

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To: Senate

From: Senate Committee on
Academic Planning

Subject: External Review of the
Department of English

Date: March 9, 1989

An external review of the Department of English at SFU conducted in the Fall of 1987 is attached for the information of Senate.

D E P A R T M E N T O F E N G L I S H

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. G. Ivany,
Vice-President, Academic

FROM: Sandra Djwa, Chairwoman,
Department of English

SUBJECT:

DATE: 27 September, 1988

Dear Dr. Ivany,

The English Department has responded to the recommendations of the External Review that the English Department strengthen the Undergraduate and Graduate programs somewhat to correspond with programs in English offered elsewhere in Canada.

Specifically, the external reviewers recommended that undergraduate students studying English be offered a more systematic approach to the discipline with greater reference to historical periods, major literary figures and criticism and theory. In addition, the external assessors recommended "a coordinated writing program and more courses in composition which would serve the larger needs of the university more effectively." Finally, it was recommended that the graduate program be tightened up with additional courses to be offered, and that the rate at which students progressed through the program be accelerated.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM:

In response to these observations the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee began an internal review of the English department offerings by reading and analysing the curricula of eleven universities from across the country (Queens, University of Toronto, University of British Columbia, University of Victoria, Western Ontario, Carleton, University of Alberta, Waterloo, York, Dalhousie, and University of Ottawa) to determine if there was a "standard" curriculum from which ours deviated. It quickly became apparent that no norm or standard existed, that with the exception of Queens, all curricula examined were an amalgam of period, genre, movement, major authors, topics, and theory courses. The question of "coverage," however, was looked at carefully. In a series of changes to curriculum, discussed at the Bowen Island retreat and subsequently approved by the department in a ballot vote, the requirement of two courses from the early periods (Beowulf to the

Eighteenth Century) which has been changed to three, assures that students will have studied major authors as well as historical periods. Other courses have been redefined and the curriculum as a whole tightened up through a series of course changes that will encourage coverage of major figures. For example, two courses in American literature numbered 344 and 346 have been collapsed into one course. Where the present curriculum specifies 344 as a historical period (Puritan and Colonial Studies) and 346 as a major authors course (Hawthorne, Melville, Whitman, and Dickinson), the new course will bring the two together. The reviewers' concern that more emphasis be given to criticism and theory is addressed by changes in the Honours Programme which will make compulsory that Honours students take English 366, "Studies in Critical Approaches to Literature."

Also worth noting here are two new courses. English 361 will be titled "Contemporary Canadian Writing" and will offer study in theoretical issues that arise specifically out of the study of Canadian literature. English 380, already approved by F.A.C. and Senate, is titled "The Book and the Author in Society." Both courses respond to the demand for courses with increased theoretical content and social relevance.

The concern of the reviewers for a coordinated writing program has long been a priority of the English department. As of September 1 we have instituted, with the assistance of the Dean of Arts and the Vice-President, Academic, a new two-year Lectureship to which we have appointed Dr. Janet Giltrow as Coordinator of the Writing Program. We are proposing as a standard format, a course devised by Dr. Giltrow which has met with great success in the past and which is being published as a two-volume book by an eastern press in 1989. This will enable all instructors in English 099 to use this program. We consider Dr. Giltrow an ideal coordinator for our Writing Program on a long-term basis. It is the department's urgent wish that a permanent CFL position be made available in the area of writing and composition.

GRADUATE PROGRAM:

Over the last three years the English Department has made several changes to the Graduate program. Though most of these were made before the visit of the external reviewers, they were too recent for their impact to be visible to outsiders. We have also made some significant changes since the receipt of the reviewers' report.

1. The curriculum has been reorganized to offer wider-ranging courses in a regular cycle. The courses are designed to include several textual and critical interests: for instance, a course may study a group of texts from a particular theoretical perspective so as to be of interest to students whose concern is with texts in a particular area as well as those whose main concern is with theory.

2. We have introduced a Research Seminar which has to be taken by all graduate students and introduced a language requirement which came into place administered by the French Department during Summer 88.

3. There are some changes in course requirements. M.A. students choosing the extended essay now need to take 6 courses instead of five. This emphasis on course work is to be traded against an expectation for research that tended to make the essays into mini-theses. Ph.D. students are now required to take two courses and complete two areas of research. This will cut down on the time taken by the student to complete four areas of research.

4. The process of advising, committee formation, and supervision has been considerably tightened. Students are strictly directed to form their committees by the end of the third semester. (Ph.D. students are given a senior supervisor at the time of admission and are advised to design their research areas as early as possible). M.A. students doing theses are advised to be examined on their theses proposals early in the fifth semester. M.A. students choosing the extended essay option are advised in their third or fourth semester to consult with professors regarding papers which may be expanded for submission.

5. All students who have finished their course work and are registered for research are required to meet with their supervisors at least three times a semester. Supervisors are expected to submit a semesterly report on the student's progress including a summary of the research prepared by the student.

6. All work for a course must be completed no later than the third week of the following semester. Faculty members are expected to design their courses to make it possible for the student to finish his/her paper in time.

7. It is proposed that we offer at least one course a year to be taught by members of faculty working as a team without teaching credit. This will be in addition to the courses we already offer.

These measures are beginning to show some results. While the quality of our graduates remains high, the attached figures will show that the time taken for completion of degrees has shortened considerably.

As will be apparent, the English Department is actively engaged in the process of developing and strengthening present and future course offerings with careful attention to the recommendations of the External Review Committee.

SD:ds

cc: Dr. R.C. Brown,
Dean of Arts

cc: Dr. B. Clayman,
Dean of Graduate Studies

List of students graduating since 86-2:

| | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|
| Clement, Lorette | Graduated 87-2 | 15 semesters in M.A. program |
| Elwood, Margaret | Graduated 86-3 | 16 semesters in M.A. program |
| Fladager, Don | Graduated 86-3 | 17 semesters in M.A. program |
| Frost, Wendy | Graduated 86-3 | (exceeded time, re-applied to defend thesis won Dean's Medal) |
| Houle, Ruth | Graduated 86-2 | 9 semesters in M.A. program |
| Judy, Bill | Graduated 86-3 | 10 semesters in M.A. program |
| Jensen, Karen | Graduated 86-2 | 15 semesters in M.A. program |
| Janz, Jim | Graduated 86-3 | 16 semesters in M.A. program |
| Melczer, Regina | Graduated 88-1 | 15 semesters in M.A. program |
| Maxwell, Barry | Graduated 86-2 | 15 semesters in M.A. program |
| Niechoda, Irene | Graduated 87-3 | 17 semesters in M.A. program |
| Robson, James | Graduated 87-3 | 17 semesters in M.A. program |
| Relke, Dian | Graduated 86-2 | 14 semesters in Ph.D. program |
| Sweatman, Marg | Graduated 87-3 | 12 semesters in M.A. program (transferred 5 credits from Manitoba) |
| Valiquette, M. | Graduated 86-3 | (exceeded time, re-applied to defend thesis won Dean's Medal) |
| Witheford, N. | Graduated 87-1 | 17 semesters in M.A. program won Bert Henry Memorial Scholarship |
| Wallace, D. | Graduated 86-2 | 27 semesters in Ph.D. program |
| Wong, Shelley | Graduated 86-2 | 15 semesters in M.A. program |
| Yim, Sung, Kyun. | Graduated 86-2 | 12 semesters in M.A. program |
| Zieroth, Dale | Graduated 86-2 | 13 semesters in M.A. program |
| Fatkin, Grace | Graduated 88-2 | 8 semesters in M.A. program |
| Insley, Rob | Graduated 88-2 | 8 semesters in M.A. program |
| Olsen, Rob | Graduated 88-2 | 10 semesters in M.A. program |
| Black, Pamela | Graduated 88-2 | 15 semesters in Ph.D. program |

Prospective graduates for 88-3

| | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Bergunder, Janet | 9 semesters in M.A. program |
| Buday, Grant | 6 semesters in M.A. program |
| Lai, Fushan | 7 semesters in M.A. program |
| Kamra, Sukeshi | 19 semesters in Ph.D. program |
| He, Shanqiang | 7 semesters in M.A. program |
| Simons, Jennifer | 18 semesters in Ph.D. program |

Summary
Report of the External Reviewers
Department of English: Simon Fraser University

Introduction

The review of the Department of English at Simon Fraser University was conducted by Professors T.J. Collins (Western), G.D. Killam (Guelph) and H. Rosengarten (UBC) on Wednesday, October 14, through to Friday, October 16, 1987. The review team met with a large number of groups and individuals, including the President, the Vice-President Academic, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Chairwoman and Associate Chairman of the Department, the Head of Graduate Studies of the Department, members of Faculty and graduate and undergraduate students. In addition, the team attended a Faculty seminar, an undergraduate lecture, and met with several Directors, Chairmen, and Co-ordinators of the Faculty of Arts at lunch. Various materials were provided to us prior to the visit to campus: these included all Departmental c.v.s., and also a comprehensive Self Profile report describing the Department and its activities, generated for the occasion by the administration of the Department in concert with, we were informed, a large number (22) of Department members.

The three-day visit was extremely busy, but the assessors agreed during their private discussions at the time, and in subsequent communications, that we had acquired a fairly good sense of the Department's past, its present situation, and issues which, in our judgement, should be considered for the future. It should perhaps also be noted here that the assessors, each naturally influenced, informed, and

prejudiced by his own experience and background, have reached unanimous agreement concerning both their general impression for the Department and particular issues which should be addressed in our report. Since the assessors were given no specific guidelines for their review, we have decided to comment on those areas important to any Department of English: Undergraduate programs, Graduate programs, and Personnel matters. But first some general impressions.

1 General Impression

Simon Fraser's Department of English currently has a capable administration doing a good job in relatively difficult times. There appears to be a sense of collegiality and an openness in the Department that are in marked contrast to the atmosphere that seems to have prevailed in earlier years. But the reviewers noted a continuing sense of hostility and residual bitterness in some members of the Department, and concluded that the unity now exhibited by the Department might well be the result of an attempt to maintain the status quo (or better) in the face of the potential necessity given past history and present budgetary circumstances, of change and retrenchment.

Indeed, the reviewers believe that the most identifiable attitude currently prevalent in the Department, no doubt the result of the sense of self-protectiveness noted above, is a general unwillingness to admit even the possibility that there might be good and sufficient reasons to consider the necessity of significant change in any areas of the Department's endeavours. Such conservatism is remarkable, given that the large majority of members of the Department were hired from relatively progressive

United States graduate schools in the mid to late 1960's. Many of these hired from other graduate schools during those and later years seem to have converted to the same view. That view is implicit in the Self Profile, and it was repeatedly expressed in individual interviews: everything is just fine in the Department; the undergraduate and graduate programs are satisfactory; the quality of the teaching and research activities is above standard; there are, however, far too many students, and for this reason at least two new appointments are necessary. Interestingly, the only generally accepted need for change articulated by members of the Department was in conjunction with the above mentioned appointments: such appointments would allow the Department to return to the more comfortable student-faculty ratios and the lecture-tutorial teaching method of the mid 1960's.

Simon Fraser's Department of English can be justly proud of the positive relationship which it establishes with its students, of the high quality research and publication record of some of its members, of its capable administrative leadership, and of the hard work and co-operative spirit of its support staff. But it is the belief of the assessors that the Department is unrealistic in its view of itself, and mistaken in its belief that some new appointments will solve its problems. The average teaching load in the Department is approximately two-thirds that in other Departments in Canada with which the assessors are familiar (including those on the semester system). This includes number of students taught, number of students marked by an individual instructor, TA supervision etc., etc. The overall research and publication profile of the Department is comparatively modest, and the undergraduate and graduate programs are lacking in rigour, focus, and structure. These programs do not, in the opinion of the assessors, offer students a systematic approach to education

in our discipline, with reference to historical periods, to major figures, or to criticism and theory. These issues will be addressed in the following comments.

II Undergraduate Curriculum

Lower division courses and writing instruction

SFU's first-year courses follow a standard "Introduction to" pattern based on the genres. Each course meets for three hours, two lectures and one tutorial. In addition, six hours of a "writing lab" are added to each tutorial group over the semester. For students seeking help with writing problems, the Department offers a non-credit course, English 099 (University Writing), taught by all faculty members in rotation (Self Profile 61): Additional help is available to students on a "drop-in" basis through the Writing Referral Centre, staffed by two instructors. English 099 and the Writing Referral Centre are the means by which the Department has tried to fill the gaps caused by the loss several years ago of five lecturers who taught English 010.

Useful as they may be, these measures are really stopgaps and imperfect substitutes for a coordinated writing program. Composition and (at the higher levels) language or rhetoric get short shrift. In that the department seeks to help students improve their writing through English 099 or the Writing Referral Centre, it is to be commended for stretching its already slim resources even further. However, much of this instruction appears to be done by TA's, lecturers, or sessionals; of the nine sample teaching schedules given to the reviewers, only one showed a faculty member teaching 099 this year (87-3, 87-1), and none teaching English 210

(Composition), 212 (Study of Language), or 371 (Advanced Composition). It was also our impression that the brunt of this work fell on a few overworked individuals. As the Self Profile itself observes in several places, there is a high demand for composition courses at every level, a demand which the Department cannot presently meet. One student told us of her frustration at having to wait until her fourth year to be able to get into a writing course that would have been of greater help in her second or third year.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from this is that the steady attrition of instructors has seriously affected the Department's capacity to provide necessary services to junior students, and impaired its ability to offer better students the more advanced writing courses that should be available on a regular basis. The restoration of an introductory writing course, staffed by lecturers and by regular full-time members of Faculty, would extend the Department's capacity to teach basic composition, and enable it to offer sections of 210, 212, and 371 more regularly.

The second-year survey courses are appropriately described as providing a basis for studies in the upper division, and thus play an important part in the preparation of majors and honours students. From the few reading lists we obtained during our visit, it was not possible to determine exactly what works were being studied in these courses, or what degree of parity there was among different sections of the same course in content, writing requirements, and grades. However, there seemed to be no particular cause for concern about these courses.

Majors and Honours Programs

The undergraduate program for Majors and Honours students at SFU is designed to give students as much freedom as possible to develop their own interests. This does not mean that there are no requirements: the intending Major must have obtained "credit or standing" in three of the four first year courses and in 204, 205, 206. The Major must then obtain 32 credit hours in eight courses numbered 300 to 446. One course must be in the 300-308 range, and one in the 310-316 range. Honours students are required to obtain 52 credit hours in the upper-division English courses: that is, 10 semester courses, plus a course on literary criticism (364), two Honours seminars, and an Honours graduating essay.

A possible Majors program might be as follows:

Engl 308 Malory, More, Sidney, Spenser

Engl 312 Shakespeare

Engl 344 American Prose and Poetry...

Engl 346 Hawthorne, Melville, Whitman, Dickinson

Engl 348 American Literature ... to WW I

Engl 350 20th Century American Writers to WW II

Engl 352 American Writers of WW II and After

Engl 372 Creative Writing A

Such a program might be difficult to arrange because of scheduling problems, or because not all courses can be offered every year, or because an advisor might dissuade the student; but the fact remains that the regulations would permit a student to graduate as an English Major without having read Chaucer, Milton, Swift, Pope, the Romantic poets, the eighteenth or nineteenth-century novelists, Wilde, Shaw, Lawrence, etc., or any

Canadian literature, beyond what may be included in the second-year survey courses.

One consequence of such a program is that it may produce graduates lacking the breadth or background to make them effective in the classroom. We were told of one TA who was required to teach a Victorian novel, but who had not read any Victorian fiction. If this can happen, requirements should be introduced to ensure better historical or genre coverage by both Honours and Majors students.

Problems in course planning

A frequent complaint about both lower division and upper division courses was that the original tutorial system, intended to give students close contact with faculty members through small classes, has lost much of its effectiveness because of the pressure of numbers. Tutorials designed for 15 students are now expected to accommodate between 17 and 22. The problem has been exacerbated by the reduction in faculty numbers, and the increase in student enrolment over the last few years (Self Profile 57-8). This situation has evidently led to the reduction of course offerings. The university administration has made funds available for a series of temporary or sessional appointments, but such ad hoc arrangements are unsatisfactory on both logistical and pedagogical grounds. Course planning, book ordering, room scheduling all need more lead time than has evidently been possible in the recent past.

The most common solution to these problems proposed by the faculty members we spoke to (and suggested in the Self Profile 137, 147) was the addition of new faculty members. Given the depletion suffered by the Department in recent years, the addition of two to three new members

seems a modest enough measure, justified on the grounds of both student numbers and gaps in specialization (renewal is urgently needed in several areas, including Shakespeare, language, Commonwealth literature, and literary theory). At the same time, two or three new appointments will not of themselves solve all the problems described in the Self Profile, and we believe that the Department should consider other measures. One proposal we explored with faculty members was an increase in teaching load, perhaps by adding a tutorial to each member's program. This was received with universal horror, though one member did acknowledge that such a step would relieve the pressure on upper-division tutorials, and would reduce the need to bring in external sessionals. While we have no wish to impose added burdens of teaching and marking, we would point out that presently, with two preparations rather than three, faculty at SFU enjoy teaching loads somewhat lighter than those found at comparable institutions elsewhere.

Quality of Instruction

Of some concern to the reviewers was the lack of coordination and control evident in the Department's handling of writing standards in 100 and 200-level courses. In theory, each group of TAs handling tutorials works closely with the faculty lecturer, whose task it is to supervise the TAs in their selection of materials and assignments, and to oversee their grading. In practice, some faculty members take their supervisory duties very seriously, while others do not, and this laissez-faire attitude on the part of some influences the attitudes of TAs to the importance of teaching writing. The result, predictably, is a good deal of unevenness in grading standards, and an inflation of grades in some classes. To achieve greater parity among

different tutorial groups, the Department should take the following measures:

- a) give all new TAs more detailed guidance and preparation, and provide workshops on teaching and marking on a regular basis throughout the semester;
- b) insist on proper supervision by faculty members, including regular checks on TA marking;
- c) bring faculty members together from time to time to discuss grading standards;
- d) introduce a standardized student questionnaire to evaluate teaching at all levels.

III Graduate

The Department of English offers courses of study leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. degree. The M.A. has been offered since the Department was created and the Ph.D. introduced in 1972. Both, therefore, are in a sense in their infancy. The M.A. program is described as moderately sized and the Ph.D. strictly limited so as "not to utilize too great a proportion of the Department's resources." Substantial changes have been made to the programs in 1985 and 1986 to bring them up-to-date with developments in English studies; the Department believes that it has brought a degree of soundness and efficiency to the program and that no further changes will be required in the immediate future.

The M.A. program offers two routes to the Master's degree: four semester courses and a thesis, or eight semester courses without a thesis. Students are required to demonstrate competence in one foreign language. The program is intended to provide sound traditional preparation for students intending to pursue a Ph.D., to secondary school teachers who wish to upgrade their qualifications, and to others who may seek the degree for personal enrichment.

The curriculum is organized conceptually, emphasizing modes of study rather than specific textual content and reducing literary history to one of several possible modes. We have, then, a multiplicity of specific courses taught under one conceptual heading or under a series of conceptual headings which makes it possible to "cross index any particular course to several headings." And this philosophy accounts for the relatively few formal courses which are offered by the Department -- only eight (presumably for both M.A. and Ph.D. students). Of these, two graduate research seminars, Part I and Part II, are required courses and are graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.

The Table marked Faculty Supervision M.A. and Ph.D. Theses (Self Profile 87-90) reveals that all colleagues in the Department are involved in thesis supervision at both the M.A. and Ph.D. level both as senior supervisors and members of supervisory committees. This would seem to support the Department's assertion on page 82 of the Self Profile that all periods and fields in the canon and other specialized areas are covered.

Since graduate instruction is so comprehensive, therefore, and since undergraduate teaching commitments are relatively small, it could be argued that there is no need for further appointment. The Department does, however, note the need for better coverage in "areas like Composition,

Modern British Literature, Irish Poetry, Shakespeare, Elizabethan Poetry and Prose," and laudably looks down the road to the time when retirements will create a need for appointments in 17th Century, American, and Shakespeare Studies. This matter will be addressed in Section IV following.

Problems in the Graduate Program

The general entrance requirements for entry into the M.A. program as announced in the University Calendar for 1987-88 seem adequate and coincident with those required in other places. The entrance requirements of the Department as set forth on pp. 234-235 are very breezy indeed.

For the M.A.:

The Department requires evidence of ability in academic writing, in the form of at least two substantial literary essays which are scholarly in format and approach. The papers submitted may be undergraduate essays previously prepared, or ones specially written for the purpose.

For the Ph.D.:

The Ph.D. program in English assumes in the student a background in English or comparative literature equivalent to our M.A.; this is the condition of admission to the program.

The general demands made of students in each program does not bolster confidence:

In the M.A.:

While offering students the opportunity of specializing in one of the various areas of strength in the department, the program requires them to ground their interest in a wide and flexible understanding of literary history and the possibilities of study.

In the Ph.D.:

The student is required to do a minimum amount of coursework to fill any gaps or satisfy any needs. The major emphasis of the program is on personal supervision in one primary and one secondary area and the production of a doctoral thesis. The program is designed to encourage innovative studies.

This lack of focus and rigour is reflected in the slow progress students make through the degree-earning process -- though efforts are being made to adjust this -- and in comments offered by some faculty and students we interviewed. Some students seem to take more than an usual number of their courses as directed reading courses. We were told that the program is too "loosey-goosey," that there is such freedom in the graduate program that one might deal with "Mallarme's left toe" for a thesis, and that so many reading courses are offered that they "bleed off graduate students and so courses disappear." It was further stated that there is no bibliography course offered (though one has recently been introduced), no comprehensive examination, that an anti-grading mentality dominates (and that graduate students who are given teaching assistant positions are given little instruction on grading); that no emphasis is placed on producing publishable work -- no training, that is, on how to produce publishable manuscripts; one student offered the opinion that graduate courses are not taught by the best people in the Department -- the proven and active

scholars. Finally, there was the comment that the quality of supervision across the graduate program is of a low calibre. Clearly, some of these comments exaggerate the problems, but despite the improvements which have recently been introduced, further work is required in the tightening-up process.

Such changes as will be effected to tighten and improve the program are the task of the Chairman of the Committee on Graduate Studies who has direct responsibility for graduate students. The current Chairman has begun to take hold of the program, to rationalize it and to try to give it some new direction. The office should be regarded as a challenge; the Director should have a small committee working with him to review applications, to solicit students from elsewhere and also, as we have suggested, to review the whole program of seminars with greater concern for a clear objective and structure. The program needs a good deal more rigour.

The Department should perhaps reconsider the breadth of its offering as enunciated in the Self Profile with respect to the expertise of the total graduate faculty (which is, we have noted, the undergraduate faculty as well). Perhaps it should develop within it a special program in areas where there is considerable strength. Such a program could be carefully constructed, well publicized and supported by the University. It is, perhaps, here that new faculty appointments could most appropriately be made.

But one must recognize at the same time that Master's candidates in general are not ready to be highly specialized and that many different constituencies must be served. In addition, the discipline itself requires placing the particular subject of research within broad historical, generic, and linguistic contexts. Good research in English requires such a broad base, and it is for this reason that graduate departments of English require some

form or other of comprehensive examination and spread of courses. Also, the creation of a graduate faculty could assist the tightening-up process -- and lend greater credibility to the program. Membership should be open only to recognized scholars, and applicants for membership in the graduate faculty should be screened by a committee of scholars of international repute. This is typical of many university graduate departments; in some such departments, if a scholar is not active in his or her field for a period of four to five years, consideration is given to dropping his or her name from the graduate faculty roster.

The Department should confront the problem of rationalizing and expanding the graduate course selection. A decision should be made about a comprehensive examination to ensure uniformity. It should consider the possibility of offering a more specific range of courses; these courses should, in the first instance, be offered by those scholars who have made their reputations in the field and not offered willy-nilly across the board by all members of the Department. This would necessitate a redeployment of teaching responsibilities, but there should be no difficulty in hiving off the established scholars to do the bulk of the work in a revised graduate program.

Finally, the Department should keep statistics on the length of time it takes students, both full- and part-time, to complete the degree, and take steps to speed passage through the program if the time proves to be too protracted. As things currently stand, students are encouraged to take far too long (3 years) to complete an M.A. It should not take a full-time student more than two years -- and even two years is excessive -- to complete the Master's degree. A parallel review should be undertaken of the time for

completion of the Ph.D. Our impression was that students are encouraged to spend far too long on this degree as well.

IV Personnel Matters

As already noted, while there are a small number of highly productive scholars in the Department, there appears to be, on the part of many members of the Department, a lack of balance between their interests in teaching and research. During our interviews with individuals we heard the common self-justification from the non-publishers -- they do research in preparation for teaching, and the teaching endeavour is so important that research for purposes of publication must be sacrificed for that higher purpose. Such an attitude is understandable, and there appear to be some excellent teachers in the Department. But, considering the comparatively light teaching loads of members of the English Department at SFU, the lack of research productivity should be carefully examined by the administration, and the rewards of promotion and salary increases should be reserved primarily for those who can demonstrate that they are good teachers and publishing scholars of quality material. Those who wish to devote all of their time to teaching, and who teach well, could perhaps be given heavier teaching loads than others.

Three other matters related to personnel were brought to our attention:

1. The last minute hiring of sessional appointees seems to be rather chaotic, and does not allow for rational planning of the size and number of sections/courses offered each year. Some attempt should

be made by the administration of the Faculty and the Department to solve this problem.

2. The staff of the Department (five in number) seem to be very capable and are respected; however, they appear to be overworked. As far as we could determine, this is at least partly because, in the area of advising students, the staff is doing work that should be done by members of Faculty. The semester system no doubt creates some extra pressures on staff activity, but staff support in English at SFU seems reasonable in terms of numbers. Work in advising students, and other areas that could be identified, should be shifted to full-time faculty members on a rotational basis.

3. The Self Profile report, recognizing the pressures on the area of writing and composition, urges that a full-time Faculty appointment be made in this area. The reviewers disagree; we believe that a permanent position in writing should be established, but as a language assistant (or some other such staff category) rather than as a tenure-track appointment. Those who now work in the area of writing assume a great burden in the Department -- some of which could and should be assumed by full-time tenured Faculty. To demand that such overworked individuals compete for tenure seems to us unfair, and unwise.

Finally, we address the issue of new faculty appointments. We recommend that the Department engage in a vigorous recruiting process during the coming years to replace upcoming retirements and to make the

two or three additional appointments suggested in Section II above. And we believe that it is vital to the Department's future that such appointments be made, in areas to be determined by the Department in consultation with the Dean. We make this recommendation not primarily because of the pressure of student numbers, but because there are gaps in the Department which should be filled (Shakespeare, Commonwealth, Theory, etc.), and new blood and new ideas are needed in the Department to enliven and enrich its scholarly endeavours.

There will be a large number of positions open in many Canadian university English Departments during the next decade, and the pool of highly qualified Canadian candidates will be relatively small. The competition for first-rate candidates will be stiff (indeed, such has been the case for the past five years -- faculty members at SFU seemed surprised to hear this), and it is necessary to begin planning now on an intensive recruiting process. Particular attention should be paid to recruiting Canadians, and especially Canadian women.

11 November 1987