As a result of the third cycle of DePaul University's Academic Program Review Process (Cycle 3), the participants in the process enter into the following agreements. The participants understand that this document will be available to be made public once all the signatures are in place.

Actions agreed upon for the coming academic year

1. Curriculum

   a. Adequacy of Curriculum. The department is satisfied with the current structure and content of the curriculum in relation to student outcomes, market for graduates, and trends in the profession. Since the curriculum is relatively new, the department will make no immediate changes next year. The department now has a curriculum committee in place to review the curriculum. Next year, it will explore how the Barat History curriculum and course offerings relate to DePaul’s, and it will explore how Secondary Education History majors are served by the History department curriculum.

   b. Assessment of Students. The department has developed a survey to discover how students experience the curriculum. Alumni, current undergraduate and graduate majors will be surveyed next year; the department agrees to consult OIPR to get assistance with the design, administration, and analysis of the survey. The curriculum committee will review the results of the survey to revise the curriculum to best meet student needs.

   c. Future of the Graduate Program. The department has decided to continue the M.A. program in History on the condition that it be substantially reshaped. The department faculty will have a retreat in the fall to consider several proposals from internal committees; the department will also use the graduate student and alumni surveys to help reshape the graduate program. The department has committed to completing a thorough revision of the graduate program for implementation in September 2003. The Dean noted that the department should consider that revising the graduate program will take faculty time and other department resources, two issues that already concern the department.
2. STUDENTS

Advising. The department is concerned that the new NROL/PeopleSoft registration system which lets students register without first contacting an advisor will significantly limit faculty/student interaction necessary for good academic advising. The EVP and dean agree that this is an issue. The EVP noted that next year, the Office of University Academic Advising will explore ways to address this problem. The EVP also noted that the PeopleSoft system will be improved next year so that information on student course histories will be provided to advisors in a more timely manner. The department agrees to consider other options next year for encouraging faculty-student interaction, such as asking students to come meet with faculty, having group advising, etc.

3. RESOURCES

Staff support. The department requested more resources for staff support, since there is an increasing level of administrative responsibility for the department secretary. The dean agreed that the workload has been increasing, and has provided resources for the hiring of an additional full-time staff member to be shared between the Religious Studies department and the History Department for next year.

Issues on which there is joint commitment to continue working

1. CURRICULUM: Relationship with School of Education (re preparing secondary history teachers)

Currently, about one third of History majors are in the School of Education as Secondary Education History majors. The department is concerned that these students are not receiving the appropriate level of content-area instruction or advising in order to prepare them to be good history teachers. The dean and the EVP agree that his is a legitimate issue with university-wide implications, and the EVP’s office will think about methods to look further at this issue. The department is committed to further investigating this problem by having discussions with other departments that also have Secondary Education majors in their content areas (English, Modern Language, Math, Sciences, etc.). The dean suggested that the department could also take a pro-active approach to dealing with the current situation, such as hiring a historian with a secondary education specialty. However, the department noted that there is already a faculty member in the School of Education who works in this specialty, and that the deeper problems they see here can be remedied only by future teachers of history at the secondary level—along with other teachers at that level—being LA&S students pursuing their majors in their respective disciplinary fields, however long and complex a transition that may be.

2. FACULTY
a. Workload issues: desire for a regular sabbatical/leave program. The department was concerned that an increasing number of full-time faculty have gone on leave. This means that service and teaching burdens fall disproportionately to the few full-time, tenure-track faculty who are not on leave. In response to the department's request to be allowed to hire additional full-time tenure-track faculty to address these problems, the dean noted that it is the department's responsibility to evaluate each faculty member's leave request in light of staffing concerns. The dean suggested that instead of hiring more full-time tenure-track faculty, the department should consider designing some service responsibility for those faculty who have full-time, non-tenure-track, one-year appointments in exchange for a reduced teaching load. The department agreed to take this under advisement.

b. Role of and extent of reliance on part-time faculty. The department raised the issue that the increasing enrollments in History has forced the department to rely on part-time faculty as instructors. The department was concerned that a disproportionate number of courses were being taught by part-time faculty, not by full-time faculty, as the University desires. The dean noted that the percentage of courses taught by part-time History faculty has in fact decreased. The department agreed to continue monitoring the situation, while noting that their concern is as much about the percentage of courses taught by non-tenure track faculty, whether part or full time, as it is about part-time, strictly speaking, a situation that can only be changed by additional tenure-track positions.

Issues noted for further discussion

1. The department review committee noted that the faculty within the department raised the concern that the University did not provide child care options.

2. The department requested that the dean consider a post-doc position for a minority scholar, such as a teaching fellow, who would have a reduced teaching load in exchange for increased time for research and scholarly work. The dean suggested that the department draw up a proposal for such a position and present it to the dean for consideration.

University-level Issues and Commitments

During Cycle 3, the unit program review self-studies raised several issues that have important university-wide implications. In subsequent conversations about these major issues, the units, the deans, the Academic Program Review Committee members, and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs all have recognized the need for university-level coordination in the following areas: a) developing appropriate staffing models to support growth; b) assisting units in the transition to the PeopleSoft student
administrative system and in getting the maximum benefits from it, such as identifying and counting double majors, enforcing prerequisites, and securing better information and support for student advising; c) providing research assistance to units through university-level research offices; d) improving support for advising, especially in light of PeopleSoft; e) facilitating cross-college collaboration within DePaul with respect to new programs of study. To follow up on these common issues and determine the appropriate courses of action needed to address them at the university and unit level, the Academic Program Review Committee and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs agree to do the following:

1. The Academic Program Review Committee agrees to prepare a summary report on Cycle 3 to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs which discusses these and other issues that have important connections to other university-wide initiatives. That report will be made public, along with the Memoranda of Agreement.

2. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs agrees to direct the appropriate university-level offices to work with the units and their deans to determine how to effectively address these issues.

3. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will require a progress report in June of 2002 from the appropriate university offices that will be shared with the Academic Program Review Committee.
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