

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
GRADUATE SCHOOL**

**SELF-STUDY REVIEW:
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS**

DECEMBER 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Organization	1
II.	Description	1
III.	Faculty	2
IV.	Students	4
V.	Curriculum/Instruction	6
VI.	Research	12
VII.	Service	15
VIII.	Evaluation	17
IX.	Development	19
X.	Summary	24

REVIEW OF DEGREE PROGRAMS: DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

I. ORGANIZATION

1.1 Unit authorized to offer degree programs:
Department of Linguistics

1.2 College:
Arts and Sciences

1.3 Exact Titles of Degrees Granted:
Bachelor of Arts, Masters of Arts, and Doctor of Philosophy

1.4 Administration:

The department administration consists of a Chair (Kaisse), Graduate Advisor (Newmeyer) and Undergraduate Advisor (Saporta). Committees include Admissions, Distribution List, Interdepartmental Liaison, Graduate Requirements, and search committees. Because the department is small, the faculty often acts as a committee of the whole. We are not formally affiliated with any centers, but several faculty are affiliated with or adjunct faculty of the Middle East Center, Canadian Studies, Philosophy, etc. We also have several cross-listed courses with Anthropology and Philosophy.

II. DESCRIPTION

2.1 Nature and Objectives:

The recent past has resulted in the emergence of linguistics as central in the developing field of Cognitive Sciences. The most impressive progress has been in the development of syntactic, phonological and semantic theories of considerable abstractness and complexity. Both the undergraduate and graduate programs have focused on these recent advances as pivotal. The undergraduate program is loosely structured, with requirements divided between Linguistics and other departments, and is a typical Liberal Arts degree. Our undergraduate program has been adjusted slightly as course credit hours have increased with the growth of knowledge in the field and as we have begun to offer

new courses, for instance in morphology. The content of these courses is constantly revised in accord with current research. Our undergraduate majors are very well prepared, comparing favorably with those holding Masters degrees from many other institutions, and those wishing to continue in the field have been accepted into the best linguistics programs in the country. We participated in the recent project on undergraduate education in linguistics sponsored by our professional association (the Linguistic Society of America) and our degree is comparable with those of the best programs in the country.

The graduate program offers an M.A. and a Ph.D. with emphasis on theoretical linguistics. While the graduate degree programs have recently been reorganized to improve the balance between M.A. and Ph.D. requirements (see brochure in appendix), the basic emphasis on the core areas of linguistics has not changed greatly in the twenty-six years of the department's existence.

The programs' requirements are described in detail in the departmental brochure, which is attached as Appendix F.

Our undergraduate and Masters degrees have served as fine preparation not only for professional linguists, but for language teachers, teachers of reading, educators of the deaf and hearing-impaired, speech pathologists and audiologists, computer scientists and cognitive scientists, and anthropologists.

2.2 Basic Program and Unit Data:
See Appendix A.

III. FACULTY

3.1 Faculty List and Curricula Vita:
See Appendix B.

3.2 Visiting, Part-Time and Other faculty.

All eight regular members of the faculty are full-time. Almost every year we have one or two visitors replacing faculty on-leave, since the regular faculty receive frequent invitations as visiting professors elsewhere. For instance, in 1988-89, Michael Moortgat, a semanticist and computational linguist, replaced ter Meulen (on-leave) and Emonds (Visiting Professor in Paris.) and Saporta

'traded places' with Carlos Otero of UCLA for two quarters. In 1989-90, we will have a visiting phonologist (Mohamed Guerrsel) replacing Hargus (release time award from the Graduate School); and David Gil, a semanticist, replacing ter Meulen (Visiting Professor at Indiana). The department has been notably successful in competing for College Visiting Professorships: Geoff Pullum in 1981, George Clements in 1985, and Jerzy Rubach in 1990. These visitors are important to a small department such as ours which rarely has new positions or retirements.

Faculty members of other units play an important role in our department. Our 400-level historical linguistics courses are taught each year by Voyles (Germanic), Klausenburger (Romance) or Shapiro (Asian); Schiffman (Asian) and Eastman (Anthropology) offer cross-listed courses each year in sociolinguistics, language policy, areal linguistics, and/or dialectology; Hunt (Psychology) and Tanimoto (Computer Science) cooperate with ter Meulen of our department to offer a College Studies sequence in Cognitive Science; Dale (Psychology) offers a yearly course at the 400-level in child language acquisition, while both Dale and Stoel-Gammon (Speech and Hearing) offer 500-level courses every other year in syntactic and phonological development of children's language. In addition to all these courses with linguistics numbers, there are several courses offered in other departments which are frequently taken by our students, including linguistically-oriented courses in virtually all the language departments, Speech and Hearing, Philosophy, and Computer Science.

3.3 Disadvantaged Groups.

Of our eight faculty, three, the last three tenure-track hires, are women, two of whom have been granted tenure during their employment here. Our commitment to hiring and supporting the professional development of disadvantaged groups is thus, we feel, unquestionable and notably successful. (See Appendix L which details national availability of women and minorities on its first page and our faculty's distribution on the second.) Our Assistant Professors receive, in addition to yearly advisory meetings with the Chair, abundant informal peer counseling, particularly concerning where to publish. Each year, beginning a few years ago, we have collected the publications of Assistant Professors and made them available for other faculty to read and comment on, passing comments to the chair for transmittal, discussing the articles directly with the author.

Our pool of minority applicants, unhappily, has been virtually nil. We had a black faculty member, Wayne Williams, who joined the department in 1975 and remained for several years, but he chose to move gradually into Afro- American Studies here and has recently left the university. Contreras may technically qualify as a minority, but as he is a native Chilean, we do not feel he meets the spirit, even if he fulfills the letter of the need to hire traditionally underrepresented groups.

We intend to continue our demonstrated policy of hiring traditionally underrepresented ethnic and gender groups, and we beat the bushes for such candidates whenever a faculty opening becomes available. Most of us attend a large number of conferences and institutes and teach frequently elsewhere, so we have a very good idea of the candidates on the job market at any time. Perhaps our reputation for hiring and supporting disadvantaged groups improves our applicant pool at each new search. We have found that out short lists, constructed without regard to race or gender, usually have a large number, often a majority, of women on them, and that there is no need to compromise standards to increase gender diversity. We are not so sanguine about our chances of hiring an ethnic minority because there are simply so few PhDs belonging to these groups, especially in the theoretical fields in which we most desperately need to hire. But we are eager to hear suggestions.

IV. STUDENTS

4.1 Baseline Information:

Autumn 1989: 35 undergraduate majors

1988-1989: 11 B. A. Graduates.

A recent survey of undergraduate majors reflected the wide variety of positions held. Graduates in 1987-88 averaged 3.39 G.P.A. upon graduation.

The average undergraduate G.P.A. for an entering graduate student is 3.87. The average G.R.E. scores are as follows: Verbal--592; Quantitative--714; Analytical--621. If the Verbal and Analytical scores seem unusually low, it is because approximately half of our students are not native speakers of English, and naturally have difficulty with these particular tests.

Offers of admission are decided upon by a vote of the entire faculty, each of whom applies whatever criteria he or she feels are most appropriate. The following criteria are typically ranked high by all faculty: Undergraduate G.P.A., G.R.E. scores, the student's Statement of Purpose, letters of recommendation, background in linguistics, and knowledge of and desire to work on the linguistic properties of a little-studied language.

No systematic study has been undertaken comparing G.P.A., G.R.E. scores, etc. with later success as a graduate student.

4.2 Enrollment Patterns:

Our enrollments have been fairly steady in the last ten years, with the occasional unexplained perturbation up or down. (See Appendix I for 1989 enrollment.) Part of this steadiness is enforced—we must regularly turn down graduate applicants due to lack of space as imposed by the Graduate School. We could not handle all that many more than our current limit of 48 due to the size of our faculty, but we would like the flexibility to accommodate good applicants up to about 56 if the occasion arises. (see Appendix H.) One third to one half of our graduate students attend part-time (usually after their first full-time year), largely due to lack of internal funding. Students do not regularly register for summer quarter, though of course many graduate students writing theses and dissertations do so. We have had approximately two non-matriculated graduate students per quarter since the program was initiated about four years ago.

4.3 Graduation Patterns:

Undergrad Degrees: 1975-76: 1	1982-83: 10
1976-77: 5	1983-84: 9
1977-78: 8	1984-85: 11
1978-79: 17	1985-86: 12
1979-80: 22	1986-87: 16
1980-81: 17	1987-88: 13
1981-82: 17	1988-89: 11

4.4 Disadvantaged Groups

The Department works in conjunction with the Minority Division to attract members of disadvantaged groups to its

graduate program. We have managed to attract and award degrees to a good proportion of women. Unfortunately, we have not been as successful as we would have liked in our efforts to attract representatives of ethnic minorities. However, at present, we do have a very active candidate for the Ph.D. who is from Seattle's black community, one of probably no more than a dozen blacks in linguistics doctoral programs nationwide.

4.5 Nontraditional Students

A large number -- on average perhaps a quarter -- of our students are older students returning to school after careers in other fields. In the past two years, for example, the vice president and the secretary-treasurer of our student linguistics organization (the LSUW) have been women in their thirties and forties, one of whom had a career as a scientific illustrator.

V. CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

A. Undergraduate

5.A.1 Degree programs/options:

See Appendix F, Departmental Brochure.

5.A.2 General and Service Education:

We have several courses that are on the university distribution lists, those with the highest enrollments being in Linguistics 200 (Humanities Part A) with about 200 per quarter and Linguistics 201 (Social Science Part A) with about 60 per quarter. These courses serve as a means to keep the advances in our discipline before the university community, since they and other distribution list courses are often taken by majors in speech and hearing sciences, psychology, foreign languages, philosophy, ethnomusicology, etc. as an integral part of their professional training in those disciplines. Each professor is expected, unless special factors intervene, to teach one of these courses per year. Our adjunct faculty is often integrated into our program through this teaching also, which puts them in working contact with our teaching assistants. Since these are our only courses with teaching assistants, they also serve as our principal laboratory for training future teachers in our field under faculty supervision (with the teaching assistants giving two lectures per week on their own). In general, these distribution list courses serve a

crucial function of keeping both our faculty and our graduate students aware of the need to integrate linguistics into a general liberal education and to present the results of linguistics in an accessible way to the educated public.

Another recent initiative in this area has been completed by Professor Hargus, our American Indianist, who has now installed a joint Introduction to Linguistics and Anthropology, which should qualify for Social Science Distribution, and which in any case will be more suitable for students in their department than introductions previously offered.

While many majors, both graduate and undergraduate, do use our resources in their own courses of study, the clearest instance of service classes provided by our department concerns the ongoing relation with the MA program in Teaching English as a Second Language within the English Department, described below under V.5.B.3.

In the past three years, we have finally formalized, through the Council on Teacher Education, the possibility for a Washington State high school teacher to receive an endorsement for teaching a foreign language through a minor in our department (in conjunction with a requirement for actual language proficiency that equals that of the language's department), rather than in the language department. It has long been widely recognized that linguistics students with strong interests in a particular language are typically among the most effective and motivated teachers of the language; we repeatedly elicited such comments from faculty teaching coordinators in the university's language departments during the period in which this alternative to a language department major was being formally approved through the Education School's Field Committee on Foreign Languages. This Linguistics Minor for foreign language teaching endorsement constitutes an important step toward making Linguistics an integral part of the State educational process that forms our high school system's teachers, and adds an "applied" dimension to our primarily research-oriented department.

We thus feel that we have made and are continuing to make great efforts to expand such general education and service offerings, and that these courses in fact greatly enrich our faculty's flexibility and usefulness to the university community.

At this point, we feel no particular detrimental pressure from service courses on that instruction which is at least de facto reserved for majors; the consensus in the department seems to be that all is well in this area (account being taken of course of the universal uneasiness at teaching classes of more than 100 enrolled).

5.A.3 Interdisciplinary Programs:

Our unit's main participation in interdisciplinary curriculum concerns our long-standing and solid contributions to the MA program in Teaching English as a Second Language, which is under the supervision in particular of Professors J. Tollefson and S. Silberstein. Their students are obligated to take courses within our standard introductory phonology and syntax sequences (451-2-3 and 461-2-3), and our courses 445 (Descriptive Aspects of English as a Second Language) and 446 (Descriptive Aspects of English Phonology and Morphology) both have been designed especially for their program and are taken mainly by students in it. Each of the latter two is offered once yearly.

We feel that the enormous resources poured into teaching English worldwide are often misdirected because so little effort is made to remedy the fact that so many "teachers" of English are nothing more than native speakers with a general education who know next to nothing, consciously, about the language's structure that they can transmit to non-native speakers. Our participation in the English Department's TESL program gives their students a rigorous foundation in English grammar, morphology, and phonology that is beneficial both to them in the marketplace, and to their future students.

B. GRADUATE

5.B.1 Master's Degree:

See Appendix F, Departmental Brochure

5.B.2 Doctoral Degree:

See Appendix F, Departmental Brochure

5.B.3 Instructional relationship to other programs:

One of the closest relations between our graduate instruction and that in other departments is the integration between the MA in

TESL in the English Department and our courses, described in section V.5.A.3 above.

Less formally, many candidates for graduate degrees in the language departments (Slavic, Romance, and Germanic especially) take minors or at least several courses in our unit. In fact, it is not unusual for a student in these departments to find ours quite congenial to their interests and to switch departments in the course of their graduate studies.

In addition, our department is typically a conduit through which passes any work in this university on the languages of the Pacific Northwest, including recent grants obtained for example to compose dictionaries of some of them (alumna Dr. Dawn Bates) and the work in re-organizing and classifying Northwest Indian basketry by our alumnus Dr. Nile Thompson (leading to a well-known exhibition that a few years ago toured several State museums).

5.B.4 Teaching and Research Participation:

Graduate students are assigned to teach small sections of our large introductory lecture courses, Linguistics 200 and 201. A faculty member lectures three days per week; the remaining two the classes are broken down into sections of about 28 which are led by graduate students, who generally assign and go over homework problems, supplement the lectures, etc. TAs receive a general orientation at the beginning of the year and then are closely supervised by the professor in charge of the class in the quarter they are teaching. Each TA teaches two sections per quarter and we thus are able to employ four students per quarter. In addition, advanced graduate students are occasionally employed to replace on-leave faculty in courses such as our first and second quarter phonology and syntax classes (Ling 451-2, 461-2). In this, we tread a somewhat perilous track between the desire to supplement our ludicrously small number of TAs (4 per year for our 48 graduate students) and the equally desirable goal of staffing non-introductory classes with faculty only. We generally assign an advanced student to teach the introductory Linguistics 200 in the summer quarter on his and her own, and this has always worked out well. If we had funding for more TAs we would aim to have all introductory classes taught in classes of 28 or so by TAs. This is the practice at many peer departments, such as the University of Massachusetts and Ohio State. It has the advantage of creating small classes in which problem-solving and discussion, so crucial to learning linguistics, can go on, of freeing faculty in a

small department to teach more courses in their area, and, of course, of supporting more graduate students while training them as teachers.

Because we have only 4 teaching assistantships each quarter, selection of TAs is the most painful thing we do each year. No first year student is ever given a TAship and almost no second-year students are either. Thus Masters students rarely receive TAships. Also, no student ever receives more than two quarters of TAship in a single year. This allows us to meagerly support 6 students. Our criteria for selection are academic excellence and productivity, financial need, and teaching excellence. However, many good TAs are not renewed and many excellent students are not supported. A doctoral student receives on average from 2 to 5 quarters of TAship though some receive none.

Students occasionally receive TAships from language departments and from the Language Learning Center. Our best successes have been in placing a computationally sophisticated student in the Language Learning Center for one quarter for the past two years and in Asian Languages and Literatures, where we have had assistantships in Japanese, Korean, and Chinese. In other departments, however, obtaining TAships for our students has been very difficult. We have had a couple of positions in Romance languages over 10 years, one in Germanic, and a couple in English as a Second Language. We have never placed any of our qualified students as a Logic TA in Philosophy.

The problem of placing TAs elsewhere is a vexed one. Of course we understand that departments will want to reserve their positions for their own students. On the other hand, linguistics students are often the best qualified language teachers, as they have an interest in the structure of language that a literature specialist may lack. Similarly, many of our students have a professional interest in the theory and practice of teaching English as a second language, but virtually all spots in that area are reserved for MATESL students. MATESL and language department graduate students receive TAships in far greater proportion than linguistics students. Almost every MATESL student is supported for a full year at least (in a two-year program) as there are about 15 slots per year. The same is true, we believe, of most graduate students in language and literature departments. It seems to us

that in such a situation, only action from the administration can increase our ability to place our students in other departments.

We do not have formal research training prior to the dissertation, per se. However, almost all students must write a Masters Thesis, and under our recently revised doctoral requirements, must write two generals papers as well and deliver two papers at conferences or colloquia; these are intended as supervised research practice before the student launches into the dissertation.

5.B.5 Funding:

As detailed in the preceding section, we have 4 three quarter teaching assistantships per year, generally distributed among 6 students. Our only additional stipend support package is a Graduate School Recruitment award, which we apply for yearly, and which pays tuition and the salary of a research assistantship for one year. (Once or twice we have been awarded one and a third such packages from the Graduate School.) There is no provision for support beyond the first year from the Graduate School, so we commit a year of TAship from our own store to the student thus recruited. The only other sources of support are very irregular Research Assistantships from Graduate School Research Fund awards to our faculty or, this year, a one-time National Science Foundation grant awarded to Professors Hargus and Kaisse which pays two quarters of RAship. There are also the partial tuition waivers which the Graduate School makes available to all departments.

This funding picture is dismal compared to our peers and accounts for the loss of many of our B.A. students who might go on for further training here, the flight of many of the best graduate students we do attract, and our failure to attract many others in the first place. UCLA, for instance, with about the same number of graduate students, has fifteen TAships within the linguistics department, supports two students on grant money to their phonetics lab, and receives four fellowships yearly from the university. The University of Massachusetts, again of comparable size, guarantees support to every graduate student for five years. Support comes in the form of a tuition waiver and stipend of \$6750 (i.e. about as much as three quarters of TAship at the UW). During the first year, the aid is in the form of a fellowship, after which most students have full responsibility for a single section of an introductory linguistics course. The money comes from

college and university support for the introductory courses, research assistantships on grants, and an outright gift of money from the college. UC San Diego supports 40 of its 45 linguistics graduate students as teachers in linguistics courses or in European language courses, for which the department has first responsibility for supplying TAs. Indiana University supports the majority of its graduate students through introductory course TAs and posts in English as a Second Language. While the U.Mass situation is unusually rosy, the others cited are quite typical of what we are competing against.

VI. RESEARCH

6.1 Funding:

Although large external funding agencies such as NSF have designated funding for research in linguistics, not many linguists whose research is purely theoretically oriented receive such awards. Funding for descriptive (data-gathering) projects, on the other hand, is relatively easy to come by. Prof. Hargus has fairly regularly obtained modest grants (\$1200.-3500.) for research on Native American languages from a variety of sources; this compares reasonably well with awards made to faculty with similar interests at other institutions.

As this report was being written, Profs. Hargus and Kaisse received notice that their NSF proposal to hold a conference on Lexical Phonology this spring had been funded. The grant of approximately \$15,000 will support a research assistant for 2 quarters and bring in scholars from around the world.

We recognize that a substantial grant from an external agency could support a graduate student for a reasonable period of time, and we will continue to seek such funding. This was one goal of Prof. ter Meulen's 1989 proposal to NSF for research on tense and aspect. Prof. Hargus plans to submit a request to NSF for research on word formation in Babine-Witsu Wit'en, and her proposal will request major support for a research assistant. Our Principal Research Associate, Prof. Tarlinskaya, received a year's NEH grant a few years ago and continues to apply for NEH and NSF support. On balance, we are reasonably successful, as linguistics departments go, in attracting outside funding. A great expenditure of effort

could probably increase our funds; we as faculty must each decide if this is the best course, giving the low level of funding available.

6.2 Current Research:

The eight full-time faculty members are each very active in their subspecialties in the field and have made significant contributions in the past five years. For example, Professor Kaisse has shown that there are more distinct types of phonological rules than had been previously believed; Professor Emonds has led the linguistics profession to begin rethinking the standard analysis of parts-or-speech that had been taken for granted for decades; Professor ter Meulen has become the world's leading authority on the semantic properties of events, Professor Hargus has put forward the first systematic theoretical account in history of the American Indian language Sekani, and Professor Newmeyer has made an original contribution to our understanding of the origins and evolution of language. The contributions of several of our graduate students to the field are also significant. For instance, Dawn Bates (Ph.D. 1988) described the form of English compounds whose regularities had never been captured before and Karl Reynolds (Ph.D. 1989) pushed forward the understanding of Swahili word-structure.

It is now taken for granted that our graduate students will have presented major research papers at important conferences before graduation.

6.3 Interdisciplinary Projects:

In 1986, the department initiated a cognitive science seminar series, jointly carried out with Psychology and Speech and Hearing Sciences. In a fruitful follow-up effort, Prof. ter Meulen has led an effort to organize the interdisciplinary cognitive science research group on campus. A College Studies sequence in that area now includes courses from Linguistics, Psychology, and Computer Science. This year she has applied, with the support of those departments, for funds from the Provost's initiative for interdisciplinary research to hold a series of lectures in cognitive science.

On a less formal level, there has developed over the years a close research-oriented relation, which also includes some coordination of of upper level and graduate course offerings, with Romance Linguistics Program. In particular, Professors

Klausenburger, Zagona, Strozer, and Herschensohn in that program and our faculty often direct our graduate students toward the other unit's offerings, suggest selecting members from the other unit for doctoral committees, and present colloquia that are jointly advertised and attended.

One unit with which we have made repeated efforts to increase contact, which have not so far born much fruit, is the Computer Science Department. While their Chairs (Paul Young, Jean-Loup Baer) have tried to encourage this, it appears that their faculty interest in artificial intelligence, particularly as it may interface with computational linguistics, is almost non-existent, in spite of the burgeoning nationwide developments in this field. For example, one of the fastest expanding units in Boeing Computer Services is the Linguistics group involved in a number of projects that computer-monitor the enormous task of technical writing for their product manuals (for entire aircraft models, etc.). This year, this group hired one of our MAs, and would be willing to hire more often, but for the lack of locally available trained personnel; while our students are anxious to move in this direction, they find it most difficult to design an appropriate interdepartmental program, such as is increasingly available at Stanford, UC Santa Cruz, etc. Among other obstacles, it is difficult, to put it mildly, to enter appropriate classes in the Computer Science Department without being a major, and our efforts to establish an interdisciplinary major have not been approved from their side.

Most recently, Professor Emonds has been involved with the Humanities Center, headed by Professor Moore of Philosophy; this center has sponsored several speakers of interdisciplinary interest, perhaps the most notable from our point of view being Noam Chomsky from M.I.T., co-sponsored last January also by Psychology, Speech and Hearing, Romance Languages, Philosophy, and Computer Science, who gave an explicitly interdisciplinary lecture on "Research Directions of a Future Cognitive Science", very well received by leading researchers in other fields, such as Professor Patricia Kuhl of Speech and Hearing.

In a related development, Professor Emonds is presently pursuing especially with Dr. Paul Aoki, the head of the Language Learning Center, the possibility of establishing a "Translation Institute" which would involve a summer school, invitation of well-known translation scholars during the academic year, and a

program leading to accreditation with the national professional society of translators.

6.4 Technology Transfer:

The department itself does not have significant research interactions with the private sector. However, we do have a fruitful relationship with Boeing Computer Services' language group. We have placed two of our graduate students (an M.A. and a Ph.D) with that group, co-sponsored lectures, sent our Visiting Professor Moortgat to lecture there, and been taken on tours of their research facilities. We sense the potential for similar interactions with other regional companies interested in artificial intelligence and natural language but without a faculty member centrally involved in such issues, we can only do a hit-or-miss job of capitalizing on them.

VII. SERVICE

7.1 Consulting:

Consulting is not a major occupation of the faculty. The very occasional outside work we perform is almost entirely covered by the examples given below.

In October 1988, Prof. Hargus and Dr. Nile Thompson, a Visiting Scholar and 1985 Ph.D. from this department, were invited to visit the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana by Velda Shelby for the purposes of advising the tribe on documentation of the Kootenai language, and more generally, on priorities in linguistic documentation and pedagogy. Hargus and Thompson spent three days there, interviewing elders, political figures, and other members of the community. They prepared a report on their activities for the Chair and for Ms. Shelby, which included their recommendations. This activity came to naught, however; Ms. Shelby's initiative ended several months later for reasons which remain largely mysterious but which seem to be related to tribe-internal political events.

In 1986, Prof. ter Meulen did some consulting for German industry which resulted in a publication on the semantics of perception reports. Prof. Brame has given lectures on linguistics at the invitation of the government of Kuwait. Faculty members have testified on the interpretation of language in trials on a handful of occasions.

Such occasional consultations do not play a significant role in departmental instruction and research.

7.2 Community Service:

Prof. Hargus' research on the phonology of certain Native American languages involves data-gathering, and thus firsthand involvement with Native Americans and their communities (in the U.S. and Canada). It is an increasingly recognized fact that the history of U.S. involvement with Native Americans has included broken treaties, broken promises, and general exploitation of the aboriginal people by the U.S. government for the purposes of enhancing U.S. economic development. It seems only right that linguists, anthropologists, and any other people who enter Native American communities from the outside not continue this tradition of exploitation. For this reason, Prof. Hargus, who works mainly with speakers who are illiterate in their native language, has become involved in several projects which could be regarded as 'applied', in that their intended audience is not theoretical linguists, but speakers of the languages themselves. She considers this a public service; i.e., her way of giving something back to the speakers and the communities who have shared their language with her.

Almost all members of the faculty evaluate proposals for the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities and several sit on boards awarding national fellowships.

Professor Newmeyer holds the major administrative office of the Linguistic Society of America, our professional organization. Brame, Kaisse, and Newmeyer are editors of national or international journals; Emonds, ter Meulen and Contreras sit on editorial boards of major journals.

The involvement of the faculty in such professional service reflects their central position in the field and keeps them absolutely current on recent research developments, which is in turn reflected in their own teaching and research. Prof. Hargus' work for Native American groups forms the basis for much of her research and inspires our students to conduct fieldwork which attempts to give back to the tribes something of what they give to us.

7.3 Continuing Education:

The department offers Linguistics 200 as part of the continuing education program. The course was initiated in 1984, and satisfies the Writing requirement for the college. An average of 25 students complete the course each year.

VIII. EVALUATION

8.1 Faculty:

As described in section 3.3, the publications of junior faculty are made available to the faculty yearly so that their comments on the work can be passed on by the chair in the yearly conference. Not everyone reads everything, but we find this practice keeps us in touch with the details of the younger faculty's work. In addition, we have recently instituted a yearly peer evaluation of teaching. Each faculty member is evaluated by a colleague, on the basis of a combination of student evaluations, syllabi and reading lists, class materials, and class visits. Faculty have at least one class per year, and usually more, evaluated by students and are encouraged to have a copy of the results sent to the chair. (See Appendix K.) Such evaluation of teaching and research is then considered by the chair when merit increases are distributed.

8.2 Students:

Applicants to the graduate program are evaluated on the basis of GPA, GRE, letters of recommendation and (for the doctoral program) samples of their research.

There is an annual review process for second-year students and up, based on a self-evaluation which is discussed by the core faculty, with feedback provided in writing by the student's principal advisor.

8.3 Major Competency:

We have no formal means of evaluating the competency of our undergraduate majors nor can we envision a means for doing so. However, our undergrad majors have proceeded to excellent graduate programs in Linguistics (UCLA, University of Massachusetts, UC Santa Cruz, U. of Illinois, etc.), and elsewhere and have done well in our own graduate program. In addition,

graduates have been placed in local and national computer companies. (See section 9.2)

8.4 Curriculum/Instruction:

The department's phonologists meet each year to discuss the content and organization of the phonology sequence. The semantics sequence has been recently re-organized by Prof. ter Meulen who gathered texts and syllabi from other major universities and who is herself finishing a major text. Two years ago we met as a committee of the whole to reorganize our introductory offerings, resulting in the addition of a social science distribution course and the clear division between our humanities and social science offerings. The syntacticians feel it would be beneficial for them to meet to discuss the content and organization of the syntax series as well.

The yearly evaluation of graduate students is discussed in section 8.2. In addition, students are supplied with a sheet detailing the expected progress toward a degree and the various probationary steps the department will take. Students are encouraged to talk at least once each year with the graduate or undergraduate advisor. The graduate advisor keeps a chart for each student detailing his or her progress toward fulfilling degree requirements.

Our yearly report from the graduate school's survey of students receiving degrees (a recent sample is included in Appendix J) always puts us in the very good to excellent range (above the university average); students complain only about the quality of facilities, though we expect that will improve with the recent budget increases. Further positive feedback comes from the fact that virtually all of our Ph.D.'s who sought academic employment have found it. (See section 9.2)

8.5 Research:

While such matters are difficult, if not impossible, to quantify, it is our belief that there are few, if any, other linguistics departments in country whose faculty are as immersed in research and are as productive in number and quality of publications as ours. Section 6.2 outlines some of our accomplishments in this regard. A recent ranking placed the UW'S Linguistics Department 15 among Ph.D. granting programs (see

Appendix G). Since this ranking was carried out before the addition of Professors ter Meulen and Hargus to the faculty, our current ranking would most certainly be even higher.

We believe that quality research and quality education go hand-in-hand and therefore do not attempt to weigh one against the other. For example, most faculty members give graduate courses reflecting their current research activities. This helps integrate students into the field and thus furthers their education in a way that classes based entirely on past research (or someone else's research) could never do.

8.6 Accreditation: Not applicable.

8.7 Role Within Region:

We are the only linguistics department in the state. Western Washington and Washington State Universities offer the occasional introductory course, but there is nothing remotely comparable to our program. Within the Pacific Northwest, the only other degree granting programs are in Alaska and Oregon, neither of which has a major theoretical program, though Alaska does important work on Native languages. We consider ourselves to be in the top ten departments in the nation.

IX. DEVELOPMENT

9.1 Faculty Distribution:

We cover the core areas of our discipline, syntax, phonology, and semantics, as well as almost any department in the country. We have always been excellently staffed in syntax. With the addition of Prof. Hargus to the regular faculty in 1988, we became well-staffed in phonology as well, with two specialists in that field. Prof. ter Meulen gives us strength in semantics, though she does not have the time to properly cover as well the fields of computational linguistics and mathematical linguistics in which she has some expertise. We also excel in metatheory and history of the discipline. What we lack is staffing in the areas of the field which have a solid theoretical grounding but branch out into related areas: psycholinguistics, phonetics, and computational linguistics. We also lack a historical linguist and must rely on the kindness of linguists in other departments for our basic offerings in this field. Our next appointment will be in one of these areas. With no growth in faculty size, we will wait for our next

retirement to make this appointment, but we have no faculty member subject to mandatory retirement.

While our staffing in core areas is adequate, our overall ratio of graduate students to faculty, 6 (sometimes 7) to 1, is unusually high, particularly as all M.A. students must write theses. Advising graduate students on research is a very time-intensive undertaking, and the addition of more faculty would be of great help. Our faculty is clearly excellent but they cannot fully realize their potential when they are so burdened.

9.2 Demand:

Linguistics is an area where employment based on expertise in the field as such generally requires a graduate degree; however, it is by no means the case that a doctorate rather than an MA is required for such placement, as examples below will indicate. Due to its specificity, an undergraduate degree in linguistics serves as well and probably better than a bachelor's in one of the more commonly pursued fields such as English or sociology. In many cases, our undergraduate majors go on to receive even full support in linguistics graduate programs elsewhere (many of them we would like to retain here, but poor funding of graduate study here undermines our efforts). We do not have the means to keep records on subsequent activities of our undergraduate majors or of how they fit into the marketplace of demand.

Our extensive doctoral program clearly meets a continuing demand within the United States and internationally (but not one that is reflected in our state, since ours is the only university with a full linguistics program). As shown in appendix D, 12 of 14 PhDs in the last three years are teaching linguistics on the faculty of four-year colleges and universities, 6 within the US and 6 in East Asia (Japan, Korea, Thailand, and Malaysia). The 6 US universities represented are Arizona State, Boston, California State at Dominguez Hills, George Mason, South Carolina, and Wisconsin. Over the years, it is clear that our department has become a principal training ground for state-of-the-art linguists for countries of the West of the Pacific Rim; in light of this welcome use of our resources by overseas academics (not infrequently via full funding by their home institutions for at least one and sometimes three years of study), it appears ever stranger that the State of Washington is not willing to reap a return on what it has invested in faculty by funding local graduate students

in their studies, since our placement record reveals a strong demand.

Demand for Linguistics MAs has also been strong, if from varied sources. Besides going on for PhDs in better funded departments (usually with full support), two areas stand out. First, the many programs private and public for Teaching English as a Second Language require administrators who have linguistic overviews, capable of designing the programs, selecting materials, etc. Two of our MAs from the mid-eighties moved into management positions (one in Washington DC) in this field; another 1981 PhD is presently Director of the University's Language Learning Center, after serving several years with a Federal organization. A second growing area for MAs in Linguistics is in the area of computer-assisted translation and technical writing; an MA from this year has found an excellent position at Boeing Computer Services.

9.3 Curriculum Change:

The most important change in the department's curriculum in the past five years is the addition of a set of courses in the area of semantics--a consequence of the addition of Professor ter Meulen to the faculty. Other new courses reflect a branching out of interests of pre-existing faculty, such as the addition of two courses in the history of linguistics and one in morphology. Another new course, specifically devoted to English phonology and morphology, fills a long-existing gap in our program and serves both our students and those in the MATESL program of the English Department.

As a result of the increase of many of our core courses from 3 to 4 credit hours, the undergraduate requirements were made slightly more flexible: students may now take either a third quarter of phonology or of syntax rather than being required to take both. This keeps the major requirements in line with comparable requirements at other universities.

We have also in the past five years begun to teach two 200-level introductions to linguistics: one with a 'humanities' focus and one with a 'social science' focus. As a result, our program (and the field in general) are known to a broader spectrum of undergraduates than previously.

Typically, the most recent trends and developments in the field are not immediately encoded as new course offerings with new numbers, but are covered in Linguistics 580 (Problems in Linguistics) and other flexibly-labeled courses.

The desirable changes in curriculum that have not been accomplished are entirely a result of our lacking personnel in several key areas of linguistics, as described in section 9.1. One of our most serious needs is in the area of psycholinguistics. We are also in desperate need of an historical linguist (courses in this are now covered by faculty in other departments), a computational linguist, and a phonetician.

The university as a whole suffers from the lack of logic courses and faculty specializing in logic. Our semantics students feel this need, as do students in Computer Science, Philosophy, and Mathematics.

We collaborate quite well at present with other University units as far as curriculum is concerned. For example, courses with Linguistics Department numbers are taught by faculty in the Departments of Germanics, Anthropology, Asian Languages and Literature, Romance Languages, Speech and Hearing Sciences, and Philosophy. We might profit from increased interaction with Computer Science and Philosophy.

9.4 Research Development:

We are often told by job applicants and faculty at other institutions that we have a reputation for fostering research in an informal atmosphere of support, productivity and impressive interaction within the faculty and between faculty and students. This is a place that people want to come to. Both faculty and students are extremely active in the field. We deliver a large number of conference papers, attend and teach at Linguistic Institutes, receive and accept invitations to teach at other institutions, and correspond (particularly since the advent of electronic mail) with our colleagues in this country and abroad. We have a staggering number of journal editorships for a department of our size (Linguistic Analysis, Phonology, and Natural Language and Linguistic Theory are all edited or substantially edited from this department.) Our students are encouraged to submit abstracts to conferences and we hold a yearly Abstract Workshop to teach them how to write good ones. Several years ago we changed our

internal colloquium requirement for Ph.D. candidates to allow and encourage presentation of papers at outside conferences instead. Our students founded the Northwest Linguistics Club for the presentation of student papers from the U.W., University of British Columbia, and University of Victoria.

Faculty travel is adequately, though not extravagantly, funded, particularly since our faculty receive enough speaking invitations to allow them to attend conferences not entirely at the department's expense. However, student funding is highly inadequate. We feel that any student who has a paper accepted at a conference should have his or her travel funded. At current levels, we cannot even subsidize every such acceptance. We do not have a single budget line for student travel but divide Graduate School funds between student travel and our budget for invited speakers.

9.5 Funding Sources:

As described in section 6.1, our external funding is about what can be expected for a theoretical linguistics department. With the addition of Profs. Hargus, Tarlinskaya, and ter Meulen, we have increased both our application and our award rate, and hope to continue to do so, but external funding is unlikely ever to be a major source of support for a linguistics department.

9.6 Resource Trends:

As anyone entering the area of Padelford Hall devoted to the Department of Linguistics may easily observe, the Department suffers overcrowded conditions. This is best exemplified in the open office-reception area through which one must pass in order to reach most of the faculty and T.A. offices. In this area, two secretaries, half a dozen machines (computers, xerox, ditto), faculty mailboxes, filing cabinets, and sofa compete for space.

Therefore our greatest resource need is extra space. Minimally, the machines need to be removed and placed in a room of their own.

Equally as important, the full-time secretary should be given an office of her own, away from the distracting fish bowl-like conditions under which she must now work.

Students need a lounge of their own. They are currently forced to congregate either in the departmental office area or in a room

that doubles as a reading room. As things stand now, students microwaving their lunch rub elbows with those attempting to concentrate on reading material put on reserve in the same room.

This room (Padelford A-216) should be turned into a real reading room/library, with added materials and a librarian to check out books and papers.

Finally, several offices should be made available for the visiting scholars who affiliate with our Department each year, and for graduate students.

X. SUMMARY

10.1 Present Condition and Future Plans:

The Department of Linguistics at the University of Washington is a healthy and productive unit. We have one of the strongest theoretical faculties in the world. Our undergraduate program produces well-educated and well-rounded graduates who go on to graduate degrees in linguistics, computer science, anthropology and into fields such as language-teaching, speech pathology, and natural language processing. Our graduate program produces M.A.s and Ph.D.s who have gone on to become productive members of the field, and virtually all of our recent Ph.D.s who sought employment in academia have found it. Our weaknesses center in two areas: we lack of staffing in areas such as psycholinguistics, computational linguistics and phonetics; and our lack of fellowship and assistantship support for graduate students is demoralizing and counter-productive. Our graduate students are better than we deserve, given the funding situation. But with our faculty, we could be in the top five departments in the country if we could offer adequate and comparable funding.

10.2 Contribution to State-Wide Goal: Appendix E