

Date: 6 February 2017

To: Heidi Sherman, Chair, History

From: Greg Davis, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Re: Provost's Recommendations on History Program Review

Note: Due to significant turnover in the Provost's office as well as significant budgetary and organizational challenges, this memo was delayed. It responds to the Program Review submitted by History in 2013, and represents an effort to correct a significant oversight.

The History Program's Self-Study nicely summarizes the fundamental strength of the program, which is its faculty. Their accomplishments as teachers and scholars are remarkable. Our students are fortunate to be able to work these teachers, who are expanding the boundaries of the discipline and our interdisciplinary mission. That said, I am concerned about a few aspects of the Self Study, particularly the declining enrollments.

Program Strengths:

- The faculty have made excellent progress in devising new student learning outcomes.
- The faculty are among the most accomplished teachers and scholars on campus.
- The faculty and their students are highly engaged in the larger community of public history.
- The plans for developing the history curriculum are quite practical. The resource issue is common on campus, though there may be some strategic ways of dealing with them.
- The faculty are highly engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Needs and Suggestions for Improvement:

- Although I applaud the history faculty for revising the program's student learning outcomes, I remain concerned that there is not a concrete method for gathering data to determine how successful the faculty and students are in meeting those outcomes.
- I am concerned about the overall drop in the numbers of majors and minors.
- I share the concern raised in the Self Study about the overall structure of the curriculum, especially in regards to non-Western history.

	,				
	•				