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The fate of English 306 came under scrutiny Wednesday as the majority of the English department faculty debated a proposal that would restructure English requirements at the University.
Although the department met to discuss the entire E 346 K Committee proposal, created over the summer by a six-man committee appointed by department Chairman William Sutherland, attention focused on issues surrounding E 306, the freshman rhetoric and composition course.

The proposal drew mixed reaction from the department's 63 voting members who attended. The department has 79 voting members.
Under the E 346 K Committee proposal, E 306 would remain a part of the nine-hour English requirement, but could be satisfied only by examination, transfer, a summer course at the University or a course taken through UT extension.

The strongest opposition and questioning came from four faculty members - Maxine Hairston, James Kinneavy, John Trimble and John Ruszkiewicz - who questioned having UT extension rather than the English department teach the course.
Ruszkiewicz, director of the freshman English office, said the proposal creates "a whole new entity, a bear trap that we're giving to someone else."
Ruszkiewicz said extension was unprepared to handle the 4,000 students required to take E 306 each year. Forty percent of freshmen place out of E 306 through examination.

Hairston, professor of English, said giving the course to extension was comparable to "farming it out to Taiwan." She said the extension program consists of "cheap labor" and part-time teachers.
Trimble, associate professor of English, posed several questions about the proposal, although he
said he was in agreement with many of its provisions.
Trimble said the department needed to evaluate the proposal's financial impact on 4,000 students each year. He said the proposal would inconvenience many students, who would pay $\$ 84$ more through extension or pay extra to take the course elsewhere.

But Joseph Kruppa, E 346K Committee chairman, said extension was only one option of the proposal, and the other means, such as taking the class at another university, had been available to students for years. "We haven't proposed some heresy," he said.
The four faculty members who criticized the proposal distributed a written statement to the faculty addressing problems of the proposal.
The statement criticized several of the proposed changes, including the quality and cost of E 306 under extension.
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course, no member of the English department will ordinarily teach the course," the statement reads. The statement said the committee's report implies that "freshman are not worth the time of the department."
The statement also suggested that an alternative plan, created by the four and presented in May to Robert King, dean of liberal arts, be considered by the faculty.

Kinneavy first addressed the plan's strengths and then suggested the alternative be included in the faculty mail ballot vote.

The department will vote on the E 346K Committee proposal through a mail ballot, with a Sept. 18 deadline.
Faculty members then debated parliamentary procedure, with Kinneavy rewording his motion several times.
Sutherland said discussion would be limited to the meeting agenda, which specified an evaluation of University writing requirements.
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meeting did not address specific writing requirements, he said.
Kinneavy then made a substitute motion that the department be allowed to vote on the E 346 K Committee proposal as well as the proposal sent to King in May.
Kruppa said the statement before the department and the E 346 K proposal were not comparable in form and course recommendation. He said if the E 346 K proposal were voted down, the committee could then consider an alternate plan.
But discussion was not limited to a few faculty members - many either voiced approval of the E 346 K proposal or offered changes.
Robert Twombly, associate professor of English, suggested the department require only six hours until the department could teach all required classes.

Twombly asked that the department "simply pull back for the time being."
Lester Faigley, assistant professor of English and E 346 K committee member, said the E 306 decision was difficult for him and the committee. He said the course had a good history, but the department could staff only one required writing course, and intermediate courses would be more beneficial to students.
But many members outside the E 346 K committee, including John Slatin, Wayne Rebhorn and Evan Carton, voiced approval for the proposal and the three new lower-division writing courses it offers.
Wayne Lesser, associate professor of English, said the proposal merely defined "what it takes to make it in the University of Texas."

Kruppa said in comparison to many top institutions, the University is more extensive with its ninehour requirement. "We have nothing to apologize for," he said.

