

## DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH MINUTES

April 18, 1980

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

Mr. Moldenhauer called attention to the department calendar for the next three weeks. A meeting on recruitment policy for 1980-81 would be scheduled for April 25. The Task Force on Freshman Composition would release its proposals to the department by May 2; meetings would probably be held the following week.

Mr. Friedman spoke on the work of the Governance Committee and distributed the Committee's preliminary report. The Committee was established by the Chairman in Fall 1979 to serve for one year; the Committee (which consists of Goldbarth, Heinzelman, Malof, Rossman, Spivak, and Friedman as Chair) was asked to investigate problem areas in the present EC document, to produce a coherent description of the Department if that is possible, to identify specific areas where departmental procedures regularly break down, and to propose procedural changes to remedy these deficiencies. The Committee had met at least once every two weeks since October and had sought departmental input from time to time. The focus of the Committee's work was divided into four areas: lexicon, statement about the department, proposed departmental officers, and standing committees.

The Committee encountered problems when it tried to develop a lexicon for the department. Concepts which needed definition (for example, "academic rank," "standing committee," "ad hoc committee") had historical definition but little, if any, formal definition by the University administration. Both the Regents' Rules and the Handbook of Operating Procedures provide broad descriptions of such items. The Committee decided to defer the writing of such definitions until the department gave its explicit approval.

The Committee had written a statement about the department which it felt might provide workable definition for the department. The list of departmental officers include those that presently exist as well as those that the Committee felt needed to exist; again, the Committee believed that this list would provide some useful definition for departmental use.

The list of standing committees includes only those the Committee talked about and is necessarily incomplete. The policy statement represents the consensus of the Committee as perceived by Mr. Friedman, but it had not been formally approved by the Governance Committee. Mr. Friedman briefly discussed some of the Committee's recommendations about standing committees. The Governance Committee recommends only minor changes in the EC; replacement of the Hare System of voting with a simpler system may provide for easier counting of elections although the department may lose some precision of choice in the process. The Coordination and Planning committee (C&P) would be a new committee whose work would lighten the workload of EC members. This committee, for example, might be responsible for the preparation and execution of recruitment activity; such responsibility might include preparing Joblist copy or contacting interested applicants. One important function of the C&P committee would be its collection



and dissemination of information from one part of the English Department to another. Because its membership would include persons from all the various offices in the department, the exchange of ideas and information relating to all would be facilitated. The Governance Committee recommended that it be made a standing committee because of the continuing need for revision and overview of the department. The Governance Committee decided that the TA Committee and the Undergraduate Course Committee needed further clarification.

Mr. Friedman opened the floor to general discussion.

Mr. Walter wondered what the responsibility of the Undergraduate Course Committee should be; if the Chairman of the Department is responsible for assigning courses, then the UCC should be an advisory committee to him. Mr. Walter warned the department against defining roles contrary to the intent of the Regents' Rules. Mr. Friedman believed that the Regents' Rules were open to broad interpretation; for example, the department could assign powers to the UCC without circumventing the Chairman's authority.

There was much discussion about the proposed Coordination and Planning committee (C&P) and its relationship to the Executive Committee. Several faculty members felt that the C&P committee might undermine the Executive Committee's effectiveness. Mr. Whitbread worried that if the C&P directed recruitment, for example, EC activity would be minimized; the possibility that the EC might make ill-informed decisions on candidates would be increased. Mr. Walter foresaw complications arising from different decisions reached by the two committees on the same issues; by its nature, the EC should make the informed decision. Mr. Friedman stressed that the intent of the C&P committee was to relieve the EC workload; the C&P committee would not be empowered to make decisions on EC business.

The Governance Committee report defined voting members of the faculty as:

"all faculty at the rank of Instructor and above, except when the regular faculty [i.e., tenured and tenure-track] shall, by majority vote, determine that a specific issue is properly theirs alone to decide, or where otherwise restricted in this document."

Mr. Kinneavy said that in the past the department had encouraged the input of the TAs and AIs; does the Governance Committee now plan to make a clean sweep of this past commitment or will TAs and AIs be welcomed to vote on issues?

Mr. Walter observed that the Governance Committee was allowing the pool to vote on issues, regardless of whether these Instructors are full-time, part-time, or holding joint appointments with other departments; the Handbook of Operating Procedures allows Instructors to vote only if 100% at the University.

Mr. Friedman said that the Governance Committee didn't believe that the H.O.P. had caught up with departmental change, especially with the Pool. The intent of the Committee was to give temporary Instructors a voice in departmental governance. The proposals, moreover, are structured so that those matters restricted to regular faculty may be closed to the Pool.



Mr. Whitbread thought the model agenda (distributed as part of the Committee's report) was excellent, but he believed the quorum should be less than the proposed one-third or one-fourth; only about one-sixth currently attend meetings. Mr. Friedman replied that the Governance Committee is not wedded to any particular figure, but the Committee did want the quorum to be large. For example, the General Faculty quorum is 15%, he said. Mr. Friedman suggested that if department meetings were outlined as indicated, more people would come. Furthermore, the proposed C&P committee could handle more of the department's business, and fewer plenary sessions of the department would be needed. This would also increase attendance at departmental meetings. Mr. Bowden wanted the Committee to reconsider the idea of a quorum. On the one hand, it allows a minority to prevent the department from conducting its business (i.e., a minority could stop action by calling for a quorum). On the other hand, Mr. Carton believed that a quorum prevented a minority of the department from deciding departmental policy (i.e., a minority would not be able to institute major policy changes at a poorly-attended department meeting). Mr. Moldenhauer suggested that the Committee give thought to practical considerations of a quorum, for example, size of rooms available, time available for departmental meetings, etc.

Mr. Walter asked if the Governance Committee intended to elaborate on the proposed document; such a Constitution should allow departmental officers the flexibility to act in emergencies. Mr. Friedman explained that the Governance Committee as presently constituted is an ad hoc committee; its work is essentially over unless the department or Chairman chooses to reinstate it. Discussion followed on whether the Governance Committee should be reinstated and, if so, whether the present committee members should be reappointed. The department unanimously approved a motion by Mr. Westbrook that "the Chairman appoint an ad hoc committee on governance for next year, that committee to include, as determined by circumstances and the judgment of the department chair, all or almost all of its present members."

Mr. Friedman asked for suggestions about issues the Governance Committee should address. Mr. Carton said that the Committee's report seemed to be the skeleton for a larger report, or a detailed charter; the Governance Committee should continue its work in this area. Mr. Megaw believed the Governance Committee should further consider the C&P committee and its possible authority and composition. Mr. Kinneavy would return more power to the Chairman, and he urged the Governance Committee to look into this possibility. Mr. Rossman observed that the Chairman has lots of power, although his authority may be shared with the EC; it is up to the Chairman to exercise that authority. Mr. Kinneavy replied that departmental precedent had been not to let the Chairman use such power; presently, the Chairman's power is eroding from both above and below.

Mr. Malof wanted more input from the department; some believe power within the department is too dispersed while others believe it is too centralized. As Ombudsman Mr. Malof is told repeatedly that many faculty members feel alienated from the department because they have so little control over, or input in, departmental affairs. Communication should be increased.

Mr. Gribben suggested one easy way to increase communication and input from alienated faculty: they could attend department meetings. Mr. Megaw disagreed and said that the department's concern is not with punishing the apathetic but with making sensible decisions. Mr. Megaw suggested that an elected departmental senate would provide a stable, democratic, and effective way of making policy decisions that genuinely represent majority opinion in the departmental faculty. Such a senate should meet at least once a month, and its meetings should be open to all department members interested in attending. The department faculty should retain authority for revising policies and procedures by calling for plenary sessions, but the month-by-month policy decisions should be made by the elected senators. As in the University as a whole, legislation should be classed as minor and major, and different procedures for handling objections or requesting fuller discussion should be provided for each.

There was discussion of the differences and similarities between the proposed C&P committee and the old CIC. Mr. Friedman theorized that the CIC had been badly set-up and was not allowed to succeed. The proposed C&P would consist of members elected by the department, and it would be given specific tasks and powers.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Correction to the Minutes of April 4, 1980:

Page 2, paragraph 2 should read as follows:

The UCC had decided not to do anything about 329K/329L except to keep the numbers but not offer the courses next year. The content of these courses would be carried by 379N: English Romantic Poetry (Fall 1980, Heinzelman) and 379N: Topics in Romanticism (Spring 1981, Heinzelman).

Distributed May 19, 1980.

Enclosure: Governance Committee Report, Spring 1980.



## Governance Committee Preliminary Report

April 1980

1. A Department Lexicon
2. The Department
3. Departmental Officers
4. Standing Committees

Albert Goldbarth  
Kurt Heinzelman  
Joe Malof  
Chuck Rossman  
Gayatri Spivak  
Alan Friedman, Chair

---

### 1. A Department Lexicon

No action taken.

### 2. The Department

The Department, meeting in plenary session, shall determine all matters of general policy. All proposals of substantive import shall be brought to the Department for consideration, except that in cases where final departmental consideration is reserved for other bodies within the Department, such proposals shall be presented to the Department for information. At its meetings, the Department shall hear and act upon reports from its officers and standing committees, determine policy in such areas as recruitment, academic programs and quality, and curriculum, consider all items on its agenda, and take other appropriate action.

The departmental teaching staff is comprised of "regular" (i.e., tenured and tenure-track) and temporary faculty (whether full-time, part-time, or holding joint appointments with other departments), visitors of the professorial ranks, lecturers, assistant instructors, and teaching assistants. Voting members of the Department shall include all faculty of the rank of Instructor and above, except when the regular faculty shall, by majority vote, determine that a specific issue is properly theirs alone to decide, or where otherwise restricted in this document.

The Department shall meet in plenary session at least twice each semester, preferably at a time when all voting members shall be free of class assignments (e.g., Friday 12-1 p.m.). Notices of meetings shall be placed in departmental mailboxes at least four working days in advance of meetings. The departmental agenda shall be modeled on that of the Faculty Senate (see below) and its meetings, so far as is practical, shall be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order. A quorum shall consist of one-third (one-fourth?) of the voting faculty (the number to be calculated and announced to the Department by the Chairman at the beginning of each semester); this is also the minimum number of voting members needed for a meeting to begin and to conduct its business. A quorum count request shall be in order at any time during a meeting except when someone is speaking. Debate may continue in the absence of a quorum until someone raises the point while no one is speaking. A mail ballot of the voting faculty shall be conducted whenever a majority of voting members attending a departmental meeting deem it appropriate for a particular issue.

Any voting member may place an item on the agenda by submitting it, at least 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting time, to the appropriate departmental secretary. Should a departmental meeting fail to complete its agenda, it shall resume the following week at the same hour. Additional meetings (over and above the required two per semester) may be set by the Chairman, by a majority of the Executive Committee, or by 10 members of the voting faculty.

Model Agenda

(adapted from Faculty Senate/University Council)

- I. Approval of Minutes
- II. Secretary's Report
- III. Discussion of Secretary's Report
- IV. Reports of Officers
- V. Discussion of Reports of Officers
- VI. Old Business
- VII. Reports of Standing Committees
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Questions to the Chairman
- X. Adjournment



### 3. Departmental Officers

Chairman - as per H.O.P. 21103, appointed after due faculty consultation for one-year terms by the Dean of Liberal Arts; review before completion of fourth year as per H.O.P. -

Associate Chairman - appointed annually by Chairman to assist in administrative duties of the department; coordinates all course assignments for faculty

Chair, Graduate Studies Committee - selected by the graduate faculty

Graduate Advisor - appointed by Graduate Dean on recommendation of graduate faculty of department

Undergraduate Advisor: appointed by Chairman

Director, Freshman English - appointed by Chairman with the approval of the Dean of Liberal Arts

Director, Sophomore English - appointed by Chairman

Director, English for Foreign Students - appointed by Chairman

\*Ombudsman - appointed by Chairman or elected by voting members of the department

\*Elections Officer/Parliamentarian - appointed by Chairman from list of candidates submitted by Governance Committee (by EC?)

\* proposed officers

\*\* All appointments made by Chairman are made with the advice of the EC

### 4. Standing Committees

Policy Statement (e.g., Much of the Department's business is delegated to its standing committees. All members of the Department are expected to serve on such committees as a regular part of their duties as faculty. Every effort will be made to minimize the service required of faculty in their first year of teaching at UT, those in their sixth year of service, and those in their final year before retirement. Where possible, TLC points will be allocated to those who perform particularly onerous committee tasks.)

Departmental Officers

Executive Committee - simpler voting method?

Freshman English Policy Committee - broad-based to represent various departmental interests

Coordination and Planning Committee - Functions: (a) Recruitment; (b) Long-range planning; (c) Recommend to Chairman faculty for appointment as departmental officers and members of standing committees; (d) Coordination of TLC's; (e) Provide for exchange of ideas and information among departmental officers, standing and ad hoc committees, and Chairman; (f) Items of business that arise from time to time that remain outside the purview of the EC; (g) "Quality of Life." Membership: (a) Chaired by departmental Chairman (without vote); (b) ex officio with vote: Director of Freshman English, Undergraduate Advisor, Chairman of Graduate Studies Committee; (c) elected by rank: two full Professors, two Associate Professors, two Assistant Professors.

Governance Committee - to serve as means of continuing departmental self-analysis

TA Committee - relationship to EC?

Undergraduate Course Committee - relationship to department?