

**Department of English and Cultural Studies  
University of British Columbia—Okanagan Campus  
Unit Review Report**

Submitted by

Patricia Badir, Professor and Head, Department of English, University of British Columbia  
Susan Hamilton, Professor of English and Associate Vice President Research, University of Alberta

Jacqueline Jenkins, Professor and Head, Department of English, University of Calgary

**Review Summary:**

We were greatly helped in our work by the self-study that was prepared by the Department, and wish to acknowledge the hard work and conscientiousness of all those who put it together. In the committee's view, the main strengths of the Department of English and Cultural Studies are a collegial working environment, a thriving culture of exciting research, innovative developments in teaching and pedagogy that position the department to participate fully and meaningfully in the new BA, and thoughtful leadership at both the department and decanal level. Despite its newness as a combined unit of English and Cultural Studies, we found that members of the department were actively seeking out ways to develop collaborations, invigorate course offerings, and provide meaningful and thoughtful educational experiences for the diverse group of students they teach. These strengths provide a foundation upon which to undertake a response to the challenges that are put forward in the committee's recommendations.

Our observations are organized around six themes:

1. Undergraduate Programming
2. MA Program and Graduate Studies
3. Research Culture
4. The relationship between English and Cultural Studies in the newly formed department
5. Service and Staffing
6. Community and Cohort

Each section concludes with a set of specific recommendations. In summary, however, our recommendations address these broad areas:

1. Strategic hiring to support the defined mission of the newly formed unit;
2. Growing and sustaining research culture;
3. Curriculum development and restructuring, and the Department's relationship to the new BA as well as to UBC's Strategic Plan;
4. Department administration, specifically the roles of the program coordinators and program-specific committees;
5. The MA in English;
6. ECS identity and distinctiveness;
7. Fostering collegiality and creating community.

## **Section 1: Undergraduate Programming BA/ Honours**

### **Curriculum Issues**

The department has a clear strength in Rhetoric and Composition and the committee commends the work currently being done on first- and second-year programming in response to the communications requirements of the new BA. We are particularly impressed with the programming developed for multilingual students and for indigenous students.

However, we are also concerned that the pressure created by the new BA program is driving the department to focus primarily on its service offerings at the expense of its core programming in literature and cultural studies. We recommend that the department re-visit current offerings in order to align them with the new degree program. There is some urgency here – if the department is not proactive in asserting its contribution to all parts of the new degree, it will not attract new majors and might find itself turned into a service department more responsible for “communication” than for literature and cultural studies.

Specifically, we recommend that the department look closely at the distribution requirements of the new BA (Critical Thinking, Indigenous Content; Digital Literacy; Power, Diversity, and Cultures; and Sustainability) and consider the following:

- Which courses in your current offerings respond to the criteria proposed by the new BA? We agree with your self-study: the department, even as it currently stands, is extremely well equipped to play a central role in the roll-out of the new degree – particularly given the emphasis directed to “Critical Thinking”
- What kinds of new courses could the current faculty complement develop in response to the criteria proposed by the new BA? We know that most faculty are already folding questions of diversity, power, sustainability into their courses but highlighting this, either through new course titles or by means of on-line resources, would be helpful.

The calendar list of courses potentially offered by the department is long and unwieldy and likely reflects many generations of curriculum redevelopment and design. We recommend some housekeeping: the elimination of courses no longer regularly taught; the consolidation of courses in the historical areas; the renumbering and reordering of courses to reflect a coherent curriculum with particular areas of concentration and expertise. This kind of work can help with recruitment.

It was brought to our attention that while the department has a consultative program committee (or possibly committees) most of the administrative work falls on the program coordinators. The coordinators need working program committees to attend to matters of curriculum design and, crucially, recruitment strategy. The department’s self-study recognizes just how important recruitment is becoming but it is clear to us that the responsibility for this cannot fall on the head and the coordinators alone. This must be a department-wide initiative supported by staff. We recommend the constitution of a joint program committee with significant representation from Literature and Cultural Studies and the creation of sub-committees for curriculum design and recruitment

The student with whom we spoke made note of the excellent quality of teaching in the department. It was also apparent to us that this unit is filled with faculty who work hard and who teach their areas of expertise with rigor and commitment. That said, we think that the program is somehow less than the sum of its parts and that it could benefit from some high-level thinking and some blue-sky planning. We recommend that the department develop program-level learning outcomes that are commensurate with the principals structuring the new BA as well as the UBC Strategic Plan.

The committee finds the 9-credit second-year requirement in the BA to be more rigid than most BA programs these days. We think this may be a roadblock to the major. We recommend that these requirements be reduced to 6 or even 3 credits.

We understand that it can be difficult to acquire required courses because they are not offered every year. Here again, we recommend a reconsideration of the requirements for the program. It might be more feasible to require fewer *specific* courses of honors students, though honors students would still be required to take more courses than majors. We also recommend a capstone seminar for honors students; this recommendation is addressed again in a slightly different context in Section 6: Community and Cohort.

### **Recommendations:**

1. re-visit current course offerings in order to align them with the new degree program
2. reorganize and rationalize the calendar entries for all programs
3. constitute a joint program committee with significant representation from Literature and Cultural Studies and create sub-committees for curriculum design and recruitment
4. develop program-level learning outcomes for English Literature and Cultural Studies that are commensurate with the principals structuring the new BA as well as the UBC Strategic Plan
5. reduce required credits in second year for majors and honors students
6. reduce the specific course requirements for the honors program
7. develop a capstone seminar for honors students

### **Hiring:**

It is clear to us that even though enrollments are low (a reality faced by all humanities departments the world over), this department needs to make strategic hires in both the research stream and in educational leadership if it is to become responsive to the needs and the goals of UBC and of the new BA. Faculty renewal is also a key component to recruitment. UBC is about to embark on a period of “Academic Renewal” and UBC-O will be able to leverage UBC resources to make key hires on the Okanagan Campus. We have learned that the department is not well served by contract faculty because it is difficult to recruit qualified instructors to the region with only the promise of short-term employment. It is also difficult to build a research culture (and thus to retain ambitious faculty) if colleagues can’t settle in. It should also be noted that the department is currently providing a lot of support to the Faculty by way of administrative secondment – this is having a significant effect on the department’s ability to cover its courses. This department needs to hire and we recommend that it do so in a manner responsive to the requirements of the new BA.

We did not hear a lot about the indigenization of the department's faculty and curriculum but we know that this work is happening to great effect and that it needs more support. The committee agrees with the self-study's assessment of the need to hire for English 104 and recommends that the Department seek support from the Faculty to hire an Educational Leadership instructor in Composition for Indigenous Learners.

While the question of the inclusivity and diversity of the department was raised by several members, we did not hear much about efforts to address these issues either on the level of the curriculum or with respect to hiring. We agree with the self-study's observation that that Cultural Studies program is particularly well positioned to be responsive to student demographics and should be grown in a manner consistent with UBC-O's particular student needs. We recommend that inclusivity and diversity, both of which are cornerstones of the new BA (as well as UBC's Strategic Plan), become priority issues with respect to hiring in both programs but we see Cultural Studies as providing unique opportunities in this respect.

We did hear a lot about exciting new directions in both digital humanities and the environmental humanities. These are clearly emerging strengths of the department and both are responsive to the pillars of the new BA. Newer faculty in these fields made it clear to us that they feel supported at UBC-O, but we still think they are a flight risk. The best way to retain faculty is to create context for their work. We recommend that the department continue to build strength in Environmental Humanities and Digital Humanities

The historical areas are well represented in the department but it is also the case that those who teach in pre-modern British Literature are feeling under threat. There is some justification for this feeling given that the word "history" doesn't figure anywhere in the language for the new BA. While it may not be possible for the department to continue to offer courses in all areas of historical study, we support hiring in these fields, recommending that future appointments bridge cultural studies and literary studies and take into consideration the requirements of the new BA (i.e. medieval/critical race studies; 18<sup>th</sup>C/ecocriticism; 19<sup>th</sup>C transnational/migrant literatures; early modern/gender and sexuality).

### **Recommendations:**

1. hire tenure-track faculty in a manner responsive to the requirements of the new BA
2. hire an Educational Leadership instructor in Composition for Indigenous Learners
3. make inclusivity and diversity, both of which are cornerstones of the new BA (as well as UBC' Strategic Plan), priority issues with respect to hiring
4. continue to build strength in Environmental Humanities and Digital Humanities
5. take requirements of new BA into consideration when hiring in historical areas

## **Section 2: MA Program and Graduate Studies**

Our review is focused on the ENGL MA, which began in 2007. We wish to note that members of the Department contribute to the administration, student supervision, and committee work in the IGS MA and PhD programs. In our view, the English MA has the potential to stimulate the Department's participation in graduate programming at UBC-O. Overall, the Department must assess how best to participate in UBC-O's overall movement towards a greater focus on graduate studies, especially at the doctoral level where external funding can accompany an increase in registrations. UBC-O envisions a tripling of graduate students on campus, so the Department must both ensure its participation in that large initiative and properly balance commitments to its own MA and the IGS themes at the MA and doctoral level.

Enrollment and graduation data shows that the English MA program is very small, with most years since 2014 seeing 3 or 4 registrants. The program is consistently unable to maintain sufficient numbers to run dedicated graduate courses. We did not have access to historical data on application numbers, offers, and rates of acceptance, and so are not able to advise on possible strategies for improvement in these areas. Brief descriptions for graduate courses offered indicate a program that is heavily focused on literary studies, though Cultural Studies and interdisciplinary offerings are proportionally allocated in theory. In practice, all non-mandatory courses are cross-listed with undergraduate offerings. There are also opportunities for studies in environmental approaches, Critical Animal Studies, and Critical Theory via these cross-listed courses.

The challenges raised by small numbers and a heavy reliance on cross-listed undergraduate courses are considerable. Most pressingly, a strong cohort experience for the students is dependent on individual professorial and student efforts rather than a feature of program design. The shared office space for graduate students assists in developing relationships and a sense of belonging, but also is not an integrated design component of the program, and so vulnerable to space pressures.

Faculty members' perspectives on the English MA program are split: for a substantial number, the program has had a long time to prove itself and has failed to do so. A smaller number see the success of placing graduating students in nationally competitive doctoral programs as evidence of a solid program that needs care and attention to flourish. For this latter group, the department's new themed English MA, Place and Promise, offers flexibility and legibility for the program, as well as an opportunity to further improve student success.

We understand that the new MA is under a three-year review. Prior to final review at the end of that period, we recommend that the department establish clear goals and measures for key improvements, if it has not already done so, including:

- Student success. Identify key measures: External funding? Recruitment to doctoral programs? Improved rates of completion? Improved time to completion?
- Increased application numbers
- Wider application pool
- Competitive rates of acceptance and registration

- Establish minimum student number to run distinct courses
- Establish key elements of cohort experience for students
- Expectations for graduate supervision, including loads and best practices
- Establish best practices for program administration

We spoke with only one graduate student, and so are unable to extrapolate a sense of the program's strengths and weaknesses from the students' point of view. Administrators indicated that improvements in communication around funding and teaching assistantship assignments and scheduling is needed.

Notably few faculty members spoke about graduate teaching or supervision in either the English MA or the IGS MA and PhD programs as a service and responsibility to graduate students, though some did express appreciation for the opportunity for intellectual stimulation and research endeavor that graduate programming offered them. Certainly, the existing IGS PhD (in which Department participation is relatively modest) is sufficient to meet student demand and to offer research stream faculty the opportunity to supervise and work with graduate students. There are insufficient resources to mount a separate doctoral program, and compelling evidence that the current provincial (and national) program offerings are more than adequate to meet demand.

It is unclear if there is a Departmental graduate committee. The Department needs a functioning graduate program committee to work alongside the program co-ordinator on all aspects of the program, from recruitment and admission to curriculum, including overseeing courses to ensure quality, consistency, and relevance to the theme, and overseeing the cross-listing of courses (currently invited by co-ordinator). We also recommend that the Department seek relevant training for program administrators to best ensure the transparent, efficient, and fair execution of such key tasks.

### **Recommendations:**

1. During 3-year review process, ensure that the MA is appropriately promoted and establish key measures and ways to meet them as outlined above.
2. Hire ONE research stream position to promote new focus/theme, if MA successfully completes its review.
3. The reviewers recommend *against* a PhD in the Department.
4. Seek appropriate training for grad program administrators.
5. Create a department level graduate committee to participate in key decisions, including admission to programs and oversight of graduate courses.

### **Section 3: Research Culture**

There are currently 26 FTE tenure/stream in ENGL/CULT ST, of which 17 in English and 2 FTE in Cultural Studies have research expectations. There is a strong record of publishing in the English research stream, with 7 monographs published or forthcoming since 2014. Presses include premier international presses (Oxford UP), leading national press (University of Toronto

Press) as well as strong international publishers (Manchester UP, Palgrave Macmillan, and Routledge) as well as good national presses (WLU Press). Editing activity in the Department is also lively and varied with 8 edited and co-edited volumes published or forthcoming since 2014.

This level of publication is comparable with a good national department, and speaks well of faculty members' commitment to UBCO's research mandate, though we note that research activity is somewhat unevenly distributed across individuals. Based on the CVs submitted (not all of which list conference and other research presentations), a relatively small number of faculty disseminate their research at international conferences and similar venues, and the department is encouraged to find ways to support faculty members' efforts to share their work internationally.

The department's record of SSHRC and other competitive grant funding is limited, with only 4 faculty holding external grants as sole researcher or PI. Faculty appreciate access to UBC internal grants (ie. Hampton) and have had good success in these competitions. We note that UBC-O as a whole tends to get represented as a department when entering the broader UBC research adjudications, and that this causes difficulties for faculty members recruiting internationally (eg. Killam Post Doctoral Fellows), and other instances when UBC-O departments undergo two layers of competitive scrutiny (at UBC-O and then again at UBCV) for national funding opportunities.

There is a sense that though research activity is good overall, departmental research culture is effectively non-existent. Certainly, the 2/2 teaching load for all research stream faculty leaves ample time for increased research activity, especially given the very small graduate supervision obligations undertaken by the Department overall. We heard about a lack of visibility for research in the Department, and recommend that research exchanges are organized so that this becomes a vibrant part of Department culture, and the unit's research is accessible to the broader UBC-O research community. Research exchanges (from brown bag lunch presentations to lecture series) can help to build a more collegial and supportive research culture in the Department. The Department might also consider working with other humanities and social sciences units to organise and promote talks and visits from distinguished scholars, perhaps focusing initially on scholars visiting the UBC Vancouver campus. This kind of scholarly exchange is especially vital to smaller, relatively isolated institutions such as UBC-O.

As the Department settles into its new organizational structure, it needs ways to better support the research mandate of its members, especially those who are pre-tenure. Mentorship hitherto has been haphazard and primarily a result of serendipitous individual relationships amongst faculty members, inside and outside of the Department. Pre-tenure faculty struggle without research mentorship, and new hires suffer without a sense of cohort and collegiality with other new faculty on campus. The organization of the Dean's Office, especially the establishment of an Associate Dean Research position and the creation of the Research Support (RSS) in the Humanities and Social Sciences, has meant that important strides in mentorship and support are happening. Nevertheless, it is evident that faculty members are overly reliant on the Dean's Office for research mentorship, and that career support happens exclusively at the Faculty level rather than in consort with unit level activities. Though some research mentorship is necessarily

better positioned at the Faculty level, it is vital that the Department establish working unit-level mentorship processes and relationships. Such mentoring can:

- Serve as sounding-boards for early/initial project ideas
- Advise on project design and development, including budget and public engagement/impact activities
- Discuss funding/grant options
- Give feedback on draft publications and publishing strategies
- Find/Ask other colleagues with relevant knowledge to give feedback on draft grant applications
- Help researchers develop to make a 5-year research plan

We note that the level of administrative labour demanded of the Department's key officers means that such mentorship has fallen by the wayside.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Establish departmental level opportunities to share research (talk series; colloquia; seminars).
2. Establish departmental mentoring processes based on best practices. This should focus on pre-tenure needs, but should also consider research mentoring for research grants and key career transition points more broadly.
3. For pre-tenure colleagues:
  - a. Create opportunities to meet colleagues across UBC-O
  - b. Commit faculty funding to facilitate specific connections between new hires and senior colleagues in institutions close by to talk to about ideas/ getting grants (including at UBC-V).
4. Build on the Dean's ongoing work to connect to UBC and other institutions. (eg. promote collaborative mobility awards to fund movement back/forth to Vancouver for research purposes).
5. Advocate for Humanities representation in VPR Office. As UBC-O increasingly embraces a research mission, it is vital that the distinctive needs and research modes of humanities research is represented in that office.
6. Participate in UBC-V research adjudications (eg. Killam, Hampton, CFI) to promote unit's research expertise and increase research profile
7. Develop cross-unit partnerships to organise and promote visits from external distinguished scholars.

### **Section 4: English and Cultural Studies**

Many people with whom we spoke referred to the historical rift between faculty in Cultural Studies and faculty in English. In many characterizations of this rift, Cultural Studies was described as the smaller, beleaguered unit struggling to maintain its distinction in the face of the monolith of English Literature. In order to preserve its distinct identity, Cultural Studies has to "borrow" faculty and courses from English creating an even greater sense of marginalization. The committee recognizes some of the issues that distinguish work in Cultural Studies from

work in Literary Studies and found the program description provided in the self-study to be very compelling in its articulation of the commitment to public and global engagement. In many ways Cultural Studies is well positioned to assume a leadership role in the implementation of UBC's strategic plan. However, we feel strongly that, given the ways both fields (but particularly English Literature) have been evolving over the past few decades, the distinction is, or should be, artificial. We recognize that the department does have a historical investment in Cultural Studies and we wouldn't want this history to be subsumed into "English" but we encourage the department to take direction from its most junior members and work to think productively across the two programs. We recognize and appreciate the department's diverse research and teaching strengths, not only in Cultural Studies and English Literary Studies but also in Digital Humanities, and in Rhetoric / Composition, for example. We recommend that the future hiring into core areas noted elsewhere in this report work toward diminishing the distinctions between the two programs.

A more radical solution, which we pose at least as much as a thought experiment as an actual recommendation, would be to retain the department's title – English and Cultural Studies – in recognition of commitments beyond English Literary Studies, but to combine the programs into one with a single course code, eliminating the need to cross-list courses or to identify faculty with one camp or the other. Along with a single course code, this combination might facilitate reduction of course committees, and other duplicated administrative structures in the current departmental organization. We perceive enormous possibilities for this unit with this kind of collaborative, energetic repositioning within the larger institution.

At the very least, we strongly recommend that the department develop practices around programming that work to create and support the new organizational identity, and support, as well, the interdisciplinary strengths of many of the faculty members. Policies should seek to make explicit and transparent opportunities for faculty to teach courses in either program, and the criteria by which courses are cross-listed and available to students in either program, while reducing administrative duplication and the potential to isolate programming into academic silos. As part of the package provided to reviewers, we received the department's Constitution, which states clearly that "The relationship between the two Programs within ECS shall be based upon mutual respect, program autonomy, and transparency around issues such as membership in programs and curriculum planning" ("Preamble"). Yet, based on our consideration of the current organizational structure and, especially, our meetings with individual faculty, we feel that in practice there remain significant issues in relation to program isolation, transparency, and respect. In part, this is a more general issue with identity and community (see Section 6), but insofar as it is programmatic and organizational, we offer the following recommendations.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Engage the possibility of revising the departmental course codes that distinguish between ENGL and CULT courses, with a move to combining all courses under one code with curriculum that preserves core courses in each area.
2. Use future hiring opportunities to work towards diminishing the distinctions between English and Cultural Studies.

3. Revise programming practices to emphasize collegial collaboration in program decisions, such as faculty teaching assignments (ie., how decisions about who teaches CULT ST courses are made) and cross-listing of courses.
4. Revise segregated organizational and administrative practices and committee structures towards more collaborative processes and committees, thus increasing transparency and collegiality.
5. Build community through opportunities to share research and pedagogical achievements (talks, brown-bag lunches, collaborative events); create opportunities for the development of collaborative research and teaching innovations.

### **Section 5: Service and Staffing**

Our conversations with the faculty administrators have made it clear that this department is severely under-resourced with respect to staffing. While the department has been managing remarkably well due to the extraordinary commitment of key faculty members, it is also clear that senior administrators are so busy putting out daily fires – many of which could be handled by a manager – that they do not have the bandwidth to think creatively about curriculum development, recruitment or about faculty career development. We heard that junior faculty are under-mentored; that recruitment is a priority and yet there is no support for it; and that the department has little opportunity to gather as a whole to discuss matters of curriculum and pedagogy, or hiring and recruitment. We also heard from program coordinators that they are being defeated by tasks like scheduling that could be better managed by staff. Furthermore, *no head in the UBC system should be as under-resourced as is the head of this department*. We cannot state emphatically enough, if this department is to achieve its potential, it must be better supported. We, therefore, recommend the hiring of an M & P level manager for the department with some experience in communication and the hiring of a high-level CUPE staff person to serve as the head's assistant and to assist with course scheduling.

#### **Recommendations:**

1. hire a full-time M & P manager for the department with experience in communication (web design, social media, strategic recruitment)
2. hire a full-time high level CUPE staff person to serve as the head's assistant and to assist with course scheduling.

### **Section 6. Community and Cohort**

One of the themes we heard repeated in the interviews we conducted during our visit was that of community, specifically in the concern that members of this unit felt the lack of a defining cohort identity and the lack of a sense of community generally. This was echoed in our conversations with faculty at all levels and from both ENGL and CULT ST, as well as with the student we met.

**Faculty:**

In earlier sections we address the challenges and opportunities we observed for creating and fostering a shared identity amongst faculty in this recently developed unit. In this section, we focus specifically on the issue of community, especially as it relates to departmental space and resources.

A key theme we heard repeated in our conversations with faculty concerned the current space limitations the department faces. Faculty members expressed concern about limited office space, especially for contract instructors and teaching assistants, who often are required to share office space or receive inconsistent office assignments. We learned that contract faculty may be required to make use of offices of continuing faculty on leave, or that teaching assistants may have to share office space with instructors. Many of the people we spoke with were concerned with the lack of communal space in the building the department now inhabits, noting that not only were there no communal spaces for students, but there was a significant lack of communal space for the department members more generally. Faculty members expressed specific concern that the new departmental space lacked opportunities for informal collegial gathering and conversation, with implications for the ability to generate collaborative research and teaching discussions. We heard that the current configuration of the floors which housed departmental offices in effect prevented such informal collegial conversations. A general lack of space for meeting students was identified as an issue, as was more formal departmental meeting space, such as that for department meetings. We recognize that any recommendations we might make relating specifically to infrastructure, such as space, are potentially outside the purview of our report; nevertheless, given the ubiquity of these concerns in the discussions we held, and the impact of this reality for departmental collegiality, we offer recommendations below.

Faculty members who met with us frequently observed a general lack of community or shared identity, and while this is in part related to the recent creation of this new academic unit (see Section 4), concerns about community and shared identity reach beyond discipline or research specific difference. For instance, in our discussions we heard concerns expressed about the inordinately heavy burden on the department that secondments of faculty into administrative roles creates. One obvious implication of such secondments is in the dispersing of departmental research and teaching resources; another perhaps less obvious implication is in the erosion of the sense of departmental community. There are significant opportunities, as well as some challenges of course, in the newness of this academic unit for the creation of intellectual community, and we urge the department to commit to those opportunities that both bridge the perceived divide between English and Cultural Studies and develop a shared sense of research / teaching distinctiveness and collegial identity. We believe that faculty members who understand and respect each other's research and pedagogical achievements have a greater investment in their shared community.

**Students:**

The undergraduate student with whom we spoke described their enthusiastic appreciation of the available academic opportunities in the department and within the programs, but lamented the lack of a community experience in general for undergraduate students. We were told in this and other interviews that students in ENGL and CULT ST lack formal cohort experience at all levels of the programs, have no recognizable or dedicated community spaces, enjoy no formal

departmental student groups or clubs, play no formal or official role in departmental self-governance, and as a result have no sense of themselves as part of a student community of English or Cultural Studies majors or as part of the department more broadly. We acknowledge that some at least of these opportunities may exist (or may have recently), but students don't seem to know about them, or may learn about them randomly. The sense of community and cohort identity for undergraduate students is essential to any institutional or departmental efforts towards both recruitment and retention of engaged students and to the creation of successful student experience.

**Recommendations:**

1. Create physical spaces associated with the department, such as an informal lounge for faculty to meet in or to eat lunches together. Advocate for the creation of department meeting spaces located within or near to departmental space.
2. Create more transparency around the assignment of offices, especially for contract instructors. Consider ways that shared office space might contribute to collegiality amongst contract instructors and continuing faculty as well as amongst teaching assistants.
3. Develop opportunities to build community within the unit, such as a departmental research and pedagogy series, or brown-bag lunch series. Circulate opportunities to present amongst all faculty, and invite students.
4. Create undergraduate community through program initiatives such as an honours capstone experience; for instance, a seminar dedicated to the undergraduate thesis would foster and support a cohort identity.
5. Create opportunities to celebrate and engage with undergraduate research, such as an honours colloquium to showcase the work of the honours students / seminar.
6. Provide opportunities for students to participate in departmental self-governance in official roles, such as representation at the department council meetings and on hiring or other relevant committees. Where such opportunities do exist, create a consistent and transparent (to students in particular) method for inviting, appointing or selecting students to such committees or councils.
7. Revive the undergraduate student clubs and organizations in English and Cultural Studies, to create community for undergraduate students across both programs, and have these clubs or organizations consistently supported and advertised within the department. We do not, however, recommend that supervision or responsibility of these clubs be added to the existing workload of the Undergraduate Program Coordinator.
8. Create spaces for students to meet. Ideally, this would be space connected or adjacent to the space of the department.