

DOCUMENTS AND MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY
AND
DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of January 24, 1983, published below, have been prepared for the immediate use of the members of the University Council and are included in its Documents and Proceedings. They are also included in the Documents and Minutes of the General Faculty for the information of the members.

H. Paul Kelley
H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The General Faculty

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 24, 1983

The fifth regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1982-1983 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, January 24, 1983, at 2:15 p.m.; in the absence of President Peter T. Flawn, Vice-President William S. Livingston presided.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Lawrence D. Abraham, John R. Allison, Mark I. Alpert, Frank D. Bean, Jr., Paul E. Begala, Gerard H. Behague, Harold W. Billings, Shirley F. Binder, J. Harold Box, Robert E. Boyer, Billye J. Brown, Ronald M. Brown, Ben H. Caudle, Randall J. Charbeneau, James H. Colvin, Mary S. Crockett, William H. Cunningham, James W. Daniel, Patrick J. Davis, John D. Denson, James T. Doluisio, David J. Drum, James Duban, Barbara J. Dugas, Carla F. Dunn, John R. Durbin, Toni L. Falbo, Gerhard J. Fonken, Donald J. Foss, Alan W. Friedman, J. David Gavenda, William P. Glade, Earnest F. Gloyna, Donald J. Grantham, Vickie L. Hampton, E. Glynn Harmon, Roderick P. Hart, Thomas M. Hatfield, Forest G. Hill, Ira Iscoe, Robert C. Jeffrey, E. Earl Jennings, Eleanor W. Jordan, H. Paul Kelley, Robert D. King, Sanford V. Levinson, William S. Livingston, Steven I. Marcus, R. Neill Megaw, Jack Otis, Dorothy K. Payne, Shirley B. Perry, David L. Phillips, Walter L. Reed, Ramon Saldivar, Joel F. Sherzer, James H. Sledd, H. Eldon Sutton, John F. Sutton, Mary P. Taylor, Julie A. Tindall, James W. Vick, Terry J. Wagner, Stanley N. Werbow, Roxanne K. Williamson, J. Robert Wills, Ronald E. Wyllys.

Absent: Frank N. Bash, Leigh B. Boske, Betsy E. Bowman, Oscar G. Brockett (excused), Brett M. Campbell (excused), Heather L. Carter, Larry D. Carver, William C. Dueterhoeft, Jr. (excused), Parker C. Fielder, Peter T. Flawn (excused), G. Charles Franklin, Lorrin G. Kennamer (excused), Thomas W. Kennedy, Larry W. Lake (excused), Robert D. Mettlen (excused), Elspeth D. Rostow, Claire E. Weinstein (excused), Martha S. Williams.

Total members present: 67Total members absent: 18

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF DECEMBER 13, 1982 (D&P 9006-9040; D&M 14959-14993). (APPROVED AS CORRECTED)

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of December 13, 1982, (D&P 9006-9040; D&M 14959-14993) were first corrected to indicate that William H. Cunningham was present.

Next, James H. Sledd (English) made the following statement: "I took the precaution of getting a copy of the original transcript of last month's meeting, and the Minutes as circulated differ from that transcript in a number of substantive ways. I listened to only part of the tape, so I do not know what was on all of the tape."

"1. The Minutes, D&P 9016, toward the bottom of the page, the numbered item 2, line 2, and the numbered item 3, line 1: The crucial clause 'who chooses the freshman option' does not appear in the original transcript, where the corresponding passage is on page 13. The addition of that clause, drastically changing the nature of the assertion as it appears in the original transcript, weakens Mr. Megaw's statement, D&P 9021, 'I do not...agree with the case made by Professor Kinneavy to the effect that we would be denying the students E. 346K'; and of course the assertion that my motion would deny students that opportunity was one of the misrepresentations I objected to."

"2. The Minutes, D&P 9016, the last line, and D&P 9017, the first line, say that the legislation approved by the Council and the Faculty included 'a provision that a certain percentage (we are currently using 10%)' would be required to do remedial work; but page 14 of the original transcript makes 10% a part of the legislation by reporting 'a provision that the lower 10% of the students would have to take remedial work.' Since I have had trouble all along in determining what the legislation really is, that ought to be cleared up."

"3. [The] Minutes, D&P 9017, line 8, include the statement that 'last year 600 people a week were helped'; [but] page 14 of the original transcript does not include that statement. If the statement was not made, it should not be added as an afterthought."

"4. The Minutes, D&P 9017, line 6, read, 'ECT scores,' but page 14 of the original transcript reads 'SAT scores.' The two exams are quite different, though they may give the same rankings."

"5. [The Minutes,] D&P 9020, ten lines from the bottom of the page, there is an ellipsis after the phrase 'in this University.' The original transcript, on page 17, supplies that ellipsis: 'We have tenured and tenure-track faculty of some 90; we have, we are using our budgeted lines. We have not been given any additional budgeted lines in a good many years.' Now that last statement is crucial because it indicates what the real problem with all the composition work has been, namely that the administration has refused to support it."

"[6. The Minutes,] D&P 9022, lines 6 and 7, say 'Dean Jeffrey asked for an indication of the members who had read the document.' On this point, I both listened to the tape and read the transcript, and the transcript is quite correct when it says, 'Dr. Sledd asked for a show of hands.'"

"Someone should check the transcript against the tape, and if the transcript is accurate according to the tape, then the readings of the transcript should be substituted for those which I have listed."

Secretary Kelley stated that he would check the transcript and the Minutes to be sure that they agree, and the Minutes were then APPROVED as corrected. Subsequent checking of the tape recording of the meeting, the transcript of that recording, and the Minutes as edited and circulated resulted in the corrected Minutes shown in ATTACHMENT A (D&P 9092-9098; D&M 15013-15019).

SECRETARY'S REPORT (D&P 9061-9064)

The Secretary's Report had been previously distributed as D&P 9061-9064, and there was no discussion of the report.

QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT (D&P 9042-9043)

James H. Sledd (English) had submitted questions to the President concerning conflicting statements about the new English requirements (D&P 9042-9043). In the absence of President Flawn, Gerhard J. Fonken (Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Research) replied: "...the question... is: 'If transfer students will indeed have to take E. 346K, when and by whom was that decision made, and when was it discussed by the English Department, the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts, and the University Council, all of which had considered the new requirements under the opposite assumption?'"

"I cannot speak to discussions by the Department of English, I did not participate in them; nor do I know when the discussion might have occurred in the College of Liberal Arts.... I believe the question is centered largely around English 307, in the matter of whether a student who has taken E. 307 or the equivalent thereof at another school can transfer that course to U.T. Austin as the equivalent of E. 346K. The answer to that question would be, 'No, any transfer students who have not had E. 346K or a course determined by The University of Texas at Austin as being the equivalent of that course--namely, an upper-division English course with a certain course content--would have to take E. 346K when they arrive here or at the appropriate time in their curriculum.' ...A student who has taken E. 307 somewhere else indeed could have that transferred here if it is judged to be the equivalent of our E. 307 [and] would receive 3 [semester hours of credit], but that student would not have fulfilled the requirement of E. 346K; [he or she] would be faced with that requirement at some later point."

Mr. Sledd then stated: "The question remains totally unanswered. I asked when the decision that has just been given was made and by whom, and the point of the question is that the previous documents, all of them, specify that two semesters of composition elsewhere do exempt one from E. 346K. Now, after we have voted on that assumption, we are told that that will not exempt one from E. 346K, and what I have asked is, who made that decision after we had voted on the opposite assumption? And Mr. Fonken simply ignored my question."

Ramon Saldivar (English) MOVED that the privileges of the floor be extended to James L. Kinneavy, and the motion was seconded and ADOPTED. Mr. Kinneavy (English) said that since the statement Mr. Sledd referred to had been made by him, he would reply. "The first five statements cited by Mr. Sledd represented the intent of the proponents of the English proposal as the proposal was considered at the Department, the College, and the University Council deliberations. That intent was stated, and he quotes it very exactly: 'Transfer credit for a composition course beyond E. 306 satisfies this requirement.' The last statement cited by Mr. Sledd, and it is the discrepancy between the first five and the last one that Mr. Sledd is concerned about, is an attempt to adjust the intent of the English proposal with the wording of President Flawn's approval of the proposal and with the practical impact of the additional writing requirements as they are being written into the various college catalogues. A word of explanation may clear up this necessary shift."

"The wording of President Flawn's statement approving the English proposal follows: 'The legislation, PROPOSAL BY THE GENERAL FACULTY FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE UNIVERSITY REQUIREMENT IN ENGLISH (D&M 14189-14193), is hereby approved' and I am going to underline the next phrase 'except for the section that authorizes the University Council to approve substitutes for English 346K.' Now, a strict interpretation of this wording certainly discourages substitutes for E. 346K. Mr. Fonken's interpretation of that ruling gives additional confirmation to my interpretation of the President's ruling. Since the basic Writing Requirement calls for two additional courses beyond those of the English requirement, at the time I made that statement it seemed better for me to count the community college transfer [course] as one of the additional writing courses and avoid the whole substitution issue...."

Mr. Sledd closed by stating: "...the President ruled out substitutes by other departments for E. 346K.... It was not E. 307 he ruled out; it was the provision that other departments, with the approval of this Council, could offer courses which could be substituted for E. 346K. And to say that that applied to the second semester of freshman English is simply a distortion; it did not."

SPECIAL ORDER

MOTION TO CHANGE ALL U.T. AUSTIN UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS THAT ARE WITHIN THE SPIRIT OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8910-8911). (DEFEATED)

Mr. Livingston read the motion by Mr. Sledd which had been made and seconded but not acted upon at the December meeting of the University Council: "At every point where the new Writing Requirements for U.T. Austin undergraduate degree programs specify E. 346K, students will be given a choice between E. 346K and a second semester of composition at the freshman level."

James L. Kinneavy (English), who had been given privileges of the floor earlier in the meeting, said: "I do not feel that there has to be a systematic response to the latest memorandum by Mr. Sledd distributed from the Office of the General Faculty last Thursday. [That memorandum is reproduced as Attachment B, D&P 9099-9101; D&M 15020-15022.] The issues raised are the same issues which were discussed at considerable length two years ago and at the last University Council meeting."

"I would like to make a brief summary statement about the motion itself. There are two educational objections and one major logistical objection to the Sledd amendment."

"The educational effect of the amendment would be to rule out, for those who would take advantage of it, any required writing in their own discipline. Of all the five writing courses mandated by the English proposal and the Vick Committee, only one, E. 346K, requires the student to write professional prose in his own discipline. E. 306 is a course with general humanities as the subject of the themes; E. 307 (the one Mr. Sledd is recommending as a second semester freshman course) is a course in literature and composition; so is E. 316K. After fulfilling the English requirement in this manner, following the Sledd motion, a student could take, for example, Speech 319 and an upper-division course in Victorian literature. These five courses would meet the Vick Committee requirement. And at no time would the student be writing in his own field, learning the genres and conventions of his own discipline."

"How common would such a sequence be? I spoke to literally hundreds of students during my seven-year stint as Director of Freshman English. My solid conviction is that most freshmen want to get their requirements in general education out of the way as early as possible. They do not realize the importance of writing either in their University experience or in their future careers. Consequently, most of them would tend to take the Sledd option of a second freshman course. They would also tend to take another course with 'substantial writing' (like Speech 319) as early as possible."

"The general effect of such a tendency would be to eliminate any course in the sequence dedicated to writing in the student's own discipline. Yet, the writing requirement certainly is supposed to be a course which teaches the student to write intelligent prose in his own professional field. We are not training a generation of literary critics. We are training engineers, lawyers, historians, scientists, and business majors who can write competent prose in the media and the publications of their own field."

"The solution to this problem would be to [ask] the student to take both E. 307 and E. 346K, a possibility suggested by Mr. Sledd on two occasions. This solution, however, leaves to the English Department the teaching of four of the five writing courses--and the student could take the fifth in the English Department also. I will return in a moment to the staffing problems which this would create."

"However, I would first like to point out that such a sequence would have the effect of taking away from the individual departments the motivation to establish their own courses with substantial writing requirements. One educational value of the Vick Committee Report was to emphasize the importance of such courses. Such courses make the business of literacy the business of the entire University--as it should be. This by-product of the Sledd amendment could be even more educationally disastrous than the one I outlined above. But they both would lead to the same result: discouraging the student from writing in his own discipline."

"Finally, the Sledd amendment, particularly if interpreted in the manner suggested above (to allow the student to take four or five of his courses for the writing requirement in the English Department), also would impose a severe staffing problem on the Department. If any substantial number of students follows the sequence he suggests: E. 306, E. 307, E. 316K, E. 346K, the English Department will have to hire an additional 30 or 40 teachers to meet this new composition course, for then the English Department will be teaching three full-fledged composition courses (with small classes necessitating many teachers). We are currently staffing three of the writing courses, with two courses in composition. But if we have to teach three full-fledged composition courses and another course in literature and composition, a requirement which no other university of which I am aware has, then we will have a severe staffing problem."

"In other words, Mr. Sledd has not thought through either the educational or the logistical implications of his motion."

"Let me just add one footnote. There have been some articles in the papers suggesting that a substantial number of the English Department [faculty] agrees with Mr. Sledd, or at least [that] there is a strong group. The vote of the English Department at the time the vote was taken was 77% of the people voting for the proposal which we are still proposing and 23% voting for other options; none of those options at the time was the proposal suggested by Mr. Sledd. I urge you to defeat the amendment."

Paul E. Begala (Student Representative) said that he was speaking not only for himself but also for the student delegation. "While we support Dr. Sledd's proposal in principle, we certainly recognize the problems that were brought up by Dr. Kinneavy. While perhaps he overstates...by calling it an educational disaster to have students not write in their own field, certainly that disaster can be avoided by not defeating the Sledd proposal. I think we should realize that those problems may indeed exist under the Sledd proposal, but they can be dealt with under an amendment. If Dr. Sledd will agree, I propose the following friendly amendment: [A second paragraph will be added to the Sledd motion that says,] 'At every point where the Writing Requirements for U.T. Austin undergraduate degree programs specify six semester hours of courses certified as having a substantial writing component, the three semester hours required to be at the upper-division level shall also be required to be in the student's major.'

"[This would] address all the points that Dr. Kinneavy brought up from an educational point of view as being problematic under the Sledd proposal. What [it] would also do is strongly encourage--in fact, require, that each college design writing courses for each student's discipline. The effects of this, I think, would be greatly advantageous. I think we all agree that it is important that we turn out people who are literate in their own fields and that each student be able to write well."

in his or her own discipline, rather than simply be generalists. Dr. Kinneavy is absolutely correct; we do need to learn how to write in our own fields. I think [my amendment would bring this about] while still preserving the flexibility of the Sledd option, while still allowing us to build the proper foundation in two semesters of freshman English, and while giving us an exposure and upper-division teaching at our own department's level so that we can learn to write in our own discipline. So I think there are tremendous...advantages to be gained by Dr. Sledd's motion, and I think that the one educational disadvantage cited by Dr. Kinneavy can easily be dealt with by this amendment.

"Now as far as logistical problems go, I do realize that this would require...an increase in staffing, but I think what we have to set here are our priorities. I think if we allow ourselves to place logistical problems above our ideals of academic excellence, then I think that the rest of the academic community and the community at large will see that we are not, in fact, committed to [improving] the student's ability to write, but, in fact, are only giving lip service to it."

David L. Phillips (Student Representative) seconded the Begala amendment and attributed his academic success at U.T. Austin to having two freshman-year courses in composition and rhetoric. "Why should we insist that each student be required to take a technical writing course in their junior year when perhaps they might have needed some additional writing instruction in their freshman year? And I would like to further suggest that if they do not receive that freshman instruction, then they might not make it to the junior year.... The E. 346K requirement presents to us the idea that perhaps we have the chance for education in composition in our junior year. If we do not receive the educational training in composition at our freshman level, this is totally insignificant. We will not have the rhetorical foundation to be able to write in our discipline...."

"Let me offer...an observation that I think many students here can support. E. 306 is not regarded as a highly intensive educational course; it is regarded primarily as a remedial course. I would suggest to you that the most effective freshman composition course would be one that is a hardnose-teaching course of rhetoric and composition. I fear that E. 306 does not satisfy this definition."

"Finally, ...[there is] variation in student needs. If you think about your own students...and the vast diversity of their writing abilities, it is most ineffective for this body to dictate an educational policy to 10,000 undergraduate students that does not apply to their specific needs. Dr. Kinneavy has not addressed these needs in terms of individual requirements. I would encourage him to do so, especially in reference to our amendment that requires two freshman composition courses with the composition course in the third year."

John D. Denson (Student Representative) reiterated the support of all the student members of the University Council for the Sledd proposal and the Begala amendment. He said that if there were to be a survey of student opinion, he thought "every student would agree that we would like to have the option" of taking either E. 307 or E. 346K. "It is not just a matter that you want to take E. 307 and get your requirements out of the way. Most of us, the Student Representatives on the Council, know from personal experience, coming from Plan II backgrounds for the most part, that having the first year writing program was probably the most helpful thing [in our] college education. ...I think it is important for most students at least to have the opportunity to take the strong writing program the first year. My experience with E. 306, and from talking to students who have taken E. 306, is that E. 306 simply does not offer that strong a writing component. I can understand the emotion and the reasons for E. 346K; it makes sense. No one can dispute the value of having a second writing class your junior year, especially a writing class supposedly in your major. But, I do not think you are going to get to E. 346K unless you have a strong writing background such as E. 307."

...It does not make a lot of sense to me that allowing the option would in itself increase the staffing requirements. I can see if all four courses were required that, of course, you are going to have to increase the staffing requirements, but [I cannot see why] simply allowing students to choose between E. 307 and E. 346K [would require] a staffing increase." Mr. Denson concluded by stressing that the Student Representatives were unanimous in their belief that the Sledd proposal as amended was in the best interest of students.

Sanford V. Levinson (Law) said: "I am still much more persuaded by Professor Sledd than by Professor Kinneavy's response, in part because I am really quite disturbed by the whole imagery of undergraduates as professionals. As somebody who has taught academic political science and has a Ph.D in political science, quite literally the last thing I would want is majors in political science to start writing like political scientists--or, for that matter, lawyers to start literally writing like lawyers except when filling that specific professional role...."

"In my role as the director of writing at the Law School, I know that a lot of graduates of this university and others do not write well.... And I agree with the statements of Mr. Phillips and Mr. Denson that at least the option of taking an additional course in composition, rhetoric, and the like would actually be of great help. I am somewhat sympathetic to the logistical arguments; I know that all departments view themselves as set upon in a way, and I do think it is an open question of whether or not the English Department should be forced to bear the burden of this entire program. But I must say that I also agree with Mr. Denson that in terms of staffing, if one assumes a constant pool of people taking composition courses, then the only question is whether the English Department or some other department [will be hiring additional faculty].... Unless I hear stronger arguments as to the educational benefits of defeating the Sledd proposal..., I must say I have been much more persuaded by Mr. Sledd and the students who have spoken than by the argument against it."

James W. Daniel (Mathematics) said that he was puzzled by the logic of the issue being discussed. "Perhaps foolishly I have come to view upper-division courses as distinct from lower-division courses. Generally an upper-division course is more demanding and requires a certain level of maturity as compared to a lower-division course. 'Thou shalt take either E. 307, a second-semester freshman course, or E. 346K, an upper-division junior or senior course.' It is that logic that disturbs me. It seems to say that we will demand a certain high level of performance (E. 346K) for a certain class of people, but if you are poorly prepared enough, then instead you will take this lower level course and never have to take the upper level course. I do not want to propose this, but it would make more sense to say that in order to get into E. 346K there is a certain prerequisite demonstrated measured ability of some sort, and if you do not [demonstrate] it by virtue of E. 306, then you take E. 307 on the way--you have to take E. 307 and E. 346K, which would be an even worse problem and would be exactly the sort of thing Professor Kinneavy is afraid would occur. I really am puzzled at how we can say you shall meet a requirement either by this lower-division or by this upper-division course; I do not see how those can be equivalent academically."

Mr. Phillips posed two questions to Mr. Kinneavy, the first concerning the nature of E. 346K. Mr. Kinneavy responded that E. 346K is "an advanced expository writing course in which the student does themes in the area of his own discipline and, since these themes are addressed for a person who is in the English Department, these themes are addressed to the general amateur reader. They are not intended to be the kind of publications that a graduate student would do or that a person would do in Petroleum Engineering for a Petroleum Engineering degree. They are intended to force the student to speak to the general educated reader about something which he has a mature knowledge of--that is to say, his

own field. [Four types of sections are envisaged: science and technology, social sciences, humanities, and general business.] The sciences and the social sciences sections would indeed resemble, to some extent, some of the aspects of a technical writing course, but they would also incorporate the analytical elements (and this was insisted upon by the English Department discussions) of reading and analyzing some texts in the field, too. That is the general idea of E. 346K."

Mr. Phillips' second question was: "Was not the previous technical writing course a lower-division course with the number of E. 317?" Mr. Kinneavy responded that such was the case but that "most of the people who took it were at the junior or senior level; and, secondly, it did not have the analytical component, the humanities component, which the English Department wants to graft onto the old E. 317K course."

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) said: "In the long history of this university we have had, I think, E. 306, 307, 312, 314. We find out that our students can not write, or at least some people say they can not write, well enough. I am not sure that [continuing] E. 307 is going to do other than avoid the issue. I am sympathetic to what [the students want], but if what we have used in the past has not worked, why should we then give the students the alternative of going into E. 307? ...Perhaps it would be a good idea to have some qualification [for entrance] into E. 346K and [a requirement] that if you do not pass E. 346K appropriately, you do not graduate."

J. David Gavenda (Physics) spoke against the Begala amendment. "I do not think we would be doing a great service to the students, in my own personal opinion, to force them to take a course in writing given by my colleagues in Physics. I think that it is much too narrow a specification...."

H. Eldon Sutton (Zoology) pointed out that the proposed amendment would create a problem for the student who took the upper-division writing course in his major and then changed majors. After a brief discussion, Mr. Begala re-worded the last clause in his amendment to read "in the student's college" instead of "in the student's major."

John R. Durbin (Mathematics), concurring with Mr. Gavenda, said he opposed the Begala amendment regardless of its wording. "I cannot imagine what kind of a course this would be in the Mathematics Department. There are problems with teaching students to write proofs, for instance, in the upper-division courses, and you treat that by taking time when you teach the course. You are writing a proof about something specific, and that is where you treat it. ...To me, it is the English Department that knows about writing; they know more than people in the Mathematics Department, and I think it just should be left that way."

Mr. Sledd observed: "If we listen to the last speakers, then E. 346K is a dead duck, because the same objections are precisely applicable to E. 346K, and the argument we have heard for it is that it requires students to write in their own field. Now the students' amendment, which does the same thing, suddenly becomes, to people who voted for E. 346K, an enormous objection."

"Now I want to be as silent as my nature allows, which is not very silent, but on the question of logistics, remember that the Chairman of the English Department has predicted a reduction in temporary staff from 60% to 70% under the new requirements. I do not see how a staffing problem can be squared with that remark."

"On Mr. Daniel's question [about] E. 346K [being] more advanced, a colleague wrote me a note just before this meeting: 'How do you change a freshman course to an upper-division course by changing the number?' If students enter E. 346K with no preparation, it will have a high number; it will not be a high course. Moreover, there is no block at all under my proposal against having students take both a second freshman course and E. 346K."

"We have heard objections to E. 307. I have not specified E. 307; my motion is for a 'second-semester freshman course.' I think those are the chief misunderstandings which I have heard so far."

Mr. Gavenda said that he had not spoken against learning to write in a field; he had spoken against such writing being taught in departments other than English.

Mr. Denson said that he had arrived at U.T. Austin with an inadequate background in writing. "I had two classes that stressed writing my freshman year--one was Mr. Gavenda's tutorial class in modern theories of matter and energy, in which we had a small writing component, and the second class was my Plan II English class, which had a substantial writing component. We had to do quite a few papers, and basically it was in that class that I learned to write. The thing that concerns me about going with the proposal of just requiring E. 346 is that I do not think I would have gotten to E. 346K had I not had that primary writing program my first year. I would not have been around...."

"What we are trying to do [with the Begala amendment] is take care of one of Mr. Kinneavy's problems with Mr. Sledd's proposal--that it would enable students to avoid learning how to write in their area of study. What we are intending to do is, in a sense, ask the departments to develop writing courses similar, perhaps, to the Plan II tutorials in Science, Math, whatever, and at least give the students the opportunity to learn to write from people within their own field. I do not think anything in our proposal would prohibit a student from taking E. 346K and [using it to satisfy] that writing requirement."

Julie A. Tindall (Student Representative) pointed out that the Begala amendment had been modeled after a requirement in the College of Communication degree program which had already been approved by the Council: that one three-hour upper-division writing course must be in the College of Communication.

By a voice vote, the reworded motion to amend was then LOST, and the discussion returned to the original motion by Mr. Sledd.

Lawrence D. Abraham (Physical and Health Education) commented: "It seems to me that both of the alternatives that we are considering here allow students the option to take an additional semester of freshman English; that is, Sledd's proposal offers the option that students can take it in place of E. 346K, whereas the legislation that he is seeking to amend requires students to take additional courses, one of which could be a lower-division course, E. 307, I suppose, or another freshman-level course in English. So the real issue seems to be whether or not E. 346K is required.... [I have a] question about the intent on the part of the English Department...: Will students continue to have options to take additional courses besides E. 306 at the freshman level? Certainly now there are several courses that they could take that would fulfill all these requirements that are addressed in the original legislation."

Mr. Kinneavy responded: "There are a couple of courses which can be taken at the freshman level after E. 306. I mentioned E. 314L, which is fundamentally a course...teaching...different aspects of literature; it also requires some writing. Conceivably also a person could take E. 318M, which is an introduction to modern grammar.... However, the E. 307 and E. 308 options, which are currently under discussion, will eventually be phased out; that was the general intent. They would be replaced by the required upper-division course. ...I might also add that there are [as part of the proposal] the requirements of E. 106 and E. 206, remedial courses for the lower 10%...; those are also freshman courses."

Barbara J. Dugas (Student Representative) said that she felt the unanimous opinion of the Student Representatives was falling on deaf ears.

She MOVED that action on the Sledd motion be postponed until the March meeting of the Council, and that a survey of faculty and student opinion be conducted in the interim. The motion was seconded, and Mr. Sledd spoke in support of it.

Mr. Kinneavy spoke against the motion, saying that discussion on this issue began in the English Department in 1978. "It went through the Department and passed in 1979 and 1980. Mr. Sledd, as a matter of fact, ran his earlier survey in...1976, or was it 1975?...There already has been a survey made of this; it is called the Hereford Report. It is available to anybody who wants to look at it. ...The students' opinions have been elicited; they are in the Hereford Report. The faculty opinions have been elicited; they are in the Hereford Report. They also voted on it substantially last year; 1,747 faculty out of 1,749 voted in favor of the proposal.... I really think that this is just another postponement which is delaying the whole process that has been going on for three years."

Dean Jeffrey (College of Communication) agreed with Mr. Kinneavy. "I do not want to sit through another session...if we have to go through these same arguments. This is a representative body. We have representatives of the students here. I think they probably express student opinion, and I am sorry that some members of the student [delegation] feel that they are not heard. I think that this afternoon's debate is demonstration sufficient for them to know that they are heard. The fact that proposals that any of us bring before [the Council] are voted down does not mean that we are not heard. It simply means that we do not necessarily agree with those proposals, and anyone who has been here as long as I have has brought a number of proposals before this group that have been voted down. I have not been hurt by it at all, and I think that is one of the risks you run when you make proposals.

"It seems to me that some members of the student delegation have not learned as much as they should have through their E. 306 and E. 307, because they have not learned the problem of generalizing from too few specific instances. The fact that two members of the student delegation here rose above E. 306 and E. 307 to get where they are today does not mean that the majority of students do achieve excellence through those two courses. One of the reasons we asked for a change is that there has been a demonstration, as has already been pointed out, that E. 306 and E. 307 have not been sufficient to produce students who can write. ...some of us have been here a long time, ...we have heard these arguments, ...we have worked with students, some of us for decades; [we] do not necessarily have to agree with a student proposal to feel that we are supportive of students. I certainly will not be bound by a student survey. I will not be bound by a faculty survey. I think I am here to represent my college and my faculty and the integrity of education. I am ready to vote, and I hope everybody else is and will vote against this motion to delay."

Mr. Denson responded: "This is by no means a motion to delay. What we are asking for is a motion to gather more information. The 1975 Hereford study was used to help develop the Vick report and, in particular, the English proposal in the first place.... There is no question in my mind that if we can bring back [to the students and faculty at large] the specific issues, now that they have been formulated and defined for the survey, that it will clear up a lot of confusion that still exists about the impact of Mr. Sledd's proposal."

Alan W. Friedman (English) said that he had "strong reservations about what a delay or new survey might accomplish. Mr. Sledd's earlier survey, (the so-called Hereford Report, which I presume the vast majority of you have never seen, much less read...) has been quoted in all sorts of contexts and by all sorts of people to prove all sorts of things. That is not surprising; it is a report which says a lot of different things, at least to me. I wonder who will write the questionnaire that we are talking about distributing. I wonder what questions will be included. I

wonder who will read and interpret the results, and whether we will not wind up with many different interpretations yet again. Mr. Sledd himself, in a document addressed to the Department of English Executive Committee in February of 1979, says this: 'We must turn the best of our energies into the cultivation of literacy among the whole University population. We should follow the lead of the University of Michigan and enlist the entire faculty in support of a University-wide composition program, including the replacement of one of the freshman semesters by an upper-division course given by each department, school, or college for its own majors.' Mr. Sledd is saying different things today about what he would like to see accomplished. To give you one item from the Hereford Report (one among many, and I am doing this selectively, and I grant you it is distorted)...: 'How helpful have you found the required freshman courses in English composition at U.T. Austin to be?' A total of 27.2% say either 'very' or 'moderately helpful.' That number is also broken down by class standing, so that, for example, 16.4% of the freshmen, 14.1% of the sophomores, 6.7% of the juniors, and 5.1% of the seniors find it 'very helpful.' That kind of pattern is maintained throughout.... It suggests that the impact of the course, the quality of its educational value, declined for the students as they went on in their college career, which of course is one of the reasons, one among many, why the Department of English has moved in the direction that it has. The report, as I say, is complex and mixed and can be used for a variety of different purposes, and has been. I submit we would probably find the same to be true of a report taken today."

James W. Vick (Mathematics) said "that the surveys that were taken earlier with regard to English sequences had very little perceptible effect on [the Basic Education Requirements] Committee. We looked at the new English sequence strictly on educational grounds. We did not talk about logistics; we did not talk about surveys. As a member of that committee I would say that even if you had a survey that showed a substantial percentage of students favored having an option, it would not change my mind that the educational value of the new English sequence is one that we should not change by offering this alternative. So I certainly encourage your interest in trying to find out what students and faculty feel about this, but I feel also that, at least from my perspective, not that my mind is completely closed, but it would take a great deal to change my mind about the educational value of this English sequence, and it would take more than just a large percentage of students favoring having the option."

Mr. Begala and Ms. Dugas reiterated their opinions that the action of the Council on the Sledd proposal should take into account the current opinions and wishes of students and faculty.

The Dugas motion to postpone action until the March meeting and to conduct a survey in the interim was then LOST by voice vote, and again the discussion reverted to Mr. Sledd's original motion.

Mr. Phillips, Mr. Denson, and Ms. Dugas each spoke in behalf of the motion to provide students with the option of taking a second-semester freshman composition course. Mr. Livingston then invited Mr. Sledd to close the debate.

Mr. Sledd replied: "I am delighted, at the moment, because we have reached what I think is the highest point of absurdity in my four terms on this Council. And Ms. Dugas is completely right; nobody intends to listen to the students. We began with Mr. Kinneavy's assertion that the most compelling reason for the new requirements was the wishes of faculty and students. Dean Vick has just assured us that the people who framed the report did not give a damn for the wishes of students. Now, at this point, I simply revel in it. This is the sort of thing I love. It is better than a comic opera. It is better than a novel. You can get this only in the University Council. But, being a stick-in-the-mud, I am going to make my last serious remarks, and I will be as happy to see this thing over with as anybody else.

"The main argument for my motion is the argument which was called 'the most compelling reason' for the new requirements--namely, the wishes of students and faculty as reported in my study of 1975; and I have spent myself in this fight because I could not allow administrative spokesmen, for their own purposes, to misrepresent the results of my research. My motion provides the option which the faculty voted for and which most closely matches the preferences expressed by students. At the same time, it keeps whatever advantages can be claimed for the new requirements.

"The arguments which have been brought against my motion are not the real reason for the violent attacks upon it. Some of those attacks have been purely personal, and I have been amused to learn what a villainous rogue I am--I am motivated only by personal grudges; I am not motivated by personal grudges but by a general, unfocused desire to raise hell; my real motive is not to raise hell but to get publicity; I have no rational motive (this is the one that my children loved) because I am senile (and I have changed my office tag to read C. Niles Ledd instead of James Sledd); and, finally (another one which my Number Two son reported), I am the resident neo-Marxist. Now, how in God's name neo-Marxism got into this, I do not know....

"Now, most of the remaining arguments against my motion have betrayed 'so lamentable a lack of acquaintance with reality,' I quote Dean King, that response would be pointless. One administrative spokesman says only that my proposal is ridiculous and would totally destroy the new requirements; other spokesmen similarly ignore the plainly established documentary record. A factual reply to persons who are determined to ignore the facts would be a waste of breath.

"But there is a real reason why my motion to give students and faculty what they voted for has prompted so much opposition. It is clearly untrue that I am denying students the chance to take E. 346K, that I am asking the English Department to staff four composition courses, or that my motion would create a staffing problem. My motion asks the English Department to make available just three composition courses, of which just two would be required. My motion would allow anyone who wants to take E. 346K to take it. As for the staffing problem, I remind you that the Chairman of the English Department has predicted a reduction in temporary staff of 60% or more under the new requirements, and I have already showed, from administration statistics, that 60% of our present temporary staff could teach three additional required hours of composition, while my motion asks merely for three additional available hours.

"What, then, is the real reason for the opposition to an innocuous motion? The Chairman of the English Department made the reason perfectly clear in his response to a suggestion that freshmen might be allowed to take the required sophomore course, E. 316K, in their freshman year. He said: 'This would only compound the problem the task force was attempting to solve: to space out the student demand for required courses. Not only did this spacing alleviate unpredictable enrollments and, thus, staffing problems, but it also forced the student to take one English course per year for the first three years of college work.'

"I invite your attention to the Chairman's own word: 'forced.' The desires of students, the Council was originally told, were part of that 'most compelling reason' for the new requirements; but in fact the new requirements, by the admission of the Chairman of the English Department himself, force students to take just one semester of freshman composition and to replace the second with a semester of composition in the upper division. I do not believe that students can or should be pushed around like that. But if the second semester of freshman composition is forcefully abolished, and if 'prearrangement with Dean and President' (that, too, is quoted from the Chairman of the Department) allows the English Department to forcefully inform freshmen that half of them cannot even take the first course in freshman composition until their spring

semester, then the English Department will cut enrollment in freshman English by one-half. That forced reduction is what my motion would prevent, and that is why the motion and its maker have had both to be denigrated.

"Real supporters of the new requirements ought in fact to vote enthusiastically for my slight modification of them. My motion offers students a choice, some slight degree of freedom. According to that motion, students who most need help with their writing could get help when they most need it, in their freshman year. Students who want an upper-division composition course could get it without difficulty. Students who want both second-semester freshman and upper-division composition could get both, but they would not be forced to. The surest way to abort the new requirements (and I am a right-to-life man) is to deny that freedom--to force students to do what is administratively convenient. My motion does offer them a choice.

"Let me conclude by disillusioning anyone who has been led to believe that I am alone in this fight, without support for my motion. First I will quote a bit of that letter from a distinguished colleague: 'I thought you would like to know there are others with you in spirit.... Why does anyone think calling a class in elementary composition an upper division course makes it one? ...the students who teach it are on your side.' Second, I had already made my little student poll before the Texan published its stories. The vote was 71 to 6 in favor of my motion.

"No, of course that little poll is just a straw in the wind, not a conclusive demonstration; but the support of the students is one of the reasons why the fight that I could not win (and I knew, of course I would not) is the fight I really could not lose. I have shined a little light on the real nature of the new requirements in English and of the procedure by which they were imposed.

"First, I have showed the simple falsehood of the claim that the new requirements embody the wishes of faculty and students as those wishes were expressed in my study of 1975. (On that point, the study is not in the least ambiguous, despite what Mr. Friedman said.) My motion does embody those wishes and has, I believe, the present support of the majority of the students. Yet proponents of the new requirements have attacked my motion as strongly as they could, and the preference of the students is just going to be ignored.

"Second, I have showed, by the documentary record of the English Department's deliberations, that the new requirements have always been, and now remain, primarily a logistical device. Again today I have quoted the Chairman's quite unequivocal statement.

"Third, in that statement I have highlighted the word 'forced.' The new requirements prohibit any student from taking two freshman courses in composition and require every student to take E. 346K. Not only do the new requirements deny students the help of a second freshman course in the year when they most need it, they also weaken E. 346K by forcing it on students despite their preference for a choice.

"That same word, 'force', brings me to my conclusion. The deepest problem with the new requirements and with the procedure for their imposition has been indifference to the real needs of real people. My proposal gives faculty and students what they voted for, provides continuity of instruction, gives any student who wants it access to E. 346K, makes help with writing available when that help is most needed, allows our students as well as transfers the opportunity to take three real courses in composition, and removes the element of brute force which the Chairman of the English Department unwittingly emphasized. That motion, however, will be defeated, as I have always known, because it conflicts with enrollment management on the model of a big corporation. (And I hope that Regent Blumberg is listening.)

"I am sorry that my motion will now be defeated. It would provide a better writing program than the one which is being forced on unwilling students. But the fight which I could not win is the fight which I could not lose. I have let a little light shine in--maybe nothing much to be proud of, but certainly nothing like misrepresentation, of which my colleagues should be deeply ashamed."

The Sledd motion was then LOST by a vote of 2 to 45, with 7 abstentions.

Mark I. Alpert (Marketing) stated: "I voted for the motion in spite of the summary statement by Mr. Sledd. I would like to just say that I do not believe he or anyone else knows why those who voted against me did so, and I do not interpret that they voted against student interest."

NEW BUSINESS

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS PART OF THE U.T. AUSTIN CATALOGUE, 1981-1983, TO BRING UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS WITHIN THE SPIRIT OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 9045-9060). (POSTPONED UNTIL FEBRUARY 21, 1983)

Dean Robert D. King (College of Liberal Arts) said that three proposals were presented. "The first one is the change in the B.A., Plan I, degree program. The document before you for the B.A., Plan I, degree program agrees identically with the version that was adopted in the fall when the College of Natural Sciences brought it before the University Council. You will recall that...the College of Liberal Arts does not have its own degree, its major degree; the B.A., Plan I, degree is shared between the College of Natural Sciences and the College of Liberal Arts. On several different occasions the Faculty Council of the College, the chairmen, [and] the College itself have voted to accept the Vick Committee recommendations. In the fall, when the College of Natural Sciences (under their catalogue deadline) had to bring this before the University Council, we got together [and] agreed on the changes that it would take to come into agreement with the Vick Committee, and that is what you have before you.

"The second degree program which is before you is the B.A., Plan II, degree; and the changes which are made there again, apart from some changes having to do with essentially stylistic matters, are simply to bring the B.A., Plan II, degree program into compliance with the Vick Committee recommendations.

"The third degree plan that you have before you is the B.S. in Architectural Studies, which is a degree which we have in our college.... That language tracks the language in the revisions that the School of Architecture brought earlier in the fall, so that in effect it agrees with the School of Architecture in its wording." Dean King then MOVED the adoption of the three sets of changes in degree requirements, and the motion was seconded.

John R. Durbin (Mathematics) noted that the Council and the General Faculty had approved his motion made in October, 1982, that general education requirements in Mathematics without the exclusions included in the College of Liberal Arts proposals would be "within the spirit" of the Vick Committee recommendations; the point of that motion had been to give colleges more freedom than they would have had under the Mathematics Requirement recommended by the Vick Committee. He then MOVED to amend the second paragraph on D&P 9047 to read as follows:

Three semester hours of mathematics other than Mathematics [301, 302, 303F, 316K (r) or 316L. [Algebra courses at the level of Mathematics 301 or the equivalent (r) cannot be counted toward the Area G requirement or toward the total hours required for the degree] [if taken September, 1972, or later]. Students who enter the University with fewer than three units of high school

mathematics at the level of Algebra I or higher must take Mathematics 301 or 304E without degree credit in order to remove their deficiency.

Mr. Durbin estimated that, if his motion was not adopted, 33% of all students, and 40% or more of the students entering the College of Liberal Arts, would not have placement test scores high enough to get into any mathematics course except M. 316, Introductory Statistics. And that particular course is not the best first course for many students, including those in the Colleges of Engineering and Business Administration. In addition, he stated that there are good educational reasons for giving students more choices than they would have if his motion was not adopted. He felt that M. 316K and M. 316L should continue to be excluded because they were designed specifically for, and enrollment was limited to, students preparing to become teachers in elementary schools. Finally, Mr. Durbin noted that this specific motion with regard to the College of Liberal Arts catalogue changes was consistent with the earlier, more general motion he had made and the Council had approved in October, 1982.

Gerhard J. Fonken (Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Research) expressed concern that Mr. Durbin's motion to amend the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts, Plan I, for students in the College of Liberal Arts had apparently not involved previous consultation with representatives of both the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Natural Sciences, and he urged that it be "voted down unless the College of Liberal Arts gives full and complete assent to it."

Mr. Durbin responded that, with regard to his motion, he had consulted previously with the Administrative Committee of the University Council, the University Council itself last October, the Chairman of the Mathematics Department, an Associate Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and a member of Vice-President Fonken's staff. He expressed regret for not having discussed it with Vice-President Fonken in person.

Dean Robert D. King (College of Liberal Arts) said: "Basically, I do not look on this as a College of Liberal Arts matter; it is a question for the Math Department to instruct us what courses to count. All we did was adopt the language of the Vick Committee Report. We are in no position to determine which courses in Math should count for the degree [and] which courses should not count.... [When] Professor Durbin [presented] his earlier amendment...[he] made some persuasive arguments that I, for one, had no trouble with; I basically accepted it, and I voted in favor of his amendment at that time. There was subsequent discussion. I have talked to several different people in the Math Department; there does not seem to be any kind of agreement over there.... We had...two concerns--one was to adopt the Vick Committee recommendations, and [the other was] to make sure that the Math courses that people are taking are good, solid, tough Math courses.... So I cannot say that there is any College [of Liberal Arts] position on this; it is for the Math Department to tell us what courses should count.... We have to have the same degree program as [the College of] Natural Sciences.... I feel like, from the College [of Liberal Arts] point of view, we have adopted the Vick Committee recommendations in consultation with the College of Natural Sciences, and that is what you have before you."

James W. Daniel (Chairman, Mathematics) said that it was difficult to express a common viewpoint for the 65-70 faculty members in the Department of Mathematics. He had appointed an ad hoc committee to examine the courses in question with an eye to the type of motion that Mr. Durbin had made. The ad hoc committee had recommended to the departmental Course and Curriculum Committee that all of the courses as presently constituted, except M. 302, be certified; they further recommended that more stringent guidelines be adopted for M. 302 so that it, too, could be certified as being appropriate to meet the general education requirements. The chairman of the Course and Curriculum Committee anticipates that the committee will endorse those recommendations.

Vice-President Fonken suggested that the best procedure would be for the Council to approve the original College of Liberal Arts proposals, then to ask representatives of the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Natural Sciences to discuss the proposed amendment, and to ask that whatever joint agreement the representatives reach be brought back to the Council for approval. Mr. Durbin's motion to amend was then LOST by voice vote.

Mr. Durbin next MOVED that further consideration of the College of Liberal Arts proposals be postponed until the February 21, 1983, meeting of the University Council, and the motion was seconded. John D. Denson (Student Representative) supported the motion to postpone, noting that the student delegation also had some concerns about the proposals for the B.A., Plan II, requirements. The motion to postpone was then ADOPTED by a vote of 30 to 21.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR MEETINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL IN 1983-1984 (D&P 9044). (ADOPTED)

Secretary H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology) MOVED the adoption of the Council's meeting schedule for 1983-1984. He pointed out that two of the proposed dates would not be on the third Monday of the month; the December meeting would be at 10:00 a.m. on December 12, 1983, and the May meeting would be at the usual time on May 7, 1984. Both of those days would be "no class days" before the beginning of final examinations. The motion was ADOPTED by voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The Council will next convene at 2:15 p.m. in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, February 21, 1983.

ATTACHMENT A: D&P 9016-9022/D&M 14969-14975, as Corrected.

"To conclude on a lighter note: anyone who can swallow that logistic camel need not strain at my logistic gnat. 'Enrollment management,' I am sure, can deal with any slight difficulties which my proposal offers." Mr. Sledd ended by requesting the privilege of closing the debate.

James L. Kinneavy responded first to Mr. Sledd's statements. "Sometimes I get the idea that when I am dying Mr. Sledd and I will still be arguing. It has been going on for a long time. I was asked Friday by the Office of the Dean to make a brief statement about the motion before the floor and so, over the weekend, I tried to whip such a statement together. I am not going to read the whole thing to you. [The written statement which formed the basis for Mr. Kinneavy's remarks is appended to these Minutes as Attachment B, beginning on D&P 9038; it has not previously been distributed to members of the Council. For the benefit of new members of the Council, it begins with a summary of the history, description, and rationale for the General Faculty legislation of May 28, 1981.]

"I think you have heard a good deal about this motion for a good number of years. I would, however, like to call attention to a few highlights. I am not going to remind the Council of the basic arguments for the advantage of an upper-division English course; I will, however, touch on them in some of the reasons which I will give for voting against this motion. I would like to call attention to one facet of the program which we proposed, which, in conjunction with the Vick Committee Report, gives us, I think, the best composition program on paper of any institution in the country. That is to say, we will have a freshman composition course E. 306; it is not a remedial course. We will have a sophomore literature course, with a substantial component of composition; the department voted on that. We will then have E. 346K at the junior level...; it will ask the student, at a time when he has a fairly mature grasp of his content, to write prose on that subject matter, addressed to the general reader. That is the basic focus of one of the prototype programs which we are following in this; that is the Maryland program. Then in the senior year or the junior year, with the Vick Committee Report he can write prose intended for the specialist, that is his own teacher. Mr. Sledd's proposal will not give the third component....

"Let me now just give four or five reasons why I think we should go along with the General Faculty legislation of May 1981.

"First of all, Mr. Sledd's proposal removes the heart out of the legislation of the General Faculty. Both the English Department and Mr. Sledd concede that the transfer of the freshman writing course to the junior level is the essence of the proposal.

"Why would it remove the heart out of it? Because it would deprive the student [who chooses the freshman option*] of a professional teacher of writing to assist him in his writing in his major area at a time when he has a mature grasp of his own field. The Sledd proposal would not do that.

"It would deprive the student [who chooses the freshman option*] of the opportunity of systematically addressing a general reader when writing in his special field. This is probably more critical than addressing specialized audiences. The work that we are doing with the Law School, for instance, right now, shows that that is the major problem; they [the law students and young lawyers*] know what they want to say, but the problem of addressing the general reader is the critical issue.

"Fourthly, there are other options for the freshman level which Mr. Sledd has not mentioned:

*The words enclosed in brackets were added editorially by the Secretary at the suggestion of Mr. Kinneavy in order to clarify the intent of his remarks.

"(1) Built into our proposal and approved by the General Faculty and this Council was a provision that the lower 10% [a certain percentage (we are currently using 10%)*] of the students would have to take remedial work in the lab. We have been carrying that program out, even without giving the students credit, for the last year and a half with marvelous success. The people who are in the lowest 10% of the SAT scores are mandated to go into the lab to get tutorial help one or two hours a week. [Mr. Kinneavy later notified the Secretary that in the previous sentence he should have said ECT scores rather than SAT scores.] It has been working marvelously.

"(2) The transfer students can count the second semester of the freshman English when they come into this institution. Given the way the catalogues are being written,... I think that that is the spirit of the Vick Committee Report; and I think it is very commendable. The people who come in from community colleges will take the second freshman course and count that as one of the two other writing courses with substantial writing requirements. That way we do not get into a hassle with the community colleges and invade their terrain -- and the English Department has tried to avoid that all along. They [students*] would then go ahead and take the three courses in our English proposal; that is to say, all of them would still have to take E. 346K. That became very clear when the ramifications of the Vick Committee Report were thought out. In other words, one of the big logistical savings which we were hoping to get, we lost; but we still supported the Vick Committee Report.

"(3) Some departments do have courses [with a substantial writing component], and they can be offered at the freshman level--for instance, Chemical Engineering... has a writing course along with a computer course at the freshman level.

"(4) E. 314L is an eligible course; it is a sophomore course in literature with some writing in it, too. My daughter has just finished it; she did a lot of writing in it. That [E. 314L*] is available to everybody in the second semester of the freshman year.

"(5) The writing lab is useful not only for people who have to go there, but for referrals, and we are handling a good number of referrals.

"The fifth argument for not voting for the proposal is the staffing problem. If both a freshman writing course (beyond E. 306) and a junior writing course are offered, many departments will simply satisfy twelve hours of the writing requirement by mandating four courses in the English Department. That is a very simple way out of your fifteen-hour requirement. We simply cannot staff four composition courses for the entire University. Very few English departments across the country staff three [courses*]; most staff two or one, and many do not staff any. Institutions comparable to us normally staff one or two; we are staffing three [courses*]. We could not staff four.

"My final argument against the proposal is a procedural argument. Already, through many years of parliamentary procedure in discussion and debate, the English Department has spoken, the College of Liberal Arts has spoken, the University Council has spoken, the General

*The words enclosed in brackets were added editorially by the Secretary at the suggestion of Mr. Kinneavy in order to clarify the intent of his remarks.

Faculty has spoken, the President has spoken. Should we reverse all of these decisions without giving their program a try? And in the cases of the parliamentary discussions, all of them were by very convincing majorities; in the case of the General Faculty, there were two protests out of 1,749 Voting Members.

"Finally, in the lengthy document...which Mr. Sledd distributed to the members of the Council, there have been some charges made against the English Department and the College of Liberal Arts, and in general against the University's attitude towards composition, about which I would like to say a few things.

"1. The charge that the primary motivation behind the English proposal is mainly logistical.

"First of all, the charge is irrelevant. Why? No one denies that there were logistical concerns in the Department discussions about the composition program. We still have not solved some of our major problems. But, as the implications of the Vick plan became increasingly evident, it was clear that most of the logistical advantages of the English proposal would be wiped out. Nevertheless, the English Department cooperated with the Vick Committee and did not oppose it at any level. In the meantime it continued to support its own program, which it felt was compatible with the Vick plan. This support had to be based on educational reasons since the logistical ones had been abolished. I will explain this in detail if anybody wants me to do it. Basically, it has to do with this:

"[First,*] the largest gain would have been from the people coming from the community colleges into the junior year; [they would have taken a second freshman course*] and that particular course would count for the junior course. Now with the Vick Committee Report asking for two additional courses, that course [the transfer freshman course*] will simply count as one of those two additional courses and everybody will take the general sequence [of the English Department*]. We lost that large logistical gain which we had originally envisaged.

"[Second, before*] the Vick Committee Report...we thought that some departments such as [those in the College of*] Communication and others would pick up some of these substitute courses for E. 346K. Now that the Vick Committee Report requires these courses [with substantial writing components*] in addition to the three [courses*] in the [English*] sequence, we do not pick that up either. In other words, we are supporting our proposal, not on logistical grounds, but on educational grounds.

"[Second of all,] the charge is inaccurate. Mr. Sledd says that there was a "Content" committee [in the English Department*] which did not have much to do with the departmental discussions. As a matter of

*The words enclosed in brackets were added editorially by the Secretary at the suggestion of Mr. Kinneavy in order to clarify the intent of his remarks.

fact, the so-called "Content" committee, one of the eight committees appointed by the Chairman, met more frequently [and*] offered more alternatives [than all the other committees.*] Eventually [it*] absorbed all of the other committee recommendations; it became the basis for the Task Force recommendations and was the foundation of the Department's final proposal. Critical content issues were debated at length. I can document this if anybody wants me to. The reason Mr. Sledd does not know that is because he did not participate in any of these departmental meetings; he participated in the first departmental meeting, none of the Task Force meetings, none of the subcommittee meetings.

"2. The charge that the English Department has not strengthened the staff of the lower division classes. I agree with Mr. Sledd that there has not been an adequate resolution of the staffing problem for composition teachers in the English Department. We have hired many new regular faculty each year, but we have also hired many lecturers. Their status has been improved, but it remains a major problem. The reticence of some members of the Department to hire twenty additional members when it was not certain that they would have permanent status was, however, understandable. I am referring to something in the [Sledd*] document; if you have not read the document you may not understand that allusion.

"3. The charge that the English Department is planning to discontinue its sophomore writing courses. E. 316K, that is the second one in the required sequence, Masterworks of Literature, must have a substantial writing component; the Department voted on this. Consequently, there is a sophomore writing course required of everyone in the University; previously there was no requirement of this nature. The courses in technical writing (E. 317) and in expository prose (E. 310) are upgraded to the different sections of E. 346K (there are now four options, not two, as formerly).

"4. The charge that the English Department denies and defies the expressed wishes, opinions of students and faculty. The students and the faculty expressed a favorable reaction to the possibility of a junior-level course; the Department is meeting that reaction. The students also expressed the need for a freshman course; the Department is also meeting that need. The reasons why the junior level course is not being presented as an option were given above.

"5. The charge that the English Department misrepresented the effectiveness of the current composition program. This is again in the document; if you have not read the document, you may not know what I am talking about. This is a charge which I do not understand. As far as I recollect, neither I nor anyone else made any extravagant claims about the effectiveness of our composition program or of E. 306 in particular. We are very aware of the deficiencies of the program, and this proposal is one attempt to improve it. I did say that we have made some twenty empirical studies to assess various aspects of the program, and we will continue to assess it.

"6. The charge that there is 'a good deal of evidence to suggest that abolition of Freshman English is the ultimate intent.'

"The English Department has no intention of lowering the exemption scores. In fact, contrary to what Mr. Sledd says, the exemption scores were decided in the departmental discussions and are in the documents he

*The words enclosed in brackets were added editorially by the Secretary at the suggestion of Mr. Kinneavy in order to clarify the intent of his remarks.

alludes to. As I said in my statement to the Department, they are somewhat more rigorous than the current scores. We also plan to use a writing sample, if the details and funds can be worked out. We are not limiting ourself to the writing samples, we are using those in conjunction with the other scores.

"Secondly, the suggestion that the President, the Dean, and the Department engaged in a conspiracy in this matter must have come as a surprise to all of the parties involved. The President and the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts have insisted on the importance of composition at every turn....

"I would like to give my personal impression of the comparative emphasis on composition at this institution and others which I am acquainted with. During the past 15 years I have worked and consulted with some 45 institutions of higher learning across the country, ranging from humble community colleges to large and prestigious public and private institutions, concerning their writing programs. I can honestly say that, on a comparative basis, The University of Texas, the College of Liberal Arts, and the Department of English invest more money in composition teaching, require more composition courses, hire more faculty to teach composition, train prospective assistant instructors more assiduously, assess their composition program more meticulously, support a better graduate program in rhetoric and composition, and in general worry more about composition for the students than any other institution I have ever visited. We are not perfect; we could be much better, but most comparable institutions are much worse. I ask you to defeat the amendment."

Joseph J. Moldenhauer, Chairman of the English Department, was given the privileges of the floor in order to participate in the debate. Mr. Moldenhauer heartily seconded Mr. Kinneavy's observations that the energies of the English Department are very heavily invested in training in composition and have been for a number of years. "Over the past four or five years, as you recall, the total student count at this university rose from something like 40,000 to pretty close to 50,000. It is very difficult for even departments which teach non-required courses, and teach those non-required courses in large lecture sections where the ratio of students to teacher can range in the vicinity of 150-250 students to a teacher, to adapt to enrollment and admission increases of the sort that this institution has undergone. I ask you...to bear in mind that a concern with numbers is not contemptible; a concern with numbers is furthermore intimately related at every step with the question of the quality of the educational services that an institution can deliver.... We cannot blithely ignore the question of numbers, the distribution of inherently and necessarily limited resources on the part of an educational establishment in the presence of very heavily swelling demand. There comes a point at which physically it might be possible to satisfy the growing numbers of students, but the educational quality will necessarily suffer. I think all of us have had numerous experiences of precisely that kind of development.

"Finally, I would simply suggest, by way of attempting to gain the understanding of the members of the Council for some aspects, educational as well as numerical, of the situation that we have had at The University of Texas for the past five or more years, I would ask you to imagine the course offerings of your several departments as involving a three-course, nine-hour requirement in your subject.... Imagine that those courses have to be taught in student-teacher ratios of 25 to 1 -- in at least two of those three courses a maximum of 25 students for every teacher in the classroom, and for the third of those courses a maximum of 40 students for every teacher in the classroom. Imagine furthermore that every student in the University who has to take those nine hours of coursework in your department is inclined to satisfy all of those nine hours before the

end of the sophomore year, and that the enormous majority of those students do indeed take their courses in your department by the middle, or at least the end, of the sophomore year of study. And imagine that you have ... 5,500 freshman students admitted to the University and taking the courses required of them -- three courses, nine hours at the lower-division level -- in classes where the maximum number of students is 25 per class. Imagine that in your department. The English Department is currently ... the largest department in this University. We have tenured and tenure-track faculty of some 90; we are using our budgeted lines -- we have not been given any additional budgeted lines in a good many years. We have, in addition to our 90 or so tenured and tenure-track faculty, 70 individuals with high-level terminal degrees -- Ph.D. in most instances; and we have in addition to that 100 T.A.'s and A.I.'s, roughly 60% of whom are conducting study in the English Department, the remainder conducting study in closely-related departments. We have a teaching staff of close to 260; imagine that in your department, also."

John M. Weinstock (Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts) stated, "I would just like to make a very brief statement on behalf of the College of Liberal Arts. We have been working for four years with the English Department on this new program and, though Professor Moldenhauer has just pointed out some of the problems concerning the numbers of students, I would like to stress that never has there been anything more important than the quality of the writing education that we are providing our students. That has been the number one concern throughout all of the discussion. We have always had as our primary aim improving the writing of the students here at The University of Texas."

R. Neill Megaw (English) spoke in favor of the motion. "I think it is important to disabuse you of any idea that the English Department is a united phalanx in opposition to Dr. Sledd on this issue. I think it would be a pity if we conveyed in this discussion the idea that we have some sort of party line on this matter. I think it is quite clear that there are conscientious people on both sides of the issue within our department."

"I do not want to address the huge document that Dr. Sledd has circulated. I just want to return to the issue, a very simple one; he is urging that students be given the choice of the second freshman semester or the junior-level course. I sympathize very, very much with the difficulties that Professor Moldenhauer has outlined to you and, in particular, the existence of those 70 individuals on one-year contracts; and I recognize that if, in point of fact, the Sledd motion passes, we will have a little less success in immediately launching very strong [E. 346K's] in the different areas of study. I do not however, agree with the case made by Professor Kinneavy to the effect that we would be denying the students [E. 346K's.] I think that, if the English Department gets the support of the administration and our colleagues in other departments, we can get those things launched and sold to the students in sufficient quantities so that we can give [E. 346K] courses a test."

"It is clear to me that the performance of students entering the University has declined very substantially in the last ten years or so, and I think that the mandate that I have been hearing in the discussions for the last five years or so is to the effect that the English Department, although it is already performing a prodigious amount of work as Professor Kinneavy correctly said, simply must do more, and that is the position that I would like to support, so pace the arguments of Professors Kinneavy and Moldenhauer, I think we should support the Sledd motion, give the students a choice between the second freshman semester and the [E. 346K], and run an experiment for at least several years until we have stronger data on the results that we get in the second freshman semester as against [E. 346K's]. So I would urge you, as against those who have spoken from the Department so far, to support the Sledd motion."

Paul E. Begala (Student Representative) also supported the motion. "Speaking for the student delegation to the University Council, we have conferred on this matter, and it has been our experience as students that

freshman-level composition has been the most effective and the most valuable to us. For this reason, and especially for the reason that Dr. Sledd's proposal gives students the flexibility to choose an option of second-semester freshman composition or taking it as an upper-division course, we urge the University Council to accept the Sledd motion and we, in fact, support it very strongly."

Vice-President Livingston then called on Mr. Sledd to close the debate. Mr. Sledd responded: "I would like to do so with a motion, which I hope is in order. What I have heard strikes me as again simple misrepresentation. I do not believe that most people present have read my document. I think if they do read it they will see that there has been simple misrepresentation, so I therefore want to move, Mr. Chairman, that a vote on this motion be deferred until the January meeting, when people will have had time to read the document and to read the text of Mr. Kinneavy's remarks. I am quite content to stand on the document; I think it makes my case quite well. So I MOVE that we postpone the vote on this and make the conclusion of this matter a Special Order for the January meeting of the Council." The motion to postpone was seconded.

Dean Robert C. Jeffrey (College of Communication) opposed the motion to postpone. "Mr. Chairman, we have heard this debate. We have heard it, some of us, for many, many years. I think we have heard enough, and I see no reason to postpone it until the next meeting where we will simply hear the same arguments again. And I think for Dr. Sledd to assume that people have not read his document is demeaning to the members." Mr. Sledd asked for a show of hands as to how many had read his document, and Vice-President Livingston announced that the show of hands suggested that most members had indeed read it.

James W. Vick (Mathematics) supported the motion. "I would just like to say briefly that I am in favor of the motion to postpone. There have been a few things that have been raised in discussion today that have brought new questions to my mind that I would like to have cleared up before I vote on the motion. I did not agree with all the things in Professor Sledd's document. I think some of his statements about our committee's position were not accurate, but that should not necessarily be a reason for voting against the motion. So I would support the motion to postpone, not liking to have this debate drawn out, but just so we will have the best possible vote on a difficult issue."

John D. Denson (Student Representative) also supported the motion. "One of my reasons is that we have only half of the Student Representatives here today; we are in the middle of our final exams. We would like to have a fuller opportunity for the student members to give their input before the final vote is taken. As a courtesy to the student members, we ask that you support the proposal to postpone the final vote."

The motion that the vote on the Sledd proposal be deferred until the January meeting of the Council was then ADOPTED by a vote of 28 to 25. Dean Jeffrey then asked for clarification of the parliamentary situation resulting from the motion just adopted, and Vice-President Livingston indicated that the question had been postponed and would be open for further debate at the January meeting.

Parker C. Fielder (Law) made "an impassioned and earnest plea to those who have further written communications to address to the Council on this matter to do so preferably several days, but certainly not merely several minutes, before we next convene."

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m. The University Council will next convene at 2:15 p.m. in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, January 24, 1983.

ATTACHMENT B: Document Distributed by James H. Sledd (English).

Department of English
Parlin Hall 110

January 10, 1983

From: James Sledd
To: Members of the University Council
Subject: More misleading statements about the new requirements in English

As I said at the end of the Council's December meeting, the spokesman for Dean King had continued his obfuscation there, and probably I should clear it away well before January 24. Again I add that I myself have typed the statement and paid for its duplication.

1. In 1980-81, when the new requirements in English were under consideration, the spokesman cited my 1975 study as providing "the most compelling reason" for them--namely, "the desire of the U.T. faculty and student body," which he called "a mandate" (D&P 8214). After I had told the Council, in February, 1981, that my study was being misrepresented, the spokesman repeated his falsehood in more extreme form: "Mr. Sledd suggests that [his study] is not really a mandate. I will withdraw; Mr. Sledd is right.... that is not a mandate..., that is practically a divine call." The fact, however, as I have already proved, is that the faculty directly, and the students indirectly, favored an optional shift of one semester of composition from the freshman year to the upper division, not the required shift which the new requirements impose and which Dean King's spokesman has called "the main feature of this particular proposal" (D&P 8285). Now, in December of 1982, my motion has offered precisely the optional shift which faculty and students favored; but Dean King's spokesman maintains that the motion "removes the heart" of the new requirements (Original Transcript, University Council, December 13, 1982, p. 13). Thus the spokesman has maintained both (a) that the desires expressed by faculty and students in my 1975 study are "practically a divine call" for the new requirements and (b) that a motion to satisfy those desires "removes the heart" of those same requirements. A desire for a choice, he claims, has been satisfied by denying the possibility of choosing (Original Transcript, University Council, December 13, 1982, p. 15). Such misrepresentation, especially under administrative auspices, corrupts the entire legislative process.

2. The spokesman continued his misrepresentation by enumerating advantages of E. 346K of which, he said, my motion "would deprive the student" (Original Transcript, p. 13). That misrepresentation confuses need not with must not, just as the earlier misrepresentation confused must with may. My motion would allow any student who wanted to satisfy the writing requirement by taking E. 346K to do so.

3. Dean King's spokesman proceeded to enumerate options for the freshman year which the new requirements permit. He specially mentioned E. 314L, a "course in literature with some writing in it too." The spokesman has thus voluntarily made it plain that there would be no objection, under the new requirements, if freshmen took both a course in composition and a course in literature (E. 306, E. 314L) and followed those two courses with E. 316K in the sophomore year and E. 346K in the upper division. The objection, then, which prompted a dean, a chairman, and a dean's spokesman to claim the privilege of the floor at the last Council meeting is not that my motion would allow freshmen to take a second English course in addition to the specified trio (E. 306, E. 316K, E. 346K) but that my motion would allow freshmen to take a second composition course in that freshman year--the year when more than three-fourths of student respondents said that systematic instruction in composition would be most helpful. No further argument is needed to prove that the real heart of the new requirements is simply the abolition of the second semester of freshman composition. A second course in "literature with some writing in it too" is perfectly acceptable for freshmen; a second course in composition must be attacked with all the guns that Dean King can bring to bear.

4. A further misrepresentation by Dean King's spokesman is that my motion would create a "staffing problem. If both a freshman writing course (beyond E. 306) and a junior writing course are offered, many departments will simply satisfy 12 hours of the writing requirement by mandating four courses in the English department. That is a very simple way out of the 15 hour requirement. We simply cannot staff four composition courses for the entire university" (Original Transcript, p. 14). But my motion makes no such request.

4a. The misrepresentation in the spokesman's statement appears most clearly in the phrase "four composition courses." Nobody is proposing four composition courses. Of the five courses which both the new requirements and my motion specify, E. 316K is primarily a course in literature, not composition, and in that respect it is comparable to two others among the five: it isn't a course in composition but a course with "a substantial writing component," just as E. 314L, which Dean King's spokesman finds perfectly acceptable for freshmen, is a "course in literature with some writing in it." My motion would indeed make three courses in composition available but would require just two, and it doesn't create the slightest possibility that the English Department would be asked to staff "four composition courses for the entire university." To put the case in another way, between my motion and the new requirements the only difference in the composition work that might be required of the English Department is the difference between the writing in a real composition course and the writing in a course with "a substantial writing component." I do indeed suspect that that difference may be substantial and that the twelve hours of writing newly required beyond E. 306 are not really twelve hours of writing, but it is embarrassing that a spokesman for the new requirements should cast such doubt on the phrase "substantial writing component."

4b. The objection by Dean King's spokesman, if indeed it were valid, would have been made earlier, when the College of Communication announced its intention to "require 15 semester hours of writing courses, to include English 306, 316K, and 346K, plus three hours in British or American literature" (Summary of Changes in the College of Communication Catalogue, Submitted October 5, 1982). On October 18, when the Council approved the Communication proposal, Dean King was present, as well as seven members of the English Department. Nobody suggested that Communication is requiring the English Department to "staff four composition courses"; yet by the spokesman's definition of a composition course, that is precisely Communication's requirement. Indeed, there is nothing in the new English requirements themselves to prevent students from taking all fifteen hours of required "writing" courses within the English Department. Plainly the spokesman's objection was fanciful.

To conclude:

To persons who have read both the remarks by Dean King's spokesman and my document dated December 7, 1982, there is no need to say more about the spokesman's misrepresentations, though I have by no means exhausted the subject. The essential difference between my motion and the new requirements is that my motion would allow students, if they wished, to take a second freshman course in composition, while the new requirements emphatically deny them that possibility. Proponents of the new requirements would quite happily allow freshmen to take a second English course--a course other than 306, 316K and 346K--provided that second course is in literature, but they object most violently to a second freshman course in composition. Thus the first of the following sequences would be acceptable to them, but not the second:

1. E. 306, E. 314L, E. 316K, E. 346K, course with "substantial writing component"
2. E. 306, E. 307, E. 316K, E. 346K, course with "substantial writing component"

15022

9101

I am grateful to Dean King's spokesman for making it so clear that the heart of the new requirements is the denial of the very possibility of a second course in composition for freshmen whose entrance examinations and subsequent performance show that they desperately need just such a course. Whatever becomes of my motion, the spokesman has helped me to make the real nature of the new requirements a matter of public record.