



DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

PAR 108 · Austin, Texas 78712-1164

MEMORANDUM

To: Bill Sutherland

From: John Ruszkiewicz J.R.

Date: October 1, 1985

Re: AI Consultants

As you are aware, I had no objections to the previous policy of allowing AGSE to elect representatives to the FEPC. In my six years of direct experience with the committee, I found that AGSE made uniformly excellent selections, choosing people who were knowledgeable, interested in the freshman program, and aware of graduate student interests and concerns. I hope the new procedure works equally well.

I do have three concerns:

1. I don't think that a graduate student without the gumption to apply for a position as AI consultant should be eligible for an appointment through nomination.
2. I object a bit to the procedure that "will allow an AI for whom there is not room in one course to serve with the committee of another." While I think it is desirable for an AI to gain experience in a variety of courses, I don't believe that faculty should place students on a course committee other than the one for which they have applied.
3. More seriously, I don't understand why a representative of the graduate office should have a voice in the selection of consultants to course committees. It would seem to me sufficient that the AI applicants "satisfy the requirements of the Office of Graduate Studies." The final recommendation should be made to the chair by the representatives of the freshman and sophomore offices working in consultation with the graduate representative and AGSE. Allowing a graduate representative to select consultants to course committees invasively extends the authority of the graduate office to matters of undergraduate curriculum.

Despite these concerns, I am pleased that the department is finding a way to use the expertise and experience of our Assistant Instructors in its lower-division programs.