

DRAFT COPY

THE LECTURERS: VICTIMS OF BOTH SYSTEMS
(Submitted for EC consideration, 3/26/84)

I did not vote for the EC recommendation on the hiring of lecturers since I had not had a chance to study it at the time at which the EC voted on it. And, since I will be gone to the CCCC conference at the time of its discussion by the Senate, I would like to present to the members of the Senate a few additional considerations. In general, they support the stance of Neill Megaw, though not in all respects.

The glaring inconsistencies between the first policy and the second policy and internally within the second policy will make us look ludicrous both at the national and the state level. Let me attempt to document this rather strong statement.

POLICY 1. "The lecturer position is a temporary, one-year or one-semester non-tenure accruing appointment." This position is consistent with the regent's rules and the contracts of the lecturers. It does permit indefinite hiring; and it does permit the department or the EC to establish priorities for hiring. It is clearly opposed to the AAUP position, which does not countenance working on a non-tenure accruing basis.

POLICY 2. "In order to prevent the assumption of tenure by default, at least according to the AAUP principles. . . the EC recommends the following: 'A person may serve in the position of Lecturer no more than a total of eight long-session semesters at full time.'" This policy begins (1) by assuming that the lecturers have been working on a tenure-accruing basis (the AAUP position); (2) it then rightly foresees that at the end of seven years, there may be the possibility of tenure (the AAUP position). (3) To prevent this, it recommends that full-time service be limited to four years. This third step in the argument thus effectively denies the very purpose of a tenure-accruing period: the possible acquisition of tenure. It therefore effectively denies the premises of the first two steps of the argument. The policy is self-contradictory.

In effect, it uses the AAUP position to defeat the purposes of the AAUP position. Adopting it will make us look foolish and callous in the eyes of the state and the entire country. In particular it will convince anyone connected with the AAUP that we are cynically using its umbrella, while denying its basic principle: the policy of tenure.

For all practical purposes, the present policy recommendations rather ruthlessly apply two contradictory sets of criteria and the lecturers are victimized by both systems.

SOME SUGGESTIONS.

1. PERMANENT.

a. Regents' rules. If we really believe only in the Regents' rules, then we should be willing to accept the principle of indefinite hiring. This, incidentally, will allow us to establish a quasi-permanent staff for teaching the composition classes, something the University has not had for the past thirty or more years. This is not my option, but it is clean, legal, pedagogically attractive, and probably appeals to many lecturers.

b. AAUP standards. If we really believe in the AAUP principle that all faculty should ordinarily be hired to work on a tenure-accruing basis, then we should attempt to get the Regents' rules changed. In the meantime we should respect the right of the lecturers to be hired indefinitely; this posture accepts the present facts, applies the notion of de facto tenure acquisition, and works to a final solution. It is consistent with the present law (the Regents' rules) and the fundamental principle of the AAUP: tenure acquisition.

2. TEMPORARY.

1. Since there will be more E 346K classes next year and this year and since they will reach a saturation point two years from now, we have to recognize that we are going to need a full complement of teachers for this substitution of E 307. There is no longer an excuse for not knowing what the registration will be in the future. This year is the nadir. The basic resistance to a permanent solution to the plight of the lecturers no longer is defensible.

2. The fear that a few lecturers might achieve de facto tenure and the fear that we may be reprimanded by the AAUP are not serious arguments. If we really believe in the arguments of the AAUP, we should take the principle of tenure acquisition seriously for everybody, not just for two-thirds of the teachers in the department.

3. The present situation should be as temporary as possible. The real danger of the present situation is that the legislature can see that the largest department in any university of the state believes that teachers of literature who teach an average of 2.2 courses per semester can acquire tenure, while those who teach composition (with a course load of 4 courses per semester) cannot acquire tenure. Such a selective tenure policy endangers the very principle of tenure for everybody (and an executive assistant to Lt. Gov. Hobby has pointed this out to me).

This issue is perhaps the most momentous of all. Both Policy 1 and Policy 2 permit hiring of faculty to teach ordinary English classes with no hope of tenure. This, of course, is in direct opposition to the AAUP policy--and no flowery language can disguise this fact. This EC does not believe in the fundamental principle of the AAUP--the possible acquisition of tenure for the protection of freedom of speech. It believes in freedom of

of speech only for an elite; it denies to the people who teach almost half of the courses of the department whatever protection tenure provides to the tenured in matters of free speech. If this department endorses the present suggestion of the EC, it will provide the legislature the most dangerous ammunition it possibly could to lead to the eventual abolition of tenure for the entire state.

We have no excuse for Policy 1. The central administration imposed it on us. We have no excuse for Policy 2--it's our own choice. I hope the Senate has more foresight than the EC.

James L. Kinneavy
3/27/84