

DOCUMENTS AND MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY
AND
DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of March 17, 1986, published below, have been prepared for the immediate use of the members of the University Council and are included in its Documents and Proceedings. They are also included in the Documents and Minutes of the General Faculty for the information of the members.

H. Paul Kelley

H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The General Faculty

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 17, 1986

The seventh regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1985-1986 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, March 17, 1986, at 2:15 p.m. President William H. Cunningham presided.

ATTENDANCE.

Present: Lear L. Ashmore, Lance Bertelsen, Lowell J. Bethel, Julie H. Bichteler, Harold W. Billings, Shirley F. Binder, Allen H. Bizzell, David L. Bourell, J. Harold Box, Robert E. Boyer, Ronald M. Brown, Cindy I. Carlson, Alan K. Cline, William H. Cunningham, William C. Duesterhoeft, Jr., Gerhard J. Fonken, Wallace T. Fowler, R. LaVerne Gallman, Earnest F. Gloyna, Sheldon E. Good, Maureen M. Grasso, Alan D. Gribben, Wilma P. Griffin, Vickie L. Hampton, Thomas M. Hatfield, Kurt O. Heinzelman, Elaine K. Horwitz, Ira Iscoe, Gaylord A. Jentz, Sharon H. Justice, H. Paul Kelley, Lorrin G. Kennamer, Robert D. King, James L. Kinneavy, William R. Koch, Steven W. Leslie, William S. Livingston, John C. Loehlin, Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr., Jack Otis, Jane E. Perelman, Robert A. Prentice, David M. Rabban, Wayne A. Rebhorn, Thomas F. Reese, Diane L. Schallert, John M. Scott, A. Donald Sellstrom, Max R. Sherman, Pamela J. Shoemaker, RoseAnn L. Shorey, Gideon A. Sjoberg, Charles A. Sorber, Waneen W. Spirduso, William M. Stott, R. Craig Stotts, W. O. S. Sutherland, Jr., H. Eldon Sutton, Paul J. Szaniszlo, James W. Vick, J. Robert Wills, Ronald E. Wyllys.

Absent: D. Blake Alexander, Terrell Blodgett, Billye J. Brown (excused), JonAnn E. Coniglio (excused), Wayne A. Danielson, James T. Doluisio (excused), G. Charles Franklin, Robert C. Jeffrey, J. Parker Lamb, Priscilla Nelson, David J. Quan (excused), Bonnie Rickelman (excused), Scott L. Scarborough (excused), Leonard G. Schulze, Martha S. Williams, A. Leslie Willson, Lewis R. Wiman, Robert E. Witt (excused), Mark G. Yudof (excused).

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF FEBRUARY 17, 1986 (D&P 10376-10402/
D&M 16196-16222). (APPROVED)

Minutes of the meeting of February 17, 1986, were approved as circulated.

II. SECRETARY'S REPORT (D&P 10403-10410).

The Secretary's Report had been previously circulated. Secretary H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology) announced that the formal photograph of the Council would be re-taken at 2:00 p.m. on the south steps of the Main Bldg. on April 14. He reminded members that the next Council meeting would be a week earlier than originally scheduled -- April 14 -- due to the Sesquicentennial Holiday on the following Monday.

III. DISCUSSION OF SECRETARY'S REPORT -- None.

IV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

A. QUESTION CONCERNING COURSE-INSTRUCTOR SURVEY ITEMS.

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management), Chairman of the Faculty Senate, requested that the Senate be given the opportunity to review the Course-Instructor Survey items which are to be developed for use in administrative decision-making. He further requested that the Senate review occur before that of the Deans' Council, if possible. President Cunningham responded that the request was an "excellent idea."

B. QUESTIONS CONCERNING BUDGET RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED IN ACCORDANCE WITH EXECUTIVE ORDER MW-36 AND INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE U.T. SYSTEM.

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management), Chairman of the Faculty Senate, said: "We understand that the Governor has made a request of all state agencies and state universities to reduce budgets by 13 percent. We also understand that the University System has responded. We would appreciate knowing how the University responded and what impact this is likely to have on our program for the next year."

President Cunningham began his response by distributing copies of a February 28, 1986, letter from the Chairman of the Board of Regents and the Chancellor of the U.T. System to Governor Mark White (appended as Attachment A). President Cunningham then highlighted some of the major items in the letter.

"[First,] at the bottom of page five [reference is made to] the fact that the System hopes to save \$90,630,000. That represents approximately 7 percent of the savings, so we are not going to be able to do what the Governor requests initially in terms of 13 percent...." [With regard to the source of savings], "the first one is the \$33,000,000 revenue enhancement.... That really represents increased revenues available to the System from revenue from the health facilities...."

"The second item represents \$12,500,000 to be made available to U.T. Austin..., and that will be a direct substitute on a one-year, one-time-only basis, for state funds. It comes about really because of the changes that have taken place in the bond market and the ability of the System people to refinance the bonds and save that kind of money. That was just a windfall that came along; that money is coming here, and we will simply not spend \$12,500,000 [of appropriated] state funds.

"The next major item is the \$4,500,000 in terms of the energy contract; that again represents money that the University is working on and is confident we can renegotiate ... and save the state \$4,500,000...."

"The next item is the \$930,000 which represents a 20 percent reduction of ... travel funds. We are working on exactly how we are going to implement that...."

"The next major item is the \$2,000,000 reduction in new professional and personal service contracts and space leases. That number is obviously not a firm number; it is a number we are trying to shoot for at the System. We will do our best to achieve it...."

"The next major item is a \$12,000,000 item, and that is the deferral of some maintenance and operating expenses across the System. There will simply be some roof repairs and some other kinds of facility repairing that [will have to be deferred, probably until] the next biennium.

"And then, finally, [there is] a savings of \$22,000,000 associated with [a] freeze [on hiring] and promotions primarily [of] people outside of the teaching and research side of the enterprise.... Does that mean the people who were put up for promotion in the academic side will not be promoted? It does not. The salary increases that have already been decided will stand for both staff and faculty. We believe we can, again, meet our portion of this \$22,000,000.

"These are obviously tough things for us, but I am confident that ... we will be able to keep the heart of the University beating at full speed. These are tough cuts, and a lot of them represent simply deferral of expenses we will have to take care of in the future."

C. QUESTIONS CONCERNING RECRUITMENT OF SUPERIOR STUDENTS AND UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING REMEDIAL EDUCATION.

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) raised two issues to which he requested a response at the April Council meeting. "One, I would like to have a report on the success of recruiting superior students to our University [which would contain] more than just the number of Merit Scholars that we have attracted.

"The other is an important policy question of where this University stands in remedial education. My own position on that is clear -- that world class universities do not spend any money at all in remediation;

they spend it in improving ... students' learning.... Remedial education is a blind alley. I would like to know what kind of policy we have established, where our funds are going..., and what priorities and ... policies [U.T. Austin] is going to pursue."

D. QUESTION CONCERNING ENROLLMENT AND FINANCIAL AID INFORMATION ABOUT MINORITY STUDENTS.

On his own initiative, President Cunningham distributed three tables summarizing enrollment and financial aid information about minority students at U.T. Austin and at 22 other institutions (appended as Attachment B). In Table 1, he pointed out, first: "If you start with our base year of 1976, the University has grown from approximately 41,000 students to almost 48,000 students. The second thing is that ... the total number of minority students ... has grown from a little less than 4,000 students to a little more than 7,500 students. Probably the [numbers that are] the most important on this table [are that in 1976] we had 9.5 percent and in 1985 we had 16.1 percent [minority students]. This in no way implies that we have succeeded in our mission towards attracting qualified minority students to the campus, because we have not; we need to be more successful, and we are all dedicated to doing that. But the one thing that is at least encouraging to me is that not only the percentage has grown, but the pie has grown as well. So what we have is an increase in a piece of a larger pie, and I think that is important to the University. In terms of Blacks and Hispanics, we [increased] from 8.6 to 12.4 percent.

"[Table 2] compares The University of Texas at Austin with a number of other schools across the country that are competitive with us.... In terms of the [combined] percentage of Blacks and Hispanics on this campus, of the schools we contacted U.T. Austin is second in the United States now with 12.4 percent. If you look at [Columns C and D] ... you will find ... that we are [fifteenth] in terms of the ... percentage ... of Blacks on campus but [are sixth] in terms of [the number of Blacks]. So our percentage is relatively low, and we need to improve on that ...; but the number 1,643 ranks us sixth in the United States, which is significant progress. If you take a look at [Columns E and F you will find] that we are 8.9 percent Hispanic, and that ranks us number two in the nation, [second] only to U.C.L.A.; in terms of [the number of Hispanic students] we are number one.

"In terms of Column I, which is the total percent minority on ... campus, we have 16.1 percent. We rank behind only three other schools. Two of those [schools are] U.C.L.A. and [U.C.] Berkeley; those schools both ... attract large numbers of Chinese American students, and that changes that situation dramatically. The only other school that ranks ahead of us is the University of Washington, with 16.7 percent....

"The one last column I will mention to you on that table is Column M, which [refers to] the amount of money the University spends each year on merit [grants and] scholarships ... for minorities. The University of

Texas at Austin ranks number one, with \$3,900,000. We rank ahead of the second, third, and fourth schools combined.... But my point is, ... again, not that we do not need to do more in all areas, not that we do not need to be more successful ..., [but] that we have made some progress. We need to make more progress, but I think we can be confident that we are making progress. I think that is the most important thing.

"Table 3 lists in great detail where all that money comes from. The one important piece which is not [apparent] is that from the Available University Fund, which is ... available to the University for its enrichment programs that are really at our discretion, the largest single item ... is minority recruitment scholarships; we spend almost \$4,000,000 a year out of the AUF on that subject alone. If you take a look at the smaller box [at the bottom] to the left, labeled Total 1984-85 Funds by Race, you see some interesting numbers. Blacks, as an example, ... [get] 6.8 percent [of the aid] and represent 3.3 percent of the student body. You can see the same kind of relationship with Hispanics. You can see the same kind of relationship a little bit with Asian Americans. You find that Anglos get a little bit less than their percentage of the student body....

"I pass [these data along] for your information.... We need to make more progress, and I am confident that we will. Racism in any form to me is simply totally unacceptable, and I know that everyone in this room agrees with that. Certainly anything associated with violence in racism is totally unacceptable to me personally and to The University of Texas, and we will respond in an extremely swift manner to anything like that...."

Ira Iscoe said that he appreciated the report, "and I think those responsible ought not to be apologetic. I have been at the University a long time, and I have seen great improvement. I think we should always pay attention to the pool [of potential students] available. U.C.L.A., my alma mater, for example ... has about 9 million people around that city, and L.A. County [has] a tremendous Hispanic population. Austin is a little bit isolated. If you take the total Mexican American population in California [and] in Texas, I think we are doing very well. I think it is rather interesting to compare Michigan, around the Detroit area, and the percentage of Black population in the state of Michigan ... to Texas; and there again we are not doing too badly.... I think we ought always to consider urban versus nonurban universities. Urban universities have a much easier job of recruiting certain groups ..., so I would compliment the people who are working at this; I think the University is doing a very good job."

E. COMMENTS CONCERNING THE RECENT INCIDENT INVOLVING A BLACK STUDENT.

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) said that he wished "to compliment you, and Vice President Brown, and Vice President Brown's staff in terms of their extremely prompt response in the Randy Bowman incident.

None of us liked what allegedly happened; we did not like the news, we did not like the events, and we did not like the emotion that it raised. But for those of you who do not know, the President arrived at Randy's room at the Health Center very, very promptly along with the Dean of Students [and] has been consistently working with the Black Students' [Alliance] in making efforts, 1) to see that Randy is protected, [and] 2) to see that we get at the bottom of who is responsible for what under what set of circumstances. While the President has not taken any credit for that, and it is kind of downplayed a little bit in the newspaper, I would like all of you to know that he and [the staff of the] Vice President of Student Affairs have been tremendously responsive to what has been a terribly tense situation among the Black community here at the University."

V. SPECIAL ORDERS - None.

VI. PETITIONS - None.

VII. OLD BUSINESS - None.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS.

A. REQUEST FOR FACULTY ACTION CONCERNING THE ENGLISH COMPOSITION PROGRAM (D&P 10370-10375) - (TABLED).

Prior to the meeting, the Secretary had circulated to members a preliminary assessment of the proposed English composition program prepared by James L. Kinneavy [English]. Mr. Kinneavy made the following statement and motion: "I trust that most of you have read the statement which I had circulated to the University Council for today. I do not intend to go over it, except to clarify any points or sustain any challenges. When I sent in my assessment of the English department's proposal, I envisaged a simple discussion, as we had last month. When Paul Kelley informed me that he had classified it minor legislation, I shaped a brief motion, which I will make, and then if it is seconded, I will speak to it. I MOVE that the President appoint a committee to make recommendations to this body concerning the structure of the writing program." The motion was seconded.

Mr. Kinneavy continued: "I believe that such a recommendation is needed since the program proposed by the English department simply will not work at any of the three levels. As my statement to the Council shows, it is inherently unsound at all three levels: the level of admission, the level of the freshman English course, and the level of the advanced composition courses. The admission proposal to teach cram courses in grammar to get students to pass the English Composition Test (ECT) is a shame. There are 70 years of research which show that the isolated teaching of grammatical skills has no carry over to writing ability--such tests would [just] get students [past] the test, but would not teach them anything about writing.

"Secondly, the freshman proposal is unsound because it is based on the gradual elimination of E. 306 after four or five years -- they say now. But there is not a shred of evidence for this assumption -- all

the evidence is to the contrary. Let me just give you a little tiny bit of evidence. [In] 1983, the exemption rate [based on] the ECT was 41.3 percent; [in] 1984, the exemption rate was 40.8 percent. [In] 1985, this year, the exemption rate was 40.1 percent. It is staying substantially the same, [even] dropping a tiny bit. And that does not count the 1,000 provisional admission [freshmen] that come in during the summer; [the exemption rate for them was 12%].

"The third level, the new courses substituting for E. 346K, depends on the elimination of E. 306--that is to say, they will not offer the new courses until E. 306 is exempted. The new courses are currently a fiction; students are substituting some literature course for the requirement at the present time. In other words, the third level is required, but the course is not being offered--the same arrangement the department had earlier suggested for E. 306. The English department's proposal, as the administration has interpreted it (by 'the administration' I mean the administration of the English department), consists of one course which it would like to get rid of but seems stuck with. Now, that is not likely to change in the near future. In other words, the English department proposal says that we are going to teach E. 306, period; we will teach E. 316K, which is not really a composition course--it is a literature course with some writing; and we will not teach the third-level course until E. 306 is out of the way.

"At the September meeting when these resolutions were adopted, the Associate Chairman of the Department told the Department of English, 'Now that the lecturers are gone, we now can tell what the extent of our commitment to composition will be.' What was the extent of the commitment? We are teaching E. 306 this year, [the] freshman English course. In addition to that we taught five or six courses of composition beyond English 306 [at the] sophomore [and] upper-division levels. [The] second semester we are teaching five courses. That is the extent of our commitment. The Associate Chairman then said, 'That is what we can do.' That is all you are going to get; you are going to get a freshman English course, and you are going to get a sophomore literature course with a little bit of writing.

"I hope you read what I had to say about the sophomore literature course. I submit to this whole body that that is the worst composition program of any public institution in this state. As far as I know, it is the worst composition program for almost any major public university in the country. I said that in my statement; they have not responded to that. I do not think we should put up with the worst composition program in the state or one of the worst in the country. With a student body of 38,000 undergraduate students we ought to be able to offer more than four or five courses in composition beyond the freshman level.

"I hope that the make-up of the committee [I am proposing] will reflect the needs of the entire student body of this university in all twelve undergraduate colleges--including all of the professional colleges. (I do not mean that there will have to be twelve people on the commit

but I mean I hope that the committee will pay attention to the needs of the professional students and the liberal arts students and so on.) I also hope that the committee will look elsewhere to see what other universities are doing to meet the writing needs of students. Sometimes we live by internal myths.

"I hope that the committee will interpret 'structure of the writing program' to apply both to the courses involved (all the English courses involved, and the writing across the curriculum courses, too) and to the administrative entities which manage and supervise them. I believe that the committee should take a hard look at the University's resources and potentials and do the best for the writing program that it can."

As members had arrived at the meeting, they had been given a document entitled Response of the English 346K Evaluation Committee to James Kinneavy's Message to the University Council; a copy is appended as Attachment C. In the next portion of his remarks, Mr. Kinneavy responded to that document. "It basically consists of two arguments. The first argument is that I would bring lecturers back to this university. That is not necessarily true. If the University would hire regular people to teach composition courses, I would be totally in favor of that; I think that is unrealistic, however. I think, as a second option, I would temporarily hire some lecturers to teach some of these courses. Instead of offering only four courses beyond the freshman level, I think the presence of some lecturers on campus is highly superior to not offering the courses at all. That is my position on that.

"The second argument is that I do not go along with the 'professional judgment of my department.' I do not think that my department made a professional judgment in this particular case; as a matter of fact, it lacks professionalism. I hope, in any case, that even if it is a professional judgment that I can disagree with my department. I hope that that is what all of this is about; if I cannot disagree with my department, then I am going to quit. Those are the two points which they have raised.

"I noticed that there was no response to any of the substantive issues which I raised--that is to say, the use of cram courses to get people out of E. 306, use of the writing center for that; to the bogus argument that E. 306 is going to be eliminated somehow or other. How? By cram courses? I am ashamed that my department even suggested that publicly. Thirdly, the fact that they are offering so few courses beyond E. 306. We have 97 people in the department. We are offering five courses beyond the freshman level--I mean composition courses; that is not classes. That has not been responded to. That is a terrible program; it is almost a non-program."

At the request of Mr. Kinneavy, privileges of the floor were

extended to John J. Ruszkiewicz (English) and Maxine C. Hairston (English). At the request of Alan D. Gribben (English) privileges of the floor were also extended to Joseph E. Kruppa (English).

John J. Ruszkiewicz (English), Director of Freshman English at U.T. Austin for the last four years, said: "I wish to discuss only two points -- the quality of E. 306, and the role of research in shaping the proposed English program. First of all, there have been many erroneous characterizations of E. 306 in the past eighteen months, some circulated within the department, some published in The Daily Texan, others made at departmental meetings. If you add up the number of times the most vocal critics of E. 306 have actually taught the course in the last five years, you would find the sum would about equal what a lecturer might have taught in a single semester. In most cases, the critics of E. 306 are attacking the impression they have of the course -- not the substance. I have invited people to review the syllabus; few have. The course has been characterized as a high-school level grammar/spelling/punctuation class. It is not. It has been characterized as a remedial course. It is not. The syllabus spells out quite clearly the formidable theoretical assumptions and the research the course is based on. The syllabus has been refined and updated almost yearly for ten years. E. 306 is a state-of-the-art college-level writing course, and I would challenge anyone to present evidence that it is not. We are told by critics of E. 306 that it needs to be replaced by something 'more interesting and more sophisticated,' yet the suggestion is made on little or no evidence.

"What I suspect is that [a] 'more interesting and more sophisticated' [version of E. 306] really means a literature course. Yet we have had a text-based literature course available at the freshman level for five years now for teachers who wanted to teach it and students who wanted to take it. And students have elected to take the regular course over the literary version year after year. Our biggest problem at every registration is to get these literature-based sections to make. After years of writing about literature in high school, students are ready when they come to college for a broader, more challenging view of writing and rhetoric. It seems inappropriate to me that an English department with almost seventy undergraduate literature courses in its catalogue ... should seek to eliminate the rhetorical perspective in one of only several courses in its listings to carry the word 'rhetoric' or 'composition' in its title.

"My second point is addressed more particularly to that part of the new English proposal which would set up a remedial writing center to prepare students for a placement exam that would earn them credit for E. 306. It will be wrong to regard this portion of the debate as essentially an ideological struggle within a department rather prone to civil broils. In fact, the basic issue is much more fundamental. It asks what role research and scholarship is to play in the teaching mission of a research university?

"We all agree that the advancement of knowledge for its own sake needs no justification. Knowledge for the sake of knowledge is a first principle.

"But we also know that research must inform teaching. We read, study, explore, and investigate that we may operate in the classroom with knowledge and authority derived from the most careful research and the best scholarship.

"To place the composition issue in terms that should concern every college in the University is to ask this question: what the English department proposes to do is ... gradually replace a fully-researched, well-proven, college-level writing course with a remedial program that is not only untried and uncertain, but which is flawed in its most basic concepts.... Not flawed in some minor aspect, not over a quibble or a subtlety of departmental ideology, but in the most fundamental way that suggests that the framers of the proposed program are either unaware of the conclusions of basic research or have chosen to ignore them.

"No research finding in rhetoric and composition in the last several decades has been so fully and repeatedly demonstrated as the fact that what students learn through basic skill routines and grammar drills and work exercises done outside the context of actual writing does not transfer to writing ability. The existing research says compellingly [that a] program of drills and workbooks and computer programs such as that proposed as a way of replacing E. 306 will have no positive effect on the quality of student writing.

"Unlike our current writing lab this new writing center will be isolated from the actual writing experiences prompted by real course work. Students subjected to this new program will earn credit for E. 306 because they can fill in the blank, because they can perform workbook exercises designed to prepare them to pass an exam, not because they can write, not because they can think. What is routinely taught now in E. 306 -- the understanding of logic, argumentation, persuasion, the exploration of ideas, [an] appreciation for research and documentation methodology -- cannot be reduced to rote drills and hence will not be taught to the more than four thousand students who currently take this course.

"If the English department is unaware of the basic research that undermines one of its major proposals in this program (and this matter could not be debated on the departmental floor because this concept of the lab was not in the document presented to the English department last September), I repeat, if the framers of the departmental proposal are unaware of this basic research, [then] the flaw in their work is too obvious for further comment.

"If the English department is aware of the basic research but chooses to ignore it, then, in asking support for its program, the English department is expecting the faculty of a major research university to repudiate any relationship between teaching and research.

"If the English department is aware of this basic research and intends to challenge it, it should use the appropriate scholarly forums first -- the journals, the research studies, the national meetings -- before foisting an experiment upon more than four thousand students and before expecting a university faculty to endorse a return to methods and ideas that have been disproven and repudiated again and again.

"Whatever the English department's degree of knowledge in proposing this program, whatever its intentions, one thing is certain: the program ought not to go forward in its proposed state. It will, if implemented, jeopardize the education of thousands of students and seriously harm the national reputation the University of Texas has laboriously earned over the last fifteen years in the field of rhetoric and composition."

Maxine C. Hairston (English) said: "I have just completed a term as the president of the eight thousand member National Association of College Writing Teachers, so I have some experience with these matters.

"The needs or preferences of the students or the University community have never been mentioned by the proponents of the new writing program. Three years ago the English department promised the University community that it would work to improve student writing by establishing an upper-division course in the various disciplines; that is, E. 346. In order to put that course in, it did away with [the] required second-semester freshman composition [course] and it abolished two heavily subscribed and very popular sophomore writing courses, one of them Technical Writing. Before the E. 346 course was ever fully in place, it was abolished (without the consent of or consultation [with] the faculty), and students at the University of Texas were left with one freshman writing course, E. 306, and a few highly specialized, highly selective advanced courses that are now enrolling fewer than 100 students -- these [courses] do not serve [the needs of the] students that need them. So while everyone at the University seems to agree that students badly need to be learning to write at the college level, this institution is making it more and more difficult for them to do so. Currently, students who place out of E. 306 (and that is two thousand students every year) cannot take any other writing course; there are none there. The students themselves know how badly they need writing courses -- perhaps some of you noticed that in a recent survey published in The Chronicle of Higher Education 45 percent of college students said their institutions should offer more writing courses.

"The program that has been dismantled has been a state-of-the-art composition program, one that has been put together and run for the past fifteen years by professional specialists in composition and rhetoric with national reputations in their fields. The goals of the program, the training for the graduate students who work in it, the theory underlying the syllabus, and the methodology in the course reflect the best thinking that has been done in the teaching of writing in the past ten years. The proposal to get rid of that program and replace it with one put together

by faculty whose expertise is in other areas contradicts the principle that is supposed to govern curriculum decisions at a university; that is, courses and programs in an area are to be designed by experts within that discipline.

"These changes are not only going to hurt the undergraduate writing program; they are already seriously damaging the University's graduate program in rhetoric and composition, until now ranked as one of the best in the country. We are already losing graduate students because of adverse publicity about what is happening at Texas, and the best young faculty in rhetoric and composition will not consider coming here. We have not been able to replace the three people we have lost in the past two years. I cannot imagine another department undermining its scholarly reputation in this way.

"All of these developments affect the quality of education at the University of Texas and they affect its national standing, two concerns that I think are important to all of us."

Joseph E. Kruppa, Associate Chairman of the Department of English, had served as chairman of the E. 346K evaluation committee and spoke concerning the document to the Council from that committee (Attachment C). "I will not review the document [that was] passed out to you; I think it is self-explanatory....

"I do want to add a few specific comments about Professor Kinneavy's representation of the English department proposal. He pretends to offer an 'assessment' of the new writing program, but what he gives us instead is a series of misrepresentations, misstatements, and, to use a term which emanates frequently from the White House these days, 'misrememberings.' His 'assessment' simply recycles the same arguments he used when this was debated in the English department, and those arguments are no more convincing now than they were then, when they lost by a vote of 53-18; I might add parenthetically that several members who voted against our proposal told me they voted against it because we did not go far enough and totally eliminate E. 306.

"Professor Kinneavy misrepresents the very intent of the new program in regard to E. 306. Forty percent now place out of that course. Of the sixty percent who [must] show credit for it or take [it], roughly 3,600 students a year, only one-third of those students will actually graduate in this institution. So the English department devotes much of its resources to a basic skills course in the first year for 2,400 [students per year] who simply disappear from our school. We have suggested as a remedy for this that students be informed that we expect them to bring the proficiency level of E. 306 to the University. They may place out of the course, they may transfer credit for it (as many do now), or they may make up the deficiencies they have in this area after they arrive here through a variety of instruments: short courses, computer-assisted instruction, diagnostic tests which reveal their special needs.

"Professor Kinneavy objects that short courses in grammar and mechanics cannot do the job; [he said] it today, as a matter of fact. He said, 'It flies in the face of seventy years of research which demonstrates that the isolated teaching of grammatical skills has no appreciable carry-over to writing ability.' First of all, we have never intended for these [short] courses to be simply focused on grammar and mechanics. But, even more ironically, if you turn to page one of Professor Kinneavy's master E. 306 syllabus, you find this: 'Isolating the basic skills for study and practice is consistent both with modern research findings in the teaching of composition and with the general procedure in intellectual activities.' Now, which Kinneavy should we believe? Which body of research is he referring to in this document and which in the E. 306 syllabus? I wish I knew.

"Professor Kinneavy goes on to misrepresent the new writing course which will take the place of E. 306. First he engages in a rhetorical smokescreen by objecting that the new course was originally a sophomore level course, but has 'been downgraded to freshman level courses by someone.' He should know better, or he should be able to read more carefully. The original proposal used the numbers 311, 313, 315 as provisional numbers only. There was no indication that these were 'sophomore' courses -- there was no prerequisite of sophomore standing for them. The only prerequisite was E. 306 or its equivalent. The obvious intent of the plan was that the new writing course be taken by freshmen and sophomores, preferably before they took E. 316K, the Masterworks of Literature course, which does have a prerequisite of 27 hours. When we learned that the numbers 309K, L, and M were available to us, we took them gladly as more appropriate to the intent and design of the course.

"Professor Kinneavy also ... goes on to misrepresent the nature of the new course. If he had read the original course proposal (rather than creating a bogus one for public consumption), he would know that there are three versions of E. 309: Topics in Writing, 309K; The Writing Process, 309L; and Thinking and Writing, 309M. The first one ... allows for topics like Literature and Composition or Great Books and Composition, the second focuses on the processes of writing (and is modeled, perhaps, on our old E. 310), and the third focuses on argumentation, the use of evidence, and ways of convincing readers (and most clearly resembles our old E. 308 called Rhetoric, Logic and Expository Writing). Again he is either misrepresenting or misremembering.

"But the final 2 1/2 pages of his document constitute his real agenda, as far as I am concerned. Lamenting the loss of his constituency, the Lecturers, he argues for a department that teaches every conceivable kind of writing course for every college or department, and which does so with a large body of temporary faculty. We have been through this experience in the English department, and it was not a pretty one. A true writing across the curriculum will take place when it is not generated by English departments, not sponsored by some super-program in rhetoric which depends on hordes of temporary faculty, but when individual departments

and colleges assume some of the responsibility for teaching their students the kind of writing appropriate to individual disciplines.

"What bothers me finally, I guess, about Professor Kinneavy's 'assessment' is its intellectual arrogance. Having lost an argument, and a rather overwhelming vote among his peers and colleagues, he blames that loss on 'the administrators of the English department,' of which I am one. His so-called 'assessment' sheet misinforms the University community, ... misrepresents my department, and too often misremembers important details of our proposal. His 'assessment' is not a balanced critique of what we presented, but a special plea by one individual for his own hidden agenda."

In response to Mr. Kruppa's remarks, Mr. Kinneavy said: "Normally, only 40 percent of any of the freshmen in any of our courses graduate. Does that mean we should get rid of all freshman courses? I have always felt that at that level we train people to transfer to other places; they train people to transfer to ours. The argument that only one-third of the people we are teaching at the freshman level are going to graduate is, I think, as spurious an argument as I could think of. It would call for the elimination of all freshman courses."

"Secondly, quoting the syllabus where I said that isolating certain things while teaching writing is necessary -- yes, I meant this. We do not teach logical patterns and everything else when we are teaching people how to write. We teach people to write a particular inductive theme or a deductive theme, and we focus on logic -- the logic of deduction or the logic of exploration or whatever while writing. The research would say do not just teach deduction or induction without writing, or grammar without writing. That is a misinterpretation of the whole syllabus. We never in freshman English stop and devote a whole semester, or half a semester, to grammar."

"The new courses, in a certain sense, are a moot issue. The new courses will not be offered because freshman English will continue to be offered as long as the 60 percent of the people do not pass the test. They have not given any evidence yet that the numbers are going to drop; all the figures are saying they are going to be steady."

"Finally, yes, I have chosen to use the term 'the administrators of the English department' because a good number of the things which are happening right now were not passed by the English department. The English department voted (and this is its only vote) to get rid of freshman English and to teach the sophomore level courses. Somebody (I say, euphemistically, 'the administrators of the department') put it back in. Other changes have been made, too. I simply am trying to say that the department did some things and 'the administrators' have done other things, and they are very often quite different. And the E. 306 situation is one of the major issues. The department, for instance, never voted to have the writing center offer cram courses in grammar to

get out of E. 306; that was done by somebody else, not the department."

H. Eldon Sutton (Zoology) said that there was widespread concern about the English requirements and about the need for students to have the opportunity to "learn composition." He then offered a substitute motion to refer the entire question of English requirements to the Educational Policy Committee. Mr. Kinneavy said that he would accept the substitute motion under the condition that the committee consider not just English courses but the "writing across the curriculum" courses as well. Mr. Sutton and his seconder agreed.

Mr. Sutton then added: "I would like to note that [one of the functions of] this body is to vote on degree requirements. The deans have the authority to waive requirements but not to change them, and therefore any change in degree requirements ultimately will have to come here anyway. So I would like this thing approached in a more global way by persons who could consider that general issue and let us have it debated in a forum which is better able to address the issue than this [Council]."

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) spoke against the substitute motion because "I have a feeling of 'deja vu' and embarrassment. I agree that the Educational Policy Committee and the Deans should be involved in requirements for the entire University. We will never know those requirements until the English department stands firm on what it wants. I view this as a family quarrel, and as a good psychologist I stay ... out of family quarrels...."

"The English department has taken a vote...; by a majority they have embarked on a certain path. It is not our business to tell an English department or a college what to do. The people who do not like the decision of the English administrators [should] take it to the Dean of that college; and if the Dean says, 'I am sorry,' or makes a decision, you stick with the Dean. I am not about to overrule a college and tell them what to do and how to do it. I think this is an issue for the English department, and we cannot tell a department what they are supposed to do without being prepared to get into all sorts of issues of what Engineering ought to teach, or what Architecture ought to teach, and how they ought to teach it, and where it should be. I strongly support people being prepared to write before they come here, and I think that the proposals as put forth are good ones. I would like to urge my colleagues to vote down this [substitute motion] because I would like to make another proposal...."

Agreeing with Mr. Iscoe, Dean Robert D. King (Liberal Arts) said that "there is not a discipline at this university in which there is not serious long-standing disagreement about the way to teach the course. That is true of history, true of engineering, it is true of mathematics. I am opposed to either of these motions. When the original motion was made, which was to set up yet another committee to look into the writing

requirement, the English requirement, I was opposed to that. When [Mr. Sutton] made his substitute motion, I am opposed to the Educational Policy Committee looking into it. They have done it, I would say, in the twenty years I have been at this university probably half a dozen times. We still do not know the best way to teach freshman English. Dr. Kinneavy and his colleagues have devised a very good way; so have an awful lot of other people in the English department. If you are going to extend it to writing across the disciplines, I would like to see the purview of that committee to be extended to the teaching of modern languages, the teaching of mathematics, the teaching of chemistry, physics, architecture, social work, every other thing in which there is a fundamental body of material that has to be taught. The one thing that is different about the English department (actually there are several ...) [is that] it is the only department I know [in] which when faculty members lose a vote within the department they bring it to the University Council. I think it is time to stop that nonsense."

William O. S. Sutherland, Chairman of the English department, said: "I am distressed at some of the things that have been said in attacking the committee that worked on this proposal, and some of the things that have been said about the Department and its interest in writing. I am also concerned at the rather loose way that statistics are cast around. You just heard that there are 97 members of the English department. Actually I went through the teaching schedule today to see how many members of the regular faculty are on duty [and] are involved in our writing program. There are 74 regular faculty on duty, and 39 of them are involved in the writing program."

"Now, the writing program as Mr. Kinneavy defines it and the writing program as we practice it in the Department are apparently two different things. The courses that Mr. Kinneavy allows are those in which he has been instrumental in the design and development. But I would like to point out [that] we have a very large creative writing program, which is a very important program. And we have the advanced expository program that Mr. Kinneavy is concerned about, but he should know that his E. 346K killed that advanced expository course. We did have 8 or 12 sections.... We have interesting courses in editing, we have courses in article writing, we have courses in writing about American culture. And, of course, all of our E. 316K courses have the equivalent of substantial writing components in them. [In addition,] we are the department on the campus that teaches the largest number of substantial writing component courses. It is not right for these people to say that our department is not interested in writing. It is."

"I do not know what the term 'research' means, but I know that I read the material, and I would like to say in seconding what Mr. Iscoe and Dean King have said ... that this really is essentially an argument about how to teach the course. Do you teach the course as has been proposed by the group that has just talked -- in a narrow way, isolating the elements and teaching the isolated elements? (I am sorry to be talking

about this. This is the way I talk in my department, not in the University Council.) Or do you teach the problems as problems of writing. I can read you one or two things that have been said about this.... 'The teaching of skills in process is not necessarily incompatible with our intellectual and ethical ambitions, but technique without intellectual content is blind.' May I repeat that? 'Technique without intellectual content is blind.' It does not lead our students into thinking substantively about the world around them, or inspire them to look for solutions to its problems, or help them evaluate its workings; and I think that such goals should be the ultimate goals of all courses in the humanities, including writing courses. I could read you other material, but I will read you just briefly what a critic in College English said about Mr. Kinneavy's approach: 'As readers of Kinneavy,' he said, 'we ought to discern a pattern of intolerance here, and we ought to question how closely we as teachers of writing ought to be identified with that.' I think Mr. Kinneavy teaches the course very well ..., but I do not think that that ought to be imposed on the rest of the department."

"I would like to say something about so-called cram courses in grammar and mechanics. One of our problems, I think, with this disagreement is not in writing but in reading. The English department proposed what is essentially a freshman course. All these people were there; they listened to it, but somehow it came through as a sophomore course to them. I do not understand that, but let me say about the so-called cram courses in grammar and mechanics (and you can see that there are past masters of rhetoric talking about these things), I said to this body, 'We are planning with the Dean of the College to develop our writing center (the writing center, by the way, has always been a function of the Department and has never been actually discussed on the department floor) and to develop short courses where the students will come in, say for three or six hours total time, working on something ... like organizing and writing the essay, or paragraphs and sentences, or focusing on the problems that the students have.'

"I hate to see what the department is doing (unknowingly, I am sure) misrepresented. I think really our department is the best place to discuss this, and I hope that the University Council will allow us to do it."

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) noted that Mr. Iscoe had raised the question of "whether or not the General Faculty had a right to discuss curriculum. I would like to raise the point of order formally, because in my opinion, while I may want the English department to solve this problem because I am ... tired of reading about it, I maintain that it is the right of the General Faculty to discuss curriculum. I maintain it has that right because we receive by circulation all curriculum changes, and we may through a protest procedure bring that to ... the University Council, and therefore it is within our purview as a body to discuss any curriculum issues that might come forward. In order to get a

definitive ruling on it, I would like to raise as a point of order whether or not the University Council has the right to discuss this curriculum issue. Mr. Iscoe says that it does not; Mr. King says that it does not.... I would like a ruling from the chair on my point of order, please."

President Cunningham ruled that the Council "has a right to discuss anything that this group would like to discuss. In that sense, if this group would like to discuss this topic, I am pleased to have it discussed." Mr. McDaniel then concluded that if the Council would like to refer the matter to the Educational Policy Committee, "it certainly may refer it, and I do not think that we should be intimidated by Mr. Iscoe and Mr. King in terms of whether or not we can discuss a curriculum issue."

Dean King responded that he had not raised the question of the Council's right to discuss the issue. "Of course [the Council has] a right to talk about this. I am saying that I do not think it is useful to single out this one department, as we have done every year for at least the last ten, and expose it to the same kind of questioning what should be taught, how should it be taught. I would like to see it done, if we are going to do it for English; I want to see it done for Math, Business, Engineering, and everything else. That is my point of view."

Wayne A. Rebhorn, Jr. (English) said: "I had hoped not to speak today, but I feel impelled to do so. Professor Kinneavy and Professor Ruskiewicz and Professor Hairston have spoken as though the English department has destroyed a program and that is it. I do not think that is the case at all. You all have documents which describe a program to be implemented. In fact, I suspect the reason that a very large majority of my colleagues in the English department voted for the program that we have is that they truly believe it to be a better program than the one that existed in the past. The cornerstone of this program is a new collection of courses, which we originally labeled E. 311, E. 313, E. 315, and have now ... more suitably labeled E. 309K, L, and M.... [That will be] the one course that every student at this University, assuming that all of the colleges approve this, will be taking as part of their General Education requirement.... What we have also done is require that students coming to this university possess the skills (or very rapidly acquire them, and we are going to work very hard to help them do that) equivalent to a 550 cutting score on ... the ECT."

"Now, it seems to me (I hope it seems to most of us) that this University, the flagship University of the System, has the right to require that students have a certain level of skills before they come here. We are going the extra yard. We are going to help them acquire those skills once they come here, because many of them simply do not have them yet. Though I am much more optimistic than Professor Kinneavy, my children go to the public schools. They are getting better. My children are learning things which my freshmen do not know (all too often, I am

afraid to say) about the English language. So I am encouraged that by the time my children come to this university they will not have to take E. 306 or its equivalent because they will have more than adequate skills. Surely it is our right as a university to require that they have these skills, just as we ... require certain skills in the area of mathematics;... students cannot take certain elementary courses in mathematics at this university unless they already have a certain set of skills involving algebra.... So, I do not think we are doing anything that is heretical or strange or really opposed to the whole principle of educating all undergraduates. The point ... is that we do have a program for undergraduates, indeed a program that would require all undergraduates, if approved by the colleges, to take a course in composition in three variants, one of which is precisely the kind of course that Professors Kinneavy, Ruskiewicz, and Hairston themselves would prefer to teach (and I assume will be doing so when we institute it)....

"I do not think it a good idea to send this to the Educational Policy Committee;... it has been scrutinized already.... To send this material to the Educational Policy Committee is a good idea in theory, but what it will mean, in fact, I am sure, is a further delay who knows for how long before we can get down to the business of actually installing this program. Professor Kruppa has told me that we are founding pilot sections of E. 309K, L, and M for the next fall. This, I hope, should disabuse everyone of the notion that the English department does not wish to teach composition. We will actually be teaching more composition once we install E. 309 than we are doing at the present moment, when we are only teaching 60 percent of the freshmen in E. 306. So what I am saying is that, basically, we have a program and we would like to get around to the business of beginning to teach it."

David M. Rabban (Law) commented: "What is of interest to me as a member of the University Council is the extent to which this issue is a intra-family quarrel within the English department, or whether it has broader ramifications for the University as a whole. My own sense is to defer to the professional judgment of the majority of the members of the English department. I am struck by not having heard from anyone outside that department about the implications of this new program. If there are many people in other departments in the University who feel this is a very bad idea, and if they speak to that, I would want to refer this issue to the Educational Policy Committee. If there are not, and I have not heard any yet, I feel we should defer it to the judgment of the English department and vote against this motion. So I am very curious to hear from any of you in departments other than English about whether you feel this new program has a negative impact on your own schools and departments."

Dean Lorrin G. Kenamer (Education) stated: "I would agree up to a point with Mr. Iscoe and Mr. King. However, I have to remind myself that approximately 10 percent ... of degree plans in all the other colleges are involved in these English courses, whatever they are. So there is, as others have said, a significant concern in all colleges ... when 10 percent of your total operation is now in disarray. Therefore it seems to me we are at a position now where we need a quick and clear statement [about the English] program. I want to know what is the program, because there [is] E. 306--it was not going to be offered, it now is going to be offered. There is E. 309--it will be offered, but we are not sure when. There was E. 346K--all the colleges adopted it; it was not offered, so now we have to unadopt it and we do not know what to put in its place--can we choose anything that we wish? Can we choose any course in the English department or in some other department? And then there are two courses [with] substantial writing [components]."

"I would like to urge the English department again to come forward as soon as possible with a very specific proposal that we can vote on in this body, because we will have to vote on it. The last time we voted on an English requirement [was the E. 346K requirement]; we have not voted on anything else, and E. 346K no longer exists. Give us a program so we can ... get our degree plans in place, because the students are being put to great disadvantage here as we are having to change from one thing to another and not know what to substitute. It is the English department's business, but we all are very much involved in it; therefore we are saying, 'Pull all your expertise together and get us a proposal that can be the core of the liberal arts English requirement of the degrees on this campus.'"

Mr. Sutherland noted: "I realize that a very vocal group can make a department appear to be in disarray. We are not. We know where we are going. In order to clarify that, we included, on [the third page of Attachment C] a statement of where we stand at the present time."

Mr. Iscoe said that he certainly agreed with Mr. McDaniel "that this is the body to debate curriculum issues.... [But] I am convinced that to refer this to the Educational Policy Committee would only mean further delay and exacerbation of the confusion that Dean Kenamer talks about and which Chairman Sutherland said can be cleared up." He then MOVED to table the motion to refer the issue to the Educational Policy Committee. The motion to table was APPROVED by a voice vote.

IX. REMAINING QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

There were no further questions to the President. However, before adjournment, President Cunningham noted that Mr. McDaniel had been complimentary about his involvement with the Randy Bowman incident. "The truth is, that has been handled largely by [Vice President for Student

Affairs Ronald] Brown's office and [Dean of Students] Sharon Justice, and they have spent just an incalculable amount of time [working] for the best interest of the University. I want to thank both of them and their staffs for all that they have done."

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. The Council will convene next on Monday, April 14, 1986, in Main Building 212 at 2:15 p.m. (This will be one week earlier than originally scheduled, due to the Sesquicentennial Holiday.)

Distributed to members of the University Council and to members of the General Faculty who want minutes on April 9, 1986.