

Tab 8

H: HEC Board summary

Appendix H. HEC Board summary.

- a. *Name of unit authorized to offer degree:* Department of Asian Languages & Literature
- b. *College:* College of Arts & Sciences
- c. *Exact titles of degrees offered* Bachelor of Arts degree in Asian Languages & Literature
Master of Arts degree in Asian Languages & Literature
Doctor of Philosophy degree in Asian Languages & Literature
- d. *Year of last review:* 1994
- e. *History of the field at the University of Washington*

The Department of Asian Languages & Literature was created in 1969, but the teaching of Asian languages, literatures, and cultures has a much longer history at the University of Washington. As early as the 1890s the University offered a program of studies in "ancient languages" which included a course of instruction in Sanskrit along with Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. In 1909 the regents voted to establish the Department of Oriental History, Literature, and Institutions, placing at its head the well-known Asianist, the Reverend Herbert H. Gowen (1864-1960). Over the next ninety-five years those early Sanskrit offerings were gradually supplemented by additional Asian language programs: Chinese (1926), Japanese (1928), Korean (1944), Mongolian (early 1950s), Tibetan (1952), Hindi and Tamil (1967), Thai (1967), Manchu (1970s), Vietnamese (1981), and, on "soft" money, Indonesian (1991) and Urdu (2004). Of these, Mongolian, Manchu, Tibetan and Tamil are no longer offered for want of faculty positions.

Beginning in 1949, instructional programs in Asian languages were housed in the Department of Far Eastern and Slavic Languages and Literature. That department was divided in 1969 into two separate and autonomous units, the Department of Slavic Languages and Literature and the Department of Asian Languages and Literature. A program in Turkic languages was established in the Department of Asian Languages and Literature in the early 1960's, but was transferred to the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization in 1986.

From the first days of the old Department of Oriental History, Literature, and Institutions it has always been clear that language instruction alone is not an adequate basis for acquiring a genuine knowledge or understanding of a people and culture, nor as an appropriate scholarly goal of a university department. As the Department of Asian Languages & Literature has evolved, the teaching of languages proper has been coupled closely with the study of literature, literary and language history, and linguistic structure. The twin subjects of language and literature, both broadly conceived, when taken together have come to constitute the scholarly basis of our discipline. In the nearly six decades since the end of the second war the department has evolved and matured such that its educational mission and philosophy now clearly reflect this.

f. *Continuing need*

The Department of Asian Languages & Literature serves a clientele of several thousand students each year in our courses in language, literature, linguistics and related subjects, covering the major language and cultural areas of South, Southeast and East Asia.* This means chiefly Hindi, Sanskrit, Chinese, Japanese and Korean, areas for which we have degree programs, and Thai, Vietnamese, Indonesian and Urdu, programs of language instruction only, with no degree opportunity. These are languages that are typically not widely taught or easily available elsewhere in the State of Washington. The vast majority of the students we serve are intent on learning one or more of these Asian languages for other than recondite scholarly purposes. We pride ourselves on the scholarly rigor of our graduate programs, but we recognize by the same token that by far our greatest impact is on the hundreds of language students, undergraduate and graduate alike, who take our classes in connection with such professional courses of study as law, medicine, engineering, business, computer programming, forestry and fisheries, and a myriad of other vocational, practical and general interests.

The upshot of this is that we serve three distinct constituencies: (i) people from among the whole university community who have a desire to learn something of the languages, literatures and cultural history of South and East Asia out of an appreciation for the literary and linguistic heritages of important non-European cultures or as a matter of general education, (ii) students with a professional or vocational need to know one or more Asian languages as a part of their career training, and (iii) the relatively small, but crucially important, number of students who follow a path of advanced scholarship in this field to a

graduate degree, usually the Ph.D. Each of these constituencies plays an important role in our modern society, each different from the other, none expendable. The Department strongly supports the sentiments of the first group, recognizes and appreciates the importance of the needs of the second group, and is professionally dedicated to the scholarly interests of the third group. In short, we are committed to meeting our teaching responsibilities to each of these groups, providing the best possible education at every level from a first year language class to a Ph.D. level seminar and ultimately in this way to fostering a level of thoughtfulness and understanding within the society that can only redound to the benefit of us all.

*Student course evaluation responses for the 2002-03 academic year totalled more than 3200, for the 2003-04 academic year, close to 2900. Actual enrollment figures will be found to be considerably higher than these numbers. (See appendix I for complete data.)

g. *Assessment of student learning and program effectiveness*

Instructional effectiveness is monitored on two levels: by the instructors themselves with regard to student achievement, and by the department in its evaluation of the instructors' performance. The first of these is shaped entirely by the instructor and the nature of the class in question and typically includes frequent assignments, tests, papers, and oral presentations on the part of the students. Our classes are often small enough that the evidence of everyday classroom exchanges is sufficient for a continuous assessment of student success.

The second is administered by the Peer Teaching Evaluation Committee (PTEC), which consists of three members of the faculty, typically two at the professorial level and one lecturer. The committee submits reports on faculty teaching performance to the chair annually according to College requirements. Student teaching evaluations, quantified and tabulated by the UW's Instructional Assessment System, serve both levels of our scrutiny of teaching effectiveness: instructors themselves use the results as a basis for knowing what they do right and where they need to make improvements, and the department uses them to assess the instructors both individually and collectively by program. The combination of these various means gives us a sound basis for judging our overall performance. We have compiled a composite student evaluation metric for all courses that were evaluated in the academic years 2002-03 and 2003-04. The resulting figures are an average measure of the department's teaching strengths as a whole. The figures for these academic years are given in the following charts:

2002-03 AY	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Median score*
Course as a whole was	41%	41%	15%	3%	1%	1%	4.28
Course content was	40%	41%	15%	3%	1%	1%	4.26
Instructor's contribution	54%	31%	11%	3%	1%	1%	4.58
Instructor's effectiveness	47%	33%	14%	4%	1%	1%	4.42
Four preceding items combined	46%	37%	14%	3%	1%	1%	4.38

2003-04 AY	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Median score*
Course as a whole was	42%	41%	14%	2%	1%	1%	4.31
Course content was	40%	43%	14%	3%	1%	0%	4.27
Instructor's contribution	55%	33%	10%	2%	1%	1%	4.59
Instructor's effectiveness	49%	35%	13%	3%	1%	1%	4.47
Four preceding items combined	47%	38%	13%	3%	1%	1%	4.41

*On a scale of 1.00 - 5.00, 5.00 being high; totals exceeding 100% are the result of rounding up.

In addition to these kinds of measures and statistics, the department makes every effort to ascertain from its graduates themselves how they judge the education that they have received at our hands. Exit surveys of our M.A. and Ph.D. students consistently show a very favorable response to questions about our performance and success.

h. *Degrees awarded*

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
B.A. degrees	42	45	43
M.A. degrees	2	7	7
Ph.D. degrees	2	0	2

i. *Enhancement of effectiveness and plans for future development*

Plans to enhance effectiveness fall generally into two broad categories: (a) those designed to strengthen and improve the department's role in general education in the humanistic sciences and (b) those directed specifically toward improving the effectiveness of our degree programs for departmental majors and graduate students. The two are distinct, but not unrelated to each other. Our department faculty explore possibilities in both regards regularly at faculty meetings, sometimes in response to specific questions or issues that may arise at a particular moment, otherwise as part of an on-going, thoughtful concern for the quality of our degree programs. Typically we have standing committees to focus attention on one or another particular issue and from time to time we convene special gatherings or "retreats" to discuss collectively questions of future planning in depth.

Our efforts in category (a) include among other things a wish to expand our interactions and collaboration with the Seattle Asian Art Museum; a plan to hold a series of evening symposia, regularly, perhaps annually, open to the public on issues of contemporary relevance arising from our areas of study and expertise, such as, for example, "Fighting Words: Language policy and language 'wars' in Asia" or "Linguistic Diasporas: Asian languages in American society." Within the University proper we are looking for ways to expand our visibility such that a greater number of undergraduates overall will discover ways to integrate some exposure to Asian languages and literature into their programs of study. To do this we need to show a higher measure of the pertinence of our subject to non-specialists than we currently have been able to do.

In category (b) we are pursuing detailed and thorough examinations of all of our degree program requirements, focusing especially on our undergraduate degrees, and proposing revisions where deemed necessary, in an effort to strengthen and at the same time "streamline" our courses of study. Among other things we are devising a single sophomore-level course to be established as a required "gateway" course for all department majors irrespective of language specialization. This course will answer three general questions for all prospective Asian Language & Literature majors: first, what does it mean to major in an Asian language, second, what is it about the study of language and literature that we have in common with one another in spite of our language and area diversity, and third, how does a major in this department contribute to a meaningful undergraduate college education overall.

Tab 9

I: Supplementary data

Instructional Assessment System

University of Washington - Asian Language & Literature
Summary for AU03, WI04, and SP04
College CD: Humanities

University of Washington
Autumn 2003 through Spring 2004

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

E=Excellent; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=Very Poor

	No. Resp's	PERCENTAGES ¹						MEDIAN	DECILE RANK	
		E	VG	G	F	P	VP		Institution	College
1. The course as a whole was:	2890	42	41	14	2	1	1	4.31	7	6
2. The course content was:	2890	40	43	14	3	1		4.27	7	5
3. The instructor's contribution to the course was:	2881	55	33	10	2	1	1	4.59	8	7
4. The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	2887	49	35	13	3	1	1	4.47	7	7
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	11548	47	38	13	3	1	1	4.41	7	6

Questions 5 through 22 differ by form type and are not included in this report.

Relative to other college courses you have taken:		Much Higher	Average	Much Lower						
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	2806	27	23	26	6	2	2	5.11	7	6
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:	2795	34	26	18	3	1	1	5.52	8	7
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	2806	30	25	20	5	2	1	5.38	7	7
26. The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	2799	34	24	18	3	1	1	5.60	8	8
27. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	2797	31	20	21	4	1	1	5.62	8	8

28. On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work? (Percentages)

Under 2	2
2-3	6
4-5	11
6-7	21
8-9	21
10-11	17
12-13	9
14-15	7
16-17	3
18-19	1
20-21	1
22 or more	2

No. Resp's 2795
Class median 8.46

29. From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education? (Percentages)

Under 2	3
2-3	8
4-5	17
6-7	22
8-9	18
10-11	15
12-13	7
14-15	5
16-17	2
18-19	1
20-21	1
22 or more	1

No. Resp's 2779
Class median 7.43

30. What grade do you expect in this course? (Percentages)

A	(3.9-4.0)	17
A-	(3.5-3.8)	38
B+	(3.2-3.4)	21
B	(2.9-3.1)	12
B-	(2.5-2.8)	6
C+	(2.2-2.4)	3
C	(1.9-2.1)	2
C-	(1.5-1.8)	1
D+	(1.2-1.4)	1
D	(0.9-1.1)	1
D-	(0.7-0.8)	1
E	(0.0)	
Pass		1
Credit		1
No Credit		1

No. Resp's 2764
Class median 3.50

31. In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: (Percentages)

In your major?	21
A distribution requirement?	12
An elective?	26
In your minor?	17
A program requirement?	13
Other?	11

This summary of Form Types A, B, C, D, E, F and X surveys includes 187 classes and 2,906 questionnaires.

Instructor rank	classes
Professor	9
Associate Professor	1
Assistant Professor	23
Instructor	8
Lecturer	52
Pre-Doctoral Associate	16
Teaching Assistant	47
Other	31

1. Percentages are based on the number of students who rated each item.