

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH MINUTES

April 25, 1980

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m., Mr. Moldenhauer presiding.

Mr. Moldenhauer announced that the department would meet Monday, May 5 from 9-12 and again from 1-5 to study and analyze the proposals for composition staffing submitted by the task force. The task force planned to submit its written proposals no later than May 2. Mr. Moldenhauer stressed the importance of solving the composition staffing dilemma; the department does not want to waste, through procrastination or neglect in the last stages, its long, thoughtful, and conscientious work throughout the semester. Soon after the May 5 meeting ballots will be distributed. The task force believes that decision by mail ballot rather than by plenary session would allow for greater participation. Mr. Moldenhauer said that Monday, May 5 was Dead Day; faculty members should be free from classes on that day. He urged all members of the faculty to set aside time to attend this important meeting.

Mr. Moldenhauer discussed the purpose of the present meeting, which was to talk about recruitment policy for 1980-81 for positions beginning in Fall 1981. Mr. Wadlington, with the backing of many colleagues, had requested in Fall 1979 that such a meeting be held in the Spring so that the department could make decisions without the pressure of Fall advertising deadlines. Mr. Moldenhauer reminded the group that MLA Joblist copy was due sometime around September 26, 1980.

Mr. Farrell reaffirmed the sense of the earlier meetings that as much should be done as possible before September. First, the department should decide whether it is recruiting "at large" or by categories (slots). Second, the department should decide the number of positions needed to be filled.

Mr. Moldenhauer said that approximately six lines needed to be filled to keep pace with normal attrition through death and retirement. The following persons need to be replaced:

1. Wittig - 100%
2. Diehl - 100%
3. new line - 100%
 - a. Lehmann (1/3)
 - b. Wilson (1/3)
 - c. given by Dean (1/3)
4. Keast - 100%
5. Teagarden - 100%
6. (seventh year untenured person) - 100% -- possible line to be filled

Recruitment efforts are currently under way for two positions (Creative Writing, Technical Writing), but we cannot be sure these positions will be

filled. The 1/3 line for DeCamp has been lost to Linguistics. The Abrahams line is currently being filled by Archie Green for an anticipated three years (until Spring 1982). These figures assume a constant Pool and do not take into account increased staffing needs through increased enrollment.

Mr. Walter wondered if the Dean would allow the department to hire five to six people for 1981-82; might he reinstitute a freeze as he did last Fall? If the department presented a well-developed recruitment plan to the Dean, Mr. Moldenhauer believed the Dean might very well approve such a level of recruitment. Such a plan would have to include an accurate projection of staffing needs, including an assessment of the Pool and future increases in staffing responsibilities. (For example, the department already expects an additional 500 freshmen for Fall 1980; this 500 translates into 20 additional sections or 5 FTE.) The task force proposals on composition, if approved, would have measurable implications for recruitment over the intermediate and long term.

There was general discussion about the department's reliance on temporary faculty ("Pool") to staff many of the lower-division courses and about the Pool's effects on recruitment. Mr. Walter believed that these faculty members were underpaid and overworked; he cited examples of the current Pool who had accepted jobs in private industry for \$20,000+. Mr. Rebhorn foresaw two possible solutions to the Pool "problem." The department could do away with the Pool and hire 50 new regular faculty to staff all of its courses. Or, the department could create a permanent pool of, say, 35; such faculty would be paid a little more than at present, would not be required to publish, and would not be tenure-track. Mr. Walter believed a permanent Pool is cruel and inhuman, and in no way did he believe the department could justify limiting a temporary faculty member's chances of promotion. Ms. Robertson expressed her distaste for a permanent Pool, although she found it difficult to understand the Pool's objection to its current situation. When Pool members contract for these temporary positions, they are aware of what they are getting into. Mr. Farrell sympathized with her distaste, but he said it was time for the department to accept that it is subject to market forces. A permanent Pool, or something like it, may be necessary; perhaps such a Pool should be tenurable. Ms. Dwyer worried that the lack of tenure-track appointments may discourage the "cream of the crop" of graduate students from entering academia; perhaps the present situation would be reversed in 10-15 years.

Mr. Moldenhauer asked who should determine departmental staffing needs and how such needs would be determined. Mr. Farrell believed the EC should determine needs and specialities; although such decisions should be made in consultation with interest groups within the department, the EC would not be bound by such groups' suggestions. Mr. Malof suggested that stringent criteria to determine staffing needs are not necessarily helpful; differences of opinion would still arise between the EC and interest groups. Mr. Moldenhauer reminded the group that the EC Constitution specifies that

recruitment policy will be determined by plenary session of the department. It is unclear, however, just what "recruitment policy" includes: does the department specify exactly which slots need to be filled, or merely determine numbers of new faculty, or what? Mr. Walter stated the problem as one of judging future student demand for courses. If a specialist is hired, then the department must base its decisions on strong projections for upper-division demand in that field. Mr. Moldenhauer noted that the department had been hiring versatile faculty and might continue to do so. Ms. Robertson observed that the department probably would like to avoid recruiting in areas where the upper-division and graduate courses are adequately staffed at present. Mr. Walter explained that when he first came to UT he was allowed to teach upper-division and graduate courses only after several years of teaching only lower-division courses. Mr. Slatin suggested that candidates be told what he was told: there could be no guarantee that an upper-division course would be available the first year. If the department does this, he said, then there would be no need to worry about the field - the department would simply look for the best candidates available.

Mr. Moldenhauer asked if the department would like to take straw votes on any of these issues. Mr. Farrell answered that in view of the importance of such discussions the department could not change recruitment policy with such a low turnout. The consensus of the group was that a meeting should be held in early September to discuss general recruitment policy and the role of advisory groups to the EC in recruitment matters.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Distributed May 19, 1980.