

Student Choice for Learning: A Look at British Columbia's English Language Arts 10 Curriculum

*Student: Kaitlyn Leask
Faculty Mentor: Ginny Ratsoy*

Key Words: choice, English Language Arts, grade 10, British Columbia

1. Introduction: Where did the inspiration for this topic come from?

Two of my greatest educational passions are English Language Arts (wanting to teach English at the secondary level) and education itself (studying educational techniques and theories). These passions have led me to the Bachelor of Education program at Thompson Rivers University, where I have been further-developing a personal teaching philosophy, one I established a couple years prior. My philosophy is based around giving students choice and freedom; my personal belief is that students learn best when they are given a say in what they are learning – it's their education, why shouldn't they have a voice in this matter?

When I saw how drastically the BC government was changing the curriculum, particularly at the secondary level – replacing English 10 with nine 2-credit options, for example – I had two immediate thoughts. My first thought was, “Wow, this is incredibly cool, look at all of these options!” and I just generally wanted to learn more about the course offerings. My second thought was, “How great is this, that the curriculum is aligning with my personal beliefs!” What I realized later, however, is that schools are not required to offer all of these choices; these are merely course selection options that are available for students to be able to graduate from secondary education, but dependent on what their school chooses to offer. As long as schools have a minimum of two of the courses – for each course is worth 2 credits each, and 4 credits is required for graduation – then they are technically within the realm of requirement, minimal as it is.

It is the vast variety of combinations that intrigued me to the point of wanting to research this topic further. What were schools thinking when they chose the curriculum options? Were the choices made with the best interest of the students in mind, or were the choices dependent on teacher availability (or were there other reasons)? Are schools following the philosophy of the BC government for a learner-centered education?

I had initially wanted to conduct this research through a series of emails and surveys – asking principals about their ELA 10 course offerings and why they chose to offer less/more; asking teachers how they felt about the ELA 10 course offerings and if they saw the pros/cons; and asking students if they were happy with the ELA 10 courses their school is offering, and whether or not they felt there were too little or too many choices. Due to unforeseen circumstances, this project has shifted to become more inquiry and inference-based by taking a look at what courses British Columbian schools are offering, and comparing and connecting it to what research is saying in relation to choice in schools.

2. ELA 10 and EFP 10: What courses are being offered in BC?

September 2018 was the first official month of implementation for the updated English Language Arts 10 curriculum in British Columbia. Instead of English 10, students at the grade 10 level will need to take two of the following nine courses: ELA 10 Composition; ELA 10 Creative Writing; ELA 10 Literary Studies; ELA 10 New Media; ELA 10 Spoken Language; EFP 10 Literary Studies; EFP 10 New Media; and EFP 10 Spoken Language; EFP 10 Writing. Although there is a division of ELA (English Language Arts) and EFP (English First Peoples), with EFP course curriculums having a heavier emphasis of First Peoples curricular competencies and content, it should be noted that there are still First Peoples curricular competency and content pieces in the ELA courses.

Every school in the province has chosen to approach the curriculum change differently – even schools within the same district are not necessarily offering the ELA and EFP options! For the purposes of this research, I looked at the course selection offerings for 59 out of the 60 school districts (only excluding School District 93: Conseil scolaire francophone, due to the overlap with other districts) for the 2018-2019 school year. Out of 269 schools that offer English Language Arts at the grade 10 level in this province, 111 schools had easy-to-access course selection guides on their websites. Of the nine course options for grade 10, these 111 schools averaged 4-5 options (either as individual half-semester classes or attached to other options and offered as a variety of combined full-semester classes). The following table shows what was offered at these schools for the 2018-2019 school year, and which ones were mandatory for students.

ELA 10 Class	# of Schools Offering Class	Mandatory Class at Schools
Composition	90 out of 111	27.0% of the 111
Creative Writing	79 out of 111	2.7% of the 111
Literary Studies	93 out of 111	21.6% of the 111
New Media	77 out of 111	2.7% of the 111
Spoken Language	62 out of 111	0.9% of the 111
EFP 10 Class	# of Schools Offering Class	Mandatory Class at Schools
Writing	16 out of 111	none
Literary Studies	21 out of 111	0.9% of the 111
New Media	16 out of 111	none
Spoken Language	15 out of 111	none

As you can see from the table above, the majority of these schools are not offering EFP 10 class options. It is uncertain whether the course selection guides were just unclear about their English 10 options, or if the schools are trying out the new ELA 10 curriculums first before bringing in EFP 10 options. Another theory is that, perhaps, schools don't have the resources needed to provide EFP 10 options, and/or there is a lack of teachers available to teach EFP 10 content.

You may also notice that a large percentage of the 111 schools have made ELA 10 Composition and/or ELA 10 Literary Studies mandatory for students. (Note: Some schools only have these two options, explicitly giving students absolutely no choice in what they can take.) Although it makes sense that schools would put a larger emphasis on

courses where reading and/or writing is the focus area, it's intriguing that they would do this and sacrifice giving students more of a say in their education (which is a large part of the curriculum redesign).

A few of the schools have chosen to keep English 10 as their only option, and while some of the course selection guides didn't paint a clear picture as to how they were using English 10 in conjunction with the updated curriculum, there were two paths that I personally noticed: 1) Using all five of the ELA 10 course curriculums, students would be exposed to a little bit of everything (maybe with a heavier emphasis on one of the areas, such as Composition or Literary Studies), and 2) Allowing choice, English 10 would act as an independent studies course, meaning the students choose the two topic areas they would like to focus on for the semester, in any combination they want.

3. Literature: What are researchers saying about choice in schools?

On February 5, 2019, I had the privilege of attending a talk given by the Superintendent of Learning for British Columbia, Patrick Duncan. In his speech, "Continuing on the Journey of Transforming Education in BC", Duncan talked about the new curriculum changes and what this looked like at the secondary level. The curriculum structure was designed to have more of a focus on the learner and for learning to be flexible; "[p]ersonalized options enable students to participate in choosing course content" and an "inquiry-based, hands-on approach encourages students to take more personal responsibility for learning" (Duncan).

To compare what other provinces are doing across the country, I had a look at Ontario's English curriculum for grade 10, which hasn't been updated since 2007. Ontario offers two English 10 classes: academic and applied. Both of these classes, as outlined in the Ontario curriculum, touch on four major areas of learning for English: oral communication; reading and literature studies; writing; and media studies. Although Ontario has chosen to split English into two options (unlike British Columbia, with nine options), both the Ontario government and the British Columbia government have decided that these four focus areas are important to offer. However, which would be more beneficial to students – offering a little bit of everything in one class to expose students to a variety of topics, or allowing students the choice and freedom in their education by letting them focus on two areas of their choosing?

Although these curricular changes impact a wide variety of individuals in the education system, it is important to note who is impacted most: the students. Jennifer Groff, from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), agrees that learners should be at the center; they are "*the* central players in the [learning] environment and therefore activities centre on their cognition and growth" (Groff 6). In regards to encouraging students to take more personal responsibility in their learning, "The Nature of Learning" says that these types of environments should aim to develop "self-regulated learners" – ones who monitor their own acquisition of knowledge, manage time well, set high personal goals, and more. This is part of getting students prepared for post-secondary, whether in the form of college or a career. Sonja Santelises, CEO of Baltimore City Public Schools, in her article, asks whether schools are truly preparing students to be ready for post-secondary life, or if they are (inadvertently) setting the students up for

failure. “Too many high schools are prioritizing credit accrual for graduation over knowledge and skill development” (Santelises). An article from OpenCanada.org talks about how students are being set up for failure before they even arrive at elementary school; socioeconomic status can make or break a child’s educational journey from the very beginning. Joan Spade, a sociology professor at The College of Brockport, State University of New York, also touches on this point of socioeconomic status for the secondary level, based on the school itself rather than the individual students. What schools are offering is often dependent on where the school is, what sort of town they are in (urban or rural, for example), or even what kind of neighbourhood they’re in within their town. Are students missing out on post-secondary opportunities, or opportunities that would enhance their education and prepare them for post-secondary, simply because of where they live in this province?

What I’ve learned during my time so far in the Bachelor of Education program is that universal design for learning (UDL) and differentiated instruction (DI) are two of the most important things to include on lesson and unit plans. Katie Novak, education consultant and president of Novak Educational Consulting, explains the difference between UDL and DI with a dinner party analogy – UDL would be if you created a buffet for dinner whereas DI would be if you created individual dinners for each guest to accommodate for different tastes and dietary restrictions. In other words, UDL is about presenting a variety of options to students (whether in class at a given time or for a homework assignment), and DI is about coming up with an individualized plan for certain students who need accommodations (more time on tests or behaviour management techniques, for example). Everyone has different preferences and needs in life in general, and education is just the same in that regard; we will never have a class filled with 30 of the exact same student. The idea that not everyone learns the same follows with what the BC government has been trying to do with the curriculum, giving students more choice in their education. Steven Netcoh, of the University of Vermont, talks about the difference between “individualized learning” (teachers in control, imposing UDL and DI) and “personalized learning” (students in control, making choices in their education) in his article, “Balancing Freedom and Limitations”. Margareta Thompson and Patrick Beymer (both American scholars), on the other hand, discuss the negative effects of “too little or too much” choice – the material having no relevance or usefulness to the students’ daily lives, for too little choice, and potential stress and anxiety from having too many choices. So where is the line, or balance, between the teacher’s control over educational choices and the teacher letting go of some of that control, in benefit of the students?

To phrase the question another way, where is the balance in giving students a say in their own education but not too much to the point where the teacher has lost control of their own class? In her article, “Democratic Classrooms”, Kristan Morrison uses the terms “democratic education” and “freedom-based education” (interchangeably). Morrison defines this type of education as students being “free to decide what they study, and how, and when they study it” (Morrison 52). A study by Nicky Didicher, of Simon Fraser University, highlights two approaches that give students freedom in summative assessment – the bento approach (where students to choose if they want to be marked based on participation, writing a report, writing an essay, or completing a final exam, but they all have the same due date) and the buffet approach (where students choose due

dates and grade weights, but they can't choose the same type of task more than once). Didicher says that students “respond more enthusiastically to the buffet approach” (Didicher 172), as the control they have in their assessment decreases their stress level. While there are positive affects from giving students choice like this, Morrison highlights some of the drawbacks or challenges of “democratic education” and “freedom-based education”, including: student resistance (because it's hard going against school norms, since democratic education is “antithetical to conventional school practices” (Morrison 54) for many students); teacher resistance (due to many teachers' lack of experience with democratic education, fearing the unknown and/or not trusting students enough to give them choice and freedom); and institutional resistance (again, that lack of trust for students to make decisions, but on a larger scale).

4. Making Connections: How does BC compare to the literature?

The introduction page of BC's English Language Arts page states that the English Language Arts curriculum is “a foundational component of education in British Columbia” – which makes sense, given that it is the only mandatory subject from K-12. However, this means there is more at stake with these courses; English Language Arts is the class that makes it possible for students to learn how to read and write, teaches them communication skills, and (in today's age of technology) creates digital citizens who are responsible and respectful online. According to Pat Duncan's slideshow, British Columbia is “dedicated to maintaining its position as a global leader in education by pioneering systematic changes that prepare students for a rapidly changing world”. It goes on to say that the education needs to better engage students in “their own learning” and foster skills for success in the world after secondary education.

Kristan Morrison's definition of “democratic education”/“freedom-based education” is synonymous with the BC curriculum's redesign to create a more learner-centered education. These theories of democratic and freedom-based education are based on the premise that “people are naturally curious and have an innate desire to learn and grow” (Morrison 52). Her article goes on to say that, when people pursue their interests, they make meaningful connections for themselves and retain more information; in other words, when students are engaged and excited about what they are learning, they learn more – simple as that! What British Columbia is trying to accomplish with this new curriculum is a form of democratic education at the macro (or whole-school) level. At this level “schools can allow students to construct their entire curricula” (Morrison 53).

Jennifer Groff also highlights the notion of more-passion-equals-more-learning, stating that emotions “are the primary gatekeeper to learning” (Groff 4). “The Nature of Learning” practitioner guide talks about how positive emotions encourage long-term recall, and how negative emotions can disrupt learning (meaning nothing is retained). Hand-in-hand with motivation – positive motivation increasing the chances of student engagement – learning environments “should aim to identify and foster personal interests and the intrinsic motivations of students” (Groff 4).

So, are the secondary schools of British Columbia achieving any of this through English Language Arts 10 course options, or is there evidence of institutional resistance on the part of individual schools?

Some schools have opted to keep English 10 and offer a little bit of everything within the one class, as opposed to having students focus on just two areas. This option mirrors what Ontario is doing in their English 10 classes; the province only offers two options for English 10 – Academic or Applied – but they’ve included a variety of topics to discuss, rather than narrow the focus to one or two. The Ontario curriculum states “[r]esearch has shown that when students are given opportunities to choose what they read and what they write about, they are more likely to discover and pursue their own interests” (Ontario Ministry of Education 5) – which is essentially what the new BC curriculum is stating as well. Initially, I had thought Ontario was behind, given their lack of curriculum updates in over a decade. However, I’m now wondering (assuming each Ontario secondary classroom is following this curriculum sentiment, the importance of student choice) if they are putting more emphasis on choices *within* the classroom. For example, Ontario secondary students aren’t getting a choice when it comes to course selection, but are they being given the freedom to choose whatever books they want for a novel study, or writing on topics that appeal to them rather than following the same prompt as their classmates? Similarly, what Didicher talks about with the flexible summative assessments, giving students the freedom to choose their own due dates and grade weights. (My English 12 teacher did this actually; we had to write four essays, choose two worth 20% and the other two would be worth 30%.) This brings up a question I would love to explore further in a future research project: Is choice better served inside or outside of the classroom (or a bit of both)?

A commonality between many of the schools in British Columbia was to make ELA 10 Literary Studies mandatory, and offering at least three of the four other ELA 10 courses as the second option for students to choose from. Schools may be following this trend because of the reading-writing connection, like Rebecca Olness talks about in *Using Literature to Enhance Writing Instruction*. “By reading literature often and widely, students more readily learn to write” (Olness 1); they acquire a wider vocabulary range, and develop a personal writing style of their own. She emphasizes this notion further with this statement: “Nobody but a reader ever became a writer” (Olness 1). Speaking from personal experience, I agree that my writing has vastly improved as I’ve gotten back into reading more frequently; I can see the value in making Literary Studies a requirement. However, as mentioned earlier, making at least one of the ELA 10 courses a mandatory requirement means taking away a student’s choice for their own learning. As understandable as it is to ensure students are being given opportunities for enhancing their reading and writing, could they not do this within the classroom, regardless of what courses they choose? For example, either ELA 10 or EFP 10 Spoken Language –the focal area of these courses is oral communication (listening and performing), but the curriculum clearly includes “reading strategies” and “writing processes” under content. There are ways to include both reading and writing into any course – whether it’s English Language Arts, English First Peoples, or something beyond this scope such as Mathematics and Science! Giving students some autonomy can ensure a chance at academic success; the literacy abilities will still be present no matter what they choose.

Research has shown socioeconomic status also plays a role in academic success. According to Rachel Bryce and her co-authors in the online article, “Inequality Explained”, “Canadian students from wealthier families enter elementary school already steps above other students in terms of preparedness for school.” This is based on what

students have access to: Are students receiving all the basic needs, such as food and water? Do the students have someone who reads to them daily, who can teach them their ABCs and 123s before entering the public school system? This isn't necessarily just at the individual level, however; as Sonja Santelises and Joan Spade mention, socioeconomic status is a factor to what's available to be offered at schools. I'm not knowledgeable enough on the various statuses within same cities to know if a school is in a "rich" or "poor" part of that particular city, but I have a general understanding of the province as a whole to know roughly which towns are urban and which are rural. A majority of the other 158 schools that didn't have a course selection guide (or at least, not one that was available for public view) were schools from rural areas and offered K-12 in the same school (no separate elementary and secondary schools in town). Something that Spade mentioned in her conclusion is that, "although we found that the organization of schooling reflects the social class of the communities in which schools exist, schools can improve learning by offering more demanding classes and channelling students into higher-level courses [... and for] the schools [...] that continue to struggle with fewer monetary resources and less cultural capital, our findings show that there are still things they can do to change the organization of schooling and improve students' performance" (Spade 124). I don't have any concrete data about what ELA/EFP 10 courses schools are offering in the smaller towns, but I did notice a couple of these districts, on their websites, alluded to the use of distance education for their secondary school students. Although Spade's article discusses Mathematics and Science and not English Language Arts, to use her sentiment, there are still ways to offer students choice despite being in more remote areas. So, if rural school districts can do this through distance education ... why can't every school?

5. Summary: What did I learn from all of this?

One of my favourite psychologists is Erik Erikson, and his theory of psychosocial development. Erikson believes that there are eight stages in which an individual's personality develops. If something happens to the individual during one of these stages, (a "crisis"), then it throws off the rest of the individual's personality development. Assuming everything goes smoothly, however, Erikson says that from ages 12 to 18 (middle school/high school age), individuals should be in the Identity vs. Role Confusion stage. We've all been this age – the age of puberty and changes, figuring out who we are and what we want to be. According to SimplyPsychology, adolescence is the stage between childhood and adulthood and is "a major stage of development where the child has to learn the roles [they] will occupy as an adult." My teaching philosophy ties into this theory; by giving students choices, I believe they can express and explore their identity – figuring out as early as possible what their strengths and challenges are, allowing them the freedom to play to their strengths or challenge themselves to improve in weaker areas, which will in turn prepare them for their future after secondary school. While I still believe this is a valid point – that students should be given freedom in their education – I have begun to see other sides to this argument, that there are potential negative affects when it comes to choice, and that there should be balance and limits.

From my research – and the research of others – it is clear that providing students with choice has its benefits (motivation to learn and engagement in the classroom). Steven Netcoh even says that many teachers believe in these benefits, but despite the research, “students are rarely provided opportunities to have choice in their learning” (Netcoh 384). Some of this may be due to student and teacher resistance, but a strong case can be made for institutional resistance on the part of schools (resisting the BC government’s curriculum redesign philosophy); people don’t always love change.

In regards to whether schools are properly preparing students for post-secondary life, there was a short story that resonated with me: Sonja Santelises spoke of a student who received advice for what courses to take, and that advice did not match with what the student needed to go into his dream profession. An argument could be made that students know better than school counsellors; although this student went to the counsellor in search of advice, he might’ve been better off doing his own research, taking control of his educational journey. This is what the curriculum was designed for, to create “self-regulated learners”. The motivation is there (when interests and passions are involved), the only things standing in the way are the institutions that don’t trust their students enough to let them make their own educational decisions. The only exceptions for this are the schools in rural areas that may not have the resources to offer anything and everything – but I believe there are even ways around this (such as distance education)!

To play devils advocate, Thompson and Beymer say that, although “a classroom that focuses on student-centred learning and allows students to feel a sense of autonomy can increase student motivation”, research also suggests “too much choice can result in negative consequences” (Thompson & Beymer 106). This is referred to as “choice overload”, and it can potentially cause anxiety and regret in decisions. When people are given too many options, it can be overwhelming, and thus the pressure builds to make a decision more quickly or rashly. The regret also comes from “opportunity costs”; “[w]hen a choice is made, something must be given up” (Thompson & Beymer 112), and the last thing anyone wants to feel is the potential that they’re missing out on something. So perhaps schools shouldn’t be offering all nine ELA/EFP 10 options; maybe three from each category is more acceptable? If this is the case, many schools are already doing the right thing, since the average school is offering 4-5 of the nine options.

At the very least, there should be an increase in the number of schools offering EFP 10 courses. Yes, EFP content is still in each ELA curriculum option, but not at the same level as the EFP curriculum options. From what I’ve heard and seen, many teachers are choosing to teach the bare minimum when it comes to First Peoples content, not necessarily out of disinterest, but rather a lack of knowledge or confidence in themselves in order to teach the content. We cannot simply demand every school to offer more EFP course options; if we do so, we are setting the teachers up for failure, because there is a chance that they are lacking in the tools to offer students success. But recognizing that there is a need for an increase in EFP options at the secondary level – for the students who need to see representation of themselves in education, and for the students who wish to learn more about First Peoples (since they are a huge part of Canadian history, Canadian present, and Canadian future) – my hope is that teachers will begin the process of furthering their education on this subject material, and that institutions (the schools they teach at) will guide them on this journey. Recognition is the first step to change; if we don’t see the problem, the problem will never get solved.

“The Nature of Learning” says it best: “Classrooms, schools, and education systems cannot change overnight but neither is it possible to accept arrangements that are in direct contrast to what makes for good learning” (Groff 2). Given that the average secondary school is offering half of these nine ELA/EFP 10 options, I would say the province, in general, is moving in the right direction. Can we improve? Absolutely! The lack of EFP 10 courses being offered is blatantly obvious, and there are some schools not offering students any choice (such as the schools that have made both ELA 10 Composition and ELA 10 Literary Studies mandatory). As it is only the first year of implementation, my hope is that these schools are doing what I wanted to do with this research project – survey teachers and students, take this information, learn how they can improve, and implement more change over the next couple of years.

6. Conclusion: Where can the research go from here?

As I mentioned earlier, my original plan for this project was to use surveys as the basis for my research – talking to principals, teachers, and students throughout the province. At some point in the future (perhaps five years after the curriculum implementation), I would love to return to this plan, taking a look at what the schools were offering in 2018-2019 and what changes they’ve made since then.

It would be interesting to compare the schools offering separate courses versus combined courses, as well as looking at the schools that are still offering English 10 (either as one class using the five ELA course curriculums, or one class acting as an independent studies course where each student chooses their own path). Prior to this research, I hadn’t expected there to be such a wide variety of ways to implement the new curriculum – yet it is the reason this project was born!

I would also love to know about the choices being offered *in* the classroom; it’s one thing to give students the choice of focus area – reading, writing, speaking, etc. – during the course selection process, but what about what they are learning in the classroom? Are they being given the choice of what books to read and what topics to write about? The curriculum changes were brought about to allow for education to become more learner-focused, so it would be nice to see if those sentiments are taking place where the learning is occurring.

One of the issues I ran into for smaller school districts is that for the schools running K-12, their websites catered more to the elementary grades than the secondary, meaning there was little to no information about course offerings. I suspect many of these K-12 schools offer courses by distance education for their secondary students. However, this would be something I would love to discuss with the principals of these schools, to confirm whether or not my hypothesis is correct, and to see if distance education facilities are offering up more (or less) choices than the regular secondary schools.

There are so many unique directions this research could take. A comparison approach can take on a variety of forms – there’s “then” (2018) versus “now” (2013), or separate versus combined courses, to name a couple. There’s also an extension approach, like if there is as much choice *inside* the ELA 10 classrooms as there is *outside* (during the course selection process). Then there is the narrowed-focus investigation of looking at K-12 schools and how they are handling the curriculum changes at the secondary level.

While I'm unsure of which approach I would personally tackle (if I'm only able to choose one), or which one I would do first, I would love to see more research done on the curriculum changes from other fellow teacher candidates.

7. Acknowledgements

Thank you so much to Professor Ginny Ratsoy, of the Department of English and Modern Languages at Thompson Rivers University. She saw the beauty in this topic from the beginning, shared my passion for the project, and was a great mentor throughout this entire journey. She led me to articles and events that not only furthered my research, but enhanced my knowledge of the education world. I will forever cherish this opportunity that I've had to work with her.

I would also like to acknowledge the 111 BC secondary schools that, unknowingly, aided in my research. It was fascinating for me to read over all of these unique course selection booklets, not fully realizing prior to this how vastly different the same curriculum can be interpreted. It has given me a new appreciation for those who worked on the curriculum update, how much time and energy they must've put into it.

8. Bibliography

British Columbia Ministry of Education. "English Language Arts: Introduction." June 2018, <https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/curriculum/english-language-arts/core/introduction>

Bryce, Rachel, et al. "Inequality Explained: The Hidden Gaps in Canada's education system." *OpenCanada.org*, 19 January 2016, <https://www.opencanada.org/features/inequality-explained-hidden-gaps-canadas-education-system/>

Didicher, Nicky. "Bento and Buffet: Two Approaches to Flexible Summative Assessment." *Collected Essays on Teaching and Learning*, vol. 9, 2016, pp. 167-174.

Duncan, Patrick H. "Continuing on the Journey of Transforming Education in BC." 5 February 2019, Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, BC. Speech.

Groff, Jennifer. "The Nature of Learning: Using Research to Inspire Practice", edited by Hanna Dumont, David Istance and Francisco Benavides, OECD Publications, 2010, pp. 1-12. Practitioner Guide.

McLeod, Saul. "Erik Erickson's Stages of Psychosocial Development." *SimplyPsychology*, updated 2018, <https://www.simplypsychology.org/Erik-Erikson.html>

- Morrison, Kristan A. "Democratic Classrooms: Promises and Challenges of Student Voice and Choice, Part One." *Educational Horizons*, vol. 87, no. 1, Fall 2008, pp. 50-60.
- Netcoh, Steven. "Balancing Freedom and Limitations: A Case Study of Choice Provision in a Personalized Learning Class." *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 66, 2017, pp. 383-392.
- Novak, Katie. "UDL vs. DI: The Dinner Party Analogy." *Novak Educational Consulting*, 1 February 2017, <https://www.novakeducation.com/udl-vs-di-dinner-party-analogy/>
- Olness, Rebecca L. "Chapter 1: The Reading-Writing Connection." *Using Literature to Enhance Writing Instruction*, 2005, pp. 1-9.
- Ontario Ministry of Education, the. "The Ontario Curriculum, Grades 9 and 10: English." 2007. Retrieved from <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/english.html>
- Santelises, Sonja. "Are Schools Preparing Students to Be College- and Career-Ready?" *The Hechinger Report*, 6 April 2016, <https://hechingerreport.org/are-high-schools-preparing-students-to-be-college-and-career-ready/>
- Spade, Joan Z., et al. "Tracking in Mathematics and Science: Courses and Course-Selection Procedures." *Sociology of Education*, vol. 70, no. 2, April 1997, pp. 108-127.
- Thompson, Margareta and Patrick Beymer. "The Effects of Choice in the Classroom: Is There Too Little or Too Much Choice?" *Support for Learning*, vol. 30, no. 2, 29 June 2015, pp. 105-120.
- Data from BC secondary schools' course selection guides, compiled onto a Google Sheet: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1sV6x0n1J2FfCzLG7jepEq60zVnahkpcMbzkW2b4UE4/edit?usp=sharing>