

Faculty

I agree with the review team that the department faculty are highly-qualified, “devoted teachers and engaged researchers.” The review team judges that the University “offers little institutional support for professional development...” While our resources are clearly more modest than those of many private institutions or public research universities, we have taken steps in the College and the University to support research and professional development. Since the last program review, I have raised amount of travel money annually available to faculty by \$200 per faculty member. Faculty may also apply to the Dean’s Office for additional support, especially for foreign or unusually expensive travel. The WSU Research, Scholarship and Professional Growth Committee awards funding on a competitive basis for research and professional development. The College also encourages faculty to seek outside grant and fellowship support, with a stipend for a proposal submitted through the Office of Sponsored Programs. One such stipend was recently awarded to a History Department faculty member.

I am pleased to see the report commend the department for its support of adjunct faculty. It also suggests that faculty members guest-lecture in concurrent enrollment classes, a suggestion the department will adopt.

Program support

The review team notes the low salary of the department secretary, who is strong contributor to the program’s success. They recognize that this is a systemic problem, and suggest beginning to raise the salary of the most senior department secretary one year, then that of the next most senior secretary the next year, and so on. This is an interesting idea which I will explore, though I would note that with 13 staff members in the College, junior people would need to wait a long time to see such a raise.

The report recognizes that the librarian liaison to the department, herself a historian, is a major resource. It also documents History faculty dissatisfaction with their level of input on Library policies and procedures, and suggest a faculty library committee to supply such input. I agree that this is a constructive idea. I encourage the department to suggest this idea (as will I) to the new Dean of the Library, who is expected to begin this summer.

External relationships

The report praises the department’s “vibrant internship program,” which connects the department to many external partners. I would cite as well the close relationship between the department and the Weber Historical Society, whose lectures the department co-sponsors, and the Lampros Lectures in 19th century U.S. history, which draw a large community audience. Additionally, I can cite the department chair’s longtime participation in the Venture classes offered to community members, and History faculty lectures to community groups, such as Dr. Little’s well-

promotion to full professor from \$5,000 to \$10,000. The other was to institute the Performance Compensation Program, whereby full professors can apply over time for up to two \$5,000 raises based on strong professional performance. These changes have already benefited faculty members in the History Department.

The report closes with recognition of the strong leadership provided to the department during Dr. Matt's nine years as chair. I fully concur, and look forward to continuing successful leadership under the incoming chair, Dr. Dant.

In sum, the review team and I agree that the History Department is a very strong one, with no major problems to confront. As it takes steps to institute suggestions from the review team, I am ready to lend my support.