

UTQAP Cyclical Review: Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan

1 Review Summary

Program(s) Reviewed:	History (HBA): Specialist, Major, Minor (<i>Specialist/Major Foci</i> : Law and History) History: MA, PhD
Unit Reviewed:	Department of History
Commissioning Officer:	Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science
Reviewers (Name, Affiliation):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonnie Effros, Professor and Department Head, Department of History, University of British Columbia • Scott Levi, Professor and Chair, Department of History, Ohio State University • Carla Gardina Pestana, Distinguished Professor and Joyce Appleby Endowed Chair of America in the World History Department, University of California, Los Angeles
Date of Review Visit:	April 3-4, 2024
Review Report Received by VPAP:	May 8, 2024
Administrative Response(s) Received by VPAP:	March 6, 2025
Date Reported to AP&P:	April 10, 2025

Previous UTQAP Review

Date: November 16-17, 2015

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Significant Program Strengths

- Impressive department offering a broad range of undergraduate and graduate courses offered on a range of areas, periods, and themes
- Excellent recent revision of graduate fields in global, transnational, and comparative frames
- Rigorous, attractive undergraduate program that balances geographic, chronological, and thematic breadth
- Impressive department with leadership among Canadian universities during a period of rapid change
- Impressive rate of research publication during the past five years
- Several faculty members have become active in pioneering media and digital projects
- Relatively large faculty drawn from three campuses offers unusual breadth
- Chinese history has become a major strength since the last external review

Opportunities for Program Enhancement

- Taking a more deliberate approach to graduate and undergraduate curriculum development, including strengthening assessment practices, adding specific courses, and providing internship opportunities
- Rethinking recruitment strategies at the undergraduate and graduate levels in light of declining enrolments
- Considering the structure of graduate funding and TA roles in relation to the structure and length of the graduate curriculum
- Recruiting and funding international graduate students to strengthen U of T's global position
- Engaging in complement planning to provide coverage of Latin American and African fields
- Addressing concerns about diversity and issues of gender equality
- Providing relief to associate professors through mentoring and teaching releases
- Supporting collaboration, intellectual community, and communication within the department, while still maintaining connections to interdisciplinary centres and institutes
- Addressing departmental space use and determining how to best serve tri-campus faculty

Current Review: Documentation and Consultation

Documentation Provided to Reviewers

Terms of reference; Self-study; Previous review report including the administrative response(s); Access to all course descriptions; Access to the curricula vitae of faculty.

Consultation Process

Faculty, students, administrative staff and senior program administrators as well as members of relevant cognate units as determined by the commissioning officer: Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science, Vice-Dean, Academic Planning, Interim Associate Dean, Unit-Level Reviews; Department Chair, Associate Chairs, Dept. Administrative Manager and Administrative Staff, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors, Chairs of Cognate Units, Graduate faculty; and undergraduate and graduate students.

Current Review: Findings and Recommendations

1. Undergraduate Program(s)

Unless otherwise noted, all bulleted comments apply to all programs reviewed.

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Department has made numerous changes to undergraduate program requirements and curriculum recommended in the previous review
 - ▶ Departmental practice of scheduling courses in a wider range of days and times rather than concentrated at midday a few days a week has had a good effect
 - ▶ One-semester 100-level courses have been successful in attracting additional students to the History minor
- Innovation
 - ▶ Recent successful innovations include launching the undergraduate writing support centre and increases in half-year course offerings
 - ▶ Law-school oriented track through the undergraduate curriculum has yielded excellent results.

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Implementation of undergraduate program changes on a piecemeal basis has resulted student confusion due to layered program requirements, opportunities, and expectations
 - ▶ Difficulty navigating program requirements may have contributed in part to a decline in enrolments in the Major program

- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Students registered some concerns regarding timely availability of course syllabi and receiving grades a timely fashion

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Conduct a systematic review of entry/completion requirements in order to create accessible and comprehensible tracks through the program and eliminate barriers to completion; reduce requirements and course prerequisites where justified
 - ▶ Update the department's course catalog, removing listings for courses that are no longer taught and accurately describing current courses
 - ▶ Continue beneficial practice of scheduling courses across a wider range of days and times
 - ▶ Continue developing one-semester 100-level courses in order to attract additional students to the History minor
 - ▶ Reviewers recommend against the practice of offering tutorials in upper-year courses and discourage "participation points" as part of their grading scheme
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Make course syllabi available to students as early as possible, to allow them to select appropriate courses and plan for their learning
 - ▶ Ensure that faculty are aware of grading practices policies when designing course syllabi, particularly regarding the requirement to return grades on a certain portion of course work prior to the course drop deadline
 - ▶ Improve communication with students to foster a more welcoming environment and to help students navigate their programs, e.g., via emails, in-person advising, and website enhancements
 - ▶ Discuss the idea of having faculty take an increased role in undergraduate student advising, with careful consideration of pros and cons; reviewers note that clarified curriculum requirements may make an additional layer in the advising process unnecessary
 - ▶ Consider making lecture slides available to students for viewing after the class

2. Graduate Program(s)

Unless otherwise noted, all bulleted comments apply to all programs reviewed.

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Admissions requirements
 - ▶ Excellent graduate students are admitted, "intent on studying a range of topics far beyond the department's traditional areas of focus"
- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Recent shift in language requirement completion deadline, to after the comprehensive exam, gives students additional time without slowing general progress

- Quality indicators – graduate students
 - ▶ Graduate students serving as teaching assistants in undergraduate courses are essential to the University's teaching mission
 - ▶ Students have excellent prospects for placement in Canadian universities and beyond
- Student funding
 - ▶ Reviewers applaud recent practice of expanding the use of restricted funds to meet graduate student needs

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Reduction in incoming class sizes creates difficulty offering courses aligned with students' own interests; reviewers observe that "specifically tailoring courses seems an impossible goal"
 - ▶ Language requirement presents challenges as students' language needs shift with the pursuit of new areas of study, which may increase time to degree completion
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Reviewers express concern regarding department's reliance on the Graduate History Society as a primary vehicle for interaction with the graduate student community, due to limited student involvement in the Society
 - ▶ Reduction in incoming class sizes may impact opportunities to build a sense of community among graduate students studying the same field
 - ▶ Feelings of isolation experienced by some students in the department, while others find intellectual and practical support in other units with which they are affiliated
 - ▶ Opportunities for active mentoring and community building appear to be available only to students whose advisors actively work to meet these needs
 - ▶ Students expressed that they would like more time dedicated to their archival research without facing financial penalties for doing so
 - ▶ International students face unique challenges including added financial constraints, the need to travel far afield for their research, and acclimating to an unfamiliar cultural context
- Quality indicators – graduate students
 - ▶ Lengthening time-to-completion rates attributed to a number of causes, including: the impact of the pandemic on student research timelines, the need to balance teaching assistantships with their academic work, and the "globalizing trend in the research that graduate students pursue"
- Student funding
 - ▶ Reliance on teaching assistantships for student funding slows progress on research and extends time to completion
 - ▶ High cost of living in Toronto is a significant challenge for graduate students; financial vulnerability "negatively affects morale, demands time away from studies to pursue funds for survival, and slows time to degree"

- ▶ While commendable, the use of restricted funds for student support is not sufficient to meet students' needs, and requires the use of departmental funds that could otherwise be used for research support

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Consider developing a year-long required graduate course, offered during the first year, to introduce PhD students to the discipline and to issues of professionalization
 - ▶ Consider ways to develop courses with appeal for as wide a range of students as possible
 - ▶ Consider ways of introducing flexibility into program language requirements, in response to students' need to learn languages in support of global studies
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ An additional required course for all incoming students would help to develop a stronger sense of community among each new cohort
 - ▶ Consider developing cross-field course work to help community building among graduate students
 - ▶ Improve departmental communication with graduate students through direct outreach to the student population; reduce reliance on Graduate Student Society for communications with students
 - ▶ Undertake a "sustained and general" effort to provide broadly available opportunities for student mentoring and community building
 - ▶ Develop additional supports for the unique needs of international students, including special mentoring, opportunities to integrate closely within the university community, and financial assistance where possible
- Student funding
 - ▶ Explore ways to provide additional resources to support research travel and time away from teaching, particularly for students whose research programs require international travel
 - ▶ Consider establishing an emergency fund to assist graduate students experiencing financial crisis

3. Faculty/Research

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Research
 - ▶ The faculty boast stellar research accomplishments including pathbreaking monographs, edited collections, articles, and chapters
 - ▶ Faculty have regularly won SSHRC Insight and Insight Development grants, Jackman Institute Research fellowships, and prestigious international awards
- Faculty
 - ▶ Accomplished faculty members support undergraduate students through History programs as well as other units with which individual faculty have relationships

- ▶ Tri-Campus Graduate Department draws on faculty expertise from each of the three campuses to guide graduate students
- ▶ Faculty pursue innovative scholarship and serve in a variety of administrative capacities

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Faculty
 - ▶ Reviewers caution that the graduate programs' recent (and successful) shift to a more global emphasis may lead to an undue burden on younger and more recently hired faculty, due to heightened student interest in these areas and a general tendency among graduate students to prefer working with younger faculty
 - ▶ Associate professors appear to be having difficulty advancing into the rank of Professor
 - ▶ Department currently has no clear guidelines on the requirements for promotion to the rank of Professor; current standards for promotion are informal and unevenly implemented
 - ▶ “Lack of transparency around promotion and perceived inequities in standards has bred mistrust in the system and undermines morale at the associate rank, where many faculty have remained for a long time despite their record of research, teaching productivity, and contributions to the department. This imbalance seems disproportionately to affect female faculty and may also contribute to disengagement from departmental activities and intellectual life.”

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Faculty
 - ▶ Consider the need for equitable distribution of advising responsibilities in the graduate admissions process, with an understanding that some faculty will attract a greater proportion of applicants
 - ▶ Distribute teaching responsibilities more evenly among faculty, in order to create a more equitable environment and allow more time for in-demand faculty to pursue research
 - ▶ Develop a robust mentorship program for pre-tenure faculty members, to help orient them to departmental expectations and develop strategies for career success
 - ▶ Increase transparency in governance and develop clear written guidelines articulating expectations for tenure and promotion, and for promotion to the rank of Professor.
 - ▶ Consider general disciplinary trends toward allowing additional flexibility in tenure and promotion processes (e.g., “requiring a second monograph *or the equivalent* for promotion”); such a change “would be consistent with the departments’ coverage of new fields of study, outreach to a broader audience, and hiring of a new generation of scholars with innovative topics and approaches”

4. Administration

Note: Issues that are addressed through specific University processes and therefore considered out of scope for UTQAP reviews (e.g., individual Human Resources issues, specific health and safety concerns) are routed to proper University offices to be addressed, and are therefore not included in the Review Summary component of the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan.

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Relationships
 - ▶ Departmental culture is collaborative, responsive, and supportive
 - ▶ Faculty enjoy considerable freedom to teach to research strengths and pursue activities in affiliated programs
 - ▶ Department is “a good partner” and supportive of inter-departmental partnerships
 - ▶ Faculty members gratefully highlighted a number of equity-related initiatives supporting them in times of need
 - ▶ Strong, stable staff enjoys working together
 - ▶ Widespread support and appreciation for the efforts of the current chair to shepherd the department through “an exceptionally challenging term”
- Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - ▶ History Department “is an exceptional academic unit by any appropriate metric”
 - ▶ Department has a longstanding international reputation, considered by many measures as “the highest ranked in Canada and among the top programs in North America more broadly”
 - ▶ Fruitful recent efforts to expand offerings at the undergraduate level and to develop a more global emphasis in the Tri-Campus Graduate Department
 - ▶ Positive steps taken since last review to develop a more global curriculum that reflects the disciplinary trend emphasizing thematic rather than geographic foundations for courses
 - ▶ Stable undergraduate enrolments, as well as the Department’s decision to restrict graduate cohort size in response to the current academic job market and a desire to ensure that students receive adequate financial support, all suggest that the unit is in good health
- International comparators
 - ▶ Department is placed highly in international rankings (QS/Times Higher Ed), and ranks “at the very top among Canadian universities and all North American public universities” in terms of publications

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Relationships
 - ▶ Self Study and some unit stakeholders expressed the need to foster a greater sense of community in the Department

- ▶ Large department size and dispersal of space across campus creates a sense that there are limited opportunities for intellectual engagement in the department; some faculty and students look elsewhere to find a sense of community
- ▶ Reviewers note ongoing challenges arising from the complex nature of tri-campus relationships
- Organizational and financial structure
 - ▶ Departmental governance structure, “largely run by committees rather than involving general consultation,” limits discussion, debate, and transparency in decision-making processes; “This has led some faculty to disengage from the department’s intellectual life and governance, attending department meetings only virtually or choosing to skip them entirely”
 - ▶ Faculty members commented on feeling excluded from faculty search processes; “Many articulated a desire for an open discussion of such important decisions”
 - ▶ Faculty members commented on a lack of clarity around retention processes and decisions
 - ▶ Large departmental office dispersed across campus creates challenges in building a cohesive sense of community
 - ▶ Shortage of departmental space on the St. George campus limits opportunities for UTM and UTSC faculty members to meet with and provide mentoring for graduate students
 - ▶ Departmental communications and events coordination duties are distributed among several staff members with limited capacity due to other responsibilities; faculty and staff expressed concern regarding inconsistent and inadequate departmental communication processes, “which negatively impacts morale and undermines opportunities to enhance the unit’s reputation on campus”
 - ▶ Faculty in leadership roles may become overextended, particularly if they elect to continue with a full teaching load; overextension often results in additional labor being undertaken by staff members
 - ▶ Reviewers observe the apparent lack of a formal document of departmental bylaws and a lack of clarity among faculty regarding how the department operates
- Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - ▶ Regarding discussions of the new FAS budget model, reviewers note concern over possible outcomes of shifting greater financial responsibility directly to individual departments
 - ▶ Duplication of material in courses offered by other units may threaten the continued health of the Department and dilute students’ education
 - ▶ Shift toward a more global curriculum, and emphasis on thematic rather than geographic foundations for courses, while positive, has resulted in faculty working within areas of traditional strength feeling that their work may be undervalued
 - ▶ Faculty specializing in the history of regions outside of Europe and North America appear to be more concentrated at the UTM and UTSC campuses than at St. George, with problematic implications

- ▶ Recent faculty departures have left some critical disciplinary subject areas underrepresented including Russia, the Soviet Union, and China; reviewers note that these are areas with natural alignments with other important U of T units

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Relationships
 - ▶ Consider providing additional support for events (e.g., workshops, speaker events, manuscript workshops, grant writing events, a departmental colloquium) to help model intellectual life and reinforce a sense of shared purpose in the department
 - ▶ Expand efforts to leverage professional events, writing and research workshops, graduate research conferences, and other mechanisms to build and maintain a more cohesive sense of community among faculty and graduate students
 - ▶ Explore ways to convene regular meetings of the full departmental staff on days when all are working in person, to promote communication and a greater sense of community
 - ▶ Appointment of a new Tri-Campus Graduate Department Chair will hopefully help to address ongoing challenges in tri-campus relationships
 - ▶ Enhance communication and consultation between tri-campus history units around graduate education and other shared agendas
 - ▶ Consider sharing a general statement of the mechanics of retention processes with departmental faculty
 - ▶ Encourage faculty to maintain professional connections with other units, to enhance interdisciplinary relationships and departmental visibility
- Organizational and financial structure
 - ▶ Allocate resources for a Communications Officer position, with responsibility for communication with various populations connected to the department, website management, and coordination of events
 - ▶ Enhanced departmental communications will bolster efforts to reach and build relationships with alumni and other potential donors, and have the potential to attract new students, increase enrollments, and generate additional revenue for the department
 - ▶ Explore options for providing space on the St. George Campus for graduate faculty at UTM and UTSC to meet with their graduate students
 - ▶ Consider whether faculty in leadership positions might be required to take course releases during their period of service
 - ▶ Discuss and draft a formal set of departmental bylaws with input from all departmental stakeholders
 - ▶ Creation of detailed guidance for departmental leadership roles would flatten the learning curve for subsequent leaders and lighten responsibility of staff members to serve as holders of institutional memory
 - ▶ Revise the departmental Policy Committee to include an advisory role for the Chair
 - ▶ Consider additional steps toward decentralizing departmental governance to bring more conversations and additional decision-making authority to the faculty as a whole

- ▶ Consider adding a departmental Ombuds position role with responsibility for orienting new faculty and addressing issues relating to morale, community, and other appropriate tasks
- Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - ▶ FAS should remain conscious that “big changes may take several academic cycles to take root; and, more specifically, the U of T History Department’s push to offer more equitable global coverage will only succeed if the FAS continues to offer appropriate languages and other skills crucial to undertaking historical research”
 - ▶ Consider how Faculty curriculum processes can prevent competition between departments offering courses covering similar material
 - ▶ Implementation of a new budget model that incentivizes student recruitment will create new challenges as well as new opportunities
 - ▶ Consider strategies for lessening “the inherent imbalance in the Tri-Campus structure for the purpose of graduate training” such as rotating the Graduate Chair appointment among the faculty of all three campuses
 - ▶ Consider faculty hiring strategies to improve the balance of disciplinary and geographic coverage among faculty at the three campuses
 - ▶ Offering a robust curriculum in areas relevant to the trajectory of global geopolitics may lead to increased enrolments and revenue for the department, and generate positive recognition for the University



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE

March 6, 2025

Professor Nick Rule
Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
University of Toronto

RE: UTQAP cyclical review of the Department of History,

Dear Professor Rule,

I write in response to your letter of December 10, 2024, regarding the April 2024 UTQAP cycle review of the Department of History and its programs, and requesting our Administrative response. The programs reviewed were: Hons. BA, History (Specialist, Major, and Minor), Master of Arts in History, and a PhD in History.

On behalf of the Faculty of Arts & Science, we would first like to thank the reviewers: Professor Bonnie Effros of the University of British Columbia, Professor Scott Levi of Ohio State University, and Carla Gardina Pestana of University of California, Los Angeles, for their thoughtful and comprehensive review of the Department. We would also like to thank the Department's leadership, faculty, administrative staff, and all those who contributed to the preparation of the self-study, as well as thank the faculty, staff, and students who met with the external reviewers and provided feedback. The UTQAP cyclical review process is an invaluable exercise that affords us the opportunity to take stock of our academic units and programs, to recognize achievement, and identify areas for improvement.

The review report was finalized on May 8, 2024, and was shared with faculty and staff in the department. We are very pleased with the reviewers' positive report on the Department of History and its programs. They praised its international scholarly reputation and research accomplishments evident in their faculty obtaining awards, grants, and in their monograph outputs. The reviewers commended the expanded services for students including the writing centre and the new law-school focused undergraduate track. The reviewers also recognized the strong relationships and partnerships with cognate units. The reviewers identified some areas for consideration including recommending a comprehensive curriculum review to clear up some of the student confusion regarding program requirements and expectations. They also recommended some improvements to the graduate student experience and to the overall sense of community in the department, while noting communication challenges facing the department should be addressed.

Each of the review recommendations has been addressed in the attached Review Recommendations Table that outlines the unit's response, the Dean's response, and an Implementation Plan identifying action items and timelines for each recommendation.

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

Sidney Smith Hall, 100 St. George Street, Suite 2005, Toronto, ON M5S 3G3 Canada

Tel: +1 416-978-3383 • Fax: +1 416-978-3887 • officeofthedean@artsci.utoronto.ca • www.artsci.utoronto.ca

My Administrative Response and Implementation Plan was developed in consultation with the Acting Chair and with the Vice-Dean, Academic Planning, and senior leadership within my office. The Implementation Plan provided identifies timeframes of immediate- (six months), medium- (one to two years), and longer- (three to five years) term actions and who (Faculty, Dean, unit) will take the lead in each area. I also identified any necessary changes in organization, policy, or governance where appropriate, as well as any resources, financial or otherwise, that will be provided, and who will provide them.

The next UTQAP cyclical review of Department of History will take place no later than the **2031-32** review cycle.

My office monitors progress on Implementation Plans through periodic meetings with chairs and directors [and through the unit's five-year unit-level academic planning process, which will begin at the conclusion of the cyclical review]. I also acknowledge that your office will request a brief Interim Monitoring Report midway between the March 2024 UTQAP cyclical review and the year of the next site visit in 2031-32 to report on progress made on the Implementation Plan as outlined in the accompanying Review Recommendations Table.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to respond to the review report. The reviewers' comments and recommendations will help inform future priorities of the Department of Political Science programs.

Sincerely,



Melanie Woodin
Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science
Professor, Department of Cell & Systems Biology

cc.

Eric Jennings, Chair, Department of History, Faculty of Arts & Science
Gillian Hamilton, Vice-Dean, Academic Planning, Faculty of Arts & Science
Caitlin Burton, Senior Manager, Curriculum, Change & Reviews, Office of the Dean,
Faculty of Arts & Science
Lachmi Singh, Director, Academic Programs, Planning & Quality Assurance, Office of
the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Amanda Pullan, Academic Planning & Review Officer, Office of the Dean, Faculty of
Arts and Science

2023-24 UTQAP Review of FAS Department of History - Review Recommendations

Please do the following for each recommendation in the table:

- If you **intend** to act on a recommendation, please provide an **Implementation Plan** identifying actions to be taken, the time frame (short, medium, long term) for each, and who will take the lead in each area. If appropriate, please identify any necessary changes in organization, policy or governance; and any resources, financial and otherwise, that will be provided, and who will provide them.
- If you **do not** intend to act on a recommendation, please briefly explain why the actions recommended have not been prioritized.
- In accordance with the UTQAP and Ontario's Quality Assurance Framework, "it is important to note that, while the external reviewers' report may include **commentary** on issues such as faculty complement and/or space requirements when related to the quality of the program under review, **recommendations** on these or any other elements that are within the purview of the university's internal budgetary decision-making processes must be tied directly to issues of program quality or sustainability" (emphasis added)
- You may wish to refer to the [sample table](#) provided by the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

Request Prompt <i>verbatim from the request</i>	Rec. #	Recommendations from Review Report <i>verbatim from the review report</i>	Unit Response	Dean's Response
The reviewers observed that recent updates to the undergraduate curriculum have been carried out in a piecemeal way, leading to student confusion regarding program requirements and expectations. They recommended undertaking a comprehensive curriculum review to clarify entry and advancement requirements, create clear pathways through the program, eliminate barriers to completion, and update the Department's course catalog.	1.	"Since the last review, the department has made numerous recommended changes to the undergraduate program requirements and curriculum. Having undertaken this work on a piecemeal basis, it now finds that students are confused by layered requirements and the resulting opportunities and expectations... Rather than continue to rely on individual exceptions, the department should undertake a systematic review of entry and advancement requirements, offering clear tracks through the program and eliminating barriers to its successful completion."	Curriculum review is underway, with curriculum consultation and an undergraduate programme retreat set for the fall of 2025 for all St. George history faculty. The Undergraduate Chair's office has already started working with the Curriculum Review Specialist in the Office of the Vice-Provost, Innovations in Undergraduate Education and the Assistant Director, Teaching & Learning Initiatives at in the Faculty of Arts & Science to support our curriculum renewal goals. We have completed an environmental scan of peer institutions' history programs internationally and of other U15 universities. This winter term, we are participating as a department in a conversation about generative AI in curriculum, teaching and learning. Next, the Undergraduate chair and staff complete a thorough review of our existing program and courses in the summer of 2025, bringing additional retirements and calendar clean-up forward in the fall 2025	Immediate to medium-term: The Vice-Dean, Undergraduate and the Vice-Dean, Academic Planning support the Department of History's plan to review its curriculum and will work with the Department leadership on any proposed curricular changes.

			governance cycle (we did a fair bit this year as well). We will then be working collaboratively with A&S Governance to bring forward a comprehensive plan for renewal in the 2026-2027 cycle following our departmental retreat and as a culmination of work began this past year. In the interim, the undergraduate programme committee and the Department as a whole are continuing to promote large thematic and methodological courses for the first and second year levels, making some of these classes modular so that professors can step in for colleagues on leave, sabbatical, etc., such as HIS112H, Ten Events that Shaped the Word, HIS115H, History Now: How the Past Shapes the Present, HIS101Y: Histories of Violence, HIS108Y, What is History?	
	2.	“When this process is completed and the department has updated its major requirements, it should also clean up the catalog, eliminating course listings for courses that are no longer taught and accurately describing current courses.”	This is an ongoing process. The department regularly eliminates courses that are no longer taught, in keeping with Arts and Science Policy.	See #1 above.
The reviewers recommended consideration of a required introductory graduate course in historiography/methods and exploring ways to address professionalization within the graduate programs.	3.	“We suggest a methods/historiography course that serves as a general introduction to the discipline, preferably offered in the first year... In addition, students need assistance with professionalization, which might be handled in a course, but could also be addressed in workshops. We encourage the department to consider a yearlong required course, offered during the first year, which might begin with the discipline and then turn to professionalization issues.”	The MA level already has a methods/historiography course known as HIS 1997 The Practice of History, which trains Masters’ students in historiography, archival methods and professionalization. The PhD programme has not included that because an MA is required to enter our PhD and our very few direct admit candidates must take HIS 1997. Methods/historiography are also built into many other graduate seminars.	The Dean’s Office recognizes that the Department has addressed this review report recommendation by reviewing its current methods course HIS 1997 The Practice of History.
The reviewers noted that financial concerns for graduate students negatively affect morale and result in increased time-to-completion rates. They recommended	4.	“...the department should consider locating funds to support research travel and time away from teaching, as mentioned previously. These resources are especially	With the implementation of the new budget model in May 2025, the department will have greater autonomy over distribution of funds. A suggestion would be to set aside a specific	Immediate to long-term. As the Unit notes, the new budget model will provide the Unit with greater budgetary autonomy, clarity, and agency, so they can allocate resources to

exploring ways to provide supports for students' research travel and time away from teaching, and establishing resources to support graduate students in moments of financial crisis.		pressing for those whose research programs require travel to foreign countries. Financial vulnerability of the sort experienced currently by the graduate students negatively affects morale, demands time away from studies to pursue funds for survival, and slows time to degree."	<p>amount (i.e. \$1,000 per eligible student per academic year) to support graduate student research travel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Immediate actions – the department manager shall analyze available funds and suggest an amount per student that is supportive of research while ensuring funds for other initiatives within the department. - Intermediate actions – the department manager will determine the long-term feasibility of the plan, designate the writing of a terms of reference document and make it available to the HIS community. - Long-term actions – establish a priority when creating an annual budgetary term of reference with initiatives to be included on an ongoing basis. 	their own academic priorities, such as to support graduate students.
	5.	"The department might want to consider establishing an emergency fund to assist graduate students in moments of financial crisis. Students report that university funds for such purposes are inadequate and restricted."	<p>The department has currently set aside an EDI distribution fund and sends a call for applications to graduate students. Any requests within the defined boundaries of the call for applications are considered. In the previous academic year, additional funds from the Dean's office were used to support the EDI distribution funds. The entirety of the fund was disbursed to students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Immediate actions – the department manager will determine the availability of funds in the new budget model and in collaboration with the leadership team determine whether to continue with the current model and the amount to be set aside for disbursement. - Intermediate actions – the department manager will determine the long-term feasibility of the plan, 	See # 4 above.

			<p>designate to write a terms of reference and publish to the HIS community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long-term actions – establish a priority when creating an annual budgetary term of reference with initiatives to be included on an ongoing basis. 	
The reviewers recommended exploring ways to provide additional support to address the unique concerns and needs of international students.	6.	<p>“We note that either the university or the department (or both) should attend better to the needs of international students. They face added financial constraints, often need to travel far afield for their research, and confront an unfamiliar cultural context. They would benefit from special mentoring, efforts to see them incorporated within the university community, and any added financial assistance that can be arranged.”</p>	<p>The Graduate History Society has put forward an initiative along these lines at the graduate level. At the Undergraduate level, our Undergraduate teaching team works in close conjunction with College Registrars to support international students, although their financial constraints cannot be addressed by the History Department, especially in the new budget model.</p>	<p>Immediate. The Dean’s Office supports the unit in their plan to work with their Graduate society to better support international graduate students. The Dean’s office further encourages the Department to consider how to communicate supports offered by the Centre for International Experience (CIE) for international students, both undergraduate and graduate.</p>
The reviewers noted concerns related to the range of disciplinary coverage in the department, observing that “retirements and other separations have left some critical areas of the department’s intellectual life underrepresented or entirely vacant” and noting that faculty specializing in the history of regions outside of Europe and North America appear to be concentrated on the UTM and UTSC campuses. They recommended exploring ways to improve how the three campuses balance disciplinary coverage.	7.	<p>“Another issue to consider is that retirements and other separations have left some critical areas of the department’s intellectual life underrepresented or entirely vacant. This includes Russia and the Soviet Union as well as China. Both areas have natural alignments with other important U of T units, and, considering the trajectory of global geopolitics, it seems likely that offering a robust curriculum in these areas would generate both positive recognition for the U of T, and student enrollments would also generate a positive revenue stream for the department and FAS.”</p>	<p>This is an important point. In 2024-2025 we were able to hire a new historian of Brazil and a historian of China, two much-needed areas. Both have had an immediate impact and are drawing impressive numbers of undergraduates in their classes. We agree that there is a clear need for a Russia/Soviet historian, especially given the current geopolitical climate and the strength that we have in terms of library support in that field. The Department is in the process of putting forward a new complement plan for 2025-2026, which addresses both the retirements of our Soviet Historian and our Japan and South Asian historians. These were the only scholars of those two essential areas on our St. George campus.</p>	<p>Immediate to long-term. The Dean’s Office recognizes that the Department is prioritizing this recommendation and will work with the unit to explore their options through the faculty complement planning process.</p>
	8.	<p>“It also appears that there has been greater success hiring faculty who specialize in the history of regions outside of Europe and North America on the other campuses than the St. George Campus. It is problematic to</p>	<p>There is a clear need in multiple areas, especially with two retirements that will leave us with no tenure-track historian of South Asia on the St. George campus, which is not just shocking in its own right for a city</p>	<p>See # 7 above.</p>

		house (or perceive to house) the histories of areas external to Europe and North America on the UTM / UTSC campuses. Looking ahead, insofar as it is possible, we encourage the department to aim for an improved balance of coverage among the various campuses.”	like Toronto, but also a major step backward for a St. George Department which previously had two South Asianists circa 2000 (one for early South Asia, one for modern). We will also be without a historian of Japan.	
The reviewers raised concerns regarding a lack of clear guidelines for promotion and tenure processes; they observed that "perceived inequities in standards has bred mistrust in the system and undermines morale at the associate rank" and highlighted that imbalances appear to disproportionately affect female faculty members. They suggested providing mentorship opportunities for junior faculty, developing written guidelines for PTR processes, and considering more flexible pathways for promotion (in developing your response you are encouraged to consult with the office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty & Academic Life).	9.	“The department currently has no clear guidelines on the accomplishments requisite for promotion to professor. This situation would be problematic even if what informal standards existed were implemented evenly. The lack of transparency around promotion and perceived inequities in standards has bred mistrust in the system and undermines morale at the associate rank, where many faculty have remained for a long time despite their record of research, teaching productivity, and contributions to the department. This imbalance seems disproportionately to affect female faculty and may also contribute to disengagement from departmental activities and intellectual life.”	As we understand the rules, the Department’s tenure and promotion guidelines must be those of the Faculty of Arts and Science. The expectations are clear and are moreover listed in Arts and Science documents which are sent out to candidates and external reviewers alike. However, it is true that past practice in History was that two books were required for promotion. The new front office team have made it clear to the Promotions Committee and to Associate Professors that no such wording exists in either departmental or Arts and Science governance documents, and that a CV featuring one book and many high-calibre articles and chapters and/or public history interventions would certainly be eligible. We have run into a challenge, though: despite our insisting on this rule, some outside colleagues at other universities still believe in the convention of two books (the fact that we are asking senior colleagues elsewhere explains this in part, as the shift across the discipline has occurred in the last decade).	Immediate to long-term. The Dean’s Office supports the Department in improving communication about the requirements for tenure and promotion and encourages consultation with the office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty & Academic Life for further guidance as needed.
	10.	“...we note that associate professors appear to be having difficulty advancing into the rank of Professor. As a long-term solution to this problem, we recommend a robust mentoring program for new faculty, whose senior colleagues can orient them toward expectations and strategies for success throughout their careers”	We have a mentoring programme and policy and have bolstered it since September 2024. Concretely, the Department is encouraging mentors to invite their “mentees” out to lunch, covered by the department.	Immediate to medium-term. The Dean’s Office supports the Department’s plan to further enhance and encourage mentorship in the Department.

	11.	<p>“ The department should develop written guidelines and consider joining the more general trend in favor of flexibility, requiring a second monograph or the equivalent for promotion... Accepting the general trend toward widening our discipline’s objectives and audiences would be consistent with the departments’ coverage of new fields of study, outreach to a broader audience, and hiring of a new generation of scholars with innovative topics and approaches. This change would also acknowledge that public-facing scholarship benefits the discipline and society as a whole, and recognize the value of and impact on the discipline of increasing funding sources for collaborative work and digital research.”</p>	<p>As indicated above, this is indeed the trend in the discipline of history. Acknowledging public history, outreach and public-facing scholarship is certainly important, and we shall endeavour to give those serious attention within our Promotions Committee and Salary Committee.</p>	<p>The Dean’s Office supports the Department’s plans to address this review report recommendation.</p>
<p>The reviewers noted opportunities to improve the graduate student experience and, more broadly, to enhance the sense of community within the Department; they recommended supporting Department-wide intellectual activities to reinforce a sense of shared purpose.</p>	12.	<p>“As the situation currently stands, some students feel isolated; others find intellectual and practical support in other units with which they are affiliated; and only those working with advisors who offer active mentoring and opportunities for community building feel that their needs in these areas are met within the department. We advise a more sustained and general effort to meet their needs.”</p>	<p>Key to addressing students’ sense of isolation is a consistent system for clear benchmarking of progress through the programme. The department is normalizing a system of regular mentorship meetings with clear and well-communicated expectations for students, their supervisors and their committee members of what these meetings should track. We offer students and faculty questions to discuss at these meetings, tailored to the student’s stage in the program.</p> <p>For PhD students, in accordance with best practice from the School of Graduate Studies the Graduate Chair, Graduate Administrator and Associate Chair Graduate manage a system of regular, scheduled meetings between students, their supervisors and (eventually) their comprehensive and dissertation committees. First year students must have a meeting at the beginning of the first year with their supervisor; in the middle of their first year and with their new</p>	<p>Immediate to medium-term. The Dean’s Office supports the Department’s plan to establish a consistent system for clear benchmarking of student progress through their graduate degrees. The Dean’s Office encourages the Department to advise their graduate student society and graduate faculty of resources available through the School of Graduate Studies Centre for Graduate Mentorship and Supervision.</p>

			comprehensive examination committee at the end of their first year. Students preparing for comprehensive exams must meet with their full committee at least once during their second year before sitting the exam. Every year after that, students must meet with their dissertation committee once a year and submit a report to the graduate office. In addition to a meeting at the beginning of the academic year, MA supervisors have been asked to have a January meeting with their MA students. This has been introduced in 2024-25 and will be continuing practice.	
	13.	“We encourage the department to launch a year-long required graduate course, offered during the first year, which could introduce PhD students to the discipline and professionalization issues. We feel that this would enhance the department’s efforts to build a greater sense of community among each PhD cohort.”	There is currently a mandatory course for MA students. However, there is no such course for PhD students. While we think this is a good idea in principle, we must balance the pedagogical benefits with the real concern that adding more course requirements to the PhD program could increase our times to completion, as well as increase the workload of our graduate students. The Graduate Chair, Associate Chair Graduate are investigating models in the university to include such a mandatory requirement that could perhaps been completed at a low intensity pace over several years in Years 1, 2 and 3 of the PhD programme. In 2023, the department created the position of Professional Development and Language Coordinator to run non-mandatory workshops in professional development for graduate students throughout the year. We are exploring ways to integrate this professional development as a mandatory part of the graduate curriculum for MA and PhD students.	Immediate to medium-term. The Department is encouraged to engage with the Vice-Dean Graduate Education regarding potential program modifications. and the Coordinator, Graduate Student Professional Development in the Experiential Learning Office for consultation about developing professionalization modules.
	14.	“The Self Study and some of the people with whom we spoke stated the need for a greater sense of community. Toward that end, we	In the recent past, there was a chair’s initiative fund created as part of the previous Chair’s package. This was typically used to	Immediate to long-term. The Dean’s Office supports the Department’s efforts to address this review report recommendation.

		recommend developing a fund, to which department members could apply, to support events. Such a fund might increase the number of intellectual activities bringing together colleagues within the department.”	support initiatives within the department to promote a greater sense of community. A suggestion would be to create a term of reference for the History operating budget in the new model that includes the need for department wide events, faculty retreats, community events etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Immediate steps - department manager to determine availability of funds based on proposed model of interactions.- I Intermediate actions – department manager to determine long term feasibility of the plan, designate to write a term of reference and publish to the HIS community.- Long-term actions – make a priority when creating an annual budgetary term of reference with initiatives to be included on an ongoing basis.	
15.	“The department might hold faculty and/or graduate manuscript workshops or reading groups, SSHRC grant writing events, and a departmental colloquium. Such activities would help model intellectual life and might reinforce a sense of shared purpose in the department.”	One of the Department’s faculty already leads a very productive writing workshop, where colleagues read one another’s work and obtain constructive feedback. Additionally, our Fellowships committee makes itself available to read all SSHRC grants, the Chair has insisted on the importance of applying for them and has shared resources for doing so within the University. The Graduate Chair has introduced a History Postdoctoral Fellows Speaker Series that is beginning in Winter 2025. As we get this series up and running the graduate department will consider other programming for faculty and graduate students. We have also worked with the Graduate History Society to begin regular coffee hours in the common room at least once a month.	See # 14 above.	

			The Graduate Chair is keenly aware of the labour demands that supporting these kinds of events places on our slim complement of front office staff and is proceeding cautiously in order to ensure that creating a stronger intellectual life for faculty and students does not create new forms of invisible labour for staff.	
The reviewers highlighted communication challenges affecting both the undergraduate and graduate programs and noted comments from faculty and staff that departmental communications are “inconsistent and inadequate.” They recommended assessing administrative staff supports to ensure that departmental communications are appropriately resourced.	16.	“...better communication with students will make the department more accessible and assist them in getting through the program. These improved communications could include emails to enrolled students, better counseling, and an upgrade to the website that gives more guidance to students about courses, the major, and the minor.”	The Department Chair has engaged A&S Administrative Human Resources in reviewing and identifying operational needs including the communications functions, so that duties are allocated in a coherent fashion. The review highlights a lack of bandwidth for communications duties amongst the existing staff complement.	Immediate to medium-term. The A&S Administrative Human Resource Services office will continue to work with the Department Chair on addressing operational needs as they relate to the communications functions.
	17.	“...the department should address better communication with graduate students. The Graduate History Society seems to be the primary vehicle for the department’s interaction with the graduate community, but apparently only a small minority of students are actually involved in it and some students registered hesitation with it when consulted in the Self-Review phase of this process. The department should decide whether relying on the GHS is ideal, and if so figure out how to involve more students in it”	Same as above, the introduction of a communications officer can address these issues.	See #16 above.
	18.	“[the Department] should also reach out directly to the student population with information and opportunities, not leaving all communications to graduate students.”	Same as above, the introduction of a communications officer can address these issues.	See #16 above.
	19.	“The department desperately needs a Communications Officer. This individual could manage the website, communicate with various populations connected to the department, assist with advertising events,	Same as above, the introduction of a communications officer can address these issues.	See #16 above.

		produce a newsletter, and otherwise coordinate outward facing elements. A first-rate graduate faculty ought to tout its many accomplishments. This new position, which we understand is already staffed in other units in the university, would free up the other staff to do their main work, which would also benefit students and others in the community.”		
<p>The reviewers observed that the Department’s committee-based governance structure “does not sufficiently encourage discussion, debate, and transparency in decision-making processes,” eroding the departmental community and resulting in faculty disengagement. They recommended clarifying and communicating departmental governance processes, engaging in succession planning for leadership, and considering ways to help the faculty feel more involved in decisions.</p>	20.	<p>“We would encourage the department to come together as a whole, perhaps at a retreat, to discuss and draft a formal set of bylaws. We would also encourage those faculty who have stepped forward to take on more onerous leadership roles in the unit to create a detailed calendar of responsibilities to pass on, as this may lessen the learning curve for their successors and reduce some of the burden that staff bear to serve as institutional memory.”</p>	<p>Detailed calendars of responsibilities have been drawn up since the UTQAP report, by the incoming Chair and the incoming Business Officer. The Undergraduate Chair has also developed a draft calendar of responsibility.</p> <p>A retreat is being planned for the fall of 2025 to discuss key undergraduate matters, especially in light of the new budget. The department’s leadership team has also rekindled community-building by marking retirements at a fall celebration at the Faculty Club and with a holiday lunch reception. Both were well attended and elicited enthusiasm.</p>	Immediate to medium-term. The Dean’s Office acknowledges that the Department is pursuing several initiatives to address this recommendation.
	21.	<p>“...the department’s faculty expressed a feeling of having insufficient agency in governance. This sense appears to contribute to the diminished faculty engagement in department meetings and intellectual life. We recommend that the department’s Policy Committee be revised to include an advisory role for the chair. We also recommend that the department take a number of additional steps toward decentralizing governance and bringing more conversations and additional decision-making authority to the faculty as a whole. Another positive step would be to consider adding an Ombuds position to the service chart, assigning responsibility for orienting new faculty and addressing issues</p>	<p>Agency in governance is a complex matter. The past front office team definitely made increased transparency a priority. There has been a decentralizing shift thanks to the untangling of the tri-campus Graduate chair from the St. George Chair, which creates a system of checks and balances. One forthcoming change involves an annual report on our budget by the Business officer, which will take place every fall.</p> <p>All of this said, agency is a double-edged sword. Precious few colleagues express an interest in serving in the key front office posts, so the desire to enact change does encounter some limits in terms of colleagues</p>	See #20 above.

		relating to morale, community, and other appropriate tasks.”	willing to spend the critical administrative time necessary to make it possible. The Policy Committee has in effect been doubled since the advent of a new Chair model. It is also renewing with its advisory role.	
The reviewers broadly observed that there is opportunity for enhanced communication and consultation among tri-campus graduate faculty, particularly regarding space usage and graduate student training. They suggested that rotating the tri-campus graduate chair appointment among faculty across the three campuses could support balanced participation and representation.	22.	“The complex nature of the relationship between three campuses with different undergraduate populations and research emphases joined by a shared Graduate Department presents on-going challenges. We hope that some of these issues will be addressed through the appointment of a new Tri-Campus Graduate Department Chair (separate from the Chair of History). We recommend greater communication and consultation between campuses around graduate education and other shared agendas.”	This important issue has begun to be addressed with the creation of a Tri-Campus Graduate Chair, separate from the Chair of the St. George History Department, precisely as the external examiners recommended. We have separated the UTSG Policy Committee, chaired by the St. George Chair, from the new Tri-Campus Advisory Council, chaired by the Graduate Chair. We have also ensured clearer separation of and distinction between the work and jurisdictional responsibility of these two crucial committees, and between UTSG and tri-campus departmental meetings. At the same time, both the UTSG and Graduate Chair have heard faculty members’ desire for clearly designated space for open discussion among faculty. For both UTSG and Graduate department meetings some meetings are clearly advertised in advance as open to all constituent groups of departmental life (whether UTSG or tri-campus). At least two meetings a year are designated in advance as “faculty-only” in order to create spaces where faculty can discuss policy issues and more sensitive professional matters more freely.	Immediate to long-term. The Dean’s Office acknowledges that the Department is pursuing several initiatives to address this recommendation.
	23.	“Shortage of space affects community as well as graduate mentoring. The St. George Campus should provide a dedicated space for graduate faculty located on other campuses to meet with their students.”	In October of 2024, the Graduate Chair and the St. George chair agreed on seven offices (two more than previously allotted) as shared office space for tri-campus colleagues. Working in consultation with an ad hoc committee of faculty from UTM and UTSC, the Department Manager and the Graduate	Immediate. The Dean’s Office supports the Department’s plans to provide space at St. George for their graduate faculty, located on other campuses, to meet with their students.

			<p>Chair oversaw a renovation and reallocation of office space for tri-campus faculty, trying to make sure that everyone who needed St. George office space received it.</p> <p>We are in the final stages of allocating desks and we will now work with tri-campus faculty to support them with a system of managing use of this office space so that the system feels more respectful, collegial and workable. For now, we adopted the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - everyone who teaches in the grad programme should have access to a designated office and, if possible, a designated desk (we accept that the latter may not be permanent); - each office has adequate space for people to be in there at the same time on the rare occasions when that might be necessary; - each office has adequate space for faculty to hold meetings with graduate students (so, not crowded with desks); - offices are designate for colleagues, not campuses; - more than one person can work there at the same time comfortably if necessary - faculty don't have to come to the front desk for a key to access an office. The front desk has a record of who has a key to each office. There is also other bookable space for anyone who wants to hold a private meeting but doesn't have a space to do it at that moment (say, two occupants of the same office need to meet someone privately in person at the same time). 	
	24.	<p>“Rotating [the Tri-campus Graduate Chair] appointment among the faculty of all three campuses would go some distance toward responding to the perception that the St. George Campus enjoys an advantage in the tri-campus relationship.”</p>	<p>This is an interesting idea, but concretely SGS, rather than our department, runs the process to nominate and select the Tri-campus Graduate Chair. This suggestion therefore seems to be beyond the mandate of the department and should be addressed to SGS.</p>	<p>The Dean’s Office recognizes that the Department has considered this review report recommendation.</p>

			The point is taken, however, that it is important, during the selection process for Graduate Chair, that the committee be mindful of the importance of faculty from all campuses being considered equally for the position.	
Other recommendations not prioritized in the Request for Administrative Response	25.	“Course scheduling that scatters course times rather than concentrating them at midday a few days a week has reportedly had a good effect and should be continued”	The Undergraduate Office is continuing to implement a revised timetabling process begun in 2022-2023. Instead of indicating a specific time and day for each course, as was past practice, faculty provide a range of hours and days when they would be available to teach. This greatly simplifies the timetabling process and avoids multiple email messages. We are able to accommodate nearly all faculty members' preferred times, and child-care pickups, etc., while greatly reducing conflicts for students.	The Dean's Office recognizes that the Department has already undertaken actions to address this recommendation.
	26.	“In addition, we commend the department for offering a number of one-semester 100-level courses, which attract additional students to the minor, and we encourage the department to create more such offerings.”	We have. This past governance cycle, we have created “HIS115H: History Now: How the Past Informs the Present.”	See #25 above.
	27.	“Requiring faculty to post syllabi during course registration or at the very least at the start of the term will allow students to select appropriate courses and to plan for their learning.”	We would like to do this but there are concerns about copyright and intellectual property and academic integrity as well as having a consistent policy that is fair to our sessional and course instructors as well. We are exploring testing a new option for the fall of 2025 in which faculty would submit to post on our website either the entire syllabus OR the proposed marking scheme (without necessarily due dates as course registration is in July) and a statement about the amount of weekly reading and a sample reading so that students could better gauge their preparedness to take the course.	Immediate and medium-term. The Dean's Office recognizes that the Department has considered this recommendation and is exploring other options.

	28.	“In designing syllabi, faculty should recall that students need grades on a certain portion of course work by the course drop deadline.”	Faculty have been adhering much more consistently to the Grading Practices Policy. We have had no infractions in the past 12 months.	The Dean’s Office recognizes that the Department has already undertaken action to address this recommendation.
	29.	“We heard some discussion of shifting undergraduate advising to faculty... Once the curriculum is regularized, it might be possible to make this change, but we suspect that greater transparency will make the need for an additional layer in the advising process unnecessary... In any event, the department should discuss whether such a system would benefit students.”	While the need for and benefits of mentorship for undergraduates is a topic that has come up before, our large number of students has made that likely unworkable. One potential change that will be discussed thoroughly at the Fall 2025 program retreat was whether faculty mentorship could be offered to students only in our specialist program. At present, there are 73 History specialists. That would create added value for the specialist program and better support students who are likely intending additional graduate training.	Medium-term. The Dean’s Office encourages directing students to undergraduate advisors on matters of curriculum and encourages the Department to work with their faculty to enhance student mentorship including for those undergraduate students enrolled in a Specialist program.
	30.	“Undergraduate students requested an accommodation which ought to be easily met: faculty should consider posting slides shown in lecture for viewing subsequently by the enrolled students. This practice makes it easier for students to review their notes after lecture or to make up for occasional absences.”	Many faculty already do this. We will discuss whether it should become a departmental teaching expectation at the fall meeting.	Immediate to medium-term. The Dean’s Office recognizes that the Department has considered this recommendation and is exploring options for implementing.
	31.	“Admissions decisions for the graduate program should take into account the need to spread the advising burden equitably, understanding that some faculty, because of their reputation or their field, will attract a greater proportion of the applicants.”	Every year, the Graduate Admissions Committee receives a current list of faculty and the students whom they are supervising, as well as each student’s year in the program. The committee only recommends admission for applicants in cases where a willing faculty supervisor has identified themselves during the stage of the admissions process when files are evaluated by all faculty. The committee chair and Graduate Chair reach out to ensure that any faculty member in the applicant’s area of interest or whom the applicant specifically mentioned as a potential supervisor or mentor has a chance to weigh in on the file.	The Dean’s Office recognizes that the Department has considered this recommendation.

			Our process does in fact take into account the need to spread the burden of advising equitably, along with other considerations.	
	32.	“...faculty in departmental leadership roles exhibit a tendency to become overextended, which often results in additional labor being pushed to the staff members. This problem escalates when committee chairs, who are offered a course release to offset their service commitment, elect not to take that release. We recommend that faculty in such positions be required to take course releases during their period of service.”	There seems to be some confusion here. Committee chairs are not offered course release. In fact, the Faculty of Arts and Science seems to be reining in course release and with the new budget model, and our 2/2 teaching load, it seems impractical to implement this idea.	The Dean’s Office supports the Department’s plan to manage the workload in their unit in accordance with the Department workload policy.
	33.	“...the FAS’s curriculum processes must guard more carefully against other units offering history courses to large numbers of students, especially courses that compete with those that History offers... this form of duplication by other units will threaten the continued health of the History Department and dilute the education offered to students.”	We agree with this point. See for example “MUN120 Revolutions,” which was originally a small first year seminar but has now been allowed to grow to 100; We hope this will not be the case with MUN197 (Strong States or Weak Parties?), currently at 30, which duplicates the content of our HIS242, 20th Century Europe . We also point to college programs like Trinity offering TRN152Y which covers the same period and history as HIS103Y. It would also be helpful to better clarify the boundaries between departments such as East Asian Studies and Near and Middle Eastern Studies in terms of time periods and topics offered to undergraduates. Similar clarification would be helpful around programs such as Canadian Studies and American Studies especially when they mount courses that are not interdisciplinary in methodology but are clearly historical and are intended to be taught by historians (or are taught by historians	Immediate to long-term. The Vice-Dean, Undergraduate and the Vice-Dean, Academic Planning will support the Department throughout the curriculum governance process, which ensures consultation happens when new courses are proposed. The Department is encouraged to address any further identified overlaps through collegial discussions.

3 Committee on Academic Policy & Programs (AP&P) Findings

The spokesperson for the reading group reported that the review summary had accurately reflected the full review, and that the Dean's administrative response fully addressed the issues identified. While the administrative response covered most of the pertinent issues, the group requested further explanation of the issues regarding graduate funding and the new budget model, governance formalization and graduate curriculum.

Eric Jennings, Department Chair, History responded that regarding governance formalization, the unit had disentangled their governance structure, which now comprised a four-chair model, and the unit was working to define the functions of these roles.

Regarding the graduate curriculum, Professor Jennings noted that the majority of MA and direct-entry PhD students took a mandatory methods course, which assisted them with methodology and thesis writing. Only PhD students entering the program with an MA from another institution were not required to take this course, having previously received methodological training. Professor Jennings commented that the unit was developing a methods course to harmonize course content and avoid repetition. There were also professionalization opportunities available to students, such as mock job talks.

Regarding graduate funding, Professor Jennings noted that the department was a pioneer in offering \$40,000 per student before this was implemented across the institution, and that the unit would explore potential adjustments as appropriate.

No follow-up report was requested.

4 Institutional Executive Summary

The reviewers praised the Department of History for its longstanding international reputation, noting that it is widely regarded as the top-ranked in Canada and among the leading programs in North America. They praised recent innovations in the Department's curriculum and student services, including the development of the writing center, the increase in introductory one-semester course offerings to attract new students, and the successful law-school-focused undergraduate track. The reviewers highlighted History faculty's stellar research accomplishments, including their pathbreaking monographs and significant success in obtaining SSHRC grants, Jackman Institute research fellowships, and prestigious international awards. Finally, the reviewers praised the Department for its collaborative, responsive, and supportive culture and its strong relationships and partnerships with other units.

The reviewers recommended that the following issues be addressed: undertaking a comprehensive undergraduate curriculum review to clarify entry and advancement requirements, create clear pathways through the program, eliminate barriers to completion, and update the department's course catalog; considering a required introductory graduate

course in historiography/methods and exploring ways to address professionalization within the graduate programs; exploring ways to provide supports for students' research travel and time away from teaching and establishing resources to support graduate students in moments of financial crisis; exploring ways to provide additional support to address the unique concerns and needs of international students; addressing concerns related to the range of disciplinary coverage in the Department and exploring ways to improve how subject areas are balanced across the three campuses; addressing concerns regarding a lack of clear guidelines for promotion and tenure processes and perceived inequities in these processes; providing mentorship opportunities for junior faculty, and considering more flexible pathways for promotion; considering opportunities to improve the graduate student experience and enhance the sense of community within the Department; assessing administrative staff supports to ensure that departmental communications are appropriately resourced; clarifying and communicating departmental governance processes, engaging in succession planning for leadership, and considering ways to help the faculty feel more involved in decisions; considering ways to enhance communication and consultation among tri-campus graduate faculty, particularly regarding space usage and graduate student training; and considering the rotation of the tri-campus graduate chair appointment among faculty across the three campuses in order to support balanced participation and representation.

The Dean's Administrative Response describes the unit's responses to the reviewers' recommendations, including an implementation plan for any changes necessary as a result.

5 Monitoring and Date of Next Review

The Dean will provide an interim report to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs no later than midway between the April 2024 UTQAP cyclical review and the year of the next site visit in 2031-32 to report on the status of the implementation plans.

The next review will be commissioned no later than the 2031-32 review cycle.

The Arts & Science Dean's office monitors progress on Implementation Plans through periodic meetings with chairs and directors and through regular governance and curricular oversight.

6 Distribution

On August 15th 2025, the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan was posted to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs website and the link provided by email to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Science, the Secretaries of AP&P, Academic Board and Governing Council, and the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. The Dean provided the link to unit/program leadership.