

External Review Report
7th Cycle Program Review
Department of History
College of Science and Engineering
San Francisco State University

March 20-21, 2019

Edward Ross Dickinson, UC Davis

Linda Ivey, CSU East Bay

Table of Contents

Section	Page #
1.0 Overview of the Program	3
2.0 Program Quality	3-13
2.1 Program Planning.....	3-4
2.2 Student Learning and Achievement.....	4-5
2.3 The Curriculum.....	6-10
2.4 Faculty.....	10-11
2.5 Resources.....	11-12
2.6 The Program’s Conclusions, Plans, and Goals.....	13
3.0 Strengths and Achievements	13-14
4.0 Recommendations	14-15

1.0 General Overview of Program

The History Department at San Francisco State University offer several impressive programs, including a BA in History and MA in History and a history minor, and they are in the process of securing academic senate approval for a graduate certificate in History education. They have approximately 300 undergraduate majors and 30 MA candidates at present. The faculty in the department are impressive in their innovation in the classroom, their scholarly output, their own collegiality as a group and most notably in their ability and success in creating a community of historians among students and all faculty. The curriculum is rigorous, and recently the faculty have worked together to update their undergraduate program for the 21st century learner, offering a program structured in breadth of study with greater flexibility in terms of course selection and path towards degree completion. They have directly addressed issues within their offerings, turning a directed effort towards assessing courses with high DFWI rates, and revised their program so that the challenging skills are scaffolded into the major courses from the lower division offering on. This department is impressively active in conscientiously building on their strengths and assessing their weaknesses with the end goal of student success.

2.0 Evaluation of Program Quality

2.1 Program Planning

The History Department has engaged in an extremely active program review, revision and planning initiative in recent years. This has led to substantial changes in course offerings, in degree offerings, and in the requirements for the major and minor of the major. This initiative is ongoing on multiple tracks, and we have provided details in the section entitled “curriculum” below. In addition to revamping their programmatic approach, the department has also wisely developed contingency plans in the event of changes that could come from the CSU Chancellor’s Office. Primary among the factors that could have an impact on the department are potential changes with the system’s General Education requirements. Recently the department introduced new lower division courses that increase their GE and other graduation requirement offerings, interweaving critical thinking, oral communication and statistics. They have deliberately looked into the DFWI rates with their GVAR course, strategically planning a more explicit introduction of writing skills in prerequisite courses. The introduction of a graduate certificate program in history education wisely draws upon a predictable pool of candidates, secondary education professionals who will be rewarded for further study but may not have the resources for a full MA program. Finally, the department is gearing up for addressing more specifically pedagogical innovations within their classes not that their revised program is on its way to approval. The review team was witness to discussion among faculty regarding the integration of high impact practices, varying content delivery and diversifying course assessments for a diversity in learning

styles. This is a department that in the area of program planning is exceptionally energetic, self-conscious, committed, and nimble.

2.2 Student Learning and Achievement

The department clearly carries out its teaching mission with extraordinary success. This year it carried out a survey of its undergraduate students (funded by the Teagle Foundation) to assess their level of satisfaction with the program. The response was overwhelmingly enthusiastic. 90 percent report being satisfied or very satisfied (65 percent) with the quality of instruction in introductory courses; 99 percent satisfied or very satisfied (69 percent) with instruction in intermediate level courses; 97 percent satisfied or very satisfied (76 percent) with instruction in advanced courses. 94 percent are satisfied or very satisfied (67 percent) with the breadth and depth of courses; 90 percent satisfied or very satisfied (59 percent) with the sequencing of courses; 95 percent satisfied or very satisfied (68 percent) with the level of intellectual engagement in their courses. 89 percent were satisfied or very satisfied with the accessibility of faculty, 87 percent with faculty commitment to teaching. 57 percent found their courses extremely or very challenging, and another 30 percent adequately challenging. The average response to a question regarding preparation for writing in the discipline was very positive—8.3 out of 10.

The review team met with some nine undergraduate students and five graduate students (including two former undergraduates, now graduate students), and that conversation entirely confirmed the impression gathered from the undergraduate student survey data. Undergraduates were particularly positive about the two key courses for majors: the HIST 300 GVAR course and the HIST 600-numbered proseminars. The combination of training in historical thinking and methods in History 300, and the application in the proseminars, is clearly extremely successful and highly satisfying for students. The graduate students responded similarly regarding HIST 700, which they clearly felt gave them a solid foundation for their further graduate work. Beyond that, both the undergraduate and graduate students were clearly delighted with the program. We repeatedly heard comments like "I love this school," the faculty "are brilliant, they're caring, they're supportive, they'll drop everything to help you," "professors want to work to make sure you succeed," the program is a "fantastic environment" for learning, and the department "has our back." We heard multiple anecdotes about faculty intervening personally and individually to help ensure student success. Students reported that faculty office doors are open, that they are happy to talk to students outside of formal office hours, that they advise and consult both with students in their classes and with students who are not taking any courses with them but interested in their fields of expertise. There was high praise too for Sheri Kennedy, the department's administrator, of whom one student remarked "you don't leave that office without an answer, and you don't leave without knowing that your problem is going to be solved."

Both graduate and undergraduate students told us consistently and vehemently that the department's use of space is outstanding, and were particularly enthusiastic about the department's student lounge and computer lab. Both graduate and undergraduate students remarked both that the program faces challenges because so many students have to commute long distances and/or do not have adequate home space for their studies, but that the lounge and lab solve those problems. In fact, all the students we spoke to reported that there is a very strong sense of social and intellectual community among students in both programs, and in fact also between graduate and undergraduate students as well. The lounge and lab, which are clearly very heavily used both as social space and as study space, are what make that sense of community possible. The department has clearly been able to make these spaces critical to the graduate program and the undergraduate experience--in a sense the heart of both programs.

The information available to us all indicates that this is a department that is delivering a well-designed and full curriculum with skill, élan, and commitment.

This level of satisfaction is all the more remarkable given the very heavy service teaching contribution the department makes.

Formal assessment of student learning outcomes has apparently languished in recent years; but the department is clearly moving systematically to correct that. In the meantime, the department's majors are clearly well-prepared for further educational achievement. Over 60 percent of surveyed alumni went on to graduate or professional study. Three quarters were either satisfied or very satisfied (49 percent) with their preparation for their careers. These numbers seem to be drawn from a survey of graduates with degrees dating back as far as the 1970s and as recent as 2015, with no distinctions made between periods—an indiscriminate approach clearly not the most useful for assessing recent outcomes. But there are certainly no warning signs in the survey data.

The Department appears to have stabilized in numbers of undergraduate majors and of incoming graduate students, and to have been able to expand the number of student enrollments, after a period of declining numbers in both regards--a decline that corresponded to national trends. The expansion of undergraduate enrollments is particularly encouraging, as that may be counter to the national trend, which saw a further decline in the last year. It is to be hoped that the recent spate of curricular changes (see below) will consolidate and enhance these positive developments.

2.3 Curriculum

a. Curricular revision: undergraduate

The department has given careful thought to its curriculum, and in recent years has undertaken a comprehensive and remarkably thorough review and revision of its curriculum. Key curricular innovations already approved include:

- A significant revision of the requirements for the major, which streamlines of requirements for the history BA. This revision appears likely to remove a challenge for prospective majors. The previous structure was overly complicated and may have inclined students to look elsewhere for less restrictive set of major requirements. The new simplified requirements appear likely to better respond to student interest, while achieving the same intellectual aims (in breadth and depth of training) as the older, more complicated set. Students should also now be able to take a range of courses more tightly fitted to their own individual interests; but the major will still require students to complete key skills-building requirements and to gain training in multiple geographic fields and time periods. The greater flexibility of the new requirements may also improve the department's already very good time-to-degree average. Finally, the more flexible approach may well help to focus student attention on the specific skills the major trains them in--a central concern for the department (see below).
- The addition, already in 2014, of the option for students to create thematic concentrations in the major (rather than focusing only on specific regions and periods), allowing students to tailor the major more to their individual interests.
- The revision of the minor, which the department has rethought as no long a "mini-major" but a flexible program that can be tailored by the individual student to complement, with an historical perspective, their training in their major field.
- A new honors certificate program in historical research, which gives students in any major progressive, scaffolded training in the particular research methods central to historical work. One of the great strengths of history as a discipline is that it gives students training and hands-on experience in research and analysis using large bodies of qualitative data. The certificate proposal appears clearly designed to appeal to undergraduates on the basis of a more explicit articulation of this established strength of the discipline.

b. Curricular revision, graduate

In the graduate program, an important recent initiative is the new graduate certificate program for K-12 teachers, which has passed its first reading in the Senate. This is an initiative that a large number of History departments nationally are currently considering, in part because graduate enrollments in history have declined. That wider trend is related to a catastrophic decline in academic positions in our discipline. SFSU has moved relatively quickly but with

proper care to adopt one of the more widely discussed strategic responses—offering graduate education in the form of professional development opportunities for teachers already active in the schools. It has assessed the likely viability of such a program by surveying its own graduates; and it has developed a proposal that seems particularly likely to be successful, because it will meet a specific and concrete need, and offer a quantifiable benefit, to active teachers in the region. If it is successful, the program will not only serve teachers in the city and region, but also offer important benefits for the department's graduate program by expanding course sizes to facilitate the emergence of a critical intellectual mass, potentially adding diversity to graduate seminars, and integrating motivated and informed professionals into the program. It is to be hoped that this will help the department to sustain its historic role in opening the opportunity for doctoral study for its MA students. (Of alumni reporting further study, we counted 19 who hold degrees in education of one kind or another, 15 who hold MAs, and 14 who went on to gain the PhD.)

The department is pursuing its commitment to practical training for entry into or success in K-12 teaching in other ways as well—particularly through exploration of the possibility of internship programs with regional community colleges and K-12 schools, and work on a CSET waiver program.

c. Undergraduate teaching methods and Program Learning Outcomes

As part of the curricular revision process, the department has also been rethinking its pedagogical approach at the undergraduate level, moving to add to the traditional focus on content (the history of particular regions and periods) a more systematic and self-conscious focus on the key skills in which the discipline of history trains students particularly intensively and well. A curriculum retreat in the Spring of 2017 appears to have been central to this effort. A number of discreet initiatives have grown out of this rethinking.

First has been the recent revision of the department's PLOs, which now directly reflect thinking within the discipline nationally--in particular for example the American Historical Association's "Tuning Project," which has developed a detailed understanding of the aims and benefits of history education for undergraduate students. The intention at the national level has been in part to help modernize history pedagogy, and in part to combat the impression that history is not a "practical" major by pointing out that it gives students incomparably rigorous training in a number of skills that can be of critical importance in many careers. The SFSU department has however taken a much more systematic approach to this shift than most. Most striking is the department's use of surveys of alumni and current students to identify specific skills on which the department needs to focus, and particularly weaknesses in its lower division courses. The department secured funding to support this work. The Program Learning Outcomes adopted by the department lend themselves to a progressive skills-based pedagogical approach—from basic

content knowledge (PLO 1), through complex reasoning regarding causation of perspective (PLO 2), to focused independent research in dialogue with wider scholarship (PLO 4), and including writing and oral presentation of findings and argument (PLO 5).

Second, like many History departments nationally, SFSUs has made an effort to expand certification of its courses for General Education competencies. This of course fits the broader goal of developing a more skills-based approach well. The department has been quite successful in this effort. At this point, the department is focusing on extending the variety of GE requirements its courses meet--a prudent strategy in light of the apparent instability of the GE requirements-regime.

A third important initiative over the past four or five years has been the introduction of a whole roster of new and innovative courses oriented specifically to the teaching of methods:

- HIST 101, critical thinking in history, for incoming majors.
- HIST 102 and HIST 303, on oral history
- HIST 103, on the narrative and identity-producing functions of history
- HIST 112, which meets the upper division B4 GE requirement for social science statistics
- HIST 660, on digital history

The department has further introduced a range of courses that are thematic in focus, including:

- HIST 313, on the history of sexuality
- HIST 620, on piracy and maritime history
- HIST 304, on teaching history with comics

The introduction of both kinds of courses would appear to have made the curriculum, as the self-report says, considerably more "student-centered" than it historically has been. The enhanced focus on the skills History teaches, rather than more exclusively on content, should mean that the curriculum nevertheless remains coherent.

Finally, the department has taken potentially important steps toward shifting toward an "active learning" pedagogical approach. The "Binder Project" in HIST 121 is a concrete step in that direction. The Department is bringing a nationally respected expert on history pedagogy (Bain) for a pedagogy "retreat" with faculty in April. And it continues to assess teaching in its courses, particularly at the introductory level, in order to move toward a more articulated and effective "scaffolding" of skills training through its curriculum. It should be emphasized that all these steps build on a record of pedagogical excellence. Particularly impressive is the attention the department has paid to skills-training and to learning outcomes in HIST 300 GWAR and the department's capstone seminars; in both cases, student response is enthusiastically positive. The recent steps, then, will help to further strengthen the department's already outstanding pedagogical performance.

d. Teaching contribution and curricular balance

The department makes an extremely important service teaching contribution to the SFSU campus. In recent years, each semester it has typically offered five sections (each with around 75 students enrolled) of HIST 120, seven of HIST 121, five or six sections of world history (HIST 114 and 115), and five of HIST 450. This is a herculean service teaching load for a department this size. The department offers a range of upper-division courses, between 20 and 25 per semester (not counting HIS 450) with enrollments generally ranging from 10 to 30. The department's proseminars—typically 8 or 9 per semester—offer students a wide range of topics; and with enrollments typically in the 5-15 range, these are obviously very high-impact, teaching-intensive classes.

Overall the department continues to offer a very full curriculum, despite declining FTE numbers. Student time to degree is healthy, suggesting that student needs for course offerings are being met consistently. In terms of course offerings, the curriculum appears to be well-balanced between lower division service/survey courses and more focused upper division courses. In terms of student numbers, the curriculum is heavily weighted toward service teaching in survey courses. The department should be commended for studying these lower division survey courses closely, and undertaking to improve on learning outcomes. DFWI rates in some of these introductory courses, and in HIST 300, appear to be relatively high (ranging up to a maximum of 33 percent). Anecdotally, this reflects more withdrawal and incomplete rates than fail or D rates. These DFWI rates should be compared to DFWI rates in comparable service teaching courses, of comparable size, in other programs; they may not actually be high in relative terms. In any case, the department has identified this as an important focus for future action.

There is one respect in which the department might examine its curriculum. The current lower division or "survey" courses are devoted almost entirely to US history and world history; the only specific non-US region in which there is a survey course appears to be Europe. The department might consider assessing whether a survey-level course in, say, Latin American or Asia-Pacific history would draw significant enrollments. But this matter cannot be addressed without expansion of department FTE (see below).

e. Advising

The department is to be commended for its recent adoption of mandatory advising for students. This is an important commitment of faculty time; but it appears likely to yield an even higher level of student satisfaction, if nothing else simply by further encouraging contact between faculty and students.

f. Graduate curriculum concerns

The declining number of FTE in the department and the shrinking size of the graduate program have generated some concerns among faculty and graduate students. Graduate students expressed concern about the limited graduate course offerings, and about course cancellations due to low enrollments. A particular focus of concern was the HIST 705 seminar, where some students felt that they were obliged to take a course in a subfield in which they did not intend to focus their studies.

The department is taking strategically sound and intelligent steps to address these concerns. A particularly promising step is the introduction of the graduate certificate program, which may substantially raise graduate enrollments. A second important step is a shift in the graduate program too toward thematic courses that meet the interests of more students (an example is the "Collapse of Empires" course, which addresses empires both ancient and modern, and which seems to have been very well-received by graduate students). What is more, the decline in graduate enrollments appears to have stopped and perhaps reversed in the most recent intake, so that the situation may be stabilizing and even improving slightly.

2.4 Faculty

The SFSU History department has seen a very significant erosion of faculty numbers in the past decade, from 22 to 17 FTE. The self-report points out the difficulty the department has faced in maintaining the breadth of its curriculum, particularly at the graduate level, and some of the changes this challenge has enforced.

We note in particular that the department is relatively heavily weighted toward the history of the United States (with a second center of gravity in European history). Because of the central importance of its survey courses in American history to the service teaching function of the department, this may be inevitable. But at this point, particularly outside US history, the department is struggling to maintain its full roster of course offerings because recent retirements have not been replaced. Particularly given the diversity of the student population SFSU serves, new hires targeting non-Western history, and perhaps particularly the history of Latin America and the Asia-Pacific region, might serve the department particularly well.

The department's members are almost uniformly active research scholars, many with quite imposing publication records. Most are also energetic citizens of the profession, as measured by papers delivered, public speaking and media presence, participation in professional organizations, book reviews, and the like. The department notes the high rate of scholarly productivity among faculty (21 monographs and 70 articles from 17 tenure track faculty in the

past five years). We might also point to the quality of the presses and journals that have published much of this work. Faculty have published in leading national and international flagship journals such as *History and Theory*, *Eighteenth Century Studies*, the *Radical History Review*, *French Historical Studies*, the *Journal of Women's History*, *Diplomatic History*, the *Journal of Social History*, as well as many other well-regarded specialist journals in their fields. Faculty publish book reviews in equally prestigious journals. Their monographs have been published by, among others, the University of Chicago Press, Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, Prentice-Hall, Duke University Press, Indiana University Press, Routledge, and Harvard University Press. Some of these monographs have won national prizes in their fields. Department faculty are not just active research scholars; they are publishing in top ranked journals and with leading presses in their discipline and fields.

Not surprisingly, department members' scholarly presence reflects the standing their scholarly work has earned them. Department faculty have presented their work in scholarly papers at leading institutions and conferences nationally and internationally, including for example the University of Toronto, the Library of Congress, King's College, Stanford, UCLA, UC Berkeley, Dartmouth, Cornell, the University of Wisconsin, Charles University in Prague, the University of Leiden in the Netherlands, the Universidad Federal de Bahia in Brazil, University College in Dublin, the University of Heidelberg, and many others.

A number of department members have also secured prestigious competitive fellowships, including from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Fulbright Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Stanford Humanities Center.

Finally, the History Department clearly encourages faculty engagement with the local, regional, and national public. Department members highly active in building and maintaining their roles as public intellectuals, for example participating in community forums on current events, contributing perspectives to multiple media outlets (for example for KQED, NPR and PBS, KPFA, Reuters, newspapers around the region, the online scholarly forum H-Net, national and regional opinion journals both in print and on-line), and working with museums, schools, bookstores (such as City Lights), and in film—among many other kinds of engagements.

In short, History Department faculty are without exception active research scholars, their individual scholarly accomplishments are impressive, and the department has an admirable collective scholarly profile. This is an energetic, ambitious, highly productive, and nationally and internationally respected group of scholars.

2.5 Resources

The Department's self-report is careful not to complain, but the department is facing extreme resource constraints, and could fairly be said to be operating on a shoe-string. Almost all faculty

members currently share offices. Their physical space, however, is in the estimation of faculty, staff and students alike, key to their strength. The shared spaces on the second floor for the science building are central to a strong sense of community, among majors, between graduate students and undergraduates and between students and faculty. Any plan to move this department must understand this critical element to the collegiality and student learning and camaraderie.

The Department appears to be managing to deliver its curriculum extremely effectively without access to larger classrooms. The close location of the lounge, seminar room and lab is, once again, a favorite element of life in the history department for students and staff..

The staffing level in the department is also extremely low, with only one full-time staff member, and one part-time staff member. This is an absolute rock-bottom minimum, and indeed appears to us to be a less than appropriate level of administrative support for a Department this size. This being said, the review team would like to commend the full-time staff person in place. She is clearly deeply valued across the board as an administrator, a financial guru, an advisor and a teacher. Students consistently cited her congeniality as playing a large part in their positive experience, and the chair mentioned more than once how truly dependent the department is on her depth of knowledge and breadth of skill.

The Department is clearly very actively and successfully engaged in fundraising, in particular in support of its recent curricular and pedagogical innovations. This is extremely commendable. On the other hand, this too is a heavy demand on faculty time, and deeper staff support might pay important dividends in this area too.

The decline in FTE in the department is a critical problem, particularly in light of recent national trends in student preferences. The decline in numbers of history enrollments has now reversed, nationally as well as at SFSU. The decline in the number of History majors has stopped, and anecdotally numbers appear now to be rising, at least in California and including in this department. If numbers rise significantly, the department will be even further stretched. This could potentially degrade the department's ability to focus on curricular and pedagogical innovation—for example if faculty teaching and grading loads increase. While it is clear that the availability of tenure track lines is limited in the CSU, this department has thought carefully about building their own future --- with marketing, with their proposed Honors certificate in research and with the graduate certificate, to name a but a few of their enacted plans. This innovation should be acknowledged and rewarded. For example, as the graduate certificate is gaining traction in the community, the administration could be more forgiving of low enrolled sections in the graduate program. And when tenure lines are considered, note that while the number of history majors is one indication of a need for resources, the innumerable students coming through lower division history courses for GE and the American Institutions Requirement courses, and helped towards graduation through directed initiatives to address DFWI rates in those courses, reveal a far greater need for faculty in this department.

2.6 Program Goals and Plans

The history department has undertaken a whole range of major innovative initiatives in recent years. Indeed, this department appears to us to be at the very forefront of initiatives within the discipline and profession nationally--it has already implemented a number of steps that the American Historical Association is urging History departments to consider (a focus on skill-based pedagogy, offering training to teachers as professional development, the development of a more thematic, global, and trans-national approach in place of the older "time and clime" subfields, etc. etc.).

It is testament to the energy and the collegiality of the department that it is clearly committed to consideration of a number of further initiatives and issues, including the following:

- The rethinking of its pedagogical approaches is ongoing, with interest particularly in addressing DWFI rates in introductory courses and in HIST 300, and in further developing active learning approaches.
- Faculty in the department spoke to the review team about their desire to expand and refine methods of assessment; to expand teaching of research methods; and to develop new pedagogical approaches to the first-year survey courses. This is a project for which the department has ongoing substantial funding.
- A number spoke of their interest in developing deeper relationships with institutions and communities in San Francisco, for example as a means of offering students more internship and research opportunities.
- Faculty spoke of the desire to enhance and support greater diversity in the undergraduate major, where for example 60 percent are still male.

These goals and plans appear realistic, and the department is either already pursuing them through a coherent strategy and concrete steps or is engaged in active, collegial, and action-oriented pre-planning conversations.

3.0 Program Strengths and Achievements

1) Overall, this department is really quite extraordinary. The curriculum offers rigor while the culture offers collegiality. This program challenges students academically, but also really seems to give them a home community, an essential ingredient in student success and a clear path to graduation. The faculty, too, laud the collegiality of the department. This is a notable, and most impressive strength.

2) The department makes a superb teaching contribution, both in general service courses and in its curriculum for majors. Student satisfaction is extremely high; the department's service

teaching contribution is very substantial; its curriculum is both well-structured and rapidly expanding and diversifying; again, there is a strong sense of community and high morale among students in both the graduate and undergraduate programs.

3) The History Department faculty maintain a very high level and quality of scholarly activity.

4) SFSU's History Department appears to be committed, nimble, collegial, and well-managed; these qualities have enabled it to become an early adopter of multiple initiatives currently being advanced as (mostly aspirational) best practices in the discipline and profession. They are a strong department, and more so, they are an excellent *history* department.

4.0 Recommendations

The external review team has very few recommendations because the history Department is clearly highly active in assessing its performance, innovating to meet recent challenges, and planning for its future. We have only three concrete recommendations to offer:

1) One and if possible two faculty hires, particularly in non-western history, will be essential to sustaining the department's current momentum in innovation and improvement, while maintaining the department's strength and contribution in US and European history. These hires are not only important in supporting curricular diversity. These hires also lend to student success across the university because the history department is a key player in delivering lower division general education courses, as well as courses in American Institutions, the social justice requirement and upper division GE. It is essential to support a strong faculty presence in these lower division courses especially—they are key markers in student retention and in the development of critical thinking and writing skills. Further, this is a department that has clearly proven its ability to use resources to support successful innovation and overall program improvement. Tenure lines here will be resources well invested.

2) The Department should continue its efforts to further improve its outstanding pedagogical performance, including through expanded use of student-centered active learning techniques and of an articulated "scaffolding" of skills to improve student success. Further effort towards pedagogical innovation in the upcoming years will buoy your recent programmatic revisions and may be critical in attracting new majors and adapting to the changing socio-economic status of students in the San Francisco Bay area.

3). The review team recommends with certain trepidation further exploration into undergraduate online courses and perhaps a low-residency program for the MA degree. Educational technology has improved dramatically in methods of course delivery in even the past few years. Students with trouble having access to local housing or needing employment may find these options helpful. That being said, be careful to guard one of your greatest assets: the sense of community

and camaraderie. Students overwhelmingly value the interaction with the faculty and with each other. Perhaps hybrid programs may be worth considering with all due caution.

In closing, one final thought from the review team as to the future of the History Department at SF State. We see SF State's history department as one that could really position itself as San Francisco's place of institutional history. So much history revolves around the campus itself! We would love to see the outreach into the community grow – through oral history courses, internships, community story gathering – making an aspect of the history major's experience learning and recording history through community engagement and service learning. For one example, the city is in a housing crisis. The historical enclaves throughout the city are endangered. Perhaps students could explore how a shared sense of history could play a role in bonding, and thus empowering, such communities.

Both reviewers were truly very impressed with the students, the staff and the faculty in this history department. We hope the university is able to see the work they put into their students and their program, and support them in these endeavors.