



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

Office of the Chairman
Department of English
(512) 471-4991

15 July 1980

Dean Robert D. King
College of Liberal Arts
WMB 201

Dear Bob:

Enclosed is my official report to you on the English Composition and Requirements actions. One copy is for you, the other for John Weinstock.

I go into considerable detail about background conditions and the rationale for the various parts of the plan. Some of these explanations will already be familiar to you; but I have written the report with a view to its consumption by members of the academic community who don't know much about the English Department. It's a kind of dress-rehearsal for our dealings next academic year with the University Council, the various colleges, and the upper administration. I hope you will direct an information copy to the President's office, so that the groundwork for next year's work can be informally laid at this time.

At the outset of departmental study of the composition question, I contacted Jim Vick, who chaired the special University Council Committee on general requirements this year. I told him I'd keep him regularly and directly informed of our progress, and I asked him to keep me informed of the deliberations of his committee, since we were both approaching some of the same crucial questions. He agreed, but unfortunately, his office did not send us any information.

I look forward to talking with you after you've read the report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Joe".

Joseph J. Moldenhauer
Chairman

JJM:psw
Enclosures



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

Office of the Chairman
Department of English
(512) 471-4991

9 July 1980

Dean Robert D. King
College of Liberal Arts
WMB 201

Dear Bob:

Allow me to transmit officially the proposals on composition and English requirements developed by the English Department in a semester-long collective effort and approved by a large majority in mail ballots counted June 3, 1980. The minutes of departmental meetings on January 25, February 1, March 21, March 28, and May 5 (copies of which you have on file) record deliberations on the subject that occurred in plenary sessions. Throughout February and March eight subcommittees or study teams did a great deal of work on such aspects of the subject as admissions, advanced placement, class format, staffing, and content. Voluntary in membership, the study teams were made up of some forty-odd faculty members, plus AIs and TAs. Throughout April an eighteen-member task force, drawn from the study team membership, met twice weekly to develop the final product. At the May 5 meeting of the department I reviewed the entire procedure by which our plan evolved. An additional copy of the May 5 minutes is enclosed for your convenience, as are copies of the ballot and voting instructions.

I was gratified by the extent to which the faculty entered into responsible and intelligent study of the complex subject of composition pedagogy and logistics during the planning and discussion phases of our work. Response to the mail ballot was also gratifying, and bespeaks a widespread concern about the issues addressed by the proposals. When we realize that of the 105 ballots distributed to voting members, two went to persons retiring at the end of the academic year (neither of whom responded), four to visiting faculty members (three did not respond), five to Creative Writing staff whose teaching activities would be unaffected by the basic plan (three did not respond), and four to full-time "pool" instructors with jobs elsewhere for next year (two did not respond), the return of 78 ballots is all the more impressive. The use of signed exterior envelopes permitted the classification of votes while preserving the secrecy of the ballot. Seventy-eight out of 105 ballots comes to a return rate of 74%; 78 out of 95 ballots (omitting from the total the ten unreturned ballots categorized above) comes to 82% -- a phenomenal degree of participation for the English Department.

The low turnout for polling purposes among the non-voting members, 30%, is understandable since this group is made up very largely of Teaching Assistants and Assistant Instructors. Interestingly enough, however, the proposals were approved by the non-voting members about as strongly as by the voting faculty.

The results from the voting members are as follows:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Basic Plan	61 (78%)	15 (19%)	2 (3%)
Ancillary Proposals:			
A (instructor courseload).....	69	5	4
B (staff from other departments).....	58	18	2
C (maximum composition workload).....	68	5	5
D (supervision of AIs).....	70	3	5
E (long 306-406-506 in summer).....	62	10	6
F (business-oriented E3--).	62	15	1
G (composition placement criteria)....	68	7	3
H (4.5 TLC for writing courses).....	73	2	3
I (20-student maximum).....	73	3	2
J (publicize 314L).....	73	5	0
K (departmental exemption control)....	74	4	0
L (Language department faculty in the sophomore course).....	48	27	3

The non-voting members responded to the poll as follows:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Basic Plan	24 (71%)	7 (21%)	3 (9%)*
Ancillary Proposals:			
A (instructor courseload).....	31	2	1
B (staff from other departments).....	23	8	3
C (maximum composition workload).....	29	3	2
D (supervision of AIs).....	21	10	3
E (long 306-406-506 in summer).....	25	7	2
F (business-oriented E3--).	26	6	2
G (composition placement criteria)....	29	3	2
H (4.5 TLC for writing courses).....	26	3	5
I (20-student maximum).....	31	2	1
J (publicize 314L).....	32	1	1
K (departmental exemption control)....	32	1	1
L (Language department faculty in the sophomore course).....	23	5	6

*rounding of figures to nearest whole percentage causes total to exceed 100%

Dean Robert D. King
9 July 1980
Page 3

Support for the basic plan was extensive: 78% of the voting faculty and 71% of the non-voting members approved. Each of the ancillary proposals received a majority, usually even higher than that won by the basic plan, but lower in two instances in the voting faculty balloting, and lower in three instances in the poll of non-voting members.

I should like to stress that the basic plan was formulated, discussed, and adopted as a package. Its parts are intimately interrelated; educational or logistical disadvantages which might attach to one element of the plan in isolation are balanced by compensatory advantages in another section. To treat these elements separately would be to invite jeopardizing the entire conception and perhaps compounding the English Department's present strains. Although the plan will require ratification by numerous bodies and individuals outside the English Department -- e.g., the Faculty Senate and General Faculty, the several colleges, and the President's Office -- I must urge that each responsible body or officer study the plan as a whole, and accept or reject its substance in toto. Where such a group or officer wishes to alter a detail of the plan, the contemplated alteration should be negotiated with a view to its effect on all the other elements. Contemplated additions to the plan should be similarly treated.

The ancillary proposals are separable from the basic plan. A majority of the English Department viewed their adoption and implementation as desirable. If, however, one or more of these ancillary items fails to obtain needed approval, the basic composition plan would not therefore be impaired. You will note that the adoption of all the ancillary proposals in addition to the basic plan would reduce pretty sharply the staff savings to be achieved by the latter: one of those ancillary proposals, desirable in its own right, would raise the TLC value for an undergraduate writing course to 4.5; another would reduce the standard 100% load for temporary Instructors from 4 to 3 undergraduate sections. The proposed TLC revaluation would make two writing sections equivalent to the System minimum workload. Assistant Instructors who taught two composition sections would then be working "full time" (by the minimum TLC definition) for half pay, whereas currently they work 2/3 time for half pay. Temporary Instructor workloads would still be out of line with the regular-faculty minimum. The standard organized course workload for regular faculty would normally be two sections -- a reasonable obligation in terms of practice in other departments and in view of the difficulty of teaching composition; but the new standard would cause an overall reduction in staff capability and would exacerbate the disparity between regular faculty, temporary Instructors, and (most seriously) Assistant Instructors.

I enclose a copy of the motions on which the English Department voted. This is followed by an annotated copy of the same, with commentary after most of the sections of the basic plan and most of the ancillary proposals. This commentary appears in brackets; I give it in order to convey to you, and to others who have not participated in the departmental deliberations, the main lines of thinking that led to each proposed change.

I conclude this portion of my report with an outline of the unwholesome conditions that led to the development of the plan, and a projection of the ways the plan, if implemented, would correct those conditions.

Dean Robert D. King
9 July 1980
Page 4

For the past four years the lower-division admissions of the University and the enrollments in lower-division English courses satisfying general degree requirements have grown at approximately 8% per year. Over the same period the size of the English Department's regular faculty (tenured and tenure-seeking) has held fairly constant, averaging 86 or 87 individuals. Also during this period, the size of the Assistant Instructor workforce has shrunk, reflecting the English Department's restriction of admissions to the Ph.D. program as a response to the glut of job-seekers with doctorates in English. The department has been justifiably unwilling to meet our large staffing needs in excess of regular-faculty and AI capability by means of massive recruitment at the junior level: to do so would perhaps lower the overall quality of the faculty, would create a "tenure logjam" of prodigious proportions, and would deprive promising young scholar-teachers of regular teaching opportunities in their areas of scholarly interest. Our graduate course offering has declined with the retrenchment of doctoral admissions, and our upper-division offering, after a sharp drop in the late 1960s and early 1970s, has remained roughly at its 1974-75 levels.

In view of this combination of factors, the department has met its excess staffing needs in lower-division English by hiring temporary Instructors with Ph.D. degrees. The number of such appointments has grown steadily during the period I describe; last year we employed 38 temporary faculty, totaling 32 3/4 FTE in the fall semester.

Teaching as many required freshman composition courses as could be done without damage to the graduate and upper-division programs in literature, language, and writing, the regular faculty last year was able to staff 39 sections in the fall and 44 in the spring. Assistant Instructors taught an additional 131 freshman sections in the fall and 129 in the spring. The remaining freshman sections, 62 in the fall and 60 in the spring, were taught by temporary faculty, who also taught smaller numbers of sophomore literature sections (E314K, E314L, E312L, E312M) and sophomore composition (E310, E317).

A small number of temporary faculty is a blessing, allowing the English Department a measure of staffing flexibility to meet variations in student demand (other departments achieve this flexibility by increases or reductions in the size of big lecture courses, an option not available in English composition teaching). But dependence upon temporary teachers on the scale of the past five years in the English Department is unhealthy. These teachers comprise a "second class" cadre in the department -- uncertain of reappointment or percentage of appointment, hired late, badly quartered, overworked, devoid of tenure expectations, ineligible for such regular faculty privileges as CAMLS travel support and URI research assignments. Their morale, predictably, is poor. The administrative efforts attendant upon their evaluation, ranking, and appointment each year are considerable.

Pedagogically, the current pattern of English courses satisfying general degree requirements leaves much room for improvement. The basic courses, E306 (Rhetoric and Composition), E307 (Literature and Composition), E308 (Rhetoric, Logic, and Expository Writing), and E314K (Introduction to Literature I), were the outcome of University-wide committee work and debate on the floor of the General Faculty

Dean Robert D. King

9 July 1980

Page 5

almost a decade ago. The normal pattern foreseen by the faculty at that time was E306, plus E307 or E308, plus E314K -- hypothetically a first course in composition, a second course in literature and composition or in rhetoric and composition, and a third course in literature. In practice, however, alternatives to E314K which involve no literature have been widely embraced by the various colleges and by individual students. E307 has always been problematical: the literature and composition "mix" makes it unsatisfactory as either a writing course or an introduction to the reading of literature. The problem of intellectual inexperience among students in E307 and E308 has been a constant. The results of a 1975 campus-wide survey of teachers and students designed by Professor James Sledd and reported by Dr. Susan M. Hereford of MEC as Academic Success and Writing Ability (Measurement and Evaluation Center Research Bulletin 76.1, 1976) indicated that 78% of the 1,454 faculty respondents approved replacing (at the student's option) one of the required lower-division English composition courses with an upper-division composition course "adapted to meet the needs of students pursuing different majors." Of the 2,486 students responding, 83.3% believed they would be "much more" or "somewhat more" motivated in a discipline-specific upper-division English composition course than in one of the required lower-division composition courses. These opinions, both faculty and student, are provocative; the plan proposed by the English Department seems unlikely to meet resistance in other departments and colleges, since it incorporates the very revision to which the respondents reacted so favorably in 1975.

While the most pressing occasion for the English Department's work on composition was logistical or administrative, the participants constantly kept educational values and consequences in mind. Each feature of the basic plan was developed with a view to both administrative and pedagogical soundness in the plan as a whole. We think the end product represents on both counts a clear improvement over the current system. These benefits are addressed in the following paragraph and in the explanatory comments accompanying the various sections of the plan, later in this report.

The postponing of the second semester of required composition from the freshman year until the junior year should have three beneficial effects, two educational and one administrative. On the educational side: writing will be done in the specific academic areas of students who should be well launched into their majors; and the students will have experience at writing in each of the first three years of college, an advantage the recent Harvard undergraduate core curriculum deliberately addresses.

The administrative effect will be to reduce substantially the number of students who will have to take the second composition course. The number of students is reduced because a considerable attrition occurs between the freshman and junior years and because many of the transfers who come in at the junior level will already have taken a second semester of composition -- a course which will be honored by our admissions office. A possible third factor reducing the numbers at the junior level will be courses taught by the various departments interested in training their students in specific-area writing procedures and standards.

Dean Robert D. King
9 July 1980
Page 6

The following table shows these reductions:

Juniors, Fall 1979.....	7,489
less exemptions, top 10%.....	- 748
less transfer students, a conservative estimate of those with a second composition course elsewhere.....	- <u>2,743</u>
	3,998
less students satisfying requirements by courses in Communications and Liberal Arts - estimate 17% of 3,998.....	- <u>679</u>
Balance to be taught in junior-level English Department composition course.....	3,319

Since the English Department currently is responsible for all of the second semester freshmen, 6,578 in 1979-1980, there would be a net savings of 3,259 students needing a required second writing course in English, assuming level enrollment. This figure represents about 130 sections of composition classes, more than the number currently staffed by the temporary Instructors. Even without alternative courses that satisfy English degree requirements in Communications and Liberal Arts, the net savings would be 2,580 students, or 103 sections.

I look forward to discussing with you the various steps we must make to obtain needed approvals up the line.

Sincerely,



Joseph J. Moldenhauer
Chairman

JJM:psw
Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
May 9, 1980

B A L L O T I N F O R M A T I O N

Franchise: For voting purposes, this ballot goes to all voting members of the Department as defined in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, Ch. 1, VI, B, paragraphs 1.a and 1.b (pp. 27-28). In brief, voting members are all faculty at the rank of Instructor and above who are on 100% University appointment.

For polling purposes, this ballot goes to all other members of the Department's teaching staff.

Due date: On or before June 2, 1980, at 5:00 p.m.

Instructions: Please vote either "yes" or "no" on the basic plan and on each of the ancillary proposals separately. Abstention on any item should be signalled by not voting "yes" or "no" on that item. Please destroy your ballot if you do not plan to use it. If you vote "no" on the basic plan or on any of the ancillary proposals, you are invited to submit with your ballot an unsigned statement of your objections and your suggestions of changes that would win your assent on the item(s) you find objectionable.

When casting your ballot, please place it in the smaller envelope, place the smaller envelope in the larger one, sign the larger envelope, and give it to Pam Wheeler in PAR 110. If you send in your ballot from out of town, please address the outer envelope to Joseph J. Moldenhauer and allow for postal delay before the deadline for receipt of ballots.

Additional Information: The tape recorded proceedings of the departmental meeting of 5 May are available to be heard by those who were unable to attend. At that meeting many questions were put about the plan, and were answered. Furthermore, the members of the task force will be glad to answer questions about the proposals, whether or not these arose on 5 May.

A copy of the basic plan and ancillary proposals, as revised in the light of the last departmental meeting, is enclosed with this ballot.

MOTION BY THE TASK FORCE ON COMPOSITION

BALLOT

(for voting members of the Department)

Basic Proposals (presented as a package)..... yes no

Ancillary Proposals

A (Instructor courseload)..... yes no

B (staff from other departments)..... yes no

C (maximum composition workload)..... yes no

D (supervision of AIs)..... yes no

E (long 306-406-506 in summer)..... yes no

F (develop Business-oriented E3 ___ ___)..... yes no

G (refine composition placement criteria)..... yes no

H (request 4.5 TLC, writing courses)..... yes no

I (20-student maximum, writing courses)..... yes no

J (publicize 314L for exempted freshmen)..... yes no

K (English Department control on exemptions)..... yes no

L (Language Department faculty in World
Masterworks)..... yes no

PROPOSALS ON COMPOSITION AND ENGLISH REQUIREMENTS
(Revised May 9, 1980)

Basic Proposals
(presented as a package)

- I. The following courses would be eliminated or superseded: E307 (regular and special), E308 (regular and special), E310, E312L/M, E314K, E317. The following courses would be retained but would not satisfy degree requirements in lower-division English, and their prerequisite changed to three hours of English (E306): E314L, E318M.
- II. Degree Requirements (recommended for all undergraduate colleges in the University): 9 hours of English, as at present in most colleges. Plan II requirements unchanged.
- III. Admissions and Enrollment
 - A. Entering students must enroll by May 1, or earlier deadline if practicable. I.e., entering students must accept UT admissions offer by that date.
 - B. Entering students must submit by enrollment deadline their results on the English placement instrument for E306.
 - C. If enrollments of freshman and lower-division transfers continue to climb beyond 1980-1981, the Department will request the President to raise entrance requirements.
- IV. General prerequisites for upper-division English courses will be reduced from 9 to 6 hours of English, with two exceptions. The prerequisite for E325M, Advanced Expository Writing, will be E306, E31__ (Masterworks; see V B below) and E3__ (Writing in Different Disciplines; see V C below). The prerequisite for E3__ (Writing in Different Disciplines) will be 54 hours -- junior standing -- including E306 and E31__ (Masterworks); see V C 1 a and c below.
- V. Courses and Sequence
 - A. E306: Rhetoric and Composition
 1. Content: attention to rhetorical strategies, reading comprehension, and mechanics. Detailed syllabus for AIs; faculty encouraged to work up own materials, with minimum core of expectations to preserve course integrity. Variant readings for Mexican-American sections (as at present) and Black sections (to be investigated), with election of these sections at student's option.

2. Exemptions: SAT Verbal 550 (credit with B) and SAT Verbal 575 (credit with A) cutting scores. These cutting scores are slightly more rigorous than the current cutting scores.
3. Nature and amount of writing: 6-7 major themes based on rhetorical strategies. Emphasis on analytical writing; some experiential writing permitted. Panel grading to be investigated.
4. Class size and format: normal sections with maximum of 25 students, as at present; alternative formats (e.g., large section) invited, as at present, under supervision of FEPC.
5. Remedial students: E506 for SAT Verbal below 353 (bottom 5%) and E406 for SAT Verbal 353-380 (next 10%): these students would take normal sections of E306 but be referred for two hours weekly and one hour weekly, respectively, to a Writing Center in the English Department. The Writing Center can be staffed by six qualified persons at 100% appointment (need not be positions defined as "faculty").
6. Foreign Students: E306Q as at present for students with TOEFL of 550; investigation of new Q courses for students with TOEFL 500-549 and low SAT Verbal.
7. Sections offered: roughly equal numbers of E306 sections in fall and spring semesters, by prearrangement with Dean and President, to prevent fall semester overload on departmental resources.

B. E31__ : Masterworks of Literature (new course)

1. Prerequisites: minimum of 27 hours (sophomore standing), including E306 by course, transfer credit, or placement exemption.
2. Content: readings in one of three alternative subject areas -- World Masterworks, English Masterworks, American Masterworks. Probably anthology courses, details of curriculum to be developed by individual instructor after basic courses are outlined by curriculum committee and approved by English Department. Introduction to major works in the literary tradition, with emphasis on historical, generic, and thematic connections, and attention to the cultural conventions informing individual works. Syllabus for AIs teaching course first time.
3. Exemptions: AP 4 (credit with B) or 5 (credit with A).
4. Class size and format: normal sections of 40 students (as presently with most E314K); alternative formats, especially large-section, invited, under supervision of SLPC.

5. Nature and amount of writing; evaluation: tests (essay, short-answer, and multiple choice) and papers, in variable proportions and numbers, as presently in E314K and E312L/M; guidelines to be developed by SLPC, as presently for E314K.
6. Foreign students: Q sections or alternative courses to be investigated.
7. Sections offered: Fall-Spring balance to be determined by distribution of staff capability in other courses, especially E306.

C. E3____ OR alternative writing course in other department approved by English Department. Third-course requirements to be determined by the individual colleges.

1. E3____: Writing in Different Disciplines (new course).
 - a. Prerequisites: 54 hours (junior standing), including E306 and E31____ (B, above), by course, transfer credit, or placement exemption.
 - b. Content: to be offered in three versions, Writing in the Arts and Humanities, Writing in the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Writing in the Natural Sciences and Technology. Readings to include classic and contemporary expository essays and books in these disciplines, and some selections which concern the social, ethical, and philosophical aspects of the disciplines. Sample course outlines to be developed by committee; syllabus for AI sections.
 - c. Exemptions: SAT Verbal 600 (credit with B), 625 (credit with A) cutting scores; will exempt top ca. 10% by 1979-80 figures. Transfer credit for a composition course beyond E306 satisfies this requirement.
 - d. Nature and amount of writing: ca. 6 major themes, chiefly analytical; experimentation encouraged. Panel grading to be investigated.
 - e. Class size and format: normal sections with maximum of 25 students; alternative formats possible, under supervision of course committee.
 - f. Foreign students: Q sections of one or more of the three versions to be devised by committee.

or 2. Writing content course developed by any department and approved by English Department as satisfying this third-level requirement.

Such courses would presumably have E306 and E31____ as prerequisite, and thus would be taken by the student no earlier than the second

half of the sophomore year. Exemptions also subject to approval of English Department.

Colleges that might be interested in developing such courses include Communications (7% of UT matriculations) and Business (23%).

Ancillary Proposals
(presented for separate vote)

- A. Reduce course load for temporary Instructors on 100% appointment to 3 courses per semester.
- B. Encourage AIs and regular faculty from other departments to teach sections of "Writing in Different Disciplines," providing appropriate training and supervision.
- C. To the extent permitted by course enrollments, overall staff capability, TLC calculations, and staffing demands of graduate, upper-division, and specialized courses, assign no more than one section of E306 or E3____ (Writing in Different Disciplines) per semester to tenured or tenure-seeking faculty, and no more than two sections of E306 or E3____ per semester to temporary Instructors.
- D. Provide more systematic supervision of AIs and TAs if regular faculty energies can be released for this purpose by reduction of staffing needs in required English courses.
- E. Develop 12-week long versions of E306, E406, E506 for summer session students.
- F. Develop in outline form a version of E3____ (Writing in Different Disciplines) for Business-oriented students, to be submitted at a later date for departmental approval.
- G. Refine placement criteria for E306 and E3____ (Writing in Different Disciplines) in consultation with Measurement and Evaluation Center.
- H. Request workload weighting of 3-hour organized writing courses (composition at any undergraduate level, creative writing) at 4.5 TLC.
- I. Assuming major reductions of pressure on departmental teaching resources through the implementation of the basic plan, a reduction to 20 students of the maximum class size for undergraduate writing courses (all composition and creative writing courses) will be requested.

- J. Descriptions of E314L options and prerequisites will be distributed to entering freshmen with placement exemption for E306.
- K. Exemption scores, instruments, and substitute courses for English requirements are to be determined by the English Department.
- L. Faculty in foreign language departments will be encouraged to request teaching assignment for E31___, World Masterworks.

BASIC PLAN

(presented as a package)

- I. The following courses would be eliminated or superseded: E307 (regular and special), E308 (regular and special), E310, E312L/M, E314K, E317. The following courses would be retained but would not satisfy degree requirements in lower-division English, and their prerequisites changed to three hours of English (E306): E314L, E318M.

[Catalogue titles of the affected courses:

- E306 - Rhetoric and Composition
- E307 - Literature and Composition
- E308 - Rhetoric, Logic, and Expository Writing
- E310 - Expository Writing
- E312L - Masterworks of English Literature through the Eighteenth Century
- E312M - Masterworks of English Literature in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries
- E314K - Introduction to Literature I
- E317 - Technical Writing
- E314L - Introduction to Literature II
- E318M - Introduction to the English Language

In the interests of insuring the adoption of a University-wide single requirement in English, and of spacing out each student's registrations in required English courses over a three-year period, the various alternative sophomore-level courses currently satisfying general degree requirements are removed from the inventory (except perhaps for phase-out sections available only to students who began their UT studies under the current requirements). The two freshman-level courses to be discontinued will be superseded by a new, required upper-division composition course. That new course will also supersede E310 and, to a lesser extent, E317. Existing upper-division courses in technical writing -- E333K and E367L -- could replace E317 in offering concentrated training in technical communications. The reduction of prerequisites for E314L (which does not now satisfy English degree requirements) and E318M (which would not satisfy degree requirements under the proposed plan) from 6 to 3 hours of English is consistent with the plan as a whole, whereby only one composition course at the freshman level is required for the Bachelor's degree.]

II. Degree Requirements (recommended for all undergraduate colleges in the University): 9 hours of English, as at present in most colleges. Plan II requirements unchanged.

[A uniform degree requirement provides a measure of unity and predictability in the body of experience with English acquired by degree recipients. The plan as a whole acknowledges the importance, in every undergraduate degree program offered by The University of Texas at Austin, of two semesters of training in composition and rhetoric and one semester of training in major works of the literary tradition. The two-course composition requirement addresses each student's need for proficiency in expository writing, whatever the student's planned career; the one-course literature requirement addresses the student's need for exposure to the elements of the western cultural tradition. Both sets of needs are apparent upon pragmatic observation and are underlined by the documented declines in the verbal skills of students entering college.]

III. Admissions and Enrollment

- A. Entering students must enroll by May 1, or earlier deadline if practicable. I.e., entering students must accept UT admissions offer by that date.

[May 1 is the deadline for acceptance or rejection of an admissions offer at private universities and colleges. Many state-supported universities also have spring deadlines. A May 1 deadline will permit the English Department -- and the University as a whole -- rationally to plan for the education of new freshmen and transfer students the following academic year. The current mode of admission and enrollment places upon the English Department the burden of conjecturing, at various times from late spring up through fall-semester registration, what the staffing needs of the department will be. The result of these uncertainties, coupled with the need to insure that every regular faculty member satisfies the System Minimum Workload regulations, has been the recruitment of substantial numbers of temporary Instructors very late in the summer or during registration and departmental adds-and-drops. The best of the temporary faculty are not inclined to endure such uncertainties if alternative teaching opportunities arise elsewhere. On occasion the English Department has faced the real possibility of insufficient numbers of qualified and available teachers, in late summer, to staff the sections of required English courses demanded by freshman admittees and new lower-division transfer students.]

- B. Entering students must submit by enrollment deadline their results on the English placement instrument for E306.

[See preceding comment. Rational planning by the English Department requires early and firm knowledge of the number of entering freshmen and transfer students who have earned advanced placement for the first required English course.]

- C. If enrollments of freshmen and lower-division transfers continue to climb beyond 1980-1981, the Department will request the President to raise entrance requirements.

[According to both practical experience and controlled research, composition can be taught most effectively with a small student-teacher ratio. It is a labor-intensive enterprise, involving the practice and evaluation of complex skills rather than the communication of a body of "objective knowledge." Composition training cannot depend upon lecture-format courses. The standard twenty-five-student maximum in regular sections of composition at UT cannot be exceeded without sacrifice of educational effectiveness; if possible, the maximum class size should be reduced. Every increase in admissions to the undergraduate programs of UT translates into a necessary increase in English Department faculty. Theoretically (leaving aside such variables as advanced placement, attrition, and election of English courses that do not satisfy degree requirements), the admission of every additional 100 freshmen in a given year requires the employment of one additional full-time faculty member teaching four sections of 25 students each. Admission of freshmen has been increasing at approximately 8% per year for the past four years. The English Department, whose tenured and tenure-track faculty averages roughly 87 members, has been obligated to employ increasing numbers of temporary faculty to meet the surplus demand for instruction in required courses. In 1979-1980 this "pool" of temporary teachers appointed in English approached 40 individuals and exceeded 32 FTE. Even with the modification of degree requirements and pacing of required courses proposed in the plan below, the resources of the English Department will again be strained severely (as they are at present) if the numbers of freshman and lower-division transfer admissions continue to increase.

Other arguments can be adduced for the restriction of enrollment at UT-Austin, notably the declining quality of freshman admittees, the shrinking enrollments at most other state-supported colleges and universities in Texas, the limitations of the physical plant, and the decision of the Regents to impose an enrollment limit (though it applied for only one year) in 1974.]

- IV. General prerequisites for upper-division English courses will be reduced from 9 to 6 hours of English, with two exceptions. The prerequisite for E325M, Advanced Expository Writing, will be E306, E31- (Masterworks; see V.B below) and E3-- (Writing in Different Disciplines; see V.C below). The prerequisite for E3-- (Writing in Different Disciplines) will be 54 hours -- junior standing -- including E306 and E31- (Masterworks); see V.C.1 a and c below.

[Non-English majors comprise a very substantial proportion of registrations in upper-division English courses. It is felt that to make the satisfaction of the entire proposed English degree requirement a prerequisite to registration in upper-division courses would be to jeopardize the upper-division offering. All students will be required to take the new, junior-level composition course (E3--, below) no earlier than their junior year; the time that remains for them to take upper-division English electives is thus sharply curtailed by comparison with the present arrangement. Under the proposed plan, students taking upper-division English courses as electives must have achieved sophomore standing and completed the required sophomore-level English course. At present, numerous students electing upper-division English are first-semester sophomores, or even second-semester freshmen, who have satisfied one or two of the required English courses by advanced placement and have taken at the earliest opportunity the remaining required English course(s). The net effect of the plan will not be to stimulate artificially enrollment in upper-division English courses by non-majors, but merely to guard against the artificial elimination of elective demand for upper-division English.

For the new required course, E3--, junior standing and the satisfaction of freshman and sophomore English requirements is the prerequisite. This will insure the spacing-out of composition training throughout the student's university career; at present, most students satisfy the composition requirement (E306-7/8) in their freshman year, and indeed they are encouraged by University policy to do so. But as a Harvard study (Derek C. Bok, "Harvard University: The President's Report, 1976-1977," Harvard University Gazette [March 17, 1978], 1-12) proves, composition skills among college students erode with disuse: it is obviously desirable to space out composition training and writing experience. The Hereford Report (1976), based on a survey of 2,486 students and 1,454 faculty members at UT, indicates that strong majorities of students and teachers favor moving the second required composition course to the junior level, as this plan does. It has been the case at UT, and probably will continue to be the case, that such writing as is assigned in most courses is rarely annotated for rhetorical effectiveness and mechanical correctness. Thus, the vast majority of UT undergraduates will continue to receive their only systematic training in written expression in the English Department. The Department views it as desirable that this training not be concentrated in the freshman year.

There is a positive correlation between a student's maturity and his or her mastery of writing skills. The plan capitalizes on this phenomenon, and also on the correlation between the student's knowledge of and interest in a subject area -- something to write about -- and writing skills.

Finally, the plan acknowledges the significant attrition among members of an entering freshman class by the time it reaches the junior level. By the junior year many poorly-motivated students have chosen to discontinue their studies, and others have decided to enroll elsewhere. Where demand for required courses drastically exceeds the English Department's normal staffing resources, as is presently the case, it is wasteful of university resources, as well as burdensome, for the English Department to be used as one of a few basic screening mechanisms for students who will not proceed to earn University of Texas degrees.

E325M, Advanced Expository Writing, will have as a prerequisite the required courses in expository writing -- E306 (introductory) and E3-- (intermediate), as befits an advanced skills course.]

V. Courses and Sequence

A. E306: Rhetoric and Composition

1. Content: attention to rhetorical strategies, reading comprehension, and mechanics. Detailed syllabus for AIs; faculty encouraged to work up own materials, with minimum core of expectations to preserve course integrity. Variant readings for Mexican-American sections (as at present) and Black sections (to be investigated), with election of these sections at student's option.

[This course remains unchanged, except for the exploration of Black sections, from the present required beginning composition course of the same catalogue number.]

2. Exemptions: SAT Verbal 550 (credit with B) and SAT Verbal 575 (credit with A) cutting scores. These cutting scores are slightly more rigorous than the current cutting scores.

[The current advanced placement instrument, the English Composition Test, is administered on the UT campus; entering freshmen typically take this examination during summer orientation. The SAT verbal component, a test of verbal aptitude which correlates closely with the ECT and is a reliable predictor of success in a composition course, is administered nationally

at various times of the year. The Scholastic Aptitude Test is a standard part of the college-bound high-school senior's application file. See II above, on admissions deadlines.]

3. Nature and amount of writing: 6-7 major themes based on rhetorical strategies. Emphasis on analytical writing; some experiential writing permitted. Panel grading to be investigated.

[Currently 6-8 themes in E306. Panel grading is a possible remedy for grade inflation, but contains other disadvantages, including legal hazards. It will be further explored.]

4. Class size and format: normal sections with maximum of 25 students, as at present; alternative formats (e.g., large section) invited, as at present, under supervision of Freshman English Policy Committee.

5. Remedial students: E506 for SAT Verbal below 353 (bottom 5%) and E406 for SAT Verbal 353-380 (next 10%): these students would take normal sections of E306 but be referred for two hours weekly and one hour weekly, respectively, to a Writing Center in the English Department. The Writing Center can be staffed by six qualified persons at 100% appointment (need not be positions defined as "faculty").

[Students with verbal skills far below the average will receive special tutorial assistance in a departmental writing lab, for credit. This assistance will be provided by qualified staff members who need not hold "faculty appointment" (with its complications and pressures regarding tenure accrual and duration of service); the student will increase his or her chances of success in the organized E306 composition course, and will be less likely to have to repeat E306 and make thereby a redundant demand upon the English Department's faculty resources.]

6. Foreign students: E306Q as at present for students with TOEFL of 550; investigation of new Q courses for students with TOEFL 500-549 and low SAT Verbal.

[The Coordinating Board now permits a remedial English course at the college level. The English Department should explore this possibility for foreign students with deficiencies in English. Only small numbers of students are involved.]

7. Sections offered: roughly equal numbers of E306 sections in fall and spring semesters, by prearrangement with Dean and President, to prevent fall semester overload on departmental resources.

[In the proposed plan, where freshmen may take only E306 of the required English courses during their freshman year, it is essential that registrations in E306 be divided almost equally between the fall and spring semesters. If allowed total freedom of choice, most freshmen will prefer to take E306 in the fall semester. This will lead to an even sharper discrepancy than at present between fall-semester demand and spring-semester demand for freshman sections. To attempt to meet this discrepancy by hiring some temporary Instructors for the fall semester only, with reappointment for the spring a dim prospect or an impossibility, is not conducive to the employment of the best-qualified teachers and is destructive of faculty morale. The balanced distribution of E306 sections between fall and spring semesters in this plan will mean asking some prospective fall-semester E306 registrants to wait until the following semester for the course; the approval of the administration must be granted to this procedure, or the Department's present staffing difficulties will be greatly compounded. Registration balance might be achieved by such equitable means as date of enrollment or the initial letter of the registrant's surname.]

B. E31-: Masterworks of Literature (new course)

[Replaces all sophomore-level English courses that satisfy general degree requirements.]

1. Prerequisites: minimum of 27 hours (sophomore standing), including E306 by course, transfer credit, or placement exemption.

[At present the prerequisite for sophomore-level courses is E307 or E308, the second freshman-level composition course. Many students enrolled in sophomore level courses now are second-semester freshmen who placed out of E306 and took E307 or E308 their first semester. In the plan here proposed the student taking "Masterworks of Literature" will have credit for one composition course at the freshman level, and must have attained sophomore standing in terms of credit hours completed.]

2. Content: readings in one of three alternative subject areas -- World Masterworks, English Masterworks, American Masterworks. Probably anthology courses, details of curriculum to be developed by individual instructor after basic courses are outlined by curriculum committee and approved by English Department. Introduction to major works in the literary tradition, with emphasis on historical, generic, and thematic connections, and attention to the cultural conventions informing individual works. Syllabus for AIs teaching course first time.

[In the proposed plan one of the three required courses is by definition a literature course. A student satisfying the requirements here proposed could elect for a course involving composition and literature at the junior level: E3--, Writing in Different Disciplines, Humanities version. Under the current requirements this is also possible for the student who takes E306, E307 ("Literature and Composition"), and E314K ("Introduction to Literature I"; alternatively, E312L or E312M, "Masterworks of English Literature"). It is also the case, however, that large numbers of students now satisfy the English requirement with no exposure to literature, by taking E306, E308 ("Rhetoric, Logic, and Expository Writing") and E310 ("Expository Writing"; alternatively, E317, "Technical Writing"). The plan here offered presupposes that most students in fields other than the humanities will elect "Writing in the Social and Behavioral Sciences" or "Writing in the Natural Sciences and Technology" rather than "Writing in the Arts and Humanities" at the junior level (E3--). For these students, therefore, "Masterworks of Literature" will be the only required course which exposes them to literature and its cultural relations. In the national context of declining reading skills among college-bound students, a required course in literary masterworks takes on increased importance; faculty members throughout the university report their disappointment in students' low levels of acquaintance with the basic humanistic documents and ideas of the western and Anglo-American traditions. A modicum, at least, of familiarity with these materials seems to us inseparable from the goals of university education. The required masterworks course will be offered in three versions -- World Masterworks (literature in translation, from the canon of great European writing), English Masterworks (great works of British literature) and American Masterworks.]

3. Exemptions: AP 4 (credit with B) or 5 (credit with A).

[At the present time, approximately 100 students per year exempt sophomore literature by means of the CLEP multiple choice examination plus interpretive essay. The Advanced Placement examination, offered to high school seniors and graded centrally by the Educational Testing Service, is an essay examination of high quality which tests the student's acquaintance with major works of literature and the student's ability to express that understanding in literate, coherent, interpretive essays. Students who failed to take the AP could seek advanced placement by means of a departmental exam.]

4. Class size and format: normal sections of 40 students (as presently with most E314K); alternative formats, especially large-section, invited, under supervision of Sophomore Literature Policy Committee.
5. Nature and amount of writing: papers and tests (multiple-choice, short-answer, and essay), in variable proportions and numbers, as presently in E314K and E312L/M; guidelines to be developed by Sophomore Literature Policy Committee, as presently for E314K.

[While the Masterworks course will not be so persistently concerned with student writing skills as E306 and the junior-level composition course, most sections will require significant amounts of interpretive writing in the form of essay examinations and critical papers, as is presently the case in E314K, E312L, and E312M. Students will thus have some systematic writing experience during the sophomore year.]

6. Foreign students: Q sections or alternative courses to be investigated.
7. Sections offered: Fall-Spring balance to be determined by distribution of staff capability in other courses, especially E306.

[See comment on V.A.7 above.]

C. E3-- OR alternative writing course in other department approved by English Department. Third-course requirements to be determined by the individual colleges.

1. E3--: Writing in Different Disciplines (new course).

[A composition course specific to discipline groups has for ten years been operating successfully at Brigham Young University, and is being introduced on many other campuses nation-wide. The principle of discipline-specific writing instruction underlies such writing programs as that at the University of Michigan (where the several colleges offer writing courses judged appropriate to their major curricula.) This principle also obtains in existing and prospective writing workshops and courses offered by UT departments other than English. It underlies such present English Department courses as E317, Technical Writing.]

- a. Prerequisites: 54 hours (junior standing), including E306 and E31- (B, above), by course, transfer credit, or placement exemption.

[The prerequisite is designed to insure that students satisfying the last required English course will take it after achieving the intellectual maturity that comes with junior standing, after having demonstrated the "staying power" which characterizes the successful degree candidate, and in most instances after having made their final choice of academic major.]

- b. Content: to be offered in three versions, Writing in the Arts and Humanities, Writing in the Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Writing in the Natural Sciences and Technology. Readings to include classic and contemporary expository essays and books in these disciplines, and some selections which concern the social, ethical, and philosophical aspects of the disciplines. Sample course outlines to be developed by committee; syllabus for AI sections.

[The range of readings suggested here as models and occasions for some of the writing assignments assures that the course will offer intellectual substance as well as training in technical expressive skills. Ancillary Proposal F communicates the English Department's readiness to develop a comparable version that would address the needs and interests of business students.]

- c. Exemptions: SAT Verbal 600 (credit with B) and SAT Verbal 625 (credit with A) cutting scores; will exempt top ca. 10% by 1979-80 figures. Transfer credit for a composition course beyond E306 satisfies this requirement.

[At present, the number of students applying for advanced placement credit for E307 or E308 (by special exam administered by the department) is negligible. The use of a national exam, the same one used for determining E306 exemption, for advanced placement in the second composition course should increase the number of exemptions by those students whose writing skills are already highly developed. Students exempting the junior-level course will have encountered opportunities for writing instruction at the sophomore level (E31-, Masterworks) and possibly at the freshman level as well (E314L; see Ancillary Proposal J and commentary). Should these students feel a further need for composition training, they will be able to elect any of the upper-division writing courses in the English Department.

Students who transfer to UT with course credit from another institution for two composition courses at the lower-division level would be poorly served by the requirement that they take a third composition course at the junior level. Exemption from E3-- is therefore prescribed for such students.]

- d. Nature and amount of writing: ca. 6 major themes, chiefly analytical; experimentation encouraged. Panel grading to be investigated.
- e. Class size and format: normal sections with maximum of 25 students; alternative formats possible, under supervision of course committee.

[As at present in E307/E308.]

- f. Foreign students: Q sections of one or more of the three versions to be devised by committee.

OR

2. Writing content course developed by any department and approved by English Department as satisfying this third-level requirement.

Such courses would presumably have E306 and E31- as prerequisite, and thus would be taken by the

student no earlier than the second half of the sophomore year. Exemptions also subject to approval of English Department.

Colleges that might be interested in developing such courses include Communications (7% of UT matriculations) and Business Administration (28%).

[The English Department acknowledges and welcomes the prospect of discipline-specific composition courses being developed by other departments. If such courses are to meet general degree requirements in English, however, the English Department feels the obligation to judge the suitability of these courses. We will be happy to cooperate with other departments in the development of appropriate writing courses to be offered by them.]

ANCILLARY PROPOSALS

(presented for separate vote)

- A. Reduce course load for temporary Instructors on 100% appointment to three courses per semester.

[While temporary faculty are not expected to engage in research and publication to be reappointed here, their prospects of permanent appointment elsewhere depend heavily on scholarly activity. The Department therefore urges that workload parity between regular faculty and temporary faculty be established. This is especially desirable since temporary faculty workloads include a higher proportion of composition courses -- with their heavy burden of grading and student conferences -- than do those of the tenured and tenure-seeking faculty. The current definition of 100% appointment as involving 4 organized classes (12 TLC) for temporary faculty in English is a recent administrative development.]

- B. Encourage AIs and regular faculty from other departments to teach sections of "Writing in Different Disciplines," providing appropriate training and supervision.

[This proposal is seen as affording flexibility to faculty in other departments and possibly enlarging the staffing resources of the English Department.]

- C. To the extent permitted by course enrollments, overall staff capability, TLC calculations, and staffing demands of graduate, upper-division, and specialized courses, assign no more than one section of E306 or E3-- (Writing in Different Disciplines) per semester to tenured or tenure-seeking faculty, and no more than two sections of E306 or E3-- per semester to temporary Instructors.

[See comment under Ancillary Proposal A above. Writing courses make, as a rule, heavier demands on the teacher's energy and time than do courses in language, literature, or folklore.]

- D. Provide more systematic supervision of AIs and TAs if regular faculty energies can be released for this purpose by reduction of staffing needs in required English courses.
- E. Develop twelve-week long versions of E306, E406, E506 for summer session students.

[Already shorter in the number of contact hours than long-semester offerings of E306, the summer session freshman composition course affords the student far less time between writing assignments for the activities of revision, reflection between drafts, and absorption of instructor comments and readings. Time pressures thus reduce the effectiveness of E306 in the summer, when the provisional students, who most need effective composition training, take this course. The Department acknowledges that a more widely-spaced twelve-week course carrying the same number of contact and credit hours as the concentrated six-week summer course poses problems for provisional admission students, who are now required to complete 12 credit hours of summer work. These problems would require solution before the twelve-week composition course were put into effect.]

- F. Develop in outline form a version of E3-- (Writing in Different Disciplines) for Business-oriented students, to be submitted at a later date for departmental approval.

[Approximately a quarter of current undergraduate registrations at UT are by students matriculated in the College of Business Administration. The Department will attempt, if the basic plan is adopted at all levels, to develop a version of the discipline-specific junior-level required writing course which will be appropriate to the particular needs of these students and which will still meet English Department standards of intellectual integrity and rhetorical maturity.]

- G. Refine placement criteria for E306 and E3-- (Writing in Different Disciplines) in consultation with Measurement and Evaluation Center.

- H. Request workload weighting of three-hour organized writing courses (composition at any undergraduate level, creative writing) at 4.5 TLC.

[See various comments above on the strenuousness of teaching composition courses. In labor expended at grading and at student conferences, writing courses are more analogous to graduate-course workloads than to workloads in subject-oriented undergraduate courses. This is true of courses in Creative Writing and Technical Writing, as well as those in expository composition.]

- I. Assuming major reductions of pressure on departmental teaching resources through the implementation of the basic plan, a reduction to 20 students of the maximum class size for undergraduate writing courses (all composition and creative writing courses) will be requested.

[See comment immediately above. The tutorial aspect fundamental to any writing course is enhanced by a reduction from a 25-student maximum enrollment. Student success in the writing course is increased by the amount of individual attention the student's efforts receive from the instructor; and the amount of attention the instructor can devote to each student bears an inverse relation to the number of students registered in the class.]

- J. Descriptions of E314L options and prerequisites will be distributed to entering freshmen with placement exemption for E306.

[Although E314L does not now, and will not, satisfy English general degree requirements, it affords the student a valuable opportunity for literary study and critical writing on an elective basis at the lower division. In the proposed plan, students exempting E306 by advanced placement will have no opportunity to study English until their sophomore year unless they take E314L. Unless it is publicized, these freshmen students may judge from the course number that they are ineligible to register for E314L.]

- K. Exemption scores, instruments, and substitute courses for English requirements are to be determined by the English Department.

[No other department at the University (including Mathematics, the foreign languages, History, and Government, which provide courses satisfying general degree requirements) lacks this authority to determine advanced placement standards, instruments, and substitute courses.]

L. Faculty in foreign language departments will be encouraged to request teaching assignment for E31-, World Masterworks.

[See comment on Ancillary Proposal B above.]

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH MINUTES

May 5, 1980

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m., Mr. Moldenhauer presiding. The meeting was interrupted for lunch at 12:00 noon and deliberations were resumed at 1:15 p.m.

The purpose of the special day-long meeting was to study and analyze the proposals submitted to the department Thursday, May 1 by the Task Force on Composition.

Mr. Moldenhauer reviewed the history of the task force. Early in the Spring semester of 1980 he proposed departmental study leading to action on what everyone in the department recognized as a major problem of at least four or five years' duration: the collision between sharply increasing demands upon departmental resources in the area of the required composition courses and the orderly functioning of the department with regard to administration and governance, faculty workload, and effective pedagogy. The problem is most obviously a logistical one, but it has pedagogical aspects as well. No one maintains that present required courses and sequences are educationally perfect; the project was to see what could be done to relieve the intolerable burden of numbers while at the same time not damaging, and hopefully improving, the required English courses.

The department met in plenary session on January 25 and February 1 to attempt to separate the subject into categories which would lend themselves to purposive study with a view to logistical and pedagogical improvement. At these first meetings the members of the department interested in the subject had ample opportunity to express their preliminary views as to what sorts of changes might be desirable. One meeting was devoted quite specifically to matters of content and curriculum. Prompt preparation of minutes of these and subsequent department meetings permitted department members who missed a meeting to inform themselves of the department's deliberations.

"Study Teams" were made up of volunteers. Fifty or sixty members of the department were attached to eight teams: Admissions and Registration, Degree Requirements, Exemptions, Format (I and II), Staffing, Administrative Reorganization, and Content. Each team chose its own chairman, and received and investigated proposals from every member of the department who wished to communicate with the team on its area of study. Mr. Moldenhauer met once with six of the eight teams, or with their chairmen, to help insure that pertinent questions were being asked and pertinent information was being sought concerning those questions. The teams worked up to spring vacation or a bit beyond, and were ready to report in the latter half of March.

The Study Teams reported to the department in two plenary sessions after spring vacation; at these meetings the teams amplified on written reports submitted to the department and heard the department's response to the proposals generated

by the teams working separately. At these two department meetings, which (like the first two) were well attended, every member of the department interested in the findings and preliminary recommendations of the teams had opportunity to question, challenge, support, and generally to express his or her opinion on the recommendations.

In early April Mr. Moldenhauer solicited recommendations from the study team chairs for members of the task force whose job would be to coordinate the team proposals into a coherent and workable whole. Each team was represented on the task force. The formulation of the task force from these recommendations was made with a view to representation of tenured and tenure-seeking regular faculty, temporary faculty and graduate-student teachers; male and female; composition-oriented and literature-oriented; idealists and pragmatists; etc.: a delicate balancing act. Members of the task force were: Jane Archer, Lance Bertelsen, Evan Carton, James Duban, Carlota Dwyer, Lester Faigley, John Farrell, James Garrison, William Goetz, Don Graham, Alan Gribben, Maxine Hairston, Janice Haney-Peritz, James Kinneavy, Joseph Kruppa, Thomas Miller, Joseph Moldenhauer, and Roger Renwick.

The task force met every Tuesday and Thursday between April 8 and May 1 (eight meetings), usually for 1-1/2 hours. Meetings were confined to 90 minutes, as a rule, because one member had to leave after that time and because the task force wanted maximum clarity and freshness of thought on the important business at hand. The meetings were excellently attended; all proceedings were taped so that a member who had to miss a sitting could review that meeting before the next one. Mr. Moldenhauer served as chair at the wish of the task force, performing the function of traffic-manager and moderator, not advocate; he did not vote.

This process of departmental action on a subject that touches the whole department was characterized by maximum opportunities for participation, for information gathering, for expression of views, and for acceptance of responsibility. Mr. Moldenhauer felt it had been as open a process as was consistent with the aim of producing any positive result at all - a process responsive to the spirit of democratic institutions.

Everyone who took part, at every level, has a large investment in the semester's work. For the sake of that investment of time, intelligence, and good will by so many, Mr. Moldenhauer earnestly hoped that the process could be brought to conclusion. Mr. Moldenhauer stated that this effort had been the subject of wagering around campus ("Will they do it? Two to one they don't..."). He hoped that those colleagues in other departments who have had enough faith in the English Department to lay bets will have their trust repaid and that the English Department will manifest faith in itself, in its own participatory and representative procedures. Mr. Moldenhauer stressed that strong departmental support for a coherent line of action will obviously add greatly to the chances for approval at other levels of decision-making.

Mr. Moldenhauer then called attention to the four-page proposal distributed by the task force late Thursday evening. The proposal has the support of 16 of the 17 voting members of the task force: one could not support it because it was his conviction that students ought to be able to take two composition courses in the freshman year. The proposal represented the best plan the task force could develop. It was a result of compromise, both at the task force stage and earlier at the study team stage. Not every part of the plan satisfies every member. But the whole has earned, as a set of compromises, very solid support from a highly representative and well-informed body. The task force was not infallible, however; and the plan was not necessarily perfect or final. This meeting was intended to give an opportunity for interested faculty to give their views on the plan, to ask questions, and to hear explanations. The meeting had been scheduled for this date two weeks ago, and it falls on a day when in theory every member of the department can attend (another provision, which could luckily be made because of the reading-period day, for maximum participation in work on this major subject).

Mr. Moldenhauer said that the proposal is a complex one with intricate relation of parts. It does not lend itself to hasty or piecemeal modification. The task force is entirely prepared for good ideas to come from the floor of the department but asks the faculty to recognize that it's impossible as a practical matter for the task force to judge instantly what all the effects of a suggested change of one part would be on the other parts. Therefore, the task force intends, after conclusion of debate on the proposal, to meet once again and to submit a plan as a motion by mail for mail ballot. The plan will incorporate any suggestions as may arise in departmental discussion which are seen as good alterations, consistent with the pedagogical and logistical objectives of the semester's work.

The task force foresees that on matters of as great magnitude and as wide-ranging effects as those addressed in the plan, the department should protect itself against the nullification of its recommendations by some higher authority (e.g., General Faculty, President's Office) on the score of irregularities in the franchise. At the same time, the task force recognizes that a large number of teachers besides those officially defined as voting members have a lively and legitimate interest in a composition and requirements plan and should be heard. Therefore, the task force wishes to poll by mail those teachers who are not officially voting members at the same time as a mail vote is taken among the voting members; this will involve ballots of two different colors, one for voting members and one for non-voting members of the English Department teaching staff.

Voting membership in the department is defined by the Handbook of Operating Procedures, Ch. 1, VI, B, paragraphs 1.a and 1.b, pp. 27-28, revised as of February 1, 1976:

A faculty member shall have voting status in a department on departmental matters if: (a) He holds a full-time appointment in that department as detailed in the budget and holds the rank of Professor, Visiting Professor, Associate Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor or Lecturer; or (b) He holds joint appointments in two or more departments, the sum of which corresponds to full-time appointment in the University, and holds any of the ranks listed in subsection a., above.

The poll ballots and voting ballots will be issued after the task force meets once again after this departmental discussion. The plan, as revised, and the ancillary proposals, as revised, will be distributed with the ballots. Each member would be asked to vote "yes" or "no" on the basic plan and "yes" or "no" on each of the ancillary proposals separately. The deadline for return of ballots will be printed on the ballots, and the interval will be sufficient for final reflections by the voters.

Those voting "no" on the basic plan will be invited to state their objections and, if they wish, to propose improvements which would win their assent to the plan, on a sheet of paper accompanying the completed ballot. If the basic plan is voted down by a majority of those voting, the task force will meet again to consider what sort of plan might win majority assent.

Mr. Moldenhauer extended his personal thanks and those of the department to the members of the task force, who were willing to devote their energies at this level as well as the study panel level and who worked with intelligence and often with passion on the large and complex issues of the plan. The members of the task force who were present at the meeting stood and were applauded by the department for their thoughtful and conscientious work. Mr. Moldenhauer then opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

I. Elimination of certain lower-division courses.

Ms. Hairston noted that a large number of business students enroll in E310; would the Business School be allowed to devise its own Expository Writing course? Mr. Moldenhauer said that any school could unilaterally develop and institute its own writing courses, but such courses would not satisfy the English requirements as set forth in this proposal.

II. Degree Requirements

Mr. Kinneavy explained that there is presently a drive underway to reinstitute the single University-wide English requirement. The Faculty Senate is seeking a 12-hour requirement, while this proposal only seeks to require 9 hours. Individual colleges are more likely to support the English Department's proposal.

Mr. Wadlington was personally assured that President Flawn would give strong support to a University-wide requirement even if the professional schools balked at an increase in the English requirement.

III. Admissions and Enrollment

In response to a question by Mr. Twombly, Mr. Duban said that the April 22 deadline for admission to UT was a suggested date and could be changed to a later date (for example, May 1). The intent of the date was to give the department enough lead time to prepare staffing for freshman composition classes.

IV. Reduction of general prerequisites for upper-division English courses from 9 to 6 hours of English.

Several faculty members worried about the consequences this might have on upper-division writing courses. E325M (Advanced Expository Writing) presently assumes writing experience gained in E306 and E310. Mr. Trimble urged the task force to make the new upper-division writing course ("Writing in Different Disciplines") a prerequisite to E325M. Mr. Renwick expressed the task force's concern that the quality of E325M be maintained; the task force would reconsider changing the prerequisites for this course to include the upper-division writing course.

V. Courses and Sequence

Mr. Megaw suggested that the second semester of the freshman year would be well utilized if, for example, remedial students took E306 in the Fall and a version of E307 in the Spring. Mr. Moldenhauer said that the standards of E306 for remedial students would have to be the same as for regular students; if these students don't measure up to the standards, they will fail the course and be required to repeat it. However, he pointed out that the task force proposed writing labs of one-to-two hours per week to help remedial students attain the necessary writing proficiency. Mr. Megaw thought students who placed out of E306 might be encouraged to consider taking E314L as an elective (not satisfying degree requirements); Mr. Moldenhauer felt this was probably a good idea.

Mr. Farrell urged that panel-grading in E306 be investigated further; normally, E306 sections lack students who are very good writers (these students have placed out of the course), and the result is a class of mediocre writers. It is difficult for the instructor to grade differentially in such situations, and the tendency is to grade high.

Mr. Byerman questioned the need for Black sections of E306. Mr. Kinneavy projected that sections for Blacks would be as successful as current sections for Chicanos. In fact, these sections are one of the few positive things the University does for its minority students, Mr. Kinneavy said. Ms. Dwyer suggested that this was one area that allowed growth at a later date; currently, the department could implement such courses with the help of the African and Afro-American Studies Center.

Mr. Rebhorn said that the SAT Verbal score was not an accurate basis for exemptions because the skills taught in English courses could not be evaluated by machine-graded tests. Mr. Wadlington believed that the present exemption test (ECT) for E306 is also an inaccurate measure of the skills emphasized in the course: the ECT tests reading comprehension while E306 is oriented toward writing. Mr. Moldenhauer agreed that there was a disparity between the specific items being tested and the intent of the course, but this disparity has been built into composition placement at UT for a long time. Mr. Moldenhauer directed the department's attention to Ancillary Proposal G which seeks to refine placement criteria for the required composition courses. There were suggestions that a writing sample submitted with the SAT score would enable the department to better place students according to writing ability. Ms. Hairston said that writing samples were required 15 years ago; these were graded by TAs and AIs who were not paid for their work - the grading of the samples was haphazard and very bad. Mr. Moldenhauer reminded the group that if writing samples were required as part of the E306 placement test, then the department would have to find the time and the money to grade and rank 6,000 writing samples between May 1 and September 1; such a situation was inconceivable to him. Mr. Wadlington suggested that writing samples be required only of those students in the "fringe area" to ensure that those who place out of E306 have a minimum standard of writing ability.

Mr. Lesser believed that there should be no exemptions from E306, that instead the course should be mandatory. A student exempted from E306 would have no English at all during the freshman year. In fact, if the sophomore Masterworks course is oriented toward literature, then such a student would not be exposed to composition at all until his junior year ("Writing in Different Disciplines"). Such a situation was unacceptable to Mr. Lesser, and he believed it robbed the student of the opportunity to improve his writing skills which, as has been suggested, aren't even guaranteed to be of a certain quality by the current placement tests. Ms. Hairston agreed with him that E306 should be mandatory, but this just is not practical at the present time; the cost would be prohibitive. Ms. MacKay suggested that if E306 were taught both Fall and Spring, all freshmen would be able to enroll without unduly taxing the department's resources. Ms. Haney-Peritz said that the task force would reconsider the question of exemptions, but the department must accept that some exemptions are necessary logistically. Mr. Moldenhauer noted that the department is obliged to provide an opportunity for exemption. Mr. Carver urged the task force to raise the cutting scores to allow fewer exemptions than proposed in the draft plan.

There was general discussion about whether the department should allow freshmen to take the second required course, E31_ ("Masterworks"), during the freshman year. Mr. Moldenhauer suggested that this would only compound the problem the task force was attempting to solve: to space out the student demand for required courses. Not only did this spacing alleviate unpredictable enrollments and, thus, staffing problems, but it also forced the student to take one English course per year for the first three years of college work. Mr. Lesser and Ms. MacKay wondered if students would have the opportunity to enroll in additional writing or literature courses at the lower-division level. Mr. Moldenhauer said that no additional lower-division writing courses could be taken under the proposed plan: E307, E308, E310 and E317 would all be abolished, together with E312L/M and E314K. E314L and E318M would still be available to students after E306, but neither of these courses would satisfy the English requirement. Mr. Gribben suggested that there is nothing to prevent a student from enrolling in E306, even if he places out of it. Mr. Faigley agreed and cited current examples where students who exempt E306 with a grade of B enroll in the course with hopes of getting an A.

Mr. Rebhorn asked if this proposal would require the analysis of literature for all students in all colleges. Mr. Moldenhauer explained that students presently have the option of satisfying the English requirement without taking a single literature course (e.g., a sequence of E306, E308, and E310, E317, or E318M). The task force's proposal would eliminate this option and require students to be exposed to literature in at least one course ("Masterworks").

Ms. MacKay was concerned that the class maximum for the Masterworks course was so high; could a class of 40 be taught effectively? Mr. Bertelsen said that the Masterworks course could be a lecture class, almost an introduction to culture, and he explained that E314K (which the new course will replace) is currently set up for 40 students and doing well. The figure of 40 is a compromise between a large lecture class of 250 and the smaller composition-class size of 25 (essential for the thoughtful grading of themes). Mr. Carton further explained that the course could be effectively taught at such a size because its emphasis was on literature and not composition. Ms. MacKay urged that the maximum size of the sophomore course be reduced to increase student contact with faculty.

Mr. Hilfer favored the upper-division writing requirement; the Hereford Report of 1975 (Sledd study) clearly showed student support for the deferment of one writing course to a time of greater student maturity and motivation.

Mr. Underwood asked what control the department would have over the courses alternative to "Writing in Different Disciplines" devised by other colleges. Mr. Moldenhauer said that the Colleges of Communication and Business Administration might devise writing courses of their own staffed by their own instructors; the English Department welcomed this activity but would expect the colleges to submit their proposals to the English Department for approval before implementing the courses. The English Department would certify that a course in another department satisfied the English requirement.

Mr. Bowden wondered why the task force had not proposed a special section of "Writing in Different Disciplines" for business-oriented students. Mr. Moldenhauer replied that the task force had deemed that such a proposal was controversial and that it might jeopardize the approval of the basic plan. Instead, the task force presented it as Ancillary Proposal F.

Mr. Walter differentiated between "Writing in Different Disciplines - Science and Technology" and E317 ("Technical Writing"). If the two courses are equivalent, how does the department plan to resolve the conflict between the emphasis on reading technical material in "Writing in Different Disciplines" and the emphasis on writing technical reports in "Technical Writing"? Mr. Moldenhauer believed that the conflict was not apparent and that the "Writing in Different Disciplines" course would strongly stress writing, not reading; and he observed that we have other technical writing courses at the upper-division level.

Mr. Heinzelman asked if the upper-division writing requirement would hurt enrollment in other upper-division courses; would students be willing to take two upper-division English courses? In Mr. Moldenhauer's opinion, there was no solid ground for conjecturing whether other upper-division registrations would be helped (by the reduction of prerequisites to six hours) or hurt (by the factor mentioned in the question). Mr. Heinzelman noted the irrationality with which students regard a course's number, and he suggested that the "Writing in Different Disciplines" course be renumbered from E32_ to E37_ ; students might be inclined to take other English courses before attempting a course in the 370s.

Mr. Reed asked if the task force could project how the proposal might alleviate staffing problems. Mr. Moldenhauer estimated that there would be a reduction in staffing demands of roughly 20-25%.

Mr. Gribben urged the department to take strong measures to promote the proposal. The department shouldn't fear the reception forthcoming from other Colleges; equivocation by the department is puzzling to them, and they would welcome the clear-cut policies this proposal represents.

Mr. Rebhorn suggested that the proposal may temporarily solve logistical problems but that eventually the problem of numbers would recur; he didn't think the English Department should decide English requirements on a logistical basis. Mr. Kruppa said that this may be true but that to remain the same would be worse; the situation is not going to improve. Mr. Garrison announced that the Admissions Office projected an enrollment of 50,000 at UT by the end of the decade. Ms. Haney-Peritz argued that the proposal gives the English Department some elasticity; although it's not perfect, the proposal is pedagogically sound and it gives the department the flexibility it presently needs.

If the proposal is approved by the department, just what are the chances that the proposal will be approved by the UT Administration, Mr. Witte asked. Mr. Kinneavy replied that some of the changes (e.g., the changes in E306 and in the Masterworks course) could be implemented with departmental approval alone. Changes relating to uniform requirements and the junior-level "Writing in Different Disciplines" would need University approval. The different levels of approval would be: College of Liberal Arts, University Council, General Faculty, Board of Regents, Coordinating Board. Such a process would take at least one academic year. Then the new requirements and courses would have to be put into catalogue and final announcement copy for the following year. The earliest the basic plan could be implemented would probably be Fall 1982.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Distributed May 19, 1980.