Table 1
History Department Degree Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>PHD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
History Department Major & Minor Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level and Major</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History Majors Undergraduate</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Majors</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Majors Minor Undergraduate</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Levels</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3
### History Department Degree Majors and Minors Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Degree Majors</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Minors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4
**History Department Courses & Sections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 to 199</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 to 299</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 to 399</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 to 499</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 599</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 plus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>167</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>226</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>226</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

**History Department Semester Credit Hours (SCH)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 to 199</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>3,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 to 299</td>
<td>4,281</td>
<td>4,317</td>
<td>4,632</td>
<td>4,986</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>4,947</td>
<td>4,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 to 399</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 to 499</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 599</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 plus</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,156</td>
<td>9,774</td>
<td>10,419</td>
<td>10,507</td>
<td>11,377</td>
<td>11,348</td>
<td>10,949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6
History Department Average Graduate Admissions GRE Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
History Department Average Undergraduate ACT Score and Undergraduate GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>24.36</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D-F-W</td>
<td>OTH</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Course GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5,012</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6,703</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>8,587</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>9,031</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>9,009</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>8,861</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL INFORMATION
Directions: The information requested on this form is essential for academic program review. In some cases, you provide the information directly below the question; in other cases, you provide the information as an attachment. Responses should be entered in the space underneath the blue question box, not inside of it.

*Items with (**) for Graduate Faculty provided by the Graduate School in Excel Sheet (current as of 7/1/13.)

1. Strategic Plan

Upload as Attachment 1 the department’s Strategic Plan.

See Attachment.

2. Assessment Reports

Upload as separate Attachments 2, 3, etc., your most-recent WEAVE “Detailed Assessment Reports” (DAR) for each undergraduate and graduate degree program.

See Attachments.

3. Assessment Evaluation

Upload as your next numbered attachment the most-recent critique of your department’s assessment activities provided to you by the Assistant to the Provost for Assessment.

See Attachment.
4. Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Upload a numbered final attachment with your department’s tenure and promotion criteria.

See Attachment.

5. Faculty Assignment by Rank

Faculty Assignment by rank for most recent fall semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17 Part-Time Temporary Instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Faculty</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Graduate Faculty

Full: 27
Associate:
Temporary:

Note: Faculty CVs are to be made available to the committee and consultant. Please let John Schmitt and OIRA know if they are already available online, will be posted publicly or privately, will be available as PDF files, etc.
6. Faculty Publications in Last 5 Years

List the number of faculty publications in refereed scholarly journals over the last 5 years and compute the ratio of publications to faculty. (Note. This section may be modified appropriately if scholarly journals are not of great importance in the field and are not a high priority in the department’s tenure and promotion guidelines).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Publications</th>
<th>Ratio (Publications/Faculty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Years Ago</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.27 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years Ago</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.28 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years Ago</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.52 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years Ago</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.24 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Years Ago</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.34 : 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Publications. (Note. This section also may be modified, as noted above, to reflect publication priorities in the discipline).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Book Chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Years Ago</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years Ago</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years Ago</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years Ago</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Years Ago</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Citation Data

Upload below #7 a table showing each faculty member’s publication citation data over the last 5 years, in a way that is typical for your discipline. (Note. If citation indices are not readily available, provide other evidence of the frequency of faculty research citations).

See Attachment.

8. Teaching Loads and Advisement

Briefly describe the undergraduate and graduate teaching loads and advising responsibilities of faculty for the past academic year.

All faculty teach a 2-2 load. The Undergraduate Director and Graduate Director teach a 2-1. The Department Chair has a 1-1 teaching load.

All faculty advise undergraduate History majors. Each faculty member has approximately 15 majors. Faculty meet with their advisees during the two-week advising period in the fall and spring semesters.
GENERAL INFORMATION

ATTACHMENTS
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3. Attachment 2a Assessment Report BA Program
4. Attachment 2b Assessment Report MA Program
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6. Attachment 2d Assessment Report Department of History
7. Attachment 3 Critique of Assessment Activities 11.15.13
8. Attachment 4 History TP guidelines 2013
9. Attachment 7 Faculty Citations
10. Attachment Undergraduate Student Satisfaction Survey
Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey: Spring 2013
Department of History

Question 3: What degree are you seeking?

Freq.
8 MA
15 PHD

Question 4: What do you like best about your major program, i.e., what are its strengths?

1 I selected UA's Department of History to pursue a PhD because I wanted to work with the faculty. They have exceeded my expectations with their helpfulness and expertise. Likewise, they foster an atmosphere of collegiality that carries over to the graduate students. It's a wonderful place to work and to study the craft of history.
2 Knowledgeable and helpful people. The funding is generous and competitive with other schools. The workshops are a great part of the program for students and faculty.
3 Tightly knit faculty that is committed to its students.
4 Faculty are very accessible and encouraging. There are many avenues for research, meeting faculty from other institutions, and participation in conferences and other professional activities.
5 Relationship with the faculty.
6 Incredible group of caring people.
7 Combined focus on conducting research and writing final products is great, access to funding and teaching opportunities are also good. Faculty are available, friendly, and provide useful feedback in a positive manner. The office staff are amazingly helpful at navigating the University's requirements.
8 Friendly and caring professors who are knowledgeable in their field, Southern History is particular strong.
9 1) Quality of instructor cadre...recognized experts in respective fields, professional conduct and outstanding instructors. 2) Excellent incorporation of workshops and guest lecturers. 3) Dr. Giggie is a superb mentor/manager of student progress. 4) Dr. Peacock is a bright, positive and motivational force in the department. 5) Front office staff make time to assist students.
10 Great one on one interaction with the professors and faculty. The faculty are always happy to meet with students, always have their doors open. It's a very friendly atmosphere. I also really like that Alabama allows its GTAs to teach sections. This has been a wonderful opportunity to learn from a professor, and then begin to take control of our class and learn many things regarding teaching, classroom management, lesson planning, and more.
11 Flexibility. Professors always willing to adapt their teaching according to grads' interests.
12 The sense of community among grad students themselves, and among faculty and grad students.
13 The faculty. They are fantastic. They are great teachers and academics.
14 Faculty interaction and encouragement of students.
15 The faculty.
16 The variety of courses offered. The ability to choose independent studies.
17 Classes focus both on learning and production of scholarly work. Professors are eager to meet beyond class time and provide meaningful guidance/critique. Department as a whole is welcoming and inclusive.
18 The History Department provides students with knowledgable faculty, a wide arrange of courses, and diverse funding options.
I believe the department's greatest strength is the faculty's willingness to engage with graduate students and their assorted projects. There is a lot of personal support, both physically and emotionally. I am also very impressed with the department's ability to help students obtain funding either through the department, the graduate school, or from outside sources. A new series of faculty-led workshops have been wonderful in that regard.

George Rable (nationally known and well-respected historian)

Strong and helpful faculty/staff; great graduate camaraderie; many opportunities for professional development

Most professors, even if they're not your instructors, are available to help on projects. Workshops allow students to present papers and practice for conferences. The other grad students are supportive. As a TA, I know that the professors have my back when issues come up.
**Question 5:** What do you like least about your major program, i.e., what are its weaknesses?

1. As a historian of the US South, it would be helpful to me if my department had at least one scholar of African history. This, to me, is the only real weakness of UA’s doctoral program in Southern History.
2. Semesters go by without offering enough variety of graduate courses. Graduate students often have to fill out their fields with slash courses while at the same time the Graduate Director doesn’t want students to take slash courses. The workshops are great but attendance can be embarrassingly low because lots of professors and grad students here are not interested which is a shame. This has gotten a little better over time, but the Graduate Director and the ladies in the history office are notorious for sending out time sensitive emails not far enough in advance and sometimes even late. Notifying students only 24 or 18 hours in advance that a very important document regarding graduation or funding is due causes headaches.
3. Cramped space, particularly for the GTA’s.
4. There can occasionally be a breakdown in communication between faculty/staff and graduate students, especially about changes to the structure of teaching assistantships, days and times that graduate courses are offered, and deadlines for applying for funding, research and travel awards, and other departmental opportunities are prohibitively short.
5. Wish the grad program was more diverse. Having to TA without the proper resources to teach (technology in classrooms, access to grading programs to keep gradebook). Overcrowded TA office.
6. Would prefer that GTAs taught at least one lecture a semester.
7. In comparison to other programs, the type of teaching opportunities is limited to being a TA during the normal school year. Summer teaching opportunities are nice, but it feels like we may be a bit behind the students in some other programs in getting teaching experience, or having the opportunity to teach beyond the survey.
8. The building is a little dated,
9. There are not much courses quite fit my fields.
10. Short turn around times when notified about administrative and funding deadlines; the sense of lobbying when it comes to securing funding.
11. The department is not rigorous enough on selecting PHD students. There seems to be an open door policy. If you want a PHD, you can get one.
12. I do not believe it really has any “weaknesses.”
13. Lack of diversity
14. The lack of access to professors. The lack of clarity in requirements.
15. The History Department lacks racial diversity. Although I do believe the department woks diligently to recruit diverse students and faculty.
16. I wish that the department would broaden its approach to professional development in regards to its graduate students. Graduate education is focused primarily on obtaining tenure-track positions at 4-year institutions of higher learning. Unfortunately, the market for those positions has declined sharply over the past decade. It would be helpful if the faculty could point students toward using jobs in the public history (museums, etc.). I would also like to see more people of color added to our department, both at the graduate student and faculty level. And, it would be a good if more people in the department participated in Safe Zone training as well.
17. The transient nature of the faculty. New hires coming, spending a few years in Tuscaloosa, then moving on. This is disruptive. The Department could fight this by contracting new tenure-track faculty for a period of five or ten years at the time of hiring.
18. Testing fields need more diversity
19. Comprehensive exam process is outdated.
**Question 6: Advising and Practical Experiences.**

Please circle the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of your major is</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of practical experiences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Practicum, Laboratory, Internship,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experience, or Field Experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your major is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of courses as preparation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for employment after graduation in your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of academic advising in your</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of career advising in your</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you attended the workshop, the quality</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the university-wide workshop for new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTAs is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were/are a GTA, the quality of</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>departmental efforts to help you develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and improve your teaching skills as a GTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were/are a graduate assistant, the</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of your experiences as a graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistant is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding instruction, courses, or advising. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

4. Most of the time, faculty are not very helpful when it comes to improving teaching skills or giving academic or career advising. Most students look to other graduate students for help in these areas. It would be much better if faculty concentrated on advising graduate students instead of spending their time counseling undergraduate students. This need could be met in a much more efficient way by a dedicated History undergraduate counselor.

5. Would like to program to become more competitive. Wish professors would work with grad students to offer courses useful to their degree (and not courses where the professor just picks out books they’ve been meaning to read). Get rid of the slash courses (combined undergrad/grad. Total waste of time).

7. More and wider variety of graduate courses would be greatly appreciated.

16. An improvement in the attitudes of instructors/professors towards students. They are not God’s gift to Earth and they need to connect better with their pupils.

19. I personally believe the GTA workshop should be completely retooled. I have discovered, over several years, that the type of work graduate teaching assistants do differ from department to department. In fact, the breakout sessions used in the GTA training were not even applicable to the type of work that we do. For that reason, I believe university-wide training should consist of sexual harassment and legal training. This could be done in the morning while afternoon sessions could be held by administrators and faculty in individual departments. This way, students get more accurate training in the job they are expected to perform.
Question 7: Personnel, Courses, and Instruction.

Please circle the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed information (e.g., catalog, brochures) about your major program is useful.</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>72.7</th>
<th>9.1</th>
<th>18.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have a professor in your major who serves as your &quot;mentor.&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in the department feel that academic and/or professional interaction with other students is an important part of your program.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department offers about the right number of combined undergraduate/graduate courses.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sequencing of courses in your major program is appropriate.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental faculty members are professionally competent.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in your major program are offered frequently enough so that you can complete your degree requirements as planned.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You receive instruction in the current research methods used in your major field.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You receive a sufficient amount of practical training for your major field.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most staff members in your departmental office are helpful.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding personnel, courses, or instruction. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

2 For a program that offers study in several major fields, the professors in those fields should offer GRADUATE courses in those fields every two years or so. The program has professors who go a long while without offering such classes and the Graduate students suffer for it.
4 Graduate courses are often offered in a haphazard manner. Faculty offer courses that they would like to teach and do not always make sure that graduate students are interested in taking those courses or that the course offerings for a particular semester will fulfill degree requirements for Master's and Ph.D. students.
6 Too many slash classes.
7 More courses covering content outside the Americas would be very helpful, especially in regards to research seminars.
9    Publish a rolling two year plan of course offerings.
15    It would be useful to have a course on African American history that goes beyond slavery.
16    Some professors get things wrong in history, their chosen profession. Out of respect and humility, I refrain from notifying them. I fear for a backlash and such an action hurting my grade. It can be irritating, though, because some things that are missed seem to be basic knowledge.
22    Some semesters the course offerings are too narrow and not every major subfield is offered each semester.
**Question 8: Assistance, Involvement, and Research.**

Please circle the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you conduct or assist in a research project in your major?</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you assist faculty or staff in your major in providing service to the community or state?</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are professors in your program available to help you outside of class?</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are you unable to enroll in a required course in your major because all sections are filled?</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are you unable to consult with your program advisor when necessary?</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do faculty encourage graduate students to participate in professional organizations associated with your major program?</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often does at least one faculty member in your major express a special interest in your progress?</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding assistance, involvement, and research. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

4. *Faculty do encourage graduate students to participate in professional organizations, workshops, and lectures. However, faculty involvement in these very same activities is quite low. This sets a bad example for students and makes graduate students feel as though they have the double burden of being the audience for all professional activities, and also for those specifically targeted toward graduate students.*
**Question 9: Facilities**

Please circle the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More than Adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The non-computer laboratory facilities for courses in your major are</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The departmental computer facilities for courses in your major are</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library holdings for your major are</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding facilities. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

1. **UA Libraries always work with us to provide us the resources that we need, and our office has computers we can use.**
   - Our problem is a shortage of space. We have more than 30 graduate students sharing one small room, and it becomes impossible to work with students when one is a GTA. We spend most of the day climbing over each other.

4. **The office for graduate students is much to cramped.**
   - There are often anywhere from 10-20 graduate students in the office at one time or another, either meeting with students, studying, or visiting with fellow graduate students. Separate space is needed for graduate students to meet with undergraduate students, so that these meetings can go uninterrupted by the noise in the graduate student office. In addition, it would help if the office was reconfigured as a student lounge. The computers can be hard to use because the space is so cramped. In addition, graduate students do not have their own printer to use for printing out course materials.

5. **Overcrowded. Run down facility of Ten Hoor that a facelift cannot fix.**
   - As a TA, it would be nice to have a desk with drawers, or my own cabinet to keep student papers in. As it is some have to share desks.

9. **The TA office needs refurbishing.**

10. **The GTA office is crammed.**
    - 26 GTAs crammed into one room, many of which do not have their own desk.

14. **We need more religious history at Gorgas.**

16. **A computer lab that is open and not used as a classroom on occasion, at least 2-4 computers and one printer.**

18. **I am unaware of any departmental computer lab for students.**

19. **That said, teaching and research are an important part of an historian's training and it is to those positions that most of us aspire.**
    - To that end, I wish the department had more space. I am aware that this is a university-wide problem. However, in our department, over 30 graduate students are stuffed into a small office where we keep valuable, and confidential, information. This space doubles as a mailbox room for graduate students and a place where all graduate students congregate (and it is promoted as such by the faculty). Beyond the fact that such quarters can be incredibly claustrophobic and that little work can be accomplished, it is dangerous because sensitive information often lies out in the open. It also makes it next-to-impossible to use office hours efficiently. And, compared to other departments, such as accounting where graduate instructors share offices with 2 other cohorts, or American Studies, a department with significantly fewer graduate students who inhabit a room of comparable-size, history TAs have less room to work (and we often have more students)! I believe these problems can be eliminated in various ways. I even believe the space we have could be utilized more efficiently.
we have an awful graduate teaching assistant office with old computers and inefficiently arranged space.

There are classrooms where I teach that do not have technology and have chalkboards instead of white boards.
The following items pertain to faculty and enrollment.

Please select the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

**Question 10:** With how many faculty members in your department have you developed a close professional relationship, such that you could ask them for a letter of recommendation?  N = 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0 None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7 Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.9 Three or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 11:** What do you think about the size of the graduate classes in your department?  N = 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Many are too small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>Most are about right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Many are too large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 12:** If you had to do it again, would you choose this major?  N = 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>Probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Probably not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding faculty and enrollment. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

2. The rule which requires graduate classes to have at least seven students enrolled is unfortunate. European seminars and proseminars suffer from this because most of the grad students here simply don’t care to take those courses. The problem is not the courses or the professors. It’s the students. Not sure how to fix that one.

4. Again, graduate classes can be hit or miss. Usually there are two classes every semester that people need to take, and these classes often get very full, so that it is difficult to participate. Other classes are not interesting or do not fulfill distribution requirements, so those classes have very few students or are canceled because not enough students take them.
The following items pertain to assistantships.

Please select the response that corresponds to your opinion about each item.

**Question 14:** How clear is the process for obtaining a graduate assistantship in your program?  N = 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Somewhat confusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Very confusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>I never tried to obtain an assistantship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 15:** How many opportunities are there for obtaining graduate assistantships (teaching, research, other) in your program?  N = 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>I never tried to obtain one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 16:** How would you rate the quality of the assistance available for obtaining graduate assistantships?  N = 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No assistance is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>I never tried to obtain one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 17:** How clearly were your duties as a graduate teaching or research assistant explained to you in a letter of appointment?  N = 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>Very clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>Fairly clearly, but I still had a number of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>The letter was vague in describing my duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>I did not receive an appointment letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>I have never had a graduate assistantship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please identify the nature of any of your concerns regarding assistantships. If you have any suggestions for improvement, please include them.

2. There should be a way for GTAs to communicate complaints that they have regarding the professors they work for. As of right now some TA’s feel it necessary to keep any kind of criticisms to themselves. That may be by design. But perhaps a anonymous suggestion box would be in order. My point is that there are professors in this department who TA’s try really hard to avoid working for. It might behoove the department to know who those professors are and why GTAs want to avoid them.

4. Teaching assistants put in an incredible number of hours during the semester. The pay that they receive does not adequately compensate them for the amount of time and energy that they devote to the 60-80 students they teach during the course of the semester.

5. So many students with so many issues (80 students). Not only is the workload extremely strenuous compared to other departments, we do not have the adequate support to do a good job.

10. The GTAs are given a substantial workload and some professors give their GTAs unreasonable amounts of work. For example, my professor had us grade 80 midterms, calculate, midterm grades, assign 300 pages of reading, and give 4 quizzes, in the span of about 7 days. In particular, there are some professors who if you are their TA, you are doing everything. But the biggest complaint is that a certain professor tends to teach his course with a very narrow, particular slant, which is fine, but it is to such an extreme that it makes it very hard for the TA to help students understand the material. The readings are not primary source based but come from various think tanks and authors attached to this professor’s political views. In addition, there is no text book and no narrative for the class. The TA must reconcile these challenges and spend lots of time in section helping the students even understand what we are studying. For example, lecture and section are pretty much two different classes. This week we studied one thing in lecture, and another event twenty years ahead in section. There is a great disconnect between content in section and lecture. I try my best to make the material engaging but I can only do so much. As someone who has a passion for history, it saddens me to see that the one time perhaps we have to show undergrads that history isn’t what “coach” taught them in high school, the one opportunity we have to show them how history informs us about so many different things in our own lives, and these students are leaving with a resentment for history because of certain class structures and professors.
The Department of History Strategic Plan Steering Committee met in April 2013 to outline our Strategic Plan process. The department held a one-day retreat in August 2013 to further refine what we saw as our strengths and areas of opportunity. The following document highlights those areas that will be the primary focus of our efforts over the next five years. The document is divided into four parts: Overview, Faculty Profile, Undergraduate Program, and Graduate Program.

PART I: OVERVIEW

Faculty and Degree Programs

The Department of History is composed of 27 tenured and tenure-track faculty, down from an all-time high of 29 in 2012. We offer the Bachelor of Arts, the Master of Arts, and the Ph.D. in History. As of the end of spring semester 2012, we have 648 undergraduate History majors and 61 graduate students (31 MA and 30 PhD). The department chair is Associate Professor Kari Frederickson. Associate Professor Jimmy Mixson serves as the Director of Undergraduate Studies (Associate Professor Andrew Huebner will serve as interim director during the spring 2014 semester), and Associate Professor John Giggie is the Director of Graduate Studies (Associate Professor Daniel Riches will serve as interim director during the fall 2013 semester). Standing departmental committees include Undergraduate Affairs, Graduate Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Bankhead, Textbook, and Technology.

The department provides instruction to more than 7,300 students annually in courses ranging from large introductory surveys to small graduate research seminars, in fields ranging from United States history to European history to Latin American history to Asian history. The department also offers courses that examine new paradigms and that transcend traditional geographical boundaries and chronologies, such as courses in the history of the Atlantic World, the global Cold War, as well as courses that examine the history of gender, race, religion, and armed conflict. Students in the MA program are trained broadly. They are required to take at least two of our readings courses that each cover the historiography of a different geographical region (U.S, Europe, Latin America), as well as complete a research seminar. Doctoral students must complete an additional research seminar and acquire 54 credits in four fields (twelve per fields in four fields and an additional six hours of the student's choice). Our examination fields for the PhD are as follows:

1. United States History to 1877
2. United States History Since 1877
3. British and European History, 1485-1815
4. British and European History Since 1815
Doctoral students are tested in three of their four fields. Students have the option to craft their own fourth (non-testing) thematic field in subjects such as religious history or the history of race.

Our doctoral fields represent faculty’s long-standing research strengths:

**United States History to 1877:** Professors Abruzzo, Freyer, Green, Kohl, Kopelson, Rable, Rothman, Selesky, Shaw

**United States History Sc 1877:** Beito, Elmore, Freyer, Giggie, Huebner, Lindquist-Dorr, Frederickson

**European and British History, 1485-1815:** Mixson, Riches, McClure, Mendle

**European and British History Sc 1815:** Professors Beeler, Peterson, Peacock, Grout, Wasserman

**Latin American History to 1800:** Professors Cribelli and Bunker

**Latin American History Sc 1800:** Professors Cribelli and Bunker

**History of the American South:** Professor Rable, Rothman, Frederickson, Lindquist-Dorr, Beito, Giggie

**Military and Naval History:** Professor Beeler, Riches, Selesky, Kohl, Rable

Since our last program review, the Department of History has developed additional research and teaching strengths:

**Religious History:** Abruzzo, Giggie, Holmes-Tagchungdarpa, Kopelson, McClure, Mixson, Rable, Riches, Shaw

**History of the Atlantic World:** Professors Beeler, Cribelli, Kopelson, Selesky, Shaw

**History of Race/Slavery:** Abruzzo, Beito, Cribelli, Frederickson, Freyer, Giggie, Green Kopelson, Lindquist-Dorr, Rothman, Shaw, Kopelson

**Gender/Women’s History:** Green, Grout, Holmes, Kopelson, Lindquist-Dorr, McClure, Shaw
Department Initiatives

*Frances S. Summersell Center for the Study of the South

In 2006, the Department created the Summersell Center for the Study of the South. Funded through a gift from late chairman Charles Summersell and his wife, Frances, the Center is dedicated to promoting the study of the history and culture of the American South through public programming and research. Directed by Professor Joshua Rothman, the Center sponsors more than ten events annually. Professor Rothman also has established research fellowships for visiting scholars, a biannual book prize, and will soon embark on a digital humanities project.

*Bankhead Endowment

The Bankhead fund makes it possible for the department to engage in a wide range of scholarly programming that is open to the public. It also allows us to support the programming of other departments through co-sponsorship. Since 2002 we have funded three postdoctoral fellows through the endowment.

*European, American, and Military History Workshops

Under the leadership of Associate Professor Dan Riches, Associate Professor Andrew Huebner, Associate Professor Harold Selesky, and Assistant Professor Jenny Shaw, the department holds bi-weekly workshops for interested faculty and graduate students in the fields of U.S., European, and Military history. The workshops provide a supportive atmosphere for students to present their research and receive constructive feedback.

*Peer Mentor Program

The Department sponsors a peer mentor program for students in HY 101, The History of Western Civilization to 1648. The Program’s immediate goal has been to reduce the percentage of students who drop, fail, or withdraw from the course (D-F-W). Twelve peer leaders enroll in a one-credit leadership course; attend weekly meetings to discuss course policies, learning strategies and outcomes for each discussion section; attend discussion sections, and regularly interact with struggling students, formally and informally to help them improve.

HY 101 with Peer Mentors: 28% D-F-W
HY 101 without Peer Mentors: 39% D-F-W

*Phi Alpha Theta

The Department boasts an active chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, the national history honor society. One of the chapter’s most successful activities has been the annual Career Day Workshop for Undergraduate History Majors. Organized by Associate Professor Jimmy Mixson, Director of Undergraduate Studies, invited speakers introduce students to opportunities in the areas of
publishing and public history, as well as share information about graduate studies in History, Law, and Business.

*Southern Historian*

Graduate students in the Department of History edit and publish the *The Southern Historian*, an annual academic journal.

*Annual Power & Struggle Graduate Student Conference*

Graduate students in the Department of History host an annual conference entitled “Power and Struggle.” The conference attracts presenters from across the country and Europe.

---

**PART II: FACULTY PROFILE**

**Productivity**

The faculty in the Department of History are productive scholars. Over the past five years, faculty have published 19 books, 45 articles in scholarly journals, and 38 essays in edited collections. Faculty also have presented their research at over 220 national, international, and regional conferences. A recent survey undertaken by the Tenure and Promotion Committee reveals that our tenure and promotion guidelines are on par with those of peer and aspirational institutions.

The department faces several challenges to continuing this level of productivity:

* Although our requirements match those of our peers, the support given to junior faculty at comparable institutions, particularly leave during the probationary period, is something we currently lack. To put it another way, our junior faculty are accomplishing as much as their counterparts at peer and aspirational institutions, but with less support. Time off pre-tenure appears to have become the norm, and we need to catch up.

* Presenting research at national and international conferences is critical to improving our reputation and ranking. The department averages roughly two conference presentations per faculty per year. Our travel budget of $25,000 is inadequate to meet the travel needs of 27 faculty members.

* Start-up packages for new faculty have improved greatly over the past five years. We have faculty who must travel to archives in South America, Europe, and Asia, and they must be able to stay abroad for several weeks. The two-year limitation on spending the start-up money seems an unnecessary burden to place on them. We propose that faculty be given a minimum of three years to spend their start-up funds.

In order to improve our reputation nationally, we need our associate and full professors to continue to be productive. Our current demographics are as follows:
Rank | Number of Faculty
--- | ---
Professor | 7
Associate Professor | 10
Assistant Professor | 10

Over the next three years, we anticipate three retirements at the Professor rank and possibly five probationary members moving into the Associate Professor rank, but only one member moving from Associate to Professor. This will leave us heavy in the middle and thin at the top. Out of necessity our Associates have assumed heavy service and administrative burdens (the current department chair, director of graduate studies, and director of undergraduate studies are associate professors), which have a detrimental impact on their ability to meet the requirements for promotion in a timely fashion. The expansion of the student body (undergraduate and graduate) has only added to the workload of all service positions.

We believe that faculty productivity would improve, and thus expedite the movement of Associates to the rank of Professor, were the chair given greater flexibility in assigning teaching loads. We propose that after a designated number of years in rank, faculty be allowed to teach overloads in two consecutive semesters, with research leave in the third (3-3-0). This leave would be supplemented by a small research grant from the department's Bankhead fund. We feel this opportunity should be available to Associate and Full Professors.

Faculty Size and Composition

Although our department boasts a number of area strengths, we also possess considerable gaps. Some of these gaps are the result of retirements (for example, Latin America, U.S. foreign policy) or because faculty have left for other universities (Asia, Ancient/Late Antique); nevertheless, we have not been allowed to replace these positions as quickly as we would like. Area gaps also exist because of the hiring priorities of the University. We understand that we can never be truly comprehensive; we also understand that our inability to teach any course before the Middle Ages, or a course in African History, or Europe in the 18th century, puts us at a disadvantage in terms of our ability to properly train our graduate students and to offer our undergraduates the range of courses they desire. The current composition of our faculty contains only three members with primary research interests outside of the United States and Europe, and no faculty members at all with research expertise anywhere in the world before the thirteenth century. This is a serious and glaring hole in our coverage that leaves us both incapable of fulfilling our departmental intentions to be a Research-I level department, and also sharply out of step with the shape of the profession nationally and amongst our peer institutions in particular. We simply cannot be the department we wish to be with this hole in coverage.
PART III: UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

The Department of History offers the Bachelor of Arts degree in History in the College of Arts and Sciences. We average approximately 675-750 majors in a given semester, and our average total enrollment is approximately 3,400-3,600 undergraduates per semester. The quality of our majors has steadily improved in recent years, and the strongest among them are now among the strongest in the nation. Several of our most recent graduates have gone on to remarkable early careers in some of the best Ph.D. programs in history (Princeton, , the University of Chicago, Notre Dame, Northwestern Vanderbilt, Rutgers, Purdue) and some of the best professional schools (Vanderbilt and UA law, and MBA programs at UA and beyond) in the nation.

The department’s primary concern is not only to maintain this momentum but to build on it. To that end, we propose reforms in three major areas:

*Curriculum reform and enrollment growth

*An enhanced major that both maintains high standards yet also appeals to and better serves our ever-changing undergraduate population

*Better overall advertising and communication about the quality and the importance of our course of study.

Curriculum Reform and Enrollment Growth

For reasons that remain unclear at present, our momentum has become threatened in recent semesters by declining enrollments and numbers of majors. Our first task is to come to a better understanding of these overall trends, and in that context refine and promote our major in such a way that it both maintains rigor and appeals to the broadest possible undergraduate population. To these ends the faculty agree to pursue the following initiatives:

- Develop a comprehensive plan for researching and understanding the fundamental causes of our volatile (and often declining) enrollments. Is our major somehow perceived as too rigorous? Too outdated? Are we not communicating well in the increasingly diverse and intellectually competitive environment of our growing campus? We propose to gather as much information as possible (whether through surveys, focus groups or other means) about our majors, as well as about those who are potential majors, or majors we have lost.

- Whatever the causes of our declining enrollments, we can do more to refine our major in ways that make it both more rigorous and more appealing. We therefore propose to expand the number and range of our 300-level courses, which are consistently among our most popular offerings. We therefore propose to develop these courses in broad, well-known areas of history that our faculty are qualified to teach, but that remain untaught (courses on “The French Revolution,” for example, or on the “American West”). We also propose to expand the enrollments of some of the most popular of these courses (perhaps to as many as 75-100 students) by hiring graduate students to serve as teaching assistants. We have had success with these strategies in the past on an experimental basis (eg. in courses on the Crusades, World War II, etc.) and propose now to expand the strategy more broadly, and to vigorously promote our most popular 300-level courses with GTAs.
• To the extent that our declining enrollments may rest on problems of student perception, we also propose to analyze and improve the way in which we communicate to our overall undergraduate population, and to our majors in particular, about our offerings. Proposals in this vein include more vigorous and thoughtful promotion of and recruitment for our revised offerings; better articulation of the structure of the major; a possible renumbering of our course offerings to better reflect their position in the curriculum (we have already begun this process for our surveys); a clear articulation of the distinction between 300- and 400-level courses.

Enhancement of the Major

To the extent that our department now competes with a growing and increasingly diverse array of attractive majors on a vibrant campus, we are conscious of the need to persuade our students of the quality and importance of a History degree (and the humanities in general) in the modern world, and to offer them a major that is both rigorous and relevant to the world in which we live. To these ends we propose the following:

• To explore options for expanding our “capstone” courses (HY 430) in ways that reach beyond the current research seminar format. Possibilities include HY 430 courses that offer experience in museum studies and public history, for example.

• To explore options for more formal internship opportunities in various fields (law, for example) that allow students to receive credit for applying historical research skills in settings beyond the traditional classroom.

• In connection with the expansion of internships, the department has expressed a desire to find ways to permanently fund and to expand the current pilot program for Peer Mentors in our large survey courses.

• The department also proposes a number of smaller measures to help recruit and retain quality students:

  1. To strengthen our ties to (and recruitment of) our most outstanding students in the University’s elite programs: the Emerging Scholars Program, the Honors Program, the five-year BA/MA program, and so on.

  2. To enhance, expand, promote, and fund more opportunities for all of our students to study abroad.

  3. To enhance, expand, promote, and fund opportunities for our best Junior and Seniors to travel to academic and other conferences.

  4. If possible, to change the AP equivalents for introductory HY courses from 3 to 4.

• Finally, the department expressed a desire to commit ourselves to improved and innovative undergraduate teaching overall. To that end, concretely, the department wishes to consider the possibility of:

  1. Focused, regular meetings dedicated to exchanging ideas about teaching, and to cultivating creative and innovative pedagogy.
2. The enhancement of our current system of teaching evaluation. Specifically we wish to think about complementing the formal evaluation of junior faculty with a more informal (but focused and structured) system that allows for “two-way” mentoring process between faculty across all levels. Our assumption is that senior teachers, too, have much to learn, and that mentoring is about more than formal evaluation for tenure and promotion.

Advising, Communications and Development

In keeping with many of the contexts and concerns expressed above, the department seeks to develop a more vigorous “brand,” to take up more space and to have greater visibility on campus and beyond, in keeping with our tradition, our current momentum and our potential.

- Develop overall marketing, communications vision, strategy and implementation. We as a department are strong in teaching, and in pursuing our own research agendas and publishing in our fields of specialty. We need now to do better about letting our students, our colleagues and the wider world know what we are up to. What is our “brand” and how do we communicate and promote it? A glance at many of our peers in other departments, especially at our aspirational institutions (Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, Texas and others) reveals a consistent, rigorous program of communication about courses, majors, curriculum, faculty and alumni affairs. How can we improve along these lines? In our own college Religious Studies seems to offer a model in how this might be done.

- There is a parallel need for better “in house” communication with our 650-700+ majors. We propose developing a regular, consistent program of communication with them—through a combination of traditional print media, social media and other means—on all aspects of the life of the department—the major and minor, current courses, faculty and student awards, publications, clubs and so on.

- We also seek to establish more intentional communication to and relations with alumni. Our past efforts, through our “Friends of History” initiative, have had great potential, but they have been inconsistent and uneven. What can we do to develop these ties more consistently? What are the model initiatives and “best practices” among our peer and aspirational departments, and how do we best adapt them for our needs and circumstance? Our recent “Career Day” initiative seems one place to begin in this regard. Several of our peer departments (e.g. Texas) have invited distinguished alumni back to campus to speak to and encourage current (and potential) majors about the possibilities of a History degree.
PART IV: GRADUATE PROGRAM

The Department of History offers both the MA and PhD degrees. Our total graduate enrollment is approximately sixty, divided roughly equally between MA and PhD students. Our students have been successful. PhD graduates have gained employment at four- and two-year academic institutions; received postdoctoral appointments at research universities (University of Mississippi; University of Illinois at Chicago); published monographs with leading presses such as the University of North Carolina Press and articles in national (Southern Cultures, Journal of Sport History) and respected regional journals; and earned a variety of outside research fellowships. MA graduates have gained admissions to highly ranked PhD programs at institutions such as Emory, Florida, Rutgers, and Vanderbilt.

To accentuate these successes, and to address areas in need of improvement, the faculty of the Department of History have identified three broad categories of issues to revisit over the period covered by this strategic plan: Graduate Recruitment and Admissions; Graduate Curriculum and Degree Requirements; and Graduate Student Productivity and Professionalization.

Graduate Recruitment and Admissions

The recruitment of highly qualified students is necessary to the health of any graduate program. While the Department of History has been fortunate to have a number of excellent students, we are aware that we could improve in our ability to attract the best students, and that part of this improvement should include the development of a more systematic strategy of graduate student recruitment. We would therefore like to consider the following matters:

* Improving communication (electronic and otherwise) with potential applicants. This would include working with the Department’s recently redesigned webpage to present the strengths of our graduate program more clearly and persuasively, and to provide potential applicants with more of the information they would need to learn about and apply to our program.

* Develop strategies to proactively reach out to potential applicants. Our recruitment efforts to this point have been mainly reactive: we respond well (and often quite successfully) to students who reach out to us for information, but do relatively little to make first contact with students to encourage them to consider us. The department intends to explore more proactive recruitment measures, including the use of database tools to identify and reach out to high-quality students in our fields of strength, and the use of faculty conference and research travel to hold informational ‘meet and greet’ sessions where faculty could come into contact with potential applicants and inform them of the strengths of our program.

* Develop a systematic strategy for hosting prospective students. The department has worked hard to organize visits from prospective students, and many of these students have commented positively on their experiences as important elements in their decision to apply to and/or attend our university. However, such efforts have been done on a purely ad hoc basis, with no systematic strategy. The department would like to consider avenues to
standardize our efforts in hosting prospective students to maximize the effectiveness of our efforts.

*Develop strategies and locate funding for targeted recruitment of top prospects. Certain university-level efforts exist to host and recruit high-priority prospects, and history departments at peer and aspirational institutions make similar efforts at the departmental level. The department would like to explore avenues to provide the structure and funding for us to also be more aggressive in proactively recruiting the prospects at the top of our list.

*Connected to the issue of recruiting top prospects is the need for better financial support for our graduate students in general. The department already does well in providing students support for smaller, shorter-term items like conference and research travel. We need, however, to improve our ability to offer longer-term funding packages if we are to be able to compete for and retain the highest quality applicants.

Related to the issue of recruitment is that of admissions policies and procedures. The faculty have identified the following two areas to consider regarding admissions:

*Consider limiting the number of doctoral students in our program. Given the extremely tight job market in history that has existed for a number of years and shows no signs of improving markedly, the department would like to consider whether it would be advisable to limit the number of students we accept into our PhD program.

*Develop a system to deal with international applications. The department usually receives several applications for admissions each year from students who reside outside of, and were educated outside of, the United States, and these numbers have been increasing in recent years. As of yet we have not developed a mechanism to deal with issues particular to these applications (such as how to assess transcripts from institutions using vastly different grading scales from those used by American institutions; how to assess letters of recommendation written by recommenders from different academic cultures and different expectations of what a recommendation should consist of; or how to deal with application materials written in languages other than English.) The department would like to consider ways in which we could deal with these applications more effectively.

Graduate Curriculum and Degree Requirements

The Department of History offers two paths to the MA degree: thirty credit hours with a revised seminar paper, or twenty-four credit hours with a thesis. Students in the PhD program must complete fifty-four credit hours, including four fields of history (twelve credit hours each) with the remaining hours taken either in history or in a different discipline. MA students and PhD students in U.S. and British history must also demonstrate proficiency in one foreign language, while PhD students in non-Anglophone fields must demonstrate proficiency in two languages.
In terms of curriculum and requirements, the department has identified the following items to consider as part of its strategic plan:

**Overall curriculum and procedures**

*Limit the number of ‘slash’ courses taken by degree-seekers. Graduate students may enroll in 600-level, graduate-only courses that are usually for four credit hours, or in 500-level courses ‘slash’ courses that meet concurrently with 400-level undergraduate courses and carry three credit hours. The department recognizes that 600-level courses are preferable for graduate education, and would like to consider whether limits should be placed on the number of 500-level ‘slash’ classes our students can enroll in during their degree programs.

*Consider adding a required historiography course to be taken in the first semester of graduate study in our department. The department has discussed instituting a required course in historiography and historiographical theory to be taken by all incoming MA and PhD students in their first semester of study in our department, based on the idea that this course could form part of the foundation for the students’ future studies, as well as cultivate a strong sense of cohort amongst students across all fields. The department would deliberate over this suggestion and vote on its adoption.

*Reconsider system of advising for graduate students. The Director of Graduate Studies currently serves as academic advisor to all MA students in the program, while PhD students are advised by their primary dissertation advisor. The department would like to reconsider the way in which it advises its graduate students, including the possibility that dissertation committees be formed earlier for PhD students and have a more active role in advising students as they progress through the program.

**MA program**

*Consider changes to the structure of the MA comprehensive exams. The department has discussed possible changes to the structure of the MA exams, including making discussion of the revised seminar paper a more central part of the exam, and encouraging the students to think more synthetically about how the various courses they have taken have contributed to their understanding of the approaches to studying history they find most compelling. The department would deliberate over this suggestion and vote on its adoption.

*Find ways to encourage better language training at the MA level. Language skills are of central importance to historians who wish to study peoples or engage with historiographies whose languages are other than English. Cultivating the requisite language skills for further study can be of crucial importance for MA students who wish to gain entry into a PhD program, either at Alabama or elsewhere. The department would like to consider ways to facilitate better language training for its MA students who desire it.
PhD program

*Consider changing number of credit hours required. We currently require fifty-four hours for completion of the PhD program. Some programs require fewer, such as forty-eight. The department should revisit the curriculum and decide if we want to remain at fifty-four hours or change that total.

*Consider separating the presentation of the dissertation prospectus from the PhD comprehensive exams. Students currently submit their dissertation prospectus as part of their PhD comprehensive examination process, and the exam committee decides whether to approve or reject the prospectus. Concerns have been raised about this procedure, including: 1). that exam committees and dissertation committees are not identical, meaning that some members of the exam committee (if not also on dissertation committee) will be passing judgment on a prospectus for a project they will not be involved with, and some members of the dissertation committee (if not also on exam committee) will have no input on passage of the prospectus; 2). having the student complete the prospectus while also preparing for the exams will mean that the student’s attention is diverted away from making the prospectus as strong as it could be; and 3). including the ‘defense’ of the prospectus at the end of the comprehensive exam process may mean that both student and committee are fatigued from the process and less likely to dedicate the time and rigor needed to really interrogate the prospectus. The department should consider whether it would be better to separate the exams from the prospectus, with one possible option being to institute a time-limit (perhaps six weeks) following successful completion of the PhD exams for the student to submit the prospectus to the dissertation committee and defend it before them.

*Rethinking our PhD fields. The fields currently offered in the program, with the exception of Military and Naval History, are all defined geographically and chronologically (U.S. to 1877; U.S. from 1877; Europe to 1815; Europe from 1815; Latin America to 1810; Latin America Since 1810; U.S. South). Students are also allowed to create one thematically defined field as their fourth, non-testing field. The department should consider various options to modernize this structure and bring it into keeping with the direction in which the discipline has developed nationally, and in which our peer and aspirational departments have already taken. These could include:

- adding new, comparative and/or thematic fields to our list of fields offered. Options could include: Atlantic World; Religious History; Women’s and Gender History; History of Race and Slavery, etc.

- adding the possibility of a constructed field of particular relevance to the student’s dissertation project (a ‘dissertation field’)

- allowing for, or perhaps even requiring, a field in an outside/cognate discipline (such as Anthropology; English; Art History; Political Science; etc.)
*Exploring the possibility of extending the deadline for completion of the PhD degree from seven to eight years. Many history dissertation projects require extensive amounts of travel to archives and libraries. Many also require the cultivation of skill-sets (languages; theoretical and analytical skills; etc.) that take a good deal of time to develop. Given this, the department would like to consider extending the official deadline for completion of degree to eight years, while retaining its desire to encourage students to complete their degrees in as timely a fashion as possible.

**Graduate Student Productivity and Professionalization**

The department has discussed the following items to consider to enhance graduate student productivity and to better prepare them for their future careers as professional historians and educators:

*Establish as a departmental goal (and develop structures to encourage and support) the submission of more revised seminar papers as articles to professional journals.

*Consider avenues to provide better teacher-training to our students. We currently offer a required course in ‘Teaching History (HY 600) for all first-semester GTAs, as well as occasional workshop sessions on teaching-related issues. The department should consider additional ways to train our students to be excellent teachers of history.

*Expand teaching opportunities for our students beyond the survey level. History graduate students currently have extensive opportunities to teach in the introductory Western Civilization and American Civilization sequences, both as GTAs and (later in their careers) as instructors of record (especially in summer sessions), but we provide them with little opportunity to teach beyond that level. The department should consider possible ways of expanding graduate student teaching opportunities, including expanded options for students to serve as GTAs in our most popular (and highest-enrollment) 300-level courses, and the prospect for advanced dissertators to serve as instructors of record in courses of their own beyond the survey level.

*Create a venue for students to deliver mock job talks. This would be of crucial benefit in preparing our students for the job market.

*Consider including a graduate student member on our departmental search committees. Student service as non-voting members of search committees (who would also not be privy to the confidential deliberations of the department as a whole) would provide those students with invaluable insight into the workings of an academic job search, including the qualities that mark a successful application. This knowledge would be of considerable assistance when the students themselves embark on their own job search. Student participation would also give the graduate student body as a whole a sense of investment and involvement in a process that affects their department (and, in many cases, their own training directly) in an
important way, and would provide the department with an additional source of information to assess the merits of our candidates.

*In light of the challenging academic job market and the range of career options open to a history PhD, the department would like to do more to make our students aware of alternate careers in fields such as public history, publishing, etc.
Mission / Purpose

The Department of History is central to the research, instructional, and outreach missions of The University of Alabama. It is one of the core departments providing the liberal arts foundation necessary to the education of all University of Alabama students. History’s particular scholarly mission is to preserve, advance, and communicate knowledge of humanity’s past. This mission is carried out through a variety of means, including a combination of research and writing, teaching, and service. The discovery and sharing of knowledge about the human past is at the heart of our enterprise. The Department of History is committed to being a recognized leader in the advancement of scholarship and embraces its role of preparing and developing future generations of scholars. The department is also committed to being a leader in the cultivation of historical thinking, both inside the university and through outreach to the broader community. A knowledge of history is central to developing a humanistic approach to contemporary social problems, and in preparing humanity for the future.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Content Knowledge
Majors will be able to identify key individuals, events, terms, turning points, and social and cultural patterns in the historical development of American and world civilizations.

Connected Document
History BA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
Reflective Statement: For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured knowledge of historical facts through quizzes, exams, and papers. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target. We are satisfied with our efforts in achieving this outcome. Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced* In spring 2011 we instituted a pilot Peer Mentoring Program to assist undergraduates in the survey courses with study skill and test-taking strategies and preparation. We will continue this program in spring 2011 and hope to expand it in the future. Statement regarding changes: We revised our Peer Mentoring Program for the undergraduate History of Western Civilization survey. Improvements resulted in a decrease in the "drop," "withdrawal," and "failure" rate for this course. No planned changes for 2012-2013.

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 History - SLO is related to historical development and change over major periods of time and/or provides a survey of social, cultural, economic and political developments that have molded the modern world

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
3.4 Increase involvement of undergraduate students in research and scholarly activities.

Related Measures
M 1: Quizzes and Exams
Identification questions on exams; in-class quizzes on readings. These measures will be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and capstone course level. These measures do not require assessment instruments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning – other
Target:
For 100/200-level surveys we expect 60% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 300-level courses we expect 70% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses and capstone course (H4 430) we expect 80% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For 100/200-level surveys, 74% of students (314 out of 424 scored a C- or better on relevant assignments. For 300-level courses, 85% of students (94 out of 110) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses, 91% of students (29 out of 31) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments.

M 3: Essays and Papers
Essay exams; Paper drafts; Research papers. These measures will be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and capstone course levels. These assignments are assessed using a rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Connected Document
Undergraduate Essay Grading Rubric

Target:
For 100/200-level surveys, we expect 60% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 300-level courses, we expect 70% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses and our capstone course (H4 430), we expect 80% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For 100/200 level surveys, 74% of students scored a C- or better on essay question that tested knowledge of historical facts. For 300-level courses, 85% of students scored a C- or better on essay question that tested knowledge of historical facts. For 400-level courses and capstone course, 95% of students scored a C- or better on research paper that required demonstration of knowledge of relevant historical facts.

INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS
Across all course levels, students met targets for demonstrating knowledge of historical facts.

M 4: Class Surveys
In-class surveys to determine the value of research projects as a form of self-directed study. This measure will be used at the capstone course level. Actual survey found in uploaded documents

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Student surveys were administered in our capstone research course during the fall and spring semesters. Results: Before they took the course all students claimed to be able to differentiate between primary and secondary sources, but only half felt comfortable working with them. By the end of the course all students responded that their comfort level with primary sources was in the 4-5 range. Students felt least comfortable about their argumentative skills before taking the course; all reported that by the end of the course that they agreed (again 4-5 range) that they had learned how to construct an argument. All but two students felt somewhat or not very comfortable about preparing a research paper before taking the course. All 27 out of 30 students stated that they felt very comfortable (4-5 range) constructing a research paper by the end of the course. We also asked students if they felt this course should be required of history majors. 28 out of 30 replied in the affirmative; 3 said they felt it should come earlier in the curriculum so students could apply lessons learned in this course in their other history classes.

SLO 2: Evaluation and Interpretation of Sources
Majors will be able to evaluate and interpret primary sources and to construct historical insights from them.

Connected Documents
History BA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
Reflective Statement for Outcome #2: During the 2011-2012 academic year, we assessed this learning outcome using a range of direct and indirect measures. Still we feel that we would benefit from further student feedback regarding their understanding of historical sources. Proposed Changes for 2012-2013 (Also on action plan page): We currently use indirect methods in the introductory survey and capstone course to measure students' own understanding of how to interpret and evaluate primary sources and how to glean historical insights from them. We seek to gain further understanding of this in 300- and 400-level courses. Therefore, for the 2012-2013 academic year, we will develop an indirect measure -- most likely a self-assessment survey -- that gauges students' understanding of the role of primary sources in the construction of historical narratives. Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced: In spring 2011 we instituted a pilot Peer Mentoring Program to assist undergraduates in the survey courses with study skill and test-taking strategies and preparation. We will continue this program in spring 2011 and hope to expand it in the future. Statement regarding changes: We revised our Peer Mentoring Program for the undergraduate History of Western Civilization survey. Improvements resulted in a decrease in the "drop," "withdrawal," and "failure" rate for this course. We will continue to refine this program.

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 History - SLO is related to historical development and change over major periods of time and/or provides a survey of social, cultural, economic and political developments that have molded the modern world
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.

Related Measures

M 1: Quizzes and Exams
Identification questions on exams; in-class quizzes on readings. These measures will be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and capstone course level. These measures do not require assessment instruments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
For 100/200-level survey courses, we expect 60% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 300-level courses, we expect 70% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses and capstone course (H430), we expect 90% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For 100/200-level surveys, 74% of students (314 out of 424 scored a C- or better on relevant assignments. For 300-level courses, 85% of students (34 out of 110) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses, 91% of students (29 out of 31) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments.

M 2: In-class discussions and exercises
Discussion groups and ungraded in-class writing exercises to evaluate student comprehension. These measures will be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and capstone course level.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

History uses a wide range of indirect measures to evaluate student comprehension of and interpretation of primary and secondary sources. 1. Class discussions: In all courses evaluated, students were placed in small discussion groups to respond to specific prompts related to course material. They were asked to discuss various issues and even draw conclusions to present informally to the class as a whole. These performances were not graded; rather, the instructor evaluated the quality of student thought and participation. The majority of students performed well as leaders rather than as followers of class discussions. 2. Impromptu in-class essays were used in the 300- and 400-level classes evaluated to gauge student comprehension of primary sources. By the conclusion of the course, most students had "mastered" this skill. 3. Blackboard postings and reader responses were used in 300- and 400-level courses to gauge student understanding of sources. By the conclusion of the course, most students had "mastered" this skill. Interpretations and Conclusions: These various indirect measures were generally successful in gauging student understanding of primary and secondary historical sources.

**M 3: Essays and Papers**

Essay exams; Paper drafts; Research papers. These measures will be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and capstone course levels. These assignments are assessed using a rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**

Undergraduate Essay Grading Rubric

**Target:**

For 100/200-level surveys, we expect 60% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 300-level courses, we expect 70% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses and our capstone course (HY 430), we expect 80% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

For 100/200 level surveys, 74% of students scored a C- or better on essay exam that required them to evaluate and interpret primary sources and glean historical insights from them. For 300-level courses, 83% of students scored a C- or better on essay exam that required them to evaluate and interpret primary sources and glean historical insights from them. For 400-level courses and capstone course, 85% of students scored a C- or better on research paper that required them to evaluate and interpret primary sources and glean historical insights from them. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION: Across all courses, students met targets for illustrating their ability to evaluate and interpret sources. Essay exams and research papers remain valuable tools for achieving mastery of this skill.

**M 4: Class Surveys**

In-class surveys to determine the value of research projects as a form of self-directed study. This measure will be used at the capstone course level. Actual survey found in uploaded documents

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**

No Target Established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Student surveys were administered in our capstone research course during the fall and spring semesters. Results: Before they took the course all students claimed to be able to differentiate between primary and secondary sources, but only half felt comfortable working with them. By the end of the course all students responded that their comfort level with primary sources was in the 4-5 range. Students felt least comfortable about their argumentative skills before taking the course; all reported that by the end of the course that they agreed (again 4-5 range) that they had learned how to construct an argument. All but two students felt somewhat or not very comfortable about preparing a research paper before taking the course. All 27 out of 30 students stated that they felt very comfortable (4-5 range) constructing a research paper by the end of the course. We also asked students if they felt this course should be required of history majors. 29 out of 30 replied in the affirmative; 3 said they felt it should come earlier in the curriculum so students could apply lessons learned in this course in their other history classes.

**SLO 3: Different Interpretations of the Past**

Majors are expected to be able to understand, analyze, and evaluate different interpretations of the past.

**Connected Document**

History BA Curriculum Maps

**Relevant Associations:**

Reflective Statement on Outcome #3: For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured students' ability to understand, evaluate, and analyze different interpretations of the past using both direct and indirect measures. Our range of methods is adequate and we met our target. We are satisfied with our efforts in achieving this outcome. There are no planned changes for 2012-2013.

**Standard Associations**

SACS 3.3.1

3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

**General Education/Core Curriculum Associations**

5 History - SLO is related to historical development and change over major periods of time and/or provides a survey of social, cultural, economic and political developments that have molded the modern world

11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

**Strategic Plan Associations**

University of Alabama

3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.

3.4 Increase involvement of undergraduate students in research and scholarly activities.

**Related Measures**
M 1: Quizzes and Exams
Identification questions on exams; in-class quizzes on readings. These measures will be employed at the introductory,
upper-level, and capstone course level. These measures do not require assessment instruments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
For 100/200-level courses, we expect 60% of students to score C- or higher on relevant assignments. For 300-
level courses, we expect 70% of students to score C- or higher on relevant assignments. For 400-level and
capstone course (HY 430), we expect 80% of students to score C- or higher on relevant assignments.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For 100/200-level surveys, 74% of students (314 out of 424) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments.
For 300-level courses, 85% of students (54 out of 110) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments. For
400-level courses, 91% of students (29 out of 31) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments.

M 2: In-class discussions and exercises
Discussion groups and ungraded in-class writing exercises to evaluate student comprehension. These measures will
be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and capstone course level.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established. These measures are not graded.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
History uses a wide range of indirect measures to evaluate student comprehension of and interpretation of
primary and secondary sources. 1. Class discussions: In all courses evaluated, students were placed in small
discussion groups to respond to specific prompts related to course material. They were asked to discuss
issues and draw conclusions to present informally to the class as a whole. These performances were not
graded; rather, the instructor evaluated the quality of student thought and participation. The majority of
students performed well as leaders rather than as followers of class discussions. 2. Impromptu in-class essays
were used in the 300- and 400-level classes evaluated to gauge student comprehension of primary sources.
By the conclusion of the course, most students had "mastered" this skill. 3. Blackboard postings and reader
responses were used in 300- and 400-level courses to gauge student understanding of sources. By the
conclusion of the course, most students had "mastered" this skill. Interpretations and Conclusions: these
various indirect measures were generally successful in gauging student understanding of primary and
secondary historical sources

M 3: Essays and Papers
Essay exams; Paper drafts; Research papers. These measures will be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and
capstone course levels. These assignments are assessed using a rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Undergraduate Essay Grading Rubric

Target:
For 100/200-level surveys, we expect 60% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 300-
level courses, we expect 70% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses
and our capstone course (HY 430), we expect 80% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For 100/200 level surveys, 74% of students scored a C- or better on essay exam that required them to
understand, analyze, and evaluate different interpretations of the past. For 300-level courses, 63% of students
scored a C- or better on essay exam that required them to understand, analyze, and evaluate different
interpretations of the past. For 400-level courses and capstone course, 85% of students scored a C- or better
on research paper that required them to understand, analyze, and evaluate different interpretations of the
past. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION: Across all courses, students met targets for illustrating their
ability to understand and evaluate different interpretations of the past. Essay exams and research papers
remain valuable tools for achieving mastery of this skill.

M 4: Class Surveys
In-class surveys to determine the value of research projects as a form of self-directed study. This measure will be
used at the capstone course level. Actual survey found in uploaded documents

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Student surveys were administered in our capstone research course during the fall and spring semesters.
Results: Before they took the course all students claimed to be able to differentiate between primary and
secondary sources, but only half felt comfortable working with them. By the end of the course all students
responded that their comfort level with primary sources was in the 4-5 range. Students felt least comfortable
about their argumentative skills before taking the course; all reported that by the end of the course that they
agreed (again 4-5 range) that they had learned how to construct an argument. All but two students felt
somewhat or not very comfortable about preparing a research paper before taking the course. All 27 of 30
students stated that they felt very comfortable (4-5 range) constructing a research paper by the end of the
course. We also asked students if they felt this course should be required of history majors. 29 out of 30
replied in the affirmative; 3 said they felt it should come earlier in the curriculum so students could apply
lessons learned in this course in their other history classes.

SLO 4: Higher Order Understanding
Majors are expected to express higher-order understandings of the past through coherent, sequential statements based
on primary and secondary sources.

Connected Document
History BA Curriculum Maps
Relevant Associations:
Reflective Statement for Outcome #4 For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured students' express higher-order understandings of the past through coherent, sequential statements based on primary and secondary sources using a range of direct and indirect measures. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target. We are satisfied with our efforts in achieving this outcome. There are no planned changes for 2012-2013.

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

General Education/Core Curriculum Associations
5 History - SLO is related to historical development and change over major periods of time and/or provides a survey of social, cultural, economic and political developments that have molded the modern world
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.
3.4 Increase involvement of undergraduate students in research and scholarly activities.

Related Measures:
M 1: Quizzes and Exams
Identification questions on exams; in-class quizzes on readings. These measures will be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and capstone course level. These measures do not require assessment instruments.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
For 100/200-level courses, we expect 60% of students to score C- or higher on relevant assignments. For 300-level courses, we expect 70% of students to score C- or higher on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses and capstone course (HY 430), we expect 80% of students to score C- or higher on relevant assignments.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For 100/200-level surveys, 74% of students (314 out of 424) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments. For 300-level courses, 85% of students (94 out of 110) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses, 91% of students (29 out of 31) scored a C- or better on relevant assignments.

M 2: In-class discussions and exercises
Discussion groups and ungraded in-class writing exercises to evaluate student comprehension. These measures will be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and capstone course level.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
No Target Established. These measures are not graded.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
History used in-class small group discussions as the indirect measures to gauge development of higher order understandings of the past based on the evaluation of secondary and primary evidence. In all courses evaluated, students were placed in small discussion groups to respond to specific prompts related to course material. They were asked to discuss issues and draw conclusions to present informally to the class as a whole. These performances were not graded; rather, the instructor evaluated the quality of student thought and participation. The majority of students performed well as leaders rather than as followers of class discussions. Interpretations and Conclusions: Small group/student-led discussions remain a valuable tool for developing critical thinking skills and higher order understanding of the past.

M 3: Essays and Papers
Essay exams; Paper drafts; Research papers. These measures will be employed at the introductory, upper-level, and capstone course levels. These assignments are assessed using a rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Undergraduate Essay Grading Rubric

Target:
For 100/200-level surveys, we expect 60% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 300-level courses, we expect 70% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments. For 400-level courses and our capstone course (HY 430), we expect 80% of students to score C- or better on relevant assignments.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
For 100/200 level surveys, 74% of students scored a C- or better on essay exam that required them to express higher-order understandings of the past through coherent, sequential statements based on primary and secondary sources. For 300-level courses, 83% of students scored a C- or better on essay exam that required them to express higher-order understandings of the past through coherent, sequential statements based on primary and secondary sources. For 400-level courses and capstone course, 85% of students scored a C- or better on research paper that required them to express higher-order understandings of the past through coherent, sequential statements based on primary and secondary sources, relevant assignment.

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION: Across all courses, students met targets for illustrating their ability to express higher-order understandings of the past through coherent, sequential statements based on primary and secondary sources. Essay exams and research papers remain valuable tools for achieving mastery of this skill.

M 4: Class Surveys
In-class surveys to determine the value of research projects as a form of self-directed study. This measure will be used at the capstone course level. Actual survey found in uploaded documents

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
No Target Established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Student surveys were administered in our capstone research course during the fall and spring semesters. Results: Before they took the course all students claimed to be able to differentiate between primary and secondary sources, but only half felt comfortable working with them. By the end of the course all students responded that their comfort level with primary sources was in the 4-5 range. Students felt least comfortable about their argumentative skills before taking the course; all reported that by the end of the course that they agreed (again 4-5 range) that they had learned how to construct an argument. All but two students felt somewhat or not very comfortable about preparing a research paper before taking the course. All 27 out of 30 students stated that they felt very comfortable (4-5 range) constructing a research paper by the end of the course. We also asked students if they felt this course should be required of history majors. 29 out of 30 replied in the affirmative; 3 said they felt it should come earlier in the curriculum so students could apply lessons learned in this course in their other history classes.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Student surveys were administered in our capstone research course during the fall and spring semesters. Results: Before they took the course all students claimed to be able to differentiate between primary and secondary sources, but only half felt comfortable working with them. By the end of the course all students responded that their comfort level with primary sources was in the 4-5 range. Students felt least comfortable about their argumentative skills before taking the course; all reported that by the end of the course that they agreed (again 4-5 range) that they had learned how to construct an argument. All but two students felt somewhat or not very comfortable about preparing a research paper before taking the course. All 27 out of 30 students stated that they felt very comfortable (4-5 range) constructing a research paper by the end of the course. We also asked students if they felt this course should be required of history majors. 28 out of 30 replied in the affirmative; 3 said they felt it should come earlier in the curriculum so students could apply lessons learned in this course in their other history classes.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcn 5: Sustained Level of Recognized Quality

Relevant Associations:
Program Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced: 1. Increase number of full-time, tenure-track faculty, capable of teaching a broad range of undergraduate courses in currently underserved geographic regions, periods, and methodologies. 2. Revise the undergraduate curriculum to better incorporate a wide array of courses and methodologies, and to broaden the knowledge of our undergraduate students.

Related Measures

M 5: Student Enrollment
Assess the number of tenure-track faculty, range of course offerings in light of student enrollment.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 6: Examine Curriculum Proposal
Examine revised curriculum proposal for its ability to deliver a wide range of courses and methodologies.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

OthOtcn 6: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completions.

Related Measures

M 7: Credit Hour Production
Undergraduate semester credit-hour production.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 8: Number of Degrees Offered
Number of undergraduate courses offered.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 9: Number in Major
Number of students in major.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 10: Number of Degrees Awarded
Number of undergraduate degrees conferred.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

OthOtcn 7: Highly Valued by Program Graduates and Key Constituencies
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 11: Graduating Senior Survey
University-wide graduating senior survey
Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program
Target:
The majority of those surveyed will value the History program.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
See Graduating Senior Survey in Attached Documents.

M 12: NSSE Results
NSSE for history seniors

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 13: Informal Discussions between Faculty and Students
Informal faculty discussions with students

Source of Evidence: Discussions / Coffee Talk

M 14: Success in Applications to Graduate and Professional Programs
Success in applications to graduate and professional programs.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
The Department of History will succeed in placing History graduates in top graduate and professional programs.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
2013 History graduates were accepted into the following graduate and professional programs with full funding: Rutgers University University of Notre Dame Purdue University Loyola University Chicago Washington State University

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
2013 History graduates were accepted into the following graduate and professional programs with full funding: Rutgers University University of Notre Dame Purdue University Loyola University Chicago Washington State University

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Student self-assessment
Although we are generally pleased with our range of measures for all outcomes, we feel that we would benefit from further student feedback regarding their understanding of historical sources (Outcome 2). Proposed Changes for 2012-2013 (Also on action plan page): We currently use indirect methods in the introductory survey and capstone course to measure students' own understanding of how to interpret and evaluate primary sources and how to glean historical insights from them. We seek to gain further understanding of this in 300- and 400-level courses. Therefore, for the 2012-2013 academic year, we will develop an indirect measure – most likely a self-assessment survey – that gauges students' understanding of the role of primary sources in the construction of historical narratives.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Survey or Student Self-Assessment of Learning implemented in 300- and 400-level lecture/discussion courses.
Responsible Person/Group: Karl Frederickson

Detailed Assessment Report
2012-2013 History M.A.
(A as of 9/27/2013 02:01 PM CENTRAL)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of History is central to the research, instructional, and outreach missions of The University of Alabama. It is one of the core departments providing the liberal arts foundation necessary to the education of all University of Alabama students. History's particular scholarly mission is to preserve, advance, and communicate knowledge of humanity's past. This mission is carried out through a variety of means, including a combination of research and writing, teaching, and service. The discovery and sharing of knowledge about the human past is at the heart of our enterprise. The Department of History is committed to being a recognized leader in the advancement of scholarship and embraces its role of preparing and developing future generations of scholars. The department is also committed to being a leader in the cultivation of historical thinking, both inside the university and through outreach to the broader community. A knowledge of history is central to developing a humanistic approach to contemporary social problems, and in preparing humanity for the future.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Broad General Historical/Historiographical Knowledge
Masters students will demonstrate an understanding of the history of the United States and the World. All students must take 600-level historiography courses in two of three broad geographic areas. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding. All Masters students must take a final oral comprehensive examination.

Connected Document
History MA Curriculum Map

Relevant Associations:

Reflective Statement: For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured knowledge of historical facts through papers and the final comprehensive oral examination. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target. Still we feel that we would benefit from further student feedback regarding their acquisition of broad historical knowledge. Proposed Changes for 2012-2013 (Also on action plan page): For the 2012-2013 academic year, we will develop an indirect measure – most likely a self-assessment survey – that gauges students' assessment of their acquisition of broad historical knowledge.

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Student self-assessment

Although we are generally pleased with our range of measures for all outcomes, we feel that we would benefit from further student feedback regarding their understanding of historical sources (Outcome 2). Proposed Changes for 2012-2013 (Also on action plan page): We currently use indirect methods in the introductory survey and capstone course to measure students' own understanding of how to interpret and evaluate primary sources and how to glean historical insights from them. We seek to gain further understanding of this in 300- and 400-level courses. Therefore, for the 2012-2013 academic year, we will develop an indirect measure -- most likely a self-assessment survey -- that gauges students' understanding of the role of primary sources in the construction of historical narratives.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Survey or Student Self-Assessment of Learning Implemented in 300- and 400-level lecture/discussion courses.
Responsible Person/Group: Karl Frederickson

Detailed Assessment Report

2012-2013 History M.A.
As of: 9/23/2013 02:01 PM Central
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose

The Department of History is central to the research, instructional, and outreach missions of The University of Alabama. It is one of the core departments providing the liberal arts foundation necessary to the education of all University of Alabama students. History's particular scholarly mission is to preserve, advance, and communicate knowledge of humanity's past. This mission is carried out through a variety of means, including a combination of research and writing, teaching, and service. The discovery and sharing of knowledge about the human past lies at the heart of our enterprise. The Department of History is committed to being a recognized leader in the advancement of scholarship and embraces its role of preparing and developing future generations of scholars. The department is also committed to being a leader in the cultivation of historical thinking, both inside the university and through outreach to the broader community. A knowledge of history is central to developing a humanistic approach to contemporary social problems, and in preparing humanity for the future.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Broad General Historical/Historiographical Knowledge

Masters students will demonstrate an understanding of the history of the United States and the World. All students must take 600-level historiography courses in two of three broad geographic areas. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding. All Masters students must take a final oral comprehensive examination.

Connected Document
History MA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
Reflective Statement: For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured knowledge of historical facts through papers and the final comprehensive oral examination. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target. Still we feel that we would benefit from further student feedback regarding their acquisition of broad historical knowledge. Proposed Changes for 2012-2013 (Also on action plan page): For the 2012-2013 academic year, we will develop an indirect measure -- most likely a self-assessment survey -- that gauges students' assessment of their acquisition of broad historical knowledge.

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational program, to include student learning outcomes
Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama

1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
2.7 Expand the University's emphasis on global and cultural studies.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.
3.5 Continue progress in achieving diversity among faculty, staff, students and administration.

Related Measures

M 3: Seminar Paper
All MA students must take one research seminar and produce a 25- to 40-page paper based on original primary research. This paper must advance an argument, illustrate analysis of evidence, be situated in the relative historiography, and be well written. Research papers will be evaluated according to the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
50% of all student will receive a grade of "B" or better on this assignment.

M 4: Book Critiques
Students write 3-5-page papers on individual works of history in which they analyze and critique the historian's thesis, organization, conceptualization, conclusions, and use of evidence.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric

Target:
90% of all students will receive a grade of "B" or better on relevant written assignments.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students achieved an "B" or better on book critiques in the classes assessed. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS Book critiques are a valuable tool for the History Instructor in assessing student learning. By learning how to distill a book's argument, the student eventually comes to appreciate the ways in which historians talk to each other (historiography). We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

M 15: Oral Comprehensive Exam
All MA students must pass an oral comprehensive examination.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of all students will pass the Oral Comprehensive Examination.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of all MA students passed their Oral Comprehensive Examinations. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS The final oral exam remains a valuable tool for assessing students' broad historical knowledge acquired through previous coursework.

M 16: Class Discussions
Students will lead and participate in class discussions each week.

Source of Evidence: Discussions / Coffee Talk

Target:
By the conclusion of the semester, the majority of students will have performed satisfactorily.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The ability to lead class discussion on the day's readings is an important skill. Successful discussion leaders will understand how the particular readings discussed contribute to the historiography of the general field. They also will be able to craft questions that engage students in discussions of the book's argument, as well as the historian's assumptions and evidence. The majority of MA students in our readings courses demonstrated basic competence in this skill.

M 17: Survey of Students
Students will complete a self-assessment survey at the conclusion of the term. Students were asked a variety of questions on their knowledge of historiography and their ability to analyze and critique works of history. Student responses could range from 1 = not competent to 5 = extremely competent.

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

Target:
The majority of students will find that their knowledge of the relevant historiography was "improved" as a result of taking this course.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Average response for students assessing their knowledge of historiography was 3 = competent.

SLO 2: Analysis and Critique
We expect our students to be able to analyze and critique the interpretations and arguments of historians. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding.

Connected Document
History MA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:

REFLECTIVE STATEMENT: For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured students' ability to analyze and critique the arguments of historians through a range of direct and indirect measures. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target. No planned changes for 2012-2013.

Standard Associations

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.

Related Measures

M 1: Research Paper
Every MA student must produce a 20-30-page research paper based on original research.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Connected Document: Graduate History Rubric

Target:
90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on research paper, which must include analysis and critique of the historical literature.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
90% of students received a grade of "B" or better on research paper. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The task of researching and writing an original piece of scholarship remains a valuable tool by which students learn to critique the work of other scholars. Data indicates, however, that MA students require a more complete and intensive introduction to research methods.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Research Methods Course
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The Graduate Affairs Committee and the Department as whole will investigate the possibility of requiring an methods/historiograph...

M 3: Seminar Paper
All MA students must take one research seminar and produce a 25- to 40-paper based on original primary research. This paper must advance an argument, illustrate analysis of evidence, be situated in the relative historiography, and be well written. Research papers will be evaluated according to the Graduate History Rubric.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on this assignment.

M 4: Book Critiques
Students write 3-5-page papers on individual works of history in which they analyze and critique the historian's thesis, organization, conceptualization, conclusions, and use of evidence.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Connected Document: Graduate History Rubric

Target:
90% of all students will receive a grade of "B" or better on relevant assignments.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students achieved a "B" or better on book critiques in the classes assessed. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS Book critiques are a valuable tool for the History instructor in assessing student learning. By learning how to distill a book's argument, the student eventually comes to appreciate the ways in which historians talk to each other (historiography). We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

M 15: Oral Comprehensive Exam
All MA students must pass an oral comprehensive examination.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of all MA students passed their Oral Comprehensive Examinations, which includes an examination on coursework and the presentation of a revised research paper. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS The final oral exam remains a valuable tool for assessing students' ability to analyze and critique historical scholarship. Examination committee members do this both by questioning students on coursework and also by assessing their ability to critique scholarship in their research paper.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of all MA students passed their Oral Comprehensive Examinations. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS The final oral exam remains a valuable tool for assessing students' broad historical knowledge acquired through previous coursework.

M 16: Class Discussions
Students will lead and participate in class discussions each week.
Source of Evidence: Discussions / Coffee Talk

Target:
By the conclusion of the semester, the majority of students will have performed this skill satisfactorily.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The ability to lead class discussion on the day's readings is an important skill. Successful discussion leaders will understand how the particular readings discussed contribute to the historiography of the general field. They also will be able to craft questions that engage students in discussions of the book's argument, as well as the historian's assumptions and evidence. The majority of MA students in our readings courses demonstrated basic competence in this skill.
M 17: Survey of Students

Students will complete a self-assessment survey at the conclusion of the term. Students were asked a variety of questions on their knowledge of historiography and their ability to analyze and critique works of history. Student responses could range from 1=not competent to 5=extremely competent.

Source of Evidence: Student satisfaction survey at end of the program

Target:
The majority of students will find that their ability to analyze and critique a work of history was "improved" as a result of taking this course.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Average response for students assessing their knowledge of historiography was 4 = very competent.

SLO 3: Historical Research

Students will demonstrate an ability to craft a historical question, identify the primary and secondary sources necessary to answer it, and develop an original interpretation, using primary sources as evidence. All Masters students must complete one research seminar, whose end product is an article-length paper. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding.

Connected Document
History MA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:

REFLECTIVE STATEMENT: For the 2011-2012 academic year, we used both direct and indirect measures to assess students' ability to craft a historical question, identify the primary and secondary sources necessary to answer it, and develop an original interpretation, using primary sources as evidence. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target. No planned changes for 2012-2013.

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.

Related Measures

M 1: Research Paper

Every MA student must produce a 20-30-page research paper based on original research.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric

Target:
90% of all students must receive a grade of "B" or better on research papers.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
90% of students received a grade of "B" or better on research paper. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The task of researching and writing an original piece of scholarship remains a valuable tool by which students learn to critique the work of other scholars. Data indicates, however, that MA students require a more complete and intensive introduction to research methods. See Action Plan.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Research Methods Course
Established In Cycle: 2012-2013
The Graduate Affairs Committee and the Department as whole will investigate the possibility of requiring an methods/historiography...

M 3: Seminar Paper

All MA students must take one research seminar and produce a 25- to 40-page paper based on original primary research. This paper must advance an argument, illustrate analysis of evidence, be situated in the relative historiography, and be well written. Research papers will be evaluated according to the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on this assignment.

M 15: Oral Comprehensive Exam

All MA students must pass an oral comprehensive examination.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of all students will pass their Oral Comprehensive Examination.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of all MA students passed their Oral Comprehensive Examinations. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS The final oral exam remains a valuable tool for assessing students' broad historical knowledge acquired through previous coursework.

SLO 4: Clear Expression of Ideas in Writing

Students will express their ideas clearly in writing. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding.

Connected Document
History MA Curriculum Maps
Relevant Associations:

REFLECTIVE STATEMENT: For the 2011-2012 academic year, we used both direct and indirect measures to assess students’ ability to express their ideas clearly in writing. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target. No planned changes for 2012-2013.

Standard Associations

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.

Related Measures

M 1: Research Paper
Every MA student must produce a 20-30-page research paper based on original research.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric

Target:
90% of all students must receive a grade of "B" or better on their research papers.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
90% of students received a grade of "B" or better on research paper. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The task of researching and writing an original piece of scholarship remains a valuable tool by which students learn to critique the work of other scholars. Data indicates, however, that MA students require a more complete and intensive introduction to research methods. See Action Plan

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Research Methods Course
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The Graduate Affairs Committee and the Department as a whole will investigate the possibility of requiring an methods/historiograph...

M 3: Seminar Paper
All MA students must take one research seminar and produce a 25- to 40-page paper based on original primary research. This paper must advance an argument, illustrate analysis of evidence, be situated in the relative historiography, and be well written. Research papers will be evaluated according to the Graduate History Rubric.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on this assignment.

M 4: Book Critiques
Students write 3-5-page papers on individual works of history in which they analyze and critique the historian’s thesis, organization, conceptualization, conclusions, and use of evidence.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric

Target:
90% of all students will receive a "B" or better on relevant assignments.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
90% of students achieved a "B" or better on book critiques in the classes assessed. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS Book critiques are a valuable tool for the History instructor in assessing student learning. By learning how to distill a book’s argument, the student eventually comes to appreciate the ways in which historians talk to each other (historiography). We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

M 15: Oral Comprehensive Exam
All MA students must pass an oral comprehensive examination.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of all MA students will pass the Oral Comprehensive Examination.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of all MA students passed their Oral Comprehensive Examinations. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS The final oral exam remains a valuable tool for assessing students’ broad historical knowledge acquired through previous coursework.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOutc 5: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

M 6: Number of Tenure-track Faculty
Assess the number of tenure-track faculty, range of course offerings in light of student enrollment.
M 7: Assess for Range of Content and Methodologies
Assess the range of content and methodologies taught in graduate courses.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures

M 8: Credit Hour Production
Graduate semester credit-hour production
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 9: Number of Courses Offered
Number of graduate courses offered.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 10: Number of MA Students Enrolled
Number of MA students enrolled in program
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 11: Degrees Awarded
Number of MA degrees conferred in History
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

OthOtcm 7: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Graduates and Constituencies
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 12: Further Graduate and Professional Experiences
Ability of our MA students to enter prestigious PhD and professional programs.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 13: Employment
Ability of MA students to obtain employment in their field.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 14: Faculty Discussions with Students
Informal but frequent faculty discussions with students.
Source of Evidence: Discussions / Coffee Talk

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Student self-assessment
For the 2012-2013 academic year, we will develop an indirect measure — most likely a self-assessment survey — that gauges students' assessment of their acquisition of broad historical knowledge. This assessment relates to Outcome 1 for MA and PhD Programs.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: This survey/self-assessment will be implemented in our reading colloquia.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Karl Frederickson

Research Methods Course
The Graduate Affairs Committee and the Department as a whole will investigate the possibility of requiring an methods/historiography course for all incoming students. Such a course would make students better prepared for their required research seminar.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Clear Expression of Ideas in Writing
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Affairs Committee

Research Methods Course
The Graduate Affairs Committee and the Department as a whole will investigate the possibility of requiring an methods/historiography course for all incoming students. Such a course would make students better prepared for their required research seminar.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Paper | Outcome/Objective: Historical Research
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Mission / Purpose

The Department of History is central to the research, instructional, and outreach missions of The University of Alabama. It is one of the core departments providing the liberal arts foundation necessary to the education of all University of Alabama students. History's particular scholarly mission is to preserve, advance, and communicate knowledge of humanity's past. This mission is carried out through a variety of means, including a combination of research and writing, teaching, and service. The discovery and sharing of knowledge about the human past is at the heart of our enterprise. The Department of History is committed to being a recognized leader in the advancement of scholarship and embraces its role of preparing and developing future generations of scholars. The department is also committed to being a leader in the cultivation of historical thinking, both inside the university and through outreach to the broader community. A knowledge of history is central to developing a humanistic approach to contemporary social problems, and in preparing humanity for the future.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Broad Historical/Historiographical Knowledge

Doctoral students will acquire and demonstrate an understanding of the history of the United States and the world. Students must take 600-level historiography courses in two of three broad geographic areas. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding. All doctoral students must pass written and oral comprehensive examinations in three of four historical fields.

Connected Document

History PhD Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:

REFLECTIVE STATEMENT: Outcome 1 was achieved. For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured knowledge of historical facts through papers and the comprehensive examination. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target. Still we feel that we would benefit from further student feedback regarding their acquisition of broad historical knowledge. Proposed Changes for 2012-2013 (Also on action plan page): For the 2012-2013 academic year, we will develop an indirect measure — most likely a self-assessment survey — that gauges students’ assessment of their acquisition of broad historical knowledge. Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Continue to encourage doctoral students to take advantage of GTA opportunities and to create study groups of comprehensive examinations. Update on 2010-2011 action item: We surveyed doctoral students and found that the majority organized study groups for comprehensive exams and found them useful. 100% of all doctoral students passed their comprehensive examinations.

Standard Associations

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
4.3 Produce scholars who will become academic and civic leaders in their disciplines.

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exams
Percentage of students passing comprehensive written and oral examinations
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target: 90% of all PhD students will pass their comprehensive exams, which require students to demonstrate broad historical knowledge and knowledge of historiography.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of all students passed their comprehensive examinations. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: 100% of students demonstrated broad knowledge of history and of relevant historiography. We will continue to use this tool as a way to measure student learning.

M 2: Survey of Students
Survey doctoral students studying for comprehensive examinations who organized study groups regarding their
Detailed Assessment Report
2012-2013 History Ph.D.
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of History is central to the research, instructional, and outreach missions of The University of Alabama. It is one of the core departments providing the liberal arts foundation necessary to the education of all University of Alabama students. History's particular scholarly mission is to preserve, advance, and communicate knowledge of humanity's past. This mission is carried out through a variety of means, including a combination of research and writing, teaching, and service. The discovery and sharing of knowledge about the human past is at the heart of our enterprise.

The Department of History is committed to being a recognized leader in the advancement of scholarship and embraces its role of preparing and developing future generations of scholars. The department is also committed to being a leader in the cultivation of historical thinking, both inside the university and through outreach to the broader community. A knowledge of history is central to developing a humanistic approach to contemporary social problems, and in preparing humanity for the future.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Broad Historical/Historiographical Knowledge
Doctoral students will acquire and demonstrate an understanding of the history of the United States and the World. Students must take 600-level historiography courses in two of three broad geographic areas. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding. All doctoral students must pass written and oral comprehensive examinations in three of four historical fields.

Connected Document
History PhD Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:

Reflective Statement: Outcome #1 was achieved. For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured knowledge of historical facts through paper and the comprehensive examination. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target. Still, we feel that we would benefit from further student feedback regarding their acquisition of broad historical knowledge. Proposed changes for 2012-2013 (Also on action plan page): For the 2012-2013 academic year, we will develop an indirect measure - most likely a self-assessment survey - that gauges students' assessment of their acquisition of broad historical knowledge. Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Continue to encourage doctoral students to take advantage of GTA opportunities and to create study groups of comprehensive examinations. Update on 2010-2011 action item: We surveyed doctoral students and found that the majority organized study groups for comprehensive exams and found them useful. 100% of all doctoral students passed their comprehensive examinations.

Standard Associations:

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations:

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
4.3 Produce scholars who will become academic and civic leaders in their disciplines.

Related Measures:

M 1: Comprehensive Exams
Percentage of students passing comprehensive written and oral examinations
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of all PhD students will pass their comprehensive exams, which require students to demonstrate broad historical knowledge and knowledge of historiography.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target Met
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of all students passed their comprehensive examinations. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: 100% of students demonstrated broad knowledge of history and of relevant historiography.
We will continue to use this tool as a way to measure student learning.

M 2: Survey of Students
Survey doctoral students studying for comprehensive examinations who organized study groups regarding their
effectiveness. Students also asked how often they met with their dissertation director, and whether those meetings were helpful in preparing them for their comprehensive exams.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
- Majority of doctoral students taking comprehensive exams in a given year should find study groups helpful in mastering historical concepts and historiography. Majority of doctoral students met with their dissertation directors at least twice prior to comprehensive exams. Majority of doctoral students found these meetings helpful.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
A majority of students participated in comprehensive examination study groups and met twice with their directors. 100% of all students passed their comprehensive exams.

**M 4: Historiographical Paper**
Students in graduate proseminar wrote a final historiographical paper on a scholarly subject of their choosing. Papers were evaluated according to the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
Graduate History Rubric PhD

**Target:**
- 60% of students will receive a "B" or better on this writing assignment.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in historiographically focused readings courses achieved a "B" or better on their final historiographical paper in the graduate proseminar. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: Mastering the historiography of a particular subject and being able to express in essay form the salient points of that historiography is a critical skill for historians. The historiographical essay remains a valuable tool for the History instructor in assessing student learning. These essays were evaluated using the Graduate History Rubric. By learning how to distill a book's argument, and by putting that book in conversation with other books, the student eventually comes to understand historiography. We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

**M 5: Seminar Paper**
Every doctoral student, during the course of their program, must produce two 25- to 40-page papers that are based on original primary research. Each paper must advance an argument and support that argument with evidence and proper analysis. The paper must be situated in the proper historiographical literature and be well written. Papers are evaluated using the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
Graduate History Rubric PhD

**Target:**
- 90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on this assignment.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students received a grade of "B" or better on their seminar paper. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: Researching and writing a seminar paper remains a useful exercise for measuring students' knowledge of the relevant historiography. We met our target. We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

**M 7: Dissertation Proposal Defense**
Percentage of Students passing dissertation proposal defense.

Source of Evidence: Academic Indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
- 90% of students passed their dissertation proposal defense.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students passed their dissertation proposal defense. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The dissertation proposal defense remains a useful tool for assessing student mastery of the relevant historiography. We will continue to use this tool.

**M 8: Dissertation Defense**
Percentage of Students passing dissertation defense.

Source of Evidence: Academic Indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
- 90% of students will pass their dissertation defense.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of students passed their dissertation defense, which requires that they demonstrate a mastery of the relevant history and historiography of their chosen topic. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION: The dissertation defense remains an important and useful tool for assessing students' knowledge of history and historiography. We will continue to employ it.

**M 9: Book Reviews**
Students write a minimum of six 3-5-page papers on individual works of history in which they analyze and critique the historian's thesis, organization, conceptualization, conclusions, and use of evidence. Papers are graded according to the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**
Graduate History Rubric PhD

**Target:**
- 90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on relevant assignments.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students achieved a "B" or better on book critiques in the classes assessed. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: Book critiques are a valuable tool for the History instructor in assessing student learning. Critiques were evaluated by using the Graduate History Rubric. By learning how to distill a book's argument, the student eventually comes to appreciate the ways in which historians talk to each other (historiography). We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

M 27: Class Discussions
Students will participate in or lead class discussions each week.

Source of Evidence: Discussions / Coffee Talk

Target:
By the conclusion of the semester, 90% of students will have performed satisfactorily.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The ability to lead class discussion on the day's readings is an important skill. Successful discussion leaders will understand how the particular readings discussed contribute to the historiography of the general field. They also will be able to craft questions that engage students in discussions of the book's argument, as well as the historian's assumptions and evidence. 100% of PhD students in our readings courses demonstrated basic competence in this skill.

SLO 2: Analysis and Critique
We expect our students to be able to analyze and critique the interpretations and arguments of historians. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding.

Connected Document
History PhD Curriculum Map

Relevant Associations:
REFLECTIVE STATEMENT: Outcome 2 was achieved. For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured students' ability to analyze and critique scholarly works through indirect and direct measures. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target.

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
4.3 Produce scholars who will become academic and civic leaders in their disciplines.

Related Measures
M 1: Comprehensive Exams
Percentage of students passing comprehensive written and oral examinations

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90% of all students will pass their comprehensive exams, which require students to demonstrate proficiency in analyzing and critiquing historical arguments and interpretations.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of all students passed their comprehensive examinations. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: 100% of students demonstrated broad knowledge of history and of relevant historiography. We will continue to use this tool as a way to measure student learning.

M 4: Historiographical Paper
Students in graduate proseninar wrote a final historiographical paper on a scholarly subject of their choosing. Papers were evaluated according to the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric PhD

Target:
90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on their historiographical essay.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students enrolled in readings courses achieved a "B" or better on their final historiographical paper in the graduate proseninar. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The historiographical essay is a valuable tool for the History instructor in assessing student's ability to analyze and critique. By learning how to identify a historian's argument, and by evaluating the assumptions of the argument and whether that argument is supported by the evidence, the student improves his/her analytical skills. The historiographical essay requires students analyze a body of work and to put the books in conversation with each other. We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

M 5: Seminar Paper
Every doctoral student, during the course of their program, must produce two 25- to 40-page papers that are based on original primary research. Each paper must advance an argument and support that argument with evidence and proper analysis. The paper must be situated in the proper historiographical literature and be well written. Papers are evaluated using the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric PhD

Target:
90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on this assignment.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students received a grade of "B" or better on their seminar paper. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: Researching and writing a seminar paper remains a useful exercise for measuring students' ability to analyze their evidence. We met our target. We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

**M 8: Dissertation Defense**
Percentage of Students passing dissertation defense.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
90% of students passed their dissertation defense, which requires that they demonstrate an ability to analyze primary sources and to reach conclusions.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of students passed their dissertation defense, which requires that they demonstrate an ability to analyze primary sources and to reach conclusions. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION: The dissertation defense remains an important and useful tool for assessing students' ability to analyze primary research and to advance reasonable conclusions. We will continue to employ it.

**M 9: Book Reviews**
Students write a minimum of six 3-5-page papers on individual works of history in which they analyze and critique the historian's thesis, organization, conceptualization, conclusions, and use of evidence. Papers are graded according to the Graduate History Rubric.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**
Graduate History Rubric PhD

**Target:**
90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on relevant assignments.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of students achieved a "B" or better on book critiques in the classes assessed. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: Book critiques are a valuable tool for the History Instructor in assessing student learning. By learning how to identify a historian’s argument, and by evaluating the assumptions of the argument and whether that argument is supported by the evidence, the student improves his/her analytical skills. We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

**M 13: Thesis Statement Activity**
This is an indirect measure. Students are given five minutes to correctly identify/describe the central argument of the day's reading. An ungraded activity, this gives the instructor immediate feedback as to the students' general level of comprehension.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
By the conclusion of the semester, the majority of students should be able to correctly identify the central argument of the book under discussion.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
This exercise was employed in a graduate seminar during the 1st, 8th, and final weeks of the semester. Week 1: 75% of doctoral students correctly identified the central argument of the day's readings. Week 6: 90% of doctoral students correctly identified the central argument of the day's readings. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The course of the semester, students became progressively proficient at distilling a book's central argument. Following the first week, the instructor developed a handout on "How to Read a Scholarly Book" and devoted time in class to developing this skill. By the conclusion of the class, all doctoral students had mastered this essential skill.

**M 27: Class Discussions**
Students will participate in or lead class discussions each week.

**Source of Evidence:** Discussions / Coffee Talk

**Target:**
By the conclusion of the semester, 90% of students will have performed satisfactorily.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The ability to lead class discussion on the day's readings is an important skill. Successful discussion leaders will understand how the particular readings discussed contribute to the history of the general field. They also will be able to craft questions that engage students in discussions of the book's argument, as well as the historian's assumptions and evidence. 100% of PhD students in our readings courses demonstrated basic competence in this skill.

**SLO 3: Historical Research**
Students will demonstrate an ability to craft a historical question, identify the primary and secondary sources necessary to answer it, and develop an original interpretation, using primary sources as evidence. Doctoral students must complete two research seminars in which the final product in each is an article-length paper based on primary research and original analysis. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding. Doctoral students must also pass a dissertation proposal and ultimately a dissertation defense.

**Connected Document**
History PhD Curriculum Maps

**Relevant Associations:**
REFLECTIVE STATEMENT: Outcome 3 was achieved. For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured students' ability to conduct primary research through indirect and direct measures. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target.
Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
4.3 Produce scholars who will become academic and civic leaders in their disciplines.

Related Measures

M 5: Seminar Paper
Every doctoral student, during the course of their program, must produce two 25- to 40-page papers that are based on original primary research. Each paper must advance an argument and support that argument with evidence and proper analysis. The paper must be situated in the proper historiographical literature and be well written. Papers are evaluated using the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric PhD

Target: 90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on this assignment.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students received a grade of "B" or better on their seminar paper.

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS
The process of crafting a seminar paper remains a useful tool for measuring students' ability to develop primary research. All successful seminar papers will base their arguments and claims on original research. We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

M 6: Crafting a Working Hypothesis
In-class exercise. Indirect measure. Students work in class on crafting a working hypothesis from their primary research.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: No Target Established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Students were given ten minutes to articulate their paper's main argument and to sketch out the evidence to support their argument. As was the case last year, the majority of students focused on their paper's purpose with its argument. This in-class exercise clarified the difference and aided them in constructing the bulk of their papers. By the conclusion of class, all students had suitable working hypotheses.

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: Creating a plausible and defensible argument backed up by solid primary research is essential to crafting a successful research paper. By assisting each other in distilling their central claims, students came away with a better understanding of the craft of history. This exercise is essential in focusing student research.

M 7: Dissertation Proposal Defense
Percentage of Students passing dissertation proposal defense.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target: 90% of all students will pass their dissertation proposal defense.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students passed their dissertation proposal defense.

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The dissertation proposal defense remains a useful tool for assessing student competency at historical research. We will continue to use this tool.

M 8: Dissertation Defense
Percentage of Students passing dissertation defense.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target: 90% of students will pass their dissertation defense.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students passed their dissertation defense, which requires that they demonstrate an ability to craft a historical question, identify the primary and secondary sources necessary to answer it, and develop an original interpretation, using primary sources as evidence. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION: The dissertation defense remains an important and useful tool for assessing students' ability to conduct historical research. We will continue to employ it.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students passed their dissertation defense, which requires that they demonstrate an ability to craft a historical question, identify the primary and secondary sources necessary to answer it, and develop an original interpretation, using primary sources as evidence. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION: The dissertation defense remains an important and useful tool for assessing students' ability to conduct historical research. We will continue to employ it.

SLO 4: Clear Expression of Ideas in Writing
Students will express their ideas clearly in writing. Grades on relevant assignments measure their understanding.

Connected Document
History PhD Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
REFLECTIVE STATEMENT: Outcome 4 was achieved. For the 2011-2012 academic year, we measured students'
ability to clearly express their ideas in writing through indirect and direct measures. Our range of measures is adequate and we met our target.

**Standard Associations**

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

**Strategic Plan Associations**

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
4.3 Produce scholars who will become academic and civic leaders in their disciplines.

**Related Measures**

M 4: Historiographical Paper
Students in graduate proseminar wrote a final historiographical paper on a scholarly subject of their choosing. Papers were evaluated according to the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric PhD

Target:
80% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on their final historiographical essay in the graduate proseminar.

*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met*
100% of students achieved a "B" or better on their final historiographical essay. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The historiographical essay is a valuable tool for the History instructor in assessing student learning. To be successful, these essays need to be well written. The essays were evaluated using the graduate essay rubric.

M 5: Seminar Paper
Every doctoral student, during the course of their program, must produce two 25- to 40-page papers that are based on original primary research. Each paper must advance an argument and support that argument with evidence and proper analysis. The paper must be situated in the proper historiographical literature and be well written. Papers are evaluated using the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric PhD

Target:
80% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on this assignment.

*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met*
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of students received a grade of "B" or better on their seminar paper. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The process of crafting a seminar paper remains a useful exercise for measuring students' ability to write well. A competent "B" paper will have a logical narrative flow and no grammatical errors. We met our target. We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

M 7: Dissertation Proposal Defense
Percentage of Students passing dissertation proposal defense.

Source of Evidence: Academic Indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
90% of students will pass their dissertation proposal defense.

*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met*
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of students passed their proposal defense. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The dissertation proposal defense remains a useful tool for assessing students' ability to express their ideas clearly in writing. We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

M 8: Dissertation Defense
Percentage of Students passing dissertation defense.

Source of Evidence: Academic Indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
90% of all students will pass their dissertation defense.

*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met*
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of students passed their dissertation defense, which requires that they be able to express their ideas clearly in writing. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The dissertation defense remains an important tool for assessing the quality of student writing. We will continue to use it.

M 9: Book Reviews
Students write a minimum of six 3-5-page papers on individual works of history in which they analyze and critique the historian's thesis, organization, conceptualization, conclusions, and use of evidence. Papers are graded according to the Graduate History Rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
Graduate History Rubric PhD

Target:
90% of students will receive a grade of "B" or better on relevant assignments.

*Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met*
RESULTS SUMMARY: 100% of students achieved a "B" or better on book critiques in the classes assessed. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: Book critiques are a valuable tool for the History instructor in
assessing student learning. To be successful, book critiques need to be well written. The students in the proseminar assessed wrote six critiques over the course of the semester, each evaluated using the attached rubric. Persuasive, clear writing comes only with practice. We will continue to use this tool to measure student learning.

SLO 5: Demonstrate Expertise in Field of Study
Doctoral students will demonstrate expertise in their chosen fields of study. All Doctoral students must master the relevant literature related to their dissertation topic, and present an acceptable dissertation prospectus outlining their research question and primary sources as part of the comprehensive examination process. All students must write and defend a dissertation.

Connected Document
History PhD Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
REFLECTIVE STATEMENT: Outcome 5 was achieved. 100% of all students successfully defended their dissertations, which requires them to demonstrate expertise in their chosen fields of study. We desire more student feedback on this outcome. Proposed change for 2012-2013: all students who plan to defend their dissertations will be surveyed as to what they feel is their level of expertise in their chosen field of study.

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Strategic Plan Associations
University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
4.3 Produce scholars who will become academic and civic leaders in their disciplines.

Related Measures
M 8: Dissertation Defense
Percentage of Students passing dissertation defense.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
90% of all students will pass their dissertation defense.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of all students passed their dissertation defense, which requires that students demonstrate expertise in their chosen field of study. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS: The dissertation defense remains a useful tool in assessing students' expertise in their chosen field of study. We will continue to use it.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcn 6: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures
M 16: Number of Tenure-track Faculty
Assess the number of tenure-track faculty, range of course offerings in light of student enrollment.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 17: Assess for Range of Content and Methodologies
Assess the range of content and methodologies taught in graduate courses.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

OthOtcn 7: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures
M 18: Credit Hour Production
Graduate semester credit-hour production
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 19: Number of Courses Offered
Number of graduate courses offered.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 20: Number of PhD Students
Number of Ph.D. students enrolled in program
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 21: Number of Degrees Awarded
Number of Ph.D. degrees conferred in History
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

OthOtcn 8: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Graduates and Constituencies
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures
M 22: Conference Presentations and Publications
Number of conference presentations and article publications of original research by doctoral students and program graduates.
Source of Evidence: Activity volume

M 23: Fellowship Recipients
Number of doctoral students receiving Graduate Council Research and Creative Activity Fellowships from Graduate School.
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

M 24: Suitable Employment
Placement of doctoral graduates in suitable employment.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 25: Monographs Published
Number of monographs published by History doctoral program graduates.
Source of Evidence: Activity volume

M 26: Faculty Discussions with Students
Informal but frequent faculty discussions with students.
Source of Evidence: Discussions / Coffee Talk

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Student Self Assessment
For the 2012-2013 academic year, we will develop an indirect measure -- most likely a self-assessment survey -- that gauges students' assessment of their acquisition of broad historical knowledge.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: This survey will be implemented in the graduate proseminar in fall and spring.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Karl Frederickson

Student Survey regarding Expertise
This will be an indirect measure that will give us feedback regarding how confident students feel in their knowledge level.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: All students defending their dissertations will be asked to assess their level of expertise in their chosen field of study.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Karl Frederickson

Detailed Assessment Report
2012-2013 History, Department of
(As of 1/22/2013 05:01 PM Central)
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request)

Mission / Purpose
The Department of History is central to the research, instructional, and outreach missions of The University of Alabama. It is one of the core departments providing a liberal arts foundation necessary to the education of all University of Alabama students. History's particular scholarly mission is to preserve, advance, and communicate knowledge of humanity's past. This mission is carried out through a variety of means, including a combination of research and writing, teaching, and service. The discovery and sharing of knowledge about the human past is at the heart of our enterprise. The Department of History is committed to being a recognized leader in the advancement of scholarship and embraces its role of preparing and developing future generations of scholars. The department is also committed to being a leader in the cultivation of historical thinking, both inside the university and through outreach to the broader community. A knowledge of history is central to developing a humanistic approach to contemporary social problems, and in preparing humanity for the future.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

Other Outcome 1: Department Outcome: Fostering Undergraduate Research
The department will foster undergraduate research opportunities.

Relevant Associations:

Reflective Statement: Outcome #1 is being achieved. By offering research classes, including research projects in many upper-level courses, promoting participation in the College's Undergraduate Research Conference, directing independent research, and supervising undergraduate honors theses, the department offers a wide range of ways in which undergraduates can get involved in historical research. Department Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced: We will continue to monitor data to determine whether future improvements are necessary.

Standard Associations

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
3.3.1.4 Research within its educational mission
General Education/Core Curriculum Associations

5 History - SLO is related to historical development and change over major periods of time and/or provides a survey of social, cultural, economic and political developments that have molded the modern world
10 Social and Behavioral Sciences - SLO is related to human behavior, social structures or economics
11 Writing - SLO is related to building on students' competency in academic writing skills and aims to extend those skills

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
3.3 Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.
3.4 Increase involvement of undergraduate students in research and scholarly activities.
4.3 Produce scholars who will become academic and civic leaders in their disciplines.
4.4 Produce graduates who will serve as effective leaders in Alabama's government, businesses, educational systems, health care, the arts, and other professions, and who will be leaders in their communities.

Related Measures

M 1: Survey Curriculum and Syllabi
Survey curriculum and syllabi to determine the extent of undergraduate research activity
Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

Target: No Target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
165 Undergraduates were engaged in primary historical research during the fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters. This was accomplished through the undergraduate history seminars (a requirement for the major), through Honors thesis research, and through independent research projects supervised by faculty.

M 2: Student Survey
Survey students to determine their perceptions of the value of primary research as a form of self-directed study.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target: No Target

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Student surveys were administered in our capstone research course during the fall and spring semesters. Results: Before they took the course all students claimed to be able to differentiate between primary and secondary sources, but only half felt comfortable working with them. By the end of the course all students responded that their comfort level with primary sources was in the 4-5 range. Students felt least comfortable about their argumentative skills before taking the course; all reported that by the end of the course that they agreed (again 4-5 range) that they had learned how to construct an argument. All but two students felt somewhat or not very comfortable about preparing a research paper before taking the course. All 27 out of 30 students stated that they felt very comfortable (4-5 range) constructing a research paper by the end of the course. We also asked students if they felt this course should be required of history majors. 29 out of 30 replied in the affirmative; 3 said they felt it should come earlier in the curriculum so students could apply lessons learned in this course in their other history classes. Survey is available in Documents section.

Other Outcome: Faculty Productivity
The department will maintain high faculty scholarly productivity and professional activity.

Relevant Associations:

Reflective Statement: Outcome #2 is being met. All faculty members are productive scholars. We do not plan any changes for 2012-2013. Department Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced: Continue to encourage high productivity and to promote opportunities for publication.

Standard Associations
SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.4 Research within its educational mission

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.1 Promote and enhance areas of academic, scholarship, and research excellence.
4.3 Produce scholars who will become academic and civic leaders in their disciplines.

Related Measures

M 3: Survey Faculty Activity Reports Regarding Publications
Survey Faculty Activity Reports to determine volume and quality of faculty publications
Source of Evidence: Activity volume

Target: No Target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Our 29 faculty submitted, had accepted, or published 144 books, book chapters in peer-reviewed edited volumes, and articles in peer-reviewed scholarly journals.

M 4: Faculty Publications
Determine percentage of faculty that publishes at least one article, essay, chapter, or review
Source of Evidence: Activity volume

Target: No Target.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
93% of faculty published, had accepted, or submitted a book, article, essay or review in mid- or top-tier peer-reviewed scholarly publications/presses.

OthOtm3: Department Outcome: Discipline-Related Community Involvement
The department will encourage community involvement related to the discipline.

Relevant Associations:

Reflective Statement: Outcome #3 is being met. Faculty are engaged in a wide range of activities. No changes planned for 2012-2013. Department Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced: Continue to encourage and promote faculty community outreach and engagement.

Standard Associations

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.5 Community/public service within its educational mission

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
1.2 Increase the recognition of the University's service priorities that enhance the quality of life for all Alabamians.
2.6 Enhance relationships among community and University of Alabama leaders to promote excellent quality of life for faculty, staff, and students.
4.2 Promote collaboration with business, non-profit, and governmental agencies to advance the economic, social, and cultural condition of Alabama.
4.8 Develop and reward leadership skills among students, faculty, and staff.

4.6 Promote leadership development among Alabama’s community leaders, businesses, educational systems, healthcare systems, government agencies, arts organizations, and other vital areas of the state.

Related Measures

M 5: Survey Faculty Activity Reports Regarding Community Engagement
Survey Faculty Activity Reports to determine percent participating in community engagement.
Source of Evidence: Activity volume
Target:
No Target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
28% are involved in community engagement/outreach activities.

M 6: Survey Faculty Activity Reports Regarding Activities
Survey Faculty Activity Reports to ascertain types of activities engaged in.
Source of Evidence: Activity volume
Target:
No Target.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Faculty collectively are engaged in more than 10 different types of activities. Activities include service on community organizations, such as Rotary; public radio/television boards; service on state commissions; cultural training for employees at local businesses; outreach to local churches, schools, and museums.

OthOtm4: Department Outcome: Timely Advising for Undergraduate Majors
Provide timely advising for undergraduate history majors.

Relevant Associations:

Department Outcome #6 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced: Continue to investigate additional means of communicating with students to insure that all majors receive adequate advising.

Standard Associations

SACS 3.3.1
3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
3.3.1.3 Educational support services

Strategic Plan Associations

University of Alabama
3.3. Encourage and reward creative strategies for engaging students in learning and life-long learning.
3.4 Increase involvement of undergraduate students in research and scholarly activities.

Related Measures

M 7: Percent of Faculty Advisors
Survey faculty to determine percentage of faculty who advise undergraduate students.
Source of Evidence: Activity volume
Target:
No Target

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of faculty (excluding those on leave and the Director of Graduate Studies) advised undergraduate students during the fall and spring advising periods.

M 8: Percentage of Advisees Seen by Faculty
Survey faculty to determine average number seen by each faculty member.
Source of Evidence: Activity volume
Target:
No Target.
**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
86% of all undergraduate History majors were advised during official advising period.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Communication with Majors**
Investigate the possibility of developing a History major listserv to more effectively communicate with them.

**Established In Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Investigate the possibility of developing a History major listserv to more effectively communicate with them.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** Karl Frederickson
Critique of Assessment Activities in the History Department

Bob Smallwood, Ph.D.
Assistant to the Provost for Assessment
November 15, 2013

Overview:

This critique is based on an examination of the 2012-13 Department Assessment Plans and the results of the assessment activities that were executed and reported in the 2012-13 History Annual Assessment Reports.

The focus of the critique is on identifying strengths of the assessment efforts in monitoring the achievement of student learning outcomes and my suggestions for potential improvements. It is also my intention to identify any areas where the departments’ assessment efforts may fall short of SACS institutional effectiveness expectations.

2012-13 History Department Assessment Plans

It is the University of Alabama’s policy and a SACS expectation that there be an assessment plan for all degree programs offered by the university. There are four degree programs offered in the Department of History at UA, including the following:

1. B.A. Degree
2. M.A. Degree
3. Ph.D. Degree

Critiques

BA Degree Program in History

Strengths:

1. Your student learning objectives are very broad and encompassing and suggest mastery of a comprehensive body of knowledge and skills
2. You are employing a broad array of indirect assessment measures in your approach to monitor achievement of the four learning objectives you have posed (quiz performance, graded assignments, surveys)

**Opportunities for Improvement:**

1. The four student learning outcomes posted in the WEAVE system are excellent learning objectives but could be significantly improved if they were expressed in outcome terms. For example, for outcome #2, what is it (or what outcome) will be observed that will lead you to infer or conclude that your majors are “able to evaluate and interpret primary sources.” Your efforts would be improved significantly if you would restate your learning objective in concise measurable terms.

2. Recording the percentage of students who earned a grade of C or better on assignments and exercises is a reasonably healthy indicator of achievement but the empirical soundness of your measurement approaches could be improved by introducing more direct indicators (such as rubrics) that provide diagnostic detail that will help you to more clearly identify where strengths and shortcoming in your students’ leanings exist.

3. The absence of results posted for the three degree program outcomes (quality-enrollment-value) puts this degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.

**MA Degree Program in History**

**Strengths:**

1. I think your four learning objectives represent graduate level proficiencies within your discipline. You have addressed discipline-specific content knowledge and appropriate skill sets.

2. Performance on research papers, seminar papers and book critiques represent appropriate graduate level measurement approaches.

**Opportunities for Improvements:**

1. I believe you recognize the distinction between grades in a course and grades on an assignment, and I think it is an acceptable metric to evaluate student learning utilizing a grade on a specific assignment as an indicator of performance achievement. However, in the spirit of striving for continuous improvement in the quality of the learning experiences provided, I do not think this metric provides diagnostic utility. I could be wrong here but it is not clear that the assignment grade indicates what was right or wrong. Complementing this assignment grade
with a more diagnostic rubric or scoring breakdown will help the student improve the quality of his/her future efforts and give you a better sense of what the students are learning and not learning.

2. You’ve indicated in one of your “Interpretations and Conclusions” that the “data indicate that MA students require a more complete and intensive introduction to research methods.” I think this is an excellent inference and conclusion but I do not see evidence that prompts this conclusion from the findings posted (i.e. percentage of students receiving a grade of B or better).

3. The absence of attention to the three common program outcomes puts this degree program out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.

PhD Degree Program in History

Strengths:

1. The quality of your learning objectives and measurement approaches and the associated expectations demonstrate appropriate graduate level program rigor.

2. In most UA departments there are more performance indicators at the undergraduate level than at the graduate level, but that does not appear to be the case in the History Department. I deduce from this emphasis that more attention and energy is directed toward monitoring graduate student achievement which I think is commendable. (I like to see the use of the “Graduate History rubric!”)

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. I would like to send you a copy of a book entitled “Making the Implicit Explicit” that is an excellent presentation on measuring the quality of a doctoral dissertation. Because of the apparent commitment to doctoral level excellence that exists in the History department, I think you may glean meaningful ideas on ways to improve the assessment of the doctoral dissertation in your discipline even beyond the excellent efforts you have in place. Expect to receive it soon.

2. Apparently the History Department did not realize they needed to provide evidence and findings associated with the three program level outcomes. Until this is done, degree programs are out of compliance with both UA and SACS requirements.
History Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines  
Revised November 2012

PRINCIPLES

The Department of History’s mission is to preserve, advance, and communicate knowledge of humanity's past. Tenure and/or Promotion are granted to members of the department both for achievements in advancing the mission and for exhibiting a potential to continue to do so in the future. This mission is carried out by historians through a variety of means, including a combination of research and writing, teaching and service.

Since the University of Alabama is a major research institution and the flagship educational institution of the state, the responsibility to advance the frontiers of knowledge is an essential element in our mission. Applicants for tenure and/or promotion must exhibit significant achievement in this area. While contributions to the profession's ever-developing body of knowledge and understanding are always to be valued, we also recognize the worth of communication of scholarship to a wider audience through teaching, writing, and other means.

Teaching lies at the heart of what we do. However difficult it may be to assess excellence in teaching, candidates for tenure or promotion must demonstrate a clear proficiency and commitment to success in the classroom. As part of the core of a liberal arts education, historical knowledge can be of value to all people. Hence we value and encourage the communication of historical knowledge beyond the confines of the university and historical profession.

Service to the department, the university, the profession, and the general public is an important component of the candidate's responsibility as a historian. Understandably, the degree of commitment to any or all of these constituencies will vary with the candidate and with time.

Evaluating the totality of a candidate's credentials requires deep knowledge and sound judgment; the process cannot properly be quantified or reduced to a simplistic formula. The quality and significance of the candidate's contributions in any area must take precedence over mere quantity. The candidate's peers in the profession, both in this department and outside the university, are therefore those most qualified to make judgments about the candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion.

Although historians are expected to make contributions in research and writing, teaching, and service, they may not contribute to all these areas equally, nor should they be expected to make the same kinds of contributions throughout their careers. Life and careers have their own rhythms, which must be acknowledged. Similarly, it is important to remember that the subject matter of any candidate's field will affect the kind of credentials he or she will be able to present. Opportunities to make contributions (types of publications, ease of publication, ability to obtain grants, opportunities for speaking engagements, access to mass media, etc.) can vary greatly depending on the field of history.
TEACHING

Communicating knowledge is central to the university’s mission. That mission is accomplished not only through research and publication but by instruction, broadly construed. All History faculty should strive to foster critical thinking and analytic skills, grade in a clear and even-handed manner, remain conversant with the latest scholarship and developments in their teaching areas, and participate in the advising process. As appropriate, they are also expected to share the responsibility of teaching survey courses, regularly offer upper-level undergraduate and graduate courses, and, if necessary directed readings or research in their field(s) of expertise. The Department furthermore expects all faculty to fulfill their instructional responsibilities with a commitment to excellence.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, and for promotion to full Professor, it is incumbent upon the candidate to furnish evidence of ongoing dedication to teaching and advising in the form of student and peer evaluations, grade distributions, lists of courses taught with enrollments, and samples of syllabi, reading lists, and paper assignments. Other appropriate materials may include a statement of teaching purpose or objectives, descriptions of new courses and/or innovative instructional techniques, student testimonials, a list of dissertations and theses directed, and a list of service on comprehensive examination committees.

RESEARCH

In the discipline of history, professional standing results primarily from the publication of research findings in the form of books and articles. Faculty members in the department of History are therefore expected to produce such publications (and others, as noted below) on a continuing basis.

For tenure and promotion to rank of associate professor, it is expected that a candidate will have published or have in-press a monograph or book-length study based on original research, or the equivalent in the form of a series of refereed scholarly articles in professional journals. (“In-press” designates a manuscript that has received a final contract and for which all final revisions have been completed.) When making its assessment of the candidate, the tenure and promotion committee will take into account the nature of the research field, the originality of the scholarship, the reputation of the publisher or journals, the reception of the work by the candidate’s scholarly peers, and other qualitative measures.

Recognizing that there are other widely accepted ways for historians to make important scholarly contributions in their fields, candidates may submit some combination of the following materials to bolster their case for tenure and promotion: critical editions; chapters in books, anthologies, and other compilations; edited volumes of essays or documents; textbooks and reference books; translations; book reviews in professional journals; papers presented at professional meetings; individual and collaborative projects in the digital humanities (on the last, see Appendix).

Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are also expected to demonstrate and ongoing plan of research and at least some progress made toward advancing that plan (e.g. a grant proposal for a new research project beyond that of the first book, a conference paper or scholarly article based on such new research, etc.)
For promotion to full professor, it is expected that the candidate will have produced new scholarship of significant import since the promotion to associate professor. Generally, evidence of such scholarship is a second scholarly monograph or an equivalent in the form of a referred scholarly articles in professional journals that establishes or confirms the national or international reputation of the candidate as an expert in his or her field.

SERVICE

Service to the department, the university, the community, and the profession constitutes an integral part of each faculty member’s duties. It is understood that the number and nature of an individual’s opportunities for service will vary in accordance with his or her field of specialization and with his or her standing in the profession. Distinction in service cannot substitute for accomplishment in teaching and scholarship. Service to the department and the university may include, but not be limited to, regular attendance at department meetings and service on department, college, and university committees, the Graduate Council, and the Faculty Senate. Service to the community may include, but not be limited to, outreach to public school teachers and students, and presentations to civic and other community groups. Service to the profession may include, but not be limited to, editing a scholarly journal, reviewing book and article manuscripts, organizing a conference, or serving on a committee or holding office in a professional organization. Evidence of satisfactory or substantial achievement in service may include letters of commendation, news clippings or press releases, conference programs, journal mastheads, etc.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor must demonstrate satisfactory performance in the area of service. As a rule assistant professors will not be expected to serve on department or university committees during their first two years of employment.

Candidates for promotion to professor must demonstrate a record of substantial service.

PROCEDURE

The History Department possesses primary authority to define standards for tenure and/or promotion. The candidate’s credentials will be evaluated as a whole, based on peer knowledge and judgment, without relying on formulas. Each non-tenured faculty member will meet annually with the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee to discuss his or her progress.

1. The History Department follows A&S and/or University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines concerning procedure, including notice, schedule, record, and review of Departmental Standards Applied.

2. In keeping with A&S and University Guidelines, the Department committees and the Chairperson shall report their decisions, including rationale for their determination.

3. The Department Chairperson should notify the candidate and the Tenure and Promotion Committee of the schedule governing the application, and regularly update both on the progress of the application through each step of the process.
4. The History Department’s Chairperson, in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the candidate, will determine those asked to provide external evaluation of the candidate’s work.

5. In preparing the Dossier the candidate should consult “Tenure and Promotion Dossier Preparation” in *The College of Arts & Sciences Policies and Procedures for Retention, Tenure and Promotion*.

**APPENDIX: SEE AHA SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING DIGITAL MEDIA ACTIVITIES IN TENURE, REVIEW, AND PROMOTION (FEB. 2008)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Aburzzo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Beeler</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Beito</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bunker</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Cribelli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Elmore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari Frederickson</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Freyer</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>Full/Research Profes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Giggie</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharyn Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Grout</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Holmes-Tagchungdarpa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Huebner</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Kohl</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Kopelson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Lindquist-Dorr</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George McClure</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mendle</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Mixson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Peacock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Peterson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Rable</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>Full/Endowed Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Riches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Rothman</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Selesky</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Shaw</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janek Wasserman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondent Characteristics

Twenty-one graduating seniors from the Department of History completed the instrument during the 2012-13 academic year. Eight respondents graduated during the Fall 2012 term and thirteen during the spring 2013 term. Ten respondents were female and eleven were male.

Survey Results

Percentages of structured responses are reported in tables. Respondent open-ended comments are given an ID number and highlighted in *red italic text*. The ID number allows comparison and context among all open-ended questions. For example, all open-ended responses for each number are given by the same graduating senior.
### Question 2: General Knowledge, Skills, Personal Development

To what extent do you think your education at UA contributed to your knowledge, skills, and/or personal development in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening skills</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension skills</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical skills</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific methods of inquiry</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic skills</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer skills</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking skills</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information gathering skills</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function as part of a team</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate racial equality</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Appreciate racial equality was added in 2011-2012.
### Question 3: Department and Department Faculty

Please assess your department and its faculty members for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did you conduct or assist in a research project in your major?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did at least one faculty member in your major express a special interest in your academic progress?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did at least one faculty member in your major express a special interest in your career development?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Were you unable to enroll in a required course in your major because all sections were filled?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did faculty in your major encourage you to be an actively involved learner?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did faculty in your major give you prompt feedback?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4: Major Courses, Faculty, Instruction, Advising

How would you evaluate the courses, faculty, instruction, and advising in your major?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instruction in 100 and 200 level courses in your major was**

- HY 21: Excellent - 28.6, Good - 52.4, Fair - 14.3, Poor - 0.0, No Opinion - 0.0

**Instruction in 300 level and above courses in your major was**

- HY 20: Excellent - 70.0, Good - 30.0, Fair - 0.0, Poor - 0.0, No Opinion - 0.0

**Instruction provided by departmental graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) in your major was**

- HY 21: Excellent - 33.3, Good - 38.1, Fair - 19.0, Poor - 9.5, No Opinion - 0.0

**The overall quality of your major was**

- HY 20: Excellent - 65.0, Good - 30.0, Fair - 5.0, Poor - 0.0, No Opinion - 0.0

**The quality of courses as preparation for employment after graduation in your major was**

- HY 21: Excellent - 33.3, Good - 42.9, Fair - 14.3, Poor - 4.8, No Opinion - 4.8

**The quality of courses as preparation for graduate or professional school in your major was**

- HY 21: Excellent - 33.3, Good - 57.1, Fair - 4.8, Poor - 0.0, No Opinion - 4.8

**Advising in your major was**

- HY 20: Excellent - 45.0, Good - 25.0, Fair - 20.0, Poor - 10.0, No Opinion - 0.0

Question 5: Department Facilities

How would you evaluate your department's facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The classroom facilities in your department were**

- HY 21: Excellent - 14.3, Good - 19.0, Fair - 28.6, Poor - 38.1, Not Applicable - 0.0

**The non-computer laboratory facilities for courses in your major were**


**The departmental computer facilities for courses in your major were**

- HY 20: Excellent - 25.0, Good - 55.0, Fair - 15.0, Poor - 5.0, Not Applicable - 0.0
Question 6: Core Courses, Faculty, Instruction

How would you evaluate the courses, faculty, and instruction in your core curriculum/general education classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Took core Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruction provided by graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) in core courses was good.

Were you unable to enroll in a core course because all sections were filled?

Did faculty in your core courses encourage you to be an actively involved learner?

Did faculty in your core courses give you prompt feedback?

Did faculty in your core courses care about your academic success?

Additional comments on the above core curriculum courses, faculty, and instruction.  N = 2

3  The only core curriculum classes I took at UA was Spanish. I thought the Spanish department was great and I really learned a great deal.

18  The requirement for core classes are ridiculous. Math specifically is obviously nothing more than a cash cow for the University. Of all courses math should not be a teach yourself thing. Add in “needing” to have a certain level of math and it’s a joke designed to separate me from even more of my money. Core classes should be tailored for the major. History students don’t need 8 credits of science and 3 math credits, for them it makes more sense to up the requirements for writing(maybe having a specific writing course targeted to History students, like the science majors have specifically targeted math courses) and social sciences(like sociology classes, better help understand historical events in a social context), halve or eliminate the requirement for science and get rid of the math. It would be better for the major, especially seeing as how so many history students can’t even write a decent paper. By requiring math and science and other seriously non-applicable course you are wasting our money, time and weakening the focus of our education.
Question 7: Campus Offices, Services, Opportunities

How would you evaluate these offices, services, and opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration process</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid services</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus food services</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply store services</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus health services</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus counseling (not career) services</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services/cashier/student accounts</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Career Center</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus residence life programs for those in University-owned housing</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in campus recreational activities</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in other extra-curricular activities</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in community service projects</td>
<td>HY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments on the offices, services, and opportunities. N = 2

2 The only experience I had in this area was working with the children at The Rise Center it was great.
6 For an off-campus student (transfer), recreational and extra-curricular activities become very difficult because of timing and parking issues
Question 8: Professional Growth from Field Experience

How would you evaluate your experience with a co-op, internship, practicum, student teaching, or other field experience in terms of its contribution to your personal and professional growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR= HY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent 30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in any of those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities 50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9: Person who made Most Significant Positive Contribution

Identify the person at UA who made the most significant positive contribution to your education: N = 21

1 Margaret Abruzzo
2 Dr. Lawrence Kohl
3 David Durham
4 Michael Mansfield
5 Stephen Bunker
6 Dr. Daniel L Riches
7 R Megraw
8 Kohl
9 James Mixson
10 Teresa Cribelli
11 Tim Dillard
12 Dr. Stephen Schwab
13 Fred Andrus
14 Dr. Lawrence Kohl
15 Dr. Stephen Bunker
16 Peacock
17 Dr. Holmes-Tagchungdarpa
18 Ariane Prohaska
19 Utz Mcknight
20 Josh Rothman
21 Dr. Steven Bunker
Question 10: Overall UA Intellectual Environment

All things considered, how would you characterize the intellectual environment at UA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR=</td>
<td>HY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your reason(s) for your answer.  N = 14

2  I feel that my education from the UA has helped me think critically about issues in ways I never did before.
3  I learned so much and I expanded my horizons. There was always a variety in classes for my major it was just a matter of if i had time to take them all. The staff was always extremely helpful.
4  Its one of the best schools in America
5  it is excellent because of the faculty and staff that are employed here.
10 It was a sufficient education on a scholastic level, but I personally had trouble finding career development.
11 It was fine
12 Great Teachers
14 It is a very good academic school, but students are more often disinterested in the development in their intellect. Grades are often valued over knowledge and learning.
16 Explaining that answer isn't really possible in such a small place. I would say Alabama is a great school and it lived up to expectations.
17 I had many passionate teachers and peers.
18 The focus of this school is football, greek life, partying and “tradition” the students are racist, mostly dumb and the administration seems disinterested in shifting focus onto intellectual activities. Over all compared to areas of the country like the East and West Coast and the great lakes area UA is really far behind. The only thing that saves it are the professors, excluding those who teach core classes, who are all very invested in their students and willing to help them reach their goals.
19 I received a great education, however it seemed as if professors didn't care much about their students. Many were great though, such as Utz Mcknight, Margaret Peacock, Charles Clark, and Barbara Chotiner. The University of Alabama has been my dream school ever since I understood what college was. It was an amazing ride.
20 Its a strong intellectual environment
21 It has always been an exciting challenge.
### Question 11: Overall UA Education Received

All things considered, how would you evaluate the overall education that you received at UA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MAJOR= HY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your reason(s) for your answer. N = 13

2 My education here has been top notch.
3 I am so happy that I chose to attend UA. It was more than I expected and hoped for. I wish I could stay longer.
4 Its one of the best schools in America
5 I love the atmosphere and the sports.
6 I was able to develop my writing and public speaking skills, as well as group work.
10 Of course, Roll Tide
11 It was fine
12 Great teachers
14 I developed numerous skills here that will help me in my job in the financial services industry.
16 No question I would chose Alabama AS A FRESHMAN instead of as a transfer student.
18 The professors in the history department and the sociology department are all really helpful and knowledgeable. And the librarians are the same. However the focus of the school leaves much to be desired and without my own personal efforts to seek out opportunity and the very good luck I had to pick certain courses over others I could have easily entered and left the university without advancing my education.
19 This is my dream school. No other school matters.
21 I simply could not have asked for a better one.
Question 12: Attend UA Again

If you had to start over again, would you still choose to attend UA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR= HY</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your reason(s) for your answer.  N = 14

2 I love History, and the History department at Alabama is one of the best.
3 I really have enjoyed my major because it is something that has always greatly interested me. If anything being a history major has expanded and caused my interest in history to increase. However, I chose probably because it will not be as easy for me to find a job as others therefore I am planning to attend graduate school.
4 It was very interesting to me
5 way to much reading for undergrads
6 For the most part I had good, helpful professors and it is fun to be a part of such a big school. It taught me a lot about people.
10 I changed majors twice and I enjoyed my major, but I don't have many opportunities now.
11 It was fine
12 Great teachers
14 Greek life plays too prominent of a role on the affairs of this university for it to be a truly outstanding institution that is too great to pass up.
15 littler career opportunities
16 I'm a double major. Yes, of course.
18 In the end this school is better for people interested in buying friends and social circles through greek life or studying specifically Southern areas of study, such as racism and inequality in the South/Southern history. Or football. People interested in other things would be better off going somewhere better.
19 I almost majored in Math, so if I did it again I would think more heavily about that.
21 I would have to be crazy not to!
Question 13: Choose Major Again

If you had to start over again, would you still choose this major?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MAJOR= HY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your reason(s) for your answer.  N = 14

2 Good Academic reputation.
3 UA is where I had always wanted to go as a little girl and where my parents always wanted me to go.
4 It was the best to go here
6 It is something I enjoy. As I do not have a very specific career I wish to pursue, it was good for me to go into something that was challenging but fun.
8 I want to go into the health field
10 I am from Tuscaloosa, always wanted to go here.
11 Location
12 Great Campus
14 I like my major.
16 The education and history departments are well known and very reputable.
17 I loved learning my major and the passionate teachers I had made me enjoy it even more.
18 The history department is full of knowledgeable professors, and other than a few individuals is a great department to work with.
19 It was one of my life’s dreams to attend and receive a diploma from UA. I made this dream become a reality.
21 I actually despised history in high school. In fact, despise is a nice word. I came into the history department here simply to take the HY203 and 204 requirements. I fell in love with the passion of the teachers and the devotion they had. I graduated with a biology degree last year and used my last year of athletic ability to acquire a history degree. I have enjoyed it so much. I enjoy my classes. I enjoy my teachers. While nobody enjoys papers or tests or long lectures when it’s raining and you’d rather be sleeping, I can honestly say that I have enjoyed being a part of the History department.
Question 14: Reason for Attending UA

What is the primary reason you chose to attend UA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR= HY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reputation</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends came here</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major/Field of Study</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/Financial Aid</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Life</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Please list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see comment below)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is the list of comments from the “Other” category. N = 2

19  Dream
21  Born & Raised ROLL TIDE
**Question 15: Participation in Clubs and Organizations**

Check all of the clubs or organizations that you participated in actively while in graduate school at UA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MAJOR=HY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student government</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer service</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study/research</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic clubs</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad or overseas program</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political clubs</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social fraternity or sorority</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural clubs</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious services/clubs</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor societies</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student newspaper/Corolla</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Million Dollar Band</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you hold an office in any of the above organizations? Yes: N = 4

The following are the offices and remarks listed by the respondents.

- **9** I am Vice President of the UA chapter of Phi Alpha Theta National History Honor Society.
- **12** Yes president of the pre law students association
- **15** Yes.
  Presidentes UAIOA
- **21** Team Captain of the Women's Rowing Team.

**Question 16: Work Status Throughout College**

Generally, what was your work status throughout college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>On-Campus Full-Time</th>
<th>On-Campus Part-Time</th>
<th>Off-Campus Full-Time</th>
<th>Off-Campus Part-Time</th>
<th>Did not work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 17: Plans Following Graduation.**

Indicate the ONE best description of your plans following graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR= HY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know yet</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have accepted a job related to my field of study:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company’s name? (see below)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have accepted a job not related to my field of study:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company’s name? (see below)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to continue in my current position</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be going to a graduate or professional school full-time next year:</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What school? (see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be going to a graduate or professional school part-time next year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and working part-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What school? (see below)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will take more undergraduate courses</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still seeking employment</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not currently seeking employment and do not plan to attend school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next year</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am entering military service</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (see below)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is the list of comments from the above questions.

I have accepted a job related to my field of study:
Company’s name?

None listed

I have accepted a job not related to my field of study:
Company’s name?

6 Covenant Classical School and Daycare
14 Northwestern Mutual
I will be going to a graduate or professional school full-time next year: What school?

7 University of West AL
8 UAB
9 Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
11 Law School
15 Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

I will be going to a graduate or professional school part-time next year and working part-time: What school?

2 Southern Georgia
3 I don't know yet.

Other

1 I plan to continue in my current career but with a degree I have the opportunity to move into management.
13 I will be taking a year off to work before attending graduate school
18 a year off to move home and reestablish residency and then graduate school
21 Working as a volunteer coach for rowing while gaining various coaching certifications

**Question 18: Additional Comments**

Additional comments: Elaborate on anything covered or not covered in the survey.  N = 3

2 The worst thing about going to The University of Alabama is the parking. The buses are always late and have driven by me several times leaving me late for class and standing in the rain. The parking is absolutely ridiculous. This was the worst part about my experience at The University of Alabama.

3 1. My Advisor, Dr. David Beito, was horrible. He was not helpful and I felt as though I had to do everything on my own. 2. Dr. Steven Bunker, Dr. David Durham, Dr. John Beeler, and Dr. Schwab have been professors that have really been awesome. These people made their classes interesting. They were always available for anything a student needed and were so helpful.

21 Please, for the sake of all the other students coming through, get ten Hoor fixed up. I have graduated from the science and the history departments. We have to get ten Hoor completed before that stairwell turns into a dangerous fire hazard.
8-YEAR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW (Form 3)
http://graduate.ua.edu/apr/formmain.html

**Directions:** The information requested on this form is essential for academic program review. Responses should be entered in the space underneath the blue question box, not inside of it.

*Refer to the OIRA Academic Program Review (APR) report which includes information about Degree Designations and Titles, Credit Hour Production, Courses and Sections, Number of Undergraduate Students, Degrees, ACT & SAT scores, GPA, and Letter Grades.*

---

### 1. Requirements

Describe the general **requirements** for each undergraduate major in your department and attach a typical **program of study** for each of the degree programs (majors) in your department.

The Department of History offers a 36 credit hour major. The curriculum is non-sequential, and for the vast majority of courses there are no prerequisites. But the structure of the major is in another sense very intentional. It consists of three tiers of courses. The foundational tier is its survey requirement, consisting of 12 hours (two courses from our Western Civilization sequence, two from our American history sequence). Interwoven with the survey requirement is 9 hour geographical or “field” requirement. Students are required to take at least one course in US history, one course in European history, and one course in Asian, Latin American or Middle Eastern history. The final tier of the requirements consists of 15 hours of upper-division credit (300-400 level) in any course, as well as a concluding “capstone” research seminar (HY 430). At least two courses in the major are also required to be "W" courses, requiring substantial writing and revision of its students. A typical course of study (including all standard undergraduate core courses) would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY 101</td>
<td>HY 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 101</td>
<td>EN 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 3</td>
<td>Semester 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 203</td>
<td>HY 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L COURSE</td>
<td>HU, L, OR FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB COURSE</td>
<td>SB COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C OR ELECTIVE</td>
<td>MINOR COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR COURSE</td>
<td>ELECTIVE COURSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 5</th>
<th>Semester 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY FIELD REQ</td>
<td>HY FIELD REQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 300-499</td>
<td>HY 300-499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU, L, OR FA</td>
<td>HU, L, OR FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR COURSE</td>
<td>MINOR COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTIVE 300-499</td>
<td>ELECTIVE 300-499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 7</th>
<th>Semester 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY FIELD REQ (300-499)</td>
<td>HY 300-499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 300-499</td>
<td>MINOR 300-499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR 300-499</td>
<td>MINOR OR ELECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W COURSE</td>
<td>ELECTIVE COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTIVE 300-499</td>
<td>MINOR OR ELECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY 430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Changes (Credit Hours)
Describe any anticipated changes in undergraduate semester credit hour production in your department for the next 3 years and discuss the reasons for anticipated changes. (Refer to Table 5 of the OIRA APR Report for Credit Hour Production information.)

Our goal is to increase overall credit hour production over the next three years, primarily through increasing enrollment in our most popular 300-level courses (see Strategic Plan).

3. Changes (Students)

Describe any anticipated changes in the number of undergraduate students in specific majors in your department for the next 3 years and discuss the reasons for anticipated changes. (Refer to Tables 2, 3, and 4 of the OIRA APR Report for Enrollment, Degrees Awarded, and Course Level and Section.)

Our goal over the next three years is to increase the overall number of undergraduate majors to at least its recent high of 581 (in 2011), and ideally to grow beyond that number at a pace that matches or exceeds the overall growth in university population.

4. Curriculum Reviews

Describe the department’s process for regular reviews of the undergraduate curriculum. Summarize the primary actions taken as a result of undergraduate curriculum reviews since the last OAA program review.

The curriculum of the department is subject to regular monitoring and review at multiple levels. Each semester the Chair and Undergraduate Director meet to review course offerings for the coming semester, above all to ensure a properly balanced allocation of offerings across the various requirements of the major—surveys, field requirements, upper-division courses, capstone courses, and so on. For longer-term strategies related to curriculum management, the department’s curriculum committee meets at regular intervals, at the direction of the chair and/or the undergraduate director, to craft Since 2004-05, the curriculum has been steadily reformed to reflect the results of the previous departmental review. There have been several measures: Most recently (in 2011-12) the curriculum committee drafted, and the department later authorized, a series of changes to our major at the survey level. Pending approval by the core curriculum committee, our survey courses have been renumbered such that all are now 100-level
courses. The sequence requirement has also been reworked. Again pending approval, future students will be required to take five survey courses, only two of which must be in sequence. These changes are designed to bring our offerings more in line with recent changes in our discipline, and to expose students more broadly to the entirety of our survey and other offerings (including Asia and Latin America) beyond the traditional Western/American civilization model.

- The department has instituted (since 2010) a capstone seminar (HY 430), in which majors must complete (with a grade of C or higher) a substantial research and writing project based on both primary sources and current scholarship, researched over the course of a semester.

The department has also clarified and streamlined the requirements and process for completing an Undergraduate Honors Thesis.
GRADUATE INFORMATION
1. Requirements and Program of Study

Describe the general requirements for each graduate degree program in your department and attach a typical program of study for each of the graduate programs.

HOURS REQUIRED FOR DEGREE

M.A.
- PLAN 1: 24 semester hours in history, plus thesis
- PLAN 2: 30 semester hours in history, plus revised seminar paper

Satisfactory completion of two historiography courses is required for all plans. Proficiency in one foreign language is required.

PH.D.
- 54 hours of graduate coursework, including 48 hours of history distributed in four fields; an additional 6 hours, which may be taken in an outside field or as additional hours in history; reading knowledge of two foreign languages, except those in U.S. history for whom one language may be approved; comprehensive written and oral examinations in three fields; and a dissertation.
FIELDS OF STUDY

- U.S. History To 1877
- U.S. History Since 1877
- History of the South
- Latin American History To 1810
- Latin American History Since 1810
- British & European History, 1485-1815
- British & European History Since 1815
- Military and Naval History

EXAMINATION FORMAT FOR MA

PLAN I

- The MA Examination for the Plan I track includes an oral exam on their M.A. course work and a defense of the thesis. The examination committee consists of the three professors who served as readers on the thesis together with at least one additional History professor. All M.A. theses must be submitted to the student’s primary advisor no later than 4 weeks before the scheduled defense and the revised thesis must be submitted to all the remaining members of the student’s committee at least three weeks before the scheduled defense. The examining committee files with the Director of Graduate Studies a written opinion regarding the student’s suitability for continuation to the PhD program.

PLAN II

- The MA Examination for the Plan II track includes an oral examination on their MA coursework and a defense of their revised seminar paper. The examining committee consists of at least four History professors, typically those with whom the student has taken courses; one of the four must be the professor who directed the student’s seminar paper. The seminar paper must be approved by the directing professor before the student may schedule his or her exams. Copies of the seminar paper must be furnished the members of the examining committee at least ten days before the date of the oral examination. The examining committee files with the Director of the Graduate Studies a written opinion regarding the student’s suitability for continuation to the PhD program.

- Students schedule MA comprehensive exams early in the spring semester of their second MA year, typically in March or April. Students must pass their comprehensive exam by the deadline specified by the Graduate School to be eligible to receive their degree.

- It is suggested that students meet with the members of their comprehensive oral exam committee well in advance to determine the scope of the exam, as well as to discuss the student’s desire to proceed to the PhD.

- In the M.A. oral examinations, two negative votes by committee members constitute a failure of the examination. Students may repeat a failed oral examination only once, after a time interval specified by the examining committee. The use of faculty from outside the department to...
serve on M.A. examination committees (except in cases where faculty from other disciplines are prescribed by the graduate regulations) must be approved well in advance by the Graduate Committee.

**EXAMINATION FORMAT FOR PH.D.**

- **COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS:** The comprehensive examinations for admission to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree consist of a four-hour written examination in three of the eight fields of study offered by the department, each administered by a committee of two professors representing the respective field. With the consent of the committee chair, a student may choose to use a computer for the written portion of the comprehensive examination. An oral examination will be administered subsequently by a committee consisting of not less than five professors who administered the written examinations. The comprehensive examinations are to be completed in a two-week period, with the written exams given the first week and the oral exam to be given the following week. The exam schedule must allow at least five days between the last written exam and the date of the oral exam. The written and oral exams in each field are considered a unit, which the student will pass or fail as a whole. Two negative votes constitute failure. A minimum of six months must elapse before the student may repeat a failed examination. A student is permitted to repeat a failed examination one time only. After passing the comprehensive examinations, students should apply for admission to candidacy for the doctorate.

- At the comprehensive exam, the student must also present to, and have approved by, the committee a dissertation prospectus. The prospectus must be distributed to committee members at least two weeks before the date of the oral examination. It must describe the proposed dissertation topic, outline the potential primary source base, and discuss the relevant secondary literature in the field. The student should write the prospectus in close consultation with the primary advisor, as well as with input from potential members of the dissertation defense committee, who may or may not also be serving on the student’s comprehensive exam committee. Doctoral students will not be considered as having obtained ABD status until the comprehensive examination committee has approved the dissertation prospectus.

- **THE DISSERTATION:** Dissertations are to be based upon research in history and make an original contribution to knowledge. Each doctoral student must select and obtain approval for a dissertation topic before scheduling his or her comprehensive examinations. Within one semester of approval of the dissertation prospectus, the graduate student, in consultation with his or her primary advisor, must appoint the student’s dissertation committee, whose insights should be solicited throughout the dissertation process. The dissertation committee will consist for at least four history professors, plus one additional member from either outside the History department, or outside the University. If the outside member of the dissertation committee is not a member of the UA faculty, he or she must be given a temporary appointment to the UA Graduate faculty well before the dissertation defense date.

- The Graduate School requires each student admitted to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree to
pursue completion of the dissertation without interruption by enrolling each semester in HY 699 for at least 3 credit hours. The student must register for a total of at least 24 hours of dissertation research in addition to the 54 course hours.

- **THE DISSERTATION DEFENSE:** The candidate must pass an oral examination on the dissertation and the field of the dissertation in accordance with the rules of the Graduate School. The examining committee consists of four history professors and one additional member from either outside the History department, or outside the University. Two negative votes constitute failure of the examination, which the student may repeat one time only, after a time interval specified by the examining committee.

### 2. Graduate Curriculum Reviews

Describe the department’s process for **regular reviews of the graduate curriculum.** Summarize the **primary actions taken** as a result of graduate curriculum reviews since the last OAA program review.

The Department’s Graduate Committee meets regularly to discuss all matters relating to the graduate program, including the graduate curriculum. Proposals for reform or revision of the graduate curriculum are then taken by the Graduate Committee to the entire department for discussion and approval. Significant curricular revisions to occur in recent years include:

- the option for PhD students to construct a thematic field as one of their four fields of study
- the creation of HY600: Teaching History, a course focused on history pedagogy that is required for all first-semester GTAs and all PhD students
- the revival of HY681: Seminar in European History, to serve the needs of our growing population of graduate students in European History
- the addition of a greater number of graduate courses dealing with Asian and Latin American History, as well as courses stressing issues of race and gender
- proposals to create a new, mandatory course for all first-semester graduate students (MA and PhD) in historiography and historiographical theory
- proposals to reform the MA examination process by making discussion of the revised seminar paper a more central part of the exam, and encouraging the students to think more synthetically about how the various courses they have taken have contributed to their understanding of the approaches to studying history they find most compelling.
• proposals to limit the number of ‘slash’ classes a degree-seeker may take during his or her program of study.

3. Slash-Listed Courses

In a table or list, show the number of slash-listed courses offered in the department and describe any efforts to increase the number of graduate-only courses for graduate students, i.e., decrease the number of slash-listed courses.

SLASH COURSES

fall 2009
  eleven 500 slash courses
  six 600 level courses

spring 2010
  twelve 500 slash courses
  seven 600 level courses

fall 2010
  ten 500 slash courses
  seven 600 level courses

spring 2011
  eleven slash courses
  six 600 level courses

fall 2011
  twelve slash courses
  eight 600 level courses

spring 2012
  thirteen slash courses
  eight 600 level courses

fall 2012
  eleven slash courses
  seven 600 level courses

spring 2013
  eleven slash courses
  seven 600 level courses

The Graduate Committee has attempted to reduce the number of slash classes taken by our students through the following means:
● developing and offering a wider array of 600-level ‘content’ courses beyond the standard Literature and Seminar courses

● consistently encouraging students to register for 600-level courses only whenever possible and appropriate through our regular registration advising process that all graduate students must complete before registering for courses (students need to provide the Director of Graduate Studies a rationale for taking a 500-level slash class in those meetings)

● raising with the department, and encouraging inclusion in our departmental Strategic Plan, placing a limitation on the number of slash classes a degree-seeker is allowed to take throughout the course of his or her program of study

4. Time to Complete Degree

Use the graduation lists received from the Graduate School to compute the average time to complete each graduate degree.**

MA = 5.9 semesters
Out of 48 graduates, 1 completed the degree in 3 semesters; 37 completed the degree in 5 semesters, 10 completed the degree in 6 or more semesters.

PhD = 17.5 semesters

5. Graduate Employment

Indicate success of graduates in securing employment (or acceptance for additional graduate work) within and outside Alabama by attaching a list of graduates during the last 5 years and indicating where each was employed or went for additional graduate work.

PhD graduates

Becky Bruce (PhD): Assistant Professor of History, Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Charity Carney (PhD): Instructor, Western Governors University (online university)

Stephanie Chalifoux (PhD): PTTI in History, University of Alabama

Colin Chapell (PhD): Adjunct Assistant Professor of History, University of Memphis
Angela Cooley (PhD): Assistant Professor of History, Minnesota State University at Mankato
Joseph Danielson (PhD): Assistant Professor of History, Des Moines Area Community College
Matthew Downs (PhD): Assistant Professor of History, University of Mobile
Ryan Floyd (PhD): Assistant Professor of History, Lander University
Richard Hourigan (PhD): Teaching Associate, Coastal Carolina University
Dean Lawson (PhD): Assistant Professor of History, Chowan University
Christian McWhirter (PhD): Associate Editor, Abraham Lincoln Papers
Daniel Menestres (PhD): unknown
John Mitcham (PhD): faculty in the Howard College of Arts and Sciences, Samford University; also PTTI in History at University of Alabama
Charles Roberts (PhD): Adjunct Assistant Professor of History, Asst. Editor, ALABAMA REVIEW, University of West Alabama
Kara Smith (PhD): Lecturer in History (full time), Middle Georgia State College
Kristopher Teters (PhD): Full-Time Instructor, Northern Kentucky University
Justin Turner (PhD): Assistant Professor of History, Suffolk County Community College (NY)
Colin Williams (PhD): active duty, United States Army

**MA graduates**

Dana Alsen (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama
Blake Ball (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama
Elizabeth Barger (MA): unknown
Wyatt Brown (MA): United States Army
Rebecca Bush (MA): unknown
Michael Cervera (MA): non-degree-seeking graduate student, University of Alabama
Michele Cooper (MA): unknown
Sarah Craddock (MA): MA student in German, University of Alabama
Jeffery Davis (MA): PTTI in History, University of Alabama; also teaching History at Shelton State Community College

Katie Deale (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

Austin Duckworth (MA): volunteer assistant coach, University of Alabama Cross Country/Track and Field teams

Adam Eason (MA): MDA program (architectural history and historical preservation), Savannah College of Art and Design

Mark Folse (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

Michael Gasque (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

Christopher Gilliland (MA): Adjunct Professor of History, Chattanooga State Community College

William Haslam (MA): unknown

Jeffrey Hood (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Mississippi

Kevin Hughes (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

Allison Huntley (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Arizona

Bryan Kozik (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Florida

Timothy LaBarbera (MA): Director of Discipleship and Youth at Willoughby Baptist Church in Willoughby, Ohio (includes teaching biblical history and bible studies)

Laura Mammina (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

Christopher Mapes (MA): PhD student, Department of History, Vanderbilt University

Samuel May (MA): currently seeking position in secondary-school teaching

Meagan McChesney (MA): PhD student, Department of History, Loyola University of Chicago

Jonathan Medley (MA): History instructor (on-line), Colorado Community College System

Paul Mokrzycki (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Iowa

Scott Morris (MA): unknown

Matthew Ogonowski (MA): PTTI in History, University of Alabama

Joseph Pearson (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama
Samantha Pline (MA): unknown

Matthew Pritchett (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

Melissa Reynolds (MA): PhD student, Department of History, Rutgers University

Ian Michael Rogers (MA): preparing applications for law school

Lindsay Smith (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

Andrew Townsley (MA): student at University of Alabama School of Law

Kimberly Tucker (MA): PhD student, Public History, Middle Tennessee State University

Lena Tudor (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

Erin Schmidt (MA): store manager, Ulta, Tuscaloosa, AL

Hong Nhung Walsh (MA): unknown

Eldon Woodie (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

Miaosi Zhang (MA): PhD student, Department of History, University of Alabama

---

6. Employers’ Satisfaction with Graduates

Provide any objective or subjective information you have on employers’ satisfaction with graduates of your graduate degree program(s).

Please see attachments 5a and 5b. We solicited 6 employers for feedback.

---

7. Monitoring Academic Progress

Describe procedures for regularly monitoring academic progress of graduate students.

Graduate student academic progress is monitored in the following ways:
● Faculty are asked to file a detailed “Graduate Coursework Evaluation” form for each graduate student they teach, responding to specific questions about the student’s strengths and weaknesses, performance in class discussion and written work, research ability, areas in need of particular improvement, etc. These reports, routinely a full page of more per student per course, are submitted to and reviewed by the Director of Graduate Studies.

● Main advisors of PhD students submit an annual progress report for each PhD student working under their direction that describes the student’s activity during the year, progress towards degree, and any concerns about the progress that may exist. These reports are submitted to and reviewed by the Director of Graduate Studies.

● All graduate students taking coursework have registration advising meetings each semester (MA students advised by the Director of Graduate Studies; PhD students by their main dissertation advisor) in which their overall progress through the program is reviewed and any potential problems or concerns discussed.

8. Sources of External Funding

Indicate sources of external funding and dollar amounts for the following:

a. research grants

Our students routinely obtain an array of research grants, ranging from smaller grants (in the $500 range) sponsored by specific historical societies or collections to fund short-term research in those collections (such as those offered by the Filson Historical Society and the Virginia Historical Society) to longer-term and more open-ended grants designed to support a student’s dissertation research in general (offered by groups such as the American Historical Association.) Though total amounts vary from year to year, student research grant money regularly exceeds several thousand dollars.

b. service or teaching contracts

Service or teaching contracts are not standard in our field, and we have no discernible patterns of students receiving such grants.

c. training grants

Training grants per se are not common in our field. Our students on occasion obtain external grants (usually in the $500 dollar range) to assist in the acquisition of
specific skills (foreign language skills; archival research skills), often via travel to summer programs offering training in those skills.


If you have a doctoral program included in the National Research Council rankings of research-doctorate programs, describe what is being done to increase its standing. If you have a doctoral program not included in NRC rankings, describe the major efforts at continuous improvement of the doctoral program.

The department has discussed a variety of strategies regarding our NRC rankings, and have incorporated them into our departmental Strategic Plan. Items described in the plan include:

- strategies to increase faculty research productivity, especially in helping faculty members advance from Associate to Full Professor rank, as faculty research production is crucial to the reputational status of the graduate program and involves those faculty most likely to have supervisory responsibility for graduate students.

- the development of a systematic recruitment strategy to proactively identify and recruit the highest quality students

- strategies to increase graduate student productivity, including a concerted push to have more graduate students transform their seminar paper projects into articles submitted to professional journals

- visibility strategies: NRC data indicate that our departmental performance evaluated according to objectively measured criteria exceeds the subjective reputation our program enjoys. We have discussed strategies to make the actually existing strengths of our department and program more visible so that our reputation among peers can more accurately match the reality of our production and performance.
10. Financial Assistance

Using the spreadsheet data provided to you, use the table below to show the number of students receiving funds from each of the six Graduate School sources.**

1. Graduate Council Fellowships (GCF)
2. National Alumni Association (NAA license tag) Fellowships
3. McNair Fellowships
4. SREB Fellowships
5. Research and Travel Fund
6. Fellowship Enhancement Program (FEP) support since the program began in 2010-2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Year Ago</th>
<th>2 Years Ago</th>
<th>3 Years Ago</th>
<th>4 Years Ago</th>
<th>5 Years Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsch/Tvl</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blank cells do not necessarily mean we did not nominate a student for a particular award.
11. Awarding Assistantships

Briefly describe the criteria and process for awarding assistantships. If there is a maximum time for a student to have an assistantship, please indicate.

Decisions on awarding assistantships are based upon recommendations drawn up by the Graduate Committee and approved by the department as a whole. The Graduate Committee bases its recommendations to award new assistantships on its assessment of the academic merit of the student and his or her seniority in the program. A student’s ability to continue on in an assistantship is based upon maintaining adequate progress towards degree as well as successfully fulfilling the duties of the position. These factors are assessed for each assistant by the Graduate Committee each year. MA students are allowed to hold an assistantship for up to two years. PhD students who enter with an MA in hand from a different institution may have an assistantship for up to three years, while those who continue on from our own department’s MA program may have a total of four years (including up to two from their MA studies.)

12. Off-Campus and Distance Learning

If the department has any off-campus and/or distance learning graduate courses, describe staffing and procedures to assure that the quality of such courses is comparable to the quality of on-campus courses.

N/A

13. Quality of Faculty Teaching

How and how often is the quality of faculty teaching of graduate courses evaluated in the department?

Probationary faculty who teach graduate courses have their teaching observed by tenured members of the faculty each year. This process results in a written review, often several pages in length, that is included as part of the faculty member’s annual retention/tenure and promotion file. Graduate students also complete course reviews of all graduate courses through the University’s course review system. In 2011, Undergraduate Affairs Committee began evaluating
the teaching of full-time and part-time temporary instructors. We have not as yet decided on an evaluation cycle for temporary instructors.

14. GTA Training Coordinator

Who is the department’s designated GTA Training Coordinator? (SACS requires that all GTAs must have “direct supervision by a faculty member experienced in the teaching discipline.”)

GTA training is under the supervision of the Director of Graduate Studies, who runs the beginning of the year GTA orientation and teaches the mandatory HY600: Teaching History course.

15. New GTAs

Does each new GTA receive:

a. a letter of appointment that details the GTA’s duties?

All GTAs receive letters of appointment. Instructors under whom the GTAs work communicate to them directly about the specifics of their duties in the course.

b. a previous syllabus for the course(s) to be taught?

Since each faculty member teaches our introductory courses in his or her own manner, it would be of little value to distribute to the GTAs a generic syllabus, or one from a different instructor. All GTAs do however receive a copy of the syllabus from the instructor under whom they will work, often weeks in advance of the beginning of the semester.

c. information concerning the department’s GTA Training Coordinator?

New GTAs are informed that the Director of Graduate Studies is in charge of their orientation and training.

d. a departmental orientation to being a GTA, in addition to the University’s Workshop for New Graduate Teaching Assistants?
16. GTA Evaluation

Describe the SACS-required “planned and periodic evaluation” the department uses for assessing all GTAs. Also, indicate where copies of those periodic evaluations are maintained and for how long. Attach a template or 1-2 completed examples, but redact information that identifies particular students.

At the completion of each semester all instructors who had GTAs writes a review of the GTAs performance that is filed with the Director of Graduate Studies. Copies of these reviews are held in each GTAs official departmental file and become parts of those files. GTAs are allowed to see a copy of these reviews upon request.

Example of actual GTA evaluation are attached. See Form 4 Attachment 3.

17. Regular GTA Training

Describe the SACS-required “regular in-service training” that the department provides to assist GTAs in continuing to develop their teaching skills throughout their time serving as GTAs in the department. Again, this is beyond the UA Workshop for New GTAs.

The department offers a one-credit graduate course, HY 600: Teaching History, that is required for all first-semester GTAs as well as all PhD students in the program. This course is designed to introduce students to issues related to teaching history at the college level, and in particular to teaching at the University of Alabama while enrolled here as a graduate student. How does one best prepare to teach? How does one go about grading students’ work? What are the classroom challenges a college history instructor can expect, and what are some strategies for dealing with those challenges? How does one balance the demands of teaching with our other scholarly endeavors?

The department also offers a series of graduate workshops coordinated by the Graduate Committee that frequently deal with teaching-related issues.

Graduate students who serve as the instructors of record for summer classes are required to attend a training session in February in which various departmental, college, and university regulations and policies are reviewed.
Finally, instructors in the survey courses where GTAs work meet with them regularly (usually once a week) to discuss the course and the pedagogical issues related to teaching that course’s material.

18. New GRAs

Does each new GRA receive:

a. a letter of appointment that details the GRA’s duties?

GRA’s receive letters of appointment, and the faculty members with whom they will work communicate to them directly about the specifics of their duties of their position.

b. orientation as a GRA?

Since the duties of each GRA vary greatly according to the position there is no unified orientation session. Each GRA receives orientation and training directly from the faculty member(s) with whom he or she will work.

19. Research by Graduate Faculty

Describe how the quality of research by graduate faculty is assessed, what rewards (in addition to merit increases and promotion/tenure) are provided as research incentives, and what is done to increase the quality/quantity of research for those not meeting expectations.

The Department of History does not maintain a distinction between graduate faculty and non-graduate faculty: all tenured- and tenure-track members of the department are considered graduate faculty. The quality of faculty research is assessed each year at the departmental level as part of the regular FAR process, and probationary faculty produce additional (and extensive) documentation of their research activity as part of their annual retention review. This material is assessed (and commented upon in writing) by the departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Department Chair, and is also submitted for review by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Departmental leadership works with faculty whose research is not meeting expectations, and awards (primarily through merit increases) those members who are excelling in their research agendas.
GRADUATE INFORMATION

ATTACHMENTS

1. Attachment 1 Program of Study MA
2. Attachment 2 Program of Study PhD
3. Attachment 3 GTA Evaluation Form
4. Attachment 5a Employer Satisfaction Data
5. Attachment 5b Employer Satisfaction Data
Department of History
MA Program of Study

**Fall Semester Year I**
-HY 666: Historiography and Theory  [required course for all first-semester graduate students]
-HY 60X: Literature of the Field  [recommended to be in student’s main field of study]

**Spring Semester Year I**
-HY 60X-63X: Proseminar  [recommended to be in student’s main field of study]
-HY 65X-68X: Research Seminar
-take foreign language proficiency exam

**Fall Semester Year II**
-HY 60X: Literature of the Field  [in field different than taken in Fall I]
-HY 60X-63X: Proseminar

**Spring Semester Year II**
-HY 60X-63X: Proseminar
-additional graduate course in History  [for those wishing to continue for the PhD, a second research seminar is strongly recommended]
-take MA comprehensive exams
Program of study for PhD degree in History

plan assumes that student enters with the following from their MA work:
- 30 credit hours, including at least one research seminar
- documented proficiency in one foreign language

Fall Semester first year:
- two graduate-level courses in History (4 credit hours each, 8 credit hours in total)
- HY 600: Teaching History [if not already taken as MA student] (1 credit hour)
- register for second graduate language exam if in non-Anglophone field

Spring Semester first year:
- research seminar in main field of study (4 credit hours)
- additional graduate proseminar (4 credit hours)
- in consultation with dissertation advisor, ask professors to join PhD exam committee

Summer between first and second years:
- begin preliminary reading for PhD exams and exploratory work on dissertation prospectus

Fall Semester second year:
- two graduate-level courses (4 credit hours each, 8 credit hours total)
- retake language exam if necessary
Spring Semester second year:

- concentrate energies on preparations for PhD exams and dissertation prospectus, to be completed either this semester or Fall Semester of third year, leaving the student with ABD status.

-in subsequent years, concentrate on researching, writing, and eventually defending PhD dissertation
NAME OF TEACHING ASSISTANT: XXX
COURSE EVALUATED: HY 203
SEMESTER AND YEAR: XXX
EVALUATOR: XXX

How would you, as the Teaching Assistant’s supervisor, rate his/her performance in each of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OUTSTANDING</th>
<th>ABOVE AVERAGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>BELOW AVERAGE</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE OF MATERIAL IN COURSE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING PERFORMANCE; PREPARATION</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPENDABILITY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVE ATTITUDE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write a prose evaluation of your Graduate Teaching Assistant below, assessing his/her strengths, weaknesses, and potential as a college teacher.

XXX performed very well as a teaching assistant. I found him very reliable and good at anticipating (and preventing) problems. He seemed to have a very good rapport with the students. My impression is that they generally respected him, and they found him helpful. He had a very good grasp of the material, and I think his experience, his knowledge, and his general concern about the students made him the strongest of the TAs.

SIGNATURE OF SUPERVISOR _____________________________________________
DATE ____________________
NAME OF TEACHING ASSISTANT: XXX
COURSE EVALUATED: HY 203
SEMESTER AND YEAR: XXX
EVALUATOR: XXX

How would you, as the Teaching Assistant’s supervisor, rate his/her performance in each of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Material in Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Performance; Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write a prose evaluation of your Graduate Teaching Assistant below, assessing his/her strengths, weaknesses, and potential as a college teacher.

I was impressed with XXX as a TA, especially for his first semester. He was very hard working, very diligent, and in general, very dependable. He did have some trouble submitting his final grades by the agreed upon deadline, but I think this is largely attributable to a combination of a rookie error and a personal issue, rather than anything worrisome for the long term. Overall, XXX was extremely conscientious and very good about following directions. What struck me most about XXX was not that he never made mistakes, but that he was always ready and willing to do whatever it took to fix those mistakes. He also sought out advice frequently, a quality that I think is important in a brand-new TA. I would be very happy to work with him again, and I think that especially as he gets more confidence in his role, he’ll be a very promising teacher.
NAME OF Teaching Assistant: XXX
COURSE EVALUATED: HY 203
SEMESTER AND YEAR: XXX
EVALUATOR: XXX

How would you, as the Teaching Assistant’s supervisor, rate his/her performance in each of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Material in Course</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Performance; Preparation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Attitude</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write a prose evaluation of your Graduate Teaching Assistant below, assessing his/her strengths, weaknesses, and potential as a college teacher.

XXX was an excellent, extremely hard-working TA. He was extremely conscientious. He generally finished his work a few days ahead of schedule. He also came across as very mature and very much a team player; he stepped in to bail out a less conscientious TA more than once. I also found that he was very good about keeping track of his students—and making sure that they did not fall through the cracks. In terms of rapport, I suspect that he sometimes came across as stern to his students. I don't think this is necessarily a problem (I never had any complaints from students about him), and I think this will also soften with time. I think he has very strong potential as a college teacher, and I do hope that he chooses to follow that path. I'd certainly be delighted to have him as a TA in the future.
Name of Teaching Assistant: XXX
Course evaluated: HY 203
Semester and year: XXX
Evaluator: XXX

How would you, as the Teaching Assistant’s supervisor, rate his/her performance in each of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Material in Course</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching performance; preparation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write a prose evaluation of your Graduate Teaching Assistant below, assessing his/her strengths, weaknesses, and potential as a college teacher.

XXX was a hard-working TA. I found her generally responsible and cooperative. She was responsible and did what needed to be done.

I think she found grading difficult, and on at least two occasions, I thought it was necessary to ask her to re-think some of her grades, which were out of step with what the other TAs were assigning. To some extent, I think the issue was that her students were not performing as well; she may have gotten more than her share of the weaker students. But it also seemed to me that it wasn’t entirely a problem of harshness; her grades clustered a lot around the low B, C, and upper D range, and she needed to do more to distinguish among students. It also seemed to me that she really struggled with grading deadlines (usually about 2 weeks after the due date), so I suspect that the problem had something to do with rushing. That said, she was willing to rethink her grades, and she was cooperative about it.

To the students, I think XXX sometimes came across as tough, but I think she cared a lot about them and was always willing to help them. I also found her willing to learn and willing to seek and follow advice.
September 10, 2013

Dr. Kari Frederickson, Chair
Department of History
The University of Alabama
Box 870212
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0212

Dear Dr. Frederickson:

I write with regard to a recent PhD recipient of yours, Charles K. Roberts.

Charles joined our faculty last January, and we could not be more pleased with his classroom performance.

We discovered on day one that he required no coaching from us, as he was completely prepared and fully prepped. Charles, both last spring and now, is teaching both Western Civilization and U.S. History, and there is no qualitative difference in his preparedness to teach both.

Additionally, and this was especially the case last spring, Charles’s students represent a broad dynamic range, which is “Edu-speak” for classes with disproportionate numbers of ill-prepared or lower-aptitude students, and a large percentage of students who failed the course previously. And these were blended in with a number of students of normal to above average ability, which makes for an extremely challenging teaching situation. And Charles handled it with aplomb. Better than we had a right to expect, really.

None of us who have observed Charles harbors a single reservation about his teaching ability; no student has ever complained. In short, he was a superbly-prepared college-level instructor.

Regards,

R. Volney Riser
Chair
September 16, 2013

Kari Frederickson
Associate Professor & Chair
Department of History
Box 870212
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487

Dear Professor Frederickson:
I am providing, at your request, an evaluation of one of your graduates--Dr. Matthew Downs. Dr. Downs joined the faculty at the University of Mobile in the fall of 2012 as an Assistant Professor of History. As the Chair of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Department, I was in charge of the job search that brought Dr. Downs to UM. As you might expect, there were many applicants for this position. Knowing the quality of the History program at the University of Alabama, I had no hesitancy in hiring Dr. Downs to fill this position. I have been quite pleased with his performance since his initial appointment. He has performed well in his teaching duties as well as taking on some other department responsibilities. For example, we have turned over responsibility of ensuring that our History learning outcomes meet the State Department of Education requirements. He has quickly picked up our advising process and student relations functions. Additionally, while maintaining a full teaching load, he has managed to complete a revision of his dissertation for publication with the L.S.U. press. Thanks for your help in securing Dr. Downs and, as always, if we can be of any assistance please do not hesitate to call.

Best,

Lonnie A. Burnett, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, and
Professor of History,
University of Mobile
Consultant Report

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Consultant Information:

Dr. W. Fitzhugh Brundage, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Professor, Department of History

1. Overall Assessment

Overall Assessment of the Department and its Degree Programs—Current Regional/National Standing and Promise for the Future

The Department of History at the University of Alabama deserves commendation for making the most of its collective talent and resources. Like most departments in the discipline during the past decade, it has confronted substantial turnover in its personnel as a result of retirements. And like many departments at public research institutions, it has faced the challenge of reconciling heavy undergraduate teaching obligations with a simultaneous commitment to research and graduate education. The Department has done an excellent job in these regards; it has repopulated itself with active and intellectually ambitious scholars and has simultaneously fulfilled its responsibilities to both undergraduate and graduate students.

The department now faces a number of choices. It can continue to do what it has been doing. Given its performance over the past decade, such a decision would be entirely justifiable. But various pressures from within the university and transformation within the discipline will almost certainly compel the department to undertake modifications in its practices and mission. The department also may conclude that its contemporary circumstances are propitious for a recalibration of its objectives. My essential point is that whatever changes in method and mission that the Department undertakes, it does so from a position of fundamental strength.

My impression is that the Department inclines toward a recalibration of its mission and methods even while its faculty is 1) uncertain as to the university’s professed mission and 2) anxious to not to erode the Department’s current strengths. Faculty understandably are cautious about formulating precise departmental goals when the
The university’s goals appear unclear or contradictory. How far-reaching and deep is the commitment to bolstering the university’s research profile? Does that commitment extend to promoting and investing in graduate education? Is the promotion of undergraduate research a priority? The answers to these questions are directly relevant to virtually all of the operations of the Department of History. Of course, the Department needs to plan for a range of possible contingencies. It has done so; its Strategic Plan identifies immediate and specific initiatives, many of which entail comparatively few resources. I have some additional suggestions for revisions in the Department’s practices. The underlying logic of these proposals is to initiate policies that sustain and enhance faculty creativity and that align graduate training with the Department’s undergraduate mission. Not only do I believe these two initiatives to be feasible but also to be interdependent. If implemented, I am confident they will burnish the Department’s reputation, elevate its prestige, clarify its identity, and bolster faculty and graduate student morale.

The Department serves +/-550 undergraduate majors and +/-190 minors. The number of majors rose substantially during the past decade before leveling off in recent years; the number of minors has jumped substantially in recent years. (I wonder if some of the new minors might have declared as majors in years prior to the new research seminar requirement for all majors. Once the required research seminar becomes the new “norm” I wouldn’t be surprised if the number of majors doesn’t begin to increase again.) The Department is simultaneously teaching more than 7,000 students annually and approximately 10,500 semester credit hours. These numbers are consonant with the History faculty’s reputation for dedicated and engaging teachers. The recent addition of a capstone research seminar to the curriculum for majors underscores the Department’s commitment to offering a rigorous major. Rather than an inefficient luxury, such limited enrollment research-intensive seminars are one of the most important fora in which undergraduates can engage is sustained and original critical analysis. With the tenure/tenure-track faculty numbering 27, the Department is almost certainly at or near full production. Indeed, without the significant number of non-tenure track instructors to bolster the Department’s faculty ranks, the Department would be unable to fulfill its teaching responsibilities. Given these circumstances, increased undergraduate enrollments pose a challenge for the Department’s permanent faculty as they juggle teaching large survey classes, providing diverse specialized classes for majors, staffing research intensive capstone courses, and offering the diverse courses that are an essential foundation for any graduate program.
2. Departmental Assessment Activities

Please read the assessment attachments to the General Information form (Form 2) and the analysis and recommendations by the Assistant to the Provost for Assessment. Offer any additional thoughts on the department’s assessment activities from your perspective as someone highly experienced in the same discipline as that of the department.

At the time of my visit, a detailed critique of the department’s assessment activities had not yet been prepared by the Assistant to the Provost for Assessment. (My understanding is that it will be completed by the end of October 2013.) No one raised the issue of departmental assessment during my visit. My impression, based on the materials provided, is that they are comprehensive, appropriate, and effective.

(This additional paragraph was posted 12/19/13):

The recommendations by the Assistant to the Provost for Assessment are appropriate and judicious. Traditionally instructors of History have been end product rather than task oriented. Consequently, students typically were assessed through exams and end of the semester research papers. Gradually shifting ideas about pedagogy have begun to reshape best practices regarding assessment in History classes. One consequence of this shift may be more frequent assessment through assignments targeted at assessing specific skills as opposed to one comprehensive assignment (e.g., final exam or major essay). This transition can be irksome to some faculty, because of their preferred mode of organizing their courses, but in most instances it can be done without great disruption. More important, once implemented, a department-wide emphasis on continual assessment will enable students to understand better the faculty’s expectations. Certainly, the assessment will need to be calibrated for the various types of classes; capstone research seminars will require different assessment tools than large lecture courses. But the goal of offering students ongoing, cumulative and specific assessment is both appropriate and feasible. The recommendations of the Assistant to the Provost for Assessment provide an excellent basis for future departmental policies.

3. Promotion and Tenure
Brief evaluation of the department’s tenure and promotion guidelines.

The Department’s standards are appropriate and similar to those at every institution with which I have been affiliated. Junior faculty appear to have a clear understanding of the Department’s and the university's expectations. I was impressed by the comprehensive scope and rigor of the pre-tenure assessment. While the annual assessment of post-tenure faculty may prove onerous for faculty and administrators alike, the annual assessment of pre-tenure faculty is commendable. Several current faculty commented that their tenure cases had proceeded smoothly and without surprises because the annual assessments had ensured that they were well prepared for the tenure review process.

4. Strengths

Strengths of the Department and its Degree Programs (in rank order).

The Department has a strong faculty of engaged researchers and dedicated teachers. During the past decade excellent hires have replenished the faculty and nurtured a collegial community of scholars. The faculty, moreover, are optimistic about the Department’s and university’s prospects.

The Department has a strong commitment to teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Graduate students expressed a high level of satisfaction with the instruction they were receiving and with the commitment of their faculty mentors.

The Department has a clear commitment to research across all disciplinary subfields. The Department is perhaps best known for its strong faculty in the history of the American South, military history, and western European history, but faculty in virtually all fields are engaged in research and are actively publishing their work. Whatever initiatives the Department undertakes, care should be taken to assure that the current “culture,” which valorizes research across all subfields, is maintained.

In sum, the Department is making excellent use of the talent and resources at its disposal. By any reasonable measure, it is fulfilling its core mission of teaching a large number of students with diverse needs (students fulfilling general education requirements, majors, and graduate students) and producing original scholarship.
5. Recommendations

Recommendations to Improve the Department and its Degree Programs (in rank order).

A. Low or No Cost (in rank order)

1) An initiative should be launched to clarify TA work loads. This initiative requires virtually no resources other than time and commitment. A committee of faculty and graduate students can use shareware polling software to generate a comprehensive and confidential survey of the TA experiences of current students. The aim of the survey should not be to identify any specific faculty or teaching practices for censure, but rather to "map out" the prevailing work practices in the Department. Once the data is collected faculty and graduate students can consider what, if any, specific changes should be undertaken to promote equity across TA assignments. Such reforms need not limit faculty autonomy or establish rigid uniformity in the tasks assigned to graduate students, but instead should establish standard expectations in terms of total hours of TA work across the semester.

2) The Department should act on its Strategic Plan and introduce a coherent “suite” of introductory graduate courses. In the first semester of the graduate program, students should enroll in an introduction to historiography/theory. In their second semester they should take a research seminar in which advanced research methods are taught. In their fourth or fifth semester they should take a dissertation prospectus course, in which they prepare drafts of their prospectuses. If these three courses are introduced, they should have substantial enrollments because they can be inclusive of all sub-disciplinary specializations. Each student’s advisor would be expected to supplement the advice offered by the course’s instructor of record. These courses would provide a common body of knowledge and promote a salutary (but not rigid) uniformity of expectations and experiences across the subfields within the Department’s graduate program.

Note: In the Strategic Plan, the Department proposes separating the dissertation prospectus defense from the PhD comprehensive exams. I understand the logic for separating the two tasks, but I caution that by doing so the Department may slow some students’ progress to degree. If a dissertation prospectus design course is added to the curriculum, students should have ample opportunity to compose an adequate prospectus. And if the 18 month review (discussed below) is added to the requirements, students should be encouraged to begin their PhD
research as quickly as is reasonable and responsible.

3) The Department should consider introducing an 18 month review for ABD graduate students. During the review, which should be conducted by a student’s entire dissertation committee, faculty can evaluate whatever work the student has completed on her/his dissertation (usually at least one-two chapters) and discuss with the student changes in her/his research strategies, dissertation organization, and analysis. The 18 month review provides an important measure of a student’s progress to degree.

4) The Department should consider establishing a Committee on Teaching staffed by graduate students and faculty. The committee could have two important duties. First, and perhaps of most pressing need, it could assume responsibility for the orientation of incoming graduate students. Current graduate students voiced enthusiasm for a more robust orientation that would: 1) address confusion about degree requirements, different types of courses, funding, etc.; and 2) better prepare GTAs for their classroom duties. The Committee on Teaching could offer a one day orientation to the responsibilities of the GTAs and a half day orientation devoted to graduate rules, expectations, and general advice. The graduate student members of the committee, in conjunction with the Director of Graduate Studies, could oversee the half day orientation. During the rest of the academic year the Committee on Teaching could provide periodic informal colloquia for faculty and graduate students on teaching issues and techniques. In this manner the committee could function as a clearinghouse for faculty and graduate students interested in best classroom practices.

Note: Just as the Committee on Teaching could provide graduate students with valuable professional training and advice, participation on search committees will promote student professionalization. The Department should be encouraged to adopt the initiative that is proposed in its Strategic Plan.

5) The Department staff merits special commendation. During my visit I heard only the highest praise for the staff. Indeed, from all appearances, their dedication to the Department is exceptional.

a) Some provisions should be made to enable staff to escape the office during their lunch breaks. Space is obviously at a premium so a staff lunch room may not be feasible. But some reasonable solution that will buffer the staff from faculty and students and provide a respite from telephone duties is needed.

b) The archaic system of book orders should be replaced by an online system.
The amount of redundant and inefficient work that is devoted to book orders can be virtually eliminated by having faculty order books through an online system hosted by the campus bookstore. As best I could discern, the current system is without evident merit and places an especially onerous burden on the Department’s small and already taxed staff.

B. Requiring New Funds or Reallocation of Existing Funds (in rank order)

1) To preserve and build upon its current strengths, the Department should propose a cogent 8 year plan to expand the faculty by between three and eight additional faculty “lines.” The Department provides a preliminary description of its needs in the Strategic Plan. Further clarification of the Department’s hiring needs should offer a clear statement of how hires will broaden the Department’s coverage while deepening its thematic strengths. If new faculty “lines” are committed to targeted hires that simultaneously extend the Department’s temporal and geographical coverage while supplementing thematic clusters within its existing faculty, a comparatively small number of new faculty could have a disproportionately large and positive impact on both the Department’s undergraduate and graduate programs.

2) Some of the new faculty “lines” should address conspicuous lacunae in the Department’s “coverage.” Two hires in Asian history and one hire in African history are immediate needs. These hires could simultaneously complement existing Department strengths. For example, the Department could search for a historian of Africa who works on the African diaspora and/or the Atlantic World. This appointment would align seamlessly with the Department’s strengths in Latin American and southern US history. Such a scholar would immediately contribute to the graduate program while also raising undergraduate interest. The African historian who teaches the undergraduate survey on the Atlantic Slave Trade at UNC-CH routinely attracts 165 students to the class and we could probably enroll as many as 220 students every semester that the class is offered. Likewise, hires in Asian history could be made in thematic specializations (eg., war and society, gender and identity, cultural history) in which the Department currently has core strength.

3) To promote the consolidation of thematic foci in the Department, I recommend that the Department plan and host three major conferences over the next six years; each conference could be devoted to a particular thematic strength in the Department. Faculty in the specific thematic subfields would organize one conference and subsequently would edit the papers presented at the conference by invited presenters,
UA faculty and UA graduate students. The collected papers could be published by a major university press. Each conference and resulting volume would advertise, so to speak, the Department’s faculty and graduate students while also highlighting the Department’s thematic specialization.

Note: These hires will complement the Department’s proposal to “rethink” its PhD fields and to add comparative/thematic fields. I anticipate that most History departments at research universities will organize around multi-dimensional specializations that cut across nation-state boundaries and conventional periodization. The Department should proceed with its Strategic Plan in this regard.

4) New resources should be directed to the graduate program. Modest investments in graduate education will result in more selective admissions and, more important, better placement of graduates, which in turn will elevate the reputation of the program. The Department is already doing a impressive job of training graduate students with resources that are modest by comparison to peer or aspirational peer departments.

a) Graduate stipends need to be raised to at least $15,000. Elite graduate programs in History routinely offer a five year packages with an annual stipend of $18,000-22,000. Comparably generous packages are beyond the resources of most public universities. Nevertheless, public universities must offer the most competitive stipends possible and a stipend of $15,000 would raise the Department to the level of Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, and other programs in the region.

Note: The Department should consider formalizing multi-year funding offers to incoming students. The current system of provisional funding on a year-by-year basis seems to work adequately, but the Department will be more competitive in attracting graduate students and will ease any anxiety that graduate students understandably have about their prospects for funding if it adopts multi-year funding packages. I am unaware of any other peer graduate program that doesn’t offer multi-year funding packages.

b) Graduate students need access to summer funding. In the short-term, expendable funds should be used to provide students with at least one summer’s funding of $2500.00. Eventually, an endowment should be raised so that the Department has an internal and sustainable source of funding to provide summer funds to graduate students. Until then, a one-time summer research award
could be granted to each student after s/he successfully defends her/his dissertation prospectus. The great benefit of summer funding is that it often translates into better dissertations, shorter time to completion of degree, and higher student morale.

5) The faculty needs additional resources in order to sustain their research across their careers. At each stage of their careers, faculty need both resources and institutional flexibility. The recommendations below will promote faculty research and will bring the practices at UA closer to those of peer institutions. All of these recommendations are targeted at professors actively engaged in research and they are fully compatible with the faculty’s teaching obligations.

a) The university’s policies regarding support for (“topping up”) external funding should be clarified. A formula (X% of salary or $X of “top up” every five years) would be very useful for faculty as they plan their grant application cycles. Faculty expressed confusion and frustration with the current policies, which seem overly obscure and/or parsimonious.

b) The research and study (ie, sabbatical) policy should be improved. In particular, junior untenured faculty should have a guaranteed one semester “sabbatical” in order to speed their completion of their first monograph. If a research and study assignment cannot be guaranteed, then the university should develop flexibility in teaching loads so that faculty can “overload” in one semester or academic year in order to “bank” a future reduction in teaching. For scholars who work in a discipline in which the monograph is the principal research objective, a periodic release from teaching is crucial. Moreover, for historians who need access to distant archives and repositories, release from teaching is also critical.

c) More generous and uniform startup funds should be provided for new faculty. By comparison to the startup funds that prevail in many other disciplines, startup funds in History are modest. Instead of ad hoc negotiations with each incoming job recipient, the chair of the Department should offer a uniform package.

d) When faculty are promoted to the associate rank, they should each receive $5,000.00 in research funds. This funding can serve as “seed money” for their next research project, and will likely improve the prospects for associate professors to secure prestigious external funding. In addition, this funding will
expedite the steady progress of junior faculty to the senior ranks.

6) The Department should either use existing funding or seek new funding to appoint an instructor whose duties will include undergraduate advising. Some of the mundane aspects of undergraduate advising are not good uses of faculty time. In addition, routine advising can best be done by someone who specializes in it. Undergraduates, of course, could still seek advice from faculty about courses, career goals, and other substantive questions, but routine transactions could be handled by the departmental advisor.

7) The Department should either use existing funding or seek new funding to appoint a History Department Web Site Content Manager. To achieve the Department’s stated goal in the Strategic Plan to expand and improve its communication with undergraduates, graduate students, and alumni, a substantial and ongoing commitment of time will be required. A faculty member or current staff member cannot be expected to maintain the Department’s web content. Based on the comments of current undergraduates and graduate students there are layers of dated content that need to be revised or removed. A History Department Web Site Content Manager (who might split her/his time as the departmental advisor) could maintain the Department’s web content and also oversee targeted list-servs for faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, and alumni. In essence, this staff member would be the Department’s communications officer.
1. Program Description

Goals

State major goals for the department, as gleaned from its Strategic Plan, assessment activities and reports, completed program review forms, and other available information.

Curriculum

Give a brief description of emphasis in course offerings such as lower division vs. upper division; master’s vs. doctoral; and nature of curriculum in terms of theoretical vs. applied, research vs. service, etc. Include a brief summary of how curriculum assessment is accomplished in the department, how often, and what modifications the department has documented as being made in the most recent revision(s) of the curriculum.

Teaching/Research/Service Mix

Describe relative emphasis among activities in the department.

Goals

The History Department does not list formal overall departmental goals in its Strategic Plan.

The Department of History is central to the research, instructional, and outreach missions of The University of Alabama. It is one of the core departments providing the liberal arts foundation necessary to the education of all University of Alabama students. History’s particular scholarly mission is to preserve, advance, and communicate knowledge of humanity’s past. The mission is carried out through a variety of means, including a combination of research and writing, teaching, and service. The discovery and sharing of knowledge about the human past is at the heart of the Department’s enterprise. The Department of History is committed to being a recognized leader in the advancement of scholarship and embraces its role of preparing and developing future generations of scholars. The Department is also committed to being a leader in the cultivation of historical thinking, both inside the university and through outreach to the broader community. A knowledge of history is
central to developing a humanistic approach to contemporary social problems, and in preparing humanity for the future.

The Department of History has listed a large number of planned initiatives and areas of focus within its Strategic Plan. Summarized within topic area, they are:

- Faculty Productivity
  - Provide greater support to junior faculty during the probationary period (e.g. time-off pre-tenure)
  - Need for a larger travel budget for faculty to present at conferences
  - Change the permitted period for use of start-up funds for new faculty to 3 years
  - Have greater flexibility in assigning teaching loads (e.g. 3-3-0) to permit the scholarly activity needed to advance in rank

- Faculty size and composition
  - To fulfill departmental intentions to be a Research-1 level department, gaps in coverage of content needs to be addressed (e.g., African history; history before the Middle Ages)

- Undergraduate Curriculum Reform and Enrollment Growth
  - Develop a comprehensive plan to understand the causes of fluctuations in numbers of students who major in History
  - Plan to expand the number and range of 300-level courses
  - Clarify information about undergraduate course offerings, including by renumbering courses and articulating the distinction between 300 and 400 level courses

- Enhance undergraduate major
  - Explore expansion of “capstone” courses (HY 430) to extend beyond the current research seminar format
  - Explore options for formal internship opportunities in various fields (e.g. law), beyond the traditional classroom
  - Permanently fund the Peer Mentor program that has been established
  - Propose methods for recruiting and retaining quality students (strengthening ties to University program such as the Honors Program; expanding and promoting study abroad; travel to conferences; change AP equivalents for introductory HY courses)
  - To enhance teaching, have focused, regular meetings to exchange ideas about teaching and to cultivate creative and inventive pedagogy

- Communications and Development
  - Letting students, colleagues, alumni and the wider world know what the department’s “brand” is
  - Need for better in-house communication with the undergraduate majors through print and social media
o Seek to establish more communication with alumni, including inviting distinguished alumni to speak to undergraduates

• Graduate Recruitment and Admissions
  o Improving communication with potential graduate student applicants, and proactively reach out to them
  o Develop a systematic strategy for hosting prospective students
  o Develop strategies for targeted recruitment of top students, including offering longer-term funding packages

• Graduate Curriculum and Degree Requirements
  o Limit the number of 500-level “slash” courses taken by graduate students
  o Add a required historiography course in the first semester of graduate study
  o Reconsider the advising system for graduate students, including having dissertation committees serve an advising role
  o Consider changing the M.A. comprehensive exams, making discussion of the revised seminar paper a more central part of the exam
  o Encourage language training at the M.A. level
  o Consider reducing the number of credit hours required for completion of the PhD program
  o Consider separating presentation of the dissertation prospectus from the Ph.D. comprehensive exams
  o Rethinking the Ph.D. fields to add new comparative and/or thematic fields
  o Exploring whether to extend the deadline for completion of the Ph.D. degree from 7 to 8 years

• Graduate Student Productivity and Professionalism
  o Establish departmental goal to have revised seminar papers submitted as articles to professional journal
  o Provide better teacher-training to graduate students
  o Expand teaching opportunities for graduate students to teach beyond the survey level courses
  o Assist graduate students in preparing for the job market by delivering mock job talks
  o Consider including a graduate student member on departmental search committees
  o Make graduate students aware of alternate career fields in areas such as public history and publishing

Curriculum

Undergraduate:

The Department of History delivers undergraduate courses that serve towards the completion of the major (B.A.) and minor concentrations in History. Departmental honors are also available to students who qualify for the honors program.

The major concentration requires 36 hours of coursework which must include HY 101,
105 or 110; HY 102 or 106; HY 203 or 205; HY 204 or 206 and HY 430 (UG Research Seminar), plus a 9-credit Field requirement (fields: United States History, European History, or African, Asian or Latin American History), and 12 credits of History electives, as stated in the most recent UA Undergraduate catalog. As noted in the report by Dr. W. Fitzhugh Brundage, external consultant: “The recent addition of a capstone research seminar to the curriculum for [undergraduate] majors underscores the Department’s commitment to offering a rigorous major.” He then adds: “Rather than an inefficient luxury, such limited enrollment research-intensive seminars are one of the most important fora in which undergraduates can engage in sustained and original critical analysis.” The Committee agrees with Dr. Brundage’s assessment.

Options for students in History also include a 36-credit hour Honors track with rigorous requirements for the GPA and the “satisfactory completion of a thesis judged to merit an honors designation.”

Regarding UG courses/sections offered over an 8-year period covering 2005-2012, overall numbers of courses from 100- through 400-level offered have waned and waxed slightly (with a low of 32 courses and a high of 39); however, the overall number of sections has grown without pause, from 130 sections in 2005 to 192 sections in 2012; a 48% increase in the number of UG sections offered. In terms of percentages, the preponderance of courses/sections offered are lower division courses.

**Graduate:**

The Department of History offers two graduate degrees: the M.A. and the Ph.D. degrees. The curricula have distinct though related goals.

The M.A. in History is comprised of two separate tracks: the first (“Plan I”) requires 24 credit hours of coursework in history plus a Master’s thesis (6 credit hours of HY 599), and an oral examination based on coursework and the thesis.; the second (“Plan II”) requires 30 credit hours of coursework in history in which the student must prepare and revise a research seminar paper as part of the Master’s oral exam. Both tracks place important emphasis on developing students’ research capabilities and output, as evidenced by course offerings and by exit requirements for the degree. Of note, too, is the requirement that students must demonstrate reading proficiency in at least one foreign language prior to being admitted to sit for the M.A. Oral Exam.

*All incoming graduate students (whether M.A. or Ph.D.) must take at least two of the basic historiography courses (HY 601/HY 602 Literature of American History, HY 603 Literature of European history, and HY 605 Literature of Latin American History) as part of their degree program, unless specifically exempted by the Graduate
The Ph.D. in History requires a total of 54 hours of graduate coursework; credit hours accumulated for the Master’s degree, including those accepted for transfer from other institutions, are included in this total. The History Ph.D. is offered in United States history, history of the South, modern British and European history, Latin American history, or military and naval history, and these divisions are further divided into eight fields, as cited in the most current Graduate Catalog and the “Strategic Plan”. The doctoral fields represent faculty’s long-standing research strengths: United States history to 1877; United States history since 1877; History of the South; British and European history, 1485 to 1815; British and European history, 1815 to present; Latin American history to 1810; Latin American history since 1810; Military and naval history.

Ph.D. students will focus on four fields of history, with at least two, but not more than three, related to the same geographic area (U.S., Europe, or Latin America). The student must earn at least 12 hours of graduate credit in each of the four fields. An additional 6 hours of graduate credit must be earned beyond the 48 hours of history distributed in fields. These credits may be earned (a) in a field outside the history department; (b) in history, but in fields not presented for the Ph.D.; or (c) in history, but as additional hours in one or more of the fields presented for the Ph.D. In most cases, doctoral candidates will be required to have reading proficiency in two foreign languages; any language and/or special skill requirements must be met prior to scheduling the comprehensive examinations.

Students in History will acquire the Ph.D. having passed a written comprehensive examination and an oral examination, and subsequently upon the successful presentation and defense of the doctoral dissertation.

Regarding GR courses/sections offered over the same 8-year period (2005-2012), the overall number of courses offered at the 500- and 600-level has decreased by 20% (from a total of 20 in 2005 to 16 in 2012) while the number of sections offered has remained approximately the same. Noteworthy is the fact that while, in 2005, the number of master’s level courses offered was greater than course offerings at the doctoral level, this trend evened out in 2007 and then decisively turned in the ensuing years. The number of courses/sections offered each year is now greater at the doctoral level, which seems to support the comment in the “Strategic Plan” that “[t]he department recognizes that 600-level courses are preferable for graduate education” (p.11).
Curriculum Assessment:

The Department of History has a Standing Committee for Undergraduate Affairs and one for Graduate Affairs both of which, the Review Committee assumes, regularly discuss and assess issues regarding curriculum. Beyond this, it seems evident from the detailed “Strategic Plan” that curricular issues have been discussed at length and continue to be discussed by the entire faculty. Indeed, the faculty have agreed upon a number of initiatives regarding undergraduate and graduate programs (e.g., enrollments, enhancements, communication, advising, degree requirements, professionalization of graduate students) that they will be seeking to implement in the coming years. (The Review Committee lists the Department’s assessment and proposed curriculum initiatives in detail in Section 1 under “Goals”: see Undergraduate Curriculum Reform and Enrollment Growth, and Graduate Curriculum and Degree Requirements.) Since the last program review the Department has implemented changes in the undergraduate curriculum, such as the introduction of HY 430 (“Undergraduate Research Seminar”) which serves to enhance the research emphasis in undergraduate learning. Furthermore, the Department has made good strides in better integrating the M.A. and Ph.D. programs since the last review.

Teaching/Research/Service Mix

- There are 27 total tenured/tenure-track faculty (7 Professors; 10 Associate Professors; 10 Assistant Professors) and 3 Full-Time Temporary Instructors. In addition, the History Department employs 17 Part-Time Temporary Instructors. Teaching loads are as follows:
  
  o The standard workload for tenured/tenure-track faculty in the Department is a 2/2 course distribution per academic year (thereby rendering a Teaching/Research/Service mix of .40/.40/.20 FTE). Tenure-track and tenured faculty members teach a combination of graduate and undergraduate (typically upper-division) courses.

  o The standard workload for faculty who are Full-time Temporary Instructors in the Department is a 4/4 (.80 FTE) course distribution per academic year.

  o Six members of the faculty carry reduced teaching loads:

      i. Dr. Kari Frederickson, who as Chair receives a one course teaching load reduction per semester (thereby carrying a 1/1 load);

      ii. The Director of Graduate Studies (Dr. John Giggie) and the Director
of Undergraduate Studies (Dr. James Mixon), who are assigned a 2/1 teaching load or, alternatively, a 2/2 load with stipend;

iii. Endowed chairholder, Dr. George Rabel, who carries a 1/1 load;

iv. Director of the Summersell Center, Dr. Joshua Rothman, who is assigned a 2/1 teaching load;

v. University Research Professor, Dr. Tony Freyer, who teaches 1/1 in History and 1/1 at the UA School of Law.

Service: Advising is considered part of the .20 FTE service component of faculty appointments in the History Department. All faculty advise undergraduate History majors. Each faculty member has approximately 15 majors. Faculty meet with their advisees during the two-week advising period in the fall and spring semesters.

2. Description of the Program Review Process

Briefly describe committee membership, documents and information reviewed, interviews conducted, and any other relevant factors in the process.

Members of the History Program Review Committee are Dr. Burcu Keskin, Associate Professor, Information Systems, Statistics, and Management Science; Dr. John Lochman, Professor, Psychology; and Dr. Barbara Godorecci, Associate Professor, Modern Languages and Classics (chair). In August 2013, the Committee met with Dr. John Schmitt, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, in order to receive a portion of the Academic Review materials and to go over procedures for the upcoming review. Deans Olin and Dorr, Dr. Kari Frederickson, Chair of the History Department, Mr. Jason Phillips, Ms. Julia McAdams, and Ms. A T Mickle (OIR) were also in attendance at this initial orientation meeting.

The committee reviewed documents submitted by the History Department along with “Student Satisfaction Survey Reports” (UG and GR) and additional supporting documents provided by the Office for Academic Affairs. The “Student Satisfaction Survey Report” provides a synopsis of the responses to questionnaires administered to graduating seniors and graduate students in the Department. A total of 21 graduating seniors out of 142 graduates (approximately 15%) responded to the Graduating Senior Survey, while 23 graduate students (8 MA; 15 PhD) of a total 61 majors (approximately
38%) responded to the *Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey*, as documented in the above-cited report. In addition, the committee held meetings with all interested stakeholders in the department, as specified by the guidelines for the review:

In August, committee members met with Provost Joe Benson; Dr. David Francko, Associate Provost/Dean of the Graduate School; Dean Robert Olin and Associate Dean Lisa Dorr of the College of Arts and Sciences. The committee then met with Dr. Kari Frederickson, department chair, in early September.

Upon his arrival on campus in October, the committee met with Dr. W. Fitzhugh Brundage, the external consultant for this review. Dr. Brundage is Chair of the Department of History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Dr. Brundage was a key source of information regarding the status of History Departments, and of the profession, in the United States. His insights into the present status of the History Department at UA aided the committee in placing in a broader context the discussions that had already ensued with the Chair and the group of Professors in the department, and in preparing to meet and conduct interesting and productive conversations with the rest of the faculty and students.

In addition, the committee invited all interested faculty (tenured/tenure-track, FTTIs, PTTIs), graduate students, and undergraduates to meet with them either individually or in groups. Throughout the month of October the committee met separately with the following groups: Professors (5), Associate Professors (6), Assistant Professors (10), Full-Time Instructors (1), Part-time Instructors (1), graduate students (approximately 30), and undergraduates (5). All of these discussions, from the perspective of the committee, had been engaging, informative, and collegial.

The Review Committee’s draft report was submitted to Dr. John Schmitt on February 7, 2014.

---

### 3. Program Evaluation

**Quality**

Discuss things such as number of faculty, their assignments, qualifications, productivity, and other indicators of quality. Discuss quality of students as may be indicated by admissions scores, GPA, student recognition, acceptance to graduate
schools, success in graduate programs, or career achievements of graduates. Additional items for discussion may include grade distribution in courses; physical facilities, space and other resources available; computer access; library holdings, etc. You also may include information related to program recognition such as accreditation, state/regional/national competitions, unique comparative advantages of programs, etc. Information from sources such as student performance on licensure/certification examinations, external examiner reports, student satisfaction surveys, exit interviews, or follow-up studies also may be included. Not all of these items must be addressed; they are examples.

**Distinguishing Characteristics of the Department and its Programs**

This is a brief discussion and should not duplicate what is included in the section on Quality. The committee may wish to discuss semester credit hour production, number of majors, number of degrees awarded at various levels, or any other measures that the committee feels distinguish the department and its programs. You might include discussion of past trends and future projections, as well as factors affecting enrollment, such as career opportunities. If relevant, discuss any specific relationships with business, industry, government, etc., as well as program relationships with other departments within the University or with other institutions of higher education.

**Departmental Assessment Activities**

The committee is asked to read the assessment attachments to the General Information form (Form 2) and the analysis and recommendations by the Assistant to the Provost for Assessment. Offer any additional thoughts on the department’s assessment activities from your perspectives as experienced faculty from disciplines outside the department under review.

**Tenure and Promotion Guidelines**

Provide a brief evaluation of the department’s tenure and promotion guidelines.

**Quality**

The Department of History enjoys a positive, collegial atmosphere. The faculty gets along well. The Department is comprised of 7 Full Professors, 10 Associate Professors, and 10 Assistant Professors, along with 3 Full-Time Temporary Instructors and 17 Part-Time Temporary Instructors. Approximately 30% of the faculty is female. In
addition, there are 26 GTA lines, with approximately half of the graduate students supported by some sort of funding. The Department is dedicated to work/life balance and is supportive of a family friendly workplace.

The last program review was conducted a decade ago (March 2004). However, some of the issues raised in the last review are still valid, including:

- impending faculty retirements, especially among the cadre of Full Professors;
- lack of faculty to cover all historical fields with breadth;
- placement (employment) of graduate students at peer institutions;
- communication among students and faculty: better in-house communication with the undergraduate majors and graduate students regarding, for example, degree requirements, relevance of foreign language study, time to graduation, comprehensive exams, better teacher training (the last three pertaining to graduate students).

Over the last decade, the Department of History has seen an increase in enrollments as has the rest of the University, though this has been at the undergraduate level. Undergraduate enrollment increased 50% between 2005-2012 (from 356 to 533) whereas the Masters and Ph.D. enrollment remained level. A similar trend ensued for degrees awarded at the graduate level, whereas there is an 80% increase of undergraduate degrees awarded over the same period (from 79 to 142) [OIRA Report Tables 2 and 3]. The Department has handled this increase remarkably well without having to compromise the quality of instruction. Given the limited number of faculty, the Department has done its best to offer adequate course coverage with interesting topics.

The Department of History students’ average ACT scores show an overall increase ranging from 23.93 in 2005 to 24.84 in 2012. History students’ GPAs, from 2005 to 2012, showed a slight increase from 2.91 to 3.05. These are indications that the Department of History attracts a consistently academically solid group of students to its program. Examination of the ratios of assigned grades (A, B, C, D, F, W) in lower-division History courses across a time period spanning from 2005 to 2012 showed an overall decrease across time, whereas the “Course GPA” category shows an upswing, from 2.46 in 2005 to 2.68 in 2012, an indication that although the number of students enrolled in lower-division courses has nearly doubled (from 4783 to 9130), the quality of student achievement has effectively increased. (*N.B.: There is a very sharp increase—from 1.5% to 34.9%—in the category, “OTH”; *this category remains unexplained in the tables provided by OIRA.) Upper-division courses follow a different
trajectory: evidence compiled by the OIRA shows a clear increase in “A” and “B” grades in the same eight-year period, with a slight decrease in “C” grades, and a rather dramatic decrease in “D-F-W” grades. Here too, the “Course GPA” rises, from 2.72 in 2005 to 3.01 in 2012. In this case, student enrollments in upper-division courses have increased by approximately 41% (from 1210 to 1706) and the quality of student achievement has increased as well. (*N.B.: the category labeled “OTH” remains virtually unchanged overall between 2005-2012 for upper-division.)*

The *Graduating Senior Survey* included a 15% response rate of graduates from the Department of History (21 students), which seems a bit low. A majority of these students reported that the Department of History faculty expressed interest in their progress and development, and showed care about their academic success; in fact, 95% report that the overall quality of the major in History was good to excellent. Over 90% of History majors reporting an opinion said that their instruction and quality was good to excellent and provided a sound preparation for graduate and professional school.

During the last decade, the graduate enrollment stayed steady. The Department of History students’ average GRE scores remain stable overall for the period covering 2005 through 2012. During this period, the average GRE score for Master’s admissions is 1185 and the average GRE score for Ph.D. admissions is 1209. [OIRA Report Table 6]. For Master’s, over the years, the quality of admissions stayed quite level, despite random fluctuations. However, for Ph.D. admission, there is an interesting observation for years 2006 and 2009: the average GRE score is 1294. If we take these two years out of the statistics calculation, the average GRE score for Ph.D. admissions becomes inline with the Master’s admission. The department should identify how they attracted such higher quality students in 2006 and 2009 and try to replicate it in the coming years. Both scores reflect the quality of students admitted into the graduate History programs.
Information regarding grade distribution for graduate level courses analogous to that provided for undergraduate courses is not included in the OIRA report. Approximately 38% of graduate students from the Department of History responded to the Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey (23 students), a much more substantive showing with respect to the undergraduate respondents. Department and Program strengths as delineated by the graduate students interviewed by the Committee include: “faculty support; good funding opportunities; collegial atmosphere; professional opportunities (Southern Historian; annual Graduate Conference); flexibility: thematic fields; broad GTA experiences; plenty of teaching opportunities in the summer.” [cited from handout provided by graduate students during Committee interview.]

The faculty is quite productive. The publications/Faculty rate stayed at reasonably high levels: the average number of publications rate is 0.33:1. Furthermore, most of the publications are in the form of single-authored books: the average number of books per faculty is 0.14:1 over the last five years.

Distinguishing Characteristics of the Department and its Programs
The distinguishing characteristics of the Department of History fall into several key areas.

First, the department is clearly dedicated to its educational mission, with a strong commitment to undergraduate and graduate teaching. The standard faculty teaching load is 2/2. The Undergraduate Director and Graduate Director each teach a 2/1 load, or 2/2 with a stipend. The Department Chair has a 1/1 teaching load, along with the Charles G. Summersell Chair in Southern History, Dr. George Rabel, and University Research Professor, Dr. Tony Freyer (who also carries a 1/1 teaching load in the UA School of Law). The Director of the Frances S. Summersell Center for the Study of the South, Dr. Joshua Rothman, is assigned a 2/1 teaching load. The inclusion of capstone courses, while time-consuming for faculty, represent a clear effort to insure that undergraduate students acquire key conceptual, writing and methodological skills important for establishing their advanced skills in their discipline. The Department has responded to the large increase in undergraduate students over the past decade by thoughtfully mixing larger classes with smaller discussion groups in effective ways, and by continually evaluating its mixture of lower and upper division courses. Undergraduate majors are very positive about the teaching faculty, and the ability to interact in meaningful ways with them. At the graduate level, the inclusion of the student research conferences/seminars have been well-received by the students, and permit them to develop their thinking about topics important for their graduate development in sophisticated and challenging ways.

Second, the Department is doing well at placing its graduate students into appropriate types of positions. Five of the last seven graduates have taken tenure-track jobs. Consistent with its ongoing focus on the development of its graduate program, the Department is actively thinking of other ways to enhance graduate students’ placement into history-related positions in settings outside of traditional academic sites.

Third, the Department is committed to high quality academic scholarship in their discipline. Faculty members are overall publishing at a solid rate, and have published books that have received strong external reviews and notice. They are perceived to be a scholarly department, with notable strengths in Southern History, military history, and in European history. However, some of these strengths may not be as visible to others outside of the University as they could be; the external reputation of the department strengths as a whole may be less than for key individual faculty members.

Fourth, the faculty members have strong functional relations, with collegial and
sociable interactions. They seem to be able to discuss conflicts in open and constructive ways, and to jointly plan for the future of the Department. The collegiality of the Department has positive effects on graduate students as well.

Fifth, the faculty and students have very positive relations with the departmental staff, who are perceived to be “awesome.”

**Departmental Assessment Activities**

The Department’s Detailed Assessment Report has been reviewed by Dr. Smallwood (Assistant to the Provost for Assessment) and by Dr. Brundage (the external consultant). Strengths noted include the breadth of the learning objectives for the undergraduate degree program (which indicate a comprehensive body of knowledge and skills), the focus on discipline-specific content knowledge for the M.A. Degree program, and the quality of learning objectives and measurement approaches that are appropriately rigorous for the Ph.D. Degree program.

Improvements can include:

- use of more frequent assessments targeted at assessing specific skills as opposed to one comprehensive assessment in classes. For the undergraduate and Master’s programs, learning objectives can be stated in concise measurable terms, and rubrics can be added that can identify students’ specific strengths and shortcomings.
- department-wide emphasis on continual assessment will permit students to understand faculty expectations
- results need to be posted for three degree program outcomes (quality; enrollment; value), for all three program levels (B.A.; M.A.; Ph.D.)
- considering additional methods for measuring the quality of doctoral dissertations (from Dr. Smallwood’s Critique)

**Tenure and Promotion Guidelines**

The Review Committee concurs with Dr. Brundage (external consultant) that the Tenure and Promotion guidelines for the Department of History are rigorous and on par with those found at peer and aspirational institutions. The Committee notes that the faculty in History still overwhelmingly agrees that the primary form of research publication, in particular for earning tenure and/or promotion, is the monograph. Nevertheless, a few members of the faculty along with the external consultant, while in conversation with the Committee, recognized that this reality of the monograph as
cornerstone of scholarly research in history: 1) might be changing (e.g., digital humanities); or 2) might be different in certain fields of history (e.g., those fields of history that might explore science or technology). The language of the current Tenure and Promotion guidelines takes into account that “professional standing results primarily from the publication of research findings in the form of books and articles” [Form 2, Attachment 4], which is a broad and inclusive statement. One question might be: does the evolving nature of the discipline or the broadening scope of historical inquiry (represented by the diversity of hires currently in the Department) warrant any new or further language in the Tenure and Promotion guidelines that speaks to changes in the profession regarding research?

4. Strengths

Strengths of the department and its degree programs (numbered list in rank order).

The description below has been drawn together as a result of the conversations held by the Review Committee with students, faculty, University administrators and the external consultant concerning the strengths of the Department of History.

As a preface to the points of strength enumerated below, it is important to note that there is a concrete consensus on the part of all of the administrators interviewed--Provost, Graduate Dean, Dean of A&S--that the Department of History is both a “good” and a “strong” department.

1. Faculty

- Teaching—acknowledged strength in teaching; “strong commitment to teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level” on the part of the faculty (Brundage). Undergraduate and graduate student feedback from surveys confirm this assertion. Undergraduate students interviewed remarked on the fact that faculty in History are generally considered “fair graders” and “approachable,” while graduate students remark that faculty are very supportive of students intellectually.
- Research—there is across-the-board consensus among University administrators that the faculty in the Department of History produce “solid scholarship,” that junior faculty are “exciting to watch,” and that
senior faculty are “extremely strong in scholarship.” From Dr. Brundage: “The Department has a clear commitment to research across all disciplinary subfields.” Remarks from faculty echo this sentiment, albeit with a sobering note of recognition: “All incredibly productive people in spite of lack of funding support.”

- Administration
  - leadership—The Department has an “excellent chair”; consensus on part of faculty and administrators interviewed.
- Excellent new hires
- Academic mentoring—particularly on the graduate level. Graduate students comment on the openness and availability of faculty to engage in matters of scholarship and research.

2. **Graduate Program**—despite graduate numbers that are at viability level but not above, which indicates that the Department faces an ongoing challenge “to keep its head above water” in terms of ACHE viability, there are certainly strengths to be noted in the M.A. and Ph.D. programs, which include these important opportunities for professionalization of graduate students, and enhancement of the graduate experience:

- Graduate History Association Conference (“Power and Struggle”), which attracts 30-50 participants each year from UA and other universities nationally;
- The journal, *Southern Historian*—an annual academic journal edited and published by the graduate students in History;
- Summersell Center Lectures—the Center sponsors more than ten events annually. Professor Rothman also has established research fellowships for visiting scholars, a biannual book prize, and will soon embark on a digital humanities project;
- quality and interest of thematic courses (e.g., Gender/Women’s history; History of Race/Slavery; History of the Atlantic World; Religious History).

3. **Programs of excellence**—Dr. F. Brundage lists three programs in his report: “history of the American South, military history, and western European history.” Committee members have discussed this topic with the external consultant and defer to his professional assessment.

4. **Undergraduate Program**—enrollments are strong at the UG level and overall student confidence in the value of an undergraduate degree in History:

- *Peer Mentor Program*—the Department sponsors a peer mentor program for students in HY 101, “The History of Western Civilization to 1648”. The
Program’s immediate goal has been to reduce the percentage of students who drop, fail, or withdraw from the course (D-F-W). Twelve peer leaders enroll in a one-credit leadership course; attend weekly meetings to discuss course policies, learning strategies and outcomes for each discussion section; attend discussion sections, and regularly interact with struggling students, formally and informally to help them improve. This appears to be an important initiative, which has already obtained tangible results. It is well worth supporting in the future.

- **Phi Alpha Theta Honor Society**—the Department boasts an active chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, the national history honor society. One of the chapter’s most successful activities has been the annual Career Day Workshop for Undergraduate History Majors. Organized by Associate Professor Jimmy Mixson, Director of Undergraduate Studies, invited speakers introduce students to opportunities in the areas of publishing and public history, as well as share information about graduate studies in History, Law, and Business. These activities through the honor society represent an important outreach component for undergraduate majors in the Department.

5. **Bankhead Endowment**—the Bankhead fund makes it possible for the Department of History to engage in a wide range of scholarly programming that is open to the public. It also allows the Department to support the programming of other departments through co-sponsorship. Noteworthy is the fact that since 2002 the Department of History has funded three postdoctoral fellows through the endowment.

6. **Staff**: “awesome”—this seems to be the unequivocal consensus of faculty and students. 100% of graduate students surveyed in the *Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey* responded that departmental staff are helpful.

---

5. **Recommendations**

**Recommendations to Improve the Department and its Degree Programs (numbered list in rank order).**

A. Low or No Cost (in rank order)

1. Have greater flexibility in assigning teaching loads (3-3-0) to permit the scholarly activity needed to advance in rank.
a. The Department proposes “that after a designated number of years in rank, faculty be allowed to teach overloads in two consecutive semesters, with research leave in the third (3-3-0)” [Strategic Plan, p.5]. The Committee considers this a proactive approach to addressing issues of faculty research and productivity well worth considering.

2. Adopt a more uniform start-up policy for Assistant Professors
   a. Change the permitted period for use of start-up funds for new faculty from two years to 3 years

3. Enhancement of graduate student program
   a. GTA teaching loads—too many students and/or too many hours
   b. Time to degree: Ph.D.—too long, too little support
   c. Assist graduate students in preparing for the job market by delivering mock job talks; make graduate students aware of alternate career fields in areas such as public history and publishing.
   d. Limit the number of 500-level “slash” courses taken by graduate students
   e. Add a required historiography course in the first semester of graduate study; consider including courses on advanced research methods and on the dissertation prospectus in later years.
   f. Consider an 18 month review for ABD graduate students.

4. Enhancement of undergraduate program
   a. Need for better in-house communication with the undergraduate majors through print and social media (e.g., clarify information about undergraduate course offerings, including by renumbering courses and articulating the distinction between 300 and 400 level courses; clarify importance of acquiring a second language, especially in preparation for graduate study).
   b. Consider expanding capstone course (HY430) to extend beyond the current research session format; consider expanding the range of 300 level courses.

5. “Brand”: how does the Department want to be perceived by the broader profession? Letting students, colleagues, alumni and the wider world know what the Department’s “brand” is.
   a. Seek to establish more communication with alumni, including inviting distinguished alumni to speak to undergraduates. This could lead to possibilities for support/internships vis-à-vis stronger ties with alumni.

6. Four-year course rotation: could lower overall teaching load in the Department

7. Consider including a graduate student representative on departmental search committees and at department meetings; this form of inclusion represents
added opportunities for professionalization of graduate students and more direct communication between faculty and graduate students.

8. External funding—History “can do more” to attain grants.
   a. Faculty in History have received grants (as in the case of the most recent award of an NEH grant to Dr. Margaret Abruzzo). An ongoing effort to obtain external funding for faculty members’ scholarly work should be maintained, reinforced, and supported not only by the Department but also by the College of Arts & Sciences (e.g., provide additional funds to travel account for faculty members who have submitted grant applications; support faculty released-time in order to complete research).

9. Consider options for more collaboration with other departments and programs, with regards to cross-listing courses, team-teaching collaborative courses, and hiring new faculty who can contribute to the scholarly and teaching work across several disciplines.

10. In order to enhance communication with temporary faculty, include temporary faculty in at least portions of faculty meetings.

B. Requiring New Funds or Reallocation of Existing Funds (in rank order)

1. Demographics: faculty retirements and new hiring; “Full Professor ranks will be thin in the near future.” Goal: to move from 27—>35 faculty lines.
   a. the new hires can further enhance the thematic strengths of the Department
      -->The department lacks proper number of faculty as well as proper coverage of geographical regions and chronological timeline. The faculty lines should be brought up to the levels of peer institutions: that should be around 35 faculty lines.

2. To fulfill departmental intentions to be a Research-I level department, gaps in coverage of content need to be addressed (e.g., African history; Asian history; history before the Middle Ages). New hires should be sought in these areas.

3. Consolidation of thematic foci and promotion of visibility of the department: funding from College to sponsor conferences (e.g., three conferences in 3 years), focussing on the thematic strengths of the Department; accompanying publication as part of the initiative.

4. Funding for graduate assistantships (should be increased to at least $15,000; five years of funding [Brundage]).

5. Provide greater support to junior faculty during the probationary period (e.g. time-off pre-tenure; sufficient and uniform startup funding).
6. Support for travel: Need for a larger travel budget for faculty to present at conferences.

7. Diversity:
   a. The Department should continue pursuing the hire of women and minority faculty;
   b. the College should assist in offering competitive hiring packages (salary et al.) to promising minority candidates.

8. Permanently fund the Peer Mentor program that has been established.

9. Space: “always an issue”; “office space is a problem”.

10. Thematic approach to teaching—thematic clusters
    a. Title VI centers for area studies (e.g., Russian History, Latin-American Studies, Asian studies). Promote interdisciplinary approach to providing instruction. Rethinking the Ph.D. fields to add new comparative and/or thematic fields
    b. Title III funding for Latin-American Studies—this initiative could involve several departments/programs along with the Department of History, including Languages and Art History.

11. Appoint a History Department Web Site Manager, to update information about the Department promptly and to improve communication with undergraduate students, graduate students, and alumni.
ACTION PLAN
Committee Recommendation A.1

(low-cost)

Have greater flexibility in assigning teaching loads (3-3-0) to permit the scholarly activity needed to advance in rank.

The Department proposes “that after a designated number of years in rank, faculty be allowed to teach overloads in two consecutive semesters, with research leave in the third (3-3-0)” [Strategic Plan, p.5]. The Committee considers this a proactive approach to addressing issues of faculty research and productivity well worth considering.

| Action(s) | Craft a proposal for Dean requesting that chair be given the flexibility to assign 3-3-0 teaching load to associate and full professors after a to-be-determined-number of years in rank. Teaching loads would be staggered in such a way that only one individual would be awarded a teaching load of 0 in any given semester. Individual will also be awarded a small research grant from the Bankhead research fund. |
| Responsible Person(s) | Department Chair |
| Timeline to Completion | Proposal to Dean September 1, 2014 -- in advance of 2015-2016 course scheduling |
| Comments | To enhance the reputation of our department, we need to give associates time off to complete their second books. Department demographics are such that associates are assuming a great service and administrative burden, slowing them on their pursuit of their next promotion. This research leave would come several years after the typical post-tenure/promotion sabbatical and would provide much needed time to finish the required second book. |

Committee Recommendation A.2

(low-cost)

Adopt a more uniform start-up policy for Assistant Professors

Change the permitted period for use of start-up funds for new faculty from two years to 3 years

| Action(s) | Submit proposal to Dean asking that new faculty be given three years to spend their start-up funds |
| Responsible Person(s) | Department Chair |
| Timeline to Completion | September 1, 2014 |
The revision of a dissertation into a book manuscript requires additional research, often in distant archives. This research often can only be undertaken during the summer months. If additional research must be undertaken at the request of manuscript reviewers, this research must be undertaken during the third summer of employment. Allowing new faculty three years to spend their start up would help this process.

It is not clear what “uniform start-up policy” means. The current policy is uniform; we would simply like the time period in which the funds can be spent to be longer.

Committee Recommendation A.3

(low-cost)

Enhancement of graduate student program

a. GTA teaching loads—too many students and/or too many hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See consultant recommendation/response A-1; Director of Graduate Studies will acquire appropriate comparative data on peer institutions from Graduate School and OIRA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Director of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Time to degree: Ph.D.—too long, too little support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See consultant recommendation/response A-3, B-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Assist graduate students in preparing for the job market by delivering mock job talks; make graduate students aware of alternate career fields in areas such as public history and publishing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Continue current practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
d. Limit the number of 500-level “slash” courses taken by graduate students.

Action(s) | All 500-level “slash” courses must be approved by Director of Graduate Studies. DGS is in the process of culling all superfluous 500s that drain enrollment from 600-level courses.
---|---
Responsible Person(s) | Director of Graduate Studies
Timeline to Completion | 
Comments | This is already in place.

e. Add a required historiography course in the first semester of graduate study; consider including courses on advanced research methods and on the dissertation prospectus in later years.

Action(s) | See response to Consultant Recommendation A.2
---|---
Responsible Person(s) | 
Timeline to Completion | 
Comments | 

f. Consider an 18 month review for ABD graduate students.

Action(s) | See response to Consultant Recommendation A.3
---|---
Responsible Person(s) | 
Timeline to Completion | 
Comments | 

Committee Recommendation A.4

(low-cost)
Enhancement of undergraduate program

a. Need for better in-house communication with the undergraduate majors through print and social media (e.g., clarify information about undergraduate course offerings, including by renumbering courses and articulating the distinction between 300 and 400 level courses; clarify importance of acquiring a second language, especially in preparation for graduate study).

| Action(s) | See response to Committee Recommendation A.5; the Department has already renumbered the American Civ surveys and will deliberate on how best to articulate the distinction between 300- and 400-level courses. The Committee will revise the internal advising workshop to advise history majors that the language route, rather than the computer science route, is the better option for those aspiring to graduate study in history. |
| Responsible Person(s) | Director of Undergraduate Studies |
| Timeline to Completion | Spring 2015 |

b. Consider expanding capstone course (HY430) to extend beyond the current research session format; consider expanding the range of 300 level courses.

| Action(s) | Solicit information from faculty regarding the structure of HY 430; create template for course schedule that increases courses offered at the 300 level. |
| Responsible Person(s) | Director of Undergraduate Studies; Undergraduate Affairs Committee; Department Chair |
| Timeline to Completion | HY 430 - Spring 2017 Expanding HY 300s: Begin Fall 2014 |
| Comments | The Department has discussed the first issue in this recommendation over the past few months. While there is currently division over how to proceed, the undergraduate committee plans to solicit ideas regarding the structure of the HY 430 requirement. |

Committee Recommendation A.5

(low-cost)

“Brand”: how does the Department want to be perceived by the broader profession? Letting students, colleagues, alumni and the wider world know what the Department’s “brand” is.

Seek to establish more communication with alumni, including inviting distinguished alumni to speak to undergraduates. This could lead to possibilities for support/internships vis-à-vis stronger ties with alumni.

| Action(s) | Develop a long-term communication and promotional plan for dissemination to potential majors, alumni, and other departments. |
Committee Recommendation A.6

*(low-cost)*

**Four-year course rotation: could lower overall teaching load in the Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Department does not support this recommendation. Given the structure of our curriculum and major, it is not practical and would not achieve the desired outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation A.7

*(low-cost)*

**Consider including a graduate student representative on departmental search committees and at department meetings; this form of inclusion represents added opportunities for professionalization of graduate students and more direct communication between faculty and graduate students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Department supports this recommendation for search committees but not for department meetings. Graduate Affairs Committee will develop procedure for choosing graduate student committee member.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Director of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>First student to be appointed in Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Given the confidential nature of many discussions undertaken at department meetings, we do not support the involvement of a graduate student in those meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Recommendation A.8

(low-cost)

External funding—History “can do more” to attain grants.

Faculty in History have received grants (as in the case of the most recent award of an NEH grant to Dr. Margaret Abruzzo). An ongoing effort to obtain external funding for faculty members’ scholarly work should be maintained, reinforced, and supported not only by the Department but also by the College of Arts & Sciences (e.g., provide additional funds to travel account for faculty members who have submitted grant applications; support faculty released-time in order to complete research).

| Action(s) | Department will hold a series of workshops on locating and applying for grants, as well as on new software, such as Pivot |
| Responsible Person(s) | Department Chair |
| Timeline to Completion | Begin Fall 2014; ongoing |
| Comments | Roughly one-quarter of all History faculty have attended the grant-writing workshops sponsored by the College. |

Committee Recommendation A.9

(low-cost)

Consider options for more collaboration with other departments and programs, with regards to cross-listing courses, team-teaching collaborative courses, and hiring new faculty who can contribute to the scholarly and teaching work across several disciplines.

| Action(s) | Will meet with other chairs to explore opportunities to cross-list, team teach, and propose joint appointments. |
| Responsible Person(s) | Department Chair |
| Timeline to Completion | April 2015 |
| Comments | The Department currently has four faculty who regularly crosslist their courses. It also has two additional faculty who are joint hires with other Departments. A joint hire with Gender and Race Studies, for example, could be a way in which to acquire a historian of Africa. |

Committee Recommendation A.10

(low-cost)
In order to enhance communication with temporary faculty, include temporary faculty in at least portions of faculty meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Do not support/proposal to meet with temporary faculty once per semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair; Director of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Begin fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Although communication with temporary instructors is critical, including these instructors in “portions of faculty meetings” is not practical. We lack the space to accommodate everyone; we cannot accommodate everyone’s schedules. Also, including temporary instructors in faculty meetings only to dismiss them at some point is not a good idea. The Department proposes that the Chair and the Director of Undergraduate Studies meet with temporary faculty at the beginning of each semester to discuss changes in policy, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.1

*(high-cost)*

Demographics: faculty retirements and new hiring; “Full Professor ranks will be thin in the near future.”

Goal: to move from 27—>35 faculty lines.

the new hires can further enhance the thematic strengths of the Department

-->The department lacks proper number of faculty as well as proper coverage of geographical regions and chronological timeline. The faculty lines should be brought up to the levels of peer institutions: that should be around 35 faculty lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See response to Consultant Recommendation B.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.2

*(high-cost)*

To fulfill departmental intentions to be a Research-I level department, gaps in coverage of content need to be addressed (e.g., African history; Asian history; history before the Middle Ages). New hires should be sought in these areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See response to Consultant Recommendation B.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Committee Recommendation B.3

*(high-cost)*

Consolidation of thematic foci and promotion of visibility of the department: funding from College to sponsor conferences (e.g., three conferences in 3 years), focusing on the thematic strengths of the Department; accompanying publication as part of the initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See response to Consultant Recommendation B.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.4

*(high-cost)*

Funding for graduate assistantships (should be increased to at least $15,000; five years of funding [Brundage]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Consult with Dean’s office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair; Director of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The College has raised Graduate stipends in those in which faculty and staff have received raises. We will continue to work closely with the Dean’s office to ensure that all constituencies within the department receive competitive compensation. Will report to faculty regarding our stipends and how they compare with those of peer and aspirational institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.5

*(high-cost)*

Provide greater support to junior faculty during the probationary period (e.g. time-off pre-tenure; sufficient and uniform startup funding).
Committee Recommendation B.6

(high-cost)

Support for travel: Need for a larger travel budget for faculty to present at conferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Work with the Dean’s office to expand funds for conference travel; establish guidelines for reasonable number of conference presentations to be undertaken per year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair; Tenure and Promotion Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Tenure and Promotion Committee review -- Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The Department’s official annual travel budget is $25,000. Typically, this fund can cover between 75-80% of the cost of faculty travel. We will continue to seek additional support from the Dean’s office. However, the Department’s Tenure and Promotion Committee should provide guidelines on what they consider to be a desirable number of conference presentations to be undertaken in any given year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.7

(high-cost)

Diversity:

a. The Department should continue pursuing the hire of women and minority faculty;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Create a diversity hiring plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Over the past ten years, the department has hired twenty faculty (some of whom have since left for other universities). Of those twenty positions, 10 were women; an additional position was offered first to a female candidate who subsequently turned it down. The department hired its first tenure-track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
African American faculty member in 2013. Prior to 2013, the department had hired two African Americans as postdoctoral fellows; each was offered a tenure-track position at UA but ultimately chose to go elsewhere (Ohio State University and the University of Pennsylvania). The Dean requires that all searches develop and execute a diversity hiring plan, which we have done. The Faculty Affairs will be tasked with drawing up a more proactive plan to recruit promising minority candidates.

b. the College should assist in offering competitive hiring packages (salary et al.) to promising minority candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Work with Dean’s office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Should a promising minority candidate be identified, the Department Chair will work closely with the Dean’s office to assure a competitive hiring package is offered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.8

*(high-cost)*

Permanently fund the Peer Mentor program that has been established.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Develop plan to approach possible donor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair; Director of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The Peer Mentor Program has generated unambiguous data that illustrates its positive impact on lowering the DWF rate in the introductory survey. The chair has worked with the advancement officer in the College to identify potential donors for this program. The chair and the DUS will resurrect the internal development group, The Friends of History, in an effort to find a permanent donor for this worthwhile program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.9

*(high-cost)*
Space: “always an issue”; “office space is a problem”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Work with Dean’s office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The Chair will report regularly on the efficient use of space within ten Hoor Hall and the continuing need for more of it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.10

*(high-cost)*

Thematic approach to teaching—thematic clusters

a. Title VI centers for area studies (e.g., Russian History, Latin-American Studies, Asian studies). Promote interdisciplinary approach to providing instruction. Rethinking the Ph.D. fields to add new comparative and/or thematic fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Graduate Affairs Committee will consider whether to add thematic or comparative fields.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Director of Graduate Studies; Graduate Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Adding new comparative/thematic fields: Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Title III funding for Latin-American Studies—this initiative could involve several departments/programs along with the Department of History, including Languages and Art History.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Investigate possibility of acquiring Title III funding for Latin American Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Director of Latin American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The Director of Latin American Studies will investigate and report on the rigorous process of acquiring Title III funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Recommendation B.11
Appoint a History Department Web Site Manager, to update information about the Department promptly and to improve communication with undergraduate students, graduate students, and alumni.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See response to Consultant Recommendation B.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation A.1

(low-cost)

1) An initiative should be launched to clarify TA work loads. This initiative requires virtually no resources other than time and commitment. A committee of faculty and graduate students can use shareware polling software to generate a comprehensive and confidential survey of the TA experiences of current students. The aim of the survey should not be to identify any specific faculty or teaching practices for censure, but rather to “map out” the prevailing work practices in the Department. Once the data is collected faculty and graduate students can consider what, if any, specific changes should be undertaken to promote equity across TA assignments. Such reforms need not limit faculty autonomy or establish rigid uniformity in the tasks assigned to graduate students, but instead should establish standard expectations in terms of total hours of TA work across the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Conduct anonymous survey on actual GTA workload experiences; from data gathered will create a document with guidelines for typical workload expectations for GTAs; will circulate this information to all faculty members and graduate students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Create survey spring 2014 semester; implement survey during fall 2014 semester; craft and circulate guidelines during spring semester 2015 for implementation fall 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation A.2

(low-cost)

2) The Department should act on its Strategic Plan and introduce a coherent “suite” of introductory
graduate courses. In the first semester of the graduate program, students should enroll in an introduction to historiography/theory. In their second semester they should take a research seminar in which advanced research methods are taught. In their fourth or fifth semester they should take a dissertation prospectus course, in which they prepare drafts of their prospectuses. If these three courses are introduced, they should have substantial enrollments because they can be inclusive of all sub-disciplinary specializations. Each student’s advisor would be expected to supplement the advice offered by the course’s instructor of record. These courses would provide a common body of knowledge and promote a salutary (but not rigid) uniformity of expectations and experiences across the subfields within the Department’s graduate program.

| Action(s)                      | The Department has already implemented ⅔ of this suggestion with the adoption (starting Fall 2014) of a mandatory, first-semester course in historiography/theory for all entering students, and with a variety of research seminars offered each spring semester (first-year graduate students very strongly advised to take one).
|                              | The Graduate Affairs Committee will consider the recommendation for a dissertation prospectus course as part of its ongoing review and reform of the dissertation prospectus prospect. |
| Responsible Person(s)         | Director of Graduate Studies; Graduate Affairs Committee |
| Timeline to Completion         | Two of three suggestions already in place. Historiography course to be taught Fall 2014. Graduate Affairs Committee will consider the dissertation prospectus course recommendation during Fall semesters 2014. |
| Comments                      | |

Consultant Recommendation A.3

(low-cost)

3) The Department should consider introducing an 18 month review for ABD graduate students. During the review, which should be conducted by a student’s entire dissertation committee, faculty can evaluate whatever work the student has completed on her/his dissertation (usually at least one-two chapters) and discuss with the student changes in her/his research strategies, dissertation organization, and analysis. The 18 month review provides an important measure of a student’s progress to degree.

| Action(s)                      | The Department accepts this recommendation. |
| Responsible Person(s)         | Director of Graduate Studies; Dissertation director |
| Timeline to Completion         | Can begin immediately based on student status |
| Comments                      | This recommendation is directly related to Committee Recommendation A.2 (b) -- the time to degree for doctoral students is too long. This action will help catch problems earlier in the process and hopefully speed time toward completion. |
**Consultant Recommendation A.4**

*(low-cost)*

4) The Department should consider establishing a Committee on Teaching staffed by graduate students and faculty. The committee could have two important duties. First, and perhaps of most pressing need, it could assume responsibility for the orientation of incoming graduate students. Current graduate students voiced enthusiasm for a more robust orientation that would: 1) address confusion about degree requirements, different types of courses, funding, etc.; and 2) better prepare GTAs for their classroom duties. The Committee on Teaching could offer a one day orientation to the responsibilities of the GTAs and a half day orientation devoted to graduate rules, expectations, and general advice. The graduate student members of the committee, in conjunction with the Director of Graduate Studies, could oversee the half day orientation. During the rest of the academic year the Committee on Teaching could provide periodic informal colloquia for faculty and graduate students on teaching issues and techniques. In this manner the committee could function as a clearinghouse for faculty and graduate students interested in best classroom practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Do not support creation of new committee; prefer to use current structures and customs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Director of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The Department does not support the creation of another committee. The Director of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Affairs Committee already do all that is recommended above. The DGS holds annual orientations for incoming students, second-year students, and GTAs (new and returning). All new GTAs are required to take a one-credit Teaching History course. The Graduate Affairs Committee sponsors several workshops each semester that address issues in teaching. The Department could also use the various workshops already in place (American, European, Military) to expand their existing commitment to hosting pedagogical sessions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultant Recommendation A.5**

*(low-cost)*

a) Some provisions should be made to enable staff to escape the office during their lunch breaks. Space is obviously at a premium so a staff lunch room may not be feasible. But some reasonable solution that will buffer the staff from faculty and students and provide a respite from telephone duties is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Directive issued to faculty, instructors, and graduate students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three staff members stagger their lunch hours so that the office is always covered and each has an opportunity to leave the office should she so desire. The problem arises when a staff member chooses to bring her lunch. There is no place in the building in which to eat, and those who choose to eat at their desks risk being interrupted by faculty and student requests. The chair has issued a directive to faculty, instructors, and graduate students informing them of this issue, and so far the situation has improved. The chair has no control over the space issue in the building.

Consultant Recommendation A.6

(low-cost)

b) The archaic system of book orders should be replaced by an online system. The amount of redundant and inefficient work that is devoted to book orders can be virtually eliminated by having faculty order books through an online system hosted by the campus bookstore. As best I could discern, the current system is without evident merit and places an especially onerous burden on the Department’s small and already taxed staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Faculty instructed to order own desk copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Spring 2014 semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The department agrees that book ordering is a time-consuming task. The university bookstore works through department office staff. The chair will investigate whether it is possible for faculty to place book orders for their individual classes. One onerous element of the book ordering system has been eliminated which is the ordering of desk copies. The chair has directed all faculty and instructors to procure their own desk copies. This has been implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation B.1

(high-cost)

1) To preserve and build upon its current strengths, the Department should propose a cogent 8 year plan to expand the faculty by between three and eight additional faculty “lines.” The Department provides a preliminary description of its needs in the Strategic Plan. Further clarification of the Department’s hiring needs should offer a clear statement of how hires will broaden the Department’s coverage while deepening its thematic strengths. If new faculty “lines” are committed to targeted hires that simultaneously extend the Department’s temporal and geographical coverage while supplementing thematic clusters within its existing faculty, a comparatively small number of new faculty could have a
disproportionately large and positive impact on both the Department’s undergraduate and graduate programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>The Department Chair will work with the Dean’s office in making its annual hiring requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee; Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>May 2014 and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Every year, the Faculty Affairs Committee prioritizes hiring requests. The chair will direct the Faculty Affairs Committee to craft an 8-year plan (to be approved by the department) that prioritizes hiring desires and clarifies how each position enhances the Department’s current strengths while extending the Department’s ability to provide coverage of neglected areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation B.2

(high-cost)

2) Some of the new faculty “lines” should address conspicuous lacunae in the Department’s “coverage.” Two hires in Asian history and one hire in African history are immediate needs. These hires could simultaneously complement existing Department strengths. For example, the Department could search for a historian of Africa who works on the African diaspora and/or the Atlantic World. This appointment would align seamlessly with the Department’s strengths in Latin American and southern US history. Such a scholar would immediately contribute to the graduate program while also raising undergraduate interest. The African historian who teaches the undergraduate survey on the Atlantic Slave Trade at UNC-CH routinely attracts 165 students to the class and we could probably enroll as many as 220 students every semester that the class is offered. Likewise, hires in Asian history could be made in thematic specializations (e.g., war and society, gender and identity, cultural history) in which the Department currently has core strength.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See response to Consultant Recommendation B.2 (1) as well as response to Committee Recommendation A.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>This recommendation can best be addressed through a comprehensive 8-year hiring plan as discussed above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation B.3

(high-cost)

3) To promote the consolidation of thematic foci in the Department, I recommend that the Department plan and host three major conferences over the next six years; each conference could be devoted to a
particular thematic strength in the Department. Faculty in the specific thematic subfields would organize
one conference and subsequently would edit the papers presented at the conference by invited
presenters, UA faculty and UA graduate students. The collected papers could be published by a major
university press. Each conference and resulting volume would advertise, so to speak, the Department’s
faculty and graduate students while also highlighting the Department’s thematic specialization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>The Bankhead Committee will study these recommendations and make proposals to department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Bankhead Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Spring semester 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>A precedent exists within the department for such a conference series using funds from the Bankhead account. In considering this recommendation, the Committee identified several questions that needed to be investigated: 1. Should such a conference be held yearly or every other year? 2. What themes should be highlighted? How do they relate to department strengths? 3. What is the relationship to the department’s graduate student conference? Should it be held in conjunction with the graduate student conference? 4. Re-publication of edited essays from conference: is this worthwhile? Is there interest from publishers?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation B.4

(high-cost)

a) Graduate stipends need to be raised to at least $15,000. Elite graduate programs in History routinely offer a five year packages with an annual stipend of $18,000-22,000. Comparably generous packages are beyond the resources of most public universities. Nevertheless, public universities must offer the most competitive stipends possible and a stipend of $15,000 would raise the Department to the level of Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, and other programs in the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See response to Committee Recommendation B.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation B.5

(high-cost)

b) Graduate students need access to summer funding. In the short-term, expendable funds should be used to provide students with at least one summer’s funding of $2500.00. Eventually, an endowment
should be raised so that the Department has an internal and sustainable source of funding to provide summer funds to graduate students. Until then, a one-time summer research award could be granted to each student after s/he successfully defends her/his dissertation prospectus. The great benefit of summer funding is that it often translates into better dissertations, shorter time to completion of degree, and higher student morale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Examine existing funds/funding strategies for possible one-time allocation to doctoral students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Director of Graduate Studies; Graduate Affairs Committee; Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>End of spring semester 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The Department does an excellent job funding graduate student research and conference travel. In the past five years, we have gone from 10 to 28 students receiving money from the department and matched by the Graduate School's Research and Travel Fund. All requests that are submitted as part of the Graduate School's call for funding are matched by the department, the Summersell Chair, or the Summersell Center. We also fund the annual graduate conference, as well as assist students who need to travel to conferences for job interviews. During FY 2012-2013, the Department spent nearly $20,000 on this type of graduate funding. The department may need to decide whether it wishes to reallocate this money to one-time summer awards to a smaller number of recipients, which would mean curtailing the type of professional support we have been able to provide. In addition to providing travel support, the Department hires, on average, fifteen graduate students to teach summer courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultant Recommendation B.6**

*(high-cost)*

a) The university’s policies regarding support for (“topping up”) external funding should be clarified. A formula (X% of salary or $X of “top up” every five years) would be very useful for faculty as they plan their grant application cycles. Faculty expressed confusion and frustration with the current policies, which seem overly obscure and/or parsimonious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>The Department does not support this recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>This formula is impractical. Such decisions should be made on a case-by-case basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultant Recommendation B.7

(high-cost)

b) The research and study (i.e., sabbatical) policy should be improved. In particular, junior untenured faculty should have a guaranteed one semester “sabbatical” in order to speed their completion of their first monograph. If a research and study assignment cannot be guaranteed, then the university should develop flexibility in teaching loads so that faculty can “overload” in one semester or academic year in order to “bank” a future reduction in teaching. For scholars who work in a discipline in which the monograph is the principal research objective, a periodic release from teaching is crucial. Moreover, for historians who need access to distant archives and repositories, release from teaching is also critical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Work with Dean’s office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>This is a College-level decision. We certainly support such a policy and will continue to plead this case to the Dean’s office. Over the past several years, new hires in the department have received a one-course reduction to be taken in the first two years. In reviewing the department’s tenure and promotion guidelines, the department learned that while its requirements for promotion and tenure were in line with peer institutions, those same institutions (as well as “lesser” institutions) offered probationary faculty a one-semester research leave. For tenured faculty and research appointments see response to Committee recommendation A.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation B.8

(high-cost)

c) More generous and uniform startup funds should be provided for new faculty. By comparison to the startup funds that prevail in many other disciplines, startup funds in History are modest. Instead of ad hoc negotiations with each incoming job recipient, the chair of the Department should offer a uniform package.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Work with Dean’s office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The Department chair has no control over start-up funds. A one-size-fits-all package is not practical. Start-up packages are competitive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultant Recommendation B.9

(high-cost)

d) When faculty are promoted to the associate rank, they should each receive $5,000.00 in research funds. This funding can serve as “seed money” for their next research project, and will likely improve the prospects for associate professors to secure prestigious external funding. In addition, this funding will expedite the steady progress of junior faculty to the senior ranks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>See response to Committee recommendation A.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation B.10

(high-cost)

6) The Department should either use existing funding or seek new funding to appoint an instructor whose duties will include undergraduate advising. Some of the mundane aspects of undergraduate advising are not good uses of faculty time. In addition, routine advising can best be done by someone who specializes in it. Undergraduates, of course, could still seek advice from faculty about courses, career goals, and other substantive questions, but routine transactions could be handled by the departmental advisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Undergraduate Affairs Committee supports recommendation; will study models from departments of similar size; will submit proposal to faculty for its consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Director of Undergraduate Studies; Undergraduate Affairs Committee;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>The department anticipated this issue during its August retreat. At present there is significant division within the department over this issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Recommendation B.11

(high-cost)

7) The Department should either use existing funding or seek new funding to appoint a History Department Web Site Content Manager. To achieve the Department’s stated goal in the Strategic Plan to expand and improve its communication with undergraduates, graduate students, and alumni, a substantial and ongoing commitment of time will be required. A faculty member or current staff member cannot be expected to maintain the Department’s web content. Based on the comments of current undergraduates
and graduate students there are layers of dated content that need to be revised or removed. A History Department Web Site Content Manager (who might split her/his time as the departmental advisor) could maintain the Department’s web content and also oversee targeted list-servs for faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, and alumni. In essence, this staff member would be the Department’s communications officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Work with Dean’s office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Department Chair; Director of Graduate Studies; Director of Undergraduate Studies; proposed Communications committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline to Completion</td>
<td>Providing timely and accurate web content is vital to our undergraduate and graduate programs. Maintaining that content is time consuming. Currently, our Early College instructor oversees our web page and facebook page. However, no one person oversees the accuracy and timeliness of the information. Staffing decisions are made by the Dean’s office. The issue here is not so much the technical oversight of the webpage; rather, we need someone or a committee charged with making sure the web manager receives the most up-to-date information. See Committee Recommendation A.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>