

Points of Difference

With John Slatin

1. Setting specific criteria for success or failure of the division. While the division should be accountable to the college and university, its continuance should not depend upon meeting specific standards unless the division is also provided with resources to achieve those ends. Moreover this scheme of accountability should also be applied to other departments, divisions, and programs.

2. Setting a specific (in this case 10%) limit upon the number of lower division courses taught by temporary, non-tenure track faculty. I'd prefer wording that emphasized our intention to staff these courses primarily with AIs and regular faculty, making it clear that we would not rely in any significant way on lecturers, but not restricting ourselves to a specific percentage.

3. I'm willing to go along with a full commitment to support English candidates for the Ph.D. program if that's tied to a similar commitment by the English department to support the graduate program in rhetoric, including graduate faculty hired by the rhetoric division.

I believe, however, that this is one area where we might be better off working from precedent and in good faith. English Ph.D candidates who in Evan Carton's words, are "in good standing and with competent teaching records" would enjoy the same support they currently do; faculty hired by the division would have their graduate courses reviewed and approved/disapproved by the English department as they currently are.

4. I don't see why the English department or any public entity should expect to be free from criticism. I think it would be more beneficial for the English Department now--after the creation of the Division of Rhetoric and Composition--to explain to the university and public what the English Department regards its mission to be, what it expects to do in the immediate future, and what resources it will need to achieve those goals.

5. I agree that the Computer Research Lab will serve both wings of the English Department, but if the composition courses become as computerized as we hope, the bulk of the Lab's support, research interests, staff, and labors will likely be related to the division. Consequently, I'd like to see the Computer Research Lab administered along the lines John S. has outlined, but within the Division of Rhetoric and Composition. That's where most people will look for it.

With Jim Kinneavy

1. I think we may need slightly more stringent criteria than one-sixth appointment for determining who shall serve on the division's executive committee.

2. Since the current English Department Executive Committee does not select the Chair of the English Department, it is unlikely that current or any future dean will extend such a privilege to the division.

Perhaps the division's executive committee can recommend a director to the Dean.

3. The status of E 316K and E 603A/B as writing courses might appropriately be a matter for the University Council to consider should it decide to examine the English department's current writing program. But these courses should not, I think, be a concern of the division at this time. Similarly, the writing division cannot deal with the content of graduate courses.

4. The current formations of E 309 should be respected, but should not restrict future development in this course.

5. A joint Division and English department undergraduate course committee might be a good idea to assuage fears that the literature wing may have about division courses fulfilling elective requirements within the English major. But how do we prevent a layering of committees so thick that nothing gets done?

With Linda Ferreira-Buckley

1. We've got to be careful about developing too many upper-division courses in various disciplines. The problem is simple: staffing. AIs cannot teach upper division classes and we don't want take the lecturer route again. That killed E 346K. What we might do is work with faculty from various disciplines who could provide model courses that our AIs would replicate in E 309L.

2. At our current levels, we can't staff one required writing course beyond E 306.

3. Program development is part of the division's routine responsibilities. Program administrators shouldn't expect special funding for developing and refining syllabi, preparing course materials, etc. Of course, I'm not against summer funding for truly special projects.