

## Report of the Academic Program Review Committee on the University of Arizona Department of History

Bruce Dinges (Arizona Historical Society)  
Elizabeth Jameson (University of Calgary)  
Suzanne Marchand (Louisiana State University)  
María Muñoz (Susquehanna University)  
David Plane (University of Arizona)  
Terry Rugeley (University of Oklahoma), committee chair  
Janet Sturman (University of Arizona)

The Academic Program Review Committee (hereafter APRC) writes to provide its evaluation of the University of Arizona History Department. The seven members of the APRC carefully read the Department's "Academic Program Review Self-Study, April 2011," together with its various appendices. On April 25-26 of this year we met with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS), the heads of that College, the faculty, the graduate and undergraduate students, and the staff of the Department itself. In the course of our readings and interviews, we reviewed the unit's history, productivity, organization, and strategies for the future. The following report explores the Department's strengths, the concerns that exist regarding current and future conditions, and our own suggestions for ways in which mission and performance might be safeguarded or improved.

### Departmental Strengths and Achievements

It is the view of the review committee that the University of Arizona History Department remains strong in the three critical endeavors of research, teaching, and service. It already ranks 42<sup>nd</sup> in the NRC ratings, a remarkable achievement given that virtually all of the more highly-ranked institutions boast considerably larger faculties.

#### 1. Research and Leadership

The APRC has concluded that the University of Arizona is an academically strong unit in terms of scholarly production. In the past six years, its professors have published eleven research monographs and ten surveys or edited volumes. Departmental members serve on a wide variety of national panels. They regularly publish refereed articles, as well as chapters in edited collections. They perform extensive service in reviewing book and article manuscripts for scholarly presses, and have won six research prizes. In general, all evidence points to a team of dedicated and productive scholarly researchers. These strengths are demonstrated in the quality and quantity of faculty research produced by scholars in these fields, by the number of graduate students who specialize in these areas, and by the placement of those graduate students in good jobs (a point discussed at some length below).

The Department also demonstrates considerable breadth of expertise. Its faculty have traditionally excelled in US, European, and Latin American history. The History Department has also established a reputation in US western and women's history, and while these fields of specialization have been depleted by faculty retirements and departures, one can hope that they may eventually be rebuilt by the hiring of faculty in this area. The committee also noted the Department's emerging strength—thanks especially to the hiring of excellent junior faculty—in the area of environmental history, world history, and the history of colonialism.

middle East  
+  
world

## 2. Undergraduate Instruction

The strengths of undergraduate instruction in the UA History Department's curriculum were evident in the passion we encountered in our meeting with representative undergraduate students. Each of the students spoke articulately and enthusiastically about their own work, their plans for the future, and how well their studies in the Department had inspired and prepared them for careers that included pre-college teaching as well as graduate study in law and history. We noted the group's love for American History and their sorrow that the Department would be losing one of several of their favorite instructors. These students were proud to be challenged by what they perceived as demanding but stimulating history classes. They wore their ability to meet demanding reading and writing assignments with immense satisfaction.

A clear strength of the undergraduate program is the sequence of courses on the 300 level. HIST 301 is a course designed to cultivate an initial mastery of research theory and method, and HIST 396a course which serves as a capstone experience bringing together students who have chosen different areas of specialization in the project of tackling questions around a shared topic of concern. The Department has constructed a logically sequenced program that moves students toward a meaningful bachelor's degree.

A variety of outcomes, both metric and qualitative, demonstrate the History Department's high standards of excellence. To take one of the most important examples, the rising GPAs and ACT and SAT test scores of its majors indicate a program of considerable academic rigor (see Appendix H.3 of the self-study). One can also point to the fact that Arizona's history courses continue to demand intensive reading and quality writing, despite the heavy demands that these standards impose on faculty time. The Department's capstone, HIST 396a, is a model for such courses. It requires students actually to become active writers of history rather than passive recipients of information; it also allows students to master a particular topic on which they write an extensive (20-25 page) research paper, something that students will remember long after they have graduated. The newer preparatory course, HIST 301, is intended to precede HIST 396a, and will give students the skills they need to succeed in that latter endeavor. The Department is vital to the mission of SBS in the enormous contribution of its faculty to Tier 1 courses, especially in the TRADS group (where it provides approximately 75% of the student credit hours), and will be adding more courses to its 200-level offerings to fill in gaps between Tier 1 and upper-division courses. Despite the decline in the number of faculty, the Department's number of majors has actually increased, from 447 in 2003 to 574 (of whom 20% come from underrepresented ethnic backgrounds) in 2009.

## 3. Graduate Instruction

The History Department's ranking within the nation's top graduate-level history institutions reflects a strong commitment to its graduate program. It has established five areas of focus: Early Europe, Modern Europe, United States, Latin America, and the Middle East. There are many strengths here. To take only one example, the Division for Late Medieval and Reformation Studies enjoys a national reputation. Even though lacking the resources available to schools like Yale University and the University of Texas at Austin, Arizona ranks within the national top ten, and continues to place (Latin American History) PhDs. Indeed, despite the recent

*all of our PhDs!*

and ongoing recession, the History Department as a whole has nevertheless placed an impressive number of completed PhDs over the past six years. Since 2003, at least 38 doctoral recipients have gone on to occupy positions in academia, including at Cornell University, Michigan State, Wake Forest, and Fordham. In the last two years alone, fifteen UA graduates have obtained professorships, while others have taken post-docs. In such economically difficult times, those numbers provide an extraordinary testimony to Arizona's success.

University of Arizona history graduate students have also been extremely successful in obtaining nationally competitive fellowships like Fulbright, Fulbright-Hays, IIE Fulbright, Mellon Foundation, Ford Foundation, and AHA (American Historical Association) among other prestigious awards. The decorated nature of the graduate student core is a testament to the intellectual production of past and current graduate students in the way of journal article and chapter publications, as well as book reviews. In addition, current graduate students participate in conferences, presenting original research to a body of peers at an impressive rate.

In terms of professional development, the graduate students with whom we met attested to a well-structured program that prepares them, both intellectually as well as pedagogically, for entry into the job market. Graduate students feel they are prepared for teaching at various levels as training includes experience as teaching assistants, stand-alone teaching during summer and winter sessions, as well as the unusual availability of a pedagogy course (HIST 597). The Graduate Committee also pointed to numerous efforts to prepare graduate students through a series of professional workshops throughout the life of their graduate student experience.

#### 4. Collaboration and Service

The overwhelming majority of History Department's faculty are highly active in service, both to the profession more generally (as society presidents, editorial board members, and as expert reviewers of books and articles), and to the Tucson community. Many give public lectures and interact with teachers locally, and perform outreach activities on a regular basis. We also found that the History faculty work collaboratively with other units of the University. Examples include close cooperation with the Latin American Studies program; a Chinese historian who holds a joint appointment with another Department; and a significant History presence in the Division for Late Medieval and Reformation Studies, in Women and Gender Studies, and in Mexican American Studies.

### Concerns

While the History Department clearly ranks high in its core areas of responsibility, it remains a fact that Arizona's recent economic difficulties have already taken their toll on peak performance. Barring future improvement in the state's economic and political climate, we must reasonably expect challenges will only increase in the future. The following paragraphs provide a list of some of those challenges, and while in all instances the Department is aware of the situation, the APRC nevertheless wishes to add its voice in calling attention to the work that lies ahead.

#### 1. U.S. Faculty Shortage

Above all, we cannot overstate our serious concern for the Department's diminished strength in United States History. An already-weakened U.S. history section will have experienced a net loss of four positions from 2004-2011. These losses have reduced the U.S. history faculty to seven faculty (five to six FTE), with another retirement and possibly two anticipated within the next three years. The inability to replace such respected scholars as Professors Sarah Deutsch, Reeve Huston, Leonard Dinnerstein, Karen Anderson, Roger Nichols, and Jack Marietta seriously erodes the Department's previously enviable national reputation in Western, Women's, and Native American history and diminishes breadth of coverage in U.S. history. The loss of strength in key fields weakens the ability of the Department to teach the history of Arizona and the West.

The impact of a weakened U.S. history section cannot be overestimated, for the History Department, the College, and the University itself. The loss of faculty lines in U.S. history weakens the undergraduate and graduate programs, with serious implications. U.S. history courses generate substantial undergraduate student credit hours and are a major contributor to the Department's steadily increasing number of undergraduate majors. The department can fill as many sections of the U.S. history survey as it can offer, but the number of sections will diminish as faculty numbers shrink. Beyond such quantitative losses, the diminished expertise in specific fields makes it increasingly difficult for the Department to meet its obligations as a land-grant university to teach the complex historical inheritance of the state or to train secondary school teachers in American history. The strong reputation of the history graduate program has rested on three primary fields of specialization, one of which is United States history. The two thematic graduate cognate fields are jeopardized by reductions in U.S. history faculty: Comparative Women's History is severely weakened by the departures of Professors Deutsch and Anderson, and the Comparative/World History cognate requires U.S. content. It is difficult to imagine how a section of seven faculty or fewer can continue to equal either the productivity or the quality for which it has been known.

Moreover, U.S. history faculty have been particularly active in community outreach and involvement with the public schools. With the departures of some of the University's most effective public ambassadors, the service obligations on the remaining faculty have grown to unsustainable levels. This is particularly troubling at the ranks of assistant and associate professor, where the impacts of service on the career advancement of mid-career faculty are of concern both for the over-committed faculty and for the daunting impact on the expectations of junior faculty. The losses of two senior women's historians may well have affected the dropping proportions of women among undergraduate history majors. All of these consequences are of concern for the ability of the Department to serve the citizens of Arizona, and for the public profile of the University.

Simply put, the first obligation of a history department in a land-grant research university is to teach United States history at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Arizona's United States history faculty is so severely eroded that it is in serious jeopardy, and is rapidly approaching a point of no repair.

## 2. Undergraduate Program

As previously stated, the declining numbers of U.S. historians also negatively impacts the undergraduate curriculum. History Department faculty recognize that there is a need for lower division curriculum offerings for history students. To address this need the Department's undergraduate curriculum committee has proposed adding a 100-level freshman seminar, based on the 120H Topics in History offering now available only for honors students. Additional curricular plans include augmenting the number of 200 level courses that might count towards the history major. The faculty also recognize a need for greater clarity in defining the different skills that students will be expected to master at each level (110, 200, 300, 400) of their program of study. The undergraduate curriculum committee has already begun this work.

While it was evident that faculty are doing wonderful work with students, a few additional questions did emerge. There was some concern that the Department's standing policy of administering its own faculty evaluations, rather than using the University TCEs, may result in a lack of recognition due for that work. We also note that the enrollment of history majors has grown over the past decade, rising 34% between 2003 and 2009, and that these students are among the brightest on campus. Faculty recognize the growing importance of thematic orientations and comparative history to their majors, despite the continued importance of developing geographic and temporal expertise. To this end, the undergraduate curriculum committee has proposed restructuring the distribution of required courses for history majors to include two courses in a new field to be called "Themes in History." This approach should allow the Department to provide better and fuller education to its increasing majors.

### 3. Graduate Program

In the course of our review we encountered the question of whether the UA History Department should consider restructuring its graduate education; specifically, whether it should abandon the more traditional geotemporal approach to history (for example, the nineteenth-century American West, or early modern Europe) in favor of a more thematic approach. A thematic approach might focus on such issues as ethnicity, the environment, gender, or imperialism. To no small degree, the question is a financial one, since maintenance of a field requires a faculty of adequate size in each area of focus. Curiosity about the possibility of re-orienting the graduate focus tended to come more from without the Department than within, but the APRC nevertheless took it upon itself to explore the issue with all parties, and a summary of our conclusions are found below under "Recommendations."

Graduate students from the United States caucus also expressed concern for their instruction as the U.S. faculty are currently few in number; the situation will only be complicated by the decrease in U.S. lines in the next three years with impending retirements of crucial faculty. As such, graduate students have found it increasingly difficult to fulfill requirements for their major coursework, since not enough U.S. courses are available.

Finally, there is considerable concern that impending budget cuts will reduce the available History Department graduate funding lines by perhaps as much as 20%. The concern is a serious one indeed, and coupled with the shrinking U.S. faculty, may prove a blow from which the University of Arizona will take years to recover.

#### 4. Various Faculty Concerns

Beyond the matters explored above, we listened to a variety of faculty concerns about the professional limitations of the University of Arizona. Among the most contentious and demoralizing problem was that long-standing financial conundrum of American academia, compression. Indeed, multiple issues raised by all the various faculty groups with whom we met are, at least in part, traceable back to the matter of longstanding salary compression. History is evidently a unit with some of the most extreme and poignant cases on campus. Whereas the public sees university-wide averages quoted in the papers at above \$100K for "Professors," one *full* professor of History told us he is paid only \$68,000.

The demographic structure of the Department is such that women faculty are most highly represented at the Associate level. It is at this level where the small (lower than national norms) size of the unit and the members' commendable commitment and dedication result in heavy teaching loads and excessive service burdens on mid-career faculty. Time to the second promotion repeatedly emerged as a concern in our discussions, although no clear consensus was reached as to whether or not it constituted a true problem.

It is not only the University's longstanding inability to fund salaries at somewhat predictable trajectories across the career stages of the life course, but also the paltriness of promotion raises (which apparently have been devolved to the College level) that have particularly demoralizing effects on History faculty. Whereas in other fields one's career progress is marked through maintenance of a steady, ongoing stream of, e.g., journal publication, the longstanding standard for promotion in History has been the publication of substantial research monographs by prestigious university presses. We noted the pernicious effects of compression extend even to junior faculty who, observing even their most productive senior colleagues' plight, worry that they must devote precious research time and energies to going on the job market while still in the career period when mobility opportunities are greatest.

All involved understand the difficulty of rectifying compression woes in the current University budgetary climate and within a severely under-resourced College. Still, one small stopgap measure (originated by Vice Provost Burd during our 'exit interview' discussions based on a practice that has apparently been possible with the resources accrued within the College of Science) is that of honorary rewards: small (perhaps \$5,000?) stipends that might be used to fund such activities as travel to archives. Small supplements of this nature could have a disproportionately large boost on morale, given the low levels of expectations regarding fair compensation that we encountered in our discussions with this faculty.

One member of the Department's faculty also expressed frustration with the University's evident current inability to fund spousal hires. The committee noted that universities located in large metropolitan areas in more densely populated parts of the country enjoy a significant recruiting advantage over the University of Arizona: indeed, there are scant non-UA job prospects for the other member of a two-academic-career household in Tucson.

#### 5. Assessment

Still another concern was the complicated issue of assessment. The APRC understands that administrators understandably feel themselves under pressure to demonstrate positive results. At the same time, it is a fact that humanities disciplines deal in skills that do not easily lend themselves to quantification, and fear that a system favoring high enrollments will tend to punish courses and instructors committed to a more difficult and demanding approach. Solutions range from "outcome-based education," with its emphasis on test scores, to an outright rejection of the very concept of assessment.

It was with these issues in mind that the APRC undertook its site visit. Although assessment has been implicit in the History Department's curriculum decisions (for instance, inaugurating History 301 and History 396A), these assessment processes have not always been transparent to the larger academic and public communities. The consequences of the lack of systematically communicated assessment processes are several: 1) the qualitative and quantitative factors that influence decision-making are not apparent; 2) information that might inform future decisions is not systematically gathered; and 3) the goals of the history curriculum and its strengths are not transparently communicated. As with the matter of refocusing graduate program, our conclusions are found below.

## 6. Development

Another question generating much discussion was the degree to which the Department of History should dedicate itself to development: that is, to raising funds from outside the University. The recourse to fund-raising looms all the more important as state support for higher education declines. As with assessment, the APRC encountered a wide variety of responses. Some individuals with whom we spoke thought that the History Department needed to make a far more concerted effort to cultivate a donor base and to solicit contributions as a way of generating its own resources. Others expressed frustration that previous fund-raising efforts had cost considerable faculty time, only to yield relatively minor results. Still others felt the Department lacked the basic infrastructure, both human and physical, to attempt serious fund-raising.

## 7. Library

The condition and future of the University of Arizona Library stand outside the purview of this committee. Nevertheless, because history and other humanist disciplines generate extensive library usage, and because our committee heard concerns about library inadequacies from so many interviewees, we must venture an observation. While it is true that electronic and on-line research has become an established part of modern research, it seems premature to abandon the idea of a book-based collection. Additionally, the official position of the library in refraining from ordering books, not because of funding shortages but space issues, compromises its ability to support graduate student research and keep the history collection updated. As a Research-1 institution, the library should reflect its role as a supporting tool. Faculty and graduate students at both the M.A. and Ph.D. levels repeatedly expressed concern over this situation.

## 8. Space

A final concern touches the matter of space, a famously rare and treasured commodity in academic life. The History Department is showing the strains of inadequate space, and the most glaring example of that fact comes from the graduate offices. The area on the first floor of the Social Science building allocated as TA workspace is dysfunctional to the point that it hinders rather than facilitates instruction. The main problem is lack of privacy to accommodate test-taking and one-on-one meetings with undergraduate students. Thirty-seven TAs share a large open area equipped with computers arranged on three rows of long tables. A small, storage-closet size adjacent room provides the only private meeting space. The limitations of this arrangement were immediately apparent to two members of the committee who met in this room with three graduate students from the American caucus. The large number of TAs utilizing the larger workspace during peak class hours produces a chaotic atmosphere that hampers class preparation, while the small meeting room affords privacy for only one mentor and student at a time. Either a new TA workspace needs to be found, or this space needs to be reconfigured to afford TAs with a work area that balances a collegial atmosphere with adequate privacy. There is also concern about the quality of computers provided to the TAs, particularly their ability to support the most current software. History graduate students were able to point to other departments on campus that provide their TAs with adequate workspace. At the same time, class space also emerged as a problem. Faculty complain of a shortage of classrooms at 75-student capacity, the difficulty of reserving tech rooms for small classes, and diminishing support from building scheduling. Finally, it is both revealing and troubling that some faculty have declined journal editorships because of the lack of institutional support in the form of available office space.

## Recommendations

### 1. U.S. History Hire

Fully understanding the current financial constraints in which the University of Arizona operates, our most urgent recommendation is the replacement of key United States History faculty. The most pressing weaknesses in United States History are in women's, Native American, and 19<sup>th</sup>-century history. Losses in these areas have further weakened the Department's strength in the U.S. West. The three hiring priorities identified in the "Academic Program Review Self-Study" are reasonable, as is the goal of endowing a chair in the Greater Southwest. It is particularly important for serving the citizens of Arizona and continuing to serve first-generation college students from the Southwest that the department's strength in Southwest/Borderlands be maintained and enhanced. We therefore make the following recommendations:

- A. The U.S. history faculty are already cooperating with other units to build an area of strength in environmental history, and to enhance women's and gender history, Mexican American history, and Native American history. Possible collaboration or shared lines in Africana/African American history, women's and gender history, Mexican American history, and Native American history should be explored, both to enhance teaching capability and to develop thematic and interdisciplinary strengths.



At the same time, such collaborations will not be adequate to staff necessary courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

- B. The top priority must be the immediate replacement of at least one U.S. faculty position, and of an additional two to three positions before additional faculty departures in United States history are absorbed.
- C. The goal of establishing a chair in the history of the Greater Southwest should be pursued. However, the Department cannot wait to achieve that goal before addressing the losses in U.S. History. We therefore recommend the immediate replacement of at least one, and if at all possible, two U.S. faculty.
- D. The top priority should be a position in U.S. West/Borderlands, with research and teaching strength in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Such a position would help maintain the strength of the Department in these fields, and would combine with the strength in Latin American history to address emerging fields in borderlands and transnational histories. Ideally, the successful candidate would have a strong teaching field in women's and gender history, and/or Native American history. Should the proposed chair in Greater Southwest be achieved, then the areas of specialization for the Chair could be adjusted in light of retirements and the research strengths of existing faculty. \*
- E. The second priority should address diversity and breadth of coverage in the field. If a specialist in women's history is not hired for the U.S. West/Borderlands position, that would be a top priority, perhaps in combination with a specialty in African American history. Alternately, the proposed position in slavery and Civil War might be targeted to a research field that would enhance offerings in the Atlantic World.
- F. Future hires should build on existing strengths, while promoting new approaches to thematic and transnational histories. These goals cannot, however, substitute for abilities to teach undergraduate surveys and train teachers in American History.

We wish to emphasize that we are fully cognizant of the constraints within which we make these recommendations. We cannot, however, overestimate the seriousness of the situation or the imperative to address it now.

## 2. Thematic minor

*African history*  
*Eastern European history*

The APRC held extensive conversations with the History faculty on the advisability of restructuring their program away from its geotemporal focus in favor of a thematic emphasis. Both approaches have arguments in their favor. However, after extensive consultation, our committee came to position of compromise. The preponderance of evidence argues that it is best to retain a geotemporal focus in a graduate student's major areas. First, said focus continues to be the basis of professional hiring, as evidence by an examination of journals such as the Chronicle of Higher Education and the American Historical Association's Perspectives, both major forums for position advertisements. The second argument for retaining a more traditional focus derives from the pitfalls inherent in the thematic approach, specifically, the tendency to

stake out impossibly broad areas or, conversely, to slip into superficiality. Take, for example, the theme of ethnicity, often mentioned in the context of this new approach. Ethnic groups have formed and dissolved since the origins of the human race, and continue to do so in the present day. How does a graduate student, with only two years of readings, tackle a theme so broad without necessarily assuming a geotemporal focus beforehand? For this reason, programs that have adopted thematic approaches often tend to revert to an unofficial geotemporal approach. The University of Arizona History Department has demonstrated significant competence in its five areas of graduate training under the current structure, and gives every indication of maintaining that competence, with the caveat regarding our concern for U.S. history.

That being said, there remains an area of compromise: admit thematic approaches as a minor field. For example, a student of Latin American History might choose to focus on modern Latin America (usually defined as post-1810) as one major area, Mexican cultural history as another, but could supplement these with a minor field using culture, gender, or ethnicity as the theme. This pairing of approaches would allow a reasonably focused area of specialization, coupled with enough comparative readings to allow the student to think and write outside of a narrowly defined space. If the Department ultimately opts for thematic minors, we would suggest that they limit themselves to five or six options built on regularly taught courses.

*we can't even  
staff the minor  
fields we have*

### 3. Undergraduate Curriculum

Rebuilding the U.S. history faculty will have an immediate and salutary effect on the undergraduate curriculum. The evaluation team supports the history faculty's interest in increasing lower division course offerings as well as those providing guidance in exploring comparative history and thematic study. The concern for additional documentation of student achievement will be addressed in the section on assessment, but as with faculty evaluations, it appears that excellent accomplishments may not be earning the recognition across the university as it merits. Perhaps new assessment procedures, such as compiling student portfolios can help remedy this.

### 4. Development and Outreach

The visiting committee is most impressed by the efforts being made here both at the Departmental and at the College level. The faculty and staff in charge of development and outreach take their jobs very seriously and have innovative ideas about how to pursue donations and public involvement in the department's mission. The biggest challenge they face is that of time; it is said to take, on the average, 10 personal contacts with a prospective donor before a donation is made. The visiting committee found that outreach projects in the Department (such as the 'mystery and history' lecture series) had actually been curtailed by the cutting back of two administrative assistants to .75 FTE each, which compelled the program coordinator to turn her attention to the everyday business of the department. We recommend that at least one of these staff persons be returned to a full 1.0 FTE, to allow the program coordinator to organize more outreach events, which could lead to a more robust development effort. We also recommend that the Department form a standing development and outreach committee, one which would help the chair coordinate and extend efforts in this area.

## 5. Collaboration within the University

Within the Department, collaboration with other programs across campus (i.e., Latin American Studies, Near East Studies, Spanish and Portuguese, Group for Early Modern Studies, Anthropology) happens in informal and formal ways. It would be most helpful for History faculty to communicate that contribution within the department in more explicit ways so that graduate students are aware of their options, especially as they seek courses to fulfill thematic minor requirements.

## 6. Assessment

The APRC recommends that the History Department design and implement procedures to assess the undergraduate curriculum on a regular basis. Such assessment rubrics should be appropriate to the critical and qualitative intellectual skills and capacities that the curriculum is intended to teach. We recommend that the Department make explicit those skills and capacities that a history undergraduate major should provide, and devise assessment tools appropriate to those goals. Appropriate strategies might include 1) a critical-thinking exercise based on historical fact and interpretation, to be administered to students at the beginning of History 301 and the conclusion of History 396A; 2) comparative assessment of writing and critical thinking skills demonstrated in a student paper written in History 301, a paper from an intermediate history course, and a paper written for History 396A. Such comparisons might be made of portfolios of individual students' work, or of work submitted in these classes in a single term; 3) assessments of undergraduate majors' skills by employers; and/or 4) self-assessments of progress from students at graduation and of a group of students at some interval after graduation. We intend these examples to be suggestive, not prescriptive. While some qualitative assessments lend themselves to quantitative expression (for instance, improvement in a defined number of measures of a good paper) any assessment plan should reflect the Department's teaching goals and should be appropriate to those pedagogical intentions. The History Department as a whole is a very strong program and in order to communicate this strength it is necessary to provide data that demonstrates students' progress.

This concludes our report on the state of the University of Arizona History Department. The Academic Programs Review Committee would like to extend its sincerest thanks to the administration, faculty, staff, and student body of the University for the extraordinary hospitality that all showed to us during our all-too-brief visit. We greatly appreciate everyone's willingness to share their many points of view. Above all, we wish you the best in your ongoing efforts to face the challenges of higher education in these difficult times, and to maintain the illustrious reputation that has always defined the University of Arizona.