

MINUTES OF THE SENATE
Department of English

19 February 1982

3:05-5:05 pm

Present: Moldenhauer (Chairman), E. Bowden, Duncan, Endres, Farrell, Flowers, Heinzelman, Kinneavy, Kruppa, Lindfors, MacKay, Megaw, Meyer, Newcomb, Ohle, Renwick, Rodi, Ruskiewicz, Simon, Whitbread.

Absent: Cable, Reed, Saldivar, Webb, Westbrook.

-
1. The Chair reported the results of the Executive Committee election and invited corrections to the Senate minutes.
 2. Cliff Endres announced that the subcommittee on Lecturers awaited any further instructions from the Senate or from constituents.
 3. For the subcommittee on teaching awards, Jack Farrell presented to the Senate a draft resolution to be conveyed to President Flawn. After discussion of the term "core courses" and the incorporation of certain stylistic changes as friendly amendments, the subcommittee motion was passed by a vote of 19-1-0. The resolution is appended to these minutes.
 4. Neill Megaw introduced a report on Teaching Load Credits prepared for the Senate by himself, Alan Friedman, and Tony Hilfer. Before the report was formally moved, questions from the floor turned on whether or not Lecturers were foreseen as benefitting from the recommended policies, and which agency ("the department") the report, if adopted, would give instruction to. After the report was moved and seconded, it was debated item by item. Kurt Heinzelman questioned the adequacy of the word "should" in the recommendations. Joe Kruppa doubted the practicality of counting on students voluntarily to change sections during adds and drops.

There was further discussion of the parliamentary procedure being followed: was the subcommittee on TLC's asking the Senate to accept and vote on their recommendation as a whole? Professor Megaw answered by moving that the Senate endorse the committee recommendations in principle and that the Senate meet soon to debate possible implementation.

John Ruskiewicz asked about the staffing implications of this proposal. Would the department need more temporary people? Professor Moldenhauer gave figures of sections offered and numbers of staff teaching for fall 1981:

Teaching Staff	Sections taught	Sections per teacher
78 2/3rds tenured, t-track, and visitors	190 sections	Average 2.4 each
82 AIs	120 sections	Average 1 1/2 each
58 F.T.E. Lecturers	230 sections	CA. 4.0 each

Professor Moldenhauer said these figures would indicate a need for 8 more lecturers if the full faculty workload were reduced to 2.0 from 2.4 and all other conditions were equal.

A discussion followed in which Professor Hilfer declared this is not a motion to put the faculty on a 2-2 teaching load but it was a mechanism that should be established so that if the faculty did get course load reduction, it would still be in compliance with current TLC policy. Joe Kruppa suggested the need to add wording that would make the document more realistic and less illusionary.

Professor Moldenhauer noted that the preamble suggests the department's responses to the TLC policies are out of conformity with general University practice. He observed that any such comparisons must be made with a view to the unusual size of certain departments such as English, to the pedagogically necessary small average section size in English (a condition the department would not wish changed), to the status of English (and Math, History, etc.) as departments offering courses that must be taken by freshmen and sophomores, and to the low numbers of graduate students proportional to undergraduate students in English. The atypicalities of English Department TLC practice are thus not "ad hoc," in the sense of "arbitrary," but are inherent in the nature of the department and the discipline. The departments where a 2-2 organized course load is typical are departments which offer courses in very large lecture sections (which carry extra TLCs) and departments where graduate course registrations and tutorial registrations are heavy. Any faculty member is, and has been, welcome to develop a large-class plan, so long as it is developed early enough that a big lecture hall can be reserved for the semester in question. The English faculty has not, however, been eager to explore this option. The wording of subcommittee recommendation number 6, "The Department should consider offering some courses in much larger sections..." is rather misleading: the question has always been, "who wants to teach a big course?" If someone does, let the appropriate program office or committee chair know.

The relative merits of large and small sections of English classes were discussed by Professor Megaw and others. Professor Megaw described the findings of a study group on TLC he had chaired a couple of years ago; the patterns of TLC accumulation in various departments vary widely. Some departments are more enterprising than others in their practice within the system. The present subcommittee is not recommending a uniform 2-2 load; it simply says "here is the teaching load system; we want to put these possibilities before the department." The differences between English and other departments seem

to involve some measure of discretionary decision within those departments. Professor Megaw answered questions from the floor about the possibility of "pooling" excess TLCs and of "carry-over credit" from one semester to the next. The system permits neither. The fractionalizing of credits for team-taught classes was also discussed.

After describing the use of supervisory and administrative points, and offering copies of the System TLC plan to anyone who wanted to see it, Professor Moldenhauer noted that course-assignment authority was theoretically an area where discretion could be exercised. But he pointed to the subject of sub-committee recommendation 14 as an instance where, given the machinery of the System's TLC plan, the major variable was the timeliness and accuracy of the faculty member's report to the Associate Chairman on conference and dissertation registration. The Associate Chair cannot estimate before registration what a given faculty member's point-count will be in individual instruction courses. And because such registrations can occur in program offices other than our graduate advising center, there is no particularly reliable way for the Associate Chairman to gather this information even during registration. The individual faculty member should be sure that his or her individual-instruction students have indeed registered, and should inform the Associate Chairman of the numbers of students and the course numbers for which they registered. In the event, say, of a registration for nine hours of dissertation (worth 3 TLC) which occurs late in departmental add-drop week or which is reported at that late date, the Associate Chairman may no longer be able to reassign an organized class originally assigned to the faculty member who has just "picked up" three TLC. Undergraduate conference course registrations, and conference or dissertation registrations in another department or program, are impossible for the Associate Chairman to monitor without the full cooperation of the faculty member. The Chair and Associate Chair can't intuit the facts, often don't receive firm information, and cannot gamble on TLC totals if the possible consequence is having numerous faculty members falling far short of the TLC minimum. The only solution is for faculty accepting individual instruction students to urge them to preregister, if possible, and otherwise to register quite early in registration period. The faculty member will then be able to transmit hard information to the Associate Chairman in time for the possibility of courseload adjustments being made.

Prof. Kruppa concurred: what number 14 calls for in principle is very hard to effect in practice. Advance information from the faculty member about tutorial TLCs is essential if courseload reduction is to be considered. There is no way to make an exact science of predictions of individual TLC counts by the Associate Chair.

The possibilities of realistic estimation by the individual faculty members were discussed by Professor Kruppa, James Kinneavy, Professor Hilfer and others.

Further discussion ensued as to the meaning and consequences of an affirmative vote on the motion. It would be an endorsement of the document in principle and a vote to have the Senate meet soon to talk about the possibilities of implementing its several recommendations.

The motion was brought to a vote and passed 13-0-0.

5. By a final motion and unanimous affirmative vote, the Chairman was instructed to choose the date for the next Senate meeting.

Adjournment occurred at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph J. Moldenhauer
Secretary, pro tem

JJM:rx

TLC COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE SENATE

February 18, 1982

President Flawn has praised the TLC system as enabling the University to fulfill its mission as an institution dedicated to research as well as teaching. The Dean and Associate Dean have noted that a few departments, including the English Department, have made appreciably less use of the various load-reduction provisions in the TLC system than the majority of departments in this and other colleges and schools at the University; our own examination of current practice across the campus confirms this judgment. The Directors of the Freshman and Sophomore programs in English have reported that increased coordination and counseling of their multi-section courses by ~~regular~~ ^{experienced} faculty could substantially improve the performance of many beginning and even some continuing instructors. Finally, partial load-reduction through greater flexibility in our course offering--for example, by permitting students to take one and two semester-hour units of study--might result in changes benefitting many students, majors and nonmajors alike.

For all these reasons, the Committee recommends to the Senate that the English Department's TLC policies and procedures be brought into conformity with general University practice. The Committee further recommends that individual load-reductions be granted not on an ad hoc but on a regularized and clearly understood basis.

Specific recommendations follow for TLC adjustments in the undergraduate program. A separate set of recommendations, appended, will be forwarded to the GSC for consideration.

Policies

1. The Department should identify all multisection courses (freshman, sophomore, and upper division) which would benefit from increased faculty coordination (not only counseling of beginning teachers but also the provision of increased professional support for continuing teachers). Written instructions should be prepared for faculty coordinators of all such courses, setting forth clearly the kind of services and the time commitment expected of the coordinator, and the performance of coordinators should be evaluated regularly.

2. The Department should seriously consider offering gap-filling undergraduate readings courses of variable weight (1-hour, 2-hour, 3-hour, 4-hour). At least some of these might be team-taught surveys which a number of faculty members, not just a single specialist, would be qualified to teach. Others might emphasize independent study or small-group study, or could function as entry-points for students interested in the English honors program. Others might be offered midweek in the evenings or on weekends, to attract both adult and regular students, on an informal, book-and-discussion basis, with a series of faculty participants

3. The Department should seriously consider the possibility, for ^{all} composition courses and perhaps certain other courses, of restating the requirements and perhaps also the weighting of courses, on a class-meetings plus laboratory or tutorial basis. ~~Additionally, the Department should request that~~ the TLC system be adjusted to allow 4.5 TLC for a "3-hour" composition course.)

4. The Department should distribute to a larger number of faculty members responsibility for the preparation and supervision of a greater

(Such action would be in addition to the July 1980 request that

amount and variety of self-paced laboratory instruction in both composition (beginning, remedial, and advanced) and literature.

5. The Department should consider offering some courses in much larger classes, when educationally suitable, with special TA or AI assistance. (In several departments the individual teaching assignment is one large undergraduate course, or a graduate course, and one rather small undergraduate course, plus fractional TLC's from coordinating, etc.)

6. Conversely, the Department should consider the use of voluntary shifting of students from larger to smaller sections in multi-section courses, either to enable some undersubscribed sections to "make" or simply to balance more evenly the paper-grading load.

7. When feasible, small classes not "making" by 12th Class Day should be converted into independent study courses, so preserving a good fraction of the originally intended 3 TLC, with the difference made up by other activities.

8. The Department should request additional advising TLC. Our advising burden is much like that in Mathematics, which requested and was granted special advising credits. It should be pointed out also that a very heavy advising burden occurs at the graduate program level, where the coordination of a number of single-section graduate courses and the advising of students can be just as demanding as the coordination and advising in multi-section freshman and sophomore courses.

9. Additional administrative TLC should also be requested; the departmental program is as large as the program of some small universities.

10. Team-teaching with full 3.0 TLC (or 4.5 if a graduate course) for both teachers involved should be requested, subject to endorsement

by the Dean, as an arrangement clearly constituting an increase in the "productivity" of the faculty members involved. (That is to say, two faculty members might team-teach a class of 100 students instead of teaching separate electives of 30 each.)

11. TLC should also be requested for course-development activities, when the specific objectives and time commitments can be clearly stated.

Implementation

12. The Committee recommends that the Department's TLC policies and procedures be written up for distribution as soon as feasible to present to department faculty and to new faculty members at the time of appointment or even during the recruitment process.

13. The Committee recommends that administration of the approved TLC policies be the responsibility of the Associate Chairman, subject to overview and approval by the Chairman.

14. The Committee recommends that the Associate Chairman should estimate, in advance of any given registration period, the probable TLC count for each faculty member, so that finer adjustments of teaching and supervisory loads can be made before sections are opened and assigned to instructors.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Friedman

Tony Hilfer

Neill Megaw, chair

Teaching Award Subcommittee (Kinneavy, Reed, Farrell)

Motion: The Senate resolves that the following be conveyed to President Flawn:

"The English Department ~~Senate~~ commends President Flawn for establishing the President Associates' Awards in Teaching Excellence for English Composition. The Senate hopes that in the future it will also be possible, through such awards, to acknowledge that the teaching of other core courses in the English Department, such as courses in literature, is likewise an important function of a university in its attempt to provide ~~our~~ students with a liberal education."