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Preface

As a self-consciously interdisciplinary enterprise, American Studies is relatively venerable—arguably the oldest in the country. At the same time, compared to the standard disciplines of the academy—English, History, Anthropology, Physics, and the like—, American Studies programs are still in the eyes of many faculty and administrators on their campuses one of the new kids on the block, still under pressure to prove their legitimacy. Although the oldest American Studies programs in the United States have been around for well over fifty years, many are much younger. And although that youth has been for many programs a key source of energy, they continually have to answer to the charge of academic immaturity. At the same time, as new interdisciplinary fields have emerged—women’s studies, ethnic studies, cultural studies, media studies—and as many English and other traditional departments have themselves taken on an increasingly interdisciplinary task, American Studies’ particular form of interdisciplinary work has sometimes been dismissed as outmoded or unnecessary, and local programs have often had to compete for tight resources, often rather unsuccessfully, with these other new programs. The past two decades have witnessed the deaths of more than a few American Studies programs.

But in the complex ecology of higher education, death and birth intertwine. Virtually every year in the 1990s has seen the founding of new American Studies programs at both small colleges and major universities, not to mention the significant renewal of American Studies programs at other schools. In addition to its defining cross-disciplinary focus on the study of the United States, American Studies has characteristically been at its strongest when most flexible and outreaching: when it has worked self-consciously and creatively to integrate into its own study the newest research of other fields. Ethnic
and feminist studies, postcolonial ethnography, postmodern theory, communication studies, critical historicism, political cultural studies, international comparative studies, and countless other threads have thus been woven into the most dynamic American Studies programs, invigorating without displacing those programs' traditional concerns with questions of culture and citizenship.

The strength of the national and international American Studies movement and the strength of local American Studies programs are reciprocal. It is thus very much in the interest of the American Studies Association to foster the vitality of local programs. One key tool for doing so is periodic program reviews. Such reviews offer individual programs the chance to assess their own health and to view themselves in the context of the larger American Studies movement. They also offer valuable information to the American Studies Association about the actual practices and problems of local programs—information that the Association in turn can use to help those programs. At the same time, such reviews play an important advocacy role. When most successful, they give both the local program and, indirectly, the Association an occasion to reaffirm the valuable contributions that a strong local program can make to campus life as well as to the larger profession.

This guide to program review is thus premised on the review’s dual role as a tool for both searching assessment and measured advocacy. It is directed primarily to the leadership of the local program, secondarily to scholars serving as external reviewers of the program. It does not address systematically the question: what should an excellent American Studies program look like? There are numerous plausible answers to that question—answers that will depend in large part on how energetically and imaginatively a local program takes advantage of its own specific on-campus and surrounding off-campus constituents and resources: the strengths of its campus' faculty, the interests of its students, the presence of local museums and archives, the needs of the local public school system and community agencies, the political and social issues that preoccupy the local community. What the guide does try to do is stimulate the local program leadership to consider whether it is taking best advantage of its local situation while keeping an eye on what is happening nationally in American Studies; and to consider how it can better convince campus administrators and faculty that its efforts are worth supporting.
II. Introduction

The nearly 300 American Studies programs in the United States take many shapes. They range from very small enterprises involving only a few faculty and students to programs with large enrollments and several dozen faculty participants. Most programs focus almost entirely on undergraduates, a few almost entirely on graduate students, and several dozens on a mixture. Some undergraduate programs are minors or tracks within other majors; some are full-scale majors that depend to varying degrees on their own and other departments’ courses. In terms of structure, many programs are administered voluntarily by committees of faculty who hold their appointments in other departments. A relatively few are controlled by faculty whose appointments are entirely in American Studies. Others—perhaps the most typical arrangement—involve a mixture of faculty with full or partial appointments in American Studies and faculty from other departments. Some programs are well-established, well-funded, and highly valued by their campuses. Some are considered more marginal by their campus administration and eke out an unstable existence on budgetary crumbs. Most fall somewhere in between—seen as useful to their campus but perhaps not as central as “real” disciplines such as English and History, regularly having to justify their mission to administrators and other faculty, typically a bit on the defensive when seeking additional resources (or seeking to preserve their existing resources).

Because of such considerable variety, no review guide for American Studies programs can possibly speak to all local contingencies. What this guide attempts to do, therefore, is to raise questions and offer suggestions in forms that local programs can adapt to their own situations.

Reviews are typically imposed on an American Studies program from the “outside,” generally by administrators or a combination of administrators and campus faculty committees. For this reason, among others, they can be irritating and even traumatic experiences for faculty, staff, and students involved in the program. At the same time, even traumas can yield some pleasures. Approached strategically and creatively, a program review can prove intellectually stimulating to the program’s members, improve the curriculum, build morale, solve difficult problems, and help the program gain increased respect (both on and off campus) and even new resources. We hope this guide will help the program’s members improve the odds that a review will generate such benefits.

What’s at Stake

Even if nothing else is at stake, and even if no “outsiders” are looking in on the process, a program review offers an excellent opportunity for the program’s members to assess the program’s present strengths and weaknesses and to develop concrete strategies for preserving the strengths and overcoming the weaknesses. Ideally, of course, an American Studies program’s members would be engaged in regular conversations with each other about the program’s goals and the strategies it has developed to achieve those goals. They would be talking to each other about their teaching and their
research, and would be constantly alert to possibilities for fine-tuning. In the face of other demands on faculty time, however, such conversations sometimes have to be relegated to less frequent intervals and a more formal occasion. A formal program review provides such an occasion.

But usually more is at stake in a formal review, and outsiders are in fact looking in. Administrators—and often campuswide faculty bodies—want to know how attractive and how good the program is so that they can decide whether to give the program more resources or take away resources, whether to actively help the program better realize its aspirations or to tell it that such aspirations are inappropriate, whether to support continuance of the program or to reduce or—in extreme cases—eliminate it. Reviewers from outside the campuses may also be brought into the process, and their assessments of the program may well, among other things, affect the reputation of the program among the national American Studies community. But the primary function of the external reviewers is to advise the various campus constituencies—American Studies participants, administrators, other faculty groups—on matters of program status and resources, based on their assessment of the program’s quality and of its value both to the campus and to national or regional American Studies community. Half of the work of the review takes place after the external reviewers have completed their part, as the various campus constituents settle down to negotiate about curricular changes, resource allocations, administrative structure, and the like, using the external review as a weapon (sometimes a double-edged weapon) in those negotiations.

This program guide will assume that the program review will involve all these on- and off-campus constituents, and that resources and power are involved as well as quality and prestige. It is absolutely critical that the American Studies program’s own members decide, from the outset, what they believe are the most critical stakes in the review; that they prepare themselves to negotiate the definition of those stakes with other players in the review (most notably key campus administrators); and that, at all stages of the review, they keep their sense of those stakes clearly in mind.
III. Steps in the Review Process

The steps in a typical review process can be readily identified, although their implementation can be complex. Those steps might be labeled as follows:

1. The decision to conduct the review
2. The preliminary preparation for the review
   ◦ by the campus
   ◦ by the program
3. The preparation of the self-study
4. The external review and submittal of external review report
5. The program’s response to the external review report(s)
6. The administration’s and other campus bodies’ discussion of the external review report and the program’s response to that report
7. The official campus response to the entire review, with recommendations for action
8. The program’s adjustment to the consequences of the review.

This guide will discuss each of these steps in turn, focusing primarily on the preparation of the self-study, the external review, and the program’s response to the external review report(s).
IV. The Decision to Conduct the Review

Many colleges and universities now have regular calendars for the review of all degree-granting programs on their campuses. If so, the local American Studies program will be able to anticipate the review, often by several years, and can begin making orderly preparations. Other campuses still proceed with reviews on an ad hoc basis. Such ad hoc reviews can be triggered by several circumstances, of which the most typical are budgetary concerns (either a desire of the administration to cut costs or shift funds or a request by the American Studies program for additional funds), a petition by the program for a change in status (e.g., to move from offering a minor to offering a major, to begin a graduate program, to restructure itself from an inter-departmental committee to a faculty-holding unit), or a belief (held by a key administrator or campus faculty body, or both) that the program is weak or in crisis and needs to be “straightened out” or eliminated.

The campus’ full array of reasons for conducting the review are generally but not always made explicit, and such lack of explicitness can add to the anxiety that a program will normally feel in any case about a review. It is therefore in the interest of the program for its faculty to make certain that they fully understand what is at stake for those administering the review and for those who will be making decisions based on the outcome of the review. The program faculty will want to negotiate as vigorously and creatively as possible with the review administrators over such matters as what topics the review will cover, who the external reviewers will be (see below), what materials will be provided those reviewers, what the actual logistics of the external review process will look like (who will be interviewed and under what circumstances, what kinds of on-site observation will be facilitated, whether program leadership will be able to participate in an exit interview), what opportunities the program will have to respond to the external review report(s), etc. To have any chance of conducting these negotiations successfully, the program’s faculty must itself have reached some agreement on what results they would like from the review. Such agreement may well require a series of searching conversations. The program’s leadership should arrange for those conversations at the earliest possible moment.
V. Preliminary Preparation for the Review

The review administrators will undoubtedly prepare for the review—and particularly for the external portions of the program—in a more or less systematic manner, directing staff to gather data, identifying external reviewers from on and/or off campus, setting external review dates, etc. Meanwhile, the program’s leadership should not be passive. It has its own work cut out for it.

One wag in the American Studies Association has remarked: “The best way to prepare for a program review is to constantly prepare for it.” What she seems to mean is that the key to preparation for a review lies in the lived daily experience of the program’s members—faculty, students, and staff—and in the on-going “culture” or “structure of feeling” of the program. This document is not the place to discuss in detail what makes for a healthy program culture. That discussion is best left to other Association documents, and to the personal testimonies of faculty in successful programs. But two relevant elements of that culture are worth mentioning briefly.

First, a program whose members are in regular conversation with each other about the goals and strategies of the program—whose faculty are talking regularly to each other about their research, their reading, their teaching, their service, and their other professional activities; whose staff and students have extensive opportunities to be involved in a discussion of the program’s aspirations and problems; whose members regularly focus some systematic thought on how the curriculum and other aspects of the program can be improved—is a program that will know what its stakes in the review are, will be able to write a self-study without undue effort, and will present itself effectively during the external review. Needless to say, such regular conversation is likely to be much less effective if it begins only a month before a self-study must be produced or only three months before external reviewers descend.

Second, a healthy program culture will keep its bridges in repair and will in fact be constantly looking out for opportunities to build new bridges—with its affiliated faculty, with chairs of related departments, with unaffiliated faculty whose interests overlap with those of American Studies, with key administrators, with program alumni, with community leaders, with scholars on other campuses, with other local American Studies programs, with activities of the American Studies Association and its regional chapters. During a review, an American Studies program needs all the understanding and sympathy it can get, especially on its own campus. A program that allows itself to drift into isolation from—or into disdain for—key faculty, departments, interdisciplinary programs, and administrators on its campus is heading for a rocky review. Such bridge-building requires constant effort, but it’s well worth the trouble.

Drawing on such regular conversation and linking efforts, the program’s faculty can move expeditiously toward preparing more concretely for the review. The program’s chair should schedule one or more meetings to discuss the review, what the program’s stake in it is, what the process will be, and what the program must produce in preparation for it. Although the program’s core faculty and staff will undoubtedly take
responsibility for much of that formal preparatory work, it makes excellent sense to involve affiliated faculty and students in at least some of the discussions. Faculty and chairs from other campus programs, for example, can offer observations about their own recent reviews that the American Studies leadership can use to the program’s advantage.

Out of these discussions may conceivably come disagreement over present goals and strategies of the program or over desirable plans for the program’s future. Allowing sufficient time, over the course of several meetings, for a frank discussion of such disagreements will increase the chances of enlarging the area of consensus. Encouraging participants to put their positions in writing, for general circulation, may stimulate productive exchanges.
VI. The Self-Study

A program review, whether or not involving external as well as internal reviewers, will nearly always include a self-study. That self-study will typically consist of two parts: 1) some descriptive and statistical oriented series of sections or appendices and 2) an evaluative and argumentatively oriented narrative. Getting these two parts “right” is one of the most critical steps in a successful review.

The Appendices

Some schools have greater desire and capacity than do others to generate a considerable amount of descriptive and statistical information about a program. Some schools keep rather informal or spotty records on such matters as course enrollments over a period of time, numbers of declared majors, alumni achievements, etc. On the other hand, in some institutions—particularly ones with elaborate computer data bases—such information can be generated to the point of overkill: much more data than is necessary for the purposes of the review, and even a considerable amount of irrelevant data that can bury the most important data and get in the way of an attempt to look at the major features of the program. At any event, such data sends a lot of messages to reviewers.

Members of an American Studies program being reviewed will therefore want to consider very carefully the data that will be going into these appendices. They may well want to negotiate with administrators, for example, over what is to be included and excluded. The goal of the program members should not be to hide data that reflects weaknesses or problems in the program but to make certain that such data is presented in the context of whatever data is available that reflects the program’s strengths. If necessary, in order to achieve this balanced presentation, the program’s member may want to add to the appendices certain data that the administrators or others who oversee the appendix’s production have not identified as relevant. For this end, the program itself should have been systematically collecting (over a period of years if possible) certain kind of information not likely to have been generated by central campus agencies—special awards earned by its students, staff, and faculty, undergraduates’ and graduate students’ publications, the achievements of its alumni, the contributions of its core faculty to other sectors of campus life, written testimony about the program’s impact on their lives from its alumni and present majors, etc.

Appendices A and B to this guide should be treated as suggestive check-lists of the kinds of information that may be usefully included in the narrative portion of the self-study or in the appendices to the self-study (see below). However, not all such data will be relevant or useful to a particular review. The check-lists therefore are best seen as a detailed reminder of program elements that can be drawn upon as appropriate for the particular self-study, as well as program elements that will be of interest to the national American Studies community.
The Evaluative Narrative

A thoughtful, well-written self-study narrative is highly important to the success of the review. It is the primary occasion for the program’s central members to show their own thorough understanding of the goals and dynamics of program, including continuities and changes in its campus history; to demonstrate their own capacity to plausibly evaluate the program’s strengths and weaknesses; and to make a persuasive case for specific actions (changes in requirements and curriculum, changes in administrative structure, new activities, augmentations in resources) that will preserve and enhance the program.

Although the core faculty are likely (and appropriately so) to take chief responsibility for drafting this narrative, those faculty will find it substantively and strategically useful to circulate the narrative for comments to all faculty affiliated with the program, as well as to program staff and even students. Comments from such individuals can spot misstatements, enrich the narrative’s perspectives, and help sharpen its rhetoric. Such involvement will also better prepare the affiliated faculty, staff, and students to participate constructively in meetings and interviews undertaken in conjunction with the external review.

The narrative should be to the point. It should avoid getting distracted by elaborate discussions of minor issues and problems and instead concisely make clear what it considers most at stake in the review. It should be efficiently organized and easy to follow. And it should be as short as possible, consistent with covering the major points it wants to make. External reviewers (from both inside and outside the campus) can quickly tire of narratives that drone on and on and fail to distinguish major from minor issues. The narrative’s drafters should aim for a document (excluding appendices and other attachments) of no more than 15-20 single-space pages, and exceed that only if there are the most compelling reasons for doing so.

The narrative should also give the distinct impression of judiciousness. Its writers should certainly use the occasion to highlight what they consider the program’s strengths and distinctive qualities, including the nature and value of the contributions it makes both to the campus and, where relevant, to the larger American Studies community. But the narrative should also take the initiative to highlight any problems the program is having. Better to highlight those problems oneself, and in one’s own terms, than to give administrators or external reviewers full control over defining those problems. Accompanying the discussion of these problems should be a discussion of steps the program is taking, or plans to take, or wants (e.g. contingent on additional resources) to take to mitigate or remedy them. This discussion also provides a good occasion for the drafters to invite the external reviewers to offer constructive recommendations for solving the problems.

The narrative should draw on and efficiently refer to the data contained in the self-study’s descriptive and quantitative appendices, as supporting evidence for the narrative’s arguments, but should not encumber itself with such data. Rather, the
narrative should focus on the implications of that data for the review. For example, the narrative should not restate the requirements (which should be included in an appendix) for the program’s undergraduate or graduate degrees. Rather, it should discuss what it has hoped to achieve by those requirements, the degree to whether they have worked as hoped, and any plans the program has to revise them. It should not simply describe the fields and extent of participation of faculty involved with the program—much of which can be made apparent in an appendix—but should focus rather on whether that range of fields seems sufficient for the program’s goals, whether the extent of participation is sufficient, and what steps the program plans to take to increase participation.

Ideally, the narrative will clearly show a faculty (and student body) that is united behind an explicit set of goals and strategies for the program. However, if significant disagreements remain among the participants when the narrative is being written, those disagreements should be stated explicitly in the narrative, the sense of what is at stake in such disagreements identified, and a plan outlined that will enable the program to deal constructively with those disagreements. Unresolved arguments have the potential, if approached in a cooperative and creative spirit, to yield new and useful programmatic directions and to demonstrate a diverse faculty’s ability to work respectfully with each other on behalf of important goals even when not all marching to the same drummer. Appendix C to this guide suggests a possible set of topics that the narrative may wish to address. The specific topics, and their specific ordering, will of course depend on the concerns and situation of the local program. Some campus administrators, for example, will insist that the narrative cover certain topics. However, the narrative’s drafters are likely to have considerable say as to the order and narrative context in which they address those topics.

One final word about the self-study. Although it must be prepared with several audiences, both on-campus and off-campus, in mind, its primary audience must be those on the campus who have power over its existence and over its resources. Among that audience may well be faculty who sit on campus program review, educational policy, or budget committees. As peers, they will certainly be sensitive to such questions as curricular quality, student quality, faculty quality and the number and range of faculty involved, impact of the program on campus life, the program’s standing in the field, and whether the program is an effective investment of resources (resources that otherwise might well go to programs in which these faculty are involved). In both its appendices and narrative, the self-study must strive self-consciously to satisfy these faculty about such matters. But an even more important audience may well be the administrator or administrator who holds the purse strings. A typical administrator is most concerned with two things: making his or her dollars go as far as possible, and being able to brag that his programs are among the best of their kind in the region or country or in the schools of whatever circle of administrators she hangs out with. So the self-study must work self-consciously to give her something to brag about, something that will make him look good if he supports the program. And the self-study must try to show him that it can make him look good without costing him an undue amount of resources. Administrative disclaimers and program wishes notwithstanding, numbers count in administrators’
eyes: enrollments and numbers of majors per faculty or per dollar spent on the program, students’ performances on standardized tests, numbers of BAs, MAs, or PhDs with good jobs, amount of external funding for the program, etc. A good self-study will help convince administrators that they’re getting their money’s worth.
VII. The External Review

By external, we mean both the review of the program undertaken by campus administrators and by faculty groups not affiliated with the program (e.g., by a campus program review committee) and the review of the program undertaken by scholars from other schools. Sometimes of course the external committee will mix on-campus and off-campus members. The dynamics of the external review process can certainly be affected by who the external reviewers are. It is one thing to be interviewed by, say, a physicist from one’s own campus who sits on the campus’ program review committee; another to be interviewed by a professor of U.S. history from another college that doesn’t itself have an American Studies program; another to be interviewed by a professor who is an active member of a successful American Studies program elsewhere. Still, certain considerations will likely apply, more or less, to any form the external review may take.

Identifying External Reviewers

Needless to say, identifying appropriate external reviewers is critical to the review’s value. The local program will unlikely have much say over any on-campus reviewers involved. But the program typically will be (and should be) invited to suggest possible external reviewers, if any are to be used, generally in the form of a list from which program administrators will select one or more.

Undoubtedly the program’s faculty will have in mind scholars from other schools whom they believe would be effective and supportive reviewers. But they should also contact the heads of American Studies programs at comparable campuses to discover whether those programs have recently undergone a review and whether any particular external scholars in those reviews were particularly helpful. Another valuable resource is the national office of the American Studies Association, which can offer suggestions about experienced reviewers.

The qualities that a local program will want in a reviewer are obvious but bear repeating. First, the program will want faculty that the campus review agencies will respect as highly qualified—faculty, for example, who have strong reputations as a scholar. Second, the program will want faculty who have been actively involved in the American Studies movement and deeply understand current intellectual trends, teaching agendas, and other issues in the field. The program should try to discourage the administration’s appointment of a scholar who may be an excellent researcher in some area of, say, U.S. history or literature but who has no demonstrable record of sympathy for interdisciplinary research and teaching and no record of significant contributions to American Studies Association meetings and similar activities. Third, the program will want if at all possible to find scholars who have been actively involved with an American Studies or similar interdisciplinary program on their own campus. There’s nothing that makes for a sympathetic understanding of those problems like having had to wrestle with the concrete problems of such programs on a day-to-day basis. Fourth, at least one
of the external reviewers should have had some significant experience as a chair or major officer of a successful American Studies or similar program, particularly an officer who has a reputation for political savvy, diplomatic skill, and expertise in campus protocols and administrative processes. The review report’s analyses and recommendations will likely have more influence if they show an understanding of the problems a campus administrator will face in trying to implement those recommendations.

**Organizing Participants for External Reviewers’ Interviews and Meetings**

The meetings and interviews organized as part of the external review will vary significantly from campus to campus. For example, review committee members may interview core and affiliated faculty singly or in groups. Reviewers will likely want to talk to undergraduate majors and, where appropriate, with graduate students. On many campuses, separate meetings are also often arranged for other relevant constituencies, e.g., women, minority students, lesbian and gay students, re-entry students, etc. Staff members also should be interviewed. And of course important meetings will be arranged with key administrators and faculty program review groups.

The program’s leadership should organize prior meetings with those of these constituencies who participate in the program itself. The point of those meetings should not be to co-opt participants or to prevent individuals from expressing their convictions when speaking to the external reviewers. Rather, these prior meetings can usefully inform those in attendance of what’s at stake in the review, give them a sense of the reviewers’ backgrounds and interests, suggest the kinds of questions the reviewers will be interested in pursuing, and so forth. The meetings can even serve as a rehearsal of any disagreements among participants over program goals and elements—a rehearsal that may help the program’s leaders themselves in interpreting the dynamics, achievements, and problems of the program to the reviewers. At best, these prior meetings may serve as a kind of pre-game warm-up that sends participants into the contest with heightened morale. They may also help meetings with the reviewers from turning merely into gripe sessions.

The program’s leaders can usefully remind themselves that their students and staff members are among the best ambassadors of the program. If their students are happy with the education they’re getting in the program, they should be given an opportunity to advertise this fact fully to the external reviewers. If they have criticisms of the program, they should be given a chance to discuss those criticisms in advance with the program’s faculty (in a safe context) and given a chance to think of how they express those criticisms to the external reviewers in a way that will help rather than hurt the program. A program’s staff are typically not only very able and very devoted to the program but a key element in what makes the program work well. They also often serve as a rich oral archive for the program’s history. If they can explain clearly the program’s goals and strategies, they add considerably to reviewers’ impression of program coherence and quality.
Interacting with the External Reviewers

With few exceptions (and, if the negotiations suggested above are pursued early and creatively enough, many of these exceptions can be avoided), external reviewers of a program will not be out to “get” the program. Certainly the off-campus reviewers, if experienced reviewers who are also active in the American Studies Association, will generally be predisposed to focus on ways in which they can be helpful to the program. This does not at all mean that they will hide their eyes from weaknesses in the program or from problems the program is facing. On the contrary, they will carry radar that quickly picks up such signals. So a key strategy of the members of the program being reviewed should be: be frank and forthcoming with the reviewers about the problems the program is facing, let the reviewers know what the program is doing to try to solve the problems, and invite them to suggest constructive solutions or propose several potentially viable options. The problems may be internal—conflict among several core faculty, withdrawal of affiliated faculty, dropping enrollments, students’ dissatisfaction with certain courses. Or they may be external—poor relations with English or History departments or Ethnic Studies or Women’s Studies programs; the hostility of the dean to whom the program reports. In either situation, full knowledge of the problem will increase the likelihood that the external reviewers can generate some recommendations that will be both diplomatic and effective.

Being Clear About Priorities

Typically, external reviewers are asked to review too many things. They are overloaded with information and, in a very short space of time, must sift through it to sort out the more relevant from the less relevant. They are typically asked to respond to too many questions about the program, relatively minor issues often being mixed rather indiscriminately with more major issues. Experienced reviewers will, with some effort, be able to thread this thicket. But the program’s leaders can be of considerable help to them in this effort, both by making clear in the self-study what the program itself believes to be the most critical issues and by stressing those issues again as early as possible in the leaders’ interactions with the reviewers.

As part of the sorting and problem-solving process, the external reviewers need time with each other. The most productive review schedules give reviewers a chance to talk to each other about their initial impressions of the program before their meetings with administrators, faculty, and others begin. The reviewers then need several opportunities to check in regularly with each other about what they’ve observed and heard in their interviews and meetings. If the review schedule extends over a two-day period, they should probably be given several hours by themselves at the end of the first day. And they need another block of time to themselves before any exit interviews. The program’s leaders can do the reviewers—and the program—a favor by making sure that the administrator coordinating the review schedule builds in such opportunities. The quality of the review will be all the better for it.
VIII. Following Up on the External Review

Although it may be a gratuitous reminder, the head of the local American Studies program will be exercising both good manners and good diplomacy by writing brief individual notes to both the on-campus and (where applicable) off-campus members of the review committee, thanking them for their efforts and volunteering to send them any further information that will aid them in completing their report (or, in some cases, individual reports). Such notes should not be used to reargue some point or play advocate for the program. An additional thank-you note should be sent to the reviewers after their report has been submitted and acted upon by the campus, whatever the outcome of the review. Short-term acts of courtesy are their own reward. They can also have longer-term payoffs.

The Program’s Response to the External Review Report

The program’s members should begin planning to act on the external reviewers’ formal report even before it is received. Shortly after the external review, the faculty (and, if the local culture makes it appropriate, staff and students) should get together to trade impressions of that review, try to identify possible or likely recommendations that will be contained in the report, and begin to consider elements of the program’s response to those recommendations and to other issues—whether or not to be addressed in the report—that have been highlighted for the program’s members by the review process. Seizing the initiative as soon as possible for any changes that the program’s members believe it desirable to make—or that they believe they will be required to make—as a result of the review makes good strategic sense.

When the external reviewers’ report is received—typically between one and three months after the review has taken place—the program will usually be (and should be) given a chance to offer a written response to the report. The drafter or drafters of this response should probably begin it even before the report is received, taking advantage of their fresh memories of the campus visit and their preliminary post-visit conversations with program members.

Like the narrative portion of the self-study, the response to the external reviewers’ report is an important tactical document. The program’s members need to use the document to show the campus officials to whom the report and their response is sent that they are (as much as possible) in “control” of the situation. It is perfectly appropriate—and in fact important—for the response to indicate clearly those issues on which the program’s members disagree with the report, and to indicate why. It is equally important for the response to highlight points of agreement. Most critical is for the program to use its response to state what changes in the program it intends to make (and not make) as a result of the review—changes that may well in some respects differ from or be in addition to those recommended by the report—to outline its strategies and timetable for making those changes, and to indicate the resource implications of those changes (e.g., the program’s plans to make more efficient use of existing—or fewer—resources, the program’s need for more faculty or staff or student aid or space).
A modest word of advice on tone: the response is likely to be most effective if it avoids on one hand an overly defensive tone and on the other hand an overly belligerent tone. There is little point (even perhaps in extreme cases) in attacking the reviewers’ motives or intelligence. Rather, the response should strive for as upbeat a tone as possible. It should use the response to reiterate its pride in the program’s achievements, to show why the campus should share that pride, and to describe (as in its self-study) in plausible terms its vision of an even better future for the program. The display of self-confidence, even if somewhat on the optimistic side, generally makes good sense. This is not always an easy assignment, especially if the program is objectively on the defensive because of, say, a hostile dean, faculty losses, or dropping enrollments. But whining or truculence rarely wins battles with deans or faculty committees. Rather, the program’s response is likely to be most effective when, like the self-study, it works to persuade those in positions of campus power that they will benefit from supporting the program.

The Campus’ Conclusion of the Review; Living with the Consequences

The program’s members need not sit back passively while the various campus administrators and committees are completing their own discussions of all the review materials and reaching some conclusions as to appropriate actions to take as a result of the review. A little diplomatic lobbying rarely hurts. Informally sounding out relevant administrators’ preliminary responses to the review can be helpful and offer potential opportunities for program members to affect those responses before they become set in concrete.

The campus’ official “sign-off” response to the review is of course, even at its most favorable, never going to give the program everything it needs or wants. Even if the results yield no more than damage control, that can be counted a victory of sorts. And even modest gains in status or resources should be considered a cause for celebration, especially in very tight budgetary times. The program should be sure to indicate to relevant administrators and faculty groups its appreciation for whatever resources and powers it does acquire as a result of the review and pledge to make good use of them.

And then comes the sobering reminder: the end of one review is the beginning of another. To repeat a point made earlier in the guide: a program’s members should constantly be aware (even if in some corner of their minds) that their actions in the years immediately following the review will directly affect the program’s ability to make the next program review yield even better results for the program.
Appendix A - Checklist of Documents to Include in Self-Study

This checklist is suggestive rather than definitive. Individual programs will want to custom-tailor the materials included in their self-study according to the program review requirements of their campus and their own specific needs. Such custom-tailoring will include determining the most effective sequence for these materials.

1. Table of contents of documents included in the self-study.
2. Evaluative narrative.
3. Descriptive and quantitative appendices:
   - One-page overview of campus—size, character, organization, structural location of the American Studies program. This overview will help off-campus reviewers understand the institutional context of the program.
   - Copy of program's description in campus’ general catalog.
   - Copy of program's advising handbook, if one exists.
   - Copy of program's degree requirements, if not included in general catalog material or advising handbook. (Separate appendices may be used for undergraduate and graduate degree requirements.)
   - Detailed description of all program's required courses and other courses considered “core” courses. This need may be met simply by including here the current syllabi from these course. (Separate appendices may be used if appropriate for undergraduate and graduate courses.)
   - List of participating faculty, with ranks and titles, nature of affiliations (for example, “full appointment in American Studies,” “.5 FTE in American Studies,” “member of Executive Committee,” “immediate past Director of Graduate Studies,” “non-voting affiliate”), and areas of major interest or expertise.
   - Vitae of core faculty and, as useful, other actively participating faculty.
   - Official description of program’s governance structure; program’s by-laws if in existence.
   - Statistical data about program, perhaps over a five- or ten-year period: enrollments by level (and perhaps by specific courses, if useful); number of declared majors; number of degrees awarded; student/faculty ratio; etc. This data will likely be most useful if these statistical tables also include relevant overall campus data or data about related campus programs.
   - Program budget, by functional categories and (if relevant) sources of funding, perhaps over a five- or ten-year period.
   - The most recent “Institutional Data” questionnaire the program has completed as part of the American Studies Association’s [biennial] survey of American Studies program. Other appendices mentioned above may be eliminated to the extent that this questionnaire covers the same data. However, it may be useful for the program to display some of this information twice: both in the “Institutional Data” questionnaire and in a format that the program itself chooses.
   - Other data that will help the reviewers understand the program or that the program is drawing upon in its evaluative narrative.
Appendix B - Checklist of Topics to Cover in Self-Study Narrative

Strategy: The Graduate Program
A program being reviewed should consider addressing the following aspects of its program, as relevant, in the narrative part of its self-study. As appropriate, it will wish to discuss the causes of or rationale for each aspect, to assess the success of that part of the program, and to note any planned or proposed changes in that part of the program. Programs may choose to cover these topics in an order different from that listed here. For a more detailed discussion of these aspects, see “Appendix C: Writing the Self-Study Narrative.”

History of the program: highlights
Goals and defining characteristics of the program (overview).

9. Does the program mix interdisciplinary and multi-departmental aims?
10. Does the program give particular attention to any particular subject areas?
11. Is the program oriented toward any particular student or other constituencies?
12. Does the program have research or service as well as teaching agendas?
13. How do program goals and features compare to major national American Studies trends?
14. Is the program a distinctive program on its own campus?
15. What does the program contribute to the life and goals of its own campus?
16. Does the program make any contributions to community, region, or profession?

Undergraduate program
Overview: general quality, trends, etc.

Students
• Enrollments in various sectors (lower-division, upper-division, graduate, etc.); trends.
• Number of majors; trends.
• Number of degrees awarded; trends.
• Quality of students; trends.
• Interests of students; trends.
• Diversity of students; trends.

Requirements

Curriculum
• Lower-division courses offered by program
• Relevant lower-division courses offered by other programs
• Upper-division courses offered by program
• Relevant upper-division courses offered by other programs
• Independent-study, fieldwork, and internship opportunities
• “Exit” experiences: senior projects, comprehensive exams, etc.

Other aspects of undergraduate program

Advising system

Resources for undergraduate program—faculty, TAs, etc.

**Graduate program**

Overview: general quality, trends, reputation, etc.

Students
• Quantitative issues: number in program (and stages), number served from other programs, etc.
• Quality of students; trends
• Interests of students; trends
• Diversity of students; trends
• Dropout rate, review mechanisms, etc.

Requirements

Curriculum

Advising system

Qualifying examinations

Master’s theses and/or dissertations

Time to degree

Teaching experience and training

Financial support

Other program features

**Faculty**

Number and range of expertise; degree of involvement

Quality of faculty
Equity of faculty workload

**Relations with other departments and programs**

**Governance structure**

Degree to which core faculty control program

Degree to which program seeks advice and participation from other faculty

Quality and stability of leadership

**Staff**

**Funding**

Budget, sources, trends

Impact of possible cuts or augmentations

Fund-raising efforts

**Space, equipment, library resources, and other resources**

**Other local program issues**

**Summary of planned changes in program; concluding comments**
Appendix C - Writing the Self-Study Narrative

Topics to Cover in Narrative Part of the Self-Study

Writing the Self-Study Narrative
Ironically enough, this appendix to this Guide to Reviewing American Studies Programs and Departments is quite likely longer than the narrative portion of the self-study will itself need to be. Its goal is to suggest a rationale for the kinds of topics that the narrative should cover and to suggest possible strategies for dealing with some of those topics. For those looking for more economical advice, a “checklist” of possible narrative topics appears as Appendix B. A few general words of advice as you write the narrative portion of an American Studies program’s self-study:

1. Keep it crisp.
2. Keep it as upbeat as possible, while giving the impression of candor (e.g., by noting problems the program faces and what it is doing about them).
3. Except for context and clarity, don’t repeat the descriptive and statistical material in the appendices to the self-study; rather, use the narrative to interpret that material, to show why the data (enrollments, number of faculty participants, etc.) are as they are, and to offer a rationale for various features of the program described in the appendices. Use footnotes and parenthetical annotations to refer the reader to the relevant spots in the appendices. Don’t load up the narrative with so much data that the program’s major stakes, problems, and achieves are obscured.
4. Keep in mind the program’s own overall goal for the review, i.e., to convince the relevant campus powers that the program is so good for the campus (because of the quality of its faculty and students, its attractiveness to students, its off-campus reputation, etc.) and is working (in demonstrable ways) to be even better that it well deserves existing and even augmented support.

The format for a particular program’s narrative will likely be a product of local circumstances—e.g., the campus’ requirement that certain materials be presented and certain questions addressed, and even in what order. For programs with options, the following sample format prove useful.

I. Introductory Sections

History of the Program
Early in the report—near if not at the very beginning—there should be a brief summary of the history of the program (generally only a paragraph or two)—when and the circumstances under which it was founded, ways in which those circumstances have changed and ways in which the program has evolved in response to or anticipation of those changes. The goal of this section is not at this point to give readers a detailed institutional analysis but to give them a general understanding of the campus setting and of major trends (on and off campus) that have affected the program and to give them an overall context for understanding subsequent sections of the narrative.
Perhaps focusing on “key moments in the program’s history” will be a useful organizing tactic.

This section might also usefully, if not quite logically, include three straight-forward sentences along the following lines: “The program presently offers the ___ degree(s). It presently has ___ undergraduate majors and ___ graduate students [or ___ M.A. and ___ Ph.D. students]. ___ core faculty and ___ affiliated faculty are involved with the program.” These sentences might also fit more gracefully in the next section. Their function is to help set a context for readers of the narrative. Their implications can be spelled out later in the narrative.

**Program Goals and Definition**

This also should be a relatively brief section. Like the history section, this too can be seen as an “overview” section. Most of the program’s specific goals are appropriately discussed in greater detail in other sections of the narrative, in conjunction with the specific strategies the program has adopted to achieve these goals. Often this part of the narrative can be drawn directly, with only a few modifications and additions, from the description of your program in your campus’ general catalog or from material in your program’s advising manual.

This section will likely be the best place to give simple, quick answers to such questions as the following (answers that will be pursued in greater detail later in the narrative):

1. **How central is an “interdisciplinary” focus to the program?** What is its working definition of “interdisciplinary”? For example, to what extent is its primary concern “multi-disciplinary” or “multi-departmental”—that is, to what extent does it focus on encouraging students to consider American society and culture from the perspective of several “disciplines” or departments (operating, so to speak, on the principle that variety is the spice of life)? To what extent is its primary concern integrative, i.e., to bring a variety of disciplinary and trans-disciplinary approaches to bear on specific issues in American life not sufficiently understandable in terms of any specific approach; or even to engage in a systematic comparison of various approaches to determine the strengths and limitations of any particular approach when applied to any specific aspect of American life? Terms like “disciplinary,” “multidisciplinary,” and “interdisciplinary” can easily be buzz words. What the narrative will want to do is to suggest the extent to which the program has endowed them with concrete and functional meanings.

2. **Does the program pay a particularly large amount of attention to any particular subject areas?** For example, does it stress the study of the region or local community in which the program is located? Place special emphasis on the experiences of women or of specific ethnic minority groups? Focus on contemporary or earlier American life? Focus on cultural expression or institutional analysis? Stress the study of the United States in an international or comparative context? Give special attention to particular bodies of theory or to any particular methods of analysis? To off-campus learning experiences? To
what extent does the program want all its students (and even all its faculty) to confront a common body of data, questions, approaches, etc., and to what extent is its stress latitudinarian, encouraging its faculty and students to pursue whatever interests them individually? (In later sections, the narrative will be able to show how such emphases actually manifest themselves in the program’s requirements, curriculum, and special activities.)

3. Does the program place special emphasis on serving particular constituencies, e.g., ethnic minority students, re-entry students, part-time students, community agencies?

4. Does the program have a research as well as a teaching agenda? An agenda if campus, community, or more general professional service?

5. To what extent are the program’s primary goals and features congruent with major national (and even international) trends in the American Studies movement, and to what extent are they unique to (or given more-than-typical attention to in) this program?

6. To what extent is the program in its goals and features a distinctive campus program? To what extent do any of the program’s goals or features overlap or duplicate goals and features of other programs on campus? What is the rationale for such overlap?

7. What are the most important contributions the program makes to the life and goals of its own campus? For example, does it contribute to student and faculty diversity on campus? To the campus’ external reputation for teaching and scholarship? To helping the campus meet its general educational goals?

8. If relevant, what are the most important contributions the program makes to its surrounding off-campus community? To the region’s or nation’s American Studies movement?

These issues need not, of course, be touched upon in above order. Like a good newspaper article, this section should touch first on those aspects of the program’s aspirations and self-definition that are most important for evaluators of the program to understand, and then let other aspects of the program flow from there.

Program Structure: First Pass
Very early in the narrative, there should be a brief statement (no more than one paragraph—even one or two sentences will do) about the governance structure of the program—conceivably blended into the “Program Goals and Self-Definition” section, the “Program History” section, or a brief section of its own. Is the program basically an arrangement for coordinating the relevant offerings of other departments, administered by an appointed/elected coordinator and/or a small faculty committee drawn from these other departments? Does it, in addition, administer a few courses of its own, taught by faculty from these other departments and/or by a few “temporary” instructors? At the other extreme, is it a fully (or relatively) independent department, whose personnel, curricular, and/or budgetary powers are vested in a faculty whose appointments are fully (or jointly) controlled by the department? Or is it administered by a committee that mixes faculty with all-American Studies or joint American Studies appointments with faculty whose full appointments are in other departments?
This section is not the place to go into the implications of the program’s structural arrangement. But it will provide a useful context for helping the narrative’s readers understand what follows, since program structure typically affects the program’s health and options in profound ways.

II. Strategy Sections
Many of the remaining sections of the narrative can be considered as focusing on the various specific strategies (curricular, structural, deployment of resources, etc.) that the program has adopted to achieve its goals, highlighting their role as strategies—that is, explaining why they have been adopted, evaluating the extent to which they have worked well, and outlining plans (and rationale) for changing any of the strategies. American Studies programs that have both undergraduate and graduate components will likely wish to discuss each of these components separately. This guide will therefore follow a similar format.

The Undergraduate Program

Overview
This is probably the best spot for briefly interpreting some of the key quantitative data about the undergraduate program (contained in the appendices) and saying something about its overall quality and value. E.g.: “Since its founding in 1975, nearly 300 students have received BAs from our program (see Appendix *, p. *). With only two minor downward blips, the annual graduation rate has steadily increased to the present __ graduates a year, a growth undoubtedly in part the product of the major increasing reputation on campus as a demanding, high-quality program and in part the product of the increasing number of courses in media studies [or whatever] that the program has been able to offer.” Or: “The number of students majoring in American Studies has declined rather sharply in the past eight years, from a high of __ in 1988 to a low of __ in 1996 (see Appendix *). We attribute much of this decline to the growth of several related majors, including Women’s Studies and African American Studies, and to the retirement without replacement of two of our key faculty. Nevertheless, the quality of our major remains high, as reflected in our seniors’ placement rate into major graduate and law schools (see Appendix *) and in the recent receipt by two of our core faculty of campus Teaching Excellence awards. Student satisfaction with the major remains high (see the results of the student survey in Appendix *), and our introductory general education courses continue to attract strong enrollments.”

Students
Some drafters may prefer to place this section later in the discussion of the undergraduate program. But there is something to be said for placing it close to the front of this discussion, especially if student enrollments and numbers of majors are healthy, student quality is good, and student satisfaction with the program is high.

In this section, the program can interpret the quantitative data about lower-division and upper-division enrollments, numbers of majors, and numbers of BAs, particularly in comparison to other programs on campus (and perhaps in comparison to American
Studies programs at other campuses of similar size and kind), can discuss whatever evidence exists about the quality of its majors (grade point averages, scores on standardized tests, prizes won, acceptance to good graduate and professional programs, etc.), and evaluate whatever evidence exists about degree of students’ satisfaction with the program. In terms of this last issue, it is probably a good idea, as a part of the program’s preparation for the external review, for it to send a questionnaire to its majors. Exit interviews with graduate seniors are also very useful as a source of information, as are students’ end-of-term evaluations of specific courses. Another important—and sometimes neglected—source of information about student satisfaction can be a pre-review meeting with majors in which they are invited to talk about their experiences in the major.

This section can also be useful as a place to highlight the program’s commitment to diversifying its student body—to attracting women, ethnic minority students, re-entry students, part-time students, and other specific student constituencies—, its strategies for doing so, its degree of success, and its plans to achieve further diversity.

Requirements
The narrative is not the place to describe in much detail the program’s degree (or certificate) requirements. That more detailed description should be included in one of the appendices—perhaps most efficiently by simply appending the relevant section of the campus catalog or program’s advising brochure. At most what will be needed here is a brief overview of those requirements—e.g.: “A BA in American Studies requires all students to complete a one-semester introductory course offered by the program, two one-semester advanced methods course offered by the program, a semester-long program-sponsored senior seminar whose topics vary from year to year, and two other introductory and four advanced courses from the departments of __. Students must also write a brief senior thesis/pass a written comprehensive exam/pass an oral examination.” (Where relevant, a list of titles of senior theses, a sample comprehensive exam, or a list of typical questions or topics on an oral exam can be included in the appendices.)

What this section in the narrative should primarily do is:

1. To briefly highlight the rationale for these requirements, showing how they are intended to reinforce the goals and self-definition of the program. (E.g., “We believe that American Studies majors need extensive grounding in the subject matter and methods of at least one traditional discipline.” “We believe that no student can understand American society without close attention to the dynamics of race, ethnicity, class, and gender.” “We require an historically oriented sequence because we believe that students cannot understand contemporary U.S. life without seeing its relationship to the past.” “We believe it important that students look beyond the boundaries of the nation.”) Some of this rationale may well have been covered in the previous section on program goals and self-definition and need not be repeated here. Or this section may be the place to make explicit the way in which those goals translate into concrete requirements.
2. To evaluate the effectiveness of these requirements, and to point to evidence supporting this evaluation. (“We believe our requirement of a pan-national comparative analysis course has been particularly successful.” “We believe our students graduate from this program with an unusually rich understanding of multicultural theory.” “We have come to believe that the program’s breadth requirements may scatter a student’s attention unduly and that a more integrative approach may be in order.” “Our requirements may not allow a student to explore a particular topic in sufficient depth.” “Requiring students to take Course X before they take Course Y seems to have been effective in systematically building their skills in Z.” “In their exit interviews, our recent BA students told us they valued the chance to write a senior thesis.” “Many students don’t like being required to take the English Department’s introduction to literary interpretation, but we continue to believe that such a course gives them important critical skills that are of value in our own courses.”) Additional comments on the effectiveness of specific courses can come in the next section of the narrative at the appropriate points.

3. To point to any changes planned in the degree requirements and to explain the rationale for those changes.

Curriculum
This section will be in effect an extension of the requirements section. Some narratives will in fact want to make them a part of a single section. There is no magic way of organizing this section, which may well be divided into a series of sub-sections. That will depend on such factors as the range and complexity of the program’s degree requirements, the number and variety of the courses offered by the program itself, the number and range of other departments’ courses on which it depends, and the variety of constituents it is trying to use its own courses to serve. The narrative should stop at various points to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of specific courses, course sequences, course clusters, etc. and, as appropriate, to suggest any plans afoot to revise any aspects of the curriculum.

Throughout this section, the narrative should show its awareness that readers will be interested in the following question: Why is it that the program has chosen to devote its resources to these particular courses rather than to other courses? Does it have a strategy for “subsidizing” its small courses with larger courses? What does it do to insure that its large courses are of high quality? How has it determined the appropriate proportion of its resources that are to go to lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses? That has determined the proportion of its attention devoted to serving its own majors and the proportion devoted to other students? By what processes (and by what criteria) does it evaluate the quality and effectiveness of its courses? That is, this section should show readers the rationale that lies behind the choices (if they are indeed that) that have been made that have resulted in this particular curriculum. In this regard, this section may also be the place to discuss the extent to which the curriculum is the product of the participating faculty member’s individual interests and the extent to which the faculty have “disciplined” and integrated their own interests on behalf of a coherent curriculum.
Typically, the section will deal (as briefly as necessary) with the following kinds of courses.

1. Lower-division courses offered by the program. Do any meet campus general-education requirements? Serve many students other than American Studies majors? Effectively prepare American Studies majors for advanced work? Serve as a training ground or employment opportunity for graduate students? What is the rationale for their size? Do they overlap with or duplicate the offerings of any other programs? If so, what is the rationale for such duplication? Are the courses popular? Of high quality? Are they sufficiently stable? Do they justify the resources put in them? Is there sufficient ladder faculty participation in them? Are there any concrete plans to improve them? Are there any gaps in these course offerings that the program would like to fill? If so, how does it plan to do so? (E.g. what does it plan to give up to do so, or can it fill such a gap only if it receives new resources?)

2. Lower-divisions offered by other programs. Do they effectively serve the interests of American Studies majors? From the perspective of American Studies, are there any significant gaps in these other programs’ offerings? Does American Studies wish to recommend ways in such gaps can be filled?

3. Upper-division courses offered by the program. In addition to addressing here many of the issues raised in 1 above, the narrative here may want to give particular attention to the extent to which the program has self-consciously sequenced its courses (and the extent to which such sequencing has worked well) and given systematic attention to certain perspectives, themes, theories, methods, and materials.

4. Upper-division courses offered by other programs. See 2 above.

5. Independent-study courses, fieldwork and internship opportunities, etc.

6. “Exit” experiences: senior projects, comprehensive exams, etc.

Other Aspects of the Undergraduate Program
The narrative should make certain that it highlights any other aspects of the undergraduate program that make it a good program or that, if implemented or improved, would make it a better program. Does the program sponsor a regular colloquium series for its majors or for undergraduates in general? (If so, what kinds of topics have been covered?) Does it have a student association? (And, if so, what does it do?) Does the program facilitate social events for its majors? Do undergraduates sit on the governing body of the program? Advise the program in any specific ways? What have these activities "cost" the program (in terms of faculty and staff time, funds, etc.), and has the cost been worth it?

Advising
 Evaluative comments on the undergraduate program’s advising structure may well fit as appropriate into the “Other Aspects” section as into a separate section. But, wherever located, advising should be discussed explicitly. The narrative should offer a rationale for its particular advising structure, point to whatever evidence it has that the structure is working or not working well (e.g., the student survey discussed above), and mention any steps being taken to improve the structure. In addition to discussion program-
focused advising (curricular planning, thesis planning help, etc.), this section can usefully discuss the program’s and campus’ efforts at career advising.

Resources
This section is likely to be most usefully placed here only if the American Studies program has both undergraduate and graduate components. Otherwise it may be a better strategy to place the discussion of resources later in the narrative. If any aspects of resources are discussed here, that discussion should focus among other things on the total amount of resources devoted to the undergraduate program. How many ladder faculty teach annually in the undergraduate program? (That might be worth expressing both in terms of the number of individual faculty and in terms of FTEs.) Do they represent a sufficient range of expertise, given the goals of the program? How stable and predictable are their contributions? How much of the teaching of the undergraduate curriculum is in the hands of temporary faculty? Of graduate students? How stable and satisfactory are those arrangements? Is the total amount of faculty teaching contributions adequate to the undergraduate program’s needs? How about faculty advising for the program? Other resources (staff, speakers’ funds, etc.) devoted to the program? What is the proportion of resources devoted to the undergraduate program in comparison to the graduate program (and the rationale for that proportion)? Also discussible: if a small amount of additional resources were to be made available to the undergraduate program, what would the program do with those resources, and why? (This section may also be required to address a similar, darker question—one that campus administrators generally ask: if resources were to be taken away from the undergraduate program, what would the program give up, and why?)

The Graduate Program
Whether the program offers an M.A. and/or a Ph.D. in addition to or instead of a B.A., many of the questions it will need to address with regard to its graduate program are similar to those applicable to an undergraduate program. In developing a narrative evaluating their graduate program, therefore, the faculty will want to draw upon relevant questions discussed above.

At the same time, the stakes are typically higher for programs offering graduate degrees—probably in the eyes of the faculty themselves, and almost certainly in the eyes of campus administrators and faculty outside the program. Graduate programs are typically more expensive than undergraduate programs. They compete with other graduate programs for scarce resources such as teaching assistantships and fellowship aid. The number of students per se in the graduate program is therefore likely to be of less concern to campus officials than the quality and off-campus reputation of the program, and its relative cost to the campus. Relatively unselective programs, for example, can be a minus unless a large proportion of the students enrolled “pay their own way. A very small and highly selective program whose students bring external fellowships with them, get terrific jobs after graduation, and go on to write lots of well-received books may be an administrator’s idea of heaven. The graduate program narrative should keep these stakes constantly in mind.
Overview
This is the place for the program to make a general assertion about the relative overall quality, reputation, and ranking of its program in comparison to similar programs in the region or nation. Some tactfulness is required here (an external reviewer may well be from one of the programs that the local program ranks itself as superior to). But the program needs to show that it knows what regional or national ballpark it’s playing in, or wants to play in, and that it’s playing well.

Students
Evaluating (and, to the extent that one can honestly do so, bragging about) the quality of one’s graduate students is critical, as is care in providing evidence to support this assessment. What are the application-to-admissions and application-to-acceptance rates, and how to they compare to the rates of other campus programs and to the rates of similar American Studies programs elsewhere? How do entering students’ Graduate Record scores compare to those in other campus programs and similar American Studies programs? Do any students bring prestigious fellowships with them or compete successfully for campuswide fellowships? Even more important, how well do students do after graduating from the program? Where have alumni gotten jobs? Have they achieved distinguished publication records or other forms of visibility? All American Studies graduate programs should work systematically to keep in touch with their graduate alumni, via regular newsletters and questionnaires—and should not wait until three months before the external review to do so. Alumni views and achievements can exercise a powerful influence over external reviewers’ perception of the program.

As with the undergraduate program section, the graduate program section should highlight the extent of the program’s commitment to attracting and retaining ethnic minority students and other specific constituents, its strategies for doing so (perhaps it may wish to include a separate section on “Outreach and Retention Strategies”), its degree of success, and its plans for improvement.

The narrative should also evaluate the overall dropout rate in the program and discuss whether that rate reflects well on the program (e.g., whether it successfully identifies at an early stage students who shouldn’t continue in the program, or whether it loses students it would like to keep). This may also be the point (although it could also fit into other sections) to discuss and evaluate any processes and criteria that the program uses to determine whether a student is to continue in the program—an end-of-the-first year examination, faculty review of the student’s record, etc.

Requirements
The program’s requirements will have been spelled out in an appendix. Here, the program should explain their rationale, giving particular attention to such topics as required core courses, language proficiency requirements, required proficiency in any bodies of theory, methods, or subject fields, and special fieldwork or internship requirements. Among the questions the reviewers likely will be very interested in is the extent to which the program requires courses from other departments’ or program’s offerings, and why. One thing that can be predicted is that a typical graduate program
will be regularly fiddling with its requirements and curriculum, under the pressure of both student and faculty dissatisfaction. External reviewers will therefore likely to expect to see signs of such fiddling (since they’ve been doing the same thing on their own campuses). A program that can show its continuing efforts to “get it right” is likely to receive higher marks from an external review than a program that has been content to stand pat.

One thing this section can usefully do is to compare the program’s requirements to requirements at similar American Studies programs. Particularly important is for the program to demonstrate that its requirements and curriculum are keeping up with national trends in the field.

Curriculum
The narrative’s drafters will want to show the extent to which the curriculum the program offers is a thoughtful curriculum—one designed, whatever else it does, to prepare the student for a productive career and succeed in that job. Specific courses will come and go, and the titles and content of courses will change, but the desired overall direction and impact of those courses should be articulable in the narrative. The section will want to note significant gaps in the curriculum controlled by the program as well as in the course offerings of other campus programs and to discuss any steps being taken to fill those gaps. One question of likely interest: to what extent are faculty allowed (or even encouraged) to teach courses on topics of their own choice, regardless of the impact of those choices on the “coherence” of the curriculum, and to what extent do they discipline their offerings to serve some overall curricular scheme or program goals? Is that disciplining or self-disciplining process a result of individual faculty negotiations with the program head or a result of collective discussions among all (or most) of the faculty who teach in the program? Does the program make any effort to influence the offerings of other campus programs? To use its courses to serve students in other graduate programs? How successful are these efforts?

Advising
Many graduate program advising structures involve using some combination of an overall adviser (e.g., the director of the graduate program), a staff adviser (often operating in an informal capacity), and individual faculty advisers. Students will often move from adviser to adviser as their interests evolve and, particularly, as they move into research on their dissertation. Many programs give students considerable latitude to choose their own advisers—and sometimes give students relatively little help in making such choices. Many programs rely on advisers, particularly at the dissertation-supervision level, who are only peripherally affiliated with the program. Many programs leave it up to the individual advisers to offer appropriate and useful advice; some bring the advisers together periodically in an attempt to achieve some consistency in and improve the quality of the advising. Career-planning and job-seeking advising is sometimes handled self-consciously and energetically, sometimes quite casually. In drafting this section of the narrative, the drafters may usefully be led to considering ways in which their program might make its own advising structure more coherent and effective.
Qualifying Examination
Whether using a written or oral format or both, graduate programs constantly wrestle with the degree to which their qualifying examinations are intended to prompt a graduate student to summarize and integrate her/his graduate work to that point, demonstrate her/his grasp (to the faculty’s satisfaction) of certain bodies of knowledge, or demonstrate her/his potential to write a successful dissertation. They must regularly consider the extent to which the exam is a gate-keeping operation, designed to prevent unqualified students from moving on to dissertation research, and the extent to which it is designed to give the student a boost in defining and pursuing that research—acting, so to speak, as a supportive editorial board. Qualifying examinations are one topic where American Studies graduate programs can profit considerably from sharing their experiences with each other. Using the self-study narrative to articulate clearly the goals of the local program’s own exam policies and procedures will likely yield useful advice from external reviewers. But the program’s faculty will be well advised to use national ASA meetings and other occasions to pick the brains of colleagues elsewhere about these exams. Like the program’s requirements and curriculum, QEs seem—appropriately—in a perpetual state of evolution.

Master’s Theses; Dissertations
Students’ work on MA theses and PhD dissertations have a number of important things in common. First, they often take longer to complete than the students expect (or hope) they will. Second, they are often more isolated and lonely efforts than is desirable. Third, the program’s faculty may not think enough about these products, after they are written in terms of what the products can tell the faculty about the quality and direction of the program itself and about what they might imply for improving the program.

The three are not unrelated. For example, if many students in the program take an overly long time to complete their dissertations, that may reflect their insufficient preparation in research methods, learning to define workable topics, organizing a work schedule, etc.; and the curriculum and advising structure may need to be revised to provide such preparation. And too many uncompleted—or weak—theses or dissertations may reflect an inadequate support structure—lack of financial support, lack of thesis workshops, etc.

Whatever else this section does, it should try to characterize the kinds of thesis or dissertation topics, discuss the extent to which these topics grow out of the emphases, requirements, and curriculum of the program, and discuss the (range of) quality of these productions. In addition to listing the titles of completed theses and dissertations for the past five or ten years in an appendix, the program might wish to compile a small pamphlet of abstracts of these works for inspection by the external reviewers.

Time to Degree
If not covered in another section, the narrative should explain and evaluate its students’ average time to degree and perhaps also the range of times.
Teaching Experience and Training
Self-evidently, service as teaching assistants or as independent course instructors provides important financial support for graduate students. But it is also, to varying degrees, an important part of their professional training. The narrative should highlight the various kinds of teaching opportunities available to its students. It should discuss the extent to which the program considers such opportunities central to the student’s experience and the steps it has taken to maximize the educational value of those opportunities (TA training workshops, forums on teaching, mentoring by master teachers on the faculty, etc.).

Typically, a considerable amount of the teaching experience of graduate students in American Studies programs comes from work in other departments’ courses—English composition courses and the like—, and some (even many) of these experiences may not be directly related to the students’ own interests. In addition, a fair number of American Studies programs, because they pay less attention to their undergraduate than their graduate curriculum, do not offer a sufficient number of large undergraduate courses in which their graduate students might gain some teaching assistant experience. The narrative should discuss any problems that have resulted from the kind and number of teaching opportunities available for American Studies graduate students and show a serious attempt to think about ways of improving the situation.

Financial Support
Financial support is invariably one of the most critical issues on graduate students’ minds—and on faculty minds, the extent and kind of support available affects the program’s ability to attract good graduate students. Very rarely to program reviews—even highly favorable ones—yield significant increases in such support. Nevertheless, a favorable report may well help a program make modest gains here. This section of the report should address at least three questions: 1) Does the program have an aggressive and creative strategy for accumulating as much financial support as possible (e.g., through negotiation over TAships with other departments, search for endowments?) 2) Given the funds it has, does it use them strategically on behalf of program goals (e.g., to attract first-rate students, to diversify its student body, to provide critical fellowship support at a point in a student’s work when such support will have maximum benefit?) 3) Does it deploy these funds equitably, and according to public criteria that can be generally appreciated? (One typical source of poor graduate student morale is the view that fellowships, plum teaching assignments, and the like are distributed out of a system of patronage and favoritism.) 4) Does it control the number of students admitted annually to the program—and the number of years it will provide support to students—according to the total funds it has for student support?

Other Program Features
Speaker’s series, social events, and the like are all relevant here.

Faculty
Reviewers will be interested in the quality of the faculty on campus, whatever their departmental affiliation, with whom American Studies graduate students typically work
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or with whom they might potentially be working. They will of course be specifically interested in the quality of the “core” faculty, using various measures of quality (research, teaching, involvement in the larger profession, campus leadership, etc.). They will be interested in whether a sufficient number and range of campus faculty are involved in and available to the program. And they will be interested in whether the program is working systematically to keep good working relations with faculty from other departments who are actively affiliated with the program, and whether the program is working systematically to involve relevant uninvolved or only marginally involved faculty in the program. The narrative should address all these issues. A program engaged in a constant “retention and outreach” effort among the faculty is likely to be a healthy program.

This section might also usefully address such issues as equity of faculty workload (both compared to the workload of other programs and in terms of distribution of workload among the faculty in the program) and faculty morale. What has the program done and what does it plan to do to make certain that faculty morale remains high (or improves?)

Although the participating faculty’s vitae are generally included in an appendix—certainly those of the most active participants in the program—it would be useful for the appendix also to include a master list of these faculty, with areas of interest and expertise and perhaps by degree of affiliation (“core” faculty, “associated faculty,” “distant friends of the program,” etc.).

**Relations with Other Departments and Programs**

Even if they control a considerable degree of institutional independence, the vast majority of American Studies programs depend on other campus departments and programs for courses, individual faculty contributions, teaching assistant opportunities, and general goodwill. Those contributions are often reciprocal, as core American Studies faculty teach courses for and in other ways serve these other departments. An American Studies program that has become too isolated from both traditional departments such as English, History, and Political Science and from newer interdisciplinary enterprises such as Women’s Studies, Ethnic Studies, and Media Studies is likely to be heading for trouble—or be there already.

If the narrative has not done so elsewhere, it should describe here the extent, nature, and quality of these relations and note what the program has done and plans to do to preserve and strengthen these relations. If it has not yet done so, the program may wish to establish formal protocols with these other units rather than simply leave the ties to informal channels. If the American Studies program is experiencing particular difficulties with some key department or departments on which it depends or with which it would like to establish cooperative ties, it should try to specify the causes of the difficulties, either in the narrative or (if the issues are sensitive ones) in interviews with the reviewers. Reviewers are often able to give constructive advice about ways in which to deal effectively with such problems.
Governance Structure

The narrative and perhaps an appendix will already have described briefly the governance structure of the program. The present section, however, will be able to take advantage of prior discussions of curriculum, faculty, relations with other units, and the like to spell out more fully the rationale for this governance structure and evaluate its effectiveness. How did it come about? How has it evolved over the years, and why? How might it be strengthened. Typically, the formal governance structure of an American Studies program and the actual daily operating structure of the program are not entirely congruent. For example, the program may be officially governed by a large advisory committee whose members are drawn from several departments, but the key decisions over requirements, admissions, and even hiring and promotions may de facto be made by a small core of these members. The larger committee may serve primarily to help the core faculty keep the program’s bridges with other campus units in good repair and to give it someone greater political muscle in its negotiations with the administration for resources and the like. But that larger committee must not be taken merely for granted. The core faculty in the program should be alert for ways in which they can make such advisory committee service useful to and interesting for that larger group of faculty.

Ideally an American Studies program’s governance structure will sensitively balance two needs. On the one hand, it is important that the core faculty, however defined (e.g., those with their formal appointments entirely or partly in American Studies, those who teach regularly the program’s core curriculum) be given primary authority for setting program policy, planning curriculum, managing personnel cases, and carrying out the normal work of the program. After all, it is they who must bear the major consequences of the program’s successes and failures. That core group should be large enough (and “large enough” will be a function in part of the size and complexity of the program) to insure the program’s administrative stability, including stability of its leadership. If the program does not now have such a structure, it should use the narrative to argue for its creation.

On the other hand, it is important that the program offer the larger adjunct faculty appropriate recognition for their valuable contributions to the program and provide them appropriate opportunities to express their views as to the program’s intellectual direction and overall policies. The building and maintenance of intellectual bridges, as any program’s chair well knows, requires constant and creative attention. The governance structure is an important element of that maintenance strategy, but should not be a substitute for other, often more informal, efforts at linkage—efforts for which the core faculty themselves should take primary responsibility.

This section, if it can do so tactfully, may also wish to address questions related to the quality and stability of the leadership of the program—particularly questions of stability. Is there presently a leadership vacuum in the program, or does the upcoming retirement of the long-time director of the program signal a potential vacuum? Are able faculty reluctant to assume the position of head of the program? If so why, and what might be done to improve the situation? Of course, if the leadership is stable, strong, and effective, that’s worth bragging about a bit.
Staff
An able and dedicated staff is, as all program directors well know, one of the major keys to the success of a program. Typically paid less than they deserve, the staff hold students’ (and often faculty) hands, provide program continuity and institutional memory, and foster program morale. Their contacts with staff in other programs and central campus units can also be a valuable source of information. A program’s leadership that finds regular ways of showing its appreciation of its staff’s efforts is doing the program a good turn. Staff can be particularly valuable if they not only understand the mechanics of the program—its requirements, courses, faculty leave plans, budget, etc.—but the rationale for each of these aspects, so the program’s leadership needs to makes sure they are informed about these issues. The leadership should also actively support staff members’ professional growth in computer skills (e.g., working with spreadsheets, desktop publishing, use of the internet), budgetary analysis and planning, etc. And it should also work to help the staff better understand the workings of the campus as a whole and the relationship of the program to the American Studies movement as a whole. This part of the self-study should not only be a place to evaluate the adequacy of staff assistance—the message, typically, will be “great staff, but overworked”—but a place to discuss opportunities that have been or will be made available for their professional growth.

Funding
An appendix of the self-study will typically contain a program budget. What this section of the narrative should do is explain the implications of that budget, the rationale for the program’s decisions as to its use of funds, and the effectiveness of its budgetary strategies.

Funds are of course never enough. The key questions the program should answer in this section are: Given the funding limitations, is the program making the most efficient and effective use of those funds on behalf of the program’s goals? Has it clearly sorted out its funding priorities? What hard choices has it made, and why does it believe it has made the right choices in the use of funds? If the program has received funding augmentations in the recent past, what use has it made of those funding augmentations, and why? What would be the concrete impact on the program if its funding were cut by, say, ten percent? If funding were augmented by, say, ten percent, what would the program do with the funds, and why? (Additions to the ladder or temporary faculty, graduate support augmentations, additional staff funds, additional funds for visiting speakers or research seminars, etc., are all potentially relevant here.) If current levels of funding were to continue, would the program alter in any respect the use of those funds, and why?

Increasingly, campus programs at both private and public schools are being called upon to undertake fundraising efforts from external sources. To the extent relevant, the narrative should discuss in this section any fundraising efforts it has made or that it is planning and evaluate the success of those efforts.
A fairly obvious footnote: administrators (for the most part) hate to give away money unless there’s a very big and clearly demonstrable payoff for them. The task of the narrative is to highlight that payoff. Arguments about the program’s high quality are not enough (virtually every other program on campus will be making the same argument). The narrative needs also to be shrewd about bringing quantitative evidence to bear on its case for more resources. One of the best sources of quantitative evidence is data in terms of which the program compares favorably to other campus programs in the humanities and social sciences—for example total program enrollments (or number of majors, or number of BAs) per faculty FTE or per total program budget; external fellowships per graduate student; the graduate application/acceptance ratio. Of course, if many of these key figures are not in the program’s favor, the program will need to peddle as hard as it can in its narrative on its quality and value to the campus while at the same time taking steps (e.g., through curricular revision) that will generate more favorable data.

**Space, Equipment, Library Resources, and Other Resources**
The contents of this section are pretty self-evident. In addition to quantitative issues (amount of space, size of equipment and computing budgets, etc.), a few more qualitatively oriented questions may be worth highlighting. For example, the program’s space configured so that the core faculty have easy access to each other? Is the program located where the faculty and staff have convenient access to faculty and staff in related programs? Are the faculty tied together by a computer network? Do they all (and their students) have ready access to the internet? (The latter is rapidly becoming an important research and teaching resource for Americanists.) To the extent that the program draws extensively on off-campus resources—libraries, museums, archives, community agencies, fieldwork sites, etc.—, this might be a good spot to discuss these resources, although they conceivably could be equally or more effectively dealt with in discussions of program requirements or curriculum.

**Other Local Issues**
If relevant, there needs to be a section in the narrative that highlights other issues of interest to the program that can’t conveniently be fitted into one of the narrative’s other sections.

**III. Concluding Section**

**Summary of Planned Changes in the Program**
This section will parallel in format a section that typically can be found in an external review report. It will draw together in a single conveniently readable spot a list of the specific planned changes that have been discussed at various points in the narrative. It will also leave the readers of the narrative with the impression of a program capable of controlling its own destiny.

**Concluding Flourish**
This section may not be necessary to all narratives. If included, it must be brief. A memorable, upbeat rhetorical flourish at the end can’t—usually—hurt. (*Building on our
terrific achievements, we march confidently into the next decade." “Our program is at a point of crisis. We see that crisis as a golden opportunity for our program and the campus. With the active help of the campus administration, we on the core faculty are committed to renewing the program in a way of which the campus can be justly proud.”}
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The ASA Survey of Departments and Programs, 2007:
Findings and Projections
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In 1994, D. Melissa Hilbish wrote that based upon data from a survey of American Studies programs, “American Studies is a growing, healthy, active field” (7). Is that still the case? With the beginning of the twenty-first century, program leaders gathering at annual “directors’ workshops” desired pragmatically to have quantitative data to answer that question, and philosophically to assess the trends and directions of American Studies’ intellectual landscape. Along with these needs was a concern by program leaders to address changes in the field as it globalized and diversified, as well as shifts in administrative strategies. Many universities were implementing assessments of academic units and asking for benchmark data; the material from American Studies appeared sorely dated. Working with the ASA Executive Director’s office, the Committee on American Studies Programs and Centers initiated a survey in fall 2006 that concluded in January 2007. It was the first electronically administered survey of programs and it also included for the first time programs outside of the United States (25.8 percent). Using the program listings in the ASA Guide to Resources as a basis for identifying programs, data was collected from 114 program representatives and analyzed with surveymonkey software. The return rate was impressive for organizational surveys of this kind at better than 60 percent.

John F. Stephens as Executive Director and I as Chair of the Committee on American Studies Programs designed the survey instrument, which was reviewed by an advisory committee composed of Andrew Ross of New York University, Lauren Rabinovitz of the University of Iowa, and Hans Bak of the University of Nijmegen in the Netherlands. Susannah Gardner of Hop Studios acted as technical consultant and the Women’s Caucus met with me before the survey. We wanted to be able to make longitudinal comparisons and therefore drafted questions based on previous surveys conducted by Robert Walker (1956), Charles Bassett (1973), and the American Studies Association in 1992 (see Walker 1958; Bassett 1975; Hilbish 1994; see also McDowell 1948). In addition, we drafted new questions of concern to program leaders that addressed faculty diversity, globalization of the field, strategic planning goals, and relations to other programs such as women’s studies, ethnic studies, and cultural studies. The lengthy instrument was divided into categories of general information, undergraduate education, and graduate education. Sections addressed issues identified in the 1992 ASA survey of (1) Institutional Demographics, (2) Administration and Structure, (3) Faculty and Curriculum, and (4) Goals and Mission. I presented preliminary findings of the survey at the directors’ workshop organized by Janet Davis of the University of Texas at the 2007 American Studies Association meeting in Philadelphia, and the discussion with program leaders and a representative of the National Research Council there was useful in preparing this report.

Institutional Demographics, Administration, and Structure

Surveys before 1960 identified the profile of American Studies programs at small private liberal arts institutions, but the pattern changed by the end of the twentieth century. The number of programs at private institutions declined from 54 percent in 1973 to 35.4 percent in 1992. In the 2007 survey, 74.8 percent of the responding institutions identified themselves as public institutions. A noticeable shift is also apparent in the location of programs in institutions defined as large (over 30,000 students). In the 1992 survey, only 6 percent of American Studies programs checked this category, but in

Continued on next Page
2007, the figure grew to 21.3 percent. The predominant category is still the medium-sized institution of between 10 and 20,000 students; in 1992, 27.8 percent of programs were located in this group and the figure dropped slightly to 25.9 percent in 2007, probably because many of these medium-sized institutions became “large,” a number of international programs are located in large universities, and the addition of programs in large comprehensive institutions. The number of programs in small institutions dropped from 22.9 percent in 1992 to 19.4 percent in 2007.

To measure the administrative structure of American Studies programs, the 2007 survey adapted categories from the 1992 survey, which in turn was based on models outlined in McDowell’s 1948 study. The 1992 survey indicated that American Studies programs were administered as an (1) independent department/program containing tenure-track lines specifically in American Studies, independent budgets, and curricular control and autonomy; (2) interdepartmental program with at least one course in American Studies, and some control over staffing and budget; and (3) other, typically a program located within a discipline of the social sciences or humanities. For the 2007 survey, we clarified the types of programs. We labeled the first category “independent” and differentiated between program and departmental status. We called the second category “dependent,” because the program’s offerings rely on the cooperation of other units of the institution, although there may be a “core” faculty and courses. We replaced the catch-all “other” category with the label of “embedded,” and sought detail on the type of embedded, whether in an interdisciplinary unit such as international studies or a traditional department such as English.

Traced longitudinally, the administration of American Studies programs has shown a marked trend toward independence. For the first time since surveys of programs were initiated in the 1950s, the predominant administrative structure is an independent department or program with 38.6 percent of the total. In 1992, the predominant pattern was the dependent program with 52.7 percent, but that dropped sharply in the 2007 survey to 21.6 percent. The embedded program declined from 14.7 percent in 1992 to 10.8 percent in 2007. This is a marked contrast to survey results in 1956 when 33 percent of American Studies programs were embedded and only 5 percent were considered independent. When respondents were asked for clarification on the administrative structure, the department was dominant for the first time. Other models mentioned, moving from the most popular to the least were: (1) the independent program with full-time faculty and curricular autonomy administered by a director, chair, or coordinator from within American Studies; (2) program governed by a steering committee of faculty from multiple units and is administered by a chair or director; (3) an program defined as a specialization or area within an interdisciplinary or disciplinary department; (4) and a matrix program in which advisers oversee individualized programs of study constituted from multiple units of the institution.

In the United States as in the world, when an American Studies program was embedded, it was likely to be in English, and affiliations of faculty to other departments were most commonly in history and English or literature departments. But a difference in the designation of American Studies was noticeable in responses from programs outside the United States. In the United States, the label of “American Studies” was overwhelmingly dominant, but a variety of other forms of study was apparent in other countries: Anglo-American Studies,
North American Studies, Western History, International Relations, and Language and Culture. Many international programs were directly comparative such as Russian and American Studies. Still, when asked to define the scope of American Studies, respondents underscored that American Studies in their programs comprised studies of the United States, and a few international programs specified "United States Studies" as a concentration. Programs in the United States tended to have a regional linkage that international programs understandably did not. Some of the options within American Studies programs in the United States are New England Studies, Southern Studies, Southwest Studies, and Great Plains Studies. Two continuities between international programs and programs in the United States were the linkage to a "center" as an archival/research or curricular unit and the designation of a core and affiliated faculty. One quarter of all respondents identified a center associated with the program and 65.7 percent of programs had faculty divided between core and affiliated (or associated) faculty.

On average, the typical American Studies program had 5.2 full-time core faculty members. Doctoral departments expectedly had a higher number of core faculty members (9.4) and the number of affiliated faculty ranged from as few as 5 to as many as 80. Part-time faculty are regularly used by most programs; on average, programs claimed to have 1.25 part-time faculty members, or 24 percent of their teaching offerings. Most programs were led by a "director" usually a faculty member appointed by a dean who granted course release and/or financial compensation for serving as program leader. Departments, following academic convention, were usually led by a chair or head. A number of respondents identified themselves as coordinator, but the responsibility described for the post could be equivalent to a director or chair with budgetary and curriculum responsibility with staff support or a sub-administrative role of a "professor-in-charge."

In early surveys, most American Studies programs were undergraduate. That is still the case, but a noticeable trend is the growth of graduate programs. In 1973, 10 percent of American Studies programs reported giving the doctorate, and in 2007, 25.7 did. The number of programs giving the B.A. decline from 75 to 67.6 percent between the 1973 and 2007 surveys. Along with this growth in the graduate side is a rise in the number of institutions whose American Studies program offers only a graduate degree. In 1973, only 3 percent restricted themselves to graduate degrees, but in 2007, that figure rose to 12.7 percent. Apparently, a number of undergraduate programs added graduate programs, because the percentage of institutions reporting that they offered both undergraduate and graduate degrees rose from 17 to 21.2 percent. The patterns identified in the 2007 survey suggest that the majority of new American Studies programs have been on the graduate side.

Overall, the number of new programs continues to show a steady increase. The 1990s and early twenty-first century have been boom times for the creation of new programs. The largest number of programs responding to the survey reported being formed in the last decade. The other concentration of programs was established during the 1950s and 1960s. When asked to forecast programmatic plans in the next five years, one third of all respondents...
responded that their programs planned to add majors, minors, or certificates in the next five years. Overall, the largest initiative was forseen in the creation of master’s degree programs, followed by an “other” category which includes minors, concentrations, options, and certificates. Six institutions reported that they were actively working on adding a doctorate in American Studies to their offerings.

Although most program leaders reported being optimistic about the future of American Studies at their institutions, they rated a number of challenges to their success. In both 1992 and 2007, the top two responses were the same: budgetary concerns and inadequate faculty size. Nonetheless, fewer program leaders noted these issues in 2007 as they did in 1992, when 44 and 40 percent were most concerned with them, respectively, compared to 32.1 and 29.2 percent. One notable difference between the response to this question in 1992 and 2007 is the concern for lack of majors. In 1992, 32 percent of program leaders viewed it as a challenge, below budgetary concerns and inadequate faculty size. In 2007, it dropped to fourth, and 27.9 percent of the program leaders also listed “lack of majors” to be the least problematic issue for them. Another situation that has apparently improved is the extension of release time for faculty teaching American Studies. We solicited comments from program leaders to give background on their ratings. A frequent response was that program leaders viewed American Studies as a discipline rather than a composite field and they faced a challenge in convincing larger traditional, larger departments of this view. Changing perception was also on the minds of program leaders who wrote that they also worked to establish the expertise of American Studies faculty, because they encountered a view in other units that “anyone can teach about America” or “being interdisciplinary is old hat.” Expanding their independence as an administrative unit and convincing colleagues in other units of their distinction were on the minds of many program leaders. Part of this independence is their self-perception that American Studies was no longer decidedly a humanities field but was a bridge discipline, or an “interdiscipline,” as one program leader described it, between humanities and social sciences. Having acknowledged that American Studies was growing in prestige on their campuses along with their number of faculty, students, and outreach activities, some program leaders expressed concerns about managing growth, and whether they had adequate staff and facilities to keep up with demand.

Faculty, Curriculum, and Mission

Although program leaders noted changes in the scope of American Studies in the last decade, when asked to state their programs’ emphasis, the majority responded with the same focus declared in 1956—history and English/literature. The most notable difference, however, was the 35.7 percent who claimed primary attention to culture. Many specified that this cultural attention was to popular and/or folk culture. Related to this concern was the 15.7 percent of program leaders who declared a focus on ethnicity, especially with reference to ethnic culture. Among topics that were hardly mentioned as emphases in previous surveys but were given special attention in the “other” category were, in rank order, public heritage, media and communication, transnationalism/globalism, material/visual culture (and arts), education, and cultural studies.
One means of projecting future trends in program emphasis is to examine the results of our question to program leaders asking what specialization they would request if they were to write a job posting today. The top ranked answer was in ethnicity and religion. Most program leaders considered a general position in ethnicity and race desirable, followed closely by designations of expertise in Hispanic or Mexican-American studies. Some respondents noted needs in religion, and the neglect within the program of certain areas prevalent in other programs of the institution such as Jewish studies and Mormon studies. Several commentators wanted more cooperation (or to have American Studies serve as an umbrella unit) with African American studies, Asian-American studies, Latin American studies, Mexican-American Studies, and Native American Studies but noted that on their campus, they tend to be independent units.

The study of ethnicity and race as part of inquiry into social forces is also related to the second most commonly stated specialization of social science, including, according to respondents' comments, ethnographic methodology, politics and economics (especially in international programs), and sociology (with attention to class and community). The specializations that follow are relatively close together in frequency. In rank order, they are historical perspectives (with more attention to twentieth century topics and cultural history), globalization and transnationalism (usually stated as entailing a comparative perspective or an area approach such as "Atlantic World" or "Pacific Rim"), material and visual culture (often in relation to the study of arts and architecture and application to museums), public practice (including areas designated as heritage studies and public heritage, culture, history, folklore), literature (particularly in non-canonical areas), popular and folk culture (with subfields mentioned for music, performance, sports, and consumer and regional culture), gender studies (including issues of sexuality and masculinity, as well as women's studies), and science and technology (stated typically as social and cultural perspectives benefiting programs in institutions with high profiles in science and engineering profiles; a related area in this category was environmental and nature studies).

Faculty appointments within programs have changed dramatically since 1973 to the point that the majority of all appointments in American Studies are totally within American Studies. In 1973, only 5 percent of programs had faculty who had full-time appointments in American Studies; in 2007, the figure rose to 51.3 percent. Related to this trend is the collapse of the "joint appointment," a strategy mentioned by program administrators in earlier surveys to add offerings and participating faculty to their curriculum. In 1973, 57 percent of programs reported having faculty with joint appointments; in 2007, the figure was 3 percent.
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Another notable change in the American Studies professoriate is the representation of women. Results of the 2007 survey showed that women dominated every professorial category. In 1973, women taught in 58 percent of programs; in 2007, the figure was 97.1 percent. The 2007 survey also revealed that the American Studies professoriate is increasingly diverse, with the largest representation of a minority being African American. In 1973 ethnic minorities taught in 32 percent of programs; in 2007, the figure was 47 percent. Among programs in the United States, the figure is 60 percent. According to the 2007 survey, women dominate all professorial ranks, especially at the assistant professor level (by a ratio of 1.6:1) reflecting a trend of hires in the last decade. Women are also well represented at the full professor level by a ratio of 1.4:9.4 of women to men, and more

"junior" or "assistant." Evidence from the 2007 survey reveals that a large proportion of these junior positions are new hires. On average, 1.5 positions in American Studies programs were not replacement positions, but were newly created. The evidence also indicates more mobility for faculty than reported in earlier surveys. Almost 30 percent of programs reported hiring 1 or 2 faculty members in the last five years; 10.4 percent hired three or more. Those faculty who vacated a position, according to the survey, resigned to take another position. Most programs reported being able to replace vacated positions; 1.7 positions in a program were replacement hires in the last five years. In contrast, in the 1973 survey, only 1 total hire was made per program, and 49 percent reported no American Studies hires. In 2007, the percentage of programs making no hires slid markedly to 37 percent. An increasing number of programs insisted on the American Studies degree as a condition of hiring. In 1973, 70 percent of program leaders reported hiring someone without an American Studies degree, but that percentage dropped 10 points in 2007.

The 2007 survey asked program leaders to project hiring patterns based on retirements, vacancies, and the acquisition of new lines. Close to 30 percent of respondents expected one retirement in the next five years and 17.9 percent projected 2. In contrast to 1973 when 40 percent of leaders did not expect to be able to create any new lines, 66 percent of programs reported needing 1 to 3 faculty members in the next five years. Program leaders were optimistic about the job prospects of their graduates, and noted the expansion of the non-academic job market for American Studies graduates. Program leaders noted that although the master’s degree was considered sufficient for such positions in the twentieth century, in the twenty-first century the Ph.D. was increasingly advantageous for advancement in such positions. To be sure, most graduate programs were still geared toward college teaching as a career path, but program leaders noted more student demand for public sector work, indicating that it was a primary career choice, rather than an alternative to college teaching. A few programs mentioned having applied areas in their curriculum such as museum studies, public practice (public heritage, public history, public folklore, historic preservation, archives and records management, cultural resource management), and media and digital technology. Totaling the number of positions expected, it is possible to project over 1000 positions designating American Studies training as a prerequisite over the next five years. If this is the case, it appears that the number of Ph.D.'s produced will not exceed the demand, assuming that

Continued on next page
American Studies programs increase their rate of hiring candidates with American Studies degrees.

A factor in the perceived demand for American Studies backgrounds that program leaders stated is the advantage over graduates from traditional disciplines in the integrative or interdisciplinary skills desired to teach in core curricula. Over 30 percent of program leaders mentioned that undergraduate American Studies courses counted toward a campus-wide general education or core curriculum requirement. This included introductory courses serving as surveys of American culture and diversity or arts and humanities surveys that are serve as interdisciplinary models. Besides providing a critical service role in college-wide curricula, American Studies programs reported a rise in the size of their pool of majors. In 1958, a typical undergraduate program in American Studies graduated an average of 7 students; that number increased to 9.7 in 1973 and rose to 13 in 2007. The ratio of women to men in programs was over 2 to 1 (8.4 women to 3.8 men). The largest minority representation was from African Americans who constituted 7.6 percent of majors. Undergraduate programs reported a number of special features that make choosing American Studies as a major attractive: internships, exchanges with institutions abroad (whether an international institution or one in the United States), collaborations with local museums and organisations (for faculty, facilities, and field experiences), study tours, and service learning opportunities. Program leaders mentioned an expansion in their roles from scheduling and budgeting to community outreach and programming, including organization of lectures, conferences, films, concerts, and exhibitions. A number of program leaders commented that this was a way that American Studies maintained a high profile as a relatively small unit within a large institution. To the question of where holders of American Studies degrees go, program leaders reported that the largest contingent went to graduate school, equally divided between American Studies and non-American-Studies programs. The next largest contingent went into business, followed by law and public service. A large "other" category included occupations in education (some program leaders mentioned that a number of majors sought teacher certification to coincide with their degrees), communications, and media.

In contrast, holders of graduate degrees were less likely to go into business than they were to college teaching and public heritage (including museums, historical and preservation societies, and cultural agencies) and information sector (libraries and archives) work. A holder of a master’s degree in American Studies was more likely than a doctorate holder to already be in secondary education or planning on advancement there (many program leaders in the United States mentioned state teacher requirements for advanced educational credits which teachers take in American Studies). Holders of the doctorate, according to program leaders, went into college teaching and public heritage work. Graduate programs in American Studies reported granting on average 4.1 master’s degrees and 3.7 doctorates annually per program. In an average entering doctoral class of 9.4 students, the ratio of women to men was 2 to 1. This is in stark contrast to the ratio in 1973 when seven of every eight doctorates went to men. In 1973 the number of students who entered graduate programs in American Studies with undergraduate degrees in American Studies was negligible, but in 2007, this number rose sharply to place just behind undergraduate backgrounds in literature and history. Also noticeable was a rise in the number of undergraduates who entered American Studies with backgrounds in art history and anthropology (fourth and fifth on the list, respectively), while the number of students with backgrounds in politics and government declined.
To provide qualitative data regarding the perception of American Studies by programs, respondents to the 2007 survey were asked to provide descriptions and mission statements for their American Studies programs. As was evident in 1992, keywords of interdisciplinary and holistic were frequently mentioned in the 2007 survey, but overall, these keywords were surpassed in frequency in 2007 by “cultural,” “diversity,” and “broad.” A significant number of comments described American Studies as a discipline or independent field with its own theories and methods rather than touting its interdisciplinary character. Program statements frequently distinguished between themselves and traditional disciplines by noting attention to “non-text-based forms and practices,” vernacular and popular culture (including keywords of folk, ethnic, mass, and everyday), educational innovation (mentioned as examples were distance education, alignment with emerging areas such as cultural studies, and explorations of citizenship models). A number of programs cited the distinction of American Studies being oriented toward communities, cities, and regions as laboratories and outreach opportunities. Several programs mentioned the interpretation of American experience in American Studies to “scholars in other fields and to people outside the academy.”

The description of mission and goals by program leaders illuminated patterns in the United States and international programs. No matter where the location of the program, mission statements tended to mention integrative and global goals. But U.S. programs mentioned “culture” or “cultural” more, and tended to draw attention to non-text based inquiry (practices and ideas) along with regional and ethnic concerns. International programs emphasized often expressed interest in texts, particularly when accompanied by preparation for work in translation and language education. Although many international programs in American Studies, according to their leaders, grew out of literature and language study, one frequently finds in the survey a different trajectory as an area study with concerns for integration of politics, society, and economics. Programs in Asia often organized United States studies as part of Anglo-American or “Western” history, whereas European programs frequently mentioned North American Studies. When programs in the United States mentioned global connections, it tended to be North America (although a few program leaders mentioned an orientation toward the Americas with attention to Latin America and the Caribbean), ethnic (with some programs having subfields in Asian-American, Native-American, and African-American studies), and regional (especially in New England, the South, West, and Southwest, although some programs affiliate with centers in the Midwest, Northwest, and Mid-Atlantic).

In sum, the results of the 2007 survey lead to affirmation of Hilbish’s conclusion in the 1992 survey that “American Studies is a growing, healthy, active field.” The signs of this growth include the increasing independence of American Studies units, creation of new tenure lines, expansion of public heritage work for American Studies graduates, and organization of new American Studies centers and programs/departments. Program leaders report a number of intellectual as well as administrative changes in American Studies since Hilbish’s statement was made. Indeed, many program leaders worried in 2007 about managing growth and realignment of their programs. American Studies is reportedly more global and at the same time more localized than in 1992. It is also more diverse ethnically and varied in subject matter, although more programs in the 2007 survey than in previous surveys report focusing on cultural issues. Having added international respondents to the 2007 survey, the situation is no less robust internationally, although political concerns that provide a context for support of American Studies are often cited as a challenge in places such as the United Kingdom and the Middle East. At the same time, growth of interest in the United States is cited in areas such as East Asia and the formerly communist countries of Eastern Europe. Program leaders report being confident that the growth of American Studies measured by the number of faculty and students as well as by intellectual activity is likely to continue in the next five years.

Summary of Major Findings

1. Demographics, Administration, and Structure
   a. Although the majority of programs are situated in medium-sized (10-20,000 students) public institutions, the largest rise since 1992 has
been in large (more than 30,000 students) comprehensive universities.

d. Programs report valuing non-academic/public-heritage jobs in American Studies but did not report significant preparation in curriculum for these fields.

4. Mission and Goals

a. Fewer programs than before organize their mission around interdisciplinary character, and more report goals of critically analyzing cultures, localism/regionalism, globalism/transnationalism, and diversity. More programs/departments than before describe American Studies as a separate discipline.

b. More programs identify outreach, community, and public component as objectives than ever before.

c. International and U.S.-based programs are similar in holistic, global goals, but are differentiated by emphasis on text, sociopolitics, culture and crossnational interest. Although the combination of history and literature is still mentioned as a foundation of study, distinctive in the 2007 survey is the focus of a majority of programs on culture (especially popular culture) and societal issues (race, ethnicity, and gender).

d. A consistency from past surveys is the perception of American Studies as primarily an inquiry into the United States.
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Appendix E- Statement on Standards in Graduate Education

The statement that follows was approved by the American Studies Association National Council on November 3, 2005. This statement builds upon the standards advocated by the American Association of University Professors in their Statement on Graduate Students, but has been modified to address the more specific conditions of graduate study in American Studies and related fields.

Preamble
As the largest professional organization in its discipline and as an organization with broad interdisciplinary reach, the American Studies Association has a unique responsibility to establish the standards of professional conduct and institutional support in graduate programs in American Studies and related fields. This statement has been formulated to address the complex reality of graduate study and to foster sound academic policies in graduate programs in American Studies and related fields.

The following statement sets forth recommended standards that pertain to graduate students in their roles as advanced students, future colleagues, and teachers within the university. Graduate students are not only engaged in an advanced course of study, they are often also in programs of professional academic training and hold teaching and research assistantships. As graduate assistants, they carry out many of the functions of faculty members and receive compensation for these duties. The statement that follows has been formulated to address the complex reality of graduate study and to foster sound academic policies in graduate programs in American Studies and related fields.

The responsibility to secure and respect the conditions conducive to graduate study is shared by all members of the university community. Every department of American Studies and every college or university has a duty to develop policies and procedures that safeguard against the infringement of the rights of graduate students as outlined in this statement. These standards will not only enhance the educational and professional development of graduate students, but will support the freedom of thought and expression so vital to the intellectual life of the university.

Each program in American Studies has a responsibility to make these standards available to continuing and prospective graduate students and to all faculty members either by inclusion in the program description or by public posting in the department.

General Standards:
1. Graduate Students have the right to academic freedom. While graduate students are responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled, they should be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study and should be encouraged by faculty to exercise their freedom of discussion, inquiry and expression. Graduate students’ freedom of inquiry is necessarily qualified by their still being learners in the profession; nonetheless, their faculty mentors should afford them latitude and respect as
they decide how they will engage in research and teaching.

2. Graduate students have the right to be free from illegal or unconstitutional discrimination, or discrimination according to, but not limited to, age, gender, disability, race, religion, political affiliation, national origin, marital status, or sexual orientation, in admissions and throughout their education, employment, and placement. This right extends not only to discrimination in admissions and hiring, but also in the right to study and work in an environment free of intimidation and harassment.

3. Graduate Students are to be considered members of an academic community, and as such, they have the right to collegial and respectful treatment by faculty members and other students alike.

4. Graduate Students are entitled to the protection of their intellectual property rights, including recognition of their participation in supervised research and their research with faculty, consistent with the standards of attribution and acknowledgement relevant to the field of study. This includes the right to co-authorship in publications involving significant contributions of ideas from the student. The student should receive first authorship for publications which are comprised primarily of the creative research and writing of the student when consistent with the conventions of the field.

5. Graduate students have the right to confidentiality in their communications with faculty and administrators of their program. Discussion of the students’ performance among faculty should be of a professional nature and should be limited to the students’ academic performance and fitness as a graduate student and graduate instructor.

6. Graduate students should be free of reprisal for exercising any of these rights.

Standards Pertaining to Program and Institutional Support:

7. Prospective and current graduate students should be fully informed on degree and program requirements. This includes a clear and regularly updated written statement on program requirements, as well as a clear and consistent articulation of the recommended preparations and procedures necessary for fulfilling those requirements. These requirements should be consistently applied, and if degree requirements are changed, students admitted under the old rules should be allowed to continue under those rules. If the program is discontinued, graduate students already admitted in the program should be allowed to complete their degrees. Students should also be told of acceptance and attrition rates in their program, funding possibilities, employment prospects, and the normative and average time of degree completion.

8. Graduate students should be assisted with the progress of their degrees through periodic assessments, appropriate and timely course offerings, faculty advisors in every step of their degree program, and adequate dissertation supervision.

9. Graduate students should be provided with a realistic assessment of funding opportunities by their program and institution upon admission and periodically thereafter as necessary. Programs should have clearly written policies regarding the distribution of financial and resource support, and these policies should be made public or be readily available upon request.
10. Graduate students should be allowed to participate in institutional governance at the program, department, college, graduate school, and university levels, and should be able to voice their opinions in matters of their interest.

11. Programs and departments are encouraged to support the professional development of graduate students through information on professionalization and the provision of conference and research expenses.

12. Graduate students have a right to mentorship and should be offered a fair notice of discontinuation of adviser relationship. If a graduate student’s dissertation or thesis supervisor departs from the institution, whenever possible, the student should be allowed to keep on working with that supervisor. If this is not possible, the program should make every effort to assist the student in finding alternative supervision.

13. Programs are encouraged to provide graduate students, especially those involved in instruction, with offices and work-spaces, computing and printing equipment, as well as access to copiers, subject to appropriate budgetary limits.

14. Graduate students should have access to their files and placement dossiers. If access is denied, graduate students should be able to ask a faculty member of their choice to examine their files and receive a redacted account, at the discretion of said faculty member. Graduate students should have the right to direct the addition or removal of materials from their placement dossiers.

15. Graduate students have the right to refuse duties and tasks irrelevant to their academic or professional program. This includes the right to request more appropriate assignments without jeopardizing financial aid, or teaching and research appointments.

16. American Studies and similar interdisciplinary programs are responsible for preparing their students for the risks and opportunities involved in obtaining interdisciplinary degrees. Such programs should also enhance their students’ placement opportunities by providing information and guidance in the relevant application procedures and professional standards of related disciplines.

**Standards Pertaining to Teaching:**

17. Teaching assistants, faculty fellows, and research assistants should have the right to organize and bargain collectively. Administrations should honor majority requests by graduate students for union representation anywhere state legislation permits such activity. Graduate students should not suffer retaliation from administrators or faculty because of their activity and position on collective bargaining.

18. Graduate students should be furnished with terms of appointment and with clear guidelines of terms and conditions of their graduate student employment. Graduate students should have the right to grievance procedures in their program and institution that include impartial hearing committees.

19. The time that graduate students spend in teaching, grading, researching, or other graduate employment should be kept to the standard maximum of about twenty hours per week. Programs and institutions should offer compensation so that graduate student employees are not obligated to seek substantial employment elsewhere. Health and dental benefits should be included in any teaching,
grading, research, or fellowship package.

20. Graduate Programs have the responsibility to train and properly supervise graduate student instructors in pedagogical methods. Graduate Student Instructors should have access to seminars on pedagogy and university teaching, and have the right to request that a member of the faculty observe, evaluate, and provide guidance on their teaching.

21. As a service to their own graduate students but also their profession, programs should recognize the adverse effects of relying on adjunct faculty. Although adjunct appointments can add significant dimensions to curricula and some individuals prefer adjunct appointments because of other commitments, the practice of hiring numerous adjunct faculty members year after year to teach the core courses of a program of undergraduate study undermines professional and educational standards and academic freedom. It is recommended that departments should establish an appropriate limit on the number of adjunct faculty members in relation to the number of tenured or tenure-track faculty members and of graduate student instructors. ii

Notes