

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH MINUTES  
October 24, 1980

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m., Joseph Moldenhauer presiding.

Several announcements were made. Mr. Moldenhauer reminded the Department of the General Faculty meeting to be held Tuesday, October 28 at 4:00 p.m. in Hogg Auditorium. All faculty and staff are encouraged to attend. The next departmental meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 31, at 3:00 p.m. One tentative agenda item is a discussion of AI-TA salaries.

Mr. Moldenhauer introduced the first agenda item for today's meeting: senior recruitment. Senior recruitment is inspired by two rather different circumstances. The first circumstance occurs when a major and indispensable area in a department's offering is suddenly and drastically underpopulated as a result of retirements, resignations, deaths, or terminations. Sometimes this can be foreseen, and a senior recruitment effort may span two or three years. The second circumstance is the "target of opportunity," when there comes to a department's attention either directly or indirectly news to the effect that a person of considerable distinction (in a given field which is not overpopulated in a given departmental program or offering) is contemplating a move and would like to be considered for an appointment. Mr. Moldenhauer said that just such a person was interested in a UT appointment. This person offers distinction in the fields of Chicano literature, American Studies, and Fiction Writing (with an emphasis on Chicano expression).

Mr. Moldenhauer explained the procedures involved in senior recruitment. Recruitment policy must be set by the Department. Section IV.(A) of the EC Constitution states:

"The Department as a whole, in its regular meetings, shall set its general policies, including general policy on recruitment and appointment; but within the limits of the policies thus set, the Executive Committee shall be empowered to act on all matters of recruitment as well as appointment, promotion, and budget, subject to the approval of the Dean and the higher administration. . . ."

The Executive Committee has given a preliminary look at the candidate's vita and has requested that the Dean entertain the possibility of a senior appointment. The Dean has consented to this request. The EC has also requested that either (or both) of the two open fractional lines in the budget (1/3 and 1/2) be supplemented to make a full line at the appropriate funding level. That request is under advisement. In addition, an ad hoc committee has been formed to

investigate the qualifications of the candidate and to consult with members of the Department, or other departments to which the contributions of the candidate might be relevant, in an attempt to assess the potential contributions of that person to the academic offerings of the University.

Mr. Moldenhauer then opened the floor to departmental discussion on senior recruitment. He stressed that the discussion should focus on policy in general terms and avoid discussion of individuals.

Américo Paredes strongly supported the recruitment of a senior member in the area of Chicano literature. He reminded the Department that the Mexican-American Studies Program (which was conceived in the English Department in 1969) was begun in 1970; the Program has grown to 14 tenured and tenure-track faculty. But after ten years, the Program has reached a critical point in its development. The Program needs a senior person with the wisdom and the intelligence to guide, stimulate, and stabilize the Program. Those involved with the Program believe very strongly that this person should be in the Humanities, preferably in literature and criticism because no other field in Chicano studies has grown and matured as has Chicano literature. Mr. Paredes recognized the strong support the English Department has given to the Program; senior recruitment at this time would be another example of its support.

Ramón Saldívar also supported the policy of senior recruitment in this area. He pointed out that the Department's only tenured Mexican-American scholar, Américo Paredes, is recognized as one of the most distinguished scholars in the country. Largely because of his presence, the University has become a major center of Mexican-American Studies. Therefore, Mr. Saldívar continued, the Department has a historical strength in this area and now has the opportunity to consolidate this strength, and perhaps even to increase it. Chicano studies at the University continues to grow in terms of quantity and quality of work produced and in terms of student interest. Currently, the English Department offers four sections each of 306 and 307 and several sections of 314L stressing Chicano literature and ethnic literature, and several sections yearly of 342 ("Life and Literature of the Southwest"). Presently, all of these courses are taught by junior faculty; an additional senior faculty member would help future development of these courses and perhaps even generate other course offerings. Another area which would benefit from this bilingual/bicultural approach would be the Creative Writing Program; there is room for much development in this area. A third area where a senior faculty member could increase

course offerings in the English Department is Mexican-American studies on the graduate level. The University of Texas is one of the few major universities in the southwest that does not offer a concentration in Mexican-American literature in its master's program. A final consideration for the presence of an additional senior person in Mexican-American studies is that it would naturally tend to attract more minority students and faculty to the program at UT; this would be of obvious benefit to the Department and the University, Mr. Saldívar concluded.

As a point of information, Mr. Moldenhauer reported that one other Mexican-American faculty member had been contacted on this matter; Carlota Dwyer could not be at the meeting, but she was supportive of the recruitment of a senior faculty member in Chicano literature.

Alan Friedman moved that the Department seek to hire a senior person in Chicano literature; the motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The Chair then directed the Department's attention to the second item on the agenda: the continuation of the Governance Committee Report.

Mr. Friedman (Chair, Governance Committee) reminded the Department that all of the Committee's recommendations for revisions of the EC Constitution were approved either as written or as amended at the departmental meeting of October 10, 1980. When the Department finishes its review of the Governance Committee Report, the Governance Committee will present the proposals to the Department for mail ballot. Before the Department considers the next part of the Committee's report, however, Mr. Friedman said that Warwick Wadlington had requested permission to present further revisions to the EC Constitution that were not included in the Committee's report.

Mr. Wadlington distributed copies of his proposals to the Department (copy attached). The first proposed revision concerns Section II ("Membership") and has two parts, paragraphs A and B:

- A. The E.C. shall comprise the Chair of the department (ex-officio) and thirteen elected members. If not an elected member, the Associate Chair shall be ex-officio without vote. The Chair of the department shall serve as Chair of the Executive Committee. The thirteen members shall consist of five Professors, two Associate Professors, two members drawn from the ranks of Assistant Professor and Instructor, and four members drawn from the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor.

- B. The two members drawn from the ranks of Assistant Professor and Instructor shall be relieved of all E.C. "subcommittee" responsibilities such as making reports and recommendations to the rest of the body. The right of these two members to vote on all E.C. matters will be unaffected by this modification.

Mr. Wadlington explained that paragraph A was inspired by the desire to decrease the heavy workload on EC members; increasing the size of the EC would allow the workload to be distributed more widely. As workload for individual EC members decreases, more members of the faculty will be willing to serve on the EC. Paragraph B was inspired by the desire to release untenured faculty from the extraordinary burdens of service-related work (which is not heavily weighted in tenure decisions at the College level) in order to devote more of their time to scholarship and teaching (which are the solid bases of promotion to tenure). Mr. Wadlington's motion that this part of his proposal be approved by the Department was seconded. There was prolonged debate on the release of untenured members from subcommittee work on the EC. (Mr. Wadlington clarified "subcommittee" to mean committees of one or more which prepared reports for the EC's action.)

Kurt Heinzelman said that the Chair should be empowered to relieve faculty members of onerous and unnecessary burdens, but that there was no reason to mandate the release from subcommittee work and, in fact, much harm could be done by such exemptions. Full involvement is necessary for informed decisions. Furthermore, Mr. Heinzelman believed that if what Mr. Wadlington suggests is true, that is, that service on the EC doesn't count, then service on any committee doesn't count. This, he concluded, was not true; service on any committee should entail full responsibility and involvement. Albert Goldbarth agreed and suggested that there were strong and generous reasons for Assistant Professors to serve fully on the EC; to deprive them of full service is to deprive them of the opportunity to display their potential, and it deprives the Department of their contribution in service areas. Mr. Goldbarth wondered if the heavy service burden on untenured faculty may be unrelated to EC work and may be more representative of the already heavy burden on each member of the Department. Janice Haney-Peritz noted that the quality of the working life is just as important as gaining tenure; members of the Department should grow professionally, and this includes service to the Department and to the larger academic community. Neill Megaw said that it was inaccurate to say that service does not count; he believed that professional growth is advanced through service. Mr. Megaw stated that less than

full involvement on the EC leads to a form of junior membership on the EC; this is not a desirable goal for the Department. Joan Lidoff wondered if it weren't possible to accomplish the same goals by changing the terms of office from two years to one year, or perhaps to modify service in other areas.

Mr. Wadlington was sympathetic with the desire of untenured faculty to serve the Department, but he believed that the Department could not allow these faculty members to sacrifice themselves. Such self-sacrifice doesn't benefit the individual and it doesn't benefit the Department. Instead, the Department should nurture the junior faculty, and, in fact, should relieve them of almost all burdens within the Department. The issue is not one of the value of service to the Department or to the individual; rather, it is the value of the quantity and quality of other work the member is unable to perform because of service on the EC. James Duban expressed his support of the motion; in both spirit and potential impact the motion is in the best interests of the junior faculty and the Department. William Sutherland stated his support for the motion, also; he defined professional growth in terms established by the academic community: professional standing is achieved through scholarship and teaching, not through service. The crucial steps one must take to become a member of the profession are, first, to get hired, and second, to attain tenure. Mr. Sutherland believed that it is the Department's obligation to do everything it can to help its members attain tenure.

Lynda Boose proposed that the motion be amended so that it was divided into two parts: paragraphs A and B would be voted on separately. The motion was seconded. (Mr. Megaw offered a motion to table both of these motions until after discussion of the "Curriculum and Planning Committee" presented in the Governance Committee Report. That motion was defeated by a show of hands.) The vote to divide the motion into two parts was approved.

It was agreed that paragraph B, dealing with workload in the EC by untenured faculty, would be voted on first because its result would have implications for the motion in paragraph A. The motion to relieve untenured members of the EC from subcommittee work was defeated.

Mr. Wadlington moved to modify his motion in paragraph A such that ". . . and thirteen elected members. . . ." was changed to ". . . and eleven elected members. . . ." and that ". . . and four members drawn . . ." was changed to ". . . and two members drawn . . ."

The motion was seconded. The purpose of this modification, Mr. Wadlington explained, was to keep the EC from becoming too large a body. Mr. Sutherland disagreed with this reasoning; thirteen members was not too large a body, and, in fact, thirteen members would be more efficiently organized than either the present nine or the proposed eleven member EC would be. Mr. Sutherland noted that an even greater advantage would attach to a larger EC: the larger number might change the nature of the EC and would certainly provide for wider representation. The vote to modify paragraph A as stated was approved. Paragraph A, as amended, read:

"The EC shall comprise the Chair of the department (ex-officio) and eleven elected members. If not an elected member, the Associate Chair shall be ex-officio without vote. The Chair of the department shall serve as Chair of the Executive Committee. The eleven members shall consist of five Professors, two Associate Professors, two members drawn from the ranks of Assistant Professor and Instructor, and two members drawn from the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor."

The motion to adopt the paragraph was passed unanimously.

Mr. Wadlington's three other proposals for revisions in the EC Constitution were withdrawn.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Attachment: Proposals for Revisions to the EC Constitution  
by Warwick Wadlington, dated 10/15

Proposed revision to the E.C. Constitution

1. II. Membership

A. The E.C. shall comprise the Chair of the department (ex-officio) and thirteen elected members. [Next two sentences in original unchanged.] The thirteen members shall consist of five Professors, two Associate Professors, two members drawn from the ranks of Assistant Professor and Instructor, and four members drawn from the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor.

B. The two members drawn from the ranks of Assistant Professor and Instructor shall be relieved of all E.C. "subcommittee" responsibilities such as making reports and recommendations to the rest of the body. The right of these two members to vote on all E.C. matters will be unaffected by this modification.

Reasons:

- (1) In recognition of the less important role that service plays in securing tenure compared to teaching and scholarship, to allow non-tenured faculty to continue to be represented on the E.C., without, as at present, putting heavy service obligations on these representatives during the period in which they are establishing the most essential credentials for promotion.
  - (2) In recognition of the overly heavy workload entailed for current E.C. members in our large department: two additional members elected to take up the responsibilities presently held by non-tenured members, and two more to distribute the work more widely by increasing the size of the body.
  - (3) Also by increasing the size, to provide the opportunity for wide representation on the E.C. of a variety of viewpoints and professional specialization within the department.
2. In present paragraph II.(C), change the word "six" to "eight."
  3. Redesignate present paragraph II.(B) as II.(C), II.(C) as II.(D), and II.(D) as II.(E).
  4. In III.(C)(3), change to the following: "After the elimination of ineligible and withdrawn names, there shall be a nominating round for choosing as members of Panel A half of the remaining eligible Professors and Associate Professors and for choosing as members of Panel B half of the remaining Assistant Professors and Instructors. The number shall be

Revisions to the EC Constitution  
Wadlington 10/15  
Page 2

half-of-one more than half if the total is odd. All eligible voters at the rank of Professor and Associate Professor shall be entitled to nominate for Panel A by checking half of the names on the nominating ballot, with no indication of preference. Those chosen shall constitute Panel A on the final ballot. The result to be achieved is the election of eleven members (including carry-overs) from the tenured ranks, including a minimum of five Professors and two Associate Professors. As with Panel A, all eligible voters at the ranks of Assistant Professor and Instructor shall be entitled to nominate for Panel B.