

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

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of April 20, 1981, 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 APRIL 20, 1981

The seventh regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1980-1981 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, April 20, 1981, at 2:15 p.m.; President Flawn presided.

Present: Abram Amsel, Harold Billings, Francis Bostick, Harold Box, Robert Boyer, Robert Brody, John Brokaw, Ronald Brown, Mark Cassidy, James Colvin, Mary Crockett, Mitzi Dreher, John Durbin, David Edwards, Parker Fielder, Peter Flawn, Gerhard Fonken, Charles Franklin, Karl Galinsky, LaVerne Gallman, David Gavenda, William Glade, Earnest Gloyna, Donald Grantham, Terence Grieder, Dagmar Hamilton, Glynn Harmon, Roderick Hart, Kimberly Helbig, Forest Hill, James Hurst, Ira Iscoe, Robert Jeffrey, Gaylord Jentz, James Jirsa, Paul Kelley, Robert King, George Kozmetsky, Judith Langlois, Gerlinde Leiding, William Lesso, William Livingston, Ernest Lundelius, Don McDermott, James McGinity, Thomas Marquardt, Larry Nettles, S. Chad Oliver, Joanie Powell, Mary Ann Rankin, Phyllis Richards, Elspeth Rostow, Susan Russell, William Shive, Guy Shuttlesworth, Ray Sommerfeld, C. G. Sparks, Waneen Spirduso, James F. M. Stephens, James Vick, Warwick Wadlington, Stanley Werbow, Robert Williamson, Eugene Wissler, Louis Zurcher;

Absent: Martin Baughman, Billye Brown (excused), James Browne, James Doluisio, Bonnie Cook Freeman, Alan Friedman, Eleanor Greenhill, Thomas Hatfield (excused), Lorrin Kennamer, Robert Kline, Charles Lamb, Clarence Lasby, Neill Megaw, Thomas Philpott, Michael Sharlot, Lawrence Speck, John Sutton.

Total members present: 65; total members absent: 17.

NOTE: The ex-officio membership position for the Director of Admissions and Records is unfilled.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING ON MARCH 23, 1981 (D&P 8276-8194d).
(APPROVED AS CORRECTED)

Secretary Kelley announced two corrections: (1) In the third line on D&P 8278 the word "immanance" should be "imminence." (2) In the third line on D&P 8290 the second word should be "Emersonian." The Minutes were then approved as corrected.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY (D&P 8296).

There was no discussion of the Secretary's Report.

QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

There were no questions to the President.

PROPOSAL BY THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE UNIVERSITY REQUIREMENT IN ENGLISH (D&P 8212-8216). (AMENDED AND APPROVED)

When the meeting on March 23 was adjourned for lack of a quorum, the Council was considering the proposal by the College of Liberal Arts for an undergraduate University requirement in English (D&P 8212-8216) that called for all undergraduate degree programs at U.T. Austin to involve a sequence of three English courses: (1) English 306, Rhetoric and Composition, in the freshman year; (2) English 316K, Masterworks in Literature, in the sophomore year; and (3) English 346K, Writing in Different Disciplines, or an equivalent course offered in any department and approved by the Department of English, in the junior or senior year. These requirements would not apply to students in Plan II, and Humanities 306 would remain as a substitute for English 306 in all programs. Foreign students would take E.306Q, E.316KQ, and E.346KQ, similar to the current alternatives for foreign students. The weakest students would be required to take English 206 or English 106, courses to accompany English 306 and mandating 2 hours or 1 hour per week, respectively, in the language laboratory; those would be credit courses, but the credit would not count towards graduation.

The original motion had proposed four topics for English 346K: Writing in the Arts and Humanities, Writing in the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Writing in the Natural Sciences, and Writing in Business; however, at the March 23 meeting, the maker of the motion had deleted the Writing in Business topic at the request of representatives of the College of Business Administration. Also, the Council had approved a motion by Dean Stanley Werbow (College of Fine Arts), supported by the maker of the motion, to specify that the University Council, rather than the English Department, would approve courses as being equivalent to the new English 346K course.

At the time of adjournment on March 23, the Council was debating an amendment proposed by David Edwards (Government) that called for the insertion of a fourth course (English 309, Advanced Rhetoric and Composition) to be taken at the lower-division level before English 316K, Masterworks in Literature. The first motion on the floor on April 20, therefore, was Mr. Edwards' motion to amend the College of Liberal Arts proposal, and debate on that motion continued.

James Kinneavy (English), who had presented the College of Liberal Arts proposal, reiterated several points he had made in the discussion on March 23.

"I agree with Mr. Edwards. I wish we could staff 12 hours of English courses in the Department of English. If we could staff them, then if I were a member of this body I would second the motion and vote for it.

"We are, as a matter of fact, the biggest single English Department in the country; we may be the biggest English Department in the world, for all I know. We are at least number one in that, in size. And yet this biggest Department (counting about 90 full-time members, about 80 AI's, 20 TA's and 50 temporary people) cannot really staff four required courses in English. I wish we could. If we could, I would support the motion.

"I am left, then, with what we can do at the present time. At the present time we can handle, very effectively and efficiently, 9 hours; to get the best out of those 9 hours is to sequence them the way that the College of Liberal Arts has proposed--one course in the freshman year, one course in the sophomore year, and one course in the junior year. Now, if enrollments are stabilized at the University, and this has been a big problem, and if some other departments around the University will take

over some of these upper-division courses, then the Department of English conceivably could offer another course; at that time I think we would very seriously like to consider this course suggested by Mr. Edwards. Therefore, I would suggest that the wise thing to do is to do what we can now, and when we are in a position to offer the fourth course, offer it then."

Dean Robert King (College of Liberal Arts) requested privileges of the floor for several people who, like Mr. Kinneavy, had worked for the last two years on the proposal: Joseph Moldenhauer, Chairman of the Department of English; William Sutherland, Professor of English; and John Weinstock, Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Those floor privileges were approved.

Dean Stanley Werbow (College of Fine Arts) spoke against the Edwards motion, primarily because he believed it, like part of the Kinneavy motion, was out of place at that time when the Council had just decided to allow the schools and colleges to review the general education degree requirements and to come forward with recommendations for establishing new general education requirements in each school or college. He called upon members of the Council to defeat the Edwards motion so that he could introduce a substitute for the Kinneavy motion.

David Edwards (Government) urged that his amendment be approved. "I suspect everyone in this room agrees that the correct approach to this problem is something approximating the approach that I have proposed in my amendment; the question is whether we can manage it or not.

"We have heard from Mr. Kinneavy that the English Department can staff a 9-hour requirement but not a 12-hour requirement. One can draw two possible conclusions from that. One is the one that Mr. Kinneavy has recommended to us, which is to [move] what is presently a lower-division component into the upper division. That solution, as I have argued before, seems to me to be misguided in that it takes an already weak situation, because we know that our students are not learning what they need to know about how to write, with our present requirement, and moves some of that present requirement from the early stages...farther into their academic careers. I have said before I think the idea of an upper-division opportunity is a good one, but it would only make sense and only be valuable, I think, if students have an adequate basic training at the lower division in what we call writing or composition. The upper-division course is not a course in how to write, it is a course in some subject area...in which there is a lot of writing required. That does not address the basic problems of spelling, grammar, organization and style, which are the problems I find consistently in the writing of most of my upper-division students, even today.

"Therefore it seems to me that if the English Department can staff ...only 9 hours, and if the University is not willing to commit the resources that would be required to create a full 12-hour requirement, the best approach would be to insert a course like the one my motion proposes as a second writing course at the second-semester freshman or first-semester sophomore level and then, as we are able, add upper-division courses, perhaps staffed in large part by people in the particular disciplines in which students are majoring rather than by the English Department, if the English Department is unable to staff those courses. The most important thing is to teach our students what they need to know about how to write, and the most important way, the only way to do that, I think, is to do it at the earliest phase.

"So what I would suggest that we do is pass my amendment and then, if there is continued concern that we cannot staff what then becomes a potential 12-hour requirement, [I will move] as a further amendment that we make the upper-division component an objective toward which we will move as quickly as we can find the resources, having that taught by the English Department and by various other departments and schools as is deemed appropriate. The best thing to do is to pass this amendment and then consider an amendment relaxing temporarily what otherwise would be the binding quality of the new proposed upper-division writing-within-the-discipline requirement."

At the request of President Flawn, Secretary Kelley then restated Mr. Edwards' MOTION: "At the last session, Mr. Edwards MOVED to amend the Proposal by the College of Liberal Arts for an Undergraduate University Requirement in English, the proposal that is shown on page 8213, to insert a course, let us call it English 309, Advanced Rhetoric and Composition, to be taken at the lower-division level before the taking of Masterworks in Literature."

James Kinneavy (English) responded "to several possible misunderstandings with regard to this issue. In the first place...I would like everybody here to understand that that upper-division writing course is a writing course; it is not a content course in which some side attention is paid to writing. In the three syllabuses which have already been prepared..., we have a handbook which emphasizes mechanics and organization as much as the content, so note it is exactly the same sort of thing that we are doing at the freshman level, though it concerns itself with the higher level."

"I would just like to repeat an argument which I had in my statement last time. We can handle 9 hours efficiently. Research has shown that if one [teaches] two basic composition courses at the freshman level, or alternately teaches one [course] at the freshman level and one at the junior level, [the latter sequence] is better than the [former] because the students forget what they have learned throughout their college careers. What we are proposing is a writing experience at each level of the college curriculum, except the last, and that way the English Department will be paying attention to the writing skills of people going all the way through their writing, undergraduate career. Research at Harvard, and at Bradley University, and at Michigan bears this out. If you are going to have two courses, it is better to sequence it that way than to get them all over with at the freshmen level."

"I know there is a certain prima facie plausibility in Mr. Edwards' proposition, but given the 9-hour limitation, that is the best that we can do.... If other people want to put in another course at the freshman or sophomore level, or later on if people want to talk to the English Department about putting another course in, I would love to see that, but at the present time the research that we have does indicate that this vertical sequencing is better than that type of horizontal sequencing."

Mr. Edwards' motion to amend was then DEFEATED, and the College of Liberal Arts motion as previously amended again became the motion before the Council.

Dean Stanley Werbow (College of Fine Arts) MOVED to substitute the following for the College of Liberal Arts motion (D&P 8213); copies of this substitute motion had been distributed to members of the Council as they arrived at the meeting:

1. That all undergraduate degree programs at The University of Texas at Austin involving a required sequence of three English courses must satisfy this requirement with:
 - (1) English 306, Rhetoric and Composition, or Humanities 306 or English 306Q, in the freshman year;
 - (2) English 316K, Masterworks in Literature, or English 316KQ, in the sophomore year;
 - (3) English 346K, Writing in Different Disciplines, or English 346KQ (or an equivalent upper-division course offered in any department and approved by the University committee on English courses) in the junior or senior year.

In addition to English 306 or English 306Q, certain students may be required to take extra laboratory work in English 106 or English 206 which carry credit but do not count as credit toward graduation.

2. That proposed changes in general education requirements are to be regarded as major legislation.
3. This legislation modifies the provisions of D&M 10728-29.

Dean Werbow stated: "The major difference between the motion which was proposed by the Department of English and the College of Liberal Arts, on one hand, and my modification of it, is that I regard the present legislation as a specification of the right to satisfy the 9-hour degree requirement in English in those degree programs in which it is prescribed. The Department of English proposal establishes a 9-hour degree requirement for all degree plans. That is the essential difference. We provide protection for the general education degree requirements of the several schools and colleges by point number 2, which specifies...that, when those proposals come from the schools and colleges in January and in September of 1982, any proposals for instituting new degree requirements in general education will be regarded as major legislation. Point 3...refers to legislation of 1973, if I am not mistaken, that speaks to this general issue of English requirements." The motion to substitute was seconded.

In response to a request from the Chair for clarification of his motion to substitute, Dean Werbow explained: "Mr. President, my motion tracks the motion of Mr. Kinneavy essentially and differs from it only in putting in the words 'involving a required sequence of three English courses' rather than what the language previously stated, [which was] something like 'shall require a sequence of three English courses.'... In any case, instead of imposing a requirement [on all undergraduate degree programs] by this legislation we recognize that there is such a requirement in most degree plans, and we specify the means by which that requirement shall be satisfied."

There was no further discussion, and the Werbow motion to substitute was DEFEATED by a vote of 18 to 37.

The College of Liberal Arts motion, as previously amended, was then APPROVED; it reads as follows:

The General Faculty recommends that all undergraduate degree requirements at The University of Texas at Austin will involve a sequence of three English courses: (1) English 306, Rhetoric and Composition, in the freshman year; (2) English

316K, Masterworks of Literature, in the sophomore year; (3) English 346K, Writing in Different Disciplines, or an equivalent course offered in any department and approved by the University Council upon recommendation of an ad hoc committee on the English requirement, in the junior or senior year.

English 306, Rhetoric and Composition, is the composition course currently required in all undergraduate programs in the University. No basic change is envisaged for this course. It will continue to emphasize much expository and analytical writing, paying attention to mechanics, rhetorical strategies, and organization.

English 316K, Masterworks in Literature, is a new course involving readings in one of three alternative subject areas--World Masterworks, English Masterworks, and American Masterworks. Although the emphasis in this course is on literature, there will be significant amounts of writing in the form of critical papers and essay examinations.

English 346K, Writing in Different Disciplines, is a new course which will be offered in three topics: Writing in the Arts and Humanities, Writing in the Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Writing in the Natural Sciences. The writing exercises will prepare students for the kinds of writing in these various areas, and some of them will relate to readings in the respective areas. The University Council is authorized to approve equivalent courses in writing, offered by individual departments, as a substitute for English 346K.

These requirements do not apply to Plan II; and Humanities 306 remains as a substitute for English 306 in all regular programs. For foreign students there will be English 306Q, English 316KQ, and English 346KQ, similar to the current alternatives. Finally, for the weakest students in the University we are proposing English 206 and English 106, courses to accompany English 306 and mandating two hours or one hour per week in the language laboratory. These will be credit courses, but the credit will not count towards graduation.

This legislation supersedes the legislation of the General Faculty (D&M 10728-10729), approved by the circularization process February 20, 1973.