

DOCUMENTS AND MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY
AND
DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of March 21, 1994, published below, have been prepared for the immediate use of the members of the University Council and are included in its Documents and Proceedings. They are also included in the Documents and Minutes of the General Faculty for the information of the members.


H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The General Faculty

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
MARCH 21, 1994

The seventh regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1993-1994 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, March 21, 1994, at 2:15 p.m. President Robert M. Berdahl presided.

ATTENDANCE.

Present: Patricia A. Alvey, Robert M. Berdahl, Harold W. Billings, Robert H. Bishop, Daniel A. Bonevac, Robert E. Boyer, Eric R. Bradley, Oscar G. Brockett, Mia E. Carter, Alan K. Cline, John R. Cogdell, William L. Cook, Eli P. Cox III, Donald G. Davis, Jr., Kenneth R. Diller, John R. Durbin, Sheldon Ekland-Olson, Helen L. Erickson, Gerhard J. Fonken, Alan W. Friedman, G. Karl Galinsky, Stephen T. Gerald, Mark P. Gergen, Cynthia B. Goldberger, George K. Herbert, Martha F. Hilley, Sharon H. Justice, H. Paul Kelley, Karrol A. Kitt, William S. Livingston, Guy J. Manaster, Susan E. Marshall, Robert G. May, Patrick L. Parker, Brenda I. Preyer, Ann M. Reynolds, Peter J. Riley, Gretchen Ritter, John J. Ruskiewicz, Dolores Sands, Edwin R. Sharpe, Jr., Brooke E. Sheldon, Tara A. Smith, Waneen W. Spirduso, Sharon L. Strover, William O.S. Sutherland, Michael P. Thomas, Jr., James W. Vick, Ellen A. Wartella, Barbara W. White, Jon S. Whitmore, Richard A. Willis, Herbert H. Woodson, Julie G. Zelman.

Absent: Shirley F. Binder (excused), Patrick L. Brockett, Ned H. Burns (excused), Susan W. Clagett (excused), Randy L. Diehl (excused), John D. Dollard, James T. Doluisio (excused), Michael D. Engelhardt, Elizabeth W. Fernea, G. Charles Franklin, Paul D. Gottlieb (excused), Barbara J. Harlow, Thomas M. Hatfield, Joseph M. Horn (excused), Judith A. Jellison (excused), Manuel J. Justiz, Irene Kacandes (excused), Joseph E. Kruppa, J. Parker Lamb (excused), John D. Martin, M. Ray Mercer (excused), Deborah K. Morrison (excused), Karen Netzer, Alba A. Ortiz (excused), Loren Pogir, Karen L. Rascati (excused), Gayle E. Rosenstein, Max R. Sherman, Joel F. Sherzer (excused), Lawrence W. Speck (excused), William G. Spelman, Delbert D. Thiessen, Patricia A. Wilson, Robert E. Witt (excused), Kristin L. Wood, Mark G. Yudof.

Total members present: 54

Total members absent: 36

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

**A. Minutes of the Meeting of February 21, 1994 (D&M 20558-20563/D&P 14939-14944).
(APPROVED AS CORRECTED)**

Secretary Kelley indicated that several corrections would be made in the record of attendance at the University Council meeting on February 21, 1994 (D&M 20558-20563/D&P 14939-14944) —both Loren Pogir and Julie B. Zelman were present, and the absence of Susan W. Claggett was excused.

The Minutes of the meeting were then APPROVED as corrected.

II. SECRETARY'S REPORT (D&P 14930-14938).

The Secretary's written report (D&P 14930-14938) had been distributed in advance.

III. DISCUSSION OF SECRETARY'S REPORT — None.

IV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

A. Questions Concerning the Status of Legislation Under Review by the President.

Alan K. Cline (Computer Sciences), Chair of the Faculty Senate, asked about the status of eight pieces of legislation that were listed in the Secretary's Report of March 21, 1994 (D&P 14930-14938) as being under review by the Office of the President.

President Berdahl said that, in general, he considered himself responsible for reporting on legislation on which University Council and/or General Faculty action has been taken since he became president on January 25, 1993; he would interpret lack of action by his predecessors as being equivalent to disapproval of the legislation by "pocket veto." However, he said that he will probably approve old legislation that is "relatively routine," such as catalog changes or requirements affecting individual colleges; but old legislation that calls for a decision about policy should be updated and presented to the University Council as new legislation because "I did not hear any of the discussion of the pros and cons of [the] previous [legislation]." The eight items about which Mr. Cline specifically asked were:

1. D&P 12747-12748, *Proposed Change to the UT Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures Concerning Reports of Actions by the President on University Council Legislation*, approved by University Council on March 19, 1990. President Berdahl said he did not know what that legislation was; therefore its status remains uncertain.

2. D&P 13839-13840, *Proposed Changes to the Degree Section in the College of Business Administration Part of the UT Austin Catalog, 1991-1992*, approved by University Council on December 12, 1991. President Berdahl indicated that this legislation probably could be approved. [SECRETARY'S NOTE: This legislation was subsequently not approved by President, with request the legislation be editorially revised and resubmitted. The revised legislation, on D&P 14977-14978, was approved by President on 5-3-94.]

3. D&P 14501-14502, *Creation of a "University 101" Pilot Program*, approved by University Council on February 1, 1993. President Berdahl said, "I will approve that." [SECRETARY'S NOTE: This legislation was subsequently approved by President on March 25, 1994.]

4. D&M 19815a/D&P 14292a, *Educational Policy Committee Recommendations Concerning the Revision of Definitions and Recommendations on Multiculturalism in the Curriculum as Amended and Approved by the University Council on October 21, 1991, and as Clarified Editorially on December 6, 1991, D&M 19506-19591*, amended and approved by University Council on May 11, 1992. President Berdahl said, "I choose not to touch that one," thus indicating that he will consider it to have been "pocket vetoed" by the former presidents.

5. D&P 14505-14507, *Educational Policy Committee Recommendation Concerning Freshman Pass/Fail Courses*, approved by University Council on May 11, 1992. President Berdahl said: "That one I am approving." [SECRETARY'S NOTE: This legislation was subsequently approved by President on March 25, 1994.]

6. D&P 14566-14576, *Recommendation that UT Austin Consider Recognizing American Sign Language as a Foreign Language*, approved by University Council on April 19, 1993. President Berdahl said: "That one I am not approving.... The reason ... is that these courses are already heavily oversubscribed. I think it would create a misimpression, if not an enormous demand that could not be met for additional enrollment in those classes."

7. D&P 14847-14848, *Changes in Requirements for Pass/Fail Courses in The Undergraduate Catalog, 1992-1994, and the General Information, 1993-1994, Catalog of The University of Texas at Austin*, approved by University Council on January 25, 1994. President Berdahl said: "... I have not yet had a chance to review that one." [SECRETARY'S NOTE: This legislation was subsequently approved by President on March 23, 1994.]

8. D&P 14859-14860, *Changes in the Composition of the Recruitment and Retention Committee*, approved by University Council on January 31, 1994. President Berdahl said: "[I have not yet had a chance to review that one, either.] I will report to [you about] those [last two items] next month if you want to ask [about them again]." [SECRETARY'S NOTE: This legislation was subsequently approved by President on March 23, 1994.]

There were two additional pieces of legislation that had been approved by the University Council before January 21, 1993, to which President Berdahl's general response seemed to apply:

9. D&P 13608-13621, *Incentive Allocation of an Amount of Money Equal to a Percentage of Indirect Costs of Research*, approved by University Council on September 23, 1991. Because this legislation called for the adoption of a new policy, presumably President Berdahl will consider it to have been "pocket vetoed" by the previous presidents.

10. D&P 14171-14172, *Proposed Change to the Official Calendar of The University of Texas at Austin*, amended and approved by University Council on April 20, 1992. This legislation appears to have been approved by some president, because its provisions have been incorporated in the 1993-1994 Official Calendar.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS — None.

VI. PETITIONS — None.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

A. Report of the University Council Committee to Examine the Undergraduate Writing Program (D&P 14877-14888). (APPROVED)

20715
15030

Wallace T. Fowler (Aerospace Engineering), Chair, had introduced the Committee's report (D&P 14877-14888) at the Council's meeting on March 21, 1994. He briefly reviewed the thirteen recommendations made by the Committee; these were:

1. Strongly encourage more writing in all courses taught at UT Austin, "with the proviso that we do not encourage writing in piano courses and things like this."
2. Fully implement the Undergraduate Writing Center (UWC) as rapidly as is consistent with available resources and good academic program design.
3. Train faculty to use writing to increase student learning.
4. Train graduate students to assist faculty in evaluating writing.
5. Appoint a University of Texas at Austin Writing Committee to oversee campus-wide efforts to improve students' writing abilities.
6. Ask each college and school to establish a Writing Committee to define writing standards and monitor the quality of writing instruction within that college.
7. Develop a process to identify and recognize faculty who are especially effective in teaching writing.
8. Develop a process to identify and recognize adjunct faculty and graduate students who are specially effective in teaching writing.
9. Modify the course evaluations so that they address the writing instruction within specific courses.
10. Encourage programs within colleges (Teaching Days, etc.) that focus on the teaching of writing within specific disciplines.
11. Develop and maintain a library of materials concerning the teaching of writing at the university level.
12. Offer adjunct courses in writing taught by AIs from the various disciplines, who would be trained by the Division of Rhetoric and Composition.
13. Long term recommendation: UT Austin should consider sweeping modification and strengthening of the writing requirement.

President Berdahl noted that this set of recommendations came from the Committee and constituted a motion for approval by the University Council. Mr. Fowler suggested that the debate revolve around the issue of approving the recommendations in spirit, and then an implementation committee might look at the details of it.

John R. Durbin (Mathematics) said: "It is ... beyond me why we do not have professionals teach writing.... This has a proposal ... about training graduate students and training faculty to teach writing. I try to care about writing, and I have [taught] substantial writing component courses..., [but] I do not think I am ever going to know much about ... how to help the students improve their writing. In my ... department, we have enough problems already trying to deal with how to work computers into the curriculum, and there is a national mathematics education reform movement we have to try to work with. I really believe, as a

practical matter, that our faculty is not going to change much. We have many people who care, ... but I do not think they are ever going to know as much about teaching writing as people who have been trained in it; my guess is that is true around the campus as a whole. I assume the reason that we do not have the Division of Rhetoric and Composition teaching more writing courses is ... resources, but if you try to carry out all the things in this proposal, that is going to cost money, too.... If the University really believes that teaching undergraduates how to write is that important, it seems to me that we should find the money and let people who really know how to do it, do it...."

G. Karl Galinsky (Classics) added: "When you look at the report on D&P 14881 it is all good and well to use as a standard of reference Michigan and Cornell.... [However,] not only are they different in terms of the various particulars of the writing program that are listed very fastidiously ... on that page, the basic difference really is this — their [student/faculty] ratio is ... a lot lower, and their tuition is ... a lot higher; this is really what it boils down to. So I do commend this report on its general practicality, and it is really not asking for 'pie in the sky,' but when it comes to really implementing this, we all realize [that teaching writing] is very labor intensive [and that] it cannot be improved by a few general recommendations along these lines. I think the spirit is all good and fine, but when it really comes to implementing it, I think there are some very hard questions that have to be asked, and that were asked by [Mr. Durbin]."

Cynthia B. Goldberger (Cabinet of the Colleges Councils) said: "As a student I am ... disappointed that the comments are [so] negative.... Most of the students I spoke with feel that they are definitely not getting enough writing in this University.... I realize that it is a very labor intensive recommendation, but ... I think more could be done.... Some changes have to take place, [even] if it is only offering more courses and giving more feedback to the students. Something needs to change, and I feel that just [approving] the spirit of [these recommendations] would not be enough.... I think the University Council really needs to take the time to see what ... we can implement within the next year. I think too many students are leaving this University without the skills that they need to write.... I have friends that are in the College of Business [who] say that they do not need to know how to write because they are dealing with business. That is just not [true]; no matter what you are going to go into, once you leave this University you are going to need [writing] skills, and I feel that too many students in certain parts of this [university] are just not getting this."

Robert G. May (Accounting) responded: "I have been in business education for more than 20 years and during that time have been an administrator for 12 years. In my discipline, which is Accounting, we are very, very close to the employer community, and we get feedback regularly on both a formal and informal basis. Some of the major employers actually rate their new employees and feed back the formal processes that they go through for five years after graduation.... On the occasions when we [asked] those employers what ... [they found] most deficient in our students, communication ability, both written and oral, [were] number one, two, or three in every single year of the 24 years that I have been among groups asking those questions. That has not changed, in spite of the efforts that we have made over the years with substantial writing component courses.... With due respect to my colleagues, Professor Galinsky and Professor Durbin, what I think may be wrong with our entire education program when it comes to issues like writing, leadership, teamwork, and other things that people on the outside expect of educated individuals ... is that [those issues] do not fall into discipline boundaries. I view myself as an accounting educator, researcher, and specialist; I do not view myself as a writing specialist. That is what Professor Durbin expressed about himself, and the problem is we all end up specializing in a particular knowledge base to a tremendous degree; we compose our degree programs of some 40 to 50 samplings of those knowledge bases, so we do a good job of creating knowledgeable students. But we may be failing in creating capable students, and the outside world wants capable as well as knowledgeable people. And somehow, whether this agenda is too ambitious, or too costly, or implies too much involvement by us as educators in things that we do not feel expert in, we ought to still look at whether or not we are succeeding in creating the kinds of individuals who can be successful in society."

20717
15032

Alan K. Cline (Computer Sciences) said: "I do not share the attitude of [Professor] Durbin, and I do share that of [Professor] May; I ... believe that the responsibility for the [teaching] of writing goes beyond those that are ... the professionals in that. But I do have a question about this proposal; I am not quite sure what is supposed to be different after [it is] passed.... I think there is a problem, but ... [will approving] these items change things, and if so, how? That is not just a rhetorical question; [I would like for] Professor Fowler to respond to that. How, specifically, do you think things will change after passing this resolution?"

Mr. Fowler replied: "The committee [met], and we started looking at writing. The [members] of the committee [were] Floyd Brandt (Management), Rick Cherwitz (Speech Communication), Melissa Collie (Government), Don Davis (Library and Information Science), Lester Faigley (English, and the Director of the Division of Rhetoric and Composition), myself, Miguel Gonzalez-Gerth (Spanish and Portuguese), Deborah Morrison (Advertising), and Mike Starbird (Mathematics). We reported back at our second meeting that [as a result of our] just talking about the problems with writing all of us were changing our courses.... If you create a large awareness on the campus you are going to change the way faculty approach writing, and we as a committee of nine are a testimony to that....

"Also, if we set up ways to train faculty and graduate students to assist faculty in the evaluation of writing I think we will ... facilitate the better teaching of writing. If we modify the course evaluations so that they address writing instruction we will make people ... more aware that writing is important. The two recommendations that recognize faculty and recognize adjunct faculty and graduate students who are especially effective in teaching of writing will in the long term give us ... a little more emphasis on writing across campus.

"But I think that the three things ... that are most important are the appointing of the committees in the colleges, [the] university-wide committee, [and] an on-going committee to look at writing ... [and to update] the Council every year on the status of writing across campus. This will keep an awareness of the fact that writing is not a problem that will go away.... [Another thing this does is] strongly encourage writing in all courses taught at UT Austin. You do not learn your mathematics in two courses, then not use it for five, six, or seven semesters, then go back and pick ... it up and use it again very easily. You need to write every semester in almost every course...."

Mr. Durbin said: "It is not that I think that these recommendations are flawed; I just do not think they are really going to do the job. In teaching some of our most important courses ... one of the things we have to deal with is trying to teach students to write [mathematical] proofs. We spend a lot of time ... trying to figure out how to improve this process..., but I think there is more to writing than that. To write proofs carefully ... they have to write [sentences correctly] and they have to be logical, ... which is something that just is not a habit for many students. It is not that we ignore [writing] and not that we do not care about it.... I just think that if we really care about it, we have to do more than what is in this proposal, and if we do not then we are kidding ourselves."

Alan W. Friedman (English) said: "... We have been talking about this for over 15 years, ... [ever since] the Basic Education Requirements Committee ... first produced the substantial writing components courses.... The basic problems ... in this area remain, and for all the good work that I think [this Fowler committee] report does ... some of the problems ... are not really sufficiently addressed, it seems to me. Let me, ... just briefly enumerate the several areas of concern that I think doom [this] report to be far less successful than we would [like it to] be. One of the things [the Basic Education Requirements Committee] talked about was the need for a standing University-wide committee; ... that is one of [this report's] recommendations, and I am very pleased about that. [The earlier committee] also indicated that what was needed were small classes;... I was very disappointed ... that [this committee is] suggesting that it is okay to give 20% of the students feedback on a set of essays—you have got to do it 100% of the time; the only way [that I know of] to teach students how to write ... is to make them write, critique it, then make them rewrite, then talk about it, and make them rewrite again.... The [earlier committee said] that significant, substantial, new resources are needed to make writing a major priority of the institution, and that was never done; [this

committee talks] a lot about that in [its] report, but ... [has the committee] actually looked at that?... [Finally], I think [one] very substantial way to improve the situation with regard to writing on campus is to think about writing component courses as [being just] as labor intensive [as] graduate courses; they require certain skills, certain commitments, certain research, and certain activities over and above what most courses require, and therefore they should count ... 4.5 in the [Teaching Load Credit] scale in the same way that [the graduate courses do]. I wonder if [the Fowler committee] thought about some of those [areas of concern]?

Mr. Fowler replied: "We thought about the resource issue, and we put most of our resource-intensive ... recommendations into Recommendation 2, which dealt with the Writing Center; we realized that there were a lot of new resources going into that, and we have great hopes [that] it is going to bear some good fruit... On the other issues, I think that we looked at [and discussed] most of the issues you talked about, and I think our conclusions are about the same as yours were."

Mr. Galinsky commented: "The real concern that we have is that it is fantastically easy to vote for this report; I think most of us intend to do so, and nothing is going to change, really. I think it is a very good attempt at [consciousness-raising] on this particular issue [that is badly needed]. There are several of us who would like to go further.... I think the committee is very much aware of what ... the central issues are.... They offer some kind of alleviation of the problem here, which certainly is welcome, but it really does not go to the core of it, [which] you find in a sort of parenthetical comment on D&P 14885 at the very end of the recommendations. In the first section of Recommendation 8 they say [that] to make really significant changes a great deal more needs to be done, and they single out specifically lowering the students-to-faculty ratio in all classes to facilitate more careful interaction.... This is really [what is required], and there is just no way around it.... It is very good to talk about certain things that can be done given the current constraints, but some of us would like to emphasize is that these constraints are severe and there is only this much that we can do realistically while they exist."

Eric R. Bradley (Students' Association) said: "... I do agree that writing does go beyond any specialized discipline, but as a student I would not want a calculus teacher trying to teach me how to write. I think the awareness issue is important, but ... I would like to know ... what is going to be done beyond [addressing] that awareness issue.... I know resources are going to be a large part of it, but if learning to write and communicate well ... is that important I think we really need to look into the recommendations [for] allocating more resources, lowering the [students-to-faculty] ratios, recognizing the [excellent] AIs, and that kind of thing...."

President Berdahl asked if Mr. Bradley's call for more resources meant that he would support an increase in student tuition. Mr. Bradley replied that he would support a tuition increase that would be used for writing-intensive courses.

Donald G. Davis, Jr. (Library and Information Science) spoke as a member of the Fowler committee: "I think the issue which we are addressing here is the role of the communication skills which our graduates have when they leave [here].... Why not look at how we can work in small ways to improve the writing abilities? This is not a high-dollar program, as I think some have suggested. There are very few classes at this University which would not be able to implement additional forms of writing if the instructor was innovative about it. A graduate program in which I serve has majors [who come] from all over the University...; it is very distressing to find entering graduate students who have never written anything more than a paragraph, it appears, and they have graduated from this institution.... I think writing has to be looked at in the total context of the communication skills which we want our students to have.... This is one step in the direction, and I would urge you to approve it in spirit and then start thinking about implementing it as we are able."

Mr. May commented on why the substantial writing component courses had not been "as effective as we would have hoped. I think the reason was because it was a top down implementation process; that is, a committee recommended to the University, the University approved a set of recommendations, then

20719
15034

these were handed to the colleges and the departments, and the departments were told you shall have certain things with no new resources ...; in fact, the philosophy was, 'We can show you how to do this without investing anything in it.' ... I would get this down to the departmental level of responsibility, where the delivery system exists on campus and [where] the faculty have to recognize ... the importance of their efforts to preserving the entire University enterprise. And I would simply say, by way of admonition, to remember that, in my opinion, the biggest threat to the research enterprise is the failure to properly address the educational enterprise, because the public gets the impression when the educational enterprise is not working well that it must be because we are devoting all our time and attention to something else, namely research. So, all the faculty have an interest in the success of the educational enterprise, and the University has a very vital interest in that, and I am not sure that that philosophy is driving the decisions being made for the curriculum delivery system down at the departmental level."

President Berdahl commented: "I think some of what has just been said is very important for us. It is clear that we are not going to have the resources of a small liberal arts college to have all students taught in classes of 20 or 25, not without enormously larger tuition and state support than we currently have. But, if this is to become a priority of the University, it really has to be a priority of the faculty. It is possible, it seems to me, for ... every class [with fewer than] 50 [students to] have some writing component; I do not think that is too demanding of an instructor. It does not have to be a long writing assignment; it can be a writing assignment that is read, criticized, and responded to. All of us have taught and know the difficulty of teaching writing, but also all of us have learned to write in some fashion, and we have learned to write by writing more than by any other single activity; [we have also learned] to criticize our own work and to criticize the work of peers. I think there are ways in which, if we really set this as a priority, the review of writing can be carried out in a lot more courses.

"I have not taught here, and I do not know all of what you are up against; but I have taught at other institutions, and I know that there are a lot of classes where there are 50 or so students where there still is very little writing required. I just simply think if this is going to be a priority for us, it really has to be a priority at the faculty level, at the department level; it is not something we can pass a motion here on and expect to have anything change unless the faculty and the departments decide that this is something that is very important.... I do not think we will have resources to apply to this problem in large measure. I think that the money is not there, and I would argue as well that if we had several million dollars there are very few people in this room that would come to me and say, 'Let us hire writing instructors'; that would not be the priority that most of the faculty would have. We might add more faculty, but we would not necessarily change the relationship of writing in a whole lot of courses unless that commitment was there from the beginning."

James T. Yick (Vice President for Student Affairs) said: "I would separate ... the issue ... into courses that teach writing and courses in which students write and have feedback on their writing. I have taught substantial writing [component] courses, but I have never felt that I was even attempting to teach students how to write; I was giving them some feedback on the content and, in some cases, the structure of their writing.

"If you go back to 1979, at the time that this recommendation was originally made, most students who came into the University faced English 306 and English 307 as requirements ..., [and] many of them [placed] out of English 306. We no longer teach English 307, so now students either take or place out of English 306. So, one of my concerns ... is the fact that students coming to the University do not really get that first experience in being taught how to write, and I speak from very personal experience. My son did not come here to college; had he come here he would have placed out of English 306 with an A. He went to another college; he did not place out [of the English composition course], he made a B, and he needed [the course]. I worry that sometimes we are placing students out of English 306 and thereby not giving them the experience of a semester of intensive instruction in writing when they really need that.

"I think the other side of the coin is that more courses need to include writing [and giving] students feedback [on their writing], and we, as faculty members, I think, [too often] have shirked our duty in the way that we teach our courses. We tend to give more short-answer or multiple-choice, objective quizzes, perhaps not even a final exam; we do not give students the opportunity to write, and when they do we do not give them very much feedback. I am [as] guilty of that as anybody else, maybe a little less so I would like to think, but I think that that is serious concern that we, as faculty, need to step up to the line and address.

"I hate to think of it in terms of what kind of reward system do we have to put in place in order for faculty to do this, because in some sense it ought to be conscience that tells us that that is what we need to be doing. I agree ... that these courses demand a lot more time and therefore should, in fact, be given more weight in the teaching load credits. I do not know what the cost of that would be, it might be negligible; but it might be a way that we could, in fact, make it attractive to some people. But, I really believe that it would be nice if all of us [listened more to our consciences] and looked [less] for the benefits that we might find from it.

"I do like the ideas in the report; I am worried that we will not [take] the next step that will make it really effective."

Mark P. Gergen (Law) said: "We say much and we really accomplish very little, because we are never willing to ask more of ourselves, as a faculty. We always ask for people to give more to us—more money, more resources, a [smaller] student body. Frankly, there is something we could do from top down to increase the amount of teaching of writing to our undergraduates even at the graduate and professional level, and that is to change the teaching load requirements so you only get your current [teaching load] credit for a class [with fewer than] 50 or 75 [students] if there is a substantial writing part in your course; if [there is] not, we will give you less credit, and you can teach more courses. That would not cost the institution any additional resources; it would cost the faculty some additional labor. If writing is that important to us, we could implement that, but I question whether we, as a faculty, are willing to take on that additional labor to teach our students how to write."

Ms. Goldberger followed up on Vice President Vick's comments: "I think it is very important that we stay aware of the fact that having a class in which you write and having a class in which you write and you get feedback are two very different things. I think a lot of what the students are not getting is feedback on their writing; you write, [and] you get back a paper with a grade on it which does not tell you much—a C on a paper does not tell you what it was about the paper that you did not do successfully enough to get the A. I placed out of English 306. I decided to take it anyway, and it was difficult because I had to go through the process of not just the technical part of the writing, but what was I writing about and how was I going to communicate it in my papers. I think that the English 306 placement test is entirely too easy; too many students are placing out of that class.... If more students [took English 306] their writing would considerably improve. But, ... even ... an essay test on which you are getting feedback on your answers would help students more than just getting a grade."

William O.S. Sutherland (English): "As you know, at one time the English Department was responsible for the teaching of writing, and it was abruptly relieved of that responsibility. I was chair for almost seven years while we were responsible, and I think one of the things that impressed me most was the amount of lip service that was given to the teaching of writing—I do not mean at just at this university, but at others as well. I would like to confirm again ... that people outside judge us by our students, and they judge us [not only] by the way [our students write], though that is what they talk to me about, but they judge us by the way that our students talk as well. I think the ability of our students to express themselves orally is ... in some cases more important than the ability to express themselves in writing.

"[With regard to Mr. Durbin's comments about needing to have professionals teach writing,] I think that is very true, but I think there are things that can be done that will help those who are not professionals teach better. For a couple of summers we conducted seminars for instructors who [wanted] to teach substantial writing component courses, and the testimony of those people was universal that they had learned a lot and that they could carry that over into their classes. I do not think we need to be professional writers in order to understand [such things as] organization. On D&P 14880 there is a very nice list of [thinking abilities that students can exploit in their writing]; if we simply apply some of those things in making our judgments about writing, I think that would be helpful. I do not think we are going to change remarkably over a short period of time, but universities never do change remarkably over a short period of time.... I do not think we are going to have many resources, and ... I do not think the faculty would voluntarily put the resources that way. ... But I think the one way we could get everybody interested would be to require good teaching of writing for promotion or for salary increases; then the University would show tremendous interest in it....

"I am going to vote for this. I do not think it is going to change us all...; it is extra work that you do not get recognized for, and I think we simply have to understand that. But I think it is a matter of raising our conscience rather than our consciousness."

President Berdahl suggested that voting on the motion to approve the recommendations be done by groups of recommendations. He said: "My concern is if we just pass this as a whole we will have salvaged our conscience and gone home and done very little.... I hope that more comes of this, because I think the Committee has done very good work and put in a good deal time and effort and thought in bringing this forward." Mr. Fowler, on behalf of the Committee, requested that the President's suggestion be followed.

Without further discussion, in a series of voice votes the Council then APPROVED each of the following sets of recommendations:

1. Recommendations 1, 2, 10, and 11, to encourage and facilitate more writing.
2. Recommendations 3, 4, and 12, to train writing instructors.
3. Recommendations 5, 6, 7, and 8, to establish committees and to recognize good writing instructors.
4. Recommendation 9, to modify the current Course-Instructor Surveys so that they address writing instruction in specific courses.
5. Recommendation 13, to consider a sweeping modification and strengthening of the writing requirement, perhaps to be overseen by the University Writing Committee. After the voting was completed, Julie G. Zelman (Students' Association) asked: "What happens now? How does it get implemented?" President Berdahl replied that "this will be [given to the Executive Vice President and Provost] to carry out the mandates that are suggested here."

VIII. REPORTS — None.

IX. NEW BUSINESS.

A. Schedule for Meetings of the University Council in 1994-1995 (D&P 14907). (APPROVED)

Without discussion, the Schedule of Meetings for the University Council in 1994-1995 (D&P 14907) was APPROVED by voice vote.

20722
15037

X. REMAINING QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT—None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. The next regular meeting of the University Council is scheduled for Main Building, Room 212, on April 18, 1994, at 2:15 p.m.