25 March 2015

TO: Jim Sweet, Chair, History

FROM: John Karl Scholz, Dean

RE: Completion of L&S Review of History Programs:

- History (BA, BS)
- History and History of Science, Medicine, and Technology (BA, BS) – *joint program with History of Science*
- Master of Arts – History
- Doctor of Philosophy – History

On February 3, 2015, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered the materials submitted in fulfillment of the mandated review of the academic programs offered in History. These materials included the department’s self-study, the review committee report, and comments offered to correct errors of fact in that report.

Before I summarize the council’s discussion, I would like to thank you and everyone else who participated in the review. Though we have streamlined the L&S approach to program review, it still requires effort and attention to prepare the self-study, to discuss it, and to work with the review committee.

In the case of History, council members and observers were impressed by the quality, clarity, and candor of the self-study; by the department’s ability to reflect constructively on the current state of its programs and structure; and by the way in which you and your colleagues used the review process to promote discussion about the future of the department. The APC was particularly impressed by the ways in which the department has used the assessment of student learning in the undergraduate program to understand gaps and opportunities, to identify areas for improvement, and to adapt the curriculum (both in terms of adjusting the course array and changing requirements) to ensure that your students are well prepared. It is very impressive to see the way you have mapped the learning outcomes for the major to broader, institutional outcomes, and to signal to students and throughout the department that your students are expected not only to obtain knowledge and skills required for the major, but to understand that these things apply to life beyond college. Of course, the work you do to assess student learning at the program level is not limited to undergraduates, and the department has articulated learning
outcomes at the graduate level, too. We anticipate that History will be positioned well as the assessment of graduate level learning outcomes becomes more prominent on campus. Overall, the APC found the work History is doing to assess student learning to be exemplary.

The council also commends you and your colleagues for progress made since the last review, and in particular, efforts to improve the departmental climate. You have a lot to be proud of in this strong and excellent department.

In discussing the review and the committee’s report, the APC endorsed the committee’s recommendations. In particular:

- We encourage the department to reflect on its administrative structure and the ways in which the department supports and cultivates leadership and service. You will likely need to work with your Associate Dean to discuss changes that may have an impact on compensation for those who serve in critical leadership roles.
- Please seek formal approval for the joint graduate program between History and the History of Science, Medicine and Technology, if this program is to persist. More generally, we encourage you to work more closely with History of Science to administer shared programs, so students who are pursuing this combined major are served well.

Finally, I would like to note that the self-study identified many challenges and priorities – we know, as we face a very difficult fiscal environment that the challenges will not diminish. We appreciate the work you have done to consider priorities, and to candidly evaluate your programs, and to take the necessary steps to keep them great.

The L&S Academic Planning Council was pleased to consider this review complete. I join them in thanking you and your colleagues for helping us to better understand the past, present, and future of the outstanding academic programs in the Department of History.

x:
Marty Gustafson, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning and Assessment, Graduate School
Elaine M. Klein, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
Daniel Kleinman, Associate Dean, Graduate School
Jocelyn Milner, Director of Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean for Arts and Humanities, L&S
The History Review Committee was composed of Russ Castronovo (English), Michele Hilmes (Communication Arts), Ernesto Livorni (French and Italian), and Pamela Potter (German). In addition to reviewing the History Department, the committee was charged with reviewing the joint program shared with the History of Science, Medicine, and Technology (hereafter abbreviated as SMT) and paying particular attention to the communication and interface between the two. As we were conducting our review, a separate committee was reviewing the History of Science, Medicine and Technology. Our concern was limited to the space where the two overlap in this joint program.

The Review Committee had a series of information-gathering sessions with faculty, staff, and students from various units within the History Department. These meetings included: (1) a one-on-one meeting with James Sweet, Chair; (2) discussion of the graduate program with Colleen Dunlavy, Director of Graduate Studies, and Leslie Abadie, Graduate Program Advisor; (3) discussion of undergraduate program with Leonora Neville, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and Scott Burkhardt, Undergraduate Program Advisor; (4) meeting with graduate students; (5) meeting with undergraduate majors.

The Review Committee found much to praise in the Department: the dedication of its faculty leadership; the commitment of its academic staff; the attention to high-quality research and teaching amid an environment characterized by fewer resources and rewards. Going forward, it will be important for the Department to build on these strengths to think about strategies for increasing enrollments, innovating its administrative structure, and sharing service workloads equally.

As to joint major in SMT, this program is only partially integrated into the History Department. Part of the problem may be historical. Our committee learned that although this program was established in the late 1980s and that it officially exists as an undergraduate program, there exists no documentation within the Graduate School that relates to the creation of the joint program in SMT as a graduate program. A result is that the Graduate School is therefore treating the program as never having been approved. Nonetheless, a handful of students graduate every year with a degree in this joint program. Within the specific sections of this review that follow, we offer some provisional recommendations about the opportunities that better integration with SMT would provide to the History Department.

Overview

Department Administrative Structure

Though our charge is to review the Department’s academic programs, it is clear that overall department climate and administrative structures affect academic programs and have an impact on the way they function. The History Department is a large and
complex one, with 53 faculty members distributed over 11 subject areas; a substantial though declining undergraduate major; and a graduate program that has been scaled down in recent years but is still quite large, with over 170 MA and PhD students currently enrolled. In past years, that figure has been well over 200. This changing landscape presents a considerable challenge to effective administration, complicated by other factors.

According to Department Chair James Sweet, 20 junior faculty were hired in the last ten years and, at present, 14 of History’s 53 faculty members are recently hired junior faculty. When one considers these numbers in conjunction with the number of tenured faculty on leave at any given time (7 this year), it’s often the case that less than a third of current faculty can be deployed for many administrative tasks, and also that mentoring and evaluating the junior faculty will present a considerable challenge in the future. The faculty are supported by an administrative staff of 12 people (including 2 peer advisors and one career advisor who is shared among 5 different programs and departments) and 34 teaching assistants – again, a management challenge as well as a vital component in running the department. In daily practice, the Department operates with 9 staff members. While overall the Department seems to run smoothly and effectively – with few student complaints about communication, general advising, course offerings, etc. – in speaking with the Chair another picture emerged, one in which the burden of administration and service falls onto the shoulders of a relatively small proportion of the faculty. While much of this unequal service distribution can be explained by the generational shift that is transpiring within the Department, it also seems to be the case that service is not equally valued by all.

In any department, joint appointments, university administration, leaves, sabbaticals, fellowships, etc. can reduce those actually on hand at any time for service to the department, yet an impression is gained that service to the Department is not highly valued by some History faculty. This situation may be exacerbated by the current committee structure as well as by inadequate levels of time compensation for service. Both the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Director of Graduate Studies are appointments that carry two course releases per year, which seems like an adequate level of compensation, in fact relatively generous compared to other departments. Both of these areas seem to work quite well, though if changes in curriculum in response to current areas of concern are to be made, the committees run by these two faculty members will be taking on added work.

However, given the increased responsibility allocated by the College to the role of Department Chair over the last few years, our sense as a committee was that at present the History Chair does not have an adequate system of administrative support. Two course releases are insufficient for a chair who must manage a large faculty and administrative staff, deal increasingly with budgetary matters under the new BSR system, and above all spend increasing amounts of time on alumni development and fundraising, not to mention making the transition to digital technology and information management that departments have been grappling with over the last decade. Amid all these duties, it is hard to imagine how the Chair might carve out time to address the neglected status of
SMT as a joint program. The burden of these many duties and challenges would remain even if the Associate Chair position were fully functional and compensated, which at present it is not.

In addition, though our committee did not undertake a thorough evaluation of the Department’s committee structure, it does seem as though some rethinking and reorganization might be necessary. For instance, at present tenure committees comprise 5 faculty members—a large number; in other departments, 3 person tenure committees are the norm. There is no standing Personnel and Tenure Committee to coordinate faculty review and tenure cases; this responsibility falls to the Chair. The Department knows its needs better than a group of outsiders, and our remit is not to suggest specific structural changes, but given the challenges of declining enrollments, potential changes to the curriculum, mentoring young faculty, and graduate program funding, administrative structure is an area that may need serious attention in the near future.

Recommendations:

- consider changes in Department administrative structure and compensation that would encourage more consistent faculty participation and service;
- consider changes in Department administrative structure and compensation that would more adequately support the chair.

Although we are here talking about the administrative structure of the Department, we would be remiss if we did not say a word about the physical structure—i.e., the Humanities Building—that is home to the History Department. The sad state of the building was a topic in many of our conversations. The general feeling, one shared by faculty and students alike, is that the building presents a climate problem all its own. The Curti Lounge lacks audiovisual capabilities and is showing its age in ways that make it a problematic space for faculty meetings, colloquia, and seminars.

**Graduate Program**

The committee met with Graduate Director Colleen Dunlavy and Graduate Coordinator Leslie Abadie in one session; in another, we met with 10 current graduate students, who represented several different areas and who ranged from first year to final year dissertators. We also discussed the graduate program with Department chair James Sweet.

**Administration and Committee Structure**

The Director of Graduate Studies works with the Graduate Program Coordinator and the Graduate Program Assistant. Three separate committees handle all aspects of the program: the Graduate Council (consisting of faculty, graduate students elected by their peers, and graduate staff), responsible for curriculum and policy; the Fellowships and Scholarships Committee (faculty only); and the Joint Committee on TAs (one Graduate Council faculty member, three elected graduate students, and the Program Coordinator.
and Program Assistant), which makes decisions on hiring, training, and evaluating Teaching Assistants. Graduate students can also participate in faculty searches in their roles on the Faculty-Graduate Student Liaison Committee. The department conducts two town hall meetings per semester for graduate students, although our conversation with the students revealed that they did not find these meetings to be particularly effective.

The Director and Graduate Studies has done a phenomenal job of adjusting the program in the face of shifting numbers of applicants, increased financial pressures on students, heightened competition from peer institutions, and changes to the disciplinary composition of the faculty with the new Mellon hires primarily in East Asian Studies. The Graduate Coordinator similarly impressed us with her knowledge, experience, pragmatism and compassion, and the appreciation students expressed for her helpfulness validated our positive impressions. We learned, however, that the graduate administration have felt severely hampered by inadequate technology, making it difficult for the program to establish an adequate web presence and to set up needed databases for tracking student progress and other information.

Admissions and Orientation
Each of the eleven study programs submits recommendations for admission to the Graduate Council and fellowship nominations to the Fellowships and Scholarships Committee. With the new model of departments applying to the College for block grants, and the shift to a fully funded model, the work of these two committees will need to be merged. The department keeps in mind a target number of admissions for each study program. When students arrive on campus, they have a full schedule of Welcome Week activities run by the DGS, the Coordinator, and continuing graduate students.

Funding
Both graduate students and faculty identified funding as a major issue for the History Department. This relates both to the proportion of students with funding and to the level at which they are funded.

Proportion: At present and historically, only two-thirds to three-quarters of History graduate students receive funding from the Department/University. In 2004, data shows that 62% (or 106 students out of 172) of all PhD students were funded at 33% or higher; in 2013 that figure was 72% (or 119 out of 166 students). The fact that PhD funding has increased slightly is apparently tied to the reduction in numbers of MA students. In 2004, there were a total of 36 MA students, 28 of whom received funding; by 2013, the number of MA students had dropped to 6, with 5 funded by the Department/University. This means that one-quarter to one-third of current History graduates students receive little or no funding. However, according to Prof. Dunlavy, the Department’s own figures show that only 34 students were unfunded, and of those 31 were advanced dissertators who presumably had passed through the funding cycle. An additional 30 PhD students were funded by outside grants, which can vary from year to year.

Students interviewed by the review committee regarded funding as a major issue. When asked, “what roadblocks exist to progress to degree?” the first answer was “funding.”
They noted that lack of full funding created an effective 2-track system in the program, with unfunded students feeling at a disadvantage in relation to their peers. They also commented that there was some misrepresentation of the funding situation during recruitment, with students told that most often funding would “work out,” when in fact it often didn’t. It was noted that some faculty advisors seemed more tied into available outside funding sources than others, so that their students had opportunities that others did not; also, there was some opinion that those with advisors teaching large-enrollment classes have a better chance of gaining teaching assistantships than others.

Level: most TA/PA funding is based on a 40% appointment, which makes recruiting difficult. The Department has recently voted forward a commitment to increasing such funding to 50%, in order to increase its ability to attract top students as well as to provide something closer to a living wage. However, increasing TA appointments to 50% presumably will bring with it a greater teaching load, which may further slow a student’s progress towards degree. Students were not convinced that the modest increase would have a significant impact on bringing the closer to a living wage. Also, given the Department’s declining course enrollments, with existing TA lines sometimes being returned to L&S because there is insufficient course enrollment to support them, this may require further reduction in the number of graduate students admitted to the program, or an effort to boost undergraduate enrollments, or both. Students expressed some concerns about inconsistent TA workloads.

The Department has recently made it a priority to change the current system, moving to one in which all admitted graduate students receive the same funding package, ideally comprising 5 years of support at 50%, with years one and five covered by fellowships and the middle three years by teaching assistantships. If successful, this restructuring and change would resolve many of the issues identified here.

Advising and Curriculum
As noted above, besides their individual academic advisors, students can seek advice on university guidelines, Department policies, applying for funding, and general issues from Leslie Abadie, the Graduate Coordinator. History graduate students had nothing but praise for Leslie Abadie, describing her as unfailingly helpful and relying on her to keep them apprised of the details of requirements for degree and deadlines for funding opportunities, etc., which, given the complexity of the History Department degree requirements, is a significant task.

Relationships with academic advisors were described as a bit more complex. Some advisors were reliably present, accessible, and active in providing professional development information and support. Others were frequently away, less accessible, and less concerned with enlarging opportunities for their advisees. Lack of awareness of, and support for, non-academic careers was particularly noted as an issue. In today’s changing job climate, this is an area that needs particular attention and a change in perspective by the faculty, who should no longer assume that replicating their own experience is a sufficient strategy for recruiting and advising contemporary History graduate students.
Unevenness in advising support may be exacerbated by the structure of the graduate curriculum, as discussed below, and by lack of community-building opportunities, as discussed under Climate. Students commented that they sometimes felt isolated by dependence on academic advisors and, despite the advising staff’s help with certain kinds of issues, lacked a venue in which larger concerns having to do with professional development, access to academic opportunities, and a general issues the field as a whole (rather than one area of specialization) could be discussed.

In terms of curriculum, the History Department is extremely complex. With eleven study programs, each with its own set of requirements at both the MA and PhD levels and with most programs divided into further sub-areas, it is no wonder that the Graduate Handbook devotes 30 pages to degree requirements and guidelines. This complexity is a reflection of the way that the field of History is structured as an academic discipline, and its successful negotiation by students relies heavily on the efforts of the Graduate Coordinator, while faculty advise on research. The Handbook, recently revised by Prof. Dunlavy, is a vital and necessary component of the program and does a commendably thorough job of explanation.

Lack of faculty in some areas is a cause of concern for graduate students. African, Latin American, and East Asian areas were well supported by faculty, but the European area less so, they reported, along with a lack of seminars in early modern history generally.

Joint PhD in History and History of Science, Medicine and Technology (SMT)
The committee was specifically charged with looking into the Joint PhD Program in History and History of Science, Medicine and Technology. According to Professor Dunlavy, the program was dropped from this year’s graduate handbook because in March 2014 the Graduate School was unable to find any documentation for the creation of the program and is therefore treating it as never approved. However, it still appears in the Graduate School Catalogue and on the History of Science Department website. Again according to Professor Dunlavy, most of the students in the program have come into it not from History but from the History of Science Program, so “the ball is in their court” to initiate discussion of getting it reinstated. From our meeting with the graduate students, we learned that there is a good deal of confusion over requirements and advising in both departments. If both departments, History and History of SMT, want to formalize this relationship, it is recommended that they initiate a conversation with Elaine Klein, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning, and Susan Zaeske, Associate Dean.

The program’s conjoining of Humanities and Sciences would seem to be a promising direction in today’s university, and it could lead to higher enrollments in graduate classes if more effectively promoted and encouraged. This is an issue that should be addressed, in coordination with the Department of the History of Science, and steps taken to either support the program much more effectively, or discontinue it. Leaving it in limbo is a disservice to students as well as a missed opportunity.

Time to Degree
The time-to-degree is somewhat higher than that of AAU peer institutions. A new policy for the MA program reviews students’ progress more regularly and systematically, a step that has both benefited the students and made faculty more aware of the need to move students through the degree program. Students in the program have been competitive in winning external fellowships, and the department has a number of gift-funded opportunities that can help them at the dissertator stage. Nevertheless, the proposed increase in TA appointment levels may reverse the positive impact of these other measures in keeping students on track toward completion.

Climate
Overall, graduate students reported a high degree of satisfaction with the academic climate in the History Department. All felt that they were receiving a first-class education with scholars at the top of their fields, and that the Department cared about the wellbeing of its students and had reasonable policies and practices in place to assure it. Concerns over funding issues, discussed above, and over disparities in experience depending on area and advisor were generally mild. Students get to know their cohort in the required course for all entering graduate students (History 701), a 1-credit course that brings in visiting faculty, former graduate students, and other guests who offer a range of information on careers in the history profession. There is no colloquium series, something that the students felt would provide a valuable opportunity for them to form a stronger sense of community as well as to offer a forum for them to present their research to faculty and peers. The Graduate Program Assistant (a graduate student appointment) is responsible for organizing student events, TA training, and workshops dedicated to practical aspects of professional development.

However, a few students expressed distress over feelings of isolation within the program, particularly minority and foreign students and those from less-populated programs. These feelings seem to be partially the result of the advisor-dependent nature of academic specialization, where there are few lateral ties linking programs and areas of study within the overarching umbrella of the History Department. Very few opportunities exist for students in one program to interact with and learn from faculty and grad students in other programs, and there are few ongoing venues in which professional development or other pressing issues relating to department climate can be discussed. Students felt that there was a supportive environment amongst graduate students themselves, but they felt isolated from faculty members and from scholarly exchange outside their major and minor areas. Students also indicated that there was no grievance procedure in place, but they felt comfortable going to the Program Coordinator with such issues and were satisfied with the guidance she offered. The 60-page Graduate Handbook, while incredibly thorough and useful, does not seem to include a stated policy. While the current practice may be working so far, the department should make sure that clearly documented procedures are in place in the event that a serious problem arises in the future.

Recommendations
• continue with efforts to sustain a smaller and better-funded graduate cohort, with full funding at livable levels;
• consider instituting a system by which regular interaction and community-building can take place between graduate students in different areas, and between grad students and faculty, including discussion of professional development;
• work with the History of Science program to coordinate and develop the Joint PhD program and to clarify requirements.
• procure resources to modernize digital resources and set up much needed databases.
• consider establishing a colloquium series.
• establish a grievance procedure.

Undergraduate Program

Enrollments and Curriculum
Recent trends are indicating a nationwide decline in the numbers of humanities majors, and the History Department has not been immune to this drop in undergraduate majors and enrollments. Enrollment in History courses has dropped 20% since 2004, as has the number of majors. From an all-time high of 618 majors in fall 2007 to 434 majors in fall 2012, the current number in Fall 2014 is 379 majors. (It should be noted that for departments across L&S fall counts of majors tend to be the low point every year since summer graduates have been removed from the tally.) The decline has been perhaps more steady than precipitous, and early data suggests that revisions to the curriculum implemented in Spring 2013 are designed to enable the History Department to adapt to changing conditions.

Students now take the gateway course, History 201 (“The Historian’s Craft”), designed to foster research and writing skills that are important not only to success in the major but also to career options after graduation. This innovation is complemented by the upper-level courses, History 505 and 506 (“History at Work: Professional Skills of the Major” and “History at Work: History Internship Seminar), which together provide History majors with practical experience in research methods, public service, and international affairs. The undergraduates that our committee met with all had high praise for History 201. Students were unanimous that this course, owing to its small size, rigor, and, in the words of more than one student, “phenomenal” instruction, had given them the preparation in research methods and paper writing that have enabled them to thrive in upper-level seminars and thesis courses in the major. As an innovation to grow the major, History 201 is ensuring that students understand both the expectations and value of being a History major.

These findings are based in part on the conversations we had with majors—9 in total—who attended an afternoon meeting with the review committee. Undergraduates were pleased with the variety of courses offered and the ease of satisfying the requirements for the major. Students expressed that they would like to see more courses with writing
assignments that would count as Comm-B courses. This sample size represents roughly the same number of students (11) who participated in the “student focus groups” that were used to help prepare the 2013-14 Assessment of the History Major. In light of the History Department’s conclusion that “the student focus groups will be discontinued due to expense and low student participation” (“Assessment,” p.15), it will be important to develop and implement surveys, including exit questionnaires, that can provide useful and representative feedback.

The smaller size of History 201 (~50 students) is offset by a few large lecture courses such as History 160 (“Asian American History: Movement and Dislocation”), History 161 (“Asian American History: Settlement and National Belonging”) and History 249 (“Sport, Recreation, and Society in the United States”). At the same time, however, the drop-off in courses that used to boast robust enrollments have left some faculty feeling demoralized. Some upper-level European history courses, such as History 418 (history of Russia) and History 358 (the French Revolution) have seen enrollments drop to levels that no longer support TAs.

A department of this size (53 faculty) should want to ensure that healthy enrollments overall are spread across its the breadth of its course offerings and are not dependent on a limited set of large lecture courses. In the years ahead and no doubt sooner rather than later, it will be vital to create and support additional courses that whose popularity will draw undergraduate students. Possibilities that were suggested in our meetings with faculty and staff include Wisconsin History, the American Revolution, and American Indian History. While these and other courses might not line up exactly with current faculty specialties, members of the History Department should be encouraged to be see how they might approach their areas of expertise with a flexibility that will allow them to develop such courses that, to put it bluntly, will fill seats in classrooms. If it’s the case that some courses are no longer drawing as they had traditionally done in the past, then it is probably time for the History Department to work collectively, equitably, and proactively in innovating new larger-size courses. Faculty should not expect that they can teach a series of graduate courses and small upper-level seminars year after year. In addition, retirements will make it possible for the faculty to start having conversations about new hires that might address these needs while ensuring that the History Department’s many strengths across geographical areas continues into the future.

Support, Advising, and Community for Undergraduates
While attracting more students to History courses is a concern, it is undoubtedly also the case that staff advisors, graduate students, and faculty work extremely well with undergraduates once they are enrolled and part of the major. The Director of Undergraduate Studies rightly understands the critical importance of student enrollments and number of majors. The clear communication between the Director and the various undergraduate advisors is a real plus. The Historical Humanities Career Advisor (Lindsey Williamson) has increased the attention to internship and career opportunities that students are seeking. More programming and opportunities are expected in this area, which is a promising sign. The Undergraduate History Advisor (Scott Burkhardt) directs students to a variety of courses, helps majors find thesis advisors, and makes it easy for
students to navigate the major. No wonder that the students in our focus group all agreed that the advising in the History Department is “amazing.” Students did note that many of the courses are clustered on Tuesdays and Thursdays, which can create overlaps and conflicts. It may benefit the History Department to offer more courses on a MW or MWF schedule to appeal to the many double and triple majors who have History as one their majors. Since some of these multiple majors intend to pursue a career in education, it is important that advising work to supply students with a clear guidelines for moving between the History Department and the School of Education. The opportunity to study abroad can be difficult for History majors, especially for students with more than one major. Staff and administrators in the History Department indicated that they would like to examine strategies for reconciling the History major with the desire to study abroad.

The History Department also maintains a sense of community for students by hosting barbecues, arranging for alumni to give career talks, and supporting the Phi Alpha Theta honor society. Another high point is the undergraduate journal, Archive, which is linked to History 500 (“Historical Publishing Workshop”). This platform and the corresponding class structure provide a venue for involving students in the professional activities of editing and publishing. These efforts are valued, especially in light of the general recognition that the Humanities Building is far from an ideal space for building a community. A more welcoming undergraduate climate could be fostered if students had a common space such as a lounge, but, given the woeful state of the facilities and the impediments to finding available space for and refurbishing a lounge, this likelihood seems remote.

Publicity and the marketing of History courses to a wider population of students, especially in terms of presence on the web, is a challenge because of current needs in the History Department for a staff person with technological training. As the History Department hires new staff—a permanent position for handling the timetable is a pressing need—it will be important to make sure that this addition have web skills that can help recruit undergraduates to enroll in History courses.

**Joint Program with History and History of SMT**

At the undergraduate level, a small number of students complete a joint degree in History and the History of Science, Medicine, and Technology (SMT). Currently this program has 8 undergraduate majors. Students in SMT feel that are expertly guided by the Undergraduate History Advisor. In our meeting with undergraduate majors, we spoke with student pursuing this joint degree. Fresh off of interviews for medical schools, she felt that working in both History and SMT had prepared her extremely well for her career goals.

What’s not clear, however, is whether in terms of overall planning, publicity, and administrative support the History Department is fully behind this joint major. Better coordination with SMT may be a missed opportunity for increasing enrollments and drawing students to the major. Given student (and parent) interest in STEM fields, the joint program with SMT likely represents an area of untapped potential for future growth.
It would be worthwhile for the History Department to consider increasing publicity for this program and its profile within the curriculum as a whole.

Recommendations

- following on the promising signs of History 201, continue to innovate individual courses and the curriculum as a whole in ways designed to attract students to the major;
- as lines become available through retirement and faculty departures, think strategically about balancing existing research strengths with emerging curricular needs;
- work to achieve better integration between History and SMT.
January 22, 2015

TO: Karl Scholz, Dean  
Sue Zaeske, Associate Dean  
Elaine Klein, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning  

FROM: Jim Sweet, Chair  

RE: Ten Year Review Committee Report  

I have shared the History Review Committee’s report with our Faculty Council. After their review, we only find a few minor errors of fact. These errors are outlined below:  

- Throughout the report, the committee writes that the department consists of 53 faculty. This is the number reported in our self-study from last spring, and at that time, the number was accurate. However, we have had two retirements (Guerin Gonzalez and Archdeacon), and we added three faculty members (Hansen, Hennessey, and Chamedes) since that time. We are now 54 total faculty. In addition, we hired Amos Bitzan, whose appointment will begin in fall 2015.  
- In the graduate program section of the report, the committee writes that most of our TAs receive 40% appointments. Those were actually 41% appointments; however, L&S recently approved the department’s proposal to shift our TAs to 50% appointments. This will begin in the spring 2015 semester.  

With the correction of these minor errors, our Faculty Council voted unanimously to submit the report to the APC for review at its next meeting. Faculty Council also asked me to pass along their appreciation to Russ Castronovo and the rest of the review committee. We are impressed by the depth of the report and its recommendations. We look forward to hearing more from the APC and Dean Scholz later in the spring.  

Additional correction noted: Professor Hansen moved to History from LCA, not EALL. (per Angela Powell, LCA)