

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

SELF-STUDY DOCUMENT
DECENNIAL REVIEW
2002

MARCH 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	p. 1
Chapter I: Context and Required HECB Board Information	p. 3
Brief Description of the Field and its History at UW	p. 3
Documentation of Continuing Need for Program	p. 5
Grid	p. 6
Goal-Setting and Program Evaluation	p. 6
Chapter II: The Undergraduate Program	p. 9
Part I: The Undergraduate Curriculum and Major	p.10
A. The Curriculum	p.10
B. The Major	p.12
C. The Honors Program	p.15
D. The History Minor and Affiliated BA Programs	p.16
Part II: Research Opportunities for Undergraduates	p.16
Part III: End of Program Assessment	p.18
Part IV: Compliance with State-Mandated Accountability	p.19
Part V: Undergraduate Advising	p.19
Part VI: The Director of Undergraduate Studies	p.20
Part VII: Resource-sharing in Undergraduate Instruction	p.20
A. Official faculty affiliations with other units	p.20
B. Service Courses	p.21
Part VIII: Challenges to the Undergraduate Program	p.22
Chapter III: The Graduate Program	p.25
Part I: The Doctoral Program	p.25
Administration	p.25
Objectives	p.25
Curricular Structure	p.26
Changes since 1992	p.26
Criteria for Admission	p.27
Requirements for the Ph.D. Degree	p.27
Impact	p.28
Assessment	p.29
A. Placement Record	p.29
B. Outside Grants and Awards	p.30
C. Time to Degree	p.30
D. Publications by Graduate Students	p.30
E. Exit Surveys	p.30
Professional Development and Career Preparation	p.31
Challenges to the Doctoral Program in History	p.33
Part II: The Master's Program	p.34
Objectives	p.35

Curricular Structure	p.35
Changes since 1992	p.35
Criteria for Admission	p.36
Requirements for the M.A. Degree	p.36
Promotion to the Ph.D. Program	p.37
Impact	p.37
Assessment	p.37
Challenges to the Master's Degree Program	p.38
Part III: Graduate Students	p.39
Recruitment of a Diverse Student Body	p.39
Assessment	p.41
Graduate Student Retention and Attrition	p.42
Inclusion of Graduate Students in Department Governance	p.43
Grievance Procedures	p.44
Graduate Student Service Appointees	p.44
Teaching Assistants	p.44
Training and Supervision of Teaching Assistants	p.45
Staff Assistants	p.46
Research Assistants	p.47
Summary of 2001-2 Appointments	p.47
Chapter IV: Changes in the Department Since 1992	p.48
A. New Research and Teaching Fields	p.48
B. Curricular Changes	p.49
C. Building on Strength	p.49
D. Integration and Interdisciplinarity	p.50
E. Departmental Governance	p.51
F. Research Productivity	p.51
Chapter V: Challenges and Opportunities	p.53
A. The growing national gap in financial resources	p.53
B. Inadequate undergraduate writing preparation	p.54
C. Upcoming retirements	p.54
D. The constantly increasing specialization of historical study	p.55

An Overview of the University of Washington Department of History

The Department of History has 43 tenured or tenure-track faculty members, plus one 50% time senior lecturer. Eight of these 43 positions are split, 50%/50%, with the Jackson School of International Studies. Altogether, then, we represent approximately 39 full-time faculty equivalents (FTE's). In most years, we also employ between ten and twenty part-time lecturers, each of whom teaches one or two courses for us per year on an "as needed" basis. None of these part-time lecturers are employed year after year, so as to become a kind of "shadow faculty". We use them strictly to fill teaching needs that open up when regular, full-time faculty are on leave. Most are recently graduated University of Washington Ph.D.s, gaining additional teaching experience for the job market.

Teaching expectations are the same for all faculty members, irrespective of rank. Each year, each full-time faculty member offers two lecture courses and two seminars during the three-quarter academic year. Lecture courses meet for 4-5 hours per week; seminars generally meet for 2 hours per week, although some faculty choose to have them meet 3-4 hours per week. Seminar enrolments are generally capped at 12 (for graduate courses and senior seminars) or 20 (for junior seminars). Enrolments in lecture classes can range anywhere from 25 to 250. All faculty members are expected to offer classes at both the introductory (100 and 200 level) and advanced level (300 and 400 level for undergraduates, 500 level for graduate classes). We also encourage all faculty members to offer at least one large class per year (or perhaps every other year), so as to meet an approximate enrolment "target" of 150-200 students per year.

Even with these numbers, however, we cannot meet the student demand for History courses. Many of our classes turn away as many students as they enroll, either because we cannot provide teaching assistants in sufficient numbers to handle the additional discussion sections or else because we cannot find rooms large enough to accommodate all the students who want to enroll. Similar problems exist in other departments across the College of Arts and Sciences, especially in the Social Sciences division; but they are particularly acute in History because of the relatively smaller number of TA positions we have (recently 20, now reduced to 18) in comparison to other large Social Science departments.

The History Department plays an important role in supporting all of the College's myriad educational missions. At the undergraduate level, we teach large numbers of "general education" courses to non-history majors (indeed, apart from our junior and senior majors' seminars, none of our classes are restricted to History majors). We graduate approximately 175 to 200 majors per year, and provide minors to perhaps another thousand students per year (the University does not keep figures on minors, but we are told that History is the most popular minor on campus). We also contribute to all the various "area studies" programs on campus, as well as to a large number of other departments and interdisciplinary programs (see Chapter I, section F below). We participate in the College of Education's Teacher Training program, and we have an active Evening Degree program, to which we contribute a minimum of eight faculty-taught courses annually.

Our graduate program trains M.A. and Ph.D. students for a national job market. Our placement record for our PhD graduates is excellent. Over the past three years, we have placed 50% of our students in tenure-track positions, and 95% either in faculty positions or in other history-related employment. Between 1989 and 2001, 69% of our Ph.D. graduates received faculty positions (54% tenured or tenure-track, 15% non-tenure track), and another 18% entered other history-related employment (including post-docs). Over the past three years we have placed Ph.D. students in tenure-track positions at a number of prestigious institutions, including the University of Michigan, UCLA, Cornell University, the University of Minnesota, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Bowdoin College, and Harvard University. We have particular strength in Asian history, in American western and environmental history, in women's history, in African-American history, and in European social and cultural history. The department has unusual breadth both geographically and chronologically, and encourages its PhD students to take advantage of that breadth in their own training. This breadth of training is one reason, we believe, that our graduates have done so well over the past ten years on the job market.

Our department is distinguished both for the quality of its faculty and for the depth of its commitment to excellent teaching at both the undergraduate and the graduate level. Since 1985, four department faculty members have won MacArthur "genius" awards and three have received Guggenheim Fellowships. Since 1975, seven department faculty members (including four current faculty) have won University-wide Distinguished Teaching Awards – more than any other department in the University. At least a dozen other faculty members have been nominated either for Distinguished Teaching Awards or for the Graduate School's award for Distinguished Graduate Mentoring.

Since 1992, the date of our last Ten Year Review, department faculty have published 40 books and won ten book prizes from professional societies. Two faculty members have won Distinguished Teaching Awards, three have received Guggenheim Fellowships, and one has been awarded a MacArthur Fellowship.

Chapter I: Context and Required HECB Board Information

- A. **Name of Unit authorized to offer Degrees:** Department of History
- B. **School or College:** College of Arts and Sciences, Division of Social Sciences.
- C. **Titles of Degrees Offered:** Bachelor of Arts; Master of Arts; Doctor of Philosophy (B.A., M.A., Ph.D.)
- D. **Year of Last Review:** 1992
- E. **Brief Description of the Field and its History at the University of Washington:**

History was one of the earliest disciplines taught at the University of Washington, and has continued ever since to be one of the core units within the College of Arts and Sciences. The first Chair of the Department, in 1873-74, was the Rev. George F. Whitworth, who doubled as the University's President. (Although we are delighted to have the current University President as a member of the History Department, we have not, as yet, asked him to imitate Whitworth's example by chairing it.) Notable early leaders of the department included Edmond S. Meany (chair from 1895 until 1935), a charismatic lecturer who established the department's continuing tradition of outstanding undergraduate teaching; and W. Stull Holt (chair from 1940-44 and from 1946-54), who was hired from Johns Hopkins to revitalize the department's graduate program.

Although the department awarded its first Ph.D. in 1922, it was only during the 1950s, under Holt's leadership, that it emerged as a nationally significant Ph.D. program. A series of outstanding appointments during the growth years of the 1960s, including several senior appointments, brought the department to a national ranking of 14th in 1968. Equally significant, however, was the decision taken during the 1960s to begin expanding the department's geographical focus toward Asia. Russian and eastern European history had already emerged as significant areas of departmental strength during the 1950s under Holt's leadership. During the following decade, however, the department systematically added appointments in Chinese, Japanese, Korean and South Asian history, frequently in cooperation with the interdisciplinary "Russian and Far Eastern Institute" (now the Jackson School of International Studies). This far-sighted commitment to Asian history has continued, now with the addition, since 1989, of a strong contingent of Southeast Asian historians. In the most recent US News and World Report ranking, our Asian history program was rated as one of the ten best in the nation. The Department as a whole was rated 27th.

Although the Department made a number of strong appointments under the leadership of Donald W. Treadgold (Chair from 1972-1982), including two future MacArthur award winners, Treadgold's personal hostility toward many of the new developments within the historical profession (African American history, women's history, and social and cultural history in particular) caused the department to miss a series of hiring opportunities in

these emerging fields. A devastating state budget crisis during the 1980s then compounded the difficulties, making it impossible for the department to rectify these missed opportunities even after Treadgold had stepped down as Chair. Under Wilton Fowler's leadership, however (1982-87), the department did begin to engage in significant private fundraising, a full decade before most other departments (or indeed, the University itself) began to do this. As a result of these efforts, which have been continued by subsequent chairs, the department is now one of the best-endowed units within the College of Arts and Sciences.

The budget picture improved dramatically in 1987, just as Jere Bacharach became chair (1987-92). Under Bacharach's leadership, the department made eleven new appointments. Four of these new appointments were of women; three (all male) were at the tenured level, including one future MacArthur winner (Richard White). This cohort also brought a new diversity of academic interests into the department, including history of technology, Southeast Asian history, cultural studies, women's history, American environmental history, American Indian history, and Celtic history. Despite another budget crisis between 1993 and 1995, the department under Richard Johnson's leadership was able to continue its transformation through new appointments. Out of nine new appointments between 1992 and 1997 (the University President, Richard McCormick, is not included in this list), five were women; three of these four women were appointed with tenure, including another MacArthur winner. In making these new appointments, the department added strength in cultural studies, labor history, Asian history, and women's history, as well as expanding into two fields unrepresented in the department since the early 1970s: late antiquity and Africa.

Since 1997, under its current Chair, Robert Stacey, the department has made eight new appointments, with four further appointments still under consideration. Four of these eight appointments are women; two are African-Americans; and two are Asian-Americans. If we should succeed in making the four appointments we are presently considering, two of these four further appointments would be of Asian-Americans, and at least two (and possibly three) would be women. Since 1997 the department has added three specialists in African American history and one specialist in Asian American history, with another appointment in Filipino and Asian American history still under consideration. As a result of these new appointments, we now count ourselves among the leading programs in the country in African American history, with a distinctive focus on the Black experience both inside and outside the American South. We hope soon to be able to claim a comparable standing in Asian American history: given our strength in Asian history and in American western history, Asian American history seems to us a field in which we should be able to excel. Although we lost Richard White to Stanford, we have made a strong new appointment in American environmental history, and we continue to be regarded as one of the top programs in the country in American western history and Pacific Northwest history. We have also continued to build on our post-1987 strengths in interdisciplinary studies, cultural history and women's history.

F. Documentation of Continuing Need for Our Program

History enrolls between 6,000 and 7,000 undergraduate students per year. We have approximately 500 enrolled majors, and graduate about 200 majors per year. Our graduate program currently numbers about 90 students. Our placement record for our PhD students is excellent, measured both by the percentage of our students who find appropriate professional employment, and by the quality of the institutions that appoint our PhDs to tenured and tenure-track positions.

We also contribute significantly, both in faculty time and in financial support, to other departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and to a wide range of interdisciplinary programs. Historians are central participants in all of the Jackson School programs (International Studies; European Studies; Asian Studies; Comparative Religion; East Asian Studies; Jewish Studies; Latin American Studies; Middle Eastern Studies; Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies; South Asian Studies; Korean Studies; Southeast Asian Studies; and the Taylor Institute). Over the past decade, History faculty members have chaired at least half of these programs. Another History faculty member served as Director of the Jackson School itself. History faculty members regularly teach for the Program on the Environment, the Walter Chapin Simpson Center for the Humanities, Women Studies, Classics, French and Italian Studies, Comparative History of Ideas, the History and Philosophy of Science, American Ethnic Studies, the Drama School, the School of Art, and the Harry Bridges Center for Labor Studies. Our faculty members also teach frequently in the College Honors Program. Our department offers a very substantial percentage of all the "Writing" Credit courses offered within the College of Arts and Sciences. We have an active Evening Degree program, and play an important role in supporting teacher education programs within the College of Education (for further discussion, see Chapter II, The Undergraduate Program, Part VII, Section B).

G. Assessment Information Relating to Student Learning Outcomes and Program Effectiveness

See discussion under **Chapter II, Undergraduate Program**; and **Chapter III, Graduate Program**.

H. Grid

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01
Number of Undergrad Majors Graduated in each of last Three years	176	183	165
Number of Master's degrees Granted in each of last Three years	4	8	4
Number of Doctoral degrees Granted in each of last Three years	13	17	10

I. Goal-Setting and Program Evaluation

Since 1992 the Department of History has engaged in a series of reviews and goal-setting discussions. In response to suggestions contained in the 1992 Ten Year Review Report, the Department between 1993 and 1996 commissioned and debated a series of proposals to reform the undergraduate major requirements. The revision that was finally passed, in 1996, eliminated the three quarter "western civilization" requirement, and substituted instead a requirement that all History majors must take at least one "broad" European course; at least one "broad" American course; at least one non-American, non-European course; and that all History majors must all take at least two courses in the pre-modern period and at least two courses in the modern period. Other requirements (that all majors must take a senior seminar; that they must take at least five upper division history classes; and that a minimum of eleven courses are required for the major) remained unchanged. Lists have been established, defining "broad" courses, and designating whether any given class fulfills the "premodern" or the "modern" requirement. These requirements remain in place today, and seem to be serving us well.

Between 1996 and 1997, the Department engaged in a "long-range planning" effort, intended to establish a course for the Department during the following five years, especially with respect to future hiring. That report, adopted in the spring of 1997, recommended that the Department should seek to make appointments in the following fields: African-American history; History of Science with a European focus; Modern History of Islamic Societies on the Indian Ocean; and Asian American history. It also recommended that in searching to fill these positions, "the Department should strive to recruit women and members of underrepresented minorities, in accordance with the University's Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action plan, and to ensure retention of any members of underrepresented minorities and women appointed to the faculty." It further recommended that "the Department should gradually introduce more courses organized according to transnational, comparative, and thematic concerns." It seems to us that with the exception of the Islamic Societies position (for which we have requested

authorization to search several times, but without success), we have met the goals set out in this report.

During the 1999-2000 academic year, the History Department, along with all other units in the College of Arts and Sciences, engaged in an elaborate and searching process of strategic planning. This process involved nearly all of the faculty members in the department, as well as a significant number of our graduate and undergraduate students. Working groups of faculty and students were constituted to examine and report on: Research and Faculty Issues; Technology; Undergraduate Studies; Graduate Studies; and Development, Outreach and Alumni Relations. Each working group's draft report was discussed, revised, and then adopted in a meeting of the entire departmental faculty. These reports were then redacted by the Chair into a final report, which was discussed and adopted by the entire Department on May 24, 2000.

This strategic plan continues to guide us in our ongoing revisions of our program. During the 2000-1 academic year, the Undergraduate Studies Committee designed and brought to the full Department for its approval a sweeping revision to the undergraduate curriculum. These revisions are described more fully in Part III below, "The Undergraduate Program"; a copy of the committee's complete report is contained in Appendix M to this Self-Study. Briefly, however, this report recommended:

- (1) That we renumber and restructure our undergraduate course offerings, in order to guarantee that students acquire a sequential mastery of analytical skills as they progress through our 100, 200, 300 and 400 level courses;
- (2) That we create a new, required junior seminar course for History majors (HIST 388); and that we create an additional type of required senior seminar (HIST 494) to complement our existing senior research seminars (HIST 498).
- (3) That we design optional but recommended "tracks" through the major, so that students wishing to concentrate in particular types of history, or in particular periods or countries, could find their way more easily through the major.
- (4) That the Department initiate a series of pedagogical workshops for faculty and graduate students, to help them in implementing these changes.

As is discussed more fully in **Chapter II** below, we are currently in the midst of implementing all of these recommendations, so that they can take effect in August 2002.

During the current academic year, we are engaged in a similar review process with respect to our graduate curriculum. Our existing curricular approach to graduate study, which requires Ph.D. students to be examined in four separate fields spread across at least two divisions, is becoming increasingly unsatisfactory as the number of fields we offer continues to increase. No longer can we guarantee, for example, that a "field course", designed to prepare a student for a particular field examination, will be available when each student needs to take it. We also believe that the current curricular structure, which envisions only two types of graduate courses (field courses and research seminars), is acting to discourage faculty from teaching innovative new types of topical courses at the graduate level. The Graduate Studies Committee is discussing all these issues at the moment. We hope to have a report, with recommendations, ready by the end of the current academic year that can then be discussed by the department faculty and by our graduate students.

Our Department sets its goals by a time-consuming but wide-ranging and democratic system of discussions involving faculty, graduate students and, where appropriate, undergraduate students. We use committees (either standing committees, such as the Undergraduate or Graduate Studies Committees, or ad hoc committees, composed of volunteers or of members appointed by the Chair) to frame questions and to recommend potential solutions. We then discuss these committee reports in meetings of the entire Department faculty, and adopt them by majority vote before we proceed to implement their recommendations. We are a highly egalitarian Department, in which more senior members have been happy to entrust relatively junior colleagues with critical decision-making roles. It is characteristic of our departmental culture that all of these long-range planning efforts, but particularly the Strategic Planning process, have been driven and largely directed by the more recently hired members of the Department.

Our goals as a Department are set out at length in our Strategic Planning Report (Appendix L), along with strategies for achieving them. Briefly, however, our goals are: to be recognized as one of the top 20 History departments in America (we are currently ranked in the top 30); to maintain and improve upon our placement record for our PhD students; and to be the best undergraduate teaching department in the College of Arts and Sciences. We also hope to continue contributing to the University's ongoing interdisciplinary efforts; to cooperate with our K-14 colleagues in improving and expanding the teaching of History; and to respond to the intense public interest in historical subjects. To reach these goals, we need to continue to make excellent faculty appointments at the junior ranks (senior appointments would also be desirable, but are highly unlikely in the current budget climate); we need to increase dramatically the fellowship support we can offer to incoming graduate students; we need to increase the number of endowed professorships in the department, to correct for the miserable salaries so many of our senior faculty are paid (our full professors are 36% behind our peer institutions in salary, and this without any account whatsoever being taken of the high price of housing in Seattle); and we need to reorganize our curricula at both the undergraduate and the graduate level.

Efforts are underway on all of these goals, and will continue. Our undergraduate and graduate curricula are being reorganized; we are making a number of new appointments, including (potentially) two senior appointments; and we have recently received a new endowed professorship and a newly endowed graduate recruitment fellowship, with the prospect of others to come. Fundraising will remain critically important to us, but over the next 5-7 years faculty appointments may be an even bigger challenge, as we face the likelihood of 10-12 faculty retirements between 2001 and 2007. At the same time we are trying to get permission to fill these vacant positions, we will also need to work hard to retain the strong cohort of assistant and associate professors we have appointed over the past decade. So far, we've done well in this regard. With considerable help from the Dean and Provost, we were able to retain all eleven of the History faculty members who were short-listed candidates for positions at other schools during the 2000-1 academic year. Retention funds were eliminated from the most recent state budget, however, which makes it highly doubtful whether we will be able to repeat that accomplishment over the next few years.

Chapter II: The Undergraduate Program

The History Department prides itself on the quality of its undergraduate program. The numbers alone speak to the department's success in attracting and retaining student interest: we graduate approximately 175 student majors a year, and a recent count shows 496 active majors in our files. No exact figures are available as to the number of undergraduates minoring in History, but estimates place it at approximately one thousand, making us one of the most popular minors on campus. We maintain among the highest student enrollments in the Division of Social Sciences, and we have the highest percentage of alumni contributing to the department—a statistic in which we take considerable pride, as it suggests that the value our students place on their history training does not diminish with time. To the degree that high levels of student interest can be taken as a measure of the success of the department, the indications are encouraging. Certainly the exit surveys submitted by our majors indicate a high level of satisfaction with the program.

The department's popularity is not something to be taken for granted; rather, it reflects the tremendous amount of focused care and attention the History faculty has devoted to the education of undergraduates over many years. Simply put, teaching matters to us. All members of our faculty, including our most renowned scholars, teach across all levels of our curriculum. Currently the department has four winners of the University Distinguished Teaching Award on staff, all of whom teach entry level (freshman/sophomore) classes on a regular basis. The converse is equally true: almost all of our classes, both lower and upper division, are taught by tenure-line faculty. Course relief for scholarly or administrative work is granted to only three people in the department (the Chair, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the Editor of *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*), so everyone is equally invested in the workings and coherence of our undergraduate program. And all issues pertaining to new hires (and the fields in which we should hire) are discussed openly among the faculty as a whole. Faculty representation at job candidate talks is regularly 80-90%, and the potential of the candidate as an undergraduate teacher forms a large part of the departmental discussions that precede the making of an offer.

It was thus no accident that when the department began last year to consider in a formal way the many issues that had emerged in the course of the Strategic Planning process initiated in 1999, it chose to start with those relating to the undergraduate program. A committee chaired by the Director of Undergraduate Studies (Robin Stacey) and consisting of members of the Undergraduate Studies committee (Lynn Thomas, Frank Conlon) and two representatives from the Undergraduate Advising Office (Moran Tompkins, Stefanie Starkovich) was convened in the fall of 2000 for the express purpose of researching and implementing the ideas put forward by the Undergraduate Studies Strategic Planning group (which group had itself included one of our undergraduate majors, Julie Hughes). This committee worked throughout the year interviewing all members of the department on issues relevant to the curriculum and major; it then presented its report and suggestions for reform to the department in April of 2001.

The report was adopted by the department, which also agreed that all changes to our curriculum and major would take effect by Autumn quarter of 2002. This ten-year review finds us in the middle of the processes necessary to implement those reforms. At this point, we do not anticipate any major delays and therefore expect to have everything ready to go by next fall.

Part I: The undergraduate curriculum and major

A. The curriculum

Even apart from this most recent series of reforms, the History curriculum has changed considerably in the decade since the department was last reviewed, although the general rubrics under which we operate remain the same. The department continues to separate its courses into five divisions:

HIST -- This division includes general history and areas that do not fit into the other four categories, including the history of science, African history, labor history, Jewish history, and the history of the Middle East. Also falling under this rubric are the seminars we require of our majors: HIST 388, HIST 494 and HIST 498, on which see further below.

HSTAA -- History of the Americas. Incorporated into this division are all courses pertaining to the history of the United States, Canada, Latin America and the Caribbean.

HSTAM – Ancient and Medieval History. Included in this division are all courses pertaining to Europe and the Mediterranean basin up to c. 1500.

HSTAS – Asian History. This division incorporates the histories of China, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, India, Tibet, Cambodia, Laos and the Philippines.

HSTEU – European History. Included in this division are courses pertaining to Modern and Early Modern Europe (since c. 1500).

Within these broad rubrics, however, much has changed. Several new courses have been added during the last decade, a reflection both of the increasing diversity of the historical field and of our faculty. New hires have enabled us to enlarge on our traditional strength in Asian history, while adding entirely new fields to our curriculum. Women and gender studies have recently emerged as an important field for us, as have comparative labor history, African, African-American and Asian-American history, and the history of the Pacific Northwest. In addition, hires over the past ten years have allowed us to add courses in Late Antiquity, Celtic history, and the history of Sephardic Judaism

The reforms of last year were directed less at the content of the curriculum than at rendering our overall program more logical, coherent, and predictable to faculty and undergraduates alike. In 1999, the Strategic Planning group took the important first step of eliminating from the official course schedule all courses no longer being taught on a

regular basis, including courses developed by faculty members no longer teaching at the University of Washington. This left the committee of last year free to focus on the other curricular issues raised by the Strategic Planning group. The proposals made and subsequently adopted by the department were the following:

1) Faculty members in each subfield agreed to meet together to review the offerings in their particular subfield and, where necessary, to restructure and resequence the courses comprising their part of the history curriculum. The aim was to ensure 1) that both lower and upper division courses were available to students in every subfield, 2) that upper division courses would build on lower division courses in a manner that ensured the intellectual coherence of the program, 3) that any prerequisites necessary to allow students to enroll in upper division classes were regularly taught, and 4) that enrollment targets were set and met. (Subfields generally followed the standard department divisions outlined above. Often, however, faculty with particular interests held additional meetings to discuss issues relevant specifically to them, while faculty in fields that fell potentially into two different divisions (e.g. Early Modern Europe) attended both meetings. These decisions were left up to the faculty members in question.)

2) Individual faculty also agreed to review their courses with an eye towards ensuring that they conformed to the new definitions put forward by the committee and adopted by the department regarding the nature and content of 100, 200, 300, and 400 level courses. One of the striking discoveries made by the committee during its interviews of the faculty was that there was little communication between faculty members as to the expectations and workload appropriate to each level of instruction. Some faculty members assigned primary sources in their 100 level courses, for example, while others did not introduce them until the 400 level. Based on its interviews and its sense of the consensus of the faculty, the committee constructed general definitions of each level, hoping in this manner to render the program more predictable and coherent. Individual faculty were also asked to think creatively about how an increasing number of students might be brought into the program: by creating new entry-level classes, for example, or by moving upper division courses popular with non-majors down to the 200 level in order to make them more attractive to students from across the College as a whole, and the like.

This past fall has been devoted to the implementation of these two proposals. Each subfield has now met one or more times, and faculty have as individuals taken the opportunity to review their course offerings. These individual and communal reviews have resulted in significant changes. Many courses have been renumbered in order to bring them into line with the new definitions of course levels (e.g. HSTAA 180 and 181 have become HSTAA 283 and 284, HSTAA 201 has become HSTAA 101, and the like). Other courses have been changed from the upper to the lower division or vice versa (e.g. HSTEU 305 has become HSTEU 205, while HSTAM 201 has become HSTAM 301). Some courses have been deleted (e.g. HSTEU 403), some have been added (e.g. HSTEU 306), and some have changed names in order to reflect changes in content or focus (e.g. HIST 113). In addition, two new topics courses have been created in each subfield, one at the lower division, and one at the upper division (HIST 290, HSTAA 290, HSTAM 290, HSTAS290, HSTEU 290 and HIST 490, HSTAA 490, HSTAM 490, HSTAS 490,

HSTEU 490). These will provide faculty with a course rubric under which to teach occasional courses not in the regular curriculum, or to try out new courses before putting them permanently in the curriculum. It also gives us rubrics under which to teach courses linked with other departments or organizations on campus—e.g. Humanities 210. These changes have now been approved by the College of Arts and Sciences' Course of Study Committee and by the University Curriculum Committee.

Another change suggested by the committee is that pedagogical discussions of the sort that led to these reforms be made an ongoing feature of the academic year. A few years ago, we did a workshop on the use of the Web that proved very helpful to several members of the department. In imitation of that model, the Director of Undergraduate Studies has been asked to arrange 2-3 faculty workshops per year on pedagogical issues of interest to the department. This process also has already begun. The first workshop, which focused on ways to teach the senior majors seminars (498 and the new 494, on which see below), was held this past fall. Another, on the new junior seminar requirement (the 388, on which see further below), was held in February. A third workshop on the challenges associated with teaching at the entry level will be held during spring quarter. A small number of graduate students attended the first workshop on the 498. However, since the majority of graduate students were not able to attend, the Director of Undergraduate Studies will arrange a workshop on instructional issues of particular interest to graduate students later in the year.

B. The major

The History major is designed to guarantee students maximum flexibility while ensuring some degree of geographical and chronological breadth. Since History is a constituent department of the College of Arts and Sciences, our majors must satisfy all College requirements (e.g. composition, foreign languages, and the like). In addition, History majors take 55 credits of history (starting with those declaring the History major in Autumn quarter of 2002, that number rises to 60, for reasons that will become clear below). As most quarter-long undergraduate classes at the University of Washington are worth 5 credits each, this means that our majors must take a minimum of 11 (12 as of Autumn, 2002) courses in history. Of these 55 (60 as of Autumn, 2002) credits, 25 (30 as of Autumn, 2002) must consist of upper division coursework (300-400 level) done in residence at the University of Washington. In addition, 10 credits of the total number required for the major must be in the pre-modern period (up to 1500), while 10 credits must be in the modern period (1500 and beyond). Generally speaking, students have a great deal of freedom in designing their program. All majors must take 5 credits each of approved "broad" courses in European and United States history, and 5 credits of non-western history. (A "broad" course is one that is deemed to be "broad" in at least two of three ways: chronologically, geographically, or thematically.) Apart from this, they are free to choose the period or region on which they wish to focus. As part of their program, all History majors must take a senior seminar (HIST 498 or, as of Autumn quarter, 2002, HIST 494) in any historical field; beginning in Autumn quarter of 2002, a junior seminar (HIST 388) is also required of all majors, on which change see below. (Several 498s and

388s are taught every year in every subfield; they meet once or twice a week and center on topics chosen by the faculty members who teach them.)

From the point of view of content, the general shape of the History major remains essentially what it has been since 1997, when the 15 credit "Western Civilization" requirement was eliminated and replaced by a five credit requirement in "Broad" European history (see Appendix J, "Undergraduate Major Requirements," for a summary of the changes made to the major since the last ten-year review). That change was made for both practical and philosophical reasons. With the impending retirement of one of our most popular Western Civilization teachers, a professor who regularly drew 600-700 students per class, the requirement that all majors take three quarters of HIST 111, 112, and 113 threatened to become something of a bottleneck within the major. In addition, it became clear as we were considering how and whether we could replace him that several members of the faculty were philosophically uncomfortable with the Western Civilization requirement. National trends within the discipline were already challenging the traditional dominance of European history over the histories of other world cultures. Moreover, the consensus in the department was clearly that the essence of historical training ought to lie less in the memorization of a common body of information than in learning techniques of analysis and patterns of thought characteristic of the discipline as a whole. What we most hope our students will take away from their historical training is the ability to read and analyze primary and secondary sources, to conduct research and formulate interesting questions about the past, and to integrate their sources and ideas into a persuasive argumentative essay. A course in Western Civilization was clearly one way to achieve these goals; however, in the view of the majority of faculty members present for those discussions, it was not the only one.

Apart from the dropping of the Western Civilization requirement, the most significant changes to our major in recent years are those emerging from the Strategic Planning Process over the past two years. It became clear during the course of our faculty interviews that there was a widespread consensus that many of our students were not prepared to do serious research and writing by the time they enrolled in their required senior seminar, the HIST 498. As a result, several faculty had abandoned the research essay altogether, so that while the requirements in some 498s remained the standard 15-20 page essay, other 498s were requiring four or five relatively short papers instead—assignments which though often very challenging, did not have a real research component to them. Since the 498 functions as the capstone course experience for the major, such disparities were troubling to faculty and students alike. Another issue that emerged from the interviews—and from student comments made to our undergraduate advisers—was a desire for greater direction and focus in the major. There has been no great call to change either the overall shape of the major or the manner in which it allows students to choose their own course of study. However, some students have indicated that more direction in constructing their major, and in finding pathways through the program, might be useful. In response to this and other comments, the committee suggested the following proposals, which were adopted by the faculty in spring 2001 and are due to take effect as of Autumn quarter of 2002:

- 1) As of September 2002, all History majors will be required to take a junior seminar, HIST 388, within two quarters of declaring their major. This course, "Introduction to

History,” is designed to prepare students to do advanced work in the discipline by introducing them to intellectual approaches, professional perspectives, and research techniques current in the historical field. While each topic and subfield will have a historiography of its own, it will also of necessity draw on, and hence reveal, techniques and approaches relevant to the discipline as a whole. After completing their 388, students may choose either to do their 498 in the subfield of their 388 (if such a 498 is available) or to change to another field entirely.

The 388 is not a new course, but it is one that most faculty have not yet taught. Moreover, the new role it is playing in our major will require faculty to give extra thought to the goals the 388 is designed to accomplish and the skills students are expected to take away from the class. Our next faculty workshop, in February, will therefore focus on the subject of the 388, and will consider questions of course topics, readings, organization, and workload.

2) After some debate, the faculty decided that the experience of researching and writing an extended essay was such an important component of the major that all graduating seniors should have this opportunity. Starting in Autumn quarter of 2002, therefore, all 498s will require an extended essay (15+ pages) integrating both primary and secondary sources.

However, there was also consensus in the department that more room needed to be made at the senior level for historiographical studies and projects, and to this end a new course, HIST 494, was created to serve as an alternative to the 498 (students may take either one to fulfill the senior seminar requirement). Like 498s, 494s also integrate reading and discussion with the production of a lengthy paper. However, 494s are explicitly historiographical in nature. They may focus on the historiography of a particular field (e.g. “Medieval Women’s History,”) or center on broad, non-period-specific topics such as “History and Memory,” “Slavery,” “Gender,” and the like. They may be team-taught and explicitly cross-cultural, or they may focus on a particular region and period while bringing in theoretical and comparative readings from other cultures, or they may range broadly over a number of different cultures and time periods. In any case, they would actively encourage students to look back over what they have learned in their classes and think broadly about differences and similarities between cultures.

3) In order to inspire students both to plan the shape of their major more deliberately than most currently do, and to think broadly about connections between the courses they take during their time in the department, the Undergraduate Studies Director will create, in conjunction with the faculty and the undergraduate advisers, specific fields of concentration within the major. Examples of such fields of concentration include: Gender, Empire and Colonialism, Labor, The Atlantic (also Pacific, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean) World, War and Conflict, Migrations and Diasporas. Students will be given information on these fields of concentrations to assist them in planning their programs and to alert them to courses relevant to their interests of which they might otherwise be unaware. These fields of concentration are optional: students who do not wish to follow a particular concentration do not have to do so. We do ask, however, that one regular feature of all 388s be a 1-2 page paper written by each student in which he or she plans out his/her proposed plan of study.

This part of the reform plan will be implemented during the course of winter and spring quarters so as to be in place by Autumn quarter of 2002.

C. The Honors program

History majors with a proven record of excellence in History courses are eligible to participate in the department's Honors program. To be admitted into the program, students must possess an overall grade point average of at least 3.3, and a grade point average in History courses (including at least ten credit hours of upper-division work completed in residence) of 3.5 or higher. Students in the departmental Honors program are required to complete a total of sixty-five credit hours in History, rather than the fifty-five credit hours generally required of majors in the department (that number rises to 70 beginning in Autumn quarter of 2002). During their junior year, Honors students complete a 300-level seminar on historiography (HIST 395), the goal of which is three-fold: to acquaint them with the numerous ways in which historians have defined their craft; to provide insight into the numerous theoretical, societal, and personal factors that influence historians' perceptions of the past; and to introduce a broad range of approaches to historical analysis. In their senior year, participants complete a two-quarter senior seminar (HIST 491-492) in which they write a senior Honors thesis, typically 25-50 pages in length and grounded extensively in primary sources. The faculty member who directs the senior seminar offers generalized instruction in historical methods, but after students have defined their research interests, they are encouraged to work closely with faculty members possessing expertise in the field in which they are doing their research.

The Honors program has conformed to this general framework for the past decade, having last been significantly modified in 1992. Until that year, Honors students were simply required to complete an additional ten credits in History that were drawn—in principle, at least—from a list of approved "Honors" courses. These courses were irregularly offered, however, and the department had long before fallen into a pattern in which it routinely allowed Honors students to petition for Honors credit for any 400-level undergraduate seminar offered in the department. In sum, students normally met the requirement for graduation with departmental Honors simply by taking an additional two senior-level seminars on any subject at any time during their tenure at the university. By and large, participants in the program did not share a common curriculum, nor did they experience a sense of community in any significant sense. The modifications approved by the faculty in the spring of 1992 have increased the rigor of the program dramatically and have also promoted a sense of community among Honors students that had been previously lacking.

On average, approximately fifteen students are admitted to the Honors program each year, and usually eight to ten of these ultimately complete the program and graduate with departmental Honors. There has been an upward trend in enrollment in the Honors program over the past couple of years, which we attribute to increased efforts by the undergraduate advisers to recruit qualified students into the program at the time they declare their major. The typical Honors seminar consists almost entirely of students who

expect to continue their formal education after graduation, either by attending graduate school in history, or by pursuing some other professional degree, most commonly in law, international studies, or public affairs. The quality of these students is exceptional. Over the past five years, our Honors program has produced one Dean's Medalist (highest ranking graduating senior in the Social Sciences), one Presidential Medalist (highest ranking graduating senior in the University) and one Rhodes scholar.

In sum, the Honors program provides participants with the opportunity of extensive small-group experience with a cohort of unusually able and academically ambitious peers. The very strengths of the program recommend two areas in which the department can heighten its effectiveness in the future. It could do more to advertise the program to newly admitted majors, and it could broaden the involvement among faculty, inasmuch as almost all Honors courses are now rotated among only five or so faculty members.

D. The History minor and affiliated B.A. programs

Until September of 2001, the History department also offered a bachelor's degree in History and Science. This has now been replaced by the interdisciplinary History and Philosophy of Science major, which is mainly administered through the Philosophy Department. The History and Science major required 55 credits of history and 35 of science. Students in that program also took a junior seminar and a two quarter senior seminar in which they wrote a history thesis.

The department also offers a minor in History. History minors must take 30 credits of history, 20 of which must represent upper-division coursework, and 15 of which must be completed in residence.

In addition the department is affiliated with four other minors: Ancient History and Classics, Labor Studies, History of Science, and Medical History and Ethics

Part II: Research Opportunities for Undergraduates

Undergraduates have numerous opportunities throughout their career in the department to engage in independent research. Sometimes this research is done under the rubric of a formal class number; sometimes it is done with the assistance of a fellowship or fund situated in the department. The major venues for undergraduate research are as follows:

1) HIST 498 is one of the two options open to History majors for fulfilling their senior seminar requirement. As of Autumn quarter of 2002, all 498s must require as their ultimate written project a lengthy seminar paper based on original research in the relevant primary and secondary sources. Each 498 is taught by a specialist in the field (usually a tenure-line faculty member), so students are assured of expert assistance as they progress through the various stages of their project.

2) HIST 499 ("Independent Study") is an option that allows undergraduates to work one-on-one with individual faculty members on collaboratively designed research projects. Students typically exercise this option either when no regularly offered course exists in the curriculum on the topic they wish to pursue, or when they wish to do more advanced work in a given area after taking an introductory course on the topic. This course is open only to matriculated undergraduates, and is usually taken with a tenure-track faculty member (rather than a graduate student or visiting instructor). Students may take up to 5 credits per quarter of HIST 499, to a maximum of 15 credits during their career in the department. Since Winter 1992, 604 HIST 499s have been completed (with some students taking more than one five-credit class). Data from Autumn quarter of 1996 suggests that about 90% of these students are History majors, and that faculty participation in the HIST 499 option is widespread.

3) HIST 495 is a rubric under which students earn academic credit while pursuing internships with companies, institutions, or programs in the community. The University of Washington is officially committed to encouraging such internships for its undergraduate students. For History internships, students must have a faculty sponsor who ensures either that some component of the experience is related to history, or that an historical assignment (usually a paper) is a feature of the internship. Students may take up to 5 credits a quarter, and a total of 10 credits during their career at the university.

Since Winter of 1992, 47 such projects have been completed in a variety of fields. Most of our internships are served in archives and museums. In winter quarter 2002, for example, we had three students working with Lorraine McConaghy (a Ph.D. graduate from the department) at the Museum of History and Industry: one is conducting interviews for an oral history project on Japanese concentration camp survivors; one is working as a publications intern compiling and editing the King County collections anthology; and one is working on focused research projects for the museum. Other internships have been situated in Olympia: one student worked as a legislative lobbyist for the Puget Sound Council for Senior Citizens, assisting with medical, housing and social security issues. During her time on the PSCSC, she wrote a History paper on these issues under the supervision of a faculty member. This internship lasted for two quarters and her assignments became increasingly more responsible--she now works full-time for PSCSC in a paid staff position.

4) Also falling under the 495 rubric is the Elizabeth and Jonathan Roberts Fund, which has allowed the department to create a program in which students engage in research opportunities that extend classroom instruction by means of one-on-one mentorships with faculty members. Students share the experience of contributing to the production of knowledge while developing their skills in research and writing. To be eligible, students must be enrolled full-time, and must be History majors at the university working on their first B.A. degree. Students receive both pay (\$10 per hour) and HIST 495 credit. Roberts Fund projects originate in faculty interests, but allow students to combine their interests with those of their faculty mentors to produce mutually beneficial research.

Since the program began in Autumn of 2000, we have had four Roberts Fund student scholars; there is another project scheduled for Winter of 2001. In one project, a student assisted our Late Antiquity specialist, Joel Walker, on his Tahirler archaeology

project by scanning slides, producing an extensive bibliography, and writing a lengthy research paper of her own. Another student assisted labor historian Jim Gregory with the Labor Press Project, designing and constructing a website that displayed visual materials and reports that the student had gathered or, in some cases, written himself. Another student prepared an annotated critical edition of selections from the seventeenth-century travels of Adam Olerius to Russia and Persia for Dan Waugh; the research papers the student completed during the course of his project then formed part of a web-based anthology of teaching materials.

5) Mary Gates Fellowships provide research training grants that enable students to deepen their involvement in work with faculty on research, curricular design, the creative arts, and other forms of scholarly endeavor. Currently enrolled undergraduates who have not yet earned a B.A. degree are eligible to apply. They must have been participating in a faculty member's research activities since the beginning of the quarter in which they are applying. Students may apply in three areas: research, leadership, or venture.

Since the program was established in 1995, twenty-three History majors have applied for Fellowships; of these twenty-three, fourteen were accepted.

6) Center for Labor Studies Internships afford opportunities for students in many departments (of which History is one) to work with unions, labor organizations, and groups working for social justice.

Part III: End of Program Assessment

The major ongoing means of assessing the success of the department and its students are the in-class assignments required of students by individual faculty members. Grades are determined in a variety of ways, including papers, exams, and class participation. Because effective writing is one of the skills we hope our students will take away from their classes in History, almost all upper and lower division courses require students to write and, often, to revise, a paper or papers over the course of the quarter.

In addition, we require all our majors to demonstrate that they have learned the fundamentals of historical research and writing by taking a senior seminar (HIST 498; as of Autumn quarter of 2002, students may opt for the HIST 494 instead). In these classes, each student is asked to develop a topic with the assistance of his or her professor, research that topic, and produce a lengthy historical essay.

There is no final examination required of our majors because we believe that the true value of historical study does not lie in the retention of any particular body of information, but is rather to be measured in terms of a lifetime of intellectual curiosity and good citizenship. If our majors are still wondering about the world around them as they progress through their lives, if they approach whatever they read with a skepticism grounded in their previous experience with dissenting points of view, if they write persuasively about things they have discovered through their own research, then we have done our job.

Exit surveys of our graduating seniors are done through the Advising Office and reveal that students are in general very pleased with their educational experience in History (see Appendix N for samples of our exit surveys). Their experiences with the

History Advising Office have been particularly positive. Comments made in the past by graduating majors suggest that students would like more small classes than they currently have, and would like more direction in the major. Many of the recent changes made to our program—most notably, the addition of the junior seminar and the formation of advisory pathways through the major—were made in response to student comments offered in the exit surveys.

Part IV: Compliance with state-mandated accountability measures

The Chair, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the Undergraduate Advising Office continually monitor the curriculum to ensure that there are no arbitrary obstacles to students completing their degrees on time. The elimination of HIST 111, 112, and 113 as a requirement for all majors opened up new routes of access into and through the program. In addition, the Advising Office together with the Chair of the Department (who oversees the scheduling of classes) take great care to ensure that all courses necessary to the fulfillment of the major requirements are offered annually, and that courses requiring prerequisites are offered only if the prerequisites themselves have been taught recently. Moreover, many of the changes made during last year's reform are intended to help to streamline the process of completing graduation requirements for students. The HIST 388, for example, which students must take within two quarters of declaring the major, requires students early in their departmental careers to reflect on what pathway they wish to take through the major, and to plan out their courses accordingly.

Part V: Undergraduate Advising

The department staffs and operates an office specifically to assist and advise undergraduate students over the course of their academic careers. The office is open Monday through Thursday from 8:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Students may meet with advisers by appointment, or walk in with questions, or communicate with advisers by e-mail or telephone. Everyone is welcome, including non-majors and students not currently enrolled in the university. In order to reach all majors, the Advising Office also maintains an email list specifically for disseminating information to students majoring in History (histmaj@u.washington.edu), separate from the department's own general information list (uwhistory@u.washington.edu). All History majors are automatically enrolled on the histmaj list.

Advisers work to ensure that students understand and meet university, college, and departmental requirements and standards, both by conferring with students individually and by providing guidance through written materials. Such written materials include course description information, handouts on the requirement of the History major and its related minors, and departmental scholarship applications. Advisers field a wide variety of questions, both academic and personal. In addition to the more standard range of advising questions, they also find themselves offering career advice, referring students

to the campus mental health facilities, and giving driving directions. They also organize the departmental convocation every June.

In addition to acting as a resource for students, the advisers constitute an official interface with other offices and departments at the university. They fill out university paperwork relating to the declaring or changing of a student's major; they handle graduation applications and student petitions for graduation requirement waivers; and they fill out enrollment verification forms. They also analyze transcripts and provide verification for History endorsements for the Masters in Teaching degree centered in the College of Education.

Students rate the services of the Undergraduate Advising Office very highly, and faculty depend on it constantly for advice and assistance. The staff is one of the most friendly, professional and knowledgeable on campus.

Part VI: The Director of Undergraduate Studies

The undergraduate advisers work very closely with the Director of Undergraduate Studies, a faculty member who is appointed by the Chair for a three-year term. The main duties of the Director of Undergraduate Studies are to chair the Committee on Undergraduate Studies, and to monitor the department's curriculum and major for quality and coherence. (The reforms of last year were carried out by the Director and the Committee, for example.) In addition, the Director makes final decisions regarding exceptions to the undergraduate degree requirements, the granting of departmental credit for foreign study, the determination of credit for students transferring into the program from another college or university, and entry into the departmental Honors program. (Such questions usually come in the first instance to the advisers, who then refer them for a final decision to the Director.) In the spring, the Director and the Committee on Undergraduate Studies select the winners of the various undergraduate scholarships, awards, and essay prizes given out by the department. At present, the Director is not involved in the scheduling of classes. This task is done by a committee consisting of the Chair of the Department together with professional staff from the Undergraduate Office and the Graduate Office.

Part VII: Resource-sharing in undergraduate instruction

A. Official faculty affiliations with other programs and departments

History faculty have long maintained significant ties to other departments and programs in the University. Currently, eight History faculty members have joint appointments with programs in the Jackson School. Of these eight, two will no longer have that status as of the end of this year (Conlon retired in December 2001 and Ebrey is moving full-time into the History department). However, one faculty members currently full-time in the Jackson School (Dong Yue) is now being considered for a joint appointment with History; while another, currently full-time in Women Studies, is also being considered for a joint appointment with History (Barlow). Twelve of our faculty

members maintain formal Adjunct status in other departments and, in that role, teach classes, advise theses, and direct senior projects for students belonging to their host department. Departments in which History faculty hold Adjunct status include Women Studies (8), Near Eastern Languages and Civilization (2), and French and Italian (2). Thirty-one History faculty members currently serve as Program Faculty for external programs and/or participate in Centers located in the Jackson School; many of these faculty members contribute to more than one such program. Other History faculty members serve as principal administrators for external programs: John Toews is the Chair of Comparative History of Ideas (CHID), for example, while Bruce Hevly is a key player in the new major in the History and Philosophy of Science (our new hire Simon Werritt will also teach in this program). Still others teach or advise regularly in other departments or programs despite having no formal affiliation with that department. For example, several members of the faculty have taught in CHID foreign study programs: George Behlmer in Northern Ireland, Uta Poiger in Berlin, and Christoph Giebel in Hanoi. Bruce Hevly participated in the faculty exchange program sited in Bergen, Norway. Susan Glenn and Mary O'Neil have recently taught Humanities 210 classes under the auspices of the Humanities Center. Chuck Bergquest and Mary O'Neil teach for the College Honors Program. These lists could easily be lengthened.

The favor is, of course, returned: History has granted Adjunct status to sixteen professors from a variety of departments, including China Studies, Urban Planning, Classics, Japan Studies, American Indian Studies (AIS), Comparative Religion, Jewish Studies, Near Eastern Languages and Civilization (NELC), Scandinavian Studies, Chicano Studies, Astronomy and Astrophysics, African-American Studies, Women Studies, and Education. Of these Adjuncts, eight teach classes for us on a regular basis. In addition, we are fortunate to draw on the services of six faculty and one professional staff instructor who do not hold official Adjunct status. For further information, see Appendix O, "Lists of Joint and Adjunct Faculty."

B. Service Courses

Another measure of the department's commitment to interdisciplinary instruction and to the effective use of university resources is the important role played by History courses in other programs and departments. Currently, there are sixty-four History courses offered jointly with courses in other departments ("offered jointly with" means that the course in question is always taught this way). Of these sixty-four, thirty-nine are listed in the Jackson School, six in AES, five in Women Studies, three in Scandinavian Studies, and two each in Education and French and Italian Studies. Additionally, there is one course each offered jointly with CHID, Political Science, Sociology, Astronomy, Economics, Law, and Classics. Over the past ten years, we have offered approximately 254 senior seminars (HIST 498), forty-five of which were offered as "meeting with" a course in another department ("meeting with" means that a course is "cross-listed" with a course from another department for this one time only). Of these forty-five, thirty-seven were offered with courses in the Jackson School, two each with classes in Humanities and Medical History and Ethics, and one each with courses in Women Studies, English, CHID, and General Studies. Senior seminars are not the only courses we teach that "meet with" courses from other programs: two examples of other courses falling into this

category are HSTAA 205, which “meets with” a course in Asian-American Studies, and HSTEU 461, which “meets with” a course in Art History (HSTEU 461 is currently in the process of being formally converted to “offered jointly with” status).

History courses also figure in the major requirements of other programs in the university. Currently, nine departments list our courses as options for their major requirements: JSIS, American Ethnic Studies (AES), Asian Languages and Literature, Classics, Communications, CHID, Physics, Technical Communications, and Women Studies. In addition, eight other departments list History courses “meeting jointly with” courses in their department as optional courses towards the fulfillment of their major: Political Science, Sociology, Astronomy, Economics, Law, Education, French, and Italian. Departments teaching courses that are regularly allowed to count towards the History major (even though those courses are not formally cross-listed with offerings in History) include: Economics, Medical History and Ethics, AIS, and African-American Studies.

A very important constituency served by the History Department is students and prospective students in the College of Education. A survey of courses taught in Autumn quarter of 2001 (which should be fairly representative) suggests that we enroll approximately twenty non-matriculating students every quarter in History courses. Most of these are students planning to apply for the Masters in Teaching (MIT) program. Of the forty History and Social Studies endorsement applicants to the College of Education in Autumn of 2001, nearly half (fifteen) took History courses as non-matriculating students prior to being accepted to the program. (There were others who took the courses as preparation for that program but were not accepted; the exact number of these is difficult to calculate.) A survey of classes offered in Winter quarter 2001 reveals a further twenty-five MIT graduate students enrolled in History courses (these are matriculated graduate students at the university, and hence not included in the numbers above). Of the forty applicants in Winter quarter to the MIT program, fourteen were graduates of the History Department; seven of these fourteen were ultimately accepted into the MIT program.

Part VIII: Challenges to the Undergraduate Program in History

The department’s strengths in the realm of undergraduate instruction are numerous. We cover a wide range of fields, enjoy the services of a lively and involved faculty, and in recent years have broadened our curriculum to include peoples and subjects not previously included in our History program. Nothing is taken for granted: as a department, we constantly examine our undergraduate program to ensure that our quality and standards remain high, and that our courses reflect what we want our students to learn. Students enjoy considerable flexibility in choosing how they wish to pursue their historical studies, and we offer all majors two guaranteed small-class experiences during the course of their departmental career. Our Undergraduate Advising Office is superb, and the new system of pathways through the major should help students formulate their plans more clearly.

Some of the challenges that we face are endemic either to a large university system or to this university in particular. Many of our students enter the major late, or

follow a path that differs from the traditional four-year approach. This makes it difficult for such students to plan a coherent program of study over their career in the department. The quarter system also poses major difficulties to undergraduates trying to engage in serious research. Ten weeks is simply not long enough for most students to successfully immerse themselves in a new subject and produce an original historical essay. It is no accident that by far the most successful senior seminars are those for which students have had a lot of previous class preparation. Unfortunately, it is simply not possible to guarantee that students will in fact have taken a preparatory class in the quarters leading up to a given seminar.

Many of our problems reflect the limited resources with which we are forced to work. Students are entering the university in unprecedented numbers, and departments are being told to expect more and more students entering their classes over the next few years. Currently, History ranks in the bottom third of Social Science departments in terms of its student to faculty ratio in the Social Sciences. We are trying to address this problem by actively encouraging all faculty members to teach at least 150 students per year (or 300 over a two-year period). Unfortunately, our attempts in this direction are running into some real obstacles. Currently, History only has twenty TA slots per quarter (to be cut, starting in fall 2002, to eighteen), and it has several times happened that a faculty member who is willing to enlarge his or her class has been unable to do so because no TA can be provided.

Similarly, room availability is a constant problem. Professors willing to take on more students have been told that they cannot do this because there are simply no rooms available that are large enough to accommodate the proposed number of students. Many classes here still function on a five-day-per-week, 50 minutes-per-class-meeting schedule, a schedule that is exhausting for teacher and student alike. However, instructors wishing to switch to the three-times-a-week for eighty minute schedule find that they can only offer their courses in the afternoon, when students often work or take seminars, because there are no rooms available for them between 9:30-11:30 a.m. They are often further constrained by the fact that 80 minute discussion sections are an unfair burden on the Department's TA's, who are generally expected to teach only 50-minute discussion sections.

The non-availability of rooms is also negatively affecting the University's Access Student program. This program allows retired persons within the community to take undergraduate courses for no credit. History has the largest and most active group of Access students on campus. Beyond their leavening effect upon our classes, this group has also produced several very significant donors to the Department. Unfortunately, however, the University's current policy of putting classes into rooms that hold only as many chairs as there are registered students (or, sometimes, fewer chairs) is undermining the success of our Access program. Access students have been reduced to sitting on floors (difficult for persons in their seventies) or bringing camping stools to class on which to sit.

Perhaps our biggest challenge of the next few years will be retaining the breadth of coverage we currently offer in the face of faculty retirements and the constant prospect of faculty being lured away to teach elsewhere. We have one of the best Asian and Asian-American programs in the country, for example. However, we have just lost our subcontinental Indian and our Korean historians to retirement, and we do not know when

or if they will be replaced. Retirements are also imminent in several other fields, including Modern American Diplomatic, Middle East, Latin American, Russian, and Tudor-Stuart history.

Chapter III: The Graduate Program

The graduate program is a distinguished component of the History Department. Thanks to the breadth of interests and expertise among our faculty, we offer fields of an impressive chronological, geographic, and thematic expanse. Over the past decade, we have made great strides in keeping abreast of developments in the profession and transforming our program accordingly. We have worked hard to train our graduate students to be good teachers as well as scholars and to this end have made special efforts to give our students both opportunities to teach and the requisite training and guidance. Our success in these tasks is clearly reflected in our Ph.D. graduates' Exit Questionnaires (see below and Appendix V). Through teaching and research, our graduate program provides a number of benefits to the University as a whole, as well as to the region. We take special pride in our strong placement record for both academic and non-academic positions. Our academic placement record is competitive with the best programs in the country in terms of proportion of graduates placed in tenure-track positions and in the quality of those positions.

Part I: The Doctoral Program

Administration: Our graduate program is administered by the Graduate Program Coordinator, a tenured faculty member appointed for a three-year term by the Chair; the Director of Academic Services, a full-time member of the Professional Staff; and the Graduate Program Assistant, also a full-time member of the Professional Staff. The Graduate Program Coordinator is assisted by a committee, appointed annually by the Chair, consisting of four faculty. This Graduate Studies Committee is responsible for deciding on admissions, promotion of graduate students from the M.A. to the Ph.D. program, and any other matters that emerge during the course of the year in connection with our graduate program.

Objectives: As is typical of a major research university, the immediate objective of our graduate program is to prepare our students to work in academic institutions, namely research universities, liberal arts colleges, and other institutions of higher learning. Such preparation provides graduates with skills that are applicable in other forms of employment as well, such as work for the government, museums, historical research consultants, think tanks, etc. Our students develop skills in research, analysis, writing, and relevant foreign languages, and gain experience in oral presentations, technology, and committee work. We also strive to maintain transparency in our degree requirements to ensure that students proceed to their degrees in a timely fashion. In addition, we have several long-term goals for our graduate program, namely (1) to be recognized as one of the top 20 graduate programs in the country (we are currently in the top 30); (2) to maintain and improve upon our placement record; (3) to contribute more to the University's interdisciplinary interests; and (4) to respond to intense public interest in historical subjects.

Curricular Structure: Our program is notable for its academic breadth. Students can choose to study in divisions spanning the ages, from Ancient Greece and Rome and Early Imperial China, through Medieval Europe and China, to the Early Modern and Modern period for most parts of the world. Geographically, we cover the United States, Latin America, Western and Eastern Europe, Russia, East Asia, Southeast Asia, and Africa. Thematically, we offer several fields in History of Science and we have recently developed new fields in Comparative History, including Historiography, Comparative Ethnicity and Nationalism, Comparative Gender, and Comparative Colonialisms. Our program is particularly strong in Asian history, where we have specialists in Early and Late Imperial China, Modern China, Pre-Modern and Modern Southeast Asia, and Modern Japan. Other fields where we are particularly strong include American Western and environmental history, African-American history (for which we have three specialists), women's history, and European social and cultural history.

Doctoral students choose a first, second, third and fourth field from at least two of our divisions, putting together a committee of four faculty members to supervise their respective fields. The basic structure of our program encourages students to take advantage of this breadth in developing coherent programs of study. Fields are combined in such a way that students, alongside their field(s) of primary research, can present a profile of teaching breadth attractive to prospective academic employers. In selecting fields, students choose their primary field in conjunction with their chief research interests, and other fields with an eye to complementing their main field and developing marketable teaching proficiency over a broad range of courses.

Changes since 1992: Since our last Ten Year Review back in 1992, we have instituted a number of important modifications in our graduate program. Some of these changes were suggested in the Review itself; others were responses to continuing changes in the discipline and to graduate student concerns. As the last Review suggested we should do, we have developed new fields that enhance the diversity of our offerings in U.S. history, including Indigenous Peoples of North America, African-American and Asian-American history. In addition, we established new core course requirements for the American and Modern European history fields. These core courses acquaint incoming graduate students with the major literature, issues, and historiographical controversies in their respective fields, introduce them to a variety of methodologies, and enable them to build scholarly and social bonds with other students in their cohort. For U.S. history, a core sequence of colonial, nineteenth and twentieth century history is taught over three quarters, while for modern Europe a core sequence consisting of a one quarter course on methodology and historiography is followed by a two-quarter research seminar. These courses have evolved over the years, in content and form, in response to graduate student concerns.

Another significant programmatic change over the past decade was the introduction of several new comparative fields in recognition of new emphases on comparative research in our discipline and of graduate student desires to explore certain themes in a way that transcends geographical limitations. We now offer fields in Historiography, Comparative Ethnicity and Nationalism, Comparative Gender, and

Comparative Colonialisms. These fields have helped our students enhance both the theoretical sophistication of their research and versatility of their teaching repertoire.

Criteria for Admission: Applicants who hold or expect to complete an M.A. degree in History or a closely related field before entering our graduate program may apply for admission as a doctoral student. Applicants are evaluated based on a number of criteria: previous academic record, Graduate Record Examination scores, language preparation, proposed Ph.D. fields, letters of recommendation, a writing sample, and a statement of purpose. Files are evaluated holistically; no single criterion is decisive in determining whether or not an applicant is admitted to our program. Admission is very competitive, as is evident in the profile of our entering Ph.D. students for Autumn 2001: median GPA 3.85, median Verbal GRE score 88%. This is typical of the profile of the doctoral students we have admitted over the last ten years. (See Appendix A). Details of the admissions process can be found under Information for Prospective Students on our web site and in our printed brochure for applicants.

Requirements for the Ph.D. Degree: Students seeking a Ph.D. must meet a combination of Graduate School and Department requirements. The Graduate School requirements are:

- a minimum of 90 credits, 60 of which must be completed at the UW
- at least 18 credits of numerically-graded course work in approved 400- and 500-level courses, completed at the UW and prior to the General Examinations
- at least 18 credits of course work at the 500-level and above, completed at the UW
- passage of the General Examination
- a minimum of 27 credits of HIST 800, taken over a period of at least three quarters
- preparation of a dissertation and its acceptance by the Dean of the Graduate School. The dissertation must be a significant contribution to knowledge and clearly indicate training in research.
- completion of all work for the degree within 10 years
- a minimum grade point average of 3.0

The Department requirements are:

- a reading knowledge of at least one language other than English, which can be met by passing a translation examination, by passing an approved language examination, or by petition should the student's proficiency be clear from earlier work; proficiency in additional languages may be required in accordance with a student's field and research interests
- completion of a research seminar paper
- satisfactory performance on the Ph.D. General Examination (i.e. a written examination in four fields followed by an oral examination)
- completion and defense of the dissertation

Impact: Our doctoral program benefits our academic unit and the University in a number of ways. The better we train our students, the greater our Department's prestige and the more likely we are to attract better applicants to the University of Washington. The reputation of our Department and University is enhanced when our students present papers at regional, national, and international conferences, when they win outside grants, and especially when they are hired at other institutions. We believe our program's strengths and the quality of our graduate students are becoming better recognized nationally. This in turn enables us to attract strong and innovative faculty at both the junior and senior levels.

The Department prides itself on its training and mentoring programs by which our graduate students learn to excel as teachers. Our Teaching Assistants not only gain practical teaching experience for themselves, but also enhance the educational experience of our undergraduates in our large lecture classes by providing a weekly opportunity to meet in small discussion sections.

In addition, some of our graduate students also serve as part-time undergraduate advisors for the History Department. This benefits not only our undergraduate students who go to them for information on our undergraduate degree requirements, class schedules, course offerings, etc., but also the advisors themselves, who learn valuable skills that will be of use to them later in their professional careers.

There are a number of ways in which our program enhances the University's mission, particularly in terms of interdepartmental cooperation and interdisciplinary education. Many History graduate courses are cross-listed with courses in other programs and our faculty frequently team-teach graduate courses with faculty from other departments. For example, in Winter 2002, HIST 530 (Comparative Colonialisms) is being taught with ANTH 525 (Seminar in Cultural Processes), and HSTAA 590B (Topics in American History) is being taught with ENGL 537 (Topics in American Studies) and HUM 596 (Humanities Research Seminar). Other units regularly draw on our faculty (e.g. Comparative Religion, Comparative Literature, Textual Studies, African Studies, European Studies, Asian Languages and Literature, Drama, the Jackson School, English, Women Studies) to teach graduate-level courses for them. In this way, we develop relationships with other departments, which allows us to refer our students to their faculty and courses when needed. We also serve other units on campus by teaching broad-based graduate methodology courses, in which graduate students from other departments routinely enroll. In addition, a number of our graduate students have served other units on campus as history and language instructors and TAs, for example in English, Asian Languages and Literature, the Comparative History of Ideas Program, Near Eastern Languages and Civilization, the Program on the Environment, etc.

Our Ph.D. program's impact extends beyond the confines of the Department and even the University to benefit the Pacific Northwest region in a number of ways. With the help of Teaching Assistants and graduate student instructors, we are able to provide an array of undergraduate courses to Washington State residents, many of whom have an intense interest in learning about a great variety of places, time periods and themes. Our faculty and graduate students are frequently asked to speak to local groups and organizations as well. Moreover, our graduates are employed in a number of institutions that serve the Pacific Northwest; for example, at the Museum of History and Industry, the *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, the University of Washington Press, the local National Park

Service, and as regional historical research consultants. In addition, some of our recent graduates and current advanced graduate students have benefited the region by serving as instructors at UW-Bothell, UW-Tacoma, Seattle University, Pacific Lutheran University, the University of Puget Sound, The Evergreen State College, and local community colleges.

Assessment: The success of our doctoral program can be measured in a number of ways, most significantly through our placement record, but also by our students' success in winning outside grants and awards, the time it takes for students to attain their degrees, and the quantity and quality of the books and articles published by our graduate students. Below is a summary of our assessment efforts and their results with respect to these categories.

(A) Placement record—We are particularly proud of our placement record. Since 1989, well over half of our 113 Ph.D. recipients have secured employment as tenure-track faculty and over 85% of them are employed in positions related to their degrees and graduate training:

1989-2001

Tenure track faculty—61 (53.9%)
 Non-tenure track faculty—17 (15%)
 Post-doctoral appointment—2 (1.8%)
 History-related positions—18 (16%)
 Other—15 (13.3%)

Over the past three years we have graduated 40 Ph.D.s, 95% of whom are employed in positions related to their degrees and graduate training:

1998-2001

Tenure-track faculty—20 (50%)
 Non-tenure track faculty—12 (30%)
 History-related employment—6 (15%)
 Other—2 (5%)

Not only do we place a significant percentage of our graduates, we frequently place them in high quality appointments. For example, over the past three years, our Ph.D. graduates have secured tenure-track positions at the University of Michigan, Cornell University, the University of Wisconsin, and Bowdoin College.

Several observations and clarifications should be made about this data:

- of the graduates obtaining tenure-track faculty positions, around half are employed by Ph.D. granting institutions and half by colleges that do not grant the Ph.D.

- history-related employment includes teaching history in high school, working for governmental agencies such as the Department of State, and working in museums;
- while we do not graduate the number of Ph.D.s produced by some of the major graduate programs in the U.S., our placement rate is comparable to those programs, as can be seen from the study of Ph.D. placement rates in the U.S. by Ted Margadant, published in the May 1999 issue of *AHA Perspectives*. Margadant's study compared the placement rates of the 20 largest History Ph.D. programs in the U.S. to that of 120 "small and medium-sized programs." Though the UW is not among the 20 largest departments, its placement rate is on a par with them, and well ahead of the rate for the small and medium-sized programs.
- a weakness in our data is that it sometimes records a Ph.D. recipient's first job, but not necessarily further employment or lack thereof; we are currently trying to come up with a better means of tracking our graduates over the medium and long-term.

(B) Outside grants and awards—our graduate students have been quite successful in obtaining outside grants and awards. Our students regularly win Fulbright and Fulbright-Hays grants (ten over the past three years), as well as fellowships from IREX, NSF, Ford Foundation, SSRC and a host of other foundations. In all, the number of outside grants awarded to our students over the past three years was 19, 16, and 24, respectively. Our Graduate Studies Office tries to keep track of all outside grants and awards won by our students.

(C) Time to Degree—The University's Office of Planning and Budgeting tracks the time it takes our doctoral students to attain their degrees. The vast majority of our students have been getting through the program well within the ten-year limit set by the Graduate School. For the three-year period from 1998 to 2000, our students took an average of 8.6 years to attain their doctoral degrees. We would prefer the time to degree to be a bit less, but given the strong international flavor of our program, a number of students are held up due to the demands that language instruction, research abroad, and procurement of funding for such research impose.

(D) Publications by graduate students—We are proud of the success that our graduate students have had in the realm of publication. The February 2001 issue of the *American Historical Review*, for example, featured articles by two of our graduate students, one in Russian and one in Latin American history. We learn about graduate student publications from their faculty advisors, or from the students themselves. However, at present we do not have a set procedure for tracking publications of our current students or those of our graduates. This is something that we would like to approach more systematically in the future, and we are currently considering ways to build a database of publications by our present and former students.

(E) Exit surveys—The UW Graduate School conducts exit surveys of M.A. and Ph.D. recipients throughout the University. Our Department has done exceptionally well in

these surveys. Our Department ratings far exceed the average ratings for the College of Arts and Sciences and the University as a whole in most categories, including: adequacy of research and professional training, quality of faculty, departmental academic standards, satisfaction with supervision and/or guidance and, most notably, overall quality of the program. We also learn from these surveys about areas where there is room for improvement. For example, graduates at both levels gave relatively low ratings to the adequacy of the space and facilities allotted to us.

Professional Development and Career Preparation: The Department believes that graduate education ultimately depends on the establishment of an academic relationship between a graduate student and mentoring faculty members. To help foster these relationships, the Graduate School produced a brochure with constructive and instructive guidelines that we distributed to our entire faculty and graduate student population in an effort to raise awareness pertaining to mentoring.

This mentoring relationship varies with each professor and student. Faculty work individually with graduate students; they advise them as to what courses to take, inform them of funding opportunities, comment on their drafts of research proposals and conference papers, write recommendation letters for them, and advise them with regard to publishing their work and career options. Similarly, students spend their time and energy inside and outside the classroom in an effort to achieve academic excellence and to earn the degree in a timely fashion. This requires that students communicate regularly with their faculty mentors, keeping them informed of their research plans and progress within the program.

Graduate student appointments (TA, RA, SA) provide another means for students to acquire practical knowledge of the skills and ethics of the profession by working closely with faculty. In addition, our Department encourages students to present their research at scholarly conferences. We pay 50% of the airfare for students who are successful in getting their conference papers accepted. We also annually award grants of up to \$4000 for 5 to 10 students, who need to make research trips (the Rondeau-Evans grant), and several travel grants of up to \$750 for those who need to conduct preliminary dissertation research abroad (the Burg grant). Outside the classroom, our graduate students have the periodic opportunity to read and comment on each other's research, with faculty participation, in the History Research Workshop and the History of Science Reading Group. They also can take part, along with faculty and graduate students from the Department of English, in the Early Modern European Research Group.

Helping students prepare for the job market is a crucial part of the mentoring process. The Department encourages students to begin preparing for the job search very early in their studies and we offer several services to assist them in this regard. First and foremost, the History Graduate Office informs students of job openings, academic and non-academic, that come to our attention through channels such as electronic lists (e.g. H-NET Job Guide), notices sent by search committees to our faculty or Department, and notifications from our former students. Our faculty and graduate advisors encourage students to evaluate their teaching and research interests and abilities so that they may target appropriate institutions (e.g. research universities, liberal arts colleges, government work, etc.) when applying for positions. Since curriculum vitae and teaching portfolios

are necessary to apply for academic positions, we require our students early on to develop these materials by making them essential components of applications for departmental funding. Another means by which we assist our students to present themselves in as professional a manner as possible is by hosting “mock interviews” for those students who have been granted campus interviews. Upon request, we also arrange for students to present practice job talks to their peers and professors.

The Department’s efforts to prepare our doctoral students for their professional careers extend into the classroom through two courses specifically designed to focus on professional development. In HIST 571 (Academic Career Preparation), students learn about the structure of universities and academic programs, how to develop c.v.s, syllabae, and course curricula, and how to prepare for the job market. HIST 570 (Topics in Teaching History), a new course that we will offer regularly, introduces students to some of the latest scholarship on pedagogical theory and practice as applied to teaching History at the college level.

Teaching history to undergraduate students is one of the most important functions of the Department. To prepare graduate students for this professional responsibility and to facilitate our own instructional program, the Department appoints each year a small number of graduate students, who have completed at least one year of graduate study, as Teaching Assistants. Teaching assistantships provide graduate students with the opportunity to acquire practical teaching experience by being responsible for the discussion sections of our large lecture classes under the supervision of a faculty member. These faculty are required to evaluate their TAs quarterly in order to assist them in improving their teaching skills. In addition, TAs are required to attend quarterly workshops on issues relevant to teaching. In recognition of the role of TAs in undergraduate education, the Department has created the Power Prize for Outstanding History Teaching Assistant.

Each year, Teaching Assistants nominate a lead TA, whose task it is to coordinate the TA workshops, visit the sections of new TAs, and provide assistance and guidance for improving their classroom performance. The lead TA also acts as a liaison between TAs and the Department, and is a member of the TA appointment committee. The Department also provides many opportunities for doctoral students to develop their leadership skills both inside and outside the classroom. Many field courses and seminars require that students present research papers and/or lead discussions, and courses such as HIST 570 and 571 provide training in relevant classroom leadership skills. Outside the classroom, students also gain practical experience with departmental governance by serving on our faculty search committees, our strategic planning committee, and the Graduate Liaison Committee, a student committee whose members are elected by the graduate students (see below). Aside from opportunities to serve as Lead TAs or TAs, graduate students also gain leadership training as undergraduate history advisors, tutors in the History Writing Center, and interns at places such as the *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, the Center for the Study of the Pacific Northwest, and the Center for Labor Studies. In addition, the Department tries to provide our Ph.D. candidates with the opportunity to teach their own courses, as determined by available funding and the Department’s curricular needs. Finally, two of our graduate students are elected by their peers to represent them in the Graduate and Professional Student Senate, an advocacy

organization concerned with a wide range of issues and services of interest to graduate students.

Like most large research universities, we have traditionally operated on the assumption that our students would enter academic careers. This does not mean, however, that those choosing non-academic careers are left without substantial training relevant to their professions. Indeed, many of the skills acquired by historians transfer well into other fields, namely the capacity to research, analyze, communicate orally and in writing, use foreign languages and basic instructional technology, etc. In recent years, we have been increasingly cognizant of the number of our graduates entering professions outside the traditional academic track. For instance, we have recent graduates working at the Department of State, the Central Intelligence Agency, various NGOs, research institutes, state government, and as private consultants. We are continually looking for ways to make our program more amenable and applicable to such non-academic career tracks. We encourage our graduate students to examine their interests and abilities and explore non-traditional career options. We organize visits and talks by some of our former students now in non-academic professions. We are currently considering ways to attract non-academic applicants to our program, for example, through the possible revival of the terminal General M.A. degree (see Part II below) and by publicizing our non-traditional placements on our website and in our printed material.

Challenges to the Doctoral Program in History: Our doctoral program is distinguished by the number and breadth of the fields offered and by our faculty's expertise in both teaching and research. We are proud of our program's ability to respond to the individual needs of our students and to new trends in the discipline. However, our doctoral program does face a number of challenges that must be met if we are to sustain the high quality of our program.

The graduate program continues to suffer from a serious lack of funding, particularly in comparison with other peer history departments across the country where 2, 3, 4 and 5- year funding packages are common. We normally are able to offer incoming graduate students one-year of full funding and a promise of future funding if they do well in their first year of study. Over the last ten years we have successfully kept this promise primarily through TA appointments (which are renewable for three years). However, it is not clear that we will be able to maintain this given the current Washington State budgetary crisis. We have already lost two TA positions for next year and there is a very real possibility that we will lose additional positions. Obviously our inability to offer competitive multi-year funding packages impedes our ability to recruit our most desirable applicants. This, in turn, threatens to undermine the overall academic quality of our graduate student body. Furthermore, it may become necessary for more of our students to take on outside work in order to support themselves, thus extending their time to degree. In addition, budget limitations mean that the Department cannot offer all doctoral candidates the opportunity to teach their own courses, which makes them less competitive on the job market.

While we only admit students for whom we have appropriate fields and faculty, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the History Department to offer the field courses and research seminars necessary for our students to complete the degree in a timely manner. This is partly a consequence of several faculty retirements combined with a

number of faculty not teaching for us each quarter. Our faculty are not only called upon to teach courses in other units to serve the interdisciplinary interests of the University, but their success in winning research grants means that faculty are not infrequently on leave from teaching in order to make use of this funding. While this is evidence of the excellence of our faculty, which enhances the reputation of the Department and the University, at the same time it makes it difficult for us to offer needed courses on a regular basis. This also presents difficulties for our students, who must work closely with particular faculty to define and develop their fields. In addition, as faculty have retired and new faculty have been hired, old fields have remained on the books while new ones are added. This proliferation of fields has meant that not all fields receive the coverage they should. At the same time, we face a decreasing number of entering students, which leads to an insufficient enrollment in some graduate courses. We like to see 10-12 students enrolled in each graduate class. However, recently it is not unusual for some graduate courses to have fewer than 5 students enrolled. Obviously, such a small number is not conducive to the kind of intellectual exchange we expect to see in our graduate classes. Finally, the Department is in desperate need of additional office space for both faculty, Teaching Assistants and graduate student instructors. Proper space and adequate facilities (telephones, computers, etc.) are necessary to the teaching and research mission of our Department.

There is little the Department can do about the space/facilities issues and we, like other departments on campus, must learn to make better use of limited financial resources. However, the Department must address those challenges over which it does have some control. The Graduate Studies Committee is currently discussing ways by which we could increase our enrollments, as well as make the structure of the graduate program more attuned to the talents, needs, and character of our faculty and students. For example, we are considering ways to give students and faculty greater flexibility in designing fields. The past practice of requiring regularly taught field courses for a number of preordained fields is creating an excess of under enrolled field courses and an inability to staff all the courses we are expected to offer. Moreover, it is discouraging faculty from developing innovative, topically-based graduate courses that many of them would like to teach and many of our students would like to take. To overcome these challenges requires that we re-envision the nature and purpose of our graduate program and undertake greater fund-raising efforts to meet our needs. The Graduate Studies Committee intends to present a written proposal to the Department later this year that will define more specifically a new relationship among divisions, fields and faculty and the manner in which such changes can be implemented.

Part II: The Masters Program

Much of what was said previously about the administration of our doctoral program, our graduate fields and faculty, and the financial constraints under which we operate pertains to our M.A. program as well. However, there are certain aspects of the M.A. program that are best discussed separately.

Objectives: The primary purpose of our M.A. program, like that of other major research universities, is to prepare students ultimately for academic careers; to develop skills in research, analysis, writing, and relevant foreign languages, and to gain experience with oral presentations, technology, and committee work. Most of our M.A. candidates continue on to the Ph.D. in our program or elsewhere, although a significant number go on to other pursuits (e.g. law school, teaching, library work) after completing their M.A. degrees. Approximately 55% of those who enter our M.A. program continue on to the Ph.D., while 34% complete the M.A. and go on to other pursuits; 11% don't complete the M.A. As with the Ph.D. program, we aspire to get students through in a timely fashion. Our M.A. program is designed to be completed in one or two years depending on the M.A. option the student selects (see below).

Curricular Structure: M.A. students work with the same faculty and select their fields from the same chronological, geographical and topical areas of specialization as our doctoral students. Consequently, the field additions described earlier for our Ph.D. program under the headings Curricular Structure and Changes since 1992 also apply to our M.A. program.

M.A. students may choose: (1) a 2-field M.A. in which students select two fields from a single division, or (2) a cross-divisional M.A. in which students select two fields but from two different divisions, or (3) a divisional M.A. in which students specialize in U.S. history. Students are expected to complete the 2-field M.A. and the cross-divisional M.A. in two years, and the Divisional M.A. in one year. At this time the Divisional M.A. is available only in U.S. history.

Changes since 1992: The current structure of our M.A. program was instituted during the 1994-1995 academic year following a departmental review of our graduate program. At that time we were receiving upwards of 400 applications annually to the program and we were, as now, competing with the best graduate programs in the country for the top applicants. We needed to redesign our graduate program to move students through the M.A. and on to their Ph.D. work as speedily as possible. At the same time, the M.A. had to continue to act as a filter to catch people who proved not to be capable of first-class Ph.D. work. To meet these goals we retained the basic structure of our M.A. program, but added the first and third M.A. options listed above and reduced the M.A. seminar requirement from two research seminar papers to one.

Allowing students the additional options of choosing a 2-field M.A. with fields selected from the same division or choosing a Divisional M.A., permits our M.A. students to concentrate in their primary area of interest rather than taking on a field in another division which for many M.A. students functions as an undesirable diversion of their time away from their primary area of study and slows down their progress to the degree. The Divisional M.A. in particular was seen as a means to provide our students with a coherent overview of the subject matter in one division of concentration. Since the majority of our students intend to pursue academic careers, such preparation is essential for teaching broad survey courses. In addition, the Divisional M.A. was set up so that students are able to complete the M.A. in one year instead of two, thus moving the students onto the doctoral degree more quickly. We had hoped that faculty would develop courses to support a Divisional M.A. in other divisions of history as well.

However, this has not yet happened and the Divisional M.A. is still only available in American History. This may explain the fact that since 1994 only 10.7% of our M.A. students have chosen this option. Further, somewhat to our surprise, we have found that the 2-field M.A. option has proven to be unquestionably the most popular choice with our students. Students appreciate the benefits of being able to work within one division but at the same time prefer having two years in which to develop their fields of study and mentoring relationships with their supervising faculty.

Criteria for Admission: Applicants who hold or expect to complete a B.A. degree in History or a closely related field before entering our graduate program may apply for our M.A. program. Applicants are evaluated for admission based on a number of criteria, namely, undergraduate academic record, Graduate Record Examination scores, language preparation, proposed M.A. fields, letters of recommendation, a writing sample, and a statement of purpose. Files are evaluated holistically; no single criterion is decisive in determining whether or not an applicant is admitted to our program. M.A. applicants are evaluated in the same pool as the Ph.D. applicants, using the same basic criteria, though modified to take into account their lack of graduate experience. Admission is very competitive as is evident in the profile of our entering M.A. students for Autumn 2001: median GPA 3.79, median Verbal GRE score 92%. This is typical of the profile of the M.A. students we have admitted over the last ten years. (See Appendix A). Details of the admission process can be found under Information for Prospective Students on our web site and in our printed brochure for applicants.

Requirements for the M.A. Degree:

Students seeking an M.A. must meet a combination of Graduate School and departmental requirements. The Graduate School requires:

- a minimum of 36 credits of course work, with at least 30 of them earned at the UW; of the 36 credits, at least 18 of them must be in courses numbered 500 and above; and at least 18 of them must be in numerically graded coursework in 400 or 500 level courses taken at the UW
- an M.A. examination, in accordance with departmental requirements
- the completion of the degree within six years
- a minimum Grade Point Average of 3.0
- registration during the quarter in which the degree is conferred

The departmental requirements are:

- a reading knowledge of at least one language other than English, which can be met by passing a translation examination, by passing an approved language examination, or by petition should the student's proficiency be clear from earlier work
- passage of a written examination, in which the student demonstrates mastery of a substantial body of historical knowledge
- satisfactory completion of a graduate seminar, which entails the preparation of a research seminar paper; (most such seminars comprise two or three quarters); in lieu of the seminar paper, a student may elect to produce an M.A. thesis

Promotion to the Ph.D. Program: Students who complete their master's degree in the History Department must formally request to be considered for promotion/admission to our doctoral program. This request includes a statement of purpose outlining the student's plans for future study and specifying which fields the student proposes to offer for the Ph.D. and the names of the supervising faculty. The Graduate Studies Committee is responsible for making the promotion decisions. Upon receipt of the student's promotion request, the Committee reviews the student's record and may consult with those faculty members with whom the student has worked and with whom the student proposes to work. Written notification of the Committee's decision is sent to the student together with a request for the student to make an appointment to meet with the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee (the Graduate Program Coordinator) by a specified date. At this meeting the Coordinator discusses the Committee's evaluation of the student's file, answers any questions the student might have about the doctoral program, and if the student has been promoted, gives the student the *Request Form for Establishing A Doctoral Supervisory Committee*.

Impact: Our M.A. program is very successful in preparing our students to go on to the Ph.D. either here or elsewhere. Approximately 55% of those who enter our M.A. program continue on to the Ph.D. The skills in research and analysis developed by our M.A. students also benefit the 34% of our students who do not go on to Ph.D. programs, but continue their education in other areas such as law, librarianship, teaching, etc. or who begin working.

We are continuously looking for ways to make our program more applicable and amenable to those interested in non-academic career tracks. As stated earlier, we are presently looking into the possibility of reviving and restructuring our terminal General M.A. program. Such a step would bring additional benefits to the region. Unlike some of our peer institutions, this General M.A. would not be intended solely for the advanced training of history teachers, but open to a broader section of qualified and interested applicants. Based on past experience we expect this terminal degree would be pursued typically by high school history teachers and librarians seeking to enhance their credentials; professionals in fields such as law or business who are contemplating career changes later in life; and older residents who love history but never had the opportunity to study it formally at the graduate level. The General M.A. would not only benefit such Washington State residents, but we anticipate that these additional students would benefit our overall graduate program by increasing the number of students enrolled in our core graduate courses. This would make our courses more cost-effective in terms of faculty to student ratio, and would enhance discussions through the participation both of more students and of students who could bring to the courses experiences and interests not commonly found among the typical graduate student population.

Assessment: We measure our M.A. program's success in a number of ways—do students complete the program in a timely fashion, and do they go on to follow-up their degree with suitable employment or further education. For students who go on to pursue a Ph.D. in our Department, we find that the M.A. prepares them well. The attrition rate, for

instance, is significantly lower for students who have received an M.A. in our Department than for ones coming in with an M.A. from elsewhere. Of the 10 Ph.D. students who left the program between 1994 and 2000 without receiving their degree, 90% had received their M.A. from another institution and only 10% had received their M.A. from our Department.

We assess the quality of our M.A. program with respect to those M.A. students who are not seeking a UW History Ph.D. by their success in getting accepted to superior Ph.D. programs elsewhere, getting accepted to desired professional schools, or finding employment for which our M.A. provided appropriate training. While we do not systematically track this at present, we are aware of the career paths of most of our graduates who leave the UW, who have gone into careers ranging from law and library science to writing historical fiction. In most cases, this information comes to us either from the graduates themselves or from their faculty. In the future, we hope to be more systematic in gathering information on the career choices and accomplishments of our graduates, in particular those in non-academic careers. Such information would be useful for current and prospective students who are interested in applying an advanced degree in History to a field outside the academic profession.

For all students, we measure success by an expeditious time-to-degree. Over the past three years our M.A. students have taken an average of 1.8 years to attain their degrees, well within the Graduate School's limit and in line with the normal expectations of our program.

Challenges to the Master's Degree Program in History : One of the strengths of our M.A. program is that it affords our students a wide range of options that allows them to tailor their program to best meet their scholarly interests and career needs, whether academic or non-academic. This is not to say, however, that our M.A. program is not faced with many of the same challenges impacting our Ph.D. program. In particular, our M.A. program, like our Ph.D. program, faces a number of impediments, including: a serious lack of funding for recruitment and retention, the Department's inability to offer regularly all of the field courses and research seminars necessary for students to complete their programs in a timely manner, the problem of decreasing enrollments in our graduate classes, and the uncertainties consequent to recent and pending faculty retirements.

Other concerns are more applicable to the M.A. program but not without relevance to our Ph.D. program; for example, incompletes and grade inflation. Since the Department does not allow students to take their written exams until all their course work has been satisfactorily completed, outstanding incompletes can delay a student's progress through the program. This problem is most acute in our M.A. program because it is intended to be completed within two years.

Grade inflation also adversely affects both our M.A. and Ph.D. programs, but it is especially problematic at the M.A. level because it makes it more difficult to identify those students who may not be suitable for promotion to the Ph.D. This problem is reflected in the inconsistency between the grades faculty members assign students and the comments they make about student performance on the *Instructor's End of Quarter Evaluation Form* (see Appendix W). This persists despite the fact that we provide on the form a clear grading scale so that the faculty can match the tenor of their comments with an equivalent course grade. Unfortunately, it is not uncommon for the History Graduate

Office to receive forms indicating the faculty member has assigned a grade of 3.7 or higher, but with faculty comments indicating the student's work is just adequate or marginal and occasionally stating that the student should probably not proceed to the Ph.D.

In an effort to deal with the challenges outlined above, we are currently working on restructuring the graduate curriculum with the aim of giving both students and faculty greater flexibility in designing fields that take full advantage of our faculty strengths and student interests (see Part I: The Doctoral Program); we are encouraging faculty to make grades reflect more accurately a student's performance and potential; and we are discouraging students from taking incompletes unless absolutely necessary and requiring them to complete any ones they have pending.

Part III: Graduate Students

Recruitment of a Diverse Student Body: History, even more than most disciplines, demands a multitude of approaches and is enriched by a variety of perspectives. Both substantive and epistemological trends over the last generation have underscored the necessity of training a diverse body of future professionals to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse society. As historians have broadened their focus to explore the lived experiences of groups traditionally overlooked by their predecessors, and as their understanding of the crucial importance of perspective in historical explanation has grown, their appreciation of the imperative importance of encouraging diversity in graduate education (among both students and faculty) has increased apace.

The Department has long recognized that the recruitment of a diverse student body is absolutely essential to the promotion and perpetuation of an excellent graduate program. In an effort to make our program known among prospective students, we are listed in the American Historical Association's directory and the Peterson guides; we participate in the Western and National Name Exchange Programs; we send representatives to career fairs and all of the Professional and Student Days on campus, including those that target students from ethnic minorities; and our History Graduate Office holds an annual workshop to assist students applying to graduate school. Our program is also known through the reputations of our faculty, our national ranking as a Department, our placement record, and recommendations by colleagues and former students across the country.

In addition, we maintain a departmental website that includes relevant information about our Department and its attractions. We intend to expand this in the future to include a calendar of upcoming lectures, as well as information on faculty and student awards and publications. (We are in the process of hiring a computer specialist for this purpose). Students can now download all graduate application materials directly from our website. Next year applicants will actually be able to submit many of our forms on-line. We believe that by providing students with the most complete and comprehensive description possible of our degree requirements, faculty and fields, we will attract those applicants whose needs and interests will be best served by our program.

When screening applicants for our graduate program, the Department has never limited its assessment narrowly to the evaluation of transcripts and GRE scores, but has sought as well to give weight to elements in applicants' backgrounds and/or life experiences that promise both new perspectives and new insights into the study of the past. To facilitate this, we added three years ago to our standard application packet an option for all applicants to submit a "personal statement" (see Appendix R) in which they identify and discuss those aspects of their lives, background, and experiences that they feel makes them potential contributors to our program's diversity. Some twenty-six of our applicants for Autumn 2002 opted to submit a personal statement as part of their application materials, up from twenty-two in 2001 and thirteen in 2000. These statements have proven to be extremely useful in helping the Graduate Studies Committee to identify talented candidates who would contribute significantly to the diversity of their graduate student cohort.

Having identified promising candidates, our next task is to convince them to join our graduate program. This is no easy task, primarily because of our seriously constrained financial resources for graduate student recruitment. Our applicant pool is drawn from all over the country. By far the most formidable obstacle we face in recruiting a diverse student body is our inability to compete with our rivals - such as Stanford, Chicago, Berkeley, Michigan, and UCLA - in offering lucrative, multi-year financial aid packages. For example, in our annual survey of students who declined our offers, 12 of 18 respondents listed "financial considerations" as "absolutely critical" in their decision to go elsewhere; in our survey of the 11 respondents who accepted our offer, most cited financial considerations as a major factor in their acceptance; 5 regarded it as "absolutely critical."

We recognize that in most cases we cannot match the lucrative recruitment awards that our peer schools have at their disposal. Consequently, we have concentrated instead on increasing the range of viewpoints reflected in our graduate curriculum, reasoning that, as our Department becomes increasingly well known for its breadth of perspectives it will also become increasingly attractive to prospective graduate students from diverse backgrounds.

Since 1996 we have added to our Department a nationally known expert in the history of gender and race in the American South (Suzanne Lebsock), a specialist in African history (Lynn Thomas), a specialist in the study of American slavery (Stephanie Camp), a leading scholar in the African-American experience in the 20th century West (Quintard Taylor), a specialist in African-American intellectual history (Nikhil Singh), and, most recently, a specialist in Asian-American history (Moon-Ho Jung). In addition, we have recently added new graduate fields in African-American History, Asian-American History, The Indigenous Peoples of North America, Comparative Gender, and Comparative Colonialisms. We believe that these additions to our faculty and curriculum will augment the already large number of graduate student applicants who recognize our Department as one of the most exciting places in the United States to explore questions of diversity in the human past, and we fully expect that this will have an appreciable impact on the diversity of the students who apply to study here.

This is not to suggest that our efforts to attract a diverse graduate student body are confined to strategic changes in faculty and curriculum. We definitely try to construct the most attractive aid packages that we can, using both departmental and Graduate

School funds for this purpose. To begin with, to the extent possible, we attempt to offer financial aid packages in the form of research assistantships. Not only do such awards provide financial support, but also they promise to facilitate the recipient's integration into the life of the Department by promoting a close association with a faculty mentor from whom the student learns practical research skills as well as meaningful insights into the activities and responsibilities of academic life. We also regularly commit departmental resources to students whom we recruit in the form of teaching assistantships or departmental fellowships. These funding packages normally consist of tuition, health benefits and a monthly stipend of approximately \$1200 for the 9 months of the academic year.

We are opposed on principle to bringing in students with financial support for their first year, and then leaving them without funding for subsequent years. Our general departmental policy is to do our utmost to ensure that all students receiving financial recruitment offers for their first year of study receive essentially comparable support for three additional years, provided, of course, that they show evidence of satisfactory academic progress.

We also strive to demonstrate the sincerity of our interest through a series of personal contacts with our applicants. The Graduate Program Coordinator contacts candidates by phone to indicate broad departmental interest; in addition, we make sure that pertinent specialists within the Department are also in phone contact, and we regularly facilitate communication between recruits and graduate students already in the program as well. This year, for the first time, we have a Diversity Committee in place, through which interested faculty and graduate students will take part in our efforts to recruit targeted applicants. Moreover, in instances in which we sense that a campus visit might make a difference in recruiting a candidate, we regularly employ departmental funds as well as monies from the Graduate School Recruitment Program to make such visits possible. In addition to enabling applicants to meet our faculty and inspect Department and University resources first-hand, such offers of travel money also help us to demonstrate more concretely the level of our interest. Our current graduate students help in hosting these visiting recruits, providing them with, among other things, transportation and housing. We also participate in GO-MAP's annual Prospective Graduate Student Days, combining departmental and GO-MAP activities in hopes of providing visiting recruits with a sense of the graduate student community within the Department as well as across departments and disciplines at the University of Washington.

Assessment: We judge the success of our recruiting program by the number of applications we receive, the number of students we can fund, the number of applicants who accept our offer, and by the quantity and quality of our incoming cohorts. Over the past six years on average, we have been able to recruit successfully approximately 30% of our top 25 highest ranked applicants. While the profile of our entering graduate students has remained consistently strong in both GRE scores (85% or better) and grade point average (3.7 – 3.8), the number of applications has declined. The decline in the number of applications we believe is due at least in part to the economic prosperity of the last decade, which encouraged students to enter the workforce rather than continue with graduate education. The number of entering students has remained remarkably consistent

over the same period of time. However, since we are graduating a larger number of students than we are admitting, the total number of students enrolled in the program has declined. We attribute the increase in the number of doctoral graduates (40 over the last 3 years) to the more favorable job market of recent years. Unfortunately, at the same time, our attempts to recruit more incoming students have been hampered by our inability to offer more lucrative funding packages. The recent economic downturn may mean that we will see an increase in the number of applicants to our program. However, it also means that it is unlikely that we will be able to improve significantly our funding offers in the near future.

Graduate Student Retention and Attrition : For students who accept our recruitment offer, we work actively to enfold them into the life of the Department in such a way that will increase the likelihood of their persevering in the program and also shorten the time to attainment of the desired degree. The Department holds a half-day orientation program for new graduate students shortly before school begins in the Autumn. The orientation is followed by a reception at which the new students socialize with our continuing graduate students, faculty and staff. We have also instituted a peer-mentoring program in which each incoming student is paired with a volunteer mentor from among our continuing graduate students. Mentors not only make contact with incoming students before they move to Seattle, but also meet regularly with them throughout the year to provide practical advice and encouragement. A similar program is also in place specifically for new Teaching Assistants (first-year M.A. students do not serve as TAs in our Department), in which TAs are matched with more experienced teaching assistants for informal mentoring. These practices serve to nurture an atmosphere of inclusiveness in the Department. Moreover, our Department funds a Graduate Liaison Committee, (composed of three student-elected graduate students), which organizes student workshops and social events and contributes positively to the Department's inclusive atmosphere.

However, despite our best efforts, students leave both our M.A. and Ph.D. programs. Our attrition rate for the half-decade from 1994-1999 was 10.64% at the M.A. level (i.e. of 47 students, 5 left the program without completing the degree), and 36.84% at the Ph.D. level (i.e. of 38 students, 14 left the program without completing the degree). Attrition from our M.A. and Ph.D. programs is due to a number of factors, several of which have nothing to do with dissatisfaction with the program itself. Some students decide on different career options and move on to occupations in law, business, library science, etc. Others quit due to family or work obligations, or on account of personal problems. A number of them complete the M.A. and then decide not to go on to the Ph.D. here in our program or elsewhere. A few decide that the Department is not as good a match for their interests as they had hoped, or change their interests in the process of pursuing their degree.

We work to minimize attrition in several ways. We try to accept only those applicants who appear to be a good match with our faculty and Department, and we tend to favor those applicants who have a strong background in History. We also ask our faculty to provide quarterly evaluations of those graduate students enrolled in their courses (see Appendix W). This enables us to spot problems early on, and intervene if

need be. In addition, at the end of each school year, the Graduate Studies Committee reviews each student's progress to ensure that all students are making satisfactory progress towards the degree. Students who are judged not to be making satisfactory progress receive written notification of this assessment and are advised on what steps they must take to correct any problems or concerns expressed by the Committee or the students' faculty supervisors. In addition, students are required to keep the History Graduate Office staff informed of their program plans and they are encouraged to consult the advisors about any questions or concerns they might have. When the need arises, the graduate advisors refer students to other campus resources to deal with problems of a more personal nature that are affecting students' well-being and academic progress. Finally, we are currently working to make our website more transparent, in order to provide better and more comprehensive information about our program and its faculty and fields to prospective students.

Inclusion of Graduate Students in Departmental Governance: Since the last departmental review in 1992, the Department has worked to increase graduate student participation in departmental governance. With the help and encouragement of the Department, our graduate students have revived the Graduate Liaison Committee, a group of three graduate students at various stages in the degree process. These three students are elected annually by their peers and function as the graduate student body's liaison with the Department's faculty and staff. The GLC plans social events, hosts visiting recruits, canvasses graduate student opinion, and brings matters of concern to its members to the attention of the Department. For example, when a number of graduate students were concerned about the scheduling and format of M.A. and Ph.D. examinations, the GLC informed the History Graduate Office and Chair and worked with us on drafting reforms, which were then implemented. In addition, a GLC representative attends all faculty meetings except when confidential personnel issues are being discussed. With the assistance of the GLC, the Chair appoints a graduate student to serve as a full member of each faculty search committee and our departmental strategic planning committees (for both our undergraduate and graduate programs).

Moreover, the graduate students elect two of their colleagues to serve as departmental representatives to the University's Graduate and Professional Student Senate. In this capacity, they keep our graduate students informed of policies that concern them, and at times serve on University-wide committees that deal with such issues.

To recognize the important role that our TAs play in the teaching mission of the Department, we have established the *Thomas M. Power Prize for Outstanding History Teaching Assistant*. While other departments have TA teaching awards, this prize is unique in that the recipient is chosen by a peer committee of Teaching Assistants and not by a faculty committee. The TAs themselves establish the criteria for the evaluation and selection of the Power Prize winner. Finally, the TAs vote to determine which eligible and interested candidate will be recommended to the History Graduate Office to serve as Lead TA for the following year. This constitutes an advisory vote and is taken into consideration, but is not binding on the Graduate Studies Committee in making the appointment. In fact, however, since this practice was established, the Graduate Studies

Committee has appointed the TAs' nominee. The Lead TA has many administrative responsibilities including serving as a member of the committee to appoint and re-appoint TAs.

Grievance Procedures: The History Department and the University of Washington have established procedures to resolve grievances among students, staff and faculty over issues such as sexual harassment, unfair grading practices, and appointments of and working conditions for student employees. Graduate students are encouraged first to try and resolve problems with the faculty or staff members concerned through informal conciliation. In the Department, the problems that come up mainly deal with misunderstandings, miscommunications, or personality clashes that disrupt the working relationship between professor and student. The Chair, Graduate Program Coordinator, or History Graduate Office advisors serve as facilitators for discussion between the pertinent faculty member and student. Most problems that arise get addressed and solved informally, at the Department level.

If the attempt at an informal resolution is unsuccessful, the student may file a formal complaint. Procedures for filing complaints are outlined on pages 111-112 of the Graduate Program's Manual (see Appendix Q). The Manual also provides students with information about a half dozen other channels through which complaints can be raised and addressed, such as the Office of the Ombudsman, the University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office, and the Graduate Student Employee Action Committee. We are pleased to report that over the past three years, there have been no cases of a graduate student in our Department filing a formal grievance.

Graduate Student Service Appointees: Graduate Student Service Appointments (Teaching Assistants, Staff Assistants, and Research Assistants) are a means by which the Department is able to provide support for its graduate students. These appointees contribute to the teaching and research missions of the Department and at the same time gain for themselves valuable academic work experience. The Department assigns the responsibility for awarding appointments to the Graduate Student Appointment Committee, which consists of the Graduate Program Coordinator who serves as Chair, two additional faculty members, and the Lead TA or Senior Academic Counselor. A detailed description of the appointment and assignment process for our graduate student appointments is provided in Appendix Q, *The Graduate Program: A User's Manual*, pages 48-87.

Teaching Assistants: The Dean's Office annually allots the Department a specific number of TA positions at specified salary levels. For the last few years we have been given funding for 20 TAs but due to the recent budget crisis, our TA allotment has been cut to 18 and may be reduced further in the near future. The Department's criteria for TA appointments are based on those set out in the Graduate School's Executive Order No. 28 on Graduate Student Service Appointments. Applications are due each year by February 1st. Our Graduate Student Appointment Committee and the Lead TA reviews the files of TAs seeking reappointments and ranks the files of applicants seeking appointments.

Academic year positions (i.e., 9 months) are assigned to as many students as possible, in ranked order. We are also usually able to award a few additional assignments for shorter durations (i.e. one or two quarters). Students are kept informed of the process via the History Information (HISTINFO) list, an electronic list to which all graduate students are subscribed by our graduate advisors. We aim to complete reappointments by March 1st, and new appointments by April 15th. Students who are awarded academic-year teaching assistantships may apply for reappointment until they have served for a total of 9 quarters (i.e. three academic years). Similarly, students who receive one- or two- quarter appointments may continue to apply for teaching assistantships until they have held appointments for a total of 9 quarters.

Students who have held Teaching Assistant positions for 3 years may serve additional quarters as “replacement TAs” to fill slots left vacant by TAs who have secured other funding and who ask to be replaced. Since we consider it a serious matter when TAs who have accepted appointments later decide not to fulfill their TA obligations, the Department has established a policy for relinquishing TA appointments and for appointing TA replacements.

We are pleased to report that the four-year Freeman Undergraduate Asian Studies Initiative, a research grant secured by two of our faculty members -- R. Kent Guy and Patricia Ebrey -- now provides an additional 8 Teaching Assistant appointments. Graduate students specializing in Asian studies in any department at the University of Washington are eligible to apply. History believes that our students will be competitive for these appointments.

Compensation for TAs is based on the official University salary schedule. In accordance with Executive Order No. 28, the Department assigns salaries/TA level (TA, TAI, TAI) to the appointees based on their academic achievement, progress towards the degree, graduate classification and the appointee’s accomplishments in teaching, research and related activities. If a number of TAs meet the eligibility requirements for promotion to a higher level and if the Department has only a limited number of higher level slots available, then priority for promotion is based on two criteria—seniority as a TA, and the quarter in which the TA’s graduate classification changed (i.e., candidacy was achieved or the M.A. was awarded).

Training and Supervision of Teaching Assistants: The History Department regards the training and supervision of its Teaching Assistants as a process that continues throughout the academic year and over the course of the TA’s tenure. In this we are guided by Graduate School Memorandum No. 14, which details Graduate School policy on the training and supervision of TAs

Shortly before school starts in the fall, the University provides a campus-wide orientation and training session for all new TAs. In conjunction with this, the History Department’s Lead TA and Graduate Program Coordinator organize and run a separate three day-TA training conference which all of our TAs (new and continuing) are required to attend. The Lead TA also sets up a mentoring program whereby each new TA is matched with an experienced TA. In addition, the Lead TA organizes and schedules quarterly workshops dealing with issues related to teaching history. While these workshops are open to all graduate students, TAs are required to attend.

Moreover, in Autumn 2001 we introduced a new course entitled "Topics in Teaching History" which introduces students to some of the latest scholarship on pedagogical theory and practice as applied to teaching history at the college level. This course was developed by two of our graduate students and a supervising faculty member under the auspices of a Graduate School Huckabay Teaching Fellowship.

Supervising faculty are responsible for evaluating the TAs assigned to their courses. Faculty attend discussion sections for each of their TAs, and write up quarterly evaluations based on their observations. New TAs must be observed and evaluated twice during their first two quarters in the classroom. All other TAs are observed and evaluated once each quarter. The faculty member gives the evaluation to the TA who is required to respond to it in writing. The evaluation and response is then submitted to the History Graduate Office. See Appendix Q for details concerning this evaluation process and Appendix X for the TA notification and evaluation forms. In addition, new TAs receive peer evaluations from the Lead TA.

Teaching Assistants are also required to have their sections evaluated by their students each quarter. The Office of Educational Assessment provides the forms and compiles the results of these student evaluations. The evaluation fees are paid for by the Department. All these evaluations are intended to help the TAs by identifying their strengths and weaknesses in the classroom and by offering constructive suggestions for improvement. Finally, we encourage our TAs to make use of the support services available to them through the Center for Instructional Development and Research.

Staff Assistants: We have four 10-month Staff Assistant positions. Three of these appointees serve as undergraduate advisors under the supervision of our Senior Academic Counselor, a full-time Professional Staff member. The application process and deadlines for SAs runs concurrently with and is largely identical to that for TAs, the only difference being that the Senior Academic Counselor rather than the lead TA serves on the appointment committee. In the past, appointments were renewable for a total 6 academic quarters; two years ago we extended this to 9 quarters, or three academic years.

Staff Assistants serving as undergraduate advisors are supervised and trained by the Senior Academic Counselor, a full-time Professional Staff member. The Senior Academic Counselor arranges for appointees to be given access to the University's Student Database, trains them in its use, and familiarizes them with advising procedures and relevant paperwork. They also are required to attend the University's quarterly training sessions on various aspects of undergraduate advising. SA appointees must be willing to commit to a minimum two-year appointment, a requirement deemed necessary for training purposes, continuity, and the staffing needs of the Department.

The Lead TA also holds a staff assistantship rather than a TA appointment because so many of the duties assigned to this position are of an administrative nature. Only TAs who have held a teaching assistantship for two years and have achieved Candidacy are eligible for this position. The year spent as Lead TA constitutes the third and final year of the student's TA appointment. The Center for Instructional Development and Research holds an annual meeting each spring to provide Lead TAs with information and resources for use in their departmental TA training programs the following academic year.

Research Assistants: We have one departmental research assistantship in conjunction with the Department's Bullitt Chair. In addition, we are usually awarded between one and three RA positions each year from outside sources (e.g. the Graduate School and GO-MAP) for recruitment purposes. Moreover, our students often apply for and receive research assistantships in other units; for example, American Ethnic Studies, The History of Science Office, The Center for Transnational Studies, etc. The faculty or staff member to whom the RA is assigned is responsible for any necessary training and for supervising and evaluating the performance of the RA.

Summary of 2001-2002 Appointments: For the academic year 2001-2002, our appointments break down in the following manner:

- 20 TAs in the Department; 3 in other departments
- 4 SAs
- 3 RAs in the Department; 2 in other units
- 28 full-year fellowships (plus a number of partial grants for research and travel)
- 3 writing tutors (hourly appointees who staff the History Department's Writing Center)

Each quarter we also employ graduate students as readers (graders) for non-sectioned classes with enrollments of over 50 students. Compensation for readerships ranges from \$650-\$1125 per quarter depending upon the number of students in the class and whether or not the class is a W (writing)-class. In Autumn Quarter 2001 we employed seven graduate students as readers.

The Department also tries to provide our Ph.D. candidates with the opportunity to teach their own courses, as determined by available funding and the Department's curricular needs. Such students serve as pre-doctoral instructors, a Graduate Student Service appointment. This Autumn Quarter two of our doctoral candidates served as pre-doctoral instructors in the Department and one of our students served as a pre-doctoral instructor at UW Bothell.

Chapter IV: Changes in the Department Since 1992

At the heart of the changes in the Department since our last Ten Year Review lies the remarkable transformation of our faculty already noted in this report. Of the 43 current faculty members in the Department, 17 have been appointed since 1992, and four further appointments are currently under consideration. Even more strikingly, only 16 of the current 43 faculty members were in the Department in 1987; and of this group, all but six are likely to retire within the next three to five years. To the enormous credit of the senior members of this Department, this sweeping transformation has been accomplished with remarkable grace and goodwill. Important departmental commitments to collegiality and to excellent undergraduate and graduate teaching have been maintained and passed on, while widespread participation in department governance has been strengthened. New historical fields have been opened up, but more traditional areas of expertise have not been abandoned or marginalized. In some ways, indeed, our biggest challenge may well be whether the faculty members appointed since 1987 will be able to manage the continuing transformation of the Department over the next five to ten years with as much success and vision as has the faculty cohort currently nearing retirement.

A. New Research and Teaching Fields

Ten years ago, the 1992 Review Committee noted the relative paucity of the Department's offerings in gender history, labor history, American ethnic history, and cultural studies. We believe those shortcomings have been decisively rectified. Our faculty now includes ten colleagues whose research and teaching interests engage significantly with either women's history or the history of gender (Behlmer, Camp, Ebrey, Glenn, Jonas, Lebsock, Poiger, Sears, Robin Stacey, Lynn Thomas, Young); seven who focus on labor history (Bergquist, Camp, Giebel, Glenn, Gregory, Jung, Singh); seven who deal particularly with the histories of minority communities in America, variously defined (Camp, Gil, Glenn, Gregory, Jung, Singh, Taylor); and eight whose interests might be regarded as lying in cultural studies (Camp, Glenn, Nash, Poiger, Schmidt, Sears, Lynn Thomas, Young). We have also developed important new areas of concentration, especially at the graduate level, in comparative history, and in imperialism and colonialism (Baikin, Giebel, Johnson, Lebsock, Poiger, Sears, Singh, Thomas). In Lynn Thomas, we have also added an historian of Africa, whose interests in comparative gender history and comparative colonialism have brought welcome breadth to both of these graduate fields.

We have also emerged as one of the national centers for the so-called "new Western history" (Findlay, Gregory, Hevly, Nash, Taylor). More recently, several of our faculty members have been exploring what it might mean to study the history of the Americas from a truly global perspective. The research interests of our recently-appointed Asian American specialist, Moon ho-Jung, in 19th century Caribbean history and international capital and labor markets, suggests some of the possibilities for integrating U.S. history, Latin American history, and Asian American history. Nikhil Singh's work on 20th century black nationalist movements brings a similarly "hemispheric" perspective to questions of race, nationality, and ethnicity. Chuck Bergquist, of course, has been doing this sort of integrative work for a long time already.

As we look toward the likely retirement of our entire cohort of Latin American historians, this may be a direction in which we will look to move with new appointments.

B. Curricular Changes

The 1992 Review committee also noted the small number of 100 and 200 level classes we offered, and the extreme concentration of those classes in American and European history, a concentration that lent, in the committee's view, an overly "Euro-American" cast to our undergraduate core curriculum. This too, we believe, has been decisively transformed, with further changes still underway. In 1996, we revised the undergraduate major requirements so as to provide a variety of entryways into the major in addition to the traditional "western civilization" courses (which continue to draw very well, despite the fact that they are no longer required classes in the major). Last year, we took further steps to encourage faculty to design new, topically conceived 200 level courses, to provide alternative entryways into the major for students who might find such courses more attractive than our traditional 100 level courses, which are mainly conceived as surveys of particular regions within a defined chronological time span. A number of such new 200 level courses are currently under development.

C. Building on Strength

Even within traditional areas of strength we are working in very different ways than we did ten years ago. The appointments of Patricia Ebrey and Tani Barlow (presently in Women Studies, but an appointment for her in History is currently under consideration) have brought us two eminent practitioners of women's history and gender history in China. With Kent Guy and Madeleine Dong Yue (presently 100% in the Jackson School, but under consideration for a 50% appointment in History), we now boast one of the largest and strongest groups of Chinese historians in the country. In Laurie Sears and Christoph Giebel, we have two highly innovative historians of Southeast Asia. Japanese history is threatened, however; Susan Hanley will retire in June 2002, and Ken Pyle is nearing traditional retirement age. The recent retirements of Jim Palais in Korean history and Frank Conlon in South Asian history will present our Asian history program with real challenges if they are not soon replaced.

Our modern European cohort now has a distinctive (and we believe attractive) focus on social, cultural, and intellectual history, a focus strengthened by the recent appointment of Jordanna Bailkin, whose interest in museum studies and material culture also complements Ben Schmidt's research on cultural encounters and exoticism in early modern Europe. Five new books have been published by our modern European faculty in the past three years, bringing considerable visibility to this important part of the Department. Two more books are expected to appear within the next few years.

Glennys Young's work on religion, violence and political culture in Soviet Russia is a marked departure from the more traditional political and institutional history pursued by an earlier generation of Russian historians. Dan Waugh's recent work on the Silk Road, and on provincial print culture in 18th century Russia, marks an equally exciting departure from the paths that pre-modern Russian historians have conventionally trod. Our new appointment in pre-modern history of science, Simon Werrett, will bring further

strength also to the Russian section of the department with his interests in the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences. Herb Ellison, our distinguished Soviet Russia expert, will however retire in June 2002, with the prospects for replacing him uncertain.

Carol Thomas, a specialist in Dark Age and Archaic Greece, and Joel Walker, a specialist in late antiquity with a particular focus on Near Eastern Christianity, both bring a welcome breadth of perspective to our offerings in ancient history. Roman history has been a problem area for some time, but following upon the retirement of Arther Ferrill, a search is now underway for a new Roman historian. Cooperation between our ancient historians and the Classics Department has improved dramatically since 1992, as witnessed by the fact that the Roman history search this year is being chaired by a classicist, even though the position will be 100% in the History Department. Our ability to train graduate students in ancient history has been further improved by increasingly close cooperation with the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization, two of whose members (Michael Williams and Scott Noegel) are now adjunct members of the History Department. Recruitment of graduate students in ancient history has been greatly helped by an annual graduate recruitment award created and funded by Mr. Lawrence Roseman, a department benefactor. This award has helped us to attract excellent graduate students in ancient history.

Our graduate program in medieval history has a particular focus on the British Isles: we are the only program in the country with specialists in both medieval Celtic history and medieval English history. Our undergraduate offerings, however, range widely across all of Europe, and across the entirety of the middle ages. So too do our early modern offerings, although these will soon be reduced by the retirement, in March 2003, of Fritz Levy, our Tudor-Stuart England specialist. Levy's longstanding cooperation with the Art History Department is being continued by Ben Schmidt; while Ray Jonas and Mary O'Neil have been opening new connections with the French and Italian Studies Program through their very popular courses on "Paris" and "Rome" respectively. Each of these courses is team taught with a member of the French and Italian faculty.

D. Integration and Interdisciplinarity

We are, we believe, a more wide-ranging department than we were ten years ago, with a far greater commitment to interdisciplinarity. At the same time, however, we are also more tightly integrated. We have made a conscious effort to appoint faculty members with wide-ranging interests, and to avoid "pigeon-holing" faculty too narrowly. At the same time, however, we have tried to build links between faculty that reach across traditional chronological and geographical boundaries, whether those links are topical (gender, women, labor, race, Jewish history) or methodological (critical theory, cultural studies, history and literature, art). We are anxious to avoid the "balkanization" that can afflict large departments, especially in disciplines (such as History) whose scope grows inexorably larger over time. We have become, in recent years, a department dominated by social and cultural historians. We may, in the years ahead, need to balance those approaches by making some appointments in political, diplomatic, and economic history.

E. Departmental Governance

In 1992, the Review committee expressed some concern that we were not doing enough to integrate graduate students into the governance of the Department. Since 1992, we have taken several steps to respond to these concerns. The graduate students themselves have reconstituted the Graduate Liason Committee, a group of three graduate students elected annually by the graduate students themselves to act as a kind of steering committee for graduate student involvement in the life of the Department. The GLC has acted as a catalyst for a series of changes in graduate program procedures. They have also assisted in the redesign and redecorating of the student lounge, which was then funded by the Department's own discretionary funds.

A GLC representative now attends all faculty meetings, except when confidential personnel issues are under discussion. Since 1994, a graduate student member is also appointed to serve (with three faculty members) on every departmental search committee. The GLC nominates students to serve on these committees, and the Chair appoints them (the Chair appoints faculty members to search committees also). As full participants in all aspects of the search process, these graduate student representatives attend the interviews at the AHA convention (at Department expense), host a special meeting of graduate students with each on-campus job candidate, solicit graduate student opinion on all on-campus candidates, and then participate in the faculty discussions leading up to an appointment. As noted above, graduate and undergraduate students also participated in the Strategic Planning process; and the GLC will also be asked to participate in the ongoing review of the graduate curriculum.

F. Research Productivity

The Department's research productivity has increased markedly during the past decade over what it had been in the decade between 1982 and 1992. Partly this is a reflection of national trends; partly it reflects the high quality of the faculty whom we have appointed over the past fifteen years. Also very important, however, is the increased institutional support for junior faculty research that now exists within the University of Washington. Through its Junior Faculty Development Program, the College of Arts and Sciences now offers a package consisting of a one course teaching reduction, one quarter with no assigned teaching responsibilities, and a month of summer salary to all untenured faculty. This package is available twice: once during the first two years of appointment; and then again, during the third, fourth, or fifth year of appointment, prior to tenure consideration during the fall of the sixth year.

Additional support for faculty research at all ranks is provided through the University's Royalty Research Fund, which provides competitive grants to "buy out" faculty from one quarter of teaching, plus research and travel money. The Walter Chapin Simpson Center for the Humanities also provides course "buy outs" to support faculty research. As a result of these new programs (all instituted within the past 7 years), most junior faculty in History will be able to teach only one lecture course and two seminars per year (as opposed to the normal teaching load of two lecture courses and two

seminars) during at least two, and more often three, of their first five years of service at UW. The History Department itself has also been able to contribute resources to support faculty research through its privately-endowed Keller Fund, its state-funded travel budget, and through special grants of summer salary money from the Department's recapture funds.

The only negative consequences to the greater availability of research support for faculty are the impact these course buy-outs have on our curriculum, and their potential to undermine our traditional expectations that all History faculty members will teach an equal course load. Course buy-outs provide only enough money to hire a graduate student to teach a class; but many graduate student instructors are not yet prepared to offer the kind of large survey class that faculty members receiving buy-outs most often choose to give up. As a result, we wind up with fewer large classes than we would otherwise have, and more smaller classes and seminars. Even more serious, however, is the potential long-term effect on departmental morale if the most active research faculty are regularly able to reduce their teaching loads to one lecture class and two seminars per year, while other faculty struggle on with heavier teaching loads that in turn make it more difficult for them even to maintain, much less increase, their existing research productivity. Some sense of the impact of these course buy-outs on teaching loads can be gained from Appendix U, which lists courses taught over the past three years by each faculty member, along with each course's student enrolment on the tenth day of instruction.

Chapter V: Challenges and Opportunities

As the preceding chapters will we hope suggest, we believe the Department of History to be in good shape. We have made a great deal of progress over the past ten to fifteen years in strengthening our faculty, improving the national competitiveness of our graduate program, broadening our undergraduate and graduate curricular offerings, and improving the curricular structure and sequencing of our undergraduate courses. Although the goals we have set out in our Strategic Plan are ambitious - to rise into the top 20 History Departments nationally; to be the best undergraduate teaching department at the University of Washington; and to be a department whose Ph.D. graduates are competitive at all levels on a national academic job market - we believe these goals are achievable.

At the same time, however, we face some challenges that could not only prevent us from achieving our goals, but could potentially knock us backward from the position we presently occupy. Some of these challenges are financial, reflecting the chronic underfunding of higher education that has characterized Washington State for decades. Others are pedagogical, reflecting changes and challenges that confront the College of Arts and Sciences generally, but that affect History with particular force. Still others are internal to the Department of History itself, and will demand of us a continuing and time-consuming dedication to the responsibilities of departmental governance and the maintenance of departmental collegiality as we strive to maintain our traditional strengths despite a rapid turn-over amongst our faculty.

Among our most pressing challenges are the following:

A. The growing national gap between the financial resources of private vs. public universities, combined with the particularly low salaries paid to our department, will create serious problems for both the recruitment and the retention of faculty.

The extraordinary increase in the value of the endowments of the nation's top private universities over the past ten years is too well-known to require comment. Taxpayer support for the nation's best public universities has not kept pace, and is, in any event, acutely sensitive to downturns in the economy such as we are experiencing at present. At the University of Washington, however, this national problem is accentuated by the fact that UW's funding from the State of Washington lags so far behind even our other peer, public universities as defined by the State of Washington's own Higher Education Coordinating Board (the HECB-24) and the State's Office of Financial Management (OFM-8). As a group, University of Washington faculty salaries are, on average, 17% behind our eight peer institutions as defined by the OFM (Arizona, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, North Carolina, Oregon, Berkeley, UCLA). In History, however, our salaries are 35% behind our peers at the full professor level; 20% behind at the associate level; and 3.4% behind at the assistant professor level. Except at the assistant professor level, our faculty salary averages, by rank, are LAST among our eight OFM peer History departments. We are the ONLY social science department at the University of Washington to enjoy such a dubious distinction. We are also second to last in salaries among all UW social science departments (Women Studies is slightly lower); and this

despite the fact that we are one of only two UW social science departments to be ranked among the top 30 departments nationally in the most recent US News and World Report rankings.

The scale of the resulting problems can be judged from the fact that in the past two years alone, 13 of our present faculty have made it onto shortlists for positions at other institutions. To date, we have not lost anyone. With the recent elimination of a legislatively-funded recruitment and retention fund, however, it is doubtful whether we will be able to duplicate this record over the next several years.

For the most part, we have been able to compete successfully in a national market for beginning assistant professors; but as a result of doing so, salaries for our assistant professors now completely overlap the salary range for our tenured associate professors, and have begun to surpass even the salaries of some of our full professors.

Only two solutions to this situation seem plausible: unit-level salary adjustments funded by the central administration; and/or private fundraising efforts to create new professorships within the History department.

B. Inadequate preparation for writing expository prose amongst our undergraduate students will place increasing pressure on us as teachers.

Because of our role in general education, History feels more acutely than do most departments the impact of students entering our courses who have not yet learned to write acceptable expository prose. The problem becomes even more acute as other social science departments abandon the requirement that students at the 100 and 200 levels write papers at all. We are finding, therefore, that as a department we are having to take on more and more of the responsibility for teaching our students (whether or not they are History majors) the basic elements of expository writing and argument. We hope that the University's own on-going discussions about the teaching of writing, together with new, state-mandated educational requirements that are being introduced at the K-12 level, may turn this situation around. For the foreseeable future, however, the stresses are likely to continue. The most immediate impacts are felt by our teaching assistants, on whom much of the direct burden of teaching elementary composition inevitably falls. But there is the potential for a serious "knock-on" effect throughout our curriculum, as over-worked faculty are tempted to abandon or reduce their expectations and requirements for student writing, because it is so time-consuming and unrewarding to maintain them.

C. We will need to replace sizeable faculty losses to retirement over the next five years.

Between June 2001 and August 2002, five current History faculty members will retire. Over the following three to four years, a further eight History faculty either will retire or are likely to retire. A disproportionate percentage of these retirements will be in Asian history, Latin American history, and Russian history. These retirements pose a series of challenges for us. How many of these retirements will we be permitted to replace? Will we be able to retain the geographical and chronological breadth of coverage that has been one of the hallmarks of our department over the past thirty years? Will we be able to hire a methodologically diverse group of historians, so as to avoid

becoming a department overloaded with a single "style" of history? Can we retain the new faculty whom we recruit? And will we be able to find younger faculty members who can teach the kind of broad survey courses that many of these retiring faculty members have taught, and that are a mainstay of our general education courses?

D. We will need to keep up with the constantly increasing specialization of historical study with a fixed (or possibly even declining) number of faculty members.

It seems certain that the historical field will continue to expand. In the American field alone over the past decade we have added three specialists in African American history, one specialist (with another appointment pending) in Asian American history, one specialist in American environmental history, several new Western historians, and three specialists in American women's history. Over the following decade, we hope to build strength in Asian American history, in South Asian history, and in the Atlantic world, without losing ground elsewhere. This will require us to be imaginative in our appointments, and to continue to appoint faculty whose breadth can add strength to several areas of the department at once. We will not be able to afford to hire faculty with extremely narrow fields of vision.

We expect the growth of interdisciplinary studies in History to continue also. To keep up with all this growth, it seems clear, therefore, that we will have to rely upon faculty in other units to help us, just as we will help them. To an even greater degree than in the past, our strength as a History Department is likely to depend, therefore, on the strength of other, cognate units, such as the Jackson School of International Studies, American Ethnic Studies, American Indian Studies, Near Eastern Languages and Civilization, and Asian Languages and Literatures. We will need to do all we can to strengthen those units in the years ahead, not only as fellow citizens of the College of Arts and Sciences, but also as self-interested actors in what promises to be a decade marked by at least as much departmental change as we have witnessed over the past ten years.