

MINUTES OF THE SENATE  
Department of English

25 February 1983

3:00 - 5:20 p.m.

Present: Moldenhauer (Chair); Bertelsen, Bowden, Cable, Duban, Duncan, Farrell, Friedman, Jolliffe, Kruppa, Goldbarth, Lesser, Lidoff, Megaw, Ruszkiewicz, Sipiara, Skaggs, S. Wevill. Absent: Faigley, Ghose, Hinojosa, Renwick, Stott.

---

The minutes of the 28 January 1983 meeting were approved.

Dr. Joseph Moldenhauer announced changes in the Senate's membership. Two senators, Drs. Larry Carver and Maxine Hairston, are on leave-of-absence for the Spring 1983 semester. Dr. Carver's elected seat has been assumed by Mr. Albert Goldbarth; Dr. Hairston's appointed seat has been vacated and will not be reassigned.

Dr. Moldenhauer introduced the main agenda item: Discussion of the Senate subcommittee report on Lecturers. A motion by Dr. Thomas Whitbread, seconded by Dr. James Skaggs, to dissolve the Senate into a committee of the whole for purposes of discussion was passed. At the request of the Chair, the members of the Senate subcommittee (Dr. Whitbread, Dr. Wayne Lesser, Dr. Skaggs, Dr. Sharon Wevill, and Mr. David Jolliffe) responded directly to questions from members of the Senate and the Department; Dr. Whitbread served as moderator. [Point of information: It became evident during the meeting that the subcommittee report distributed to departmental members had the approval of three members of the subcommittee; an alternative proposal recently circulated by Dr. Sue Rodi received the support of Drs. Skaggs and Wevill.]

Dr. Lesser asked to read a statement before discussion began:

Since the proposal before you begins with a comment upon self-interest and an identification of particular self-interests, I would like to make these remarks to clarify what is being asked--of the faculty and of the present lecturers--in the names of fairness and practicality. What I'm going to say is probably self-evident to most of you. Nevertheless, in the interests of candor and of the discussion to follow--a discussion which ought to deal with principles as well as procedures--I am taking the liberty of making explicit that which is clearly implicit.

Let me begin with the faculty. What is being asked specifically of us? We are being asked to accept--in principle, not merely as an inevitability of this moment in the University's academic life--the permanent employment of roughly thirty non-tenure track English teachers. In other words, we are being asked not only to assent to the presence of these teachers, but to endorse their continued presence on grounds of pedagogy and professional enhancement and to refrain from abetting the forces which are presently at work reducing the staffing need which these teachers serve. We are being asked to accept the notion that the endorsement of non-tenure track college teaching employment does not necessarily contribute to a professionally debilitating national trend: to the shrinking of English departments--as an economic measure--through increasing use of temporary Ph.D. employees who teach more, are paid

less, and require no permanent institutional commitments. We are being asked, by the University's regulations, to grant non-tenure track employees a voice--through EC elections as well as representation in the Senate--in long-term departmental policy making. We are being asked--given our willingness to endorse and perpetuate lecturer employment--to accept, as a virtual closed shop, the present individuals in the lecturer group. (a group, for the most part, whose members hold their positions--no matter what their individual merits--simply by virtue of having been lecturers in the inaugural years of the program). We are being asked, in the case of Adjuncts and highly-ranked Lecturers II, to grant some non-tenure track teachers a de facto year-to-year tenure. Assistant professors, in particular, are being asked to believe that such a permanent group of non-tenure track teachers can be structurally contained--that is, maintained as a supplement to the regular faculty without threat to the promotion of junior faculty. The proposal asks even more of us--and here I mean faculty and lecturers--but I'll get to that momentarily.

What is being asked specifically of the present lecturers? The present lecturers are being asked to believe a vision of the hiring-staffing situation which their experience to date indicates is not true. That is, lecturers are being asked to acknowledge that, as things now stand, their positions are impermanent and that their years of service--their accrued seniority--has no legal sanction or binding precedent in the hiring algorithm. Since present lecturers--especially those who are unlikely to be grandfathered into the Lecturer I category--might well see themselves being asked to promote the claims of the new Ph.D. over their own, I will take this occasion to explain why this view is unmerited.

There are three principal reasons, in any kind of employment, to privilege seniority as a hiring principle. When one makes seniority a right and reward of a particular job, one is implicitly saying, first, that longevity of service promotes a special expertise. We simply do not accept the notion that teaching as a lecturer promotes any significant expertise over and above that achieved by faculty and AIs--a more economical and poised presentation, maybe, but not a substantive expertise. When one makes seniority a right and reward of a particular job, one is saying, second, that one values a long-term collegueship based upon longstanding proximity in the workplace. However much we like individual lecturers, we have chosen (as do most departments) to make long-standing personnel commitments on the basis of national recruitment. And if we are concerned with "continuity," we can rest easy: AIs--often pre-trained as TAs and taught by our own department theorists--certainly continue our pedagogic traditions from one year to the next. There is, of course, another reason for treating seniority as a right and reward: it's just plain humane to do so. How can one deny the claim of an employee who has years of good service? Well, one can deny such a claim. What happens when the lecturer group shrinks and our new Ph.Ds. come head-to-head with the longtime lecturers for a small number of positions? Are we going to tell the new Ph.D. that--despite our commitment to his/her professional development--he/she cannot use non-tenure track employment

for traditional professional enhancement just because someone else with a Ph.D. has elected not to use or has failed to use the intervening years of lecturer employment to find a permanent job? We had 15 candidates on the job market this year. Thirteen had two or more interviews. A half-dozen have been or are currently on short lists for tenure-track employment. We had 15 applicants from doctoral candidates for fellowships. The graduate advisors, myself included, were ecstatic over their quality and distraught at the necessity of ranking them. Jim Wimsatt, the Graduate Advisor, noted that every one of these applicants deserved and would be competitive in University-wide competition for a fellowship. The graduate faculty is fully committed to the professional advancement of this talented and ambitious group of emerging Ph.Ds. Despite the EC's non-binding precedent of rehiring our top long-term lecturers, there is no formal commitment to lecturers with seniority; in fact, there is no absolute commitment to the specific individuals in our five line lecturer positions. What commitment to our present lecturers there is will likely diminish if our staffing needs shrink, and shrink they will. The new admissions algorithm, the new English requirement, tight bell-curve grading in the business school, the possibility of lecture courses in sophomore English, and ever-increasing faculty involvement in the writing program will take their toll. Lecturers are being asked--if I might paraphrase a note I received from Steve Harris, a Lecturer--either to negotiate for a more "legitimate" standing in the department or to wait for attrition to get most all of them.

What then, collectively, is being asked of the tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track personnel? First, the proposal asks us all to abandon two incorrect presuppositions and one thoroughly debilitating proposition:

The First Presupposition: that lecturers feel as exploited by what they do as by the conditions under which they work. Lecturers enjoy their work.

The Second Presupposition: that the professors in this department are desultory and unsuccessful lower-division teachers and that they desire the permanence of lecturers as a way to avoid the responsibilities of teaching basic writing and literature courses. Anyone who believes this proposition doesn't know his colleagues or the priorities of junior faculty recruitment since 1973.

The Debilitating Proposition: that no manner of personal satisfaction, department recognition, financial reward, or job security matters in this profession unless it is achieved within the context of the tenure system. This proposition, which conflates the causes and conditions of lecturer employment and labels that employment sub-professional, preempts all attempts to reach an accommodation between tenure-track and non-tenure track employees.

Second, the proposal asks us to accept the following minimum conditions for lecturer "legitimacy": (1) a commitment to the permanence of non-tenure track employment, to a number of such employees larger than the number required to fill only the needs of our new and most recent Ph.Ds; and (2) a commitment to a scheme allowing for two-three year job security and the potential of indefinite employment for the individual lecturer with an exemplary teaching record. These conditions merely emphasize, first, that there is no such thing as "legitimacy" without the endorsed permanence of lecturer employment and the possibility for the individual lecturer to plan a personal and professional life in segments longer than nine months. These conditions, moreover, serve to remind us that small gains in hiring practice, salary, and statements of department and decanal appreciation do not constitute any substantive "legitimacy" for a professional college English teacher.

And finally, the proposal asks that the "professional place" of lecturers be established on the basis of the Lecturer I position. The entire proposal--the attitude toward non-tenure track personnel it advocates, the various interests it serves, the staffing needs it is designed to accommodate--all pivot on the Lecturer I position.

Dr. Susan Rodi wondered why the subcommittee included the professional title "Adjunct Assistant Professor" in its proposal; the Regents' Rules define an "Adjunct Assistant Professor" as ". . . may be used when a qualified person from business, industry, government, private practice, or another institution of higher education may be teaching a course or participating in the teaching of a course at one of the component institutions . . . . Appointments to the faculty with an adjunct title may be with or without pay and shall be for a stated period of time not to exceed one academic year." (RR, III, 1.84(b)) Dr. Rodi did not think that anyone would qualify for this position; therefore, the proposal leaves only two viable options: Lecturer I and Lecturer II, and she thought these positions, as defined in the document, were very inequitable and unacceptable. Dr. Lesser explained that the subcommittee's idea was to use as effectively as possible the total range of talents found to exist in the most impressive Lecturers. The subcommittee considers the Lecturer I group conceptually tied to the Graduate Program and to the Department's professional commitments to its graduate students; the subcommittee has asked that two different types of Lecturers be given special attention after moving out of that Lecturer I group: In the Lecturer II category this would simply be a good teacher, but in the Adjunct category this would be a person with unusual talents who is not being fully used in the present system. A few of the people who are presently in the line Lecturer positions would qualify for that; a number of other Lecturers have abilities and credentials that make them supplement work offered by the general faculty. Examples of areas in which adjuncts might be used include computer instruction in the humanities, editorial procedures, interdisciplinary courses, and those few traditional areas where the Department can't recruit sufficiently to staff courses (i.e., creative writing). The subcommittee used the term "adjunct" because of the spirit of the principle as outlined by the Regents' Rules; the

subcommittee did not expect the term as currently defined to be used for these special appointments. Dr. Skaggs clarified that point: the subcommittee did not perceive this position in the regular sense of adjunct as now used; rather, they perceived it as a completely new position that could possibly be used by other departments in the University. In response to a question from Dr. Elizabeth Cullingford, Dr. Lesser said that the Department would not be precluded from hiring regular, tenure-track assistant professors to fill those positions occupied by adjunct assistant professors; this assumes that the administration will approve the addition of tenure-track positions in the Department.

Dr. Maxine Hairston said that she had been a member of the American Association of Departments of English and the Council of Writing Program Administrators for many years. Many people are concerned about the national trend of using part-time and temporary faculty to teach composition courses; the figures are really shocking. The problem, as Dr. Hairston saw it, is that the Department is using a lot of words to cover-up what it's actually doing. The Department has established a different kind of professional person in the academic world, and these people have become institutionalized: the para-professional. Austin is extremely fortunate to have a great many people with excellent credentials and qualifications so that the Department has a far better pool of such people than other places. Nevertheless, the fact is that this all happened without faculty input: Lecturers, part-time people, Instructors (whatever you want to call them) were brought in gradually as the faculty and AIs diminished. This year the Department hired 70 Lecturers, almost as many as full-time faculty (87); Dr. Hairston thought this was very unhealthy. In spite of the fact that some Lecturers are very good, she said that some are bad. The Department has hired people who have previously been dismissed for bad teaching. The faculty should not rationalize its position by saying Lecturers are all wonderful teachers; this is hypocrisy. The faculty should also face the fact that the present system serves the selfish interests of the tenured and tenure-track faculty: it protects their opportunity to teach graduate courses from increased competition and allows many to have small teaching loads. In the meantime, the faculty doesn't even know who its colleagues are. There has been no effort to bring Lecturers into the departmental life. The only Lecturers the faculty is generally aware of are those who have chosen to speak up and assert themselves. Dr. Hairston did not believe there was a bona fide job shortage; perhaps there was a shortage of nerve and of commitment, but there were jobs to be had in English. The faculty should face completely what it is now being asked to do: to legitimize a system that it created out of neglect. English faculty complain because there are not more English majors and because people don't care about the humanities, and yet the faculty has abandoned the lower-division courses in English (and languages and other crucial core courses) to para-professionals. The students have gotten the message: their courses are being taught by individuals who are not professionals. The MLA Statement on Part-Time Faculty, she said, discusses the potential damage to academic programs caused by the excessive use of part-time teachers and offers these guidelines for their employment:

- (1) Each department should develop a long-range plan clarifying the uses of both temporary and permanent part-time faculty in terms of departmental needs and goals and should establish an appropriate limit on how many part-time people can be hired in relation to the number of full-time faculty and graduate students.
- (2) All part-time faculty should be treated as professionals. They should be hired at salaries comparable with full-time faculty. They should be given office space, clerical support, departmental committee assignments, and appropriate participation in determining departmental policy. They should have positions on policy-making committees for those courses of which they teach a great percentage.
- (3) If there is a recurrent need, the department should consider establishing a cadre of permanent part-time teachers.

Dr. Hairston said that several years ago Dean Stanley Werbow offered to increase the number of Assistant Professors in the Department. The Department turned down this offer for various reasons; the Department chose to hire part-time people on a temporary basis. Many years ago as Director of Freshman English Dr. Hairston was told that the Department could not hire part-time teachers on a semi-permanent basis because it would create a second-class faculty; so far as she could tell, that's exactly what the faculty is being asked to do now. If the Department is serious about this proposal, Dr. Hairston said, then it should look at several other issues: fringe benefits, research grants, travel money and other professional privileges that go with this profession. The Department should look into better methods of evaluation: the present course-instructor survey is not a good instrument; members of the Department are now working on better methods to evaluate writing programs. The Department should develop ways of evaluating teachers in terms of the students in a course and the assignments given to them. In short, evaluation should become a much more serious, in-depth procedure than it currently is. Finally, Dr. Hairston suggested that the Department should develop provisions for people who come in as Lecturers to move into tenure-track positions if they demonstrate commitment and worthiness (through publications and other professional activities).

Dr. John Farrell contested Dr. Hairston's notion of Dean Werbow's offer; he, for one, doubted the authenticity and seriousness of such an offer. Even should such an offer be valid, he doubted that the Administration would increase the number of Assistant Professor positions by 30 or 40.

Dr. Edwin Bowden said he had listened with interest to Dr. Lesser's assumptions; before the Senate became lost in detail, he wanted to look a little harder at these (some stated, some implied). First of all, the assumption that experience does not produce expertise: Dr. Bowden believed that the more teaching one does the better one is likely to teach. He disagreed with the second assumption, that the Lecturer position is in a holding action while searching for some more permanent position elsewhere. Third, the assumption that commitment to new UT Ph.Ds. should override commitment to older Lecturers with more teaching experience is unfair; Dr. Bowden thinks we owe much more to the veteran Lecturers.

The new Ph.D., he said, has known absolutely what the job situation was; why should he be treated as though he walked into something he knew nothing about? Finally, the absolute unstated assumption that the Lecturer should have no possibility of tenure is perplexing; why should this be so? Dr. Bowden thought that once the Department had examined these assumptions, it could worry about the details of the proposal. Dr. Skaggs replied that some members of the subcommittee did indeed feel that experience aids quality; furthermore, many Lecturers do not feel that they are in a holding position but feel that they are a part of the regular faculty of the Department of English. And while there is the feeling of wanting to aid the Ph.D. program, many Lecturers do not feel that priority should be given to new UT Ph.Ds. over experienced Lecturers who have proven records of quality service.

Dr. Lesser explained the ways in which allowing UT Ph.Ds. to enhance themselves professionally benefit both the University of Texas and those in the Lecturer II group. A recent graduate evaluation ranking all graduate departments of English used two ranking categories: faculty quality (the international reputation of the faculty) and effectiveness of program (the measure of the number of a department's Ph.Ds. who publish). A UT Ph.D. who is allowed the necessary perquisites to publish will publish more and therefore make himself more marketable. Every time he publishes and every time he gets a job elsewhere he is enhancing the reputation of the UT English Department. The Lecturer I positions were meant to "buy" the other positions, not to preclude them. The Department has to first earn legitimacy for the group in terms of long-term appointment and professional enhancement. After this is done, then the Lecturer group can be defined more widely so that it isn't totally built around these people: the ones who don't publish are carried also. One has legitimized all non-tenure track personnel. It's the same principle the Department used a number of years ago when it hired a number of Assistant Professors at higher salaries than people who had been here three or four years. The argument was that in the end everyone benefitted because everyone would be equalized. And if one looks at the budget, one discovers that indeed the salaries of all Assistant Professors were raised to make them equal to these new people. The higher starting salaries legitimized higher salaries for everyone. In an institution such as UT which is afraid of non-tenure track employment this proposal seeks to "buy" the rights of those in it by attaching one segment of that non-tenure track employment to a category of individual who best fits this University's traditional interests in professionalism.

In response to a question from Dr. Wevill, Dr. Lesser estimated that of the 15 people who are currently on the job market and who will receive their Ph.Ds. this year, only one seems to have no possibility for a job. In other words, probably only one new UT Ph.D. will enter the Lecturer I category next year.

Dr. Whitbread offered his sense of how the proposal differs from the way the Department currently handles Lecturer appointments. The Executive Committee has been hiring up to five new UT Ph.Ds.; that has been a priority since the beginning of the temporary one-year appointments. Sometimes there haven't been that many.

The new proposal envisions the possibility of expanding that number and enhancing the opportunities for Lecturer I to two- and three-year agreements (there would be no change in the year-to-year contracts). The concept of the subcommittee document as it now stands is that 50% of the current Lecturers would be grandfathered into the Lecturer I category. Both Dean King's letter to the Executive Committee (December 3, 1982) and the Executive Committee's recent response to that document (January 12, 1983) agree on the point that (quoting from Dean King's memorandum): ". . . length of service--provided that service is consistently good--should carry weight in the evaluation procedure. For example, if a Lecturer has rendered consistently good service for, say, five years and wishes to be reappointed, then that person would rank higher for reappointment than someone of whose teaching ability we have no direct knowledge. Always, the first consideration is whether we are providing our students with the best teachers available. . . ." Dr. Whitbread pointed out that the EC reiterated this point in its response: "As we have announced in the past we do give weight to length of service. Obviously a Lecturer who has been here for even two or three years and taught well will have a built-in advantage over outside candidates for whom we might have no evidence or sketchy evidence at best." Dr. Whitbread noted that both the Dean and the EC had qualified this priority for veteran Lecturers: they would be weighed against candidates for whom the EC had no knowledge of teaching ability. In the case of new UT Ph.Ds., of course, the Department has ample knowledge of teaching ability through the teaching evaluations required of them as AIs. This priority does not include those veteran Lecturers who have repeatedly not taught well. They might well be among the 50% (in the scheme as it now stands) who would not be grandfathered into the Lecturer I group but would be placed in the Lecturer II group. He cautioned against thoughts that the Lecturer II group would become a "pit for the misbegotten." In the proposal there is this: "To protect both the veteran Lecturer who has taught well for years and the Department's right to give its students the best possible instruction by hiring the best talent available, we propose the following: Those in the Lecturer II category whose teaching performance, over the recent two-year period, would rank among the top 50% of the Lecturer II group will be hired, assuming staffing need, before a recruit with a Ph.D. from another institution or University department. Those in the Lecturer II group without such a ranking will simply be judged head-to-head against the available competition." If and as the staffing needs gradually shrink, Dr. Whitbread said, it's clear that those who are on the bottom will be the first not to be rehired under any scale.

Dr. Joseph Kruppa estimated that five or ten people were turned away for positions this year; he said that most of the people who were ranked and were still available when the Department needed them were hired. There were also a few who were turned away in the very early stages of application. Dr. Whitbread reported on Dean King's assessment of future staffing needs: "There can, therefore, be no useful talk of permanence for Lecturer positions. Permanent is precisely what the Lecturers are not. If, say, the number of incoming freshmen drops to half of what it is now for some reason, you would not have to hire any additional teachers beyond the regular faculty of the department plus the 70 or so AIs." Realistically, Dr. Whitbread believed no such dramatic drop in enrollment was likely to occur in the next several years; the Department will continue to need substantial numbers of Lecturers. Dr. Skaggs said that Dean King also came up with some preliminary statistics; Dean King "guestimates" that by 1990 somewhere between 30 and 40 FTE for Lecturers would be needed; the Department currently employs approximately 62 FTE. Dean King expects this to be a very stable number throughout the decade.



Mr. David Jolliffe asked to make a statement. As the graduate student representative on this committee, he would like to make two disclaimers. First of all, he did not write a word of the proposal. His only lexical contribution to that document was his insistence that the word "pool" (which he thought has been used often in the past in a derogatory fashion and still was) be deleted or changed. Second, he thought the conduct of the subcommittee was abysmal. The initial meeting in December was scheduled for a week late in the semester; a member of the committee came to him and asked if he could meet on a Wednesday or Friday. As Mr. Jolliffe had to go out of town on Friday he said he could meet on Wednesday; the meeting was held on Friday. When he returned from Christmas vacation, the proposal virtually in its present form was a fait accompli. Despite these two disclaimers and despite these two unfortunate situations, Mr. Jolliffe supported the document in broad principle. First of all as a representative of the graduate students whom he was elected and appointed to represent, he supported it in the spirit of representative democracy: it's good to the graduate students. But he also believed that the graduate students do not want the Lecturers' jobs. These are jobs which both by the way the Department treats them and by the way they obviously bear themselves strikes him personally as a very "hang-dog job."

Mr. Jolliffe stated that he'd never seen a sadder bunch of people who seem to not like their work and seem to say (in body at least) that theirs is a lousy, rotten job and they are treated as lousy, rotten people. Mr. Jolliffe estimated that the number of Ph.Ds. entering the Lecturer I category would indeed be small. The Graduate Office is in principle accepting fewer and fewer graduate students so that the number of people who are going to be coming out of UT with Ph.Ds. will potentially decline. He liked the proposal in the sense that it does give Lecturers a way to achieve a distinctive position; it gives them that opportunity by allowing them to do something which distinguishes themselves. If, for example, one accepts the argument that length of service leads to quality service, then why do graduate advisors encourage graduate students to publish papers, get convention papers accepted, and go out and do things in the scholarly world which will in turn distinguish them to the point where they can get tenure-track jobs? Mr. Jolliffe said that he is in his eighth year of teaching composition in one way or another; by the reckoning of longevity of service, he should be an outstanding teacher at this point. Yet he's still publishing papers, still going to conventions, trying to make himself better. He suggested that if the Department accepts the idea that production of scholarly research, curriculum innovation, and developing talents in new fields is only valuable in the sense that it makes one a better teacher, then perhaps the Department can begin to develop a sense that these people who are distinguished and who are going to get hard budget lines as Lecturers have shown that they are distinguished. Some will say that Lecturers are not expected to publish and that Lecturers are not expected to do anything but teach. Mr. Jolliffe asserts that graduate students are not expected to do anything besides take courses and teach one or two sections a semester. Yet because they are striving to get beyond just what is expected of them and to get beyond the place where they might not be able to find full tenure-track employment elsewhere, the graduate students do go beyond the expected. The graduate students certainly recognize that the good Lecturers, the people who have distinguished themselves both within the bounds of the University of Texas and beyond, deserve to be hired continually.

Dr. Ray Cook responded to Mr. Jolliffe's observation that the Lecturers seem to be a very unhappy group; although he doesn't get paid much, Dr. Cook receives enormous ego satisfaction from what he does. He is very happy to be a part of the English Department at the University of Texas; furthermore, there are others who are as happy as he.

Dr. Lesser examined the longevity principle; he decided that it was no absolute principle for determining quality. The entire profession presupposes that certain kinds of people (because of demonstrated abilities at the graduate level both to teach and to write) will probably turn out to be excellent teachers. That is why when the EC hires Assistant Professors it looks at their teaching records (if they have been AIs), interviews them to evaluate their teaching personalities, and reads their dissertations and articles. These things are all interdependent; they all contribute to one's quality as a teacher.

Dr. Neill Megaw spoke as a concerned member of the MLA Task Force on Academic Freedom. This committee is very concerned about the over-reliance on part-time teachers; apparently, he said, some of the things Dr. Hairston had already said had not "sunk in." There was no guarantee that this proposal or any other would increase a Lecturer's "permanent" status. All it would take is one law suit challenging the tenure-accrual system to rid the Department of all Lecturers. This University is extremely sensitive to litigation; one can see this in the way the University has over-reacted to the copyright suit in New York. The Department will not solve this problem humanely or fairly until the Department is allowed to recruit for more tenure-track (i.e., Assistant Professor) positions; there are inherent advantages to the national recruitment involved in such appointments: the aims of EEO would be better served and the Department might just wind up with a better group of people. What the Department should work for, then, is an increasing number of Assistant Professorships. This should be done gradually. Dr. Megaw said that during this Centennial year the English Department should ask the University to create a vision for the future. As for the present, the Department must assume obligation for those Lecturers who are currently employed. Better methods of evaluation should be developed; the Department should seek to improve their teaching skills. The Department should not let these Lecturers go unless they demonstrate gross incompetence. It is incumbent upon the Department, he said, to improve their working conditions and to give them many, if not all, of the amenities Dr. Hairston referred to. The Department should not waver in its determination to seek tenure-track positions for these people. Priorities at this University do change, he said; they can be altered. The Department must accept full responsibility for hiring these people and must treat them as colleagues in the full professional sense.

Dr. Skaggs commented that the Lecturers, as currently used, are a financial godsend because they teach classes for less than the University pays AIs. The University's fiscal officers love this arrangement; they are going to perpetuate this system: why should they replace Lecturers with Assistant Professors who must be paid much more?

Dr. Clifford Endres wondered why there were no provisions in the proposal for travel money and other perquisites for Lecturers. Dr. Lesser explained that first the Department must prove that the University's self-interests were tied to the interests of the Lecturer group; once the University recognizes the importance of professional enhancement for Lecturers, then the Lecturers would be given perquisites for professional advancement.

Dr. Hairston stated that the department would be "morally bankrupt" if it accepted Dean King's view of the situation in blind faith. Circumstances are difficult, she said, but there are compelling reasons and needs for gradually increasing the number of tenure-track positions in the English Department while reducing the cadre of Lecturers; meanwhile, the Department should grant the Lecturers the status that they should rightfully have.

Dr. Alice Korach said that one thing the Department was not examining was the proposal's effect on the graduate program. She imagined a situation where students would apply to the graduate program in droves because they would have three-year jobs at the end of the program. That situation would not seem to be for the good of anyone except the few people who get to teach those people. Dr. Lesser said that he would be thrilled to have more applications from superb graduate students who would be willing to pass up degrees at more prestigious colleges because they thought they could get genuinely better professional training at the University of Texas. However, that in itself by no means suggests that the Department would enroll more graduate students. Vice President Livingston has recently stated that the current enrollment limit should be stable for some years to come. It becomes a question, then, of who comes, not how many.

Dr. Alan Friedman moved, and Dr. Farrell seconded, that the Senate go out of the committee as a whole and back into regular session so that the Senate could further instruct the subcommittee. The motion was approved.

Dr. Friedman said that he was very disappointed with the subcommittee report. He had hoped that the subcommittee would present to the Senate a document which had received strong endorsement from the Lecturers; the present document had the support of only three members with no support from the Lecturer members of the subcommittee. The Senate needs to have a clear statement of what the Lecturers as a group want; it needs to know what the professoriate and graduate students want. The Senate needs to know where these groups agree and disagree. Therefore, Dr. Friedman moved, and Dr. Kruppa seconded, that:

the subcommittee be asked to reconsider its report in light of today's discussion and that, as soon as feasible, it report back to the Senate with a document which states explicitly what it can and cannot agree on and then enumerates those areas where there is significant disagreement and suggests options in each of those areas; this report would be presented to the Senate for a series of straw votes which would serve as guidance for the committee in developing a coherent document to present to the Senate for final vote.

A friendly amendment changing "report back to the Senate" to "report to a Department meeting" was accepted by Dr. Friedman but not by Dr. Kruppa. Dr. Skaggs seconded the amended motion.

After discussion of the composition of the subcommittee and its charge from the Senate, Dr. Lesser suggested that perhaps another, larger committee should be appointed to investigate fully some of the questions that had arisen. Dr. Lesser introduced a substitute motion, seconded by Dr. Whitbread,:

that the present subcommittee be dissolved; that the Senate petition the Chair to appoint a study-group (whose members would cover the entire departmental staffing range) to deliberate and present to the Senate a proposal for dealing with the Lecturers; as part of its deliberations this committee would seek and receive expressions and views from any and all individual members or groups thereof in the Department.

Dr. Lesser explained that the work involved in developing a proposal of this magnitude is simply too much work for a subcommittee of the size originally created. Dr. Skaggs spoke in favor of the substitute motion; he thought that what the Senate was doing in this particular instance was probably the single most important thing that could be done as a department in the 1980s. What the Department does now and the decisions that it will be making are going to have implications on a wide scale, affecting the general hiring practices of new teachers in English Departments across the country. It is an extremely involved and complicated problem, he said, and is a national problem, not simply a local one. It certainly deserved more than the cursory attention the subcommittee had given it.

Dr. Cullingford asked if the "Rodi Proposal" [Dr. Rodi's substitute proposal circulated to the Department earlier in the week] had received the approval of the Lecturers. Dr. David Gaines said that the Lecturers had not taken formal votes on either of the proposals; his sense of the 22 February meeting of the Lecturers was that the Rodi proposal was the more popular of the two. Dr. Skaggs agreed with this assessment.

Dr. Moldenhauer noted that if the substitute motion is approved, it will supersede the original motion (Dr. Friedman's motion). The substitute motion was approved by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Pamela Wheeler  
Secretary