UCC Program Review Committee summary of review

Program – Linguistics

This program includes the following degrees, minors, and certificates:

- B.A. Linguistics
- Linguistics minor
- Japanese minor
- M.A. Linguistics
- TESOL Endorsement – Linguistics Track
- TESOL Endorsement – Non-Degree

Recommendation

This program is found to be in-jeopardy, see the report that follows for commendations, concerns, and recommendations.

The Program Review Committee recommends to UCC that the program be re-reviewed in three years, AY 2021, fall 2020. The re-review is to examine the viability of the ELIP and OPIE programs and the stability of faculty in the Linguistics program and their ability to sustain the degrees and certificates offered.

In addition, a revised self-study was provided and a summary of the changes is also attached.

Date of last review – AY 2007

Date of this review – AY 2017

This review has been sent to program director and the dean. Their comments regarding the report are attached. Also attached are comments by a senior faculty member.

This report has been sent to the Graduate Council. They provided the following comment.

“Graduate Council were very concerned about the graduate program in Linguistics. The Council is supportive of the recommendations in the report to bring in additional research active faculty to revive the graduate program. As noted in the report, the current program cannot sustain the graduate program.”
Executive Summary

A review team consisting of Dr. Pramod Kanwar (Internal Reviewer, Mathematics Department, Zanesville Campus), Dr. Teruhisa Masada (Internal Reviewer, Civil Engineering Department, Athens Campus), and Dr. Charlene Polio (External Reviewer, Department of Linguistics & German, Slavic, Asian, and African Languages, Michigan State University) visited the Ohio University Department of Linguistics on April 11 and 12, 2017 to conduct an in-depth review of the programs offered by the department. Prior to the team’s visit, the two-day visit itinerary had been put together by Dr. Christopher Thompson (Chair, Linguistics Department) and approved by Dr. David Ingram (Chair of UCC Program Review Committee).

The department consists of three units – Linguistics, Ohio Program of Intensive English (OPIE), and English Language Improvement Program (ELIP). OPIE was established in 1967. The Department of Linguistics started in 1970. And, ELIP span out of OPIE in 2009. OPIE provides English improvement courses to non-matriculated international students, while ELIP does so to fully matriculated domestic and international students. All the units are housed within Gordy Hall.

The Linguistics Department currently has six Group I faculty, five Group II faculty, one Group III faculty, and one Group IV faculty, a business manager, and an office manager. OPIE administrator/faculty list consists of Director, Associate Director, two Assistant Directors, Academic Coordinator, one Advisor, five Associate Lecturers, and thirteen Lecturers. ELIP faculty list includes Director, Assistant Director, six Lecturers, and one Assistant Lecturer.

The Linguistics Department currently offers BA in general linguistics, MA in applied linguistics & language pedagogy, and BA minors in linguistics, Japanese, and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). The department also offers a 4-course module in Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) and P-12 English as a Second Language (ESL) certificate program. In addition, the department offers language training courses in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Swahili.

There are a few notable developments taking place presently in the department. First of all, three faculty (two Group I and one Group IV) members are leaving the department at the end of the academic year. Secondly, there are discussions taking place at the college level to consider moving OPIE out of the Linguistics Department into the Center for International Studies (CIS). Another topic of discussions is centered on the possible merging of the Linguistics and Modern Languages Departments into one entity (School of Languages). Thirdly, ELIP is launching an online Teaching of English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) certificate program. And lastly, OPIE is exploring new regions of the world to recruit more international students and develop feeder programs.

The review team is of the opinion that all programs offered by the department are conditionally viable. The team believes that while the department is able to accomplish its academic mission, the programs offered by the department may face some serious difficulties in near future if appropriate steps are not taken soon. The areas that need immediate attention are
• Hiring of new Group I faculty in the light of recent and upcoming departures of faculty.
• Downward trends in enrollment numbers in programs, especially OPIE and some language courses.
• Undergraduate advising.
• Proficiency levels for students in language courses. (Currently, language courses do not seem to have any standardized proficiency levels for students.)

The review team also has concerns about the department’s RSCA. Two of the most active members of the department are leaving the department at the end of the academic year. Some of the Group I faculty in the department do not seem to be active in research. The review team observed that some Group II faculty members are more active than some Group I faculty. The department may consider having a faculty mentoring program to help new and existing faculty in the program.

In spite of these challenges, the review team is of the view that the department is successful in achieving its mission by providing a curriculum that is preparing its students for a successful professional career. It has produced graduates who went on to obtain doctoral degrees from major universities. Service contributions of the faculty (both Group I and Group II) seem to be appropriate for the size of the department. The review team recognizes the work and efforts of the OPIE faculty towards the upcoming accreditation through Commission on English Accreditation. The review team also observed the impact the uncertainty and future of OPIE is having on the program faculty and strongly recommends that this matter be addressed very carefully with input from the faculty and regardless of the location of OPIE, efforts should be made to preserve the existing association between Linguistic and OPIE.

In the light of the challenges the department is facing at the moment, the review team recommends that once these issues are resolved, a midterm review of the department may be considered.
Review Team’s Narrative Responses to Review Questions

The external reviewer provided detailed responses to the questions based on the review committee’s visit to the department. The internal reviewers agree with the observations of the external reviewer about the self-study, RSCA of the department, the undergraduate curriculum, the graduate curriculum, and other programs. Some of the information about the program requirements provided in the self-study is not consistent with the information on the department website and when asked we got conflicting responses. It is possible that this inconsistency could be a result of the university wide changes that are being made to the departmental pages at this point and that may also be the reason for some of the links on the departmental page not working properly.

As observed by the external reviewer, there are concerns about the department’s RSCA. Some of the Group I faculty in the department do not seem to be active in research and Group I faculty who are most active are leaving the department at the end of the year. With the departure of these faculty members, it is not clear how the department will be able to maintain the quality of its graduate program without hiring additional faculty and/or other faculty in the department expanding on their research explorations. The department has a detailed faculty evaluation and Promotion and Tenure criteria. It is, however, not clear whether the department has any type of faculty mentoring program. The review team did not hear any concerns about merit evaluation or Promotion and Tenure policies in the department.

Although the review team did not hear any major concerns about graduate or undergraduate advising, it appears that some students had some concerns about the guidance they receive from one of the two undergraduate advisors. It might be helpful to the undergraduate students if some additional faculty also take on the responsibility of advising undergraduates.

Please refer to the report from the external reviewer for detailed narrative responses to the questions that are related to the overall program, undergraduate program, graduate program, areas of concern, recommendations, commendations, and overall judgement. The internal reviewers would like to add the following suggestions and observations.

- The review team recognizes that the Department of Linguistics at Ohio University has long been recognized and respected in the region. This is supported by the fact that the program has produced many outstanding graduates who went on to attain doctoral degrees from some major universities and distinguished professional career.
- The department will need to have its three faculty vacancies filled as soon as possible so that it can maintain its capacity to run its BA, MA, and minor programs.
- The department needs to strengthen its BA program by establishing its own Senior Capstone course.
- Requirements (ex. minimum GPA, number of required courses) for BA program posted online are incorrect. They need to be corrected to prevent confusion.
- The department needs to appoint at least three undergraduate advisors to improve its quality of undergraduate students advising.
- The department needs to improve its efforts to recruit and retain its undergraduate students.
- Regardless of the location of OPIE, a close association between Linguistics and OPIE must be preserved.
1. Comments on the procedure and self-study report

I was originally scheduled to visit Ohio University to review the Linguistics Department on November 4, 2016. A week before the visit, the chair contacted me and apologized that the visit had to be rescheduled because the UCC had not yet reviewed the self-study report. We rescheduled for April 11-12, 2017, and I received the self-study report on March 6, 2017.

The Linguistics Department has several sections that were covered in the report including the undergraduate program, the graduate program, various languages with no majors (Chinese, Japanese, Arabic), an intensive ESL program (OPIE), and a program for matriculated students (ELIP). We were given ample opportunity to meet with faculty and students from each of the programs within the department. The committee also met with the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Vice-Provost for Global Affairs, and the Associate Provost. Overall, the visit was very well organized, and the Linguistics staff was very helpful.

I have several concerns about the way the report was assembled. Specifically, in addition to many small typos, there are two paragraphs that ended mid-sentence (on page 7 and page 21). At other points, it seems that sentences were copied and pasted without changing them (e.g., on page 27, number 3: I think “BA” and “MA” was intended). A CV with handwritten changes was included in error. In addition, on page 205, the student comments are stated as being from one student from 2010. It seems, in fact, that the comments are a compilation of comments from various students. I’m not sure if the comments are really seven years old, but if they are, recent comments should have been included. Finally, on page 32, there seems to be a misplaced paragraph. The Dean commented that there was also misinformation in the report, but it is not obvious to me what was incorrect.

I was also provided with the last external review written seven years ago, but the report was only two pages long, and I do not think that I can respond to the various questions in only two pages.

Two faculty members noted that the self-study report had not been circulated and that they had not had a chance to see it. I think had this been done, other faculty members might have caught some of the problems as well as possible misinformation.

Some information such as syllabi and the graduate handbook were not included in the appendices of the report, but we were given these documents immediately upon request.

I would like to note that I come from a similar, perhaps even more complex department that includes linguistics, TESOL, and several languages. While we do not teach ESL, we have three graduate programs, six majors, and eight minors. Compiling any type of report about such a department is challenging because of the range of unrelated missions, student bodies, and faculty.
2. Contextual factors

Immediately upon our arrival, the chair gave us an additional document that included a list of recent developments. The most significant among these is a proposal to move OPIE out of the College of Arts and Sciences, the departure of Professor Scott Jarvis, the department’s only full professor and planned incoming chair for fall of 2017, and the move of Associate Professor Greg Kessler to the College of Education.

I will address the questions that I was given, but currently, the two most important issues are:

a. How should the department deal with the loss of Group 1 faculty? This coincides with a suggestion floating about to move the Linguistics Program and the various languages to Modern Languages.

b. Should OPIE be moved outside of the department to the Center for International Studies?

Each of these issues dominated the discussions with the faculty, and while there is some sense among the faculty that the administration has already made their decisions, I suggest that both of these matters be considered very carefully with as much faculty input as possible. While the faculty departures in linguistics and the low enrollment in OPIE definitely need to be addressed, the College needs a clear plan highlighting how any changes will affect faculty and students. I will return to these major issues at the end of the report.

3. The program as a whole:

The department includes an undergraduate program, a graduate program, several languages, OPIE, and ELIP. Each of these programs has many strengths. There is little, however, that unites them overall except that they focus on language. This is in no way a criticism of the faculty but rather a fact of history. Because I come from a very similar department, I can confidently say that there is no easy way to address this problem. Our dean’s solution has been to combine all the programs with those in Romance and Classical Studies into a School of Languages and then to give each program autonomy. I’m not suggesting that such a change is the solution at OU; rather, I want to note that this lack of unity is a problem across similar departments and not unique to OU.

The specific questions that I was provided are:

a. Is the current number and distribution of faculty sufficient to carry out the broad overall mission of the Department (Teaching; Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity; Service).

b. Is the level of the Department’s RSCA appropriate for the program given the size of the faculty and the resources available to the Department? Is the Department’s level of external funding at an appropriate level?

c. Is the level of service, outside of teaching, appropriate for the program given its size and the role that it plays in the University and broader communities it interacts with? Is the Department able to fulfill its service mission?

d. Does the Department have an appropriate level of financial resources, staff, physical facilities, library resources, and technology to fulfill its mission?
With loss of three Group 1 faculty members (one having left the university last year, one leaving at the end of the year, and one moving to education), the current faculty will have difficulty covering their courses and advising graduate students. The remaining faculty already seem to have heavy service loads including the direction of language programs. Without hiring new Group 1 faculty, it is not clear how the graduate program, in particular, can continue. That said, there is a highly competent and engaged set of Group 2 faculty who seem quite happy, productive, and appreciated by the students.

The Group 1 faculty currently includes only one full professor and five associate professors. Scott Jarvis, the only full professor, is leaving at the end of the year, and Greg Kessler, the most productive associate professor, is moving to the College of Education. This will leave only four associate professors. I need to note that other than Professors Jarvis and Kessler, the faculty has not produced much research recently, and this is a major concern. In fact, some of the Group 2 faculty who have heavier teaching loads are more productive (e.g., Lee). With regard to grants, Group 1 faculty received only three grants since 2009, two of which were quite small. Given the small number of grants available, this is not a major area of concern. I note, however, that there are government grants related to language teaching, such as the STARTALK grant that the department received, and it is not clear if the department has been pursuing these.

In terms of resources, there were no concerns about the facilities or the support staff. The only area of concern was that the business manager was being moved to the Center for International Studies. It seems that the rationale for this was that OPIE might be brought into CIS. Since this move is still being explored, it does not make sense to move the business manager out of the building.

Regarding teaching overall, we met with about six undergraduate, six graduate, 10 OPIE, and 15 ELIP students and found them to be overwhelmingly happy with the instruction in all the programs. This satisfaction is reflected in the student evaluations that we were provided.

3. Undergraduate Program:

The questions provided to me were:

a. Is the Department fulfilling its service role, adequately preparing nonmajors for future coursework and/or satisfying the needs for general education?
b. Is the program attracting majors likely to succeed in the program? Is the number of majors appropriate for the program? Is the program attracting a diverse group of students?
c. Does the undergraduate curriculum provide majors with an adequate background to pursue discipline-related careers or graduate work following graduation?
d. Are the resources and the number of and distribution of faculty sufficient to support the undergraduate program?
e. Are pedagogical practices appropriate? Is teaching adequately assessed?
f. Are students able to move into to discipline-related careers and/or pursue further academic work?
We met with the undergraduate chair, a group 2 faculty member who assisted with advising, and about six linguistics majors, some of whom also studied Japanese or Chinese. I have several concerns about the undergraduate program despite the fact that the majors were very happy with the program.

As stated in the report, the BA grew out of the MA program. The general core courses for any BA in linguistics are included in the curriculum, but there is also the option of a TEFL/TESL certificate and a CALL (Computer-Assisted Language Learning) certificate. Although it not common to have these topics as a focus of an undergraduate program, the students that we spoke to seemed to appreciate having the certificate options. Two mentioned that the certificates would be useful because they might want to teach abroad. The sample student responses that we were given in the self-study were extremely positive and echoed the comments from the students with whom we met. The one concern was that some of the courses were a bit repetitive. (Two very different courses taught by the same faculty member seemed to have some lectures in common.)

When we met with the undergraduate chair, he was not able to articulate what his duties were other than advising. Thus, we are not sure who reviews the undergraduate curriculum and recruits majors. I was concerned about why historical linguistics was still included in the curriculum and was told that it was because “it was on the books.” This is not a good reason to teach a course when most linguistics programs, I believe, are no longer including this course in their curricula. That said, the students we spoke to said that the Group 2 faculty member who taught the course was able to make it interesting and relevant to practical problems. The concern is that not much thought seems to have gone into the program recently. Another concern is that one of the advisors was not accessible and did not help students plan out their programs.

There are currently about 50 majors in the program and it is difficult to say if this is below what one would expect at a university the size of OU. No one told us of any specific recruiting efforts for majors. There was some discussion in the report of expanding the undergraduate program to include some courses in forensic linguistics. I believe that this was being planned by a Group 2 and Group 4 faculty member and might be a way to attract more majors.

We were not given any information about placement of the students but I note that the advisors do conduct exit interviews and comments were provided in the self-study.

One possible way to expand the undergraduate program is by strengthening links with the College of Education. The self-study stated that the teaching endorsement in ESL lapsed and then was reinstated, but none of the faculty we spoke to discussed the endorsement. If this program could be promoted and expanded, undergraduate enrollments might increase. Perhaps with the move of Prof. Kessler to the College of Education, the undergraduate courses might attract more students from the College of Education.

The department also teaches Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, and Swahili. We met with some of the Chinese and Japanese faculty and students who had studied Chinese and Japanese. It is very difficult to evaluate language programs in two days with no classroom observations, but the students generally were happy. One commented that some of the TAs were not as strong as the faculty but another stated that the TAs were very good. Another student commented the book
used to teach Japanese is very old. The Chinese and Japanese programs might want to consider setting proficiency goals for the students and putting these on the web site or syllabi. I believe that the Japanese program does do some testing of students. They should also evaluate their placement tests: one student said s/he was misplaced because there was no oral placement test for Chinese, only written. Note that the section of the department’s web site for language is not functioning correctly and the links about the language simply return the user to the main page.

We received no information about the Swahili or Arabic programs.

4. Graduate Program:

The questions provided were:

a. Is the program attracting students likely to succeed in the program? Is the number of students appropriate for the program? Is the program attracting a diverse group of students?
b. Does the graduate curriculum provide an adequate background to pursue discipline-related careers following graduation?
c. Does the program provide adequate mentoring and advising to students to prepare them for discipline-related careers?
d. Are the resources and the number of and distribution of faculty sufficient to support the graduate program?
e. Does the program offer appropriate financial support to graduate students?
f. Is teaching adequately assessed?
g. Are students able to move into discipline-related careers?

Ohio University has historically had an outstanding TESOL program in their linguistics department. With the loss of two key Group 1 faculty, the MA program’s sustainability might be a problem. On a positive note, the MA students we spoke with were extremely happy with the program and the faculty. They found the courses helpful and the faculty very accessible and willing to spend time with students. The atmosphere in the graduate program seems welcoming and supportive.

MA TESOL programs throughout the country are in a slight decline, but OU has continued to attract good and diverse students (in the opinion of the faculty). I suspect that this is because of the historically strong program and the amount of funding available to MA students. It appears that the university provided funding for 24 MA students in AY 15-16 in addition to one Fulbrighter. If OU wants to continue to attract strong MA students, this level of funding is necessary. If the university decides that funding PhD students is more important, then such a decision will hurt the MA program. The current funding situation also allows for MA students to receive outstanding practical training. They spoke highly of their placements and supervisors at OPIE, ELIP, and the elementary school. These placements should be maintained.

There was no detailed information in the self-study about MA students after graduation, but it was noted that some went on to PhD programs.
When the review committee met with the MA students, one noted that she liked the balance between theory and practice, one wanted more theory and research, and one wanted more emphasis on practice. These types of opinions are common in MA TESOL programs and suggest that the balance is probably appropriate. The self-study stated that students had to write four “publishable quality” papers during their program. This seems like an unattainable goal to me, and, in fact, it seems that students simply take at least one research-intensive course per semester. At least one faculty member commented that students had not taken a research methods class, so s/he had to spend a lot of time on the basics of research. The students also stated that their CALL instructor had to incorporate research methods into his class so that students could conduct research. If the program wants to emphasize research, a research methods class covering the basics of quantitative and qualitative research should be included in the curriculum.

There appears to be no final assessment of MA students such as an exam or portfolio. I would recommend that students create an online portfolio of some type, but helping students do so would require additional time commitments from an already overtaxed faculty.

5. ELIP

The review committee met with ELIP faculty and students. In addition, Dawn Bikowski provided us with a copy of her annual report from 2015-2016. I have nothing but praise for this program, so I will not focus on it this report, but to summarize: the students were very happy, the faculty is highly qualified, the director is highly organized, and the program seems to provide a great service to students across campus. In addition, the MA students benefit from both the Group 2 faculty’s instruction and the placement into ELIP.

6. OPIE

The review committee met with OPIE faculty and students, but unfortunately, the director was out of town. We did not visit classes or examine the curriculum. OPIE is currently undergoing accreditation through the Commission on English Accreditation (CEA). This is an extremely rigorous process that involves detailed documentation and multi-day site visits. If there is any concern about the quality of instruction at OPIE, the accreditation report should be consulted. When we met with the students, they praised the writing instruction that they received but stated that they wished had been pushed more in their oral communication classes. The students were happy with attempts to integrate them into the university through programs such as conversation partners. The quality of the faculty seems excellent, and the linguistics faculty praised the OPIE faculty for their professionalism and commitment.

Although there seemed to be no concerns about the quality of instruction at OPIE, there is great concern about the declining enrollments. This is not a reflection of the quality of OPIE but rather a trend common throughout the US. How this can be rectified is not clear. The Dean and Vice-Provost want to move OPIE to the Center for International Studies. This topic dominated our discussions with the OPIE faculty and was brought up by many of the linguistics faculty. All faculty, without exception, do not see this move as a positive development. In my opinion, it is not clear that the move will help OPIE. According to the Vice-Provost, the move would allow
her to help OPIE recruit students and create in-country programs. While this may be true, this assistance could be given with OPIE still in the department. The OPIE faculty is deeply concerned about being put into a non-academic unit (although there is some disagreement about whether CIS is an academic unit). I believe the concern is that Group 2 faculty will be eliminated and adjuncts will be hired as a cost-saving measure. The other worry is that the move was orchestrated by the Dean and Vice-Provost without proper feedback. Indeed, the Associate Provost explained that the move was attempted without approval from the UCC and now is being handled in the appropriate manner. I believe that the OPIE faculty is properly worried about the lack of transparency. I return to this matter below in my recommendations.

7. Commendations

a. The quality of teaching and the supportive and accessible faculty.
b. The placement of graduate students during their MA program in positions that afford practical learning experiences.
c. The collaboration and sharing of faculty among linguistics and ELIP and OPIE.
d. The ELIP program as a model of organization and professionalism.
e. The potential accreditation of OPIE.
f. Community outreach through the English for All program (not addressed above).
g. Yearly retreat (not addressed above).
h. The energy and commitment of the Group 2 faculty.

8. Areas of concern and recommendations

a. Undergraduate program: There currently seems to be no caretaker of the undergraduate program nor a concerted effort to expand it or to strengthen the TESOL endorsement program (assuming the latter is possible). If the department wishes to remain a department, the undergraduate program needs to be expanded. I recommend putting someone like Michelle O’Malley, a Group 2 faculty member, in charge of the program as she seems to have innovative ideas for it. In addition, someone needs to explore ties with education about expanding the endorsement program.

b. Graduate program: Add a research methods class if the program wishes to maintain a research focus. Possibly add a final assessment such as an online portfolio.

c. Language programs: The programs might want to consider doing some type of systematic evaluation of students’ abilities during and at the end of program. I believe that Japanese does some assessment, but assessment needs to be more systematic so that when self-studies are completed, this information can be reported.

d. Depletion of Group 1 faculty and research output: The research output of the Group 1 faculty, with the exception of Scott Jarvis, is weak. With the loss of other Group 1 faculty, this situation will only get worse as the current faculty will have to perform more service. With no full professors, there is no one to mentor the faculty. In addition, it seems best to have a full professor as chair, and there are no full professors to serve as chair for AY 17-18. One change that was mentioned is moving the faculty, and
presumably all programs, to Modern Languages. The faculty was not happy about this option because of the literature focus in Modern Languages. I would not dismiss such a move if it could be orchestrated with Linguistics faculty input and a clear plan. For next year, and I’m not sure if this is an option, the Dean might want to bring in an interim chair from a related department who could lead the faculty to create a plan for such a move. I don’t know enough about the college budget to say whether or not such a move would save money and I’m not sure that it would improve research or grant production; rather, such a move should be explored because it is difficult to have a department with so few Group 1 faculty and no hiring in the near-future. In addition, an outside person with strong leadership skills might be able to motivate faculty research and get associate professors to go up for full professorship.

e. OPIE declining enrollments: There is no disputing the high quality of OPIE instruction and faculty along with the loss of money, whereas the best course of action is greatly in dispute. While I am not sure if moving OPIE to the Center for International Studies will increase enrollment and save money, I do believe that the move has not been vetted properly. I know that the faculty are skeptical and worried about their jobs, and this was disheartening to see. The Associate Provost agreed the faculty were right to be concerned and emphasized that any consideration of move needed to be an open process and investigated and approved by the UCC. The Vice-Provost for Global Affairs emphasized that she could help OPIE with recruitment, but it is not clear why this necessitated a move out of the College. It’s unclear to me what the Vice-Provost’s motives are. My recommendation is that OPIE stay in Linguistics because of the collaboration that occurs between OPIE and the Linguistics students and faculty and because of the respect shown by the Linguistics faculty to the Group 2 OPIE faculty. At the same time, I recommend that the Vice-Provost for Global Affairs assist OPIE in their recruitment efforts, special program applications, and in-country programs. I recommended to the Vice-Provost that she bring in experts from other intensive English programs and include OPIE faculty on a committee to review any major changes in administration. The faculty is concerned that a move has already been decided. This is my concern as well given the business manager for the department is being relocated to the Center for International Studies. Such a move is pointless unless the Vice-Provost and Dean have already made their decision. I do, however, completely understand the Dean’s financial concerns regarding OPIE.

8. Overall judgment: Is the program viable as a whole?

I have worries about a department with so few Group 1 faculty. I think the undergraduate and graduate programs can be maintained with the strong Group 2 faculty, but the current level of funding of MA students will have to be maintained. ELIP is certainly viable on its own, and I have addressed the OPIE issue above.
Date: June 15th, 2017

TO: University Curriculum Council

FROM: Christopher Thompson, Chair, Department of Linguistics

RE: Seven-Year Review of Linguistics, ELIP, and OPIE

I have received the internal and external evaluators’ joint review of the Department of Linguistics. I am pleased that the evaluators recognized the department as having long been recognized and respected in the region for its outstanding graduates, some of whom have gone on to attain doctoral degrees from major universities and had distinguished professional careers in the field. However, I am not satisfied with the negative findings outlined in the report. While I understand why the reviewers’ perceptions of our strengths and weaknesses resulted in the rating of our M.A. and B.A. programs as “conditionally viable” (CV) at the present time, the department intends to do everything possible quickly to correct the deficiencies. Furthermore, the department looks forward to participating in an interim evaluation (in 2-3 years) so that its rating can be restored back to a “viable” as soon as possible. I think the joint review indicates that the main reason for the department’s CV rating has more to do with the three faculty members leaving the program and the ability to maintain its existing level of quality than with the current quality of the program itself. The specific curricular and programmatic issues identified by the reviewers were generally very useful in helping the department to fulfill its ultimate goal of continuing to improving the program by learning from this joint review.

While the joint review commended our program in eight areas including the quality of teaching, supportive and accessible faculty, placement of graduate students during their M.A. program in positions that afford good practical learning experiences, and good collaboration among faculty in Linguistics, ELIP, and OPIE, several weaknesses were found. Thought our undergraduates were generally pleased with our B.A. Program, there was dissatisfaction with one of the two student advisors and two courses thought to overlap too much. The reviewers also felt there is a need for a culminating project or a capstone class and a regular curriculum review to make adjustments as needed was lacking. The advice to our foreign language programs, most students of whom are undergraduates, was to implement a more visible proficiency rating system based on ACTFL guidelines.

The B.A. advisor and program oversight issues can be addressed in time for fall semester by creatively reassigning advising and B.A. oversight responsibilities to our Group 2 faculty with Ph.D.’s whom the reviewers recognized as a strength in the department. The curricular deficiencies cited including needed adjustments to assessment procedures in the foreign language programs can be tackled during our year-end retreat (this year scheduled for early July) and implemented in time for classes in the fall. A replacement Group 4 position to cover the departing Arabic Group 2 instructor has been approved, and was posted on May 19th. Thus, the position is covered for the coming academic year.

In the M.A. Program, the lack of a research methods class nor a culminating requirement such as a final exam or portfolio requirement was cited, though the reviewers felt that graduate students
were getting a lot out of their studies and their TA and GA-ships, and appreciated the supportive and nurturing academic environment. No surprisingly, ELIP was deemed solid. Similarly, the reviewers thought OPIE was academically in good stead, thus questioning the Dean’s desire to move the program out of the department due to enrollment issues related to recruiting (normally not the responsibility of a teaching unit like OPIE) without a clear plan for why and how to do so. In addition, the reviewers’ cited departing core faculty members (including the department’s only full-professor and most productive researcher), and the lack of Group I faculty research - as a threat to the long-term viability of the M.A. Program. These deficiencies are currently being addressed as follows:

a. Lack of a Research Methods Class: The best way to address this issue at the present time is to incorporate research methods into an existing class. LING 4830/5830: Assessing Language Abilities (a required class for both graduates and undergraduates) is probably the best candidate. Various other other solutions are possible, and will be discussed by faculty at the year-end departmental retreat in July.

b. No Culminating Activity or Exam: Many highly regarded Applied Linguistics M.A. programs (like ours) do not have a culminating exam. Students this academic year were encouraged (though not required) to develop a portfolio of their M.A. work to show perspective employers. Several workshop sessions were devoted to introducing this idea. The implementation of a portfolio requirement would be very possible for first-year students. A completed portfolio could be, “highly recommended” for students beginning their second year of study in the fall of 2017, but required for second-years also there-after, for example. Again, this topic will be discussed and a decision made at the departmental retreat in July.

c. Recruiting and enrollment concerns in OPIE: These issues are being dealt with in a summer partnership between the Vice Provost For Global Affairs with the director of OPIE, the Chair of the Department of Linguistics (myself), and the department’s senior business manager, to consider the best place to situate OPIE within OHIO’s university structure to improve the efficiency of recruiting International students and those from this pool who require OPIE. Since the review period, OPIE faculty members have made recruiting trips to China and the Middle East. The OPIE Review process is designed to produce recommendations for how to address this subject that will be presented to the Provost and possibly even the UCC.

d. Replacement of Departing Group 1 Faculty: Permission has been secured from the college to hire two Group 4 one-year replacement positions for AY 17-18. The first is to replace one of the two departing Group 1 faculty, a full professor who is a Second Language Acquisition (SLA) specialist. Three different applicants with the requisite experience and background capable of bolstering the M.A. Program in teaching, research, and funded research support have been encouraged to apply. The second Group 4 position is to replace the departing Arabic Coordinator, for which suitable candidates have also been recruited. The teaching load for the second departing Group 1 faculty member (the third faculty member leaving the department), a Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) specialist, can be covered by existing OPIE and ELIP Group 2 faculty. Permission to extend the current Sociolinguistics Group 4 position has also been granted by the college. This individual was renewed because of her teaching excellence, research expertise, and grant writing ability. The Group 4 SLA hire and the renewal
of the Group 4 Sociolinguist will help the M.A. Program build new momentum going forward. Hopefully, these two positions will be approved for conversion to Group 1 positions for next year. Capitalizing on the foundation that these two positions will provide in the department, faculty will be discussing the possibility of offering an online M.A. degree and online foreign language programs in the near future. The details will be discussed and a plan created to move in this direction during the annual faculty retreat in July.

e. Improving Group 1 Research Productivity: Several ideas are currently being considered. With the departure of the two most productive researchers in the department, it will be important to continue implementing the department’s current Group 1 Merit Evaluation (ME) Process, which correlates teaching load to research on a three-year average. This means that at the conclusion of every 3-year ME cycle, Group 1 faculty who have not been research active will be asked to teach more, while those who have been active will become eligible to keep their existing teaching load or to have it reduced. This will enhance research capacity for for Group 1 faculty who are research active. As the program reviewers have noted, it’s not as though research isn’t being done in the department. We have five Group 2 faculty in ELIP, all of whom hold Ph.D.’s and have proven productivity in their specialized areas of linguistics research. It is important to recognize their contributions more visibly going forward and better articulate the benefits of their research to the department and to students. These Group 2 faculty members will be called upon from now on to participate in ongoing research projects and to work more closely with all of our students. The details of this implementation will be discussed and determined at the upcoming departmental retreat.

ERROR CORRECTION:
I would also like to second David Bell’s identification of errors in the Executive Summary of the 7YR report. They occur in two places. On page 1 paragraph 4 where the Linguistics minors are misidentified: The Linguistics minors are in four tracks – TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), Sociolinguistics, Theoretical Linguistics, and CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning). Also, the TEFL Certificate (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) for undergraduates and graduates is not mentioned at all. This has been one of our most popular programs. The second error is on page 1, paragraph 5 regarding ELIP. It is Linguistics that launched the TEFL Certificate, while it is ELIP that is working on a TESP (Teaching English For Specific Purposes) Certificate.

In conclusion, using the Group 2 talent in our department in creative ways, and by attracting new talent to both the SLA and Sociolinguistics positions will contribute greatly toward addressing the department’s weaknesses identified by the reviewers in their report. By making the adjustments described above and by replacing as soon as possible the SLA and Sociolinguistics Group 4 positions with Group 1 tenure track positions will put the Department of Linguistics back on track to be as viable and vibrant as it was when rated as, “viable” following the previous 7-Year Review.
A Response to the Report of the External reviewer: Charlene Polio  Michigan State University for the Ohio University Department of Linguistics Revised April 21, 2017. Pages 1-8 by David Bell, Undergraduate Chair, Linguistics, May 22, 2017

I wish to respond to Dr. Polio’s report with regard to the undergraduate program.

General Comments

I only had 30 minutes to meet with Dr. Polio and I had to share that time with my co-undergraduate adviser. In this limited time, I had to address my concerns for both the department as a whole and the undergraduate program, for which I have been the chair for 15 years.

I voiced two concerns about the department as a whole. 1. I expressed my opposition to moves to both sever OPIE from Linguistics and the integration of Modern Languages. 2. I argued for the reinstatement of the Group 1 Phonology position that was lost over 8 years ago when the department went from 10 group 1 positions to 7. I argued that given that Phonology along with Syntax is at the very foundation of what Linguistics is, it was essential both for the MA program and the BA program to recognize this importance with a Group 1 Phonologist. Dr. Polio did not report my concern.

Dr. Polio paints a picture of a weakened program when in fact it has steadily strengthened its enrollments. If Dr. Polio had the time to explore the history of the UG program, she would have understood that the BA curriculum went through fundamental changes in 2012 with the move from quarters to semesters. Some courses were discontinued, some were combined, and some new courses were added. One of the courses, which was discontinued against my wishes, was the required senior capstone Directed Research. I had created a student Conference: COULD: Conference of the Ohio University Linguistics Department, which showcased both undergraduate and graduate research. That conference ran for 6 years. When the decision, which I opposed, was taken to drop both the UG Directed Research and the Graduate Proseminar Research Paper requirement, the conference was no longer viable. The report would have been much strengthened if Dr. Polio had been able to describe the BA Major’s curricular history in the last 7 years.

Response to Specific Comments in the Report

p. 4 para 3

“When we met with the undergraduate chair, he was not able to articulate what his duties were other than advising. Thus, we are not sure who reviews the undergraduate curriculum and recruits majors.”
I informed Dr. Polio that my main duties were with regard to advising. Indeed, for 14 years I was the sole undergraduate advisor. As I explained, recruiting does not play a significant part in my UG work. I don’t count The Majors Fair and meeting with students who visit OU as part of Ohio Up Close as recruitment. I pointed out to Dr. Polio that we take in few undergraduates directly as freshmen. Most of our majors are recruited from within the university and our major recruiting tools are the Gen-Ed Linguistics courses we offer as well as the courses that constitute the TEFL Certificate, as well as the language classes we offer. CAS 1410 Food Matters: Explorations Across the Liberal Arts, in which I teach a Language of Food module, also serves a gateway recruitment to the linguistics program.

I also informed Dr. Polio that the responsibility for the undergraduate curriculum was shared by the Group 1 faculty. Given the small size of our teaching faculty, decisions about what we offer are constrained by faculty availability and resources.

“I was concerned about why historical linguistics was still included in the curriculum and was told that it was because “it was on the books.” This is not a good reason to teach a course when most linguistics programs, I believe, are no longer including this course in their curricula.”

i. I informed Dr. Polio that historical linguistics had not been taught since the retirement of Dr. McGinn. I explained that I had wanted to retain the course because I had wanted to balance the theoretical and applied aspects of the program and not because it was “still on the books.” And this semester, we finally managed to be able to offer it, as Dr. Polio acknowledges. I should also note that the course is double numbered for grads and undergrads.

ii. Dr. Polio suggests that historical linguistics is no longer offered by most linguistics programs. I beg to disagree. Historical linguistics plays an increasing role in the areas of economic history, ethnobotany, language planning, and the study of colonialization and migration, to mention just a few. There is also an increasing interest by students in language construction – Elvish, Klingon, Dothraki, Valyrian etc., in which knowledge of historical linguistics plays a vital role. We also in the department make a connection between historical linguistics and Appalachian English, which is explored in the Linguistics Study Abroad Program in Scotland.

“The concern is that not much thought seems to have gone into the program recently”

Here are a few developments in the program that Dr. Polio did not mention in her report

• Dr. Polio was informed of the T3-4830 Language, Culture and Sport course, which I
created 3 years ago and which is offered in the summer and as part of the Global Opportunities Spring Break UK Sport and Culture program in Manchester, England. She also heard about a new T3 recently added to the Linguistics Study Abroad Program in Scotland.

- She was also informed about the development of courses like LING 2750 Language and Culture, which I teach and which is part of the Food Studies theme, exploring culture from the perspective of food. I recently changed this course to fulfill the T2 Gen-Ed Cross-Cultural requirements. As well as being offered regularly in the fall semester, that course is also offered as part of the Global Opportunities Summer Food in Sicily program in Italy. LING 2750, with the same content of language, culture, and food, is to be offered in the fall in OPIE’s Pathways program for OPIE students graduating to the mainstream Gen-Ed program.

- LING 1010/5010 Grammar in Language Learning and Teaching was added three years ago. I developed that course as a 1 credit online self-paced module as a requirement for both the BA Major and the TEFL Certificate. That course has proven extremely popular throughout the university, and regularly has enrollments of 50 or more students in Fall and Spring Semesters and more than 20 in Summer.

“Another concern is that one of the advisors was not accessible and did not help students plan out their programs.”

CAS regularly evaluates advisors with far more robust data than anecdotal evidence such as this.

Page 4, para. 4.

“There are currently about 50 majors in the program and it is difficult to say if this is below what one would expect at a university the size of OU”

This is a robust number of UG majors and certainly above the number that would be expected when compared with other majors at OU, and even more so taking into consideration the small size of our faculty.

Page 4 para 6

“One possible way to expand the undergraduate program is by strengthening links with the College of Education. The self-study stated that the teaching endorsement in ESL lapsed and then was reinstated, but none of the faculty we spoke to discussed the endorsement. If this program could be promoted and expanded, undergraduate enrollments might increase.”
Dr. Polio is misinformed. The ESL endorsement is for graduate students only. We have a TEFL certificate which has been very popular over the years and which we have recently developed into an online program available for credit or as a non-degree qualification.

Page 6, para 1

“If the program wants to emphasize research, a research methods class covering the basics of quantitative and qualitative research should be included in the curriculum”

This class was included in the MA curriculum until 2012 and was dropped with the change to semesters. I taught that class and I opposed that change.

page 7, 8a

“Undergraduate program: There currently seems to be no caretaker of the undergraduate program nor a concerted effort to expand it or to strengthen the TESOL endorsement program (assuming the latter is possible). If the department wishes to remain a department, the undergraduate program needs to be expanded. I recommend putting someone like Michelle O’Malley, a Group 2 faculty member, in charge of the program as she seems to have innovative ideas for it. In addition, someone needs to explore ties with education about expanding the endorsement program.

Dr. Polio is misinformed. The TESOL endorsement program is for graduates. Michelle O’Malley would be an excellent choice for UG chair. I have been the Chair for 15 years and would dearly like someone else to take it over. That speaks to the fact that we have such a small Group 1 pool and no other Group 1 has expressed interest in becoming the UG Chair. It needs fresh energy like many of the positions in the department. The program is not without a caretaker and many innovations have taken place, as noted above.

Errors in the Executive Summary

p. 1 para. 4

The linguistics minors are in four tracks: TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), Sociolinguistics, Theoretical Linguistics, and CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning). There is no mention of the There is no mention of the TEFL Certificate (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) for undergraduates and graduates. This has been one of our most popular programs.
“Thirdly, ELIP is launching an online Teaching of English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) certificate program.” This is incorrect Linguistics is launching the online TEFL certificate. ELIP is working on a certificate in TESP (Teaching English For Specific Purposes)
Date:       June 15th, 2017

TO:         David Ingram, Program Review Committee

FROM:       Christopher Thompson, Chair, Department of Linguistics

RE:         David Bell’s Response to the Linguistics 7YR Report

The purpose of this memo is to comment as Department Chair on the response that David Bell wrote regarding the observations noted in the 7YR report about his position as undergraduate chair and the undergraduate program in general. From my point of view, some of the comments in the report were based on inaccurate information and unfair assumptions about our B.A. program, which need to be corrected. I will take up what was written by the reviewers in the 7YR report one at a time as David responded to them in his memo.

Pg. 1: General Comments Section
As David indicates, it is probably true that our reviewers did not have enough time to ask every question they might have wanted about the undergraduate program. More time may have helped David to explain to the reviewers why our undergraduate program lost so many of its pieces when the university converted to semesters in 2012. David did try hard to preserve the pieces that were lost. In fact, the lack of a culminating final year activity and research training were identified by the reviewers as an area in need of improvement in both the B.A. and M.A. programs. It seems as though David was feeling the frustration of having the B.A. program criticized for the very components he himself tried to prevent. This frustration must have come out in his conversation with the reviewers. I share this frustration. The reality is that our B.A. program would be better with these components, as the reviewers pointed out. I agree that it would have been nice, however, if the reviewers could have understood our current program in the context of the old. But this was not possible. David should have taken this more into account in the way he answered the reviewers questions.

Pg. 1-2: Response to Specific Comments in the Report
Again, the quote David cites referring to himself here, contained in the report, probably reflects the frustration he felt as the reviewers pointed out the deficiencies in the program that he tried so hard to prevent. David is fully capable of articulating his duties as undergraduate chair. He has held this assignment for the past 15 years, so I am not sure why the reviewers perceived him as being unable to do so. The curricular changes to the B.A. program were made collectively by the Group 1 faculty. The undergraduate curriculum is NOT the sole responsibility of the undergraduate chair, so any impression that David is alone responsible for this is not accurate.

It seemed that our external reviewer in particular had a specific idea about how recruiting in an undergraduate program works, when in fact, in the self-study and as corroborated by David, we explained why very few of our majors are recruited out of high school. I think that the explanation of this process that David describes should have been quite adequate for all the reviewers, including the number of our current majors. I’m not quite sure why David’s answer here is problematic. I agree with David here and we have always been told by previous reviewers, that our 50 undergraduate majors seem quite good for a program our size.
While David’s response here was interpreted as inappropriate (and perhaps it was), his point was that we teach the course because it continues to be important. I agree here with David’s assessment of our external reviewer’s bias against Historical Linguistics. On this question, they should have just agreed to disagree. The Group 1 faculty, of course, feel that Historical Linguistics needs to be continued if possible, though in an Applied Linguistics B.A. and M.A. program, this course may not be the highest priority when facing budget cuts.

I also tend to agree with David here. However, without an understanding of the B.A. program prior to the semester switch in 2012, it would be harder to understand why we redesigned the undergraduate curriculum as we did. David’s points in support of what he has done and why he has done so to keep the curriculum going are valid points. The external evaluator’s judgement that, “…Not much thoughts seems to have gone into the program recently,” is unfair.

It is true that CAS regularly evaluates advisors through a robust student questionnaire. The most recent evaluation, which is contained in the self-study, shows a positive rating. However, it is also true that prior to this evaluation, there was a concern with advising. This is why I assigned a second faculty member (a Group 2 colleague) to assist David with the advising. The impression given to the evaluators of one advisors not being accessible can be corroborated my other similar reports I have received during this last spring and in prior semesters. It is probably time for a change in the advising strategy of the undergraduate program.

David is absolutely correct here. The external evaluator is misinformed.

At one time, David taught the research methods class, which the department dropped from the curriculum against his advice when switching to semesters. However, this was a joint decision among the Group 1 faculty at that time. This is another instance where I have heard from multiple sources that we need to return to teaching a research methods class.

The perception that there is no caretaker of the undergraduate program is probably accurate. There is a need for someone like Dr. Michelle O’Malley to take charge, and this may indeed be a solution moving forward. And the comment about the undergraduate program needing to be expanded is also well taken. However, David is correct about the TESOL endorsement program. This is a graduate program. It could be expanded to generate revenue for the department, and perhaps David is a good person to take this on.

David is correct about the errors and omissions he describes. Our online TEFL Certificate Program is new, and was discussed by Michelle O’Malley in one of the interviews with the
evaluators, yet it wasn’t mentioned at all in the report. It is also mentioned in the self-study, but was possibly confused with the ELIP online TESP project.

To summarize the point of view I have tried to espouse in this memo, I believe that David’s comments regarding the 7YR report reflect in general the sentiments of all Group 1 faculty in the Department of Linguistics. However, the lack of time to talk at length about these issues during the interview process made it difficult to articulate the details David could have conveyed to the reviewers to provide the context needed to fully understand him and the undergraduate program in the Department of Linguistics. Also, David’s sense of humor is wry. His responses, influenced by his sense of humor may have given reviewers an inaccurate impression of him as they talked with him during the second day of a review process consisting of a very challenging itinerary.
Date: May 3, 2017

TO: David Ingram, Program Review Committee

FROM: Robert Frank, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

RE: Seven year review of Linguistics

This is my response to the 2017 report submitted for the Department of Linguistics seven year program review. I congratulate the faculty of the Linguistics, OPIE and ELIP programs for the accomplishments outlined in the self-study document. A diverse set of students is served by these programs, and each program plays a significant role within the broader curricular offerings of the college and university. It is for this reason that I have serious concerns about the future of the programs within Linguistics.

I would be remiss if I did mention among my concerns the quality of the self-study document. Its poor quality creates a barrier to the sort of comprehensive understanding of the department that is essential for a thorough program review, especially for those who are not familiar with the programs. The document contains contradictions, typographical errors and factual errors that create unnecessary confusion for the reader.

The declining Ohio University enrollment of international students is creating significant problems for both OPIE and ELIP, but particularly OPIE. A strategy for better aligning university recruitment and student support services with OPIE is a current, critical need. Conversations involving OPIE staff, the Linguistics Department, Admissions, the College and the VP for Global Affairs are underway. The goal of the discussions is the crafting of an OPIE strategic plan that is academically sound, financially viable and aligned with university priorities.

The recent loss of three tenure track faculty provides an opportunity to re-evaluate the futures of both the masters and bachelors programs in Linguistics. In addition, we are at a point where the future of the language programs deserves serious discussion in the context of all the language instruction being provided by the college.

For these reasons, I support a midterm review of the Linguistics Department. This will allow the time necessary to develop and implement a plan that addresses the concerns identified by the program review process.
Date: June 15th, 2017

TO: Dean Bob Frank

FROM: Christopher Thompson, Chair, Department of Linguistics

RE: Seven-Year Review of Linguistics, ELIP, and OPIE

This is my response to Dean Bob Frank’s assessment of the 2017 report submitted by the reviewers to the Department of Linguistics following the seven-year program review. While Dean Frank congratulates the faculty of Linguistics, OPIE, and ELIP for their accomplishments, he also notes that he has serious concerns about the future of the programs within Linguistics. I would like to address each of the concerns Dean Frank identifies as problematic, leading to his conclusion to be in favor of a midterm review of the Linguistics Department.

1. “The document contains contradictions, typographical errors and factual errors that create unnecessary confusion for the reader.”

The typographical errors occurred in part because the wrong version of the report was submitted to reviewers. These errors have now been corrected, and a new version of the report is now available, along with a summary of changes made. Regarding the, “contradictions,” and “factual errors that create unnecessary confusion for the reader,” I would like to note that while the external reviewer commented that she noticed the typos, she also wrote in the report that, “The Dean commented that there was also misinformation in the report, but it is not obvious to me what was incorrect.” (Page 1 paragraph 3 of the external review report.) Without further clarity, it is not possible to know exactly what Dean Frank meant by, “factual errors that create unnecessary confusion for the reader.” However, I think that perhaps there is disagreement between Dean Frank and the Department of Linguistics regarding the circumstances that have caused the two major issues the department is currently dealing with – the loss of tenure track faculty in the department, and the decline in international student enrollment at the university and in OPIE. I feel that I represented our departmental perspective as accurately as I know how from the departmental perspective.

2. “The declining Ohio University enrollment of international students is creating significant problems for OPIE and ELIP, particularly OPIE.”

The reason I have highlighted this issue again is because I wanted to point out that Dean Frank is well aware of the OPIE Review Process that the Department of Linguistics is currently involved in with the Vice Provost For Global Affairs. The review of how OPIE is situated at this university academically, and in terms of funding and recruitment, with the idea of potentially moving the program out of the Department of Linguistics had already begun when the external reviewers came to the department their site visit on April 11th and 12th. The reviewers noted in their report in many places that they didn’t understand the reason for this review or the idea of moving OPIE out of the department. I have attached a collection of all of their comments about this issue in an appendix at the end of this document.
3. “The recent loss of three tenure track faculty provides an opportunity to re-evaluate the future of the M.A. and B.A. programs, and the future of all language instruction in Linguistics.”

Although Dean Frank describes the Department of Linguistics as having lost three tenure track faculty, this is in the context of having lost three other tenure track positions (and not being allowed to replace them) in years previous to this current seven-year review. From the department’s point of view, this is in large-part why we are in our current predicament – because we are down six tenure track positions.

As Dean Frank alludes to, there are curricular, staffing, workload, and research productivity ramifications associated with the future viability of the academic programs in the Department of Linguistics. Over the last two weeks, I have developed a plan to address some of the major weaknesses in the program identified by the reviewers in the seven-year review report. I have also received permission from Dean Frank to hire two Group 4 faculty to cover the workload of two of our Group 1 losses for the fall, and have made several staffing adjustments to cover the third. I hope to be talking with Dean Frank again soon about the goals I want to set for making some of these positive changes. But without eventually replacing the Group 4 positions mentioned with permanent Group 1 tenure track faculty, the future of the department remains uncertain. Hopefully, permission for these Group 1 positions will be granted. In the meantime, the department looks forward to participating in an interim evaluation (in 2-3 years) so that the department’s progress toward improvement can be noted, and its rating can be restored back to a “viable” rating as soon as possible.

Appendix 1

From the Seven-Year Review of the Linguistics Department
April 24th, 2017

Executive Summary:
Pg. 2
• The review team also observed the impact the uncertainty and future of OPIE is having on the program faculty and strongly recommends that this matter be addressed very carefully with input from the faculty and regardless of the location of OPIE, efforts should be made to preserve the existing association between Linguistic and OPIE.

Pg. 3
The internal reviewers would like to add the following suggestions and observations.

• Regardless of the location of OPIE, a close association between Linguistics and OPIE must be preserved.

External Review:
Pg. 3
The only area of concern was that the business manager was being moved to the Center for International Studies. It seems that the rationale for this was that OPIE might be brought into CIS. Since this move is still being explored, it does not make sense to move the business manager out of the building.

**Pg. 6**

Although there seemed to be no concerns about the quality of instruction at OPIE, there is great concern about the declining enrollments. This is not a reflection of the quality of OPIE but rather a trend common throughout the US. How this can be rectified is not clear. The Dean and Vice-Provost want to move OPIE to the Center for International Studies. This topic dominated our discussions with the OPIE faculty and was brought up by many of the linguistics faculty. All faculty, without exception, do not see this move as a positive development. In my opinion, it is not clear that the move will help OPIE. According to the Vice-Provost, the move would allow her to help OPIE recruit students and create in-country programs. While this may be true, this assistance could be given with OPIE still in the department. The OPIE faculty is deeply concerned about being put into a non-academic unit (although there is some disagreement about whether CIS is an academic unit). I believe the concern is that Group 2 faculty will be eliminated and adjuncts will be hired as a cost-saving measure. The other worry is that the move was orchestrated by the Dean and Vice-Provost without proper feedback. Indeed, the Associate Provost explained that the move was attempted without approval from the UCC and now is being handled in the appropriate manner. I believe that the OPIE faculty is properly worried about the lack of transparency. I return to this matter below in my recommendations.

**Pg. 7**

- The collaboration and sharing of faculty among linguistics and ELIP and OPIE.

**Pg. 8**

e. OPIE declining enrollments: There is no disputing the high quality of OPIE instruction and faculty along with the loss of money, whereas the best course of action is greatly in dispute. While I am not sure if moving OPIE to the Center for International Studies will increase enrollment and save money, I do believe that the move has not been vetted properly. I know that the faculty are skeptical and worried about their jobs, and this was disheartening to see. The Associate Provost agreed the faculty were right to be concerned and emphasized that any consideration of move needed to be an open process and investigated and approved by the UCC. The Vice-Provost for Global Affairs emphasized that she could help OPIE with recruitment, but it is not clear why this necessitated a move out of the College. It’s unclear to me what the Vice-Provost’s motives are. My recommendation is that OPIE stay in Linguistics because of the
collaboration that occurs between OPIE and the Linguistics students and faculty and because of
the respect shown by the Linguistics faculty to the Group 2 OPIE faculty. At the same time, I
recommend that the Vice-Provost for Global Affairs assist OPIE in their recruitment efforts,
special program applications, and in-country programs. I recommended to the Vice-Provost that
she bring in experts from other intensive English programs and include OPIE faculty on a
committee to review any major changes in administration. The faculty is concerned that a move
has already been decided. This is my concern as well given the business manager for the
department is being relocated to the Center for International Studies. Such a move is pointless
unless the Vice-Provost and Dean have already made their decision. I do, however, completely
understand the Dean’s financial concerns regarding OPIE.