

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 511

TE 500 564

A Proposal for the Establishment of an English Ph.D. Program Beginning 1970-71 at the University of Idaho (Moscow),

Association of Departments of English, New York, N.Y.

Pub Date 69

Note - 26p.

EDRS Price MF -\$0.25 HC -\$1.40

Descriptors - *Degree Requirements, *Doctoral Programs, English, *English Programs, Graduate Study, Higher Education, *Library Surveys, Masters Degrees, Program Content, Program Costs, Program Planning, *Program Proposals

Identifiers - University of Idaho

For a 1969 report on graduate programs in English, the Association of Departments of English obtained information from chairmen or directors of graduate studies in English at 223 institutions. This document contains some of the information collected for the full report (available through ERIC as "Graduate Programs in English: A 1969 Report" by Bonnie E. Nelson). The not yet accepted proposal for a doctoral program at the University of Idaho contains five chapters: (1) Improvement of Library Resources, (2) Improvement of Faculty Resources, (3) The English Ph.D. Program in American Literature and English Renaissance Literature, (4) Improvement of Graduate Course Offerings, and (5) Improvement of the Existing M.A. Program. Attachments and appendixes include a 1960-1964 survey of Ph.D. English departments, a survey of library holdings, and suggested budget allocations. (BN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

A PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN
ENGLISH PH.D. PROGRAM BEGINNING 1970-1971
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, MOSCOW

1969

ED031511

TE 500 564

FOREWORD

The information in this document was collected by The Association of Departments of English for a report on graduate programs in English. For the full report which is available through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), see Graduate Programs in English and American Literature: A 1969 Report by Bonnie E. Nelson. Other companion reports, containing some of the information on which the full report is based, are also available through ERIC. See:

- (1) A Proposal for the Establishment of an English Ph.D. Program Beginning 1970-1971 at the University of Idaho, Moscow.
- (2) Descriptions of Graduate Programs in English at the University of Miami, Oxford, and the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.
- (3) Descriptions of Graduate Programs in English at Teachers College (Columbia), Duke University, and Princeton University.
- (4) Description of the Graduate Program in English at the University of Iowa.
- (5) Descriptions of Recently Revised Graduate Programs in English at Indiana University (Bloomington), New York University, and the University of South Carolina.
- (6) Future Ph.D. Programs in English at Boston College and Memphis State University.
- (7) Graduate Programs in English at Marquette University, and the University of Michigan--Bulletins for Graduate Students.
- (8) A Handbook for Graduate Students at the University of British Columbia.
- (9) Descriptions of Graduate Programs in English at the University of Wisconsin (Madison), and the University of Cincinnati.
- (10) Descriptions of Graduate Programs in English at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and the University of Illinois, Urbana.
- (11) Descriptions of Graduate Programs in English at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Illinois State University, and DePauw University.
- (12) Descriptions of Graduate Programs in English at the Pennsylvania State University and the University of Tennessee.
- (13) Descriptions of Graduate Programs in English at Texas Technological College and the University of Oregon, Eugene.

CONTENTS

I.	Improvement of Library Resources	2
II.	Improvement of Faculty Resources	3
III.	The English Ph.D. Program in American Literature and English Renaissance Literature	5
IV.	Improvement of Graduate Course Offerings	7
V.	Improvement of the Existing M.A. Program	8
Attachment I	1960-1964 Survey of Ph.d. English Departments	9
Attachment II	Survey of Humanities Holdings	11
Appendix I	Suggested Allocations	18
Appendix II	Total Volumes: WSU vs IDU	19
Appendix III	Total Humanities Holdings, July 1967	20

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, MOSCOW

4 December 1967

A PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ENGLISH PH. D. PROGRAM BEGINNING 1970-1971*

It is hereby proposed that the Department of English begin a "limited goal" Doctor of Philosophy program in the academic year of 1970-1971. By "limited goal" it is meant that only two major fields, American Literature and English Renaissance Literature, shall be available to qualified candidates who desire specialized studies in these areas. This limitation is imposed as a result of realistic and practical considerations given to library and faculty resources. For only in these two fields existing library and faculty resources may be, with sufficient budgetary support, made adequate and improved by 1970. It is hoped that the limitation will be gradually removed and other fields of concentration be added to the program as both library and faculty resources continue to improve in the years to come. It must be emphasized, however, that unless adequate appropriations for the improvement of both resources in the next two or three years can be assured, the implementation of this "limited goal" Ph.D. program must be postponed.

Of these two resources library holdings and facilities may be increased, enriched, and brought up to date easily, depending as they are on availability of special funding and on wise expenditure of regular allocations. The survey made by Mr. George Kellogg, the Humanities Division Librarian, supports this view. More difficult is the improvement of faculty resources since they depend on such tangible items as competitive scale of compensations and merit increases commensurate with actual achievements as well as on such intangibles as quality of incoming graduate students and of new staff, attractive research opportunities, and atmosphere conducive to scholarly pursuits. The heavy turnover of the English faculty during 1964 and 1965 not only threatened the existing M. A. program but nullified the hope of planning for a Ph.D. program in the future. Since then, because of improvement over the salary picture and of active recruitment, the situation has been remedied to a certain extent. But it is a well-known fact that salary and merit increase are far from being the only considerations of a prospective job-seeker or a member of the existing faculty who, competent to be a part of a Ph. D. program, is a specialist in his field and is sought after by departments every where. To attract and to keep a professorial staff of this category more emphasis must be given to satisfying desires for such intangible, ideal preconditions as mentioned above. As will presently be seen, the tangible and intangible requirements for the improvement of faculty resources are closely intertwined; one cannot be slighted without bringing detriment to the other. The "limited goal" English Ph. D. program will be presented and discussed in the following order:

- I. Improvement of Library Resources
- II. Improvement of Faculty Resources
- III. The English Ph.D. Program in American Literature
and English Renaissance Literature
- IV. Improvement of Graduate Course Offerings
- V. Improvement of the Existing M. A. Program

***This proposal has not yet been accepted.**

I. Improvement of Library Resources

The justification of offering an English Ph. D. program in American Literature and English Renaissance Literature is based largely upon a survey of the library's current strength in these two areas. (See Attachment II.) Mr. Kellogg's conclusions are as follows:

- A. "On the basis of these tabulations and measurements, I would estimate that by 1970, provided spending on American literature materials goes on as it has in the past five years (and, hopefully, receives special additional funds), the collection should be ready to engage a limited Ph. D. program of at least minimal adequacy."
- B. "Concerning an estimate of the readiness of the Library's Renaissance holdings to support a Ph. D., I would make the same statement as I did concerning American literature: if spending continues at present levels and especially if ten to fifteen thousand additional dollars can be appropriated, the collection should be ready to engage a limited Ph. D. program of at least minimal adequacy by 1970."
- C. "The Humanities Library has 128,387 volumes in July 1967. As far as I can determine from WSU, which makes no attempt to keep comparable statistics, they own little less than twice as many titles in humanities. They have offered a Ph. D. in American Studies for some years and are now giving an English Ph. D. There is a suggestion here perhaps that Idaho could absorb as much as 700,000 to put its humanities collection in the large university class. . . . I think that the realistic amount for the Humanities Department [the English Department] to work forwards in the next two or three years would be \$25,000."
- D. According to Appendix I, "Suggested Allocations" of this survey, it would require \$95,000 in the years after 1970 to bring the other areas-- Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Literature, Linguistics, etc.--to adequate Ph. D. strength.

Further justification for starting a "limited goal" Ph. D. program may be made from a survey of general library holdings of selected colleges and universities offering English Ph. D. (See Tables A & B, Attachment I.) This survey shows that many English departments offer the Ph. D. degree without, numerically at least, much larger holdings than that of Idaho (241,924 according to March 1967 issue of The Bookmark, a quarterly of the University of Idaho Library). Some of these schools are: Baylor (350,000), Brandeis (275,000), Delaware (375,000), Duquesne (167,000), Mississippi (336,000), Utah (355,000). Among the departments offering Ph. D. since 1960 many more are with less than adequate library holdings: Auburn (360,000), University of California at Davis, Riverside, and Santa Barbara (300,000, 200,000, and 200,000 respectively), Drew (260,000), East Texas State College (175,000), Kansas State (352,000), Kent State (330,000), Massachusetts (295,000), Nevada (192,000), University of Pacific (122,000), and Tufts (340,000). Figures are not available whereby the humanities collections of these schools can be compared with that of Idaho, not only in quantity but also in quality. For, as Mr. Kellogg has shown, the 128,387 in Idaho's Humanities Collection represent half of the entire library holdings. It goes without saying that quality in a collection is more indicative of Ph. D. strength than is quantity. It may be significant to note that schools such as Brandeis and University of Massachusetts frequently rely on a first-rate library in their vicinity, e.g., Harvard's Houghton Library, to remedy

the inadequacy of their own library collections. Idaho has easy access to WSU's larger collection. In any event, the conclusion is that if the Humanities collection in American Literature and English Renaissance Literature can be improved along lines suggested by Mr. Kellog's survey--optimum allocation of \$50,000 and minimum of \$25,000, it is believed that library resources will support, without embarrassment, a Ph. D. program in these two areas by 1970.

II. Improvement of Faculty Resources

Although the number of professorial staff varies from department to department, it is true that departments that have larger number of staff who are better paid and enjoy huge library collections are generally stronger and producing more Ph. D.'s. In the survey of English departments (Table A, Attachment I), some of the departments with less than ten professorial staff are, however, producing exceptionally large numbers of Ph. D.'s--especially those of Bryn Mawr, Catholic University of America, and Johns Hopkins. Compared with departments offering Ph. D. since 1960 (Table B), the number of staff becomes immaterial because it takes at least five to seven years to produce a Ph. D. Improvement of faculty resources not in terms of number but in terms of quality is more crucial and depends exclusively on time.

In number the professorial staff in American Literature and English Renaissance Literature is perhaps adequate at present (in fact, three in each area is seldom found among small departments); in quality, however, it is ambiguous and uncertain. It is ambiguous in that new members require time to grow and incentive to prove their competency and that older ones need competition and review of merits to become more productive in their field of specialty. It is uncertain, in quality and in number, in that some of these will be attracted by a better position probably before 1970 and that recruitment for their replacement may not always succeed. Though in the last years, average salary and compensation have been made competitive, yet recruiting in such urgently needed areas as Restoration & Eighteenth Century and the Romantic Period has not been successful; primarily it was because of low supply of specialists in the market, but possibly it was also because of the department's lack of such a reputation that would attract a specialist. The recommendations that follow aim better to attract, develop, and keep a quality professorial staff that is as indispensable to a Ph. D. Program as adequate library holdings.

- A. Teaching loads: Since research, whether for teaching seminars or for supervising theses, whether for publication or for reading papers at professional meetings, is a vital means by which the quality of a graduate faculty is maintained and improved, it is recommended that teaching load for the professorial staff of the Ph. D. program be not more than nine hours per week and that further allowance be made for 1) assuming administrative or professional duties, 2) unusually numerous committee assignments, and 3) thesis directing. A new recruit may be attracted by these provisos; and existing staff may become more productive. It is further recommended that teaching load of GIA's be gradually made lighter towards the end of their programs to allow more time for preparing for examinations and for writing dissertation.
- B. Recruiting of Quality New Staff: Recruiting should not be the sole responsibility of the chairman. (The current consultation practices are

haphazard and irresponsible; the chairman bears too heavy a burden.) Now that salary schedule has improved, the qualifications of applicants should be vigorously examined so that inferior candidates will not be considered on a salary that a competent prospect alone deserves. To lighten the burden of the chairman it is recommended that a standing committee be formed to screen applicants for professorial positions and to make timely decisions on these applications so that the chairman might have a firmer basis to bargain at regional or national meetings. In the interest of the future of the department, the chairman in principle should not hesitate in calling for emergency meetings of this committee whenever needs arise.

- C. Recruiting of High-Calibre Graduate Students: With the admission method described below (III., B.), the quality of a future Ph. D. candidate is somewhat assured. Also since the Graduate School has tacitly raised the admission GPA from "above 2.5" to "above 2.7 overall or 3.0 for the last two years," the calibre of incoming graduate students should further improve in the future. In the first two years of employing graduate students by the department to teach composition, qualified applicants were fewer than vacancies to be filled. As a result, GIA's were not infrequently admitted on a provisional basis and still given teaching duties. Although applications during the last two years have doubled and overall quality of students has improved, much remains to be done. If the Graduate School's proposal of removing GIA's from the requirement of a Regent's appointment is approved, the recruiting can perhaps be done more efficiently. Many highly qualified applicants would have been appointed in the past, had the department been able to announce the appointments sooner. It is recommended, furthermore, that along with the application form a request for samples of an applicant's best writings be made so that his ability might be assessed before he is accepted as a GIA. If this is implemented, the need for the diagnostic test after a student's enrollment shall no longer exist. It is obvious that a quality staff can train an ordinary but promising student into a high calibre degree candidate, but it is also true that high calibre incoming students will enhance the graduate program by being a challenge and a stimulation to properly designed courses and seminars.
- D. Faculty Morale: Many tangible as well as intangible factors influence the morale of a quality professorial staff. In addition to teaching loads and quality of new staff and graduate students, the following deserves careful consideration:
1. Salary inequity between old and new staff must be eliminated as soon as feasible. Written assurance might often be helpful.
 2. Merit increases from year to year should be commensurate with a staff's actual accomplishments and performances.
 3. Travel allowance should be liberalized so that encouragement to attend professional meeting will be meaningful. It must be emphasized that the reputation of a department offering Ph. D. is in part built on the recognition and prestige received by its faculty members active in regional and national societies.

4. The Graduate School offers excellent opportunity for supported research that should lead to winning national research grants and fellowships. Faculty interested in research needs little encouragement. In order to provide the right kind of atmosphere in which faculty and graduate students might exchange their research interests and results, or even works in progress, it is recommended that a philological club or society be sponsored by the Department of English. Its main purpose will be to provide a forum to which papers may be submitted to be read and discussed in public. Faculty members should be encouraged to nominate their students' papers, preferably those that were written for a specific course or seminar. Indirectly, this type of public display and exchange is a way of maintaining standards in graduate courses. An editorial board might be charged with the responsibility of selecting papers, of limiting their sizes or nature, and of advising necessary revisions in the interest of oral delivery. It is believed that this practice will be an invaluable experience to submitting papers to professional conferences.

Finally, it is recommended that an estimate of fund allocation to bring about the suggested improvements of faculty resources be either added at the end of this section or made available in a separate memorandum by the chairman.

III. The English Ph. D. Program in American Literature and English Renaissance Literature

- A. The Department of English Offers the Ph. D. degree in the fields of American Literature and English Renaissance Literature. The Ph. D. program aims at developing a candidate's skills of independent investigation and training him to become a scholar whose depth of knowledge and habits of mind will enable him to go beyond what he has learned and to make original contributions to his chosen field. To these ends the following Departmental requirements are outlined in addition to the University's general regulations and procedures for the doctorate. (See the Graduate School Bulletin, hereafter to be cited as GSB, pp. 41-45.)
- B. Admission: For admission to the Ph. D. program in English a student must have completed twenty-four credits of graduate studies as an M. A. candidate in the Department of English and have passed with distinction its M. A. Written Comprehensive Examination. (Admission to the program is not the same as advancement to the candidacy which comes later. See below.) This written examination, which will be called the Ph. D. "qualifying examination" hereafter, is to test the student's literary background and is based upon the M. A. Reading List given to the student upon his admission to the Graduate School. A student who passes the examination without distinction may then be allowed to complete six credits of thesis and receive his M. A. degree. An applicant with an M. A. in English from another institution may be admitted to the Ph. D. program by passing the qualifying examination at the end of his first semester of graduate work at Idaho.
- C. Course and Credit Requirements: In the three academic years of study beyond an acceptable bachelor's degree, a minimum of sixty credits is required, in two parts to complete the Ph. D. degree. (For details on residence requirements, see GSB, p. 44.) The first part, consisting of twenty-four credits of course work, is to be followed by the Ph. D. qualifying examination and the filing

of the "Notice of Intention" (GSB, p. 43), and the second part completes the course work with another thirty credits. Following the second part will be the Preliminary Oral Examination, the completion of which will advance the student to the doctoral candidacy and permit him to write his dissertation. (See Section E below.) For the dissertation a student may register a minimum of six credits, "but should not exceed one half of total work required" (GSB, p. 44). If a student has not had History of English Language and Literary Criticism as part of his undergraduate course work, he will be expected to make them up in addition to the first part of twenty-four credits. Course and credit requirements for the minimum two-year full-time residence beyond the bachelor's degree may be outlined as follows:

Part One (or First Year Program for Students not Holding or Pursuing a Master's Degree, GSB, p. 42)*

Required Courses:	Problems & Methods of Literary Study	3
	Old English	3
	Middle English	3
	(History of English Language	3
	Literary Criticism	3)**
Electives:	3 proseminars	9
	2 upperdivision undergraduate courses	6
		<hr/>
		24

*For students pursuing a master's degree: Introduction to Linguistics in lieu of Old English and Middle English and the two upper division undergraduate courses may be the deficient History of English Language and Literary Criticism.

**If a student is deficient in both these courses, the first part total for him will be thirty credits.

Ph. D. Qualifying Examination

Part Two (For Ph. D. Candidate Only)

Required Courses:	Introduction to Linguistics	3
Electives:	4 seminars in major writers	12
	2 genre seminars	6
	3 courses in a minor or supporting field	9
		<hr/>
		30

Preliminary Oral Examination

Dissertation 6 or more

D. Language Requirements: Normally two foreign languages are required, one of which may be the same one that has satisfied the M. A. requirement. (See M. A. Language Requirement in "The Graduate Program in English," June, 1967.)

A student will be required to take the Princeton "Graduate School Language Test" as proof of his competency in the second language, which must be relevant to his field of concentration. A student also has the choice of offering only one language which may be the same one he has studied beyond the intermediate courses as an undergraduate. To fulfill the requirement of only one language he must not only pass the Princeton test but also be orally examined by a staff from the Foreign Languages Department in order to show that he has more than a reading competency in the one language that is important to his chosen field of study. (By "more than a reading competency" it is meant that the student should be able to pronounce words and scan poetry written in that language.) The language requirement must be met before the semester in which the student will complete his course work.

E. Dissertation: As soon as the student is admitted to the Ph. D. program, a major professor will be nominated to aid him in selecting a dissertation topic and a supervisory committee will be appointed by the Graduate Dean "in accord with nomination procedures of the department and college concerned" (GSB, p. 43). After the completion of his course work, the student will take the preliminary oral examination. It will cover the period of the dissertation, the minor or supporting field, and plans for the dissertation approved by his major professor. Upon completion of this examination, he will be advanced to the candidacy for the Ph. D. degree. Normally, he is expected to complete the dissertation within five years after the advancement to the candidacy. (For details on time limit, see GSB, p. 44.)

F. M. A. Degree for Ph. D. Candidate:

IV. Improvement of Graduate Course Offerings

Although the present graduate courses were designed to meet the needs of a larger student body, they will not be adequate in meeting those of a Ph. D. program. Since the fields of concentration are limited to American literature, and English Renaissance Literature, course offerings in these areas will have to be both more frequent and more varied. It is suggested that the following general principles be adopted:

- A. A new number be given to proseminar in American Literature, e.g.: 226; then (a), (b), (c), and so on may be used to designate a wider variety of topics and special interests.
- B. Similarly, English 225 be given to English Renaissance Literature, e.g.:
 - 225a Sixteenth-Century Literature, or Poetry and Prose
 - 225b Seventeenth-Century Poetry and Prose, or Seventeenth-Century Prose
 - 225c Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama
- C. English 227 shall remain as the number for proseminars in areas other than American Literature and English Renaissance Literature.

In the same manner, seminar offerings may be modified:

- D. English 235 shall be Renaissance seminar in major writers.
- E. English 236 shall be American Literature seminars in major writers.

- F. English 327 shall remain as the number of seminars in major writers of other areas.

The individual nature of proseminars and seminars should be decided by the professorial staff in these two areas respectively by themselves. Catalog changes and additions must be readied to be submitted to the L & S Curriculum Committee by February 15, 1968. Certainly, curriculum changes will be submitted only when the program itself is approved by the Graduate School. It is further recommended that consideration be given to offering a non-credit one-hour seminar on the teaching of composition which should be required of graduate instructional assistants.

V. Improvement of the M. A. Program

As a result of offering the Ph. D. program, some requirements of the existing M. A. program have to be modified. These are mostly departmental requirements and require no catalog changes. Besides the elimination of the diagnostic test, many more proseminars instead of seminars will be taken by an M. A. candidate, whether or not he aspires after the Ph. D. An urgent consideration is to decide whether the newly revised M. A. Reading List will meet the needs of a Ph. D. qualifying examination, whether the newly designed M. A. Written Comprehensive Examination, which will be used as the Ph. D. qualifying, is adequate for that purpose. It is felt that perhaps the sections, some of which have just been combined, may be separated again into larger and more fully covered sections. One difficulty that is immediately apparent is Section II, 1550-1800. If Renaissance is to be an area of concentration in the Ph. D. program, it would seem that it should occupy a section by itself instead of combining with Restoration and the Eighteenth Century. As soon as answers to these questions can be found, work should at once be started on revising both the M. A. Reading List and the entire "Graduate Program in English." Again, except the diagnostic test, the other revisions will depend upon the approval and implementation of the Ph. D. program.

Table A

1960-1964 Survey of Ph. D. English Departments¹

Attachment I

School	Prof. Staff ⁽²⁾	Language	Time Limit ³		1960-1964		1964 Enrollment Full/Part/1st yr.	Library ⁴ (@1000)	Teaching Fellowship
			A/B/C	M.A. Ph.D.					
Alabama	16(10,5)	2(FGL)	3/2/8	49	5	2	11	768	\$1,725-2,325
Arkansas	11(10,1)		3/2/7	179	9	82	19	780	1,000-3,000
Baylor	8(8,5)	2	3/1	27	1	32	14	350	300-2,400
Boston	26(10,6)	3(FGL)	3-4/2/5-8	97	34	61	24	580	1,500-2,200
Brandeis	14(12,9)	2	3/2/8	47	8	50	1	275	1,300-4,200
Brown	23(12,7)	3(FGL)	3/2/5	65	27	52	31	1,277	2,200
Bryn Mawr	8(11,8)	3(FGL)	3/2/5	36	10	17	17	460	1,400-2,100
UC-Berkeley	70(11,9)	3(FGL)	2/2/5	320	50	460	188	2,900	2,570-2,840
"LA	52	"	"	168	29	316	116	1,875	"
Catholic Univ	7(10,6)	2	3/2/5	137	14	51	28	633	900-2,200
Chicago	25(15,5)	2	3/1	207	38	125	114	2,142	2,142-1,800
Cincinnati	10(10,3)	2	3/1/5	10	9	25	19	845	1,000-2,364
Claremont	18(14,0)	2	3/2/5	28	14	24	15	400	2,300
Colorado	29(11,3)	2(FGL)	3/2/4	100	19	52	41	943	2,400-3,000
Connecticut	25(10,9)	2/1 sup	3/2/3	104	6	65	45	400	
Cornell	32(13,6)	2(FG)	3/1 1/2/10	109	28	53	34	2,550	
Delaware	17	2(FGL)	3/1/5	18		6	6	375	1,100-2,600
Denver	12(10,2)	2/1	3/1/5	27	21	42	14	400	1,000-2,000
Duke	15(12,9)	2(FGR)	3/1 1/2/3	130	33	131	28	1,663	3,200
Duquesne	11(8,6)	2(FG)	2 1/2-3/1/8	40	1	20	59	167	1,200-2,000
Emory	14(10,8)	1	3/1	43	7	25	11	765	750-2,935
Florida St	21(10,4)	1(LGR)	2/1/8	20	22	12	21	1,062	2,300-3,250
Florida St	20(10,2)	2(OE/HEL)	2/1/5	60	12	9	55	626	2,000-3,000
Fordham	17(9,9)	2(FGR)	3/2/5	159	39	50	147	468	1,000-2,400
Georgia	20(11,2)	2	3/2/8	26	7	9	30	549	1,250-3,150
Johns Hopkins	8(13,2)	2/1	3/1/6	53	23	34	18	1,321	

¹ Data, unless noted otherwise, are taken from A Guide to Graduate Study, ed. by Jane Graham, 3rd edition, American Council on Education, 1965.

² (Figures) represent average full-time salary in 1966-1967 as reported in June 1967 issue of AAUP Bulletin.

³ Minimum time for completion beyond B.A. Residence
Maximum time for completion: figures larger than 6
may mean number of years from first registration as a
Ph. D. candidate; less than 6, from advancement to
candidacy.

⁴ Figures reflect 1964 holdings in volume recorded in
A Guide to Graduate Study and Burckel's The College
Blue Book, 11th edition, Vol. I, Christian E.
Burckel, 1965.

Table A (Continued)

School	Prof. Staff()	Language	Time Limit		1960-1964		1964 Enrollment		Library (1000)	Teaching Fellowship
			A/B/C		M.A.	Ph.D.	Full/Part/1st yr.			
Kansas	39(10,9)	2(FG)	3/1	54	15	80	65	57	1,100	\$1,900-2,300
Kentucky	16(11,0)	2(OE/HEL)	3/1/8	52	5	57	29	26	1,000	1,800-3,000
Maryland	19(10,3)	2(FG)	3/1/4	59	13	100	103	87	542	2,200
Mississippi	7(9,7)	2/1	3/2/7	65	2	30	11	20	336	500-2,800
Missouri	10(10,4)	2(G/L F/Gk)	3/1/8	97	12	230			1,100	1,600-2,600
Nebraska	27(10,3)	2/1	3/1/8	64	8	94			736	1,600-2,200
New Mexico	18(10,1)	2(FG/FGLGk)	3/1/10	27	10	40	60	42	400	2,300
Oregon	28(11,6)	2(FGR)	3/1/3	60	7	83	65	75	897	1,800-2,600
Rutgers	24(10,8)	2(FGLGk)	3/1	60	6	65	102	43	951	2,375
So. Carolina	18(9,9)	2(FGL)	3/1/8	33	2	41	18	27	567	1,600-2,400
Tennessee	22(10,4)	2(FGR)	3/1/5	57	11	86	27	34	786	1,225-3,220
Utah	18(10,7)	2(FG)	3/1	20	6	4	10	7	355	

Table B

Survey of Ph. D. Program Established Since 1960

APPENDIX I

Arizona(61)	25(10,5)	2(FG/)	3/1/10	47	2	74	25	95	450	1,200-3,200
Arizona St(61)	17(10,5)	2(FGR)	3/1/7	100	-	7	20	4	451	600-3,000
Auburn(63)	18(9,9)	2(FGR)	3/1	30	1	58	14	16	360	
UC-Davis(60)	22(11,9)	3(FGL)	2/2/5	14	1	12	47	16	300	2,570-2,840
-Riverside(62)	18	"	"	10	-	46	3	20	200	"
-S Barbara(64)	16	"	"	24	-	57	5	27	200	"
Drew(62)	5(10,5)	2(FG)	4/3/10	-	-	4	2	2	260	
ETexSC(62)	11(9,6)	2(FG)	3/1/5	21	-	18	4	17	175	1,800
Kansas St(61)	27(10,0)	1	1	17	-	12	33	21	352	2,090-2,760
Kent St(61)	15(9,7)	2(FG)	3/1/7	51	-	32	36	40	330	2,000
Massachusetts(62)	29(11,0)	2/1	3/1/9-	14	-	90	29	40	295	1,500-3,000
Nevada(63)	11(9,8)	2(FG/)	3/1/7	9	-	23	8	5	192	2,300
Pacific(60)	6(8,6)	2(FGR)	3/1/3	7	1	4	10	7	122	1,500-2,000
Purdue(64)	20(11,5)	2(OK/FGR)	3/1/5	-	-	1	10	7	675	1,250-5,000
So. Illinois(61)	22(10,3)	2	3/1/reason.	64	-	82	14	48	765	1,800-2,160
Tufts(62)	12(10,9)	2	3/1/7	15	-	14	4	9	340	2,160
WSU Am Stud(61)	16(11,2)	2/1	3/2/3			10/	6	6	800	3,000-3,220

SURVEY OF HUMANITIES HOLDINGS

November, 1967

The Library is pleased to comply with the request dated November 2, 1967 made by Floyd Tolleson, Head, Humanities Department, for a survey of holdings. As suggested, we are sending our evaluations to Dr. Tung.

A series of appendices giving statistical data and checking results will be found at the conclusion of the Library's comments in answer to Professor Tolleson's three numbered requests. Since my commentary will obviously be made on the basis of the checking and tabulating of various standard lists, as well as on my own, well-positioned observations and studies of the collection, it seemed desirable to send on the tabulations and statistics for independent study by those concerned in the department.

To begin, then, with request number 1, "Current holdings in American literature and in English Renaissance literature to permit judgement about their respective strength for supporting the Ph.D." In purely numerical terms—volume count—it can be stated with reasonable accuracy (based on the number of inches of card stock in the shelf-list) that the Library now owns between 5,500 and 6,000 volumes of American literature. Owing to the vagaries of the two classifications systems in use, no such precision of measurement can be attained with respect to the Renaissance. There are roughly eight thousand volumes of English literature, all periods considered. Perhaps a fifth to a quarter of these pertain to the Renaissance, but since our classification schemes do not permit a chronological breakdown, this is merely a subjective estimate. My educated and conservative guess would be about 2,500-3,000 volumes of Renaissance literature. I refer you, for what it is worth, to the tabulation in the appendices entitled "Total Humanities Holdings, July 1967."

Actually, total volume strength in the two areas is not very indicative. Much more significant are the tests I have run by way of gauging the two areas against various standard lists: The American Library Association's List of Books for College Libraries, The Concise Cambridge Bibliography, and Bond's Reference Guide to English Studies. There is also, of course, the hold-over significance of the very thorough survey, using many checklists, made in 1960. Although seriously outdated as of now, the study reveals certain basic patterns of strength and weakness still prevailing. Later I will discuss briefly certain measurements made against standard periodical listings.

The ALA College List (1967), an extremely rich listing, shows the Library's American literature collection to be evenly strong in all areas: general scholarship and collections, 50%; 19th century literature, 56%; 20th century literature, 53%. Especially strong author collections are Melville (44/63), Norris (11/14), Drieser (19/25), Faulkner (42/55), Fitzgerald (19/26), Hemingway (22/31), and Steinbeck (19/26). Special Collections has rich holdings of Vardis Fisher, Mary Hallock Foote, and Carol Ryrie Brink. The Library owns 207 out of 416 (50%) of periodicals listed in the annual "Articles on American Literature" appearing in American Literature. This is a strong display, considering the graduate nature of the listing. With very few exceptions all American literature periodicals in the International Index (Social Sciences and Humanities Index) are now taken by the Library. Bond's Reference Guide shows a 43/85 holdings for American literature—high, considering the nature of the gauge used. Colonial American literature, relatively low in the ALA List (9/28) is supported by the Evans Early American Imprints microprint set. A similar microform set (Wright's American Fiction) covers 19th century fiction. A third microform set, Three Centuries of English and American Drama, gives us a copy of virtually every play from the beginnings of the legitimate stage in America.

On the basis of these tabulations and measurements, I would estimate that by 1970, provided spending on American literature materials goes on as it has in the past five years (and, hopefully, receives special additional funds), the collection should be ready to engage a limited Ph.D. program of at least minimal adequacy. I have crudely indicated in the American literature tables that our 1,760 missing titles in the ALA List would cost us about \$12,320 if all were obtainable. Perhaps this is a good intuitive, arbitrary figure for the amount of extra spending that could well be made on American literature by 1970.

Now considering Renaissance literature, it is striking to notice that the ALA List shows a total holdings strength of 578/1049, or 55%, very similar to that of American literature. Other measurements for its various subdivisions confirm this tendency: Prose & Poetry, 53%; Drama, except Shakespeare, 45%; Shakespeare, 50%; Milton, 83%. The excellent showing of Milton materials establishes that author collection as the strongest in the Library, possibly excepting Scott. Donne (20/26) and Spenser (27/38) are also very strong collections in this period.

Potential optimism about Renaissance holdings undergoes a certain deflation, however, when the collection is gauged against a more severe, graduate-oriented listing such as the Concise CBEL. The Library here owns only 404 out of 1,677 titles, or 25%, about half the showing of strength in the ALA List. The explanation of this, aside from our naturally stronger holdings in undergraduate materials, is our almost total lack of first and early editions of Renaissance literary monuments. A glance at the author listings show that for many minor authors we have no holdings at all as indicated in the Concise CBEL. Strong author collections are Campion (7/13), Cowley (8/21), Denham (3/6), Milton (27/64), Spenser (13/34), Traherne (4/8), and Wyatt (6/12). Shakespeare also shows moderate strength with 41/133. I have starred the dramatic writers in

the list in that they are supported by the microprint set entitled Three Centuries of English and American Drama, which gives us a copy of virtually every play since 1500. The Wing microfilm set will give strong support to all authors after 1640, and WSU's Pollard and Redgrave set, all authors in the earlier Renaissance period. We also now own the published volumes of the Farmer and Bullen old English play series. Indeed, the department is going to have to rely on such monumental reprint sets to get access to the early editions so starkly revealed as missing in the Concise CBEL. Purchasing the originals now in large numbers is nearly impossible.

The Library shows up well in Renaissance periodicals, as well. 34 out of 55 titles indexed in "Literature of the Renaissance" (Studies in Philology, annually) are owned by the Library in partial or complete files.

Concerning an estimate of the readiness of the Library's Renaissance holdings to support a Ph.D., I would make the same statement as I did concerning American literature: If spending continues at present levels and especially if ten to fifteen thousand additional dollars can be appropriated, the collection should be ready to engage a limited Ph.D. program of at least minimal adequacy by 1970. With respect to the additional funds advised, I will clarify my position by saying that with extra money we could take on the Ph.D. with a margin of grace; without extra money, we could proceed, but under stringency and with embarrassment.

I see that in answering request number 1, I have actually covered number 2 as well. As for number 3, dealing with the other areas of English, including linguistics, I think it will be understood that I have not had time to do detailed surveys of these areas. Holdings in the Concise CBEL, however, have been determined, though not tabulated. Checking is going on currently of the ALA List. I have made some measurement of general periodical holdings. The tabulations of the Bond Reference Guide in the appendix will give some insights

and indications. Out of all this, it is my strong impression that the Library is about equally strong in the periods from 1500 on--a little weaker in the eighteenth century, perhaps, and substantially weaker in the Anglo-Saxon and Medieval periods. Linguistics also is far from adequate graduate strength. To bring any one period, after 1500, to adequate strength should require not much larger allocations than for American and Renaissance literature--somewhere in the neighborhood of \$15,000 each. This should probably be more like \$20,000 for the Anglo-Saxon and Medieval periods. I would gauge that \$10,000 would upgrade linguistics substantially.

Another way of approaching the money issue is as follows. The intuitive, quasi-statistical figure of \$100,000 was given as the amount needed to spend on Humanities, to upgrade the collection generally and bring English and American literature to Ph.D. strength, after the survey of 1960. Since that time the Library has set aside, as extra funds for upgrading the humanities collection, especially in the graduate area, annual funds totalling about \$30,000. Adding to this amount the normal departmental and Library allocations for the same period (\$15,000) would suggest that about half of the \$100,000 estimate has been met. If the original figure had any validity--and it surely didn't err on the side of generosity--the Library still could use about \$50,000 to go into a limited Ph.D. program with a wide margin of grace. \$25,000 would be barely adequate. We should be able to reach within \$10,000 of the latter figure through the Troika and HEW funds we are currently receiving.

This is not to be complacent. The Humanities Library had 128,387 volumes in July 1967. As far as I can determine from WSU, which makes no attempt to keep comparable statistics, they own a little less than twice as many titles in humanities (three times as many total Library titles). They have offered a Ph.D. in American Studies for some years and are now giving an English Ph.D. There is a suggestion here perhaps that Idaho could absorb as much as \$700,000

(100,000 volumes times \$7 per volume) to put its humanities collection in the large university class. I hasten to add that this figure is strictly utopian, given the local realities. I think, finally, that the realistic amount for the Humanities Department to work forwards in the next two or three years would be \$25,000.

Respectfully submitted,

George A. Kellogg
Humanities Librarian

APPENDICES

Suggested Allocations	I
Humanities Total Volumes, WSU vs. IdU	II
Total Humanities Holdings, July 1967	III
American Literature (<u>ALA List</u>)	IV
Periodical Strength	V
English Literature, Esp. Renaissance (<u>ALA List</u>)	VI
English Literature (<u>Concise CBEL</u>)	VII
Bond, <u>Reference Guide</u>	VIII

J

SUGGESTED ALLOCATIONS MADE IN THE TEXT OF THE SURVEY

Realistic general estimate of money needed to institute a limited Ph.D. program by 1970.	\$25,000
American Literature.	\$10-15,000
Renaissance Literature	\$10-15,000
Other periods, English Literature (allocations after 1970?) each	\$15,000 or \$45,000 total
Anglo-Saxon Literature	\$20,000
Medieval Literature.	\$20,000
Linguistics.	<u>\$10,000</u>
Total	\$95,000
To put the humanities collection (art-music-philosophy- psychology-religion-literature-linguistics-general) in the large university class.	\$500,000 to \$1,000,000



II

WSU vs IdU

Humanities Total Volumes

WSU	233,294
IdU	128,387

It is perhaps significant that the total holdings (914,880 volumes) at WSU are nearly three (3) times the Idaho holdings, whereas their humanities holdings are less than twice as large. There is a vague suggestion here that Idaho needs about 100,000 volumes of general humanities literature to equal WSU. However, WSU's greater propensity to duplicate titles may make their total volume holdings appear stronger than they are. 100,000 volumes (music-art-literature-religion-philosophy-language) would cost around \$700,000. I can't see this figure as being significant in our picture. Between the two institutions there is an overlapping collection of over 250,000 volumes in humanities.

TOTAL HUMANITIES HOLDINGS, JULY 1967

	<u>Books</u>	<u>Periodicals</u>	<u>Total</u>
A,Z (Bibl.)	63,073	10,869	73,942
B (Phil., Rel.)	7,853	1,772	9,625
M-N (Music-FA)	7,644	2,575	10,219
P (Lit.-Lang.)	<u>32,019</u>	<u>2,582</u>	<u>34,601</u>
Total	110,589	17,798	128,387

The total volumes count equals about 41% of the total volumes count for the entire Library. The hidden factor here is a high count of microforms, especially emanating from the Evans Early American Imprints, which are counted in the A, Z category.

Department of English

The Graduate Program in English

The purpose of the graduate program in English is to enable students to acquire a broad background of English and American language and literature and to develop specialized skills in independent, scholarly research and in mature, original criticism of literary works. The program intends, moreover, to help both those students who wish to become effective teachers of English in secondary schools or junior colleges and those who plan to pursue the doctoral degree. To fulfill these ends the following requirements and procedures are established to supplement those outlined in the University Catalog and the Graduate School Bulletin.

Admission: For admission to the graduate program in English the student must have a bachelor's degree with a major in English or equivalent preparation as evidenced on official transcripts. Applicants with overall averages above 2.7 and last two years' averages of 3.0 (on a 4.00 basis) are eligible for "A" enrollment (full admission). All foreign students and students with averages below 2.7 are admitted only on special recommendations.

Assistantships: The Department of English offers each year a varying number of Graduate Instructional Assistantships (GIA). Qualified students who do not plan to earn their master's degree in one year may apply for an assistantship at the same time or after they apply for admission to the Graduate School (with two copies of transcripts to the admissions office). No application for GIA will be considered unless the applicant is admitted to the Graduate School under "A" enrollment (full admission). The stipend is \$2,400 for one academic year in addition to waiver of fees and out-of-state tuition (about \$890). For this the Assistant is to teach each semester two sections of Freshman English Composition while taking six to ten semester hours of course work. The assistantship is awarded on a yearly basis and is renewed for a second year only when the student's performance both as a teacher and a graduate candidate has been judged satisfactory. Inquiries about assistantships should be made to "the Advisor to Graduate Students in English." The application must be completed and three academic or professional letters of recommendation filed with the Advisor not later than March the first.

I. Master of Arts

Credit Requirements: The student must complete a program of study totaling no less than thirty semester hours in courses approved for graduate credit, nine of which may be at the upper-division undergraduate level (i.e., courses numbered 400 or above, but below 500). Nine semester hours may be earned in a minor, or a related field which is strongly recommended by the Graduate School: they may be at either 300-400 or 500 level. A minimum of twenty credit hours must be earned in the Department of English.

Course Requirements: All students are required to complete the following courses: English 501, Problems and Methods of Literary Study; English 495, History of Literary Criticism; and English 496, History of the English Language. The last two will not be required in the graduate program if the student enters with these courses recorded on his transcript for undergraduate credit. English 501 must be completed in the first semester of graduate work. All students must complete at least two graduate seminars (courses numbered 530's) while in residence at the University of Idaho. Moreover, they are encouraged to take, whenever feasible, at least one English Language course (507, Old English; 508, Middle English; or 509, Early & Late Modern English), one genre seminar (528), and one proseminar (525, 526, or 527) that supports one of the two seminars (530's).

Language Requirement: The student must demonstrate reading proficiency in at least one of the following languages: French (Spanish, or Italian), German, Russian, or Latin. This requirement may be met either by showing that the student has had the given language through the intermediate year during his undergraduate career or by passing an examination which will be administered either by the Department of Foreign Languages (Latin or Italian) or by the Education Testing Service (ETS). The language requirement must be met before the student is allowed to take his M. A. Written Comprehensive Examinations. (See below.)

Thesis and Degree Program: All candidates for the Master of Arts degree in English are required to complete an acceptable thesis for which six credits may be obtained, more by petition. As soon as feasible each candidate will, in conference with the Advisor, choose a member of the English Faculty to be his major professor. The major professor will help the candidate form a thesis committee and prepare the M. A. Degree Program, outlining the work he plans to submit for his degree. (For detailed procedures, see the Graduate School's "Information Bulletin for Theses and Dissertations," July, 1968, and the Department of English "Supplements" which are appended to copies of the "Bulletin" distributed by the Department.)

M. A. Written Comprehensive Examinations: In order to be admitted to candidacy the student must pass the M. A. Written Comprehensive Examinations based on the M. A. Reading List. (The Reading List is available in the offices of the Department of Humanities and of the Advisor.) As soon as he has earned twelve to fifteen credits of course work, the student should take the examinations by notifying the Advisor during the registration of the particular semester (or summer school) in which he intends to take them. No student is allowed to defer taking them without special permission. In preparing for these examinations, the student will choose beforehand one section of the Reading List in which to concentrate by reading all the items in that section. For the remaining three sections he will be responsible for only the starred items marked on the list. The Comprehensive Examinations will be given five weeks before the end of each semester (three weeks before the end of summer school.)

II. Master of Arts in Teaching

Objectives: The M.A.T. English (Option I) is a terminal degree designed to enable certified teachers to strengthen their English preparation with a study program that will meet their specific needs and improve their teaching effectiveness. In addition to the general requirements of Option I in the University Catalog and the Graduate School Bulletin, the following specifics are to provide the candidates with a well-rounded knowledge of English and American literature and language. The Master of Arts in Teaching as a professional degree has no thesis. A foreign language, though recommended, is not a degree requisite.

Course Preference: For the twenty credits in English, out of the minimum thirty credits required for the M.A.T. degree, all candidates should include the following courses, if they have not had them for their undergraduate degree, as part of their program: English 441, American English; English 496, History of the English Language, and English 495, History of Literary Criticism. Under the advisement of the major professor candidates who have strong and recent preparation in English will be encouraged to take as many graduate level proseminar or genre courses as will promote some degree of scholarly competence. For the six required credits of graduate courses in Education, candidates will be under the counsel of the minor advisor from the College of Education.

Comprehensive Examinations: Three examinations are based on the candidate's course work. A special committee, consisting of his instructors and his major professor, will be formed to determine the type (written, oral, or both), the nature (critical, interpretative, or factual), the scope (breadth, depth, or both), and the length.

Graduate Staff

David Barber (Michigan) Modern British & American; Lalia Boone (Univ. of Florida) Linguistics; Jack Davis (Univ. of New Mexico) American Studies; Eleanor Heningham (New York Univ.) Medieval Lit.; James Malek (Chicago) Restoration & 18th Century; Barbara Meldrum (Claremont) American Lit.; Floyd Tolleson (Univ. of Washington) Victorian; Mason Tung (Stanford) Renaissance.

Katheryn Foriyes (Iowa), Michael O'Neel (Washington), Geoffrey Rytell (Northwestern), and William Tenney (Michigan) teach upper-division courses open to graduate students.