

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

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of March 23, 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 MARCH 23, 1981

The sixth regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1980-1981 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, March 23, 1981, at 2:15 p.m.; Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies William Livingston presided in President Flawn's absence.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Abram Amsel, Martin Baughman, Harold Billings, Francis Bostick, Harold Box, John Brokaw, Billye Brown, Ronald Brown, Mark Cassidy, James Colvin, Mary Crockett, James Doluisio, Mitzi Dreher, John Durbin, David Edwards, Parker Fielder, Gerhard Fonken, Karl Galinsky, LaVerne Gallman, David Gavenda, Donald Grantham, Terence Grieder, Glynn Harmon, Roderick Hart, Thomas Hatfield, Kimberly Helbig, James Hurst, Ira Iscoe, Robert Jeffrey, Gaylord Jentz, James Jirsa, H. Paul Kelley, Lorrin Kennamer, Judith Langlois, Gerlinde Leiding, William Lesso, William Livingston, Ernest Lundelius, Don McDermott, James McGinity, Thomas Marquardt, Larry Nettles, Chad Oliver, Thomas Philpott, Mary Ann Rankin, Phyllis Richards, Elspeth Rostow, Susan Russell, Michael Sharlot, William Shive, Guy Shuttlesworth, Ray Sommerfeld, C. G. Sparks, James F. M. Stephens, James Vick, Warwick Wadlington, Stanley Werbow, Robert Williamson, Eugene Wissler;

Absent: Robert Boyer, Robert Brody (excused), James Browne, Peter Flawn (excused), Charles Franklin, Bonnie Cook Freeman, Alan Friedman, William Glade, Earnest Gloyna (excused), Eleanor Greenhill, Dagmar Hamilton, David Hershey, Forest Hill (excused), Robert King (excused), Robert Kline (excused), George Kozmetsky (excused), Charles Lamb (excused), Clarence Lasby, Neill Megaw (excused), Joanie Powell, Lawrence Speck (excused), Waneen Spirduso, John Sutton, Louis Zurcher (excused).

Total members present: 59; total members absent: 24.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Vice-President Livingston called attention to the Special Meeting of the General Faculty scheduled for Wednesday, April 1, at 4:00 p.m., in the LBJ Auditorium. This called meeting was prompted by a resolution adopted in the Faculty Senate requesting consideration of United States policy concerning El Salvador.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING ON FEBRUARY 16, 1981 (D&P 8237-8264).
(APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED)

The Minutes of the February 16, 1981, meeting of the University Council (D&P 8237-8264) were approved as distributed.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY (D&P 8229-8230).

Secretary Kelley called attention to his previously-distributed written report (D&P 8229-8230). He added that the official notice of the Special Meeting would be distributed to members of the General Faculty later in the week, together with two resolutions and supporting materials submitted by Thomas Philpott (History) for consideration at that meeting.

MOTION TO RECLASSIFY THE PROPOSAL BY THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE UNIVERSITY REQUIREMENT IN ENGLISH (D&P 8212-8216) AS EMERGENCY LEGISLATION. (DEFEATED)

Vice-President Livingston reminded members that on February 16, at the beginning of the debate on the report of the University Council Committee on Basic Education Requirements (the Vick Committee), the Council had first amended and then adopted a procedural motion that called first for a general discussion of the report as a whole; and that general discussion had been completed just prior to adjournment. The procedural motion called next for a section-by-section discussion of the recommendations of the Vick Committee. However, before calling for the beginning of that section-by-section discussion, Vice-President Livingston called on Warwick Wadlington to introduce a motion concerning a matter that might require emergency legislation.

Warwick Wadlington (English), speaking on behalf of Dean Robert King (College of Liberal Arts), who was unable to be present, MOVED that Item 7 on the agenda, the Proposal by the College of Liberal Arts for an Undergraduate University Requirement in English (D&P 8212-8216), be reclassified as emergency legislation and be given immediate attention by the Council. The motion was seconded. Mr. Wadlington requested privileges of the floor for James Kinneavy (English) to speak to his motion; floor privileges were granted to Mr. Kinneavy and to Mr. Carl Rubino (Classics), who was substituting for Mr. Karl Galinsky.

Mr. Kinneavy (English) spoke to two or three items that he thought justified the emergency legislation status of Mr. Wadlington's motion.

First, he called attention to the fact that this particular legislation, which proposes a sequence of three English courses for all students--one freshman course, one sophomore course, and one junior course, had a separate genesis from the Vick Committee report. It had its genesis in 1978, when the Department of English made a very thorough research survey of its current offerings in composition and came to some conclusions about those offerings. Then, in 1979, the Department of English was asked by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts to examine its current offerings. As a result, the Department of English submitted, and the College of Liberal Arts subsequently approved, the proposal to which Mr. Wadlington's motion applied.

Second, he called attention to the fact that this particular proposal is not incompatible with the Vick Committee writing proposal. He said members of the Vick Committee are sympathetic to the College of Liberal Arts proposal and that English Department members, including himself, are sympathetic to their writing proposal. He further indicated that the programs that he had seen at the University of Michigan assured him that the Vick Committee writing proposal is workable.

Finally, he pointed out that, although the College of Liberal Arts proposal is compatible with the Vick Committee writing proposal, it is neither a part of nor connected with that proposal. If the Vick Committee writing proposal should be approved, the program established by the College of Liberal Arts proposal could fit right into it. But if

the Vick Committee proposal should not be approved, the College of Liberal Arts still would like to see its proposed program put into operation. Mr. Kinneavy said, "There is a certain immanence in our particular proposal which I think the Vick proposal does not necessarily face. We can carry ours out, implement ours much more rapidly, I think, than can the Vick proposal be implemented. We can implement ours beginning, actually, in 1983, although the full effect would not be seen until 1985, given new catalogues. We do not have to warn the high schools of prerequisites, and so on; this is, I think, not the case necessarily with the Vick proposal."

Gaylord Jentz (General Business) informed the Council that representatives of the Business Communication division of his department had met with Mr. Kinneavy and the Chairman of the Department of English concerning this proposal, and that the Department of English had agreed to a modification of the College of Liberal Arts proposal. He asked Mr. Kinneavy to introduce the agreed-upon modification.

Mr. Jentz also asked Mr. Kinneavy whether or not transfer students who enter U.T. Austin with a second lower-division writing course would receive transfer credit for the required upper-division writing course. He thought that issue should be resolved before declaring this proposal to be emergency legislation.

Mr. Kinneavy spoke first to the modification of the College of Liberal Arts proposal. He pointed out that the original proposal (D&P 8213) listed four topics under the new upper-division writing course, English 346K: Writing in the Sciences, Writing in the Social Sciences, Writing in the Arts and Humanities, and Writing in Business. At the meeting mentioned by Mr. Jentz, the Business Communication representatives, for good reasons, recommended that the Writing in Business topic be deleted and that Business Administration students be required to take the Writing in the Social Sciences topic. Mr. Kinneavy stated that the English Department was quite willing to comply with that recommendation.

Mr. Kinneavy then responded to the question about transfer credit. "We did not write into the legislation the particular issue of transfer students.... The transfer issue is briefly this, and it is a complex issue: if we would require that everybody who goes through an undergraduate ... program here take an upper-division course in composition, we would immediately severely affect all of the second-semester freshman composition courses offered by community colleges in the state. The University of Houston has had some experience at attempting to face up to this issue, and they backed away from it, I think wisely. Consequently our recommendation ... for those people who transfer into the University [after having taken a second-semester freshman English course [elsewhere is that their second-semester freshman course be accepted as a substitute for the] upper-division English course [called for] in this particular sequence.... I know that that does partially weaken the program for transfer students, but [we do not want to] fight the community colleges.... We may have, we think, a better program..., but for transfer students we will have to accept [the present programs in the other colleges]."

Vice-President Livingston then called for a vote on the Wadlington motion to alter the classification of the College of Liberal Arts proposal to emergency legislation and to bring it to the floor for immediate consideration. The motion FAILED, leaving the classification and the agenda position of the proposed legislation unchanged.

REPORT CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8148-8166). (REPLACED BY A SUBSTITUTE MOTION)

As its first item of Unfinished Business, the Council began its item-by-item action on the Vick Committee recommendations. Dean Stanley Werbow (College of Fine Arts) immediately MOVED to substitute the following motion for the motion to approve the recommendations of the following on Basic Education Requirements (D&P 8148-8166, 8247-8248):

The University Council recognizes the valuable contribution of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements and receives its report. This report focuses University-wide attention on educational issues which have occupied sister institutions across the country in recent years. In addition we see the need to consider the formal educational process as continuing from kindergarten through college graduation, as Professor Philip Graham stated in his summary remarks at the end of the General Faculty meeting of May 17, 1955, when the existing basic education requirements were adopted.

The Council favors the establishment of entrance requirements which will assure students entering the University of preparation in English (including writing), in foreign languages, science, mathematics, social sciences, humanities, and fine arts to enable them to pursue a baccalaureate degree with success.

The Council recommends that each College review the requirements for its undergraduate degrees and make changes to bring these requirements within the spirit of the report of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements. An interim report to the President will be expected from each Dean by ~~September~~ January 1, 1982,* and a final proposal for modification of degree requirements by September 1, ~~1983~~ 1982.* In this way, our Centennial will be marked by rededication to the goals of liberal education within the framework of undergraduate degree programs in Liberal Arts, in Natural Sciences, and in the professional colleges and schools.

After the motion was seconded, James Vick (Mathematics) spoke against it. He said he believed that the members of the Committee felt that if each college were left to go its own way, many of the objectives that were set by the Committee would not be accomplished.

*During subsequent discussion Dean Werbow, as maker of the motion, deleted the material in brackets and replaced it with the underlined material; see D&P 8282.

John Brokaw (Drama) supported the motion to substitute as having taken into account some of the differences that were discussed at the previous Council meeting. He felt that the Council could not find a solution that would satisfy everyone, so that some compromise would be necessary. He felt the procedure proposed in the substitute motion would be useful.

Eugene Wissler (Chemical Engineering) asked "...why Dean Werbow proposed to wait until 1982 to take the matter up again. Would it not be possible for the colleges to conduct their studies during the remainder of the current semester, and perhaps next summer, and be prepared to take the matter up again in September 1981?" Dean Werbow replied: "My thinking was simply that it is April next week and that summertime is not a time when deliberations of this kind normally are able to go forward well, and that our legislation will be in effect for a long time, and I did not see the harm in waiting until a further academic year passed before having these proposals worked up and come forward. In particular, I think that the colleges and departments must have the opportunity to develop the special courses, such as the courses in writing,...which the Vick Committee recommends."

David Edwards (Government) stated "... that the topic we are addressing is clearly one of importance to more than simply our colleges and schools as colleges and schools. It is a...question, really, of the ideal nature of undergraduate education in the University today and for...coming decades. That being the case, it seems to me that this is a question that ought to be decided by the University faculty as a faculty, rather than by college faculties as college faculties, and so I think it would be a mistake to adopt a motion like this which...validates the tendencies we have already seen for...erosion of the common core of education. In addition, I think if this sort of thing is worth doing, it is worth doing as soon as possible consistent with appropriate considered debate by this body and [then] by the General Faculty.... If it turns out, after that debate, that we cannot reach common agreement, we may be forced to take an approach of the sort that has just been recommended to us; if that is true, I think it will be a great misfortune not only for us as a faculty but also, perhaps particularly, for students who go through this University in coming years. Furthermore, this proposal calls for a delay of several years that is not really fair, I think, to the students who would be potentially coming in under a new program were we to develop it. For all those reasons, therefore, I MOVE to table the substitute." The motion to table Dean Werbow's motion to substitute was seconded and then DEFEATED by a vote of 25 to 31. Debate therefore continued on the motion to substitute.

Larry Nettles (student) said: "I think this motion is a clear attempt to kill any substantive change which might be forthcoming in the core curriculum required by the University. It contains no language which would require any changes by any college or school; it merely says we will review or come up with recommendations. We have already been through most of this process, and I think we will have a lot of wasted effort and lost momentum if we adopt this proposal."

Terence Grieder (Art Department) supported the Werbow motion. "The curriculum which we operate under now was created by our faculty over a long period of time and has been changed and remodeled repeatedly, and it really does express the attitudes and ideals of the faculty. One of the problems I think we have here, that I certainly feel, is it is very hard to get detailed feedback fast enough for my faculty. I have a feeling that we are operating very largely cut off from our faculties. We make

up things here that are ideals, and I think that probably is our role; I think what we have in the Vick report is truly an ideal statement, which I would like my faculty to have the opportunity to work with in remodeling our degree programs. I would hate to come to them with a statement from this body that was not an ideal statement to approach, but a 'do or die' kind of statement from us.

"I think there is another aspect to the Vick proposal which I find disturbing, and that is that it tends to do the core curriculum the easy way, which is to say that we will make every student take the beginning course in every field of study. None of those courses was made up to be taken by everyone; they are courses for people who already are committed to a field and who intend to take further courses in the field. I think [that] if we are going to do this seriously, if we are really going to change this, we have to start from scratch and devise courses which, if they should be taken by everyone, are not included in anyone's major, but are truly general education courses. That is not the thrust of the Vick [Committee] report. If we are going to do something realistic, I think we should send it back to the faculties and let them have a statement of ideals which they can shoot for, and take a year to implement it. The idea that this is a delay is false, because the Vick [Committee] report will not go into operation until 1985 anyway...."

Thomas Philpott (History) commented: "I voted to table the motion, but I looked to see who was voting the other way, and I noticed people whom I have real confidence in, whose commitment to a core curriculum of real value here I trust. I think the remarks made by Mr. Brokaw, Mr. Grieder, and Dean Werbow were thoughtful remarks. What I am getting at is that there are a couple of apprehensions in the room, and on the campus, I think.

"One apprehension is that liberal education is waning at The University of Texas, and technical and professional preparatory education is taking over. This change was foretold by the first president of the University, quoted in the opening pages of Ronnie Dugger's book, Our Invaded Universities; I think it is coming to fruition. Many people have that apprehension, and along with it, the apprehension that if a core curriculum is not staked out and defended now, the opportunity will be lost and the University will become a congeries of trade schools with a panache, maybe, of humanities.

"On the other hand, there is an apprehension...in the History Department that this is a very laborious and difficult way to go about deliberations.... And to...make a curriculum change that is going to last well into the 21st century is something that should not be done in haste.

"So there are at least two apprehensions. I share them. It seems to me that my colleagues in the department do. We want a liberal education available to all undergraduates of The University of Texas, and that is not an easy thing to defend and implement. Yet, as Mr. Grieder said, we want to take this very seriously and do it well. I have been afraid, and I have stated before, that we are going about this with some haste, more haste than is necessary...."

"I want to say that I respect the opinions expressed in this room today and previously. I want to see the Vick report, with amendments, passed, but I want to see it done thoughtfully and well. That is why I voted to table the motion, without any disrespect for the speaker and his views. And I really do have these apprehensions. But we have got to do this with deliberation and care and respect, and not ram it through [and] publish it so the faculty at large sees it just before...the end of the year."

Dean Elspeth Rostow (LBJ School) commented: "As the dean of one of those professional schools that Thomas Philpott is worried about, I rise with some hesitation, but the reason that I voted to consider the Werbow motion rather than to table it is that I take as seriously as Dr. Philpott does the need to have the changes that we trust you will make meaningful for the various parts of this large campus. And I cannot, having lived through curricular revisions in the past, believe that a discussion in this body is the best way to achieve such ends.

"We receive applications from graduates of this University, from various colleges, and I know from reading what is laughingly called the writing sample that a great deal needs to be done in order to produce the kind of students that we need for a graduate school of public policy. If the Werbow motion carries, I am going to ask my faculty to give to the President, or to whatever body considers the recommendations to be made under the Werbow motion, a sense of what it is that we feel is now missing in undergraduate training, not just here but elsewhere; we see it through a different prism, but we are perfectly aware of the imperfection of what is now being done in this country.

"I would regard Dean Werbow's proposal as giving each of us an opportunity, not to depart from the objectives of the Vick [Committee] proposals, but rather to give them some bite, some teeth, some meaning, and a degree of support which I do not believe can be achieved through the mechanism that we have before us at this time. I believe that the timing is not as much of a problem as the objective. I would far rather take the little more time to achieve a meaningful revision in each of our undergraduate offerings and then...have this body look very carefully at the reports submitted to the President; if there has been no change, no improvement, at that point impose some stiff sanctions. Dilute sanctions, which I believe are the best that we can hope for at this point, will certainly less suit our objectives [than the type] of deliberation...this motion suggests. In the end, deliberations by this body and the President [will lead] to some real, some needed, some long overdue change."

Mr. Wissler (Chemical Engineering) then MOVED to amend the Werbow motion by changing the date September 1, 1982, to January 1, 1982, and the date September 1, 1983, to September 1, 1982, in order to advance the final proposals for modification of degree requirements by one full year. The motion to amend was seconded. Dean Werbow and his seconder agreed to change the dates in the original motion to those proposed by Mr. Wissler.

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) suggested that the January date should be changed to a February date, and that the September date should be changed to a date either in May or October, in order to fit better with faculty and University Council schedules.

David Edwards (Government) suggested that dates in December and May would be better, since the reports were to be submitted to the President and not to the University Council. Mr. Wissler pointed out, however, that Dean Rostow's comment implied that the reports from the colleges would be transmitted to the University Council for assimilation and synthesis of a final proposal during the 1982 Spring Semester, and then the final proposal would be prepared and ready for debate by the Council at the beginning of the 1982 Fall Semester.

Dean Werbow clarified two points. The first point was that any changes in degree requirements which would be initiated by the colleges and schools would have to come to the University Council for approval,

either by circularization or in a meeting, so that sending the proposed changes to the President is merely a way of getting them to the University Council. The second point was that some of his colleagues seemed not to know that deans work in the summer; a date for reporting the proposals to the President for consideration by the University Council in early fall would mean that the bulk of the faculty work on the proposals would have to be completed during the Spring Semester, and the summer would be used for editing and getting the proposals prepared for submission.

Mr. Philpott wanted to see both procedures followed simultaneously, with the Council continuing its deliberations on the Vick Committee proposals while the departments and colleges were continuing to study and revise their degree requirements. He felt that the results of the two processes would feed into each other. Therefore he hoped that the motion to substitute would be defeated.

Susan Russell (student) pointed out that there was no specific language in the Werbow proposal to insure any changes in basic education requirements would be made. She pointed to the difficulty the Council was having in voting on one proposal and asked whether it was going to be easier when there were fifteen separate proposals for the Council to consider.

Dean Werbow underscored the seriousness with which he wrote the words, "to bring these requirements within the spirit of the report of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements." That was the instruction which the Council would give to the schools and colleges, not that they should consider their degree requirements in the abstract or without reference to that yardstick.

John Durbin (Mathematics) agreed with Mr. Philpott. It seemed that most of the arguments given previously had to do with proceeding slowly and deliberately, but he had not heard very many arguments that convinced him that the issue should be turned over to the colleges individually. He remembered a proposal several years ago from the Department of Music which had to do with weakening the science and mathematics part of their requirements, and he was not optimistic that any department would suddenly turn around and move in the other direction.

It was not clear to him what "within the spirit of the report" means. Does the spirit of the report include a foreign language requirement? Does it include restricting the mathematics courses that can be required? Does it include the specific science requirement that the Vick Committee recommended or the requirement set forth in the proposed amendment submitted by Mary Ann Rankin (D&P 8226-8228)? He believed that "spirit" could be interpreted in a very loose way. Therefore he thought it would be better for the Council to debate some of these issues, agree on them, and then, after all amendments had been adopted, for members of the Council to have a chance to vote down the amended Vick Committee recommendations or then to adopt the Werbow substitute.

Vice-President Livingston then called for a vote on the motion to substitute the language in the motion by Dean Werbow for the proposals of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements. The motion to substitute was APPROVED by a vote of 32 to 26.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION FOR THE MOTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8279). (APPROVED)

Vice-President Livingston then called for debate on the Werbow motion that had just been substituted for the Vick Committee motion.

Larry Nettles (student) MOVED to amend the Werbow motion so that the third paragraph would begin: "Each college shall review the requirements for its undergraduate degrees and make changes to bring these requirements within the spirit of the report of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements. An interim report to the President will be expected from each Dean by January 1, 1982, and a final proposal for modification of degree requirements by September 1, 1982. Any deviation from the report of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements shall be explained to the satisfaction of the University Council." The remainder of the paragraph would have been unchanged. The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Nettles believed that the language of the Werbow proposal, as originally drafted, did not assure any substantive change or any movement toward the goals set out in the report of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements.

Gaylord Jentz (General Business) asked whether the motion to amend was in order, since it really was a motion to approve the Vick Committee report, which the Council had just said it would not do at this point.

Dean Werbow endorsed Mr. Jentz's point of order. It was his recollection of Robert's Rules of Order that an amendment cannot reverse the intent of the original motion, which he thought this amendment did. However, as far as the insertion of "shall" was concerned, he thought it would be perfectly acceptable for the first sentence to begin, "The Council recommends that each College shall review"; all the University Council could do was recommend.

Vice-President Livingston then ruled that the question of whether or not an amendment could reverse the meaning of a motion was moot, because the amendment in question did not enact the Vick Committee report; it merely required that departments make changes, and if they did not make changes that conformed to the spirit of the Vick Committee report, they should justify their decisions to the University Council.

Mr. Nettles affirmed that his amendment spoke of the spirit of the Vick Committee report and contained no requirement that each college or school adopt the report; all that was required was that they make changes within the spirit of the report, and if they decided not to adopt the changes proposed in the report, they should explain to the satisfaction of the University Council why those changes had not been made.

Vice-President Livingston then ruled that the motion to amend was in order, so the motion on the floor was the Nettles amendment. There was no further discussion, and the motion to amend FAILED by a vote of 22 to 32.

The substitute motion by Dean Werbow was then APPROVED by a vote of 36 to 18.

AN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8170-8171). (NOT CONSIDERED)

ANOTHER PROPOSAL CONCERNING BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8204-8207). (NOT CONSIDERED)

PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING MATHEMATICS IN THE REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8208-8210). (NOT CONSIDERED)

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE PROPOSED GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8221). (NOT CONSIDERED)

PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE RECOMMENDATION REGARDING NATURAL SCIENCE REQUIREMENTS IN THE REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8226-8228). (NOT CONSIDERED)

Vice-President Livingston announced that the substitution of the Werbow motion for the motion to approve the recommendations of the Committee automatically had removed the need for consideration of the next five items of Unfinished Business, since those items were alternate proposals and amendments to the legislation recommended by the Vick Committee.

PROPOSAL BY THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE UNIVERSITY REQUIREMENT IN ENGLISH (D&P 8212-8216). (ACTION NOT COMPLETED)

The Council next turned to a consideration of the College of Liberal Arts proposal that it had earlier declined to consider as emergency legislation.

James Kinneavy (English) spoke in favor of considering that legislation now. He called attention to the heart of the proposal (D&P 8213). The core of the proposal is a nine-hour English requirement for all undergraduate degree programs at U.T. Austin. The first course would be English 306, Rhetoric and Composition, in the freshman year; it would be substantially the same as the present English 306 course. The second course would be a new course, English 316K, Masterworks of Literature, in the sophomore year; it would require a substantial amount of writing about the literature being studied. The third course would be a new course, English 346K, Writing in Different Disciplines, or an equivalent course offered in any department, in the junior or senior year. The original proposal called for English 346K to be offered in four topics--Writing in the Arts and Sciences, Writing in the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Writing in the Natural Sciences, and Writing in Business; however, as indicated earlier in the meeting, at the request of the College of Business Administration, the Writing in Business topic was being deleted from the proposal. These three courses would be basically writing courses which would prepare students for the kinds of writing they will be expected to do in these various areas; some of the writing would relate to readings in the respective areas.

The main feature of this particular proposal is the transfer of a current course offered in the freshman year to the junior year. Except for a few programs in the College of Fine Arts, all of the undergraduate degree programs at U.T. Austin currently have a 9-hour English requirement--English 306 as the first course; English 307 or English 308 as the second course, taken in the second semester of the freshman year; and a sophomore English course. The sophomore course changes according to the different colleges and even according to the different departments. This particular legislation would take that second freshman course, English 307 or English 308, and move it up to the junior year. The basic reasons for moving this second-semester course up to the junior level are outlined on the next page of the proposal.

Mr. Kinneavy called attention to the following statement on D&P 8214, which had been opposed by James Sledd (English) at the last Council meeting: "Certainly the most compelling reason for the suggestion is the desire of the U.T. faculty and student body. In the Hereford-Sledd report of 1976, 78% of the 1,358 faculty respondents (including Teaching Assistants) favored such an upper-division course, and 83% of the 2,114 student respondents said that students would be more motivated in such a course. Yet 77% of the students also favored a freshman composition course. Such a response is a mandate for our suggestions." Mr. Kinneavy commented: "Mr. Sledd suggests that that is not really a mandate. I

will withdraw; Mr. Sledd is right. A mandate is considered to be something like 60% in a political race. Nixon said he had a mandate with something like 60%; so did LBJ. The University is like France, or some of the continental countries--60% is much more than a mandate; 78% of the faculty and 83% of the students--that is not a mandate, Mr. Sledd, that is practically a divine call. I think that it is a very strong request."

Mr. Kinneavy reported that a program similar to this was installed at the University of Michigan, motivated by exit interviews with approximately 2,000 students graduating from the College of Arts and Sciences and Letters. More than one-half of those students said that they wished that they had had some sort of upper-division writing course, preferably one in their discipline. He believed that there is very strong faculty and student request for such a course at U.T. Austin.

Another reason for moving the second-semester course up to the junior year was that studies had been made, particularly at Harvard, Bradley, and other institutions, that showed that one of the problems is that if one crowded all of the teaching of composition into the freshman year, or even some in the sophomore year, and then neglected it for the rest of the student's undergraduate experience, the student could forget the skills which he had learned in the freshman year. The Harvard study showed that senior Science majors wrote worse than did freshmen Science majors, not only with regard to mechanics of writing but also with regard to overall organization of theme and similar factors, whereas senior Liberal Arts majors wrote better than did their freshmen peers, because the senior Liberal Arts majors were writing more than were the senior Science majors. A similar study was made at Bradley with Education majors.

Mr. Kinneavy stated that the English Department can staff and handle effectively 3 three-hour required courses with a writing component--the first and the third being primarily writing courses, and the middle one being a literature course with some writing. "We can get most out of our staff by [spreading the writing courses] across the student's undergraduate experience rather than crowding it at the freshman year. I know that that may sound a little paradoxical, but the research studies indicate that very strongly. Our experience with our own upper-division composition courses, and we have a lot of them, is that there is much better motivation, students have something to talk about; and in general our own experience backs up the studies at Bradley and the studies at Harvard."

Mr. Kinneavy reported that under the proposed program, the Department of English would not have to hire as many temporary faculty to teach composition courses; however, he reiterated that educational advantage to the student was the major thrust of this particular proposal.

Finally, he addressed the issue that was raised by the Vick Committee. The proposal called for each student to write in the area of his or her own discipline, but to write the kind of prose that would be intelligible to the general reader. "It is assumed...that an ordinary English teacher is a general reader. [The purpose of the requirement] is to force the whole University populus to speak the language of the general reader. It also forces members the English Department...to talk to the [faculty] members of the University. I see [this requirement] as a strong force to unify intellectually, at the level of language, the whole University community."

"We are not asking any department or any college to take over any course. Any department or any college which wants to...substitute one Different Disciplines course offered by the Department of English, can get together with the English Department; if the English Department can it is a substantial writing course, it can approve it, and the English Department encourages this. But [the Department of English] is not trying to slough off [students] to other departments...."

One possible problem that Mr. Kinneavy foresaw concerned student displacement. What would the freshmen do if they did not take a second semester freshman English course that has been a staple in many programs? With assistance from the Measurement and Evaluation Center, the English Department conducted a questionnaire survey immediately after the beginning of the current Spring Semester of all students enrolled in English 307 and English 308, the second semester writing courses. Students were asked what courses they would have taken this semester if they had to wait until they were juniors to take their second composition course. Usable responses were received from 3,344 students, about four-fifths of the possible respondents. There was a very diffuse response. Probably the Department of English would have to add an additional section of one or two other courses; the Departments of Psychology, Speech, Government, and History might possibly each have to add one section of a course, although that is unlikely. There would be no big rush to any one particular course, so this would not substantially alter the offerings of any department in the University.

The other side of that coin, Mr. Kinneavy reported, is what happens to the students when they get to the junior year. He had asked a group of Assistant and Associate Deans of the U.T. Austin schools and colleges to write him about any serious problems the proposed program would create for students in their degree programs. He had not received any letters, but he had received from the College of Business Administration a serious concern with regard to two of their degree programs; however he felt those problems could be resolved. Therefore displacement, either at the freshman or the upper-division level, did not seem to be a serious problem.

The other problem Mr. Kinneavy addressed concerned community college students who ordinarily take a second composition course at the freshman level. Should this legislation be enacted, then the English Department would suggest to the community colleges that, instead of having students take a second semester writing course in their freshman year, they have their students take a second writing course at the end of their sophomore year. That would put the second writing course only one semester off from the U.T. Austin junior-level course. It would not interfere with the community colleges' terrain, financially or academically.

Roderick Hart (Speech Communication), in light of the earlier decision not to consider the Vick Committee recommendations at this time, MOVED that discussion of the College of Liberal Arts proposal be postponed until such time as the colleges have reported back to the University Council. The motion was seconded.

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) spoke strongly against postponement. He believed that the College of Liberal Arts proposal should not be confused with the Vick Committee proposal. The two proposals were not contradictory. In this case a department had shown initiative and said, "We can improve instruction." He believed the Council should not respond, "Do not consider it; we have to wait." He felt it was clear the English Department had the ability to implement the proposal and that the Council should tell them to do so and give them all the support it could.

Mr. Kinneavy reminded the Council that this legislation was not at all a part of the Vick Committee report. It had an earlier genesis, and it was a coincidence that it and the Vick Committee report came to the Council the same week.

Ernest Lundelius (Geological Sciences) spoke in favor of trying the proposed program. He believed that some freshmen are bored by their writing courses and that a certain element of immaturity might disappear by the time the students become juniors or seniors, when they do have something to say in their major subject.

Vice-President Livingston pointed out that the question being debated was on postponing the College of Liberal Arts proposal until the responses to the Werbow motion had come in, not on the substance of the proposal itself.

Mr. Jentz asked if the course outlines for the three topics of the new upper-division writing courses had been distributed to the various colleges. Mr. Kinneavy answered that committees had been working on those outlines and that the general catalogue descriptions had been approved already, so the course topics could be pilot tested next year. Committees also had been working on the syllabuses for the topics since the beginning of this year, but they were not yet ready to be distributed to the colleges. The most complete, at the present time, is the syllabus for Writing in the Sciences.

Vice-President Livingston asked if Mr. Kinneavy expected the new requirements would take effect in the Fall Semester of 1981. Mr. Kinneavy indicated that would not be possible, since the proposed changes would still have to go through a number of different stages of approval before they could be implemented. Instead, he anticipated that the English Department would pilot test these courses while the legislation was moving forward, with the hope that the new requirements would be approved in time for them to be implemented in the Fall Semester of 1982.

Mr. Hart expanded on his earlier remarks about inconsistency. There were six major sections in the Vick Committee report. The University Council had indicated that it was not yet ready to make University-wide recommendations on the areas of arts and humanities, natural sciences, and mathematics; he did not believe the Council was in any better position to make recommendations about writing, since apparently it needed input from all the different colleges in the University. It seemed to him that it would be quite inconsistent for the Council to indicate, the same day, that it was not ready to approve University-wide requirements and then, in fact, to approve University-wide writing requirements.

John Brokaw (Drama) asked if the three upper-division course topics had been proposed in order to administer the anticipated enrollment; he wanted to know if there was anything special about those three courses that three other courses would not do just as well. Mr. Kinneavy replied that those particular courses were modeled upon several other programs which are in effect in this country at the present time. The longest-standing of the programs like this is at Brigham Young University, which for ten years has had four courses exactly like those specified-- Writing in the Sciences, Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, and Business. The University of Maryland has a similar organization. One of the problems is to suggest, as the University of Michigan has, a departmentalization so that there are forty different departments offering forty different courses; they are doing that at Michigan. He, personally, preferred the model of Brigham Young University and the University of Maryland; this program was developed in imitation of those two working models.

Mr. Brokaw then asked if such upper-division writing courses are already available to students at U.T. Austin. Mr. Kinneavy said they were not; a request had been submitted to the Coordinating Board at the beginning of this year asking that it approve the courses for next year. The English Department hoped to pilot test the courses next year and to put them into effect across the board by 1982.

Finally, Mr. Brokaw asked whether the colleges might then be able to consider the proposed courses and provide some advice for the English Department as it formulates the course contents. Mr. Kinneavy replied that he hoped the colleges would do so, or even offer alternate courses.

Mr. Brokaw then concluded that, in that case, it seemed to him wise for the Council not to go on record now favoring those courses; instead, those courses should be considered by the colleges in their deliberations. He indicated that he personally supported both the spirit and the letter of those proposals; they seemed to him to be the minimum that the University should require. On the other hand, too often faculties had delegated to the English Department the responsibility for teaching writing. He believed that the teaching of writing is the responsibility of all faculty members; every department in every college should be involved. In the college deliberations, then, we should insist that the faculty members determine how they can contribute to the teaching of writing--perhaps by offering courses or, at the very least, suggesting content for the Department of English courses.

Mary Crockett (Nursing) asked Mr. Kinneavy whether it would be possible for the professional schools, and the other schools and colleges which have a great deal of difficulty getting their course requirements into the junior and senior years, to use existing courses in their own schools and colleges and simply intensify the English writing component in those courses. Mr. Kinneavy responded that the English Department would welcome upper-division courses in other departments, schools, and colleges with intensified writing components as alternates to the upper-division writing course offered by the Department of English. He agreed that the problem of literacy is a problem of the whole University.

Dean Elsbeth Rostow (LBJ School) spoke very strongly in support of the College of Liberal Arts proposal, for a variety of reasons. "First, because, as one who teaches an upper-level course in the Government Department in which I require some writing, I, for years, have made rather rough correlation between the levels of undergraduates and their capacities to write the language. There is no direct correlation between senior status and literacy. In fact, there is no inverse correlation either, but it does suggest to me that those who have had more practice in writing, after the freshman year, tend to do better. I find it awkward to read the papers of students, say, planning to go to Law School, who are graduating seniors who still need the attention that I would have thought they would have had at a much earlier period. This may not be the ideal solution, but it clearly is a step in the right direction. Nor do I find it inconsistent with the Werbow motion, which was passed; we have deferred an overall amendment and, I hope, improvement of our undergraduate offering, but we have not rejected it.

"I am also anxious, just as a footnote, to say that I am troubled by what appears to be a difference between those of us who teach and the students who are on this Council. I would like to say to them that the expression of student interest in curricular reform is very heartening, and I think the spirit of the Council supports it. One good indication of our intent would be to accept this very modest proposal, but one which

might conceivably improve the opportunity of our graduates to emerge with some grasp of the language and some capacity to use it. So even if, in an emissarian sense, I am not troubled by the argument of consistency, I would point out that this is consistent with the objectives of the Werbow motion."

Vice-President Livingston again pointed out that the issue under consideration was whether the motion should be postponed--not whether it was a good idea. There was no further discussion of the Hart motion to postpone, and the motion FAILED. Debate was then resumed on the motion to approve the College of Liberal Arts proposal.

Dean Stanley Werbow (College of Fine Arts) commented: "In the meeting of the College of Liberal Arts at which this motion was discussed some months ago, I expressed concern about the postponement of further education in writing from the freshman year to the junior year; I still feel that concern. While I recognize and respect Mr. Kinneavy's statement that the thrust of the legislation is academic, I cannot overcome the gnawing feeling that the motivation for the change was, in my judgment, largely logistical. One concern beyond the question of whether it is better to teach freshmen how to write or to teach upperclassmen how to write is also logistical, and that is how the University is going to control the satisfaction of the degree requirement, not only by transfer students, but also by students in residence who will choose rather to take a freshman writing course at another institution during the summer, or, in accordance with very common practice at this time, at the Austin Community College, simultaneously with their enrollment at the University. I think it will take more teeth in our catalogue, insistence that students must have the permission of their dean in order to take a course at another institution while enrolled here, in order to obviate that concern.

"In addition to expressing those two concerns, I should like to suggest, and perhaps I will MOVE, that the approval of courses in other departments and colleges which would satisfy the upper-division writing requirement should be left not to the Department of English, but to a committee of the University Council with strong representation of professionals in writing, in order to vest this concern for the ongoing issue of the quality of writing at this University in the University Council rather than in the Department of English."

Dean Werbow then MOVED that the last portion of the first paragraph on D&P 8213 be amended to read, "... (3) English 346K, Writing in Different Disciplines, or an equivalent course offered in any department and approved by the [Department of English] University Council upon recommendation of an ad hoc committee on the English requirement, in the junior or senior year." He further MOVED that the last sentence in the fourth paragraph on D&P 8213 be amended to read, "The [Department of English] University Council is authorized to approve equivalent courses in writing, offered by individual departments, as a substitute for English 346K."

Mr. Kinneavy stated that he had no objections to that amendment; he had said publicly that if this is to be a University requirement, it ought to be governed by a University body. He also believed the English Department would not oppose the amendment.

The Werbow amendment was then APPROVED unanimously.

David Edwards (Government) suggested that Mr. Kinneavy had made a good case for a somewhat different proposal.

"No one, I think, disputes the virtues of an opportunity, a forced opportunity if you will, to write at the junior or senior level in a field in which one is particularly interested. The real question, though, ... is with what sort of preparation are these students going to confront that course in their junior or senior year. Anyone on this campus who teaches a course which requires significant student writing today at the upper-division level will, I am sure, agree with me that the quality of that writing, in general, is appalling.

"What this proposal offers us, as a way of coping with that situation, is cutting back on the English requirement at the lower-division level. If students today, even given the kind of education they get at the lower-division level, are unable to write acceptably at the upper-division level, what happens if we lessen the amount of required writing at the lower-division level and instead shift the burden upward? What will happen is [that] the experience of people teaching that course at the upper-division level will be at least as bad as the experience those of us who require writing regularly in our upper-division classes now have, and probably worse, because even though the students may not be enthusiastic about their lower-division English courses, they are at least...doing some writing there; if we cut that in half, they will be even worse at it.

"What I suggest would be ideal, or perhaps not ideal but at least an improvement upon the proposal we now have, would be to insert a second semester of what is called Rhetoric and Composition, clearly devoted to just those sorts of concerns rather than devoted to the appreciative writing about masterworks of the English language. What we really need, in other words, is a second semester of English 306, in effect. That is clearly a course in Rhetoric and Composition. And we need to have that course required to be taken at the lower-division level, perhaps not as a second semester of the freshman year, but then, say, at the first semester of the sophomore year.

"I think it is time we stop fooling ourselves into thinking that in shifting an already admittedly inadequate lower-division preparation upward, somehow we are going to improve the student's experience of the writing of English. I find this proposal grossly lacking in this important component, so I therefore MOVE that it be modified 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. I am not proposing this as a substitute for the upper-division course; on the contrary, I think the upper-division course in one's field, or at least related to one's field, is a wonderful idea which I wholeheartedly endorse. What I would like to see, though, is it as an addition to an improved lower-division training, and I think we owe it to our students as well as to those of us who teach heavily writing-oriented courses at the upper-division level, to get the English requirement into the sort of shape that will make a real contribution to the education of, and the development of, our students." Mr. Edwards' motion was seconded.

Mr. Wissler asked how the new proposed courses related to the existing courses.

In reply to Mr. Wissler's question, Mr. Kinneavy said the new English 306 would be exactly the same as the old English 306, Rhetoric and Composition. English 316K would be a better introduction to literature course than the present English 314K, which is an introduction to literature through basic genres chosen by the individual professor. The new

course would have either a historical format (British Literature, or American Literature, or World Literature), a serious schematic format, or a more serious genre format; basically, however, it would be fundamentally the same course as 314K, but a little bit better.

Mr. Kinneavy went on to say that he and, he thought, most of the members of the Department of English, viewed the Writing for the Sciences and Writing for the Social Sciences topics under English 346K as being English 317, Technical Writing, upgraded to the junior level. "That is why we are not terribly concerned about the syllabuses. They are going to be substantially the same syllabuses as we have been using for the technical writing courses, which are very popular on the campus. The only new component that will be introduced into these will be the requiring of some humanities readings.... So, in effect, ... English 346K is a technical writing course with some humanities readings, and writings about the readings. The Writing in the Arts and Humanities [topic] is going to be very similar to current courses which we have in literary criticism; ... it will be a course in writing about literature very similar to English 321 and 321K, Literary Criticism."

In reply to Mr. Edwards' motion to insert an additional writing course at the freshman or sophomore level, Mr. Kinneavy said: "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 of 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 it the way that the College of Liberal Arts has proposed. Now, if enrollments are stabilized at the University, and that 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. 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 Werbow believed that it was important in connection with Mr. Edwards' motion to remember the part of the Werbow substitute which spoke to the question of entrance requirements.

"I believe that the high schools are beginning to do a better job of teaching and that if we receive from the Committee on Educational Policy the recommendation that the number of units of English required for admission to this University...be raised from 3 units to 4 units, and if we specify that one of those units must be a course in writing, [then] the general quality of writing by incoming freshmen will be improved sufficiently so that English 306 can be a stronger course, one which will satisfy the needs of most entering freshmen and prepare them for the rest of the 9-hour sequence."

John Durbin (Mathematics) requested that privileges of the floor be extended to William O. S. Sutherland (English), Chairman of the Educational Policy Committee, for a report on the activities of his committee. Floor privileges were extended to Mr. Sutherland.

William O. S. Sutherland (English) reported, "The Educational Policy Committee has all but worked out the recommendations which it will make to this body, and I hope that we will finish them in a couple of weeks. We will recommend 4 units of English, with some equivalencies included. I am not sure I should say to what extent that will upgrade the student body generally, since most of our students already take 4 units, but we will certainly recommend them. We discussed with the Texas Education Agency whether we could require a course in writing and, unfortunately, a course in writing is not available in many of the high schools that we draw from; they have been encouraging their people to integrate literature and writing, so it may be difficult to make exactly that recommendation. But we would certainly like to recommend a strong background in writing.

"May I, at this point, support what James Kinneavy has said about staffing requirements under the David Edwards' proposal. The Department, and I say this having been Director of the Freshman English program a couple of times and having served on the Executive Committee, literally staggers under the burden of 9 hours of English. We would like to teach more but are simply unable to, especially as the University enrollment increases disproportionately in the freshman year, which adds an additional burden every year. And so, though what David Edwards is asking for is very desirable, it really is at this point logistically impossible without some undesirable alternative such as increasing the size of classes or something like that."

Abram Amsel (Psychology) commented, "I think there may be a way we can have our cake and eat it, too, in this situation. That is to say, I think there is a way we could have the three English courses and still have the fourth course with a strong composition requirement taught in the individual departments. That would be simply to do what was done when I was in high school in Montreal--have the separate departments designate certain junior and senior courses as courses in which students will be graded on composition as well as on content, and have each department set aside 3 or 4, or some number, of courses in the junior and senior years, one of which must be taken by every major in that department. This is something that should be done anyway. Every time I grade a course that has some amount of writing attached to it, my inclination is to grade people when they cannot write English, when they cannot spell. It is hard to do that under the present system because that is not something the students expect, that is not part of the system; but if they came to expect it in certain courses, then it seems to me that you could apply those things to those courses."

Mr. Philpott agreed with Mr. Amsel. If we conceded to James Kinneavy that we could not have four courses such as Mr. Edwards proposed, then the issue would be how best to make use of the three courses we have. He agreed that there should be a second course in how to write; then the rest of the faculty could help facilitate the offering of a course in how to write in a broad area or a discipline, such as the social sciences or the natural sciences. "One of the advocates in the English Department of the proposal [Mr. Kinneavy] has brought to us today is John Trimble, one of the outstanding teachers of composition in the United States. In arguing to me why we should adopt the Department's proposal, he said, 'I am sick of being an apologist for literacy.' I said, 'Well, thanks. That means I get the job when the student comes into the upper-division courses I teach.' Mrs. Rostow and I become not only advocates of interest in the

social sciences but apologists for literacy, too. I think we could do a better job if [Mr. Trimble] stayed in the trenches a second semester and then Mrs. Rostow and I, and the rest of us, went to work later. So, I think that [Mr. Edwards] is right and that the proposal by Professor Amsel is a necessary compromise."

At that point in the debate, Mr. Jentz inquired if a quorum was present. Vice-President Livingston announced that there was no quorum and adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

At the meeting of the University Council on April 20, 1981, the first item of Unfinished Business will be the resumption of debate on Mr. Edwards' motion to insert an additional writing course at the freshman level into the proposal from the College of Liberal Arts.

Distributed to members of the University Council and members of the General Faculty who desire Minutes on April 17, 1981.