

Report of the Academic Unit Review Committee
for the Department of History
University of Regina

14 July 2023

Prepared and submitted by:

Dr. James Muir, Faculty of Law and Department of History and Classics, University of
Alberta (Chair)

Dr. Lisa Chilton, Department of History, University of Prince Edward Island

Dr. Mark Brigham, Department of Biology, University of Regina

1. INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Review Committee performed an on-site review of the Department of History on the 5th and 6th of April, 2023. During the course of our review, we met with Department members, students (past and present), community partners, administrative staff, and members of the university's senior administration. In addition to the "Self-Study Report" and the 2013 "Reviewers' Report" that we read prior to the on-site meetings, we requested and reviewed Department members' curriculum vitae as well as course calendar registration information.

In summary, the Department of History at the University of Regina is a remarkable community. We were all deeply impressed by the commitment of the faculty, sessionals, staff, and partners to offering and maintaining an exciting, varied, and challenging set of programmes in the face of tight budgets and with limited resources. The sincere respect for the work the History Department has done that we heard from current and past students and from the Department's on- and off-campus partners was universal and heartening. The members of the Department perform an exceptional amount of service work, and the unit also contains some highly productive researchers. This is a vital department, and one that should be viewed as a leading example for the University of Regina and for other history departments elsewhere in Canada. It is important that the work of the Department be appropriately supported, and that the long-term sustainability of the unit be considered at all levels of the university administration.

The History Department finds itself at what seems to be a moment of existential crisis, largely created by factors outside of its control and despite the dedication of its faculty, staff, and students. Our report serves to identify and commend much of what the Department is doing already. We hope it can help guide the Department, as well as the Faculty of Arts, the Federated Colleges and the University of Regina to act in ways that will preserve and advance what is an exceptional small department.

The report that follows sets the department, its report, and our review in a wider context. We then follow that with sections devoted to staffing, scholarship, public engagement, teaching (with subsections on pedagogy, the undergraduate programme, and the graduate programme), and service. We conclude with a listed summary of our recommendations.

2. CONTEXT (LOCAL, NATIONAL, INTERNATIONAL)

There are contexts any evaluation of a history department must consider. Many of these contexts were only mentioned glancingly in the report shared with us, but they appeared in many ways in the conversations we had over our two days. Some of the larger contextual issues that are currently challenging humanities and social science programmes across the University of Regina, and across Canada and beyond, hung over the review process conversations. However, it was not always possible to gain a clear sense of how History compared to other departments within the University of Regina, or how it compared to history departments elsewhere.

Our review occurred at a particular local moment: university financial stresses were apparent when we arrived, and the cloud of what would ultimately be announced hung over almost every meeting we had. The announcements of what sorts of cuts would have to be made came soon after we left, and the Department will have to bear the cost of some of those cuts. All three of us have (and are) experiencing similar sorts of cuts and constraints on our own programmes. We understand that some of what we comment on here may already be gone, at least for the time being. Nevertheless, it was sad to read the review document stating

that no comments about future hiring priorities could be made because the prospect seemed unlikely. It was frustrating to be told on the first day by senior administrators that we could not recommend new hirings. We reject this instruction. The current local financial context is real, and we will not ignore it; but History, like the University of Regina as a whole, has a future, and futures in universities include thinking about and planning for new hires to replace departing/retiring faculty and to offer new opportunities to students.

Nationally, history departments (and other parts of universities) are facing a variety of situations that also provide part of the context for what we heard and what we will report. First, history departments across the country, like the U of R Department, are having more and more teaching being done by instructors with some form of precarious contract, be it course-by-course appointments or multi-course and even multi-year term contracts. The Canadian Historical Association has tried to advocate on behalf of precariously employed historians and history instructors. The faculty we met with at the U of R all spoke positively of the work the Department's sessional instructors are doing. Many also looked at the cuts to come and expressed their fears and concerns for their colleagues. We hope that the University will help the Department to continue to employ Dr. Ackerman, Dr. Burlingham, Mr. Hoffman, Dr. Patenaude, Dr. Ramirez, and Mr. Yeates.

Canadianists have been challenged to take up the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's 94 Calls to Action. Although none directly address *history departments*, many call on universities, professions, and governments to offer and require courses about the history of Indigenous people in Canada. We recognise that the History Department, and the University of Regina have a long-standing and deep relationship with the First Nations University of Canada and with Prof. Stonechild. It is important that the Department does not jeopardise this relationship. At the same time, it appears that the Department ought to be more forthright in the way Indigenous histories (both in Canadian history courses and in courses treating other regions) are integrated into the courses offered directly by its members. Through our meetings with faculty members we learned that the Department has clear incentive to take seriously the Calls to Action, and has a broader desire to Indigenize and to decolonise its curriculum, even if there is not firm agreement on what that may mean. Many of the people we spoke to both described what has been done and expressed desires to do more. We celebrate that, and yet in the written report the Calls to Action and Indigenization receive little direct comment in terms of either what is being done or in what can be done. We would like to have seen more information in the report concerning all of this. We encourage the Department to more explicitly recognise what it is already doing, and we hope the members of the Department as a whole and with the participation of FNU and Prof. Stonechild can plan for what further engagement with the calls to action and the principle of reconciliation may mean for the history curriculum at the U of R.

Canadian universities have been part of a wider, international trend that has seen declining enrollments, particularly among students majoring in humanities programmes. The U of R Department of History is not, then, exceptional when it reports a decline in the last decade in its declared majors. Everyone must recognise that the declines are a reflection of continent-wide trends, at least, and not a particular comment on the Department of History at the U of R. Moreover, there are some good signs in the numbers. First, the decline mainly occurred in the five years between 2012 and 2017. In the five years since, the number of majors has fluctuated. Second, the number of minors has fluctuated year to year, but in general has been consistent for the last 10 years. The number of Majors are coming to reflect the accentuation of the shift toward viewing university from a vocational perspective: students (and, perhaps more often, their parents) want university degrees that point them toward identifiable jobs. Minors, however, are a way students can pursue the things their hearts desire, despite the vocational shift. If minors (an admittedly smaller number all the time)

dropped proportionally to majors, it *might* be a particular comment on the Department. But, by holding up, the minor numbers are a sign of how strong the History programme is, and that students still want to pursue History, even if, at the moment, they feel they cannot make it their major. Third, and like the number of minors, the number of MA students in History has been consistent over the decade. This consistency points to a different, but equally important sign: the Department is attracting the same number of people every year who want to pursue some sort of advanced History education, despite the trend away from the humanities. Fourth, the total enrolment in History courses has grown, albeit slightly, over the last five years. The number of minors, of graduate students, and overall “bums-in-seats” all speak to how the U of R Department of History is continuing to speak to students’ interests and educational desires. For that, the Department should be proud and congratulated.

In universities across Canada, concerns relating to equity, diversity, and inclusion have become central to any review process. The self-study report did not address EDI matters head-on, and we wished that it would have done so. The faculty complement of 9 (now 10) full time members is divided between 6 (7) women and 3 men. That is unusual and worth noting. However, the lack of racial diversity is striking (although it is also worth mentioning that racial diversity continues to be a problem in History Departments across Canada). It was not clear if there is a larger faculty or university plan for addressing other diversity matters in hiring, including in relation to disability, LGBTQ2S+, and Indigenous communities. In the in-person meetings that were had with faculty and other interested parties associated with the History Department, there was plenty of evidence of awareness and concern about this situation, and willingness to keep these concerns central in any hiring decisions going forward. The range of courses offered shows a concern for reflecting EDI issues in curriculum. Our meetings with students revealed a broad feeling of inclusivity. Continued awareness and action is welcome. Engaging students, where possible, directly in EDI matters as they relate to curriculum and the student body will be beneficial.

3. STAFFING AND HUMAN RESOURCES

We met with most continuing faculty members individually, and also during a group social event. We met with a group of three returning sessional lecturers (Burlingham, Hoffman, and Munoz). We also met with Doreen Thompson, the administrative assistant for the Department.

Faculty members, on the whole, spoke to a shared recognition across the Department of people’s strengths and skill sets. This seems to mean that individuals work to their strengths so that there is some feeling of a balanced workload. This balance appears to work across class sizes, supervising honours students, and supervising MA students. However, it is important that the balance is regularly monitored and assessed to ensure that workload equity and Department harmony is maintained.

The report speaks to a departmental practice of integrating Luther and Campion College historians, FNU historians, and sessionals. Of those we spoke to, we consistently heard about how successful integration was: everyone who was not a formal part of the Faculty of Arts History professoriat spoke positively about how they are involved in almost all aspects of departmental administration, planning, and culture. It is remarkable how positive everyone was on the matter of integration. Ms. Thompson also spoke to feeling engaged with the Department as a whole, and she indicated that she has good working relationships with all of the unit’s members.

The Department will benefit from continuing to maintain healthy, inclusive relationships with all its members. That will take work, both on the part of the various people in the Department and in terms of support from the administration of the University (and

Federated Colleges). We believe that there is a sincere desire on the part of everyone to maintain a high level of collegiality. Senior administrators reacted positively when we described what we had heard and seen regarding these elements of the Departmental culture.

There are existing tensions, however, and there will be serious issues going forward. We heard from several people that there is insufficient recognition and appreciation of some of the work faculty do. Much of the supervision and focused-instruction of honours and M.A. students is performed as overload. Several people spoke to us about the long-term difficulty of maintaining these programmes without institutional recognition of the work required. There is limited capacity to offer teaching releases, research funding, or other recognition for the work devoted to these programmes; but limited capacity is not a sufficient justification for not introducing some structured forms of recognition. We encourage the Department, on its own and in conjunction with the Faculty of Arts (and where appropriate, central administration and the federated colleges' administration) to develop appropriate, tangible, methods to recognise the additional teaching and supervision work done by faculty members.

Similarly, recognition and appreciation of History faculty's engagement with service work within the broader University of Regina community needs to be developed and clearly offered by those calling on Historians. Service is expected of all tenured and tenure-stream faculty, and individuals who do exceptional service (for example, as chairs or associate deans) usually receive some form of compensation for that service. Several people, both from within and outside of the Department, told us that the History Department as a whole appears to do more faculty, university, and college service than the norm. We were told that at points this has had deleterious effects on the Department, as people's service elsewhere limits their ability to serve within, and as that service takes time away from the work of the Department as a whole. Structural ways of recognising the costs to the Department of such service and compensating for it (for example, through providing more sessional teaching slots) would be helpful. Internally, the Department may want to consider discussing ways to limit the service members do externally, perhaps by setting departmental expectations for the total volume of external service, and having individuals consult to see if the Department's external service capacity has been reached for the semester/academic year.

The previous two paragraphs speak to a pair of concerns. At this point, the Department's resources are stretched very thin, and the capacity of the Department to meet all of its current obligations relies on people constantly pulling together to cover as much of what needs to be done as they can. That is, in itself, unsustainable. But that is only *at this point*. We heard from many people that "this is an aging department." The description was applied to both the tenured faculty and the sessional pool, and to both U of R and federated colleges historians. This is a department and a teaching area that needs a commitment for renewal, from the University, and from the three federated institutions. Not only will new historians be necessary to do the jobs currently being done, but those new hires have to be on-the-job before significant gaps in teaching complement further open up. The strong, positive culture described above cannot be sustained if gaps open up that will take one, two, or more years to fill.

4. **SCHOLARSHIP (RESEARCH, PUBLISHING, GRANTS)**

In the initial materials that were shared with our committee, there were no individual faculty members' CVs. This was surprising to us, as we assumed that a review of this material would be an important part of the review process. We were grateful for the very efficient way in which the CVs were compiled and shared with us during our visit. We found reviewing the CVs to be a useful part of the assessment process.

The scholarly production associated with U of R's History Department is impressive. We heard this from the members of the University's senior management, and we noted it during our review of the faculty members' CV's. However, we also noted that the work involved in scholarly production and in engagement with funding opportunities was unevenly distributed across the members of the Department. In raw terms the Department's output is strong, but the credit for this strength lies predominantly in the hands of only a few of the faculty. While we recognise that altering the situation relating to funding is easier said than done, we encourage all faculty members to consider pursuing research grants. The History Department has a good reputation within the University for bringing in research funding. Expanding the number of grants held in the department should be a priority.

5. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES INITIATIVES

In our first meeting, the Vice President Research described the university, and especially the History Department, with the phrase "They are our best kept secret." He wanted to know how the administration could help the community, stakeholders, and more to see this. Our committee's response is, in part, that the university could learn from the History Department's quiet but successful, growing public engagement. It was not as clear that it is reaching stakeholders (depending on who is assumed to fall into that role), but the successful external relationships the department has developed appear to transcend political, social, and geographic divides in the province, so perhaps as the external engagements multiply more and more stakeholders will be reached as well.

We were able to meet with several of the Department's on- and off-campus partners. These partners have engaged history students in a variety of public history, community, and archival work. The courses and programmes are well described in the Department's report. We were very impressed with the range of partners the Department has and with the sorts of work history students have been able to do as part of their undergraduate programmes. The number and range of partnerships currently sustained by the programme is exceptional, even for larger universities with public history-oriented programmes. We also met with Lynn Gidluck, who is developing the Arts Internship programme and working with the History Department on their endeavours.

The partners we spoke with were universally enthusiastic about their relationship with the Department and with the students they have had working with them. One of the partners described how they and their organisation were "so delighted" with the partnership, which they saw as a "huge opportunity" for the organisation and the students. Another pointed out that the "faculty are very supportive and very encouraging" of both the partnerships and the students involved. The History Department, and particularly the chair of the Department, have put a great deal of work into building this work-experience programme and in fostering these relationships, and all of the partners spoke very highly of the department as a whole and the chair in particular.

It appears that History has moved further and faster into finding, offering, and promoting internships for its undergraduate students than many, if not all, other departments in the Faculty of Arts. If it can be done without jeopardising what the Department has been able to do so far, the Faculty of Arts and the University may want to work with the Department to help develop similar internship opportunities for other departments and for even more students.

At this time, all of the work the students do is volunteer and for credit. Two of the partners have used Canada Works grants in the past to hire students who have gone through the courses. In the long run, the university and the partners have to address the ethics of unpaid student labour, even if it is for credit. This is an ethical problem that is being faced by

institutions across the country. The solution cannot be to shut the programme down or limit partnerships. Rather, it must be in helping to find sources of funding that can sustain paid work by students. For example, if there are ways to use MITACS grants, SSHRC Connection Grants, and other funding opportunities to expand paid opportunities for students and partners, then faculty and university support in developing those sorts of opportunities should be made available. Undertaking development of this sort, however, will take time and effort. Considering how important the personal relationships between faculty and the partners have been so far, it would be unwise to shift partnership management away from the History Department. But some support, perhaps through providing funds for hiring a public historian in the Department, will be necessary to grow the range of partnerships and develop the possibility for funding students and partners.

6. **TEACHING**

We met with students four times: we met with groups of current undergraduate (honours) and graduate students, (relatively) recent alumni, and the president of the History Club. We also discussed teaching with all of the instructors we met, with the external partners, and others. The self-study report devotes a great deal of space to describing the programmes and we will avoid repeating the accurate information from the report. Rather, we will draw attention to key parts of what we heard and offer some suggestions for undergraduate and graduate teaching, the history club, and more generally on pedagogy.

I. **Pedagogy**

The review committee found that in general the members of the Department are enthusiastic about their teaching and very willing to be creative and adaptable in their pedagogy. We noted that there is plenty of evidence of thoughtful, innovative course construction in the History Department. Several faculty members became more animated, more excited, when offered the chance to discuss the innovations in their own classes with us. They often seemed aware that their colleagues were doing interesting things too—but they seldom knew the details. We would encourage the faculty to engage in more discussions, and perhaps workshopping, within the unit about pedagogical work. You are doing great things in the classroom, and talking with each other about those great things will help. The university is now offering money through the Centre for Teaching & Learning to sponsor innovative teaching development. Sharing within the department may also provide an opportunity to collaborate on innovations that can bring money into the department. That money in turn can help sponsor your students at both the honours and graduate levels in the short term, and help to build up more interest in History's course offerings in the medium and long term.

II. **Undergraduate Programme**

The undergraduate students (current and alumni) we met were happy to be history students. The students emphasised that there was a community among the students, and that they felt they were a part of a community shared between instructors and students. One alumnus described how they felt supported and welcomed as they entered the programme, both in the classroom and through departmental events like lectures. Another alumnus commented that even several years after graduating, the “faculty remain a great resource and are still in touch.” A third alumnus told us that the “professors were really supportive and you could approach anyone with a question

and they'd give you some insight, even when you were asking about things outside their own area." They all spoke very positively about all of their instructors: One described the History professors and classes as "Really fun; really informative; really friendly." Another "enjoys the enthusiastic professors, [who are] enthusiastic about their subject & their teaching." Some of the students we spoke with, current and alumni, had taken part in the internships and found them excellent. One, assigned to the archives, explained how that opportunity opened up the possibilities for professional fields in history and historical work. The alumni drew attention to how some of the professors in particular would relate the skills learned in doing history classes to future work in and outside of history.

The current students we spoke to one of the strengths of the programme is the variety of options available to complete the honours stream. The committee agrees. The three different streams offered to complete the honours degree allows students to complete an honours degree in ways that best suit their personal circumstances and their own abilities. It also seems that by having the different streams the Department is able to take on more honours students without adding significantly more work for professors as supervisory responsibilities vary between the streams

The students do have several concerns, and these echo concerns raised by faculty members. We came to the Department with similar concerns based on our reading of the self-study as well. All of the concerns ultimately relate to the size of the Department.

1. Breadth and variety of course offerings

Several students identified that the range of courses offered was limited. For example, one student noted how the Canadian history offerings did not include western-Canadian, French-Canadian, or Indigenous courses. Another student suggested that new courses in other areas might help to draw more students into the honours programme, and more students into the classes that are offered. One student asked if (more) FNU courses could be offered in the Department or counted as History courses. Along similar lines, a student asked if it could be made possible to apply courses from other departments to meet History- programme requirements (for example by applying one of the courses in Asian or Chinese politics to meet the Asian history requirement for the major or honours degree). Expanding options in this way can generate problems, of course: it might result in fewer students taking upper-level History classes, and it fails to recognise the disciplinary differences that remain important in how humanities and social science scholars conceptualise their subjects. Finally, students noted, as did the committee, that the lack of racial and cultural diversity in the faculty who teach in the History Department also limits the variety of course experiences that are open to History students. It is clear that members of the History Department are keenly aware of this limitation, and that they are concerned about the obvious significance of this for the programme. The only way that this can be remedied is through a diversification of teaching faculty over time.

The undergraduate programme currently has remarkable breadth requirements for majors. However, there may be difficulty in ensuring courses in all of the required areas remain available even in the relatively short term. Changing degree requirements take time to come into effect. The department should consider acting now to adjust its requirements. Maintaining a breadth of requirements is important for the discipline, but those requirements can be conceptualised in general terms (hemispheres, before and after 1500 CE or

1789 CE). Although the breadth requirements in History at the U of R are similar to those found in other Canadian history departments, breadth requirements here and elsewhere are often significantly more onerous than requirements in other disciplines in the Humanities, Social Sciences, or Natural Sciences. It may be that by loosening the breadth requirements, the department will also make it easier for students to begin majors or to transfer into majors late in their undergrad degrees.

2. Availability of upper-level courses

The students were concerned that there were few courses offered at the third or fourth-year level, which limited their choices. Both students and faculty drew attention to the experience of having some of those few upper-level courses scheduled and advertised only to be cancelled at the last minute. This further limits the options available and tended to heighten students' irritation. One of the students wondered if some of the current 200 level courses could be moved to the 300 level, to increase the options for 300 level courses and to encourage more students to take upper-level courses. We thought we would note this, although we do understand that class sizes are also, always, a factor in determining decisions about how many courses might be offered at which level. A related concern that was voiced by students was the fact that scheduling can sometimes be a problem. More than one of the students that we spoke with suggested that a greater spread of times at which courses might be taken would be helpful.

3. Size of programme

The honours students are divided on whether or not the honours programme cohort is large enough. One student opined, "I like a small programme, you're not competing for your professors' time." Another suggested that doubling to 8-10 students could be good: "not super big, but big enough to provide a greater group feeling," and would be "really helpful to keep courses going." The same student did stress, however, that an honours group of 4 to 5 is good too. Faculty members had similar thoughts: they too wanted to see the programme grow, but they worried about the time commitments even more students would impose. Again, the three streams help in this regard.

The committee would like to see the honours programme grow. Alas, we do not have any simple suggestions as to how to do that, except through further promotion of what the Department already does. Using alumni in both history-related and unrelated fields might help change the minds of students (and parents) who think History is a dead end. The UofR has a number of alumni who could be effective stars in such a campaign. Nevertheless, any growth has to be managed with available instructor and supervisory capacity. Growth that cannot be sustained by the faculty would be problematic.

The honours programme is sustainable at its current size. The committee thinks it should be kept up even if it does not grow. We commend the Department for what it has managed to do with a small programme—no student regretted their decision to take the programme, and it is clearly successful in producing alumni well prepared for a wide range of future study and work.

As the Faculty of Arts drifts toward doing more and more service teaching, the pressures on the History department to change its teaching profile will intensify. Capitalising on and promoting the History minor as a way to keep non-Arts students taking History courses, and taking courses at the third

and fourth-year level may be one way to maintain the full programme in the face of the service teaching drift. There is an audience outside of Arts majors for History and history classes. The Department has alumni and current students and supporters who could be involved in promoting the programme to non-Arts students. Having more engineering students for example who take one fourth-year class will help the department to offer more fourth-year classes in total, and thus widen the variety of fourth year-classes offered in any one year.

III. Graduate Programme

The Review Committee was told on multiple occasions that “we can’t do more at the grad level” without more faculty. At the same time, we were told that “The Honours and Graduate programmes are vitally important to the department community’s sense of who it is.” These are familiar sentiments, and the general orientation of the Department to this set of issues seems, in our opinion, to be appropriate. Even so, the communicated ideas about the development of a coursework MA and an Applied MA built on course work and internship projects are exciting, and we would encourage the Department to continue exploring these possibilities as a means of expanding the graduate programme.

Graduate students are largely funded through Graduate Studies and not grants. This is not unusual for a department of this size in Arts. But more grant funding would provide different and more opportunities for graduate students. Moreover, much of the History graduate teaching is done as overload work which taxes departmental human resources. By finding funding opportunities for grad students through research grants or work/innovation grants like MITACS there may be the potential for Research support for teaching, and in developing internships there may be opportunities for students’ learning experiences that will require less time investment from History faculty. We recommend exploring these opportunities, with the caveat that undertaking applications for funding and managing alternative learning experiences can take significant amounts of time, too, and that this is especially the case in the early stages of the development of new opportunities. We recognise that the department members cannot do a whole-hearted shift in this direction on their own. There appears to be space to work with the Faculty of Graduate Studies and the Office of Research Services to build the capacity to maintain the current programme, to develop new opportunities for students within the current framework, or to help grow graduate programming in size. We would encourage the Department to lean on these extra-departmental resources for this support.

Graduate students generally indicated that they liked the opportunity to TA, but would appreciate more funding opportunities, especially scholarships or funding that would better enable their own research.

The graduate students we met with were pleased with the University of Regina History experience. Again and again we heard that the History professors are “exceptional.” On the question of graduate programme size, we heard from students that the relatively small cohort allowed for a strong community feeling within the student body, and that “the profs really make a point of getting to know us.” One student noted that going into the programme they were concerned that the community might be too small, and that making friends would be hard. Instead, the student noted that they had had a very good cohort experience and that the “personal attention” received from faculty was much appreciated.

Two of the graduate students we spoke with had undergraduate backgrounds that were not history focussed. In both cases, the students had reached out to individual faculty members who encouraged them to apply and helped them to get in. One noted that the grad course, 900, “was excellent; it brought us up to speed and was really supportive.” One of the current students is also a mature student, coming back after several years of teaching.

IV. **Students’ History Society**

We met Matthew Alexander, president of the Students’ History Society. Mr. Alexander was perhaps the most enthusiastic of all of the students we met. We found it notable that he is not a History major; but a graduate student in Mathematics. He reached out to the Department out of interest, and was rewarded with a welcoming faculty and student body. He is “absolutely motivated” to build the SHS, and he knows it is “going to require people at all levels to work together.” He noted that he is invested in the HSH because of the community the Department has built at all levels. Again, this is *exceptional*. There is an appetite for history, and this is a department perhaps more attuned than many to the draw that is associated with a warm welcome. It can do things to encourage even more engagement; but it needs new people, more people to help sustain the community and keep more engaged students in its classrooms and in its programmes.

7. **SERVICE IN THE DEPARTMENT, FACULTY, AND UNIVERSITY**

The Department members have done and continue to do a significant amount of university and faculty-level service and they serve in an impressive number of administrative positions. In our first meeting, Dr. Dea emphasised to us that the History Department members “punch well above their weight” in service, serving on a variety of University and Faculty of Arts committees. We also heard this opinion conveyed by other members of the senior administration who identified administrative service as disproportionate to the size of the unit. We appreciated the recognition that the Department receives on this front. We would encourage the Department to try to find ways to ensure that this work does not make it difficult to perform the other forms of work that are essential to the health of the Department.

8. **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

As we summarize our recommendations, we feel it is important to reiterate that we were very impressed by the work that has been performed by the History Department at the University of Regina. The faculty members, individually and collectively, are clearly passionate about their work and about the health of their academic unit. We feel that it is important that our recommendations should be considered with this highly positive impression in mind.

1. The Faculty of Arts and the University should make maintaining the History Department at its current level over the long term a priority.
2. We recommend that the Department of History engage in some future planning regarding human resources, identifying areas where new hires would be necessary or advisable to maintain its current offering and to address changing expectations and needs of students seeking history classes.

3. The Department of History, the Faculty of Arts, affiliated colleges, and the University of Regina should strive to continue to retain the department's current sessional instructors, who bring important experience, insight, and diversity to the programme.
4. We encourage the Department, on its own and in conjunction with the Faculty of Arts (and where appropriate, central administration and the federated colleges' administration) to develop appropriate, tangible, methods to recognise the additional teaching and supervision work done by faculty members. At other universities, for example, supervisors of Honours and MA students receive one course release after every three completed programmes of study. Alternatively, supervision work might be rewarded by scholarships to support the work of future Honours or MA students.
5. We encourage the Department to more explicitly recognise what it is already doing in terms of teaching about the history of Indigenous peoples, the history of colonization, and the long-term significance of that history.
6. We encourage the members of the Department as a whole and with the participation of FNU and Prof. Stonechild to plan for further engagement with the calls to action and the principle of reconciliation in the history curriculum at the U of R.
7. The Department of History and First Nations University should work together to identify for students those courses currently offered that address the histories of Indigenous Peoples and that can apply to undergraduate History major, minor, and MA requirements.
8. The Department of History should work with the First Nations University and the University of Regina to ensure the long-term provision of courses on the histories of Indigenous Peoples and supervision of Honours and MA research on such topics at both FNU and U of R.
9. Concerns relating to equity, diversity, and inclusion, both in terms of human resources issues and in terms of curriculum development, need to be addressed. We encourage the Department to continue to make this as an important part of its strategic thinking.
10. We recommend the department to make it a priority to expand the number of grants held in the department at any one time.
11. We encourage the department's instructors to engage in more discussions (including perhaps workshops) about the very good pedagogical work that is being done in the Department.
12. We encourage the department to keep considering ways to expand the number and variety of upper-level courses.
13. We recommend that the department consider loosening the breadth requirements for majors and honours to make obtaining a History degree easier for undergraduate students and to prepare for future changes in the department's instructor complement.
14. The committee believes that the honours programme is sustainable at its current size, however we encourage the Department, with the support of the Faculty of Arts and the University to develop strategies to promote the programme so that it can grow.

15. We support the Department's plans for developing a coursework-based MA and an Applied MA built on course work and internship projects.
16. We recommend the Department, with the assistance of the Faculty of Arts, and, where appropriate, the University and Federated Colleges, attempt to expand the range of partnerships.
17. We recommend the Department and its partners, with the assistance of the Faculty of Arts and the Vice President of Research's office p explore new and further possibilities for funding students who work with partners
18. We recommend the Faculty, the Vice President of Research, and others where appropriate, commit grant-development and administrative support to maintaining and expanding partnerships and in helping to secure external funding to sustain student engagement in the internships.
19. If it can be done without jeopardising what the Department has been able to do so far, the Faculty of Arts, the University and the Department of History could consider assisting other departments in developing similar internship opportunities for even more students.
20. We commend the Department's practice of accepting graduate students who do not have History undergraduate degrees into its MA programme. We encourage the department to continue to do so, and to publicise its openness to students from diverse undergraduate backgrounds
21. Recognition and appreciation of History faculty's engagement with service work within the broader University of Regina community needs to be developed. Internally, the Department may want to consider discussing ways to limit the service members do, perhaps by setting departmental expectations for the total amount of service, and having individuals consult to see if the Department's service capacity has been reached for the semester/academic year.