

ENG4430 Environmental Literature in English  
Professor Michael Lundblad  
Spring 2026

### **Portfolio Submission**

Deadline to submit in Inspira: 11:00, 22 May 2026

What to submit:

- One file (Microsoft Word) with both drafts and revised versions of all three assignments in the following order: Assignment #1 draft; Assignment #1 final; Assignment #2 draft; Assignment #2 final; Assignment #3 draft; Assignment #3 final;
- Additional file (any format): pictures/images/etc. of creative work for Assignment #2 (both draft and final versions)

### **Examination and Assessment**

The form of assessment is a portfolio consisting of drafts and revised versions of 3 assignments first submitted in draft form during the semester. All 3 assignments must receive a passing grade for the portfolio to pass. Assignment #1 (short paper on ecocriticism) counts as 30% of the grade; assignment #2 (creative/critical intervention) counts as 20% of the grade; and assignment #3 (critical essay) counts as 50% of the grade.

### **Assignment #1: Short paper on ecocriticism (30%)**

#### **Assignment**

How can the history of ecocriticism be described in different ways? How should it be defined as a form of literary analysis?

- Read through the 3 introductory chapters listed below; it's not necessary to read through the chapter summaries toward the end of each chapter.
- Engage at least two of those introductions directly (direct quotations, paraphrasing, summarizing various parts).
- Identify, compare, and contrast at least two different ways (broadly conceived) of explaining the historical development of ecocriticism as an academic field.
- Conclude by explaining which definition of ecocriticism (it could be your own, and/or an adaptation from others) you think should be prioritized as a form of literary/cultural analysis.

#### **Requirements**

- No forms of AI should be used to develop or complete this assignment
- Papers should be 3-4 pages, not counting the Works Cited page
- Formatting: 1.5-spaced, with 2.5 cm margins, 12 pt. Times New Roman font, no extra spaces between paragraphs
- Include a Works Cited page and use in-text citations (page numbers) according to MLA guidelines:  
[https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research\\_and\\_citation/mla\\_style/mla\\_formatting\\_and\\_style\\_guide/index.html](https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/mla_style/mla_formatting_and_style_guide/index.html);
- Proofread (carefully) to avoid grammar and spelling errors
- Additional research is optional, but not required

#### **Introductions to Ecocriticism**

Garrard, Greg. "Introduction." *The Oxford Handbook of Ecocriticism*. Ed. Greg

Garrard. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013. 1-5.

Available online: [https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS\\_ILS71541494010002201](https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS_ILS71541494010002201)

Huggan, Graham, and Helen Tiffin. "Introduction." In Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin, *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. Routledge, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 2015. 1-19.

Available online: [https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS\\_ILS71548993480002201](https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS_ILS71548993480002201)

Iovino, Serenella, and Serpil Opperman. "Introduction: Stories Come to Matter." In *Material Ecocriticism*. Eds. Serenella Iovino and Serpil Opperman. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 2014. 1-12.

Available online: [https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS\\_ILS71531586750002201](https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS_ILS71531586750002201)

#### Optional additional sources

Glotfelty, Cheryll. "Introduction: Literary Studies in an Age of Environmental Crisis." In *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 1996. xv-xxxvii.

Library has 2 print copies: [https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/1bm357c/BIBSYS\\_ILS71470066260002201](https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/1bm357c/BIBSYS_ILS71470066260002201)  
1

DeLoughrey, Elizabeth, and George Handley. "Introduction: Towards an Aesthetics of the Earth." In *Postcolonial Ecologies: Literatures of the Environment*. Eds. Elizabeth DeLoughrey and George Handley. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. 3-40.

Available online [https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS\\_ILS71520066110002201](https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS_ILS71520066110002201)

Ensor, Sarah, and Susan Scott Parrish. "Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to American Literature and the Environment*. Eds. Sarah Ensor and Susan Scott Parrish. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2022. 1-14.

Available online: [https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS\\_ILS71643993920002201](https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/7c2dl2/BIBSYS_ILS71643993920002201) (It says 2018 in Oria, but the link goes to the 2022 edition).

Remien, Peter, and Scott Slovic. "Introduction: The Nature of Literature." In *Nature and Literary Studies*. Eds. Peter Remien and Scott Slovic. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2022. 1-28.

Available online: [https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/1bm357c/BIBSYS\\_ILS71659318140002201](https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/1bm357c/BIBSYS_ILS71659318140002201)  
1

Westling, Louise. "Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to Literature and the Environment*. Ed. Louise Westling. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 1-14.

Available online: [https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/1bm357c/BIBSYS\\_ILS71524856980002201](https://bibsys-almaprimo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/1bm357c/BIBSYS_ILS71524856980002201)  
1

### **Assessment**

Papers will be marked holistically according to the requirements specified in the assignment, with no specific percentage of marks for any one aspect. The marker will thus be making an overall judgment of the quality of the piece of work as a whole. Weaknesses in one area of the criteria may be compensated for by particular skill in another. Independence of thought and evidence of analytical ability will be rewarded.

### **Assignment #2: Creative/critical intervention (20%)**

#### **Background and purpose**

Which of the primary texts we've read this semester inspires you most or makes you want to tell others about it? Why might broader or more popular audiences find that text interesting? How can you bring attention to one of these texts in new ways? The purpose of this assignment is to give you an opportunity to think creatively about various ways of engaging course texts as examples of environmental literature. There is considerable flexibility here for you to experiment and try something new or to hone skills you might already have developed elsewhere. You will be assessed primarily upon the written element (1-2 pages) in which you explain the connection to your chosen course text. The creative element could be either combined with that written element or separate, with various kinds of options, such as: creative writing (e.g., a poem, a flash fiction piece, a creative nonfiction essay, a scene from a play or film), art (painting, drawing, etc.), video/multimedia, music (max. 5 minutes), craft/hobby (knitting, woodworking, gardening, etc.). Another option is to write an op-ed for a newspaper connecting your text to a current environmental issue or case study. Other ideas might also be possible—check with me!

#### **Requirements**

- Do not use AI in any form.
- Engage **one** of the primary texts from the syllabus (unless you've checked with me).
- Written elements should be 1-2 pages; creative elements can be as big or small as you choose, so long as they can be presented in some way within approx. 3-5 minutes.

### **Assessment**

Creative/critical intervention will be assessed primarily for the ways it illustrates understanding and inspiration drawn from the primary text(s), as well as how effectively and creatively it engages relevant issues within the chosen genre. Since none of these forms of creative/critical interventions were specifically taught in the course, considerable leeway will be given in the assessment. Creativity and originality will be rewarded.

### **Assignment #3 Critical Essay (50%)**

#### **Background and purpose**

Primary texts in this course can be read in the context of environmental issues, histories, aspirations, and scholarly debates. While they might shape, contribute to, or suggest solutions to tangible problems, they can also be read in relation to conceptual debates about how well they seem to address or persuade various kinds of readers. We can explore questions such as: How effective might different people see these texts as examples of environmental literature? What *is* environmental literature and what kinds of models might different texts suggest for

addressing environmental problems? What are the strengths and/or weaknesses of those approaches? Why might different audiences find particular texts less or more effective in terms of the way they are written and the perspectives they seem to support?

### Assignment

Your primary task with this assignment is to make a persuasive academic argument about why you think a particular text on the syllabus should be seen as ultimately more (or less) effective as a form of environmental literature than others might think, even though any text will have its pros and cons. In order to do so, you will need to identify your target audience as precisely as possible (postcolonial ecocritics? ecofeminists? literary scholars focusing on contemporary environmental literature or particular authors? environmental anthropologists? philosophical posthumanists? etc.). You will need to do your own research to find relevant debates in the fields you most want to address. Whether you can find academic scholarship on your specific text written by those in your target audience or not, you will need to develop an argument that addresses the concerns of that audience in ways they might find persuasive. Your argument should be debatable (i.e., some of those in your target audience could presumably disagree for particular reasons about how effectively the text in question works). Your argument should also be supportable primarily through a close reading of the text in question and engagement with relevant scholarly debates (citing particular examples and sources). This assignment is an opportunity for you to dig deeper into a text that you are particularly excited about, in order to develop and support an argument for other scholars you would really like to persuade.

### Requirements:

- Do not use AI in any form;
- Focus on one of the primary texts from the syllabus (unless you check with me first);
- Essays must be 8-10 pages, not counting Works Cited/Bibliography;
- Additional research is required (scholarly, at least 4 peer-reviewed secondary sources);
- Formatting: 1.5-spaced, with 2.5 cm margins, 12 pt. Times New Roman font, no extra spaces between paragraphs;
- Use an appropriate and consistent style and citation method (MLA, APA, Chicago);
- Proofread (carefully) to avoid grammar and spelling errors;

### **Assessment**

Essays will be marked holistically according to the requirements specified in the assignment, with no specific percentage of marks for any one aspect. The marker will thus be making an overall judgment of the quality of the piece of work as a whole. Weaknesses in one area of the criteria may be compensated for by particular skill in another. Independence of thought and evidence of analytical ability will be rewarded.

Good:

1. Work at the highest levels will present a problem statement which is argumentative, specific and substantiated (there is evidence to support it).
2. The problem statement assumes the form of an argument which can consist of several linked questions. The student's own argument is developed in relation to adequate secondary research and engagement with relevant critical debates. There is a link between problem statement and title, and between problem statement and discussion.

3. The essay has a clear structure. The student considers the flow of the argument from paragraph to paragraph and sustains the argument throughout. The various points made are relevant to the problem under consideration in the essay.
4. The essay engages in detailed analysis, developing a critical argument about relevant texts. The student manages to present and develop his/her own ideas.
5. The essay is written in formal English of a high standard, with no mistakes of grammar or spelling.

Average:

1. Includes a problem statement, which assumes the form of an argument and is for the most part sustained throughout.
2. The problem statement is developed in relation to adequate secondary research.
3. The essay adopts a clear structure and the points made are relevant to the problem under consideration throughout.
4. The essay engages in analysis, and demonstrates some awareness of the situatedness of the texts in question. It presents and to some extent develops the student's own ideas.
5. The essay is written for the most part in correct English, with only minor mistakes of grammar or spelling.

Poor:

1. The student's problem statement is excessively general or vague, or lacks substantiating evidence.
2. The problem statement is not developed adequately in relation to secondary research, although some independent research is included.
3. The structure lacks logic, and the points made are occasionally irrelevant to the problem under consideration.
4. The essay rarely engages in analysis, limiting itself to paraphrases of the texts in question. There are few ideas presented by the student.
5. There are errors in grammar and spelling, though these do not prevent understanding of the essay text.

Unacceptable:

1. The essay lacks a problem statement.
2. The essay does not engage with secondary research.
3. The structure is illogical and confusing. The points made lack relevance.
4. The essay lacks analysis, simply providing more or less adequate paraphrases of the texts in question.
5. The essay is poorly written with numerous errors of grammar and spelling.
6. The essay does not meet the minimum length requirement.