

TO: Senate Members and Others
FROM: Neill Megaw
Thursday, April 5, 1984

John, your my speaker
of choice N.

Sorry to impose yet another paper on you. But a prior commitment may prevent my being present in the meeting tomorrow to make these remarks before the final vote. I hope that a friend on the Senate or at the meeting will read them for me if I have to leave early.

I urge the Senate to defeat the EC proposal, even as--perhaps--improved by amendments.

I do so for three reasons:

- (1) This document should not be before us. Many years of anguished discussion were required before this department set up a Senate, since what was involved was a shift from participatory, town-meeting democracy to representative democracy. Except when the department meets in plenary session--as it should, in fact, on so important a question as this--the Senate, not the EC, is our policy-making group. When the EC decided that the Lecturer situation constituted a serious problem, the proper course of action should have been to send that issue to the Senate for deliberation. Instead, the EC formulated a major policy paper on its own, then sent it on to the Senate urging prompt action. If the Senate had been asked to consider the problem as a whole, rather than this particular EC formulation, it might well have come up with a much better formulation. My guess is that it would have done so. It should be noted also that four EC members now serve as voting members of the Senate, which has a quorum of thirteen and consequently can pass a measure with as few as seven votes. In addition, the Department Chair has a casting vote in the Senate. I shall ask our Governance Committee to consider this procedural matter and determine what additional constitutional provisions, if any, may be appropriate. In the meantime, I urge that this document, even as multiply amended, be thrown out so that we can begin work with a clean slate.
- (2) The provisions of the EC document--at least at the time of writing--are unclear, imprudent, and unfair. They are muddled in lumping together Texas post-docs and new Lecturers, imprecise in failing to specify what fraction of a full-time load is permissible as "less than full-time service," and silent on the question of whether the Department will nationally advertise any and all possible Lecturer openings in accordance with its own commitment to AA/EEO principles. They are educationally imprudent in not spelling out specifically the principles and policies for evaluation and reappointment of Lecturers, in enough detail to suggest that the evaluation is serious. They are unfair in offering current Lecturers with four to six years of service a substantial salary cut as a reward for the teaching which the EC has been at such pains to praise highly in the opening sentences of its document. I urge that we throw out this grievously defective document and work out a Senate version which will not be unclear, imprudent, or unfair.
- (3) The Senate should tackle the real questions first. The most important of these is: Shall we continue to rely heavily on a large group of underpaid and overworked shadow-colleagues, or shall we work out a better system, based on a real commitment to excellent instruction for our students? The EC proposal assumes that, with a little patching, the present system is good enough. Does the Senate agree? If not, then let's vote the motion down and get to work.