### Observations:

Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani, according to the University Catalog, consists of Hawaiian Studies Division, Hale Kuamo‘o, and Linguistics. In the vision statement (University Catalog p. 204), we read: “Linguistics, the scientific study of human language, is central to the Ph.D. program of Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani and informs its work in all other areas as well. The College’s B.A. and minor in Linguistics serve as a bridge to the entire UH Hilo community, especially international students. ...”

### Recommendations:

- a. Catalog page 204: In the description of linguistics under Vision, we find the mention of the Ph.D. program of Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani, but no mention of the importance of linguistics in other academic programs of the College, neither undergraduate nor graduate programs.

Clarify: whether there are “programs” or “departments” within the College. For example, in the University Catalog, we read “Linguistics Program” (p. 207) “Linguistics Department” but on page 208, “Linguistics Program.” What are the units within the College, programs or departments???

- b. Catalog page 208: Section on “Special Aspects of the Program”
 

“The University of Hawaii at Hilo is one of only a few colleges and universities in the United States to offer a bachelor of arts in linguistics. The program offers a broad range of courses taught by ....”

This needs a re-statement. There are a number of universities that offer BA in linguistics. So something like: “The University of Hawai‘i at Hilo has a strong program in linguistics offering a broad range of ....”

- c. What is not clear is the place of the faculty of the Linguistics Program. All eight teaching faculty are the holders of doctoral degrees, of whom only William Wilson – not Ohara nor Saft -- is listed among the faculty of Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani (or is the list for Hawaiian Studies Division, Hale Kuamo‘o, or both Hawaiian Studies Division, Hale Kuamo‘o???? What is the place of the Linguistic Program within the College? The catalog is telling us that all doctoral degree holding faculty with the exception of Wilson are in the Linguistic Program but not really in the College; and yet, linguistics is considered to be central to the doctoral degree of the College. This may become one of the critical problems by “outside reviewers”! So, a clear statement is needed that explains (not “defends” nor “justifies”, but explains or describes) the position of linguistic program and its faculty.

With the doctoral program implemented, a new look at the position of these faculty members is in order.

- i. Would any of the linguistics program faculty be enlisted in the doctoral program of the College?
- ii. That is, would any of them be committed to language revitalization (not necessarily Hawaiian language revitalization, but in any other place(s) or global issues)?
- iii. If any of them have a commitment to language revitalization, would they be enticed to become a College faculty by agreeing to acquire Hawaiian language competence within X-number of years? Or are they exempted from the Hawaiian language competence requirement?

**Thus, it is necessary to clean up the Catalog descriptions of undergraduate as well as the description of graduate programs.**

### **Other Observations and Recommendations**

#### **a. Observation: Dean's position**

The WASC letter of June 30, 2008, at the bottom of Page two states: "Governance structures and responsibilities be formally resolved and codified in the Faculty Manual. (CFR 3.8 and 3.11) This would include implementing the recommendations that:

- o Purview over curricular review and approval move to the University Congress "to ensure appropriate university-wide input and to avoid redundancy in courses;"
- o The School Deans' roles be clarified so that there is a cleaner correlation between their responsibilities and their authority in both academic and fiscal matters; ...

Currently, the College does not have Dean, but Assistant to Dean has recently been hired. Assistant has taken many of the administrative responsibilities off the senior faculty of the College and has considerably eased the operation of the College. It is, however, crucial for the College to fill the dean's position to make the College truly an academic unit of the University of Hawai'i at Hilo.

#### **Recommendations: Dean's position**

Prepare a position description and discuss it with Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. If it is a position of "interim dean," specify why it is the case. The 'must' in this description is the candidate's administrative ability to effectively represent the College to UHH, to work with other units and administration of UHH. It would be great to have someone who can negotiate with the UHH administrators the college benefits/welfare with vigor and diplomatic SKILLS, who can handle the budgetary matters with efficiency, and who can oversee the curricular and teaching assignment. This kind of person will be able to "take loads" off of the current core faculty's administrative chores and will allow them to focus their efforts on teaching, research and service areas.

**b. A new faculty position (see also long range plans below)**

**Observations:**

The nature of the new faculty position is not clearly understood by the College faculty.

**Recommendations:**

Prepare a position description with a clear statement on the priority specialization of the new faculty and why that specialization is needed. Make the “duties” description realistic – show what the normal teaching load is (X-number of courses per semester at the College, X-number of courses at P-12 level, etc.), expected participation in committees at the College and at UHH, etc.

**c. Recruiting experts and specialists from outside the College on UHH campus, UH system outside UHH, and outside UH system**

**Observations:**

At the current stage of the development at the College, it has been necessary to focus and emphasize the “Hawaiian language and culture” as the center of all programs, and the College has been “Hawai‘icentric” in its approach to education. The College needs to move forward to be more “global” in its training of doctoral students.

**Recommendations:**

Re-visit with what the College describes and promises to achieve in all the programs.

Content courses at the doctoral level could be in English: there seems to be a pool of Native Hawaiian faculty and non-teaching staff who could contribute to these areas. **Also**, describe the position and role of linguistics program faculty – all of them are holders of PhDs and EdD!

- May be necessary to recruit non-Hawaiian speaking faculty to be part of the College – as may be the case in the undergraduate linguistics program, or it may be crucial (at least next several years) for the doctoral program
- Project possibility of expanding the faculty resource capacity to broaden and diversify expertise. That might include, among others:
  - sociolinguistics
  - comparative linguistics
  - first language acquisition
  - second language acquisition
  - cultural anthropology (indigenous peoples)
  - history (indigenous peoples and non-indigenous contacts)
  - sociology (majority vs. minority issues, ethnicity, migration/immigration)
  - literature (creative writing)

- comparative literature
- education (curriculum development, materials development, educational technology, language program designs)
- education/anthropology/political science/? (policy studies)
- Invite adjunct “residence” appointment types that are considered to be a part of the program - formalization of status of short-time visiting scholars
- Invite adjunct “non-residence” appointment types that are also considered to be a part of the program – formalization of status of program-associated scholars. The scholars in this category may be those who agree to serve on doctoral student review committees, doctoral committees, dissertation committees, etc.
- Consider above category of scholars to include those who participate in “distance learning” activities.

#### **d. Long range plans: recommendations**

Along with the two positions (Dean/Interim Dean and faculty) currently considered, develop 5-year and 10-year long range plan. In 5 years, where the College wants to be! Include in these plans are among others:

- Program development
- Student recruitment (especially the doctoral students)
- Faculty recruitment

While formulating a long range plan, it may be necessary to clarify:

1. qualifications of faculty to become graduate faculty such as:
  - Research/publications
  - Endangered language community work (including documentation of an endangered language)
  - other?
2. qualifications of “recruited or invited” faculty from other units on campus to participate in the graduate education (at the MA level and at the doctoral level) – especially in terms of Hawaiian language ability
3. qualifications of “recruited or invited” faculty from outside UHH campus but from within the UH System to participate in the graduate education (at the MA level and at the doctoral level) – especially in terms of Hawaiian language ability
4. qualifications of “recruited or invited” faculty from outside the UH System to participate in the graduate education (at the MA level and at the doctoral level) – especially in terms of Hawaiian language ability
  - For 2 ~ 4, it may be necessary to formulate several categories:
    - those who actually offer courses
    - those who participate in student progress reviews
    - those who participate in comprehensive exams
    - those who participate in the student’s doctoral research project
5. Other?

#### **Documents consulted:**

**General**

Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission Action Letter of June 30, 2008

University of Hawai'i Hilo 2008-2009 University Catalog  
University of Hawai'i Hilo 2008-2009 University Catalog Addendum (Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani graduate/Certificate Programs)

Final Report: Faculty Diversity Summit, University of Hawaii at Hilo (June 7, 2005; Ho'oulu Terrace)

**Vice Chancellor's Office**

Documents at the Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs including the draft description of Graduate Division

**Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani**

Draft document: Evaluation Criteria for Faculty of Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani (approved August 2, 2007)

Documents prepared by Dr. Charles (Kale) Langlas  
Matrix of Courses offered and Graduate Programs

Undergraduate Linguistics Program of Ka Haka 'Ula O Ke'elikōlani provided by Dr. Yumiko Ohara