

30 November 1981

To: Members of the Faculty Senate
From: The Senate Subcommittee on Lecturers
Subject: Proposed resolution concerning Lecturers

The following is a draft of a resolution that the Senate Subcommittee on Lecturers recommends be forwarded on to the Dean by the Faculty Senate of the English Department. Please read it over by Friday.

cc: Moldenhauer, Bowden, Cable, Duncan, Engles, Farrell, Flowers, Frost, Heinzelman, Kinneavy, Kruppa, Mackay, Migaw, Meyer, Ohle, Reed, Renwick, Rodi, Ruszkiewicz, Saldivar, Simon, Spivak, Webb, Westbrook, Whitbread

Until 1979, the normal course load for English Department Lecturers (then called Instructors) was 4/3, a load considered excessive by most. In 1979, the course load was further increased to 4/4, perhaps to accommodate the dramatically increasing numbers of lower-division students. We feel very strongly that this increase was a mistake, one that does a disservice both to lower-division students and to the Lecturers who teach them. We feel that this is an opportune time to reverse the trend of imposing larger workloads on lower-division teachers. Last year President Flawn demonstrated his and the University's commitment to the quality of lower-division English by reducing the load of Assistant Instructors by 25% from 2/2 to 1/1. We applaud that move and suggest that it is now time to carry that commitment a (logical) step further and reduce the teaching load of Lecturers in the English Department by 25% to 3/3. As the following analysis shows, such a reduction would be reasonable in terms of the amount of time Lecturers actually must now spend teaching. Consider the workload of the English Department Lecturer, all of whose courses contain a substantial writing component:

- Teaching four courses per semester, a Lecturer typically
- teaches 100-400 students (4 classes x 25-40 students per class) = 12 contact hours/wk.
 - corrects 700-800 essays (50 essays per week x 20-30 minutes per essay) = 15-25 hours/wk.
 - prepares 170 hours of lectures (assuming 2 different classes x 3 contact hours per course x 2 hours preparation per contact hour) = 12 hours/wk.

Handwritten calculations:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 50 \\
 \times 12 \\
 \hline
 600 \\
 \times 15 \\
 \hline
 750 \\
 \hline
 1350 \text{ hrs.} \\
 \hline
 300 \text{ min}
 \end{array}$$

--spends 100-150 hours in student conferences = 7-10 hours/wk.

TOTAL = 46-59
hours/wk.

These figures suggest that on the average, a Lecturer spends 53 hours a week on strictly teaching and teaching-related activities. Such a load obviously permits no time for scholarly pursuits, curriculum enrichment, or intellectual exchange with colleagues. A 25% reduction in this load would limit the time required for teaching to a reasonable 40 hours per week and would enable Lecturers to devote at least some time to their scholarly interests, ~~and families~~.

A survey of the Lecturers supports the given figures. One Lecturer in his second year at UT reports:

By the end of this semester I will have graded 720 essays and 115 tests, prepared 84 lectures and made 168 presentations, and kept 100 office hours. Allowing myself a mere 15 minutes to grade a paper and but two hours to prepare a lecture, I calculate I make around \$7 an hour; a 3/3 load would give 20 minutes a paper and \$9 an hour. . . . I respectfully suggest that the students at this university deserve teachers with more than 15 minutes for their work and 5 minutes for their visits. I want to teach as effectively as possible. A 3/3 load is a step in that direction.

The other statements that appear in the following appendix testify that, given the 4/4 course load, the number of students per class, and the amount of writing required, the Lecturers cannot do an adequate job of teaching lower-division courses without working much more than 40 hours a week. As a result, Lecturers are forced to compromise their teaching, their scholarly careers, or their personal lives. It is our considered

opinion that reducing the teaching load of Lecturers is necessary to safeguard and improve the quality of lower-division teaching and to release Lecturers from the unfair and unreasonable burden they are presently under.

Note: We suggest following this with a few pertinent sections from the Lecturers' letters in support of the proposal.