# Major Modification to Program Form

**Program Title**
English Specialist (ASSPE 1645), English Major (ASMAJ 1645)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Associated with (Division)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Associated with (Unit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of English</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective Date**
March 1, 2018

## Program Information
*(Provide the proposed text as it will appear in the Calendar.)*

### Current Calendar Copy

#### English Specialist

**Enrolment Requirements:**
Enrolment in the English Specialist program requires a final grade of at least 73% in ENG110Y1, ENG140Y1, or ENG150Y1. Students applying to enrol in the Specialist after second year require a final grade of at least 77% in 2.0 ENG 200-series FCE. Students are responsible for completing all the requirements of an English program from the Calendar of the year in which they enrolled in the program.

**Completion Requirements:**
Ten FCE (including at least 7.0 ENG FCE) from the courses listed below, including 3.0 300+series FCE and 1.0 400-series ENG FCE.

Only 1.0 100-series ENG FCE may be counted. ENG100H1 may not be counted.

Courses must fulfill the following requirements:
1. At least 1.0 FCE from Group 1 (Theory, Language, Methods)
2. At least 1.0 FCE from Group 2 (Canadian and Indigenous North American Literatures)
3. At least 1.0 FCE from Group 3 (American and Transnational Literatures)
4. At least 3.0 FCE from Group 4 (British Literature to the 19th Century)
5. At least 1.5 FCE from Group 5 (Literature since the 18th Century)
6. ENG287H1; if not, STA201H1 Why Numbers Matter, or 0.5 FCE in any other BR=5 course

#### English Major

**Completion Requirements**

Seven FCE (including at least 5.0 ENG FCE) from the courses listed below, including 1.5 300+series FCE and 0.5 400-level ENG FCE.

Only 1.0 100-series ENG FCE may be counted. ENG100H1 may not be counted.

Courses must fulfill the following requirements:
1. At least 0.5 FCE from Group 1 (Theory, Language, Methods)
2. At least 1.0 FCE from Group 2 (Canadian and Indigenous North American Literatures)
3. At least 1.0 FCE from Group 3 (American and Transnational Literatures)
4. At least 2.0 FCE from Group 4 (British Literature to the 19th Century)
5. At least 1.0 FCE from Group 5 (Literature since the 18th Century)
6. ENG287H1; if not, STA201H1 Why Numbers Matter, or 0.5 FCE in any other BR=5 course
English Specialist

Enrolment Requirements:

Enrolment in the English Specialist program requires a final grade of at least 73% in ENG110Y1, ENG140Y1, or ENG150Y1; or a final grade of at least 73% in 2.0 ENG 200-series FCE. Students are responsible for completing all the requirements of an English program from the Calendar of the year in which they enrolled in the program.

Completion Requirements:

10.0 ENG FCE, including 3.0 300+series ENG FCE and 1.0 400-series ENG FCE.

Only 1.0 100-series ENG FCE may be counted. We do not accept ENG100H1, ENG102H1, or any CR/NCR courses toward our programs.

Courses must fulfill the following requirements:

1. ENG202H1, ENG203H1, ENG250H1, ENG252H1
2. 0.5 ENG FCE Indigenous, Postcolonial, Transnational Literatures
3. 2.0 ENG FCE Pre-1800 British Literature
4. 0.5 ENG FCE Theory, Language, Critical Methods
5. ENG287H1; if not, 0.5 FCE in any BR=5 course

English Major

Completion Requirements:

7.0 ENG FCE, including 1.5 300+series ENG FCE and 0.5 400-level ENG FCE.

Only 1.0 100-series ENG FCE may be counted. We do not accept ENG100H1, ENG102H1, or any CR/NCR courses toward our programs.

Courses must fulfill the following requirements:

1. ENG202H1, ENG203H1, ENG250H1, ENG252H1
2. 0.5 ENG FCE Indigenous, Postcolonial, Transnational Literatures
3. 1.0 ENG FCE Pre-1800 British Literature
4. 0.5 ENG FCE Theory, Language, Critical Methods
5. ENG287H1; if not, 0.5 FCE in any BR=5 course

Proposal Questions - General

Brief Description of the Proposed Changes (Provide a brief summary.)

On October 4, 2017, after a two-year curriculum review process, the Department of English voted in a revised curriculum, for implementation in 2018-19. This revised curriculum is meant, on the one hand, to give students more flexibility in their movement through the program and faculty more flexibility in the kinds of courses they teach; and, on the other, to ensure that all Specialists and Majors have some grounding in the four major national-historical fields that comprise literatures in English: British literature before 1700; British literature since 1700; Canadian literature; and American literature. The revised curriculum also introduces a requirement that all Specialists and
Majors take at least one course in indigenous and/or post-colonial literatures. This requirement is consistent both with the state of the field of literary studies and the University’s commitment to supporting diversity.

**Details of the Proposed Changes** *(Changes to program description, requirements, and program learning outcomes.)*

Here are the key features of the curriculum revision:

* Introduce required 200-level H national/historical “gateway” courses:
  - ENG202H1 Intro Brit Lit 1
  - ENG203H1 Intro Brit Lit 2
  - ENG250H1 Intro American Lit
  - ENG252H1 Intro Canadian Lit

* Introduce Indigenous/Postcolonial literatures requirement for all Specialists and Majors

* Introduce three new courses (not required):
  - ENG102H1 Literature and the Sciences (for non-program students – BR1)
  - ENG281H1 Writing About Literature
  - ENG289H1 Introduction to Creative Writing

* Introduce 300-level H “Topics” courses

* Ungroup 400-level courses and emphasize participation/oral-presentation component so that they are more of a true capstone experience.

We also voted to lower the Specialist entrance requirement from 77 in 2.0 200-level to 73 in 2.0 200-level.

There are no changes to the Minor program (4.0, including at least 1.0 300+ series). All current requirements for minimum FCE in 300-series and 400-series courses will remain the same for Specialist and Major.

**Rationale** *(Explain why the changes have been proposed, providing any additional information that may be helpful for review, or of relevance for Curriculum Committees. This may include connections to the unit’s priorities, recent reviews or institutional planning, or alignment with other programs.)*

The current English program has many requirements and is comparatively difficult for students to navigate. The proposed modifications introduce more flexibility: where current Specialists have 2.0/10.0 available for electives (i.e. courses beyond those that satisfy our various grouped requirements) and current majors 1.0/7.0, Specialists under the revised program will have 4.5/10.0 and Majors will have 2.5/7.0. We currently have five groups of required courses, in each of which students must take a minimum of 1.0. In the revised curriculum, there are four particular courses required of all students, plus three groups of required courses between all of which Specialists must take no more than 3.0 and Majors no more than 2.0.

The requirements-structure of the revised program is also somewhat simpler and more meaningful. In order to make sure that all students in upper-level courses, especially 400-level courses, have adequate grounding in the discipline, we are introducing four required 200-level H courses that cover the four major national-historical fields that comprise literatures in English: British literature before 1800; British literature since 1800; Canadian literature; and American literature. While students are not required to take these courses in their second year (they will be pre-requisites for entry into 400-level courses), we expect that most will, and so the courses will serve a cohort-building purpose.

English enrolments have been declining steadily for five years. Some elements of the proposed program modification are meant to attract new and more students to the program: ENG102H1 Literature and the Sciences is primarily intended to serve as a humanities breadth requirement for students in the sciences (we imagine capping it somewhere around 100 the first time we offer it, and will be willing to increase that cap if it becomes a popular course), but it may also serve as a gateway to the program for science students who decide they want to pursue a different path. ENG289H1 Introduction to Creative Writing will respond to very high demand, especially from students entering the program from high school, for creative writing courses (currently we offer only one, at the 300-level, which is capped at 20 and requires a portfolio and application for admission). Of course, program modifications alone cannot stop or reverse enrolment trends that are partly a result of larger institutional and cultural pressures on the humanities in general. While some of the modifications were created with an eye toward recruiting new students into the program, their primary purpose, on the whole, is to maximize the value of the program to those students...
who enrol in it.

**Impact** *(Specify the impact the changes will have on students, and on other units/programs. If courses listed in the program are offered by other units, include a letter of support from the head of that unit, speaking to enrolment controls and priority enrolment, if applicable.)*

We do not foresee any major impact on students in the revised curriculum, and certainly no negative impact. Most of the courses we currently have on the books will remain on the books; with one exception (ENG203H) the new required courses are H versions of already-existing Y courses, which will make dovetailing the two programs relatively easy in those cases where it is necessary. The increased number of electives available to students plus the 300-level Topics courses mean more flexibility for both students—in terms of the kinds of courses they can take—and faculty—in terms of the kinds of courses they can teach. There will undoubtedly be some early logistical challenges in figuring out how many sections of the required 200-level courses it will be necessary to offer, and what the enrollment caps should be, but this will be a problem for the Associate Chair, not students, to worry about.

**Consultation** *(Describe consultation that has already been done with students, faculty, and other units.)*

The proposed modifications have been arrived at after two years of careful deliberations with faculty and students. Discussions about curriculum revision, initially taking shape around faculty concerns about student performance in 400-level courses, began in the summer of 2015. In the 2015 academic year the department’s Calendar & Curriculum committee discussed a range of curriculum-revision possibilities; a Department meeting in April 2016 was devoted to a wide-ranging discussion of curricular issues. At a meeting in October 2016 the Department discussed an early draft of curriculum revision proposals which I, in consultation with the Calendar & Curriculum committee, had constructed over the summer; a more refined draft of these proposals (constructed, again, in consultation with C &C ) was presented for departmental discussion at a meeting in March of 2017. Between April and June of 2017, I sent individual emails to every permanent faculty member, CLTA, and SL3 in the department soliciting feedback on the revision proposal as a whole and on individual elements pertaining to the faculty member’s teaching area. Alongside all of this formal consultation I have, of course, had a great many informal conversations with colleagues about the current and future curriculum. The proposal we voted on earlier this month was thoroughly a product of Department-wide conversation and collaboration.

Student consultation has been an important part of the process as well. In my first term as Associate Chair I began holding an annual informational event for new program students, and that has provided the opportunity to hear what students think about the program (excellent teachers, too many requirements) and what they hope to get out of it (an engagement, both broad and deep, with the most significant areas and figures of English literature). This event is hosted in conjunction with the English Students’ Union, whose co-presidents sit in an advisory capacity on the Department’s Calendar & Curriculum committee, and who have been invaluable in helping to shape the curriculum revision proposals every step of the way. This fall, I held an informational event, advertised through both the ESU and the Department program-students list-serv, about the proposed curriculum revisions. This event was attended by members of the ESU executive plus a small group of students from all years in the program. I presented the students with two potential versions of the revised curriculum, both containing the new 200-level requirements, one with more elective freedom (that is, the version the Department ultimately voted in), and one with slightly less. The students were unanimous in their preference for a program with more elective freedom; they also felt that the addition of 200-level national-historical requirements would be a good way to introduce students into the program.

I have spoken about relevant curricular changes with faculty and administrators at Victoria College, in Sexual Diversity Studies, at the Centre for Indigenous Studies, and the Centre for Medieval Studies. I have accommodated various small requests (e.g. Vic did not want us to retitle a course “Introduction to Literary Studies,” which might imply a direct link between our program and the Vic Literary Studies Program), and have not had anyone express any concern about the effect our curriculum changes might have on courses or programs with which we share students.

**Diversity** *(How does the proposed program or modification support diversity? E.g through curriculum design supporting different learners, accommodation, etc.)*
In our current curriculum, there is a requirements-group called “Canadian and Indigenous Literatures” and one called “American and Transnational Literatures”; the latter also incorporates courses that cover “Postcolonial” material. In the revised curriculum, we have separated “Indigenous” and “Transnational” from the national categories and created a new requirement, where every Specialist and Major must take at least .5 in Indigenous, Postcolonial, or Transnational literatures. This new requirement is consistent with the call to action in the University’s Truth and Reconciliation Steering committee report, with the University’s overall commitment to supporting diversity, and, perhaps most importantly, with the current state of the field of literary studies, where the ability to engage discursively with Indigenous, postcolonial, and transnational literatures and literary traditions is really essential.

In an ideal world we might have not only uncoupled Indigenous from Canadian and Transnational (and Postcolonial) from American, but also resisted coupling Indigenous with Postcolonial, and perhaps created two separate requirements. The staffing/enrolment burden, however, especially for Indigenous (where we only have one permanent faculty member) would be too great.

**Resource Implications** *(Provide a statement of the resource requirements for the program, and an indication of whether you can meet these requirements through your existing resources, or have received additional resources from the Dean.)*

The proposed curriculum revision will change the way we make use of our faculty resources, but it will certainly not strain them. English is a large department, with between 40 and 50 permanent faculty on staff to teach each year plus about half a dozen sessional instructors. The biggest change that will confront teaching staff (and the Associate Chair) is the necessity to teach the required “gateway” courses; the responsibility of faculty to take on these courses was thoroughly discussed during the review process, and before the vote; it will fall to the Associate Chair to assign courses in a way that meets programming needs and that distributes the new staffing responsibilities equitably.

It must be acknowledged that we do have comparatively few faculty available to teach courses that satisfy the new Indigenous, Postcolonial, or Transnational Literatures requirement. In the near term, this may mean slightly disproportionately higher enrollments for some courses—offset, to some degree, by higher TA allocations. Some of the enrolment burden of these courses might also be displaced onto cross-listed courses. Departmental hiring priorities and plans are currently focused on the areas covered by this requirement, which means that resources and programming needs should come to a more balanced place within the next 2-3 years.

Finally, English has a very high contractual obligation to graduate student TAs (in the neighborhood of 17,000 – 19,000 hours per year at UTSG), which our decreasing enrolments have required us to address with increasing creativity. The revised curriculum, with its large gateway courses as well as its recruitment-oriented courses (e.g. ENG102H, ENG289H) will allow us to make somewhat more efficient use of our abundant TA resources.

**Faculty and TA Support**

The needs of the revised curriculum can be met with existing Faculty and TA resources (see Resource Implications above).

**Arts & Science - Divisional Data:** *For further definition of these objectives, see the Degree Objectives Guidelines (July 2008).*

**Academic Context** *(Outline the context that explains why the program is designed this way, e.g. relation of program to discipline, students’ interests, career paths, etc.)*

The Department of English faculty at the University of Toronto is literally second to none in the diverse range of courses it offers and the high level of instruction it provides. Student evaluations are almost universally high: instructors in the department are praised for their enthusiasm, rigor, and genuine, obvious interest in what students get out of their courses. There are, nevertheless, two common complaints, one on the part of the students and the other on the part of faculty: students complain that our programs require them to fulfill too many requirements; faculty complain that students in upper-year (i.e. 3rd and 4th year) courses cannot reliably be expected to have any familiarity with the material being taught—however strong the students might prove themselves to be in a given course, instructors generally feel like each course must start from scratch. These two complaints are closely connected: because students have to fulfill requirements (at least 1.0 FCE each) from five different groups, but are not required to take any particular course or courses, their approach to course scheduling is, from the beginning, rather ad hoc and logistical: there is no in-built structure to our current program which gives students some sense,
early on, of the various paths one might take through the vast field of English literary studies. In this respect, our program is notably different from that of almost every other comparable institution: in the course of conducting the curriculum review, we studied the English programs of two dozen other departments at public and private universities in Canada and the United States and determined that U of T’s is the only one to rely so extensively on grouped requirements and one of only two or three not to require program students to take one or more “gateway” courses. The Department of English is also rather different from its “cousin” departments at U of T: both History and Philosophy have gateway requirements, and neither relies very much on grouped requirements beyond those. The practical effects of moving to a more conventional curricular structure will be to directly address (if not completely eliminate) both of the complaints noted above: students now have to fulfill fewer requirements, and those that they have to fulfill more clearly articulate the desired learning outcomes of the program (see below); permanent faculty will now bear more direct responsibility for teaching courses at the introductory level which provide students with the preparation they need in order that both students and faculty can get the most out of upper-level courses.

Learning Outcomes (Explain how the change affects the program learning outcomes, including disciplinary goals, relevant methodologies and skills acquired upon program completion.)

The desired learning outcomes of the revised curriculum are essentially the same as the desired learning outcomes of the current curriculum: we want all Specialists and Majors, before their fourth year in the program, to: (1) have an understanding of some important texts and themes in British, Canadian, and American literatures; (2) to have a firm grounding in the “historical fields” of English literary studies, namely literature from periods before 1800; (3) to engage with critical literary theory or some other methodology (linguistic history, for example) that requires learning a comparatively technical vocabulary; and (4) to study literature written by Indigenous authors or by authors who write from a place (geographically, linguistically, and/or culturally) outside of the Anglo-North-American tradition. Because of the clearer sequencing and structure of the revised curriculum, we believe that we can now expect all Specialists and Majors to attain these learning outcomes. We can therefore, in the new curriculum, expect all Specialists and Majors, by their fourth year in the program, to be able to participate in high-level literary-critical discussion, and to share the results of their research or critical analysis with their peers. Finally, we can expect all program students (Minors as well as Majors and Specialists) to spend less time worrying about ticking the boxes of particular FCE requirements and, instead, to fill out the newly enlarged elective portion of their programs with a broad, curiosity-driven range of courses selected from the really amazing slate of options—national, historical, thematic, etc.—our faculty is able to offer.

Depth of Knowledge (Explain how particular courses allow students to achieve depth of knowledge, relating to the proposed change.)

The revised program is somewhat more precisely sequenced than our current program. All students are expected, before taking a course at the 400-level, to have completed all four of their 200-level “gateway” courses; instructors of 400-level courses can thus expect that all students have something like the same grounding in the major historical-national areas of the field of English literature.

Whereas our current curriculum has a lot of Y courses at the 200-level, and no sequencing, even of a rhetorical kind, from the 200 to the 300-level, the new curriculum recasts most (though not all) 200-level courses as Y “introductory” courses. At the 300-level, in-depth historical surveys are, for the most part, Y courses: so (for example) a student taking ENG363Y American Literature to 1900 can see clearly that it is a more intensive development of work begun in required ENG250H Introduction to American Literature. The 300-level also includes a number of courses that are not necessarily historical surveys, but rather structured around particular topics; these are, for the most part, H courses. I expect that, in the first few years of this curriculum’s unfolding, the new, variable 300-level “Topics” courses will become very popular with students and faculty alike. The 300-level will, then, allow students to build upon their introductory 200-level work in a variety of ways.

In order to distinguish 400-level courses (which have always been “topics” courses) from the new 300-level Topics courses, we are rebranding them more explicitly as “Advanced Studies Seminars” (one benefit of our currently lower
program enrolments is that these courses can have few enough students to be true seminars) and emphasizing the strong participation component. The program now has enough structure that we can reasonably expect students in 400-level courses to take an active part in the literary-critical conversation.

**Competencies: For these five categories, describe how each competency is developed within the program to the degree relevant to the area/discipline. If the program does not address a particular competency, explain why that competency is not relevant to your area/discipline and how students in your program are expected to attain that competency within their overall degree program.**

### Critical and Creative Thinking

Concerned as they are with the interpretation of literary texts that represent the real and imagined experiences of people (and peoples) from all over the globe and all different historical periods, all of our courses, in the current and the revised curriculum, help students to develop critical and creative thinking skills.

### Communication

Concerned as they are with the articulation and the exchange—in class discussion, in various genres of writing (essays, short writing exercises, creative responses, etc.), and in oral presentations—of ideas about works of literary art and the cultures that have produced them, all of our courses, in the current and the revised curriculum, help students to develop communication skills.

### Information Literacy

The revised curriculum puts slightly more emphasis than the current curriculum on students being literate, early in the program, in the three major national/historical fields that comprise literatures in English: British literature, American literature, and Canadian literature. The importance of this competency—both as something students attain and something the faculty delivers—is encoded by the new required 200-level gateway courses.

### Quantitative Reasoning

In the new, as in the current, program students can fulfill this competency by taking ENG287H The Digital Text or a BR=5 course in another department.

### Social and Ethical Responsibility

Concerned as they are with the interpretation of literary texts that engage with complex transhistorical and historically specific questions of personal and social identity, personal and political morality, etc., all of our courses, in the current and the revised curriculum ask students to confront issues of social and ethical responsibility. The Indigenous, Postcolonial, and Transnational Literatures requirement in the new curriculum will likely ask and allow students to confront these issues in ways that are particularly explicit as well as directly connected to pressing social concerns of our contemporary moment.

### Integrative, Inquiry-based Activity

All English courses, in the current and the revised curriculum, are inquiry based and involve some integration of discussion, research, and writing. The 300-level topics courses to be introduced in the revised curriculum provide, alongside the 400-level seminars, more opportunities for course-work to be integrated with faculty members’ current research interests.

---

### UTQAP Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development/consultation within unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Dean’s office (and VPAP)</td>
<td>November, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Office Sign-off</td>
<td>January 8, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>January 30, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts &amp; Science Council</td>
<td>February 14, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported to the Provost and included in annual report to AP&amp;P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Quality Council – reported annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>