

ATTACHMENT C

Response of the English 346K Evaluation Committee to
James Kinneavy's Message to the University Council

While the Department of English is reluctant to reenact before the University Council the well-publicized conflicts that developed in our department meetings, we also recognize a profound responsibility to offer writing courses that our university colleagues respect. Therefore our committee members, together with elected English members of the University Council, are willing to rehearse again arguments that obviously did not persuade Professor James Kinneavy at the departmental and college levels of decision-making.

Several things need to be made entirely clear at the outset, however. Professor Kinneavy's proposals in effect call for the reinstatement of "permanent" English lecturers. The English sequence adopted by our department, on the other hand, heeds the Faculty Senate resolution of March 4, 1985, which stipulates that

in a university of the first class, . . . we should expect the bulk of our teaching at all levels to be carried out by faculty holding tenure or on tenure track appointments. . . . The Faculty Senate urges deans and higher administrators to ensure that . . . classes . . . not continue to be taught by lecturers.

The Faculty Senate simultaneously disseminated the policy guidelines of the Department of Mathematics to serve as a model for other departments; those guidelines specify that "appointments as lecturers shall be special appointments clearly limited to a brief association with the University," and shall be "used as a means to support certain visitors and to provide some flexibility in managing unexpected teaching pressures." Consequently our committee began its deliberations last summer after having been advised by our Liberal Arts dean that he would approve no English program that necessitated the hiring of lecturers to staff required courses.

Yet when Professor Kinneavy appeared before the Faculty Senate last year, accompanied by numerous English lecturers, he presented a document titled "The Decomposition of English." That position paper contained his statement that "my solution is to retain the lecturers needed to staff the course and slowly turn them into regular faculty members." His new document, "An Assessment," argues that "it was a tragic mistake for the administration to allow the lecturers to go." Here and elsewhere Professor Kinneavy has implied that the people employed as lecturers had been specially trained writing experts, whereas (according to his logic) the regular English faculty are merely interested in teaching "literature." But the sixty or more

lecturers our department formerly hired on a yearly basis in actuality received the same kinds of graduate instruction and advanced degrees as our professors, and the lecturers' publications represented the same range of inquiries into English language, literature, and rhetoric. Professor Kinneavy conjures up a group of lecturers who did not exist.

Moreover, Professor Kinneavy is utterly dismissing the professional judgment of his department, and is thus refusing to abide by the recommendations of the Faculty Senate Committee Reviewing the E.346K Issue, which reported on April 29, 1985 its conclusion that, since "a basic tenet of academic governance is that matters of educational policy are the responsibility of the faculty," the Faculty Senate should encourage the "faculty of the English Department . . . to produce, through traditional scholarly interaction, . . . solutions to the problem of staffing E.346K, working within whatever financial and other types of constraints exist." This resolution, adopted by the Faculty Senate, emphasized that "matters of individual course content, teaching methods, course standards, grading, and staffing are properly the functions of the departments offering the courses, and are not the business of the Faculty Senate. Disagreements regarding these issues should be resolved within departments, for it is highly improbable that they will be solved by shrill debate before the wider audience of the Senate."

Professor Kinneavy, having failed by a large majority to win a ballot in his own department, and being unable to convince his dean that the departmental vote should be overturned, now approaches the University Council, asking it to overrule the English faculty's 53-18 vote and impose an undesired set of courses and a large number of lecturers on a department that has already reached a consensus to the contrary.

Our committee urges the University Council not to allow one of our departmental colleagues, however well-intentioned he may be, to violate the processes of departmental decision-making in this manner.

E.346K Evaluation Committee:
Joseph Kruppa, Associate Professor (Chair)
Jerome Bump, Professor
Lester Faigley, Associate Professor
Alan Gribben, Associate Professor
Charles Rossman, Associate Professor
W.O.S. Sutherland, Professor (ex officio)

Status Report about the English Requirements

To: English Faculty
From: 346K Evaluation Committee
Date: March 6, 1986

The U.T. deans have agreed to remove E.346K as a catalogue requirement for the various colleges. Our instruction of E.306 sections will proceed as usual for the time being, but pilot sections of E.309 will soon be offered under three rubrics: Topics in Writing, The Writing Process, and Thinking and Writing (E.309K, E.309L, E.309M). Originally these variants were proposed under the course numbers E.311, E.313, and E.315, but the Dean's Course and Curriculum Committee and the upper administration pointed out that a lower number such as 309 would make it clearer that a student could enroll in them as early as the freshman year, and that a lower-division writing course from another institution would transfer as an equivalency. Within two years our department will be able to offer this "second level" writing course to most of the U.T. undergraduates whose colleges decide to adopt it as one way for students to demonstrate a writing proficiency.

Our committee is developing additional methods (including a graded essay) for entering U.T. students to demonstrate college-level competence in writing at the level of E.306.

The Writing Lab will eventually evolve into a full-scale English Writing Center that can offer assistance to beginning students in a large number of ways, including computer-instruction, tutor counseling, and diagnostic testing. Special mini-courses and computer programs will help the student prepare for the ECT and essay examinations.

We are asking other departments around the campus to cooperate with the English Department by offering discipline-related writing courses that can be counted within certain majors as a "second level" writing experience.

English 316K will continue in its present three variants, all of them stressing both writing and literary readings.

English faculty members are invited to offer upper-division elective courses that will attract U.T. students interested in polishing their writing and editing skills. The Department will regularly recruit faculty for E.325M (Advanced Expository Writing), E.368E (Topics in Editing--a newly developed course), E.360M (Rhetoric and Composition for High School Teachers of English), and 379C (Topics in Composition). We hope to increase the number of sections in each of these courses.

This has been a difficult transition period for our Department, but we are optimistic about the capability of our faculty and students to instruct these specified offerings with flair and dedication. Thank you for supporting our committee in the task to which we applied ourselves.