

MINUTES

PRESENT: Rebhorn, Brodkey, Slatin, Halasek, Heinzelman, Hilfer, Twombly, Ruskiewicz, Henkel, Nehring, Piedmont-Marton, Weeda.

1. Minutes (imaginary) of last meeting approved.
2. Weeda handed out what he called a "poop sheet" with everybody's office hours on it that will be given to book reps. It was decided that freshman level text reps will see Halasek or Brodkey and sophomore level to Piedmont-Marton and Rebhorn. Brief discussion followed in which the question was raised "what do we really want from the textbook reps?" x Slatin allowed as how unless we really were considering changing texts why don't we just send the poor guys (or gals) on their way and stop wasting their time, not to mention our own. We all agreed with this but know we'll end up talking with them anyway.
3. Rebhorn opened discussion about LDPC's role in recommending four 316K professors for next fall's premier of 286T. While there was no argument with the four Rebhorn had listed (Duban, Garrison, Hedrick, and Lesser), concern was expressed by Slatin and Heinzelman that the process of selection in the future be more open. Teachers of 316K should be invited to apply, and furthermore those who do not currently teach 316K may wish to acquire some experience in the course in order to become eligible in the future.

Also re: 286T, Rebhorn passed on a suggestion he had been given that we somehow solicit feedback from former TAs in large 316Ks about their experience, so that the practicum can be made most useful. Brodkey expressed concern about soliciting information in this format and suggested that AGSE put together a position statement. Rebhorn worried that that would put AGSE in an adversarial position.

4. When Heinzelman asked if we actually have to give in to the necessity of "training" our TAs in 316K in order to teach 306, she initiated a wide ranging discussion about the effects of enrollment on our department. Several suggestions arose: 1) that TAs serve as 306 apprentices for their last semester before going it alone as an AI; 2) that rather than passively accepting the burdens of enrollment and lack of funding every year, we respond by saying that we cannot handle the load. Slatin and Heinzelman said that though this is a Department problem and not simply a Lower Division one, we need to start somewhere and draft a statement of some sort. Rebhorn cautioned that we need more concrete information to show how, despite our best efforts, we are failing to serve the needs of our students. We all agreed that it was possible, without being adversarial, to make some statement about how over-enrollment is seriously affecting the Department's pedagogical standing in the University.

Rebhorn will draft TA survey and Heizelman will work on a survey of faculty about teaching burden and quality of teaching.

5. It was decided to put off a discussion of the 308 syllabus until next spring when Brodkey has had a whole semester of teaching 396T. Brodkey did raise the question of whether we need a manual or a syllabus for 308.

6. Twombly asked us to think about the problems of credibility with 308Q and 316F. Brodkey suggested that we simply make up another course, like 304, and require it as a prerequisite for 308 for foreign students. "Why not?" seemed the general feeling. This matter will be discussed at the next meeting, at which time we will surely find out why not.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 4:40 P.M. .NEXT MEETING SET FOR OCT.28