

On April 16, 1984, I asked the following question of President Flawn in the meeting of the University Council:

The minutes of the Freshman English Policy Committee for February 10, 1984, read in part as follows:

"Haskies reported on a conversation with the chairman concerning the offering of E106/206. The decision not to offer the courses was confirmed by the dean and a vice-president."

In On Campus for March 26--April 1, Paul Kelley reports on the University Council's meeting of March 19:

"James H. Sledd (English) asked which administrator had made the decision that English 106K and English 206L could not be offered. President Flawn replied that he was not informed on that matter and called on Dean Robert D. King (Liberal Arts) to respond. Dean King stated that he had told the chairman of the Department of English that it was up to the department when to begin offering these two courses."

Is either or neither of these two statements true, or are both; and if both, which vice-president confirmed the decision not to offer two courses which had been described to the University Council as eminently feasible and potentially of special value to minority students?

President Flawn and Vice-president Fadden both replied, unequivocally, that no vice-president had been involved in the decision in any way. Their reply combined with King's to indicate that the decision not to offer 106 / 206 was made within the Department of English and was not confirmed either by the Dean of Liberal Arts or by any vice-president. Yet when does one believe?

I find it depressing (a) that the Department should make a promise to win the Council's vote but promptly break it when the vote is won, (b) that the truth concerning so important a decision should be made so hard to come by, and (c) that a university which can provide millions and millions for Superexy and Associates can't staff two promised courses for the weakest ten per cent of the entering freshmen.

James Sledd

4/17/84