

FORUM

ISSUES ABOUT PART-TIME AND CONTINGENT FACULTY

17.1 FALL 2013

CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

INSIDE

From the Editor: Digital Contingency Vandana Gavaskar	A1
Introducing the Free Market Educational Economy Joshua Boldt	A2
New Faculty Majority: Using Technology to Reach, Relate, and Rally Tracy Donhardt	A5
My Terminal Degree Is Better Than Yours: A Brief Examination of the Creative Writer as Contingent Faculty Sarah Ghoshal	A9
Web 2.0 and Contingent Faculty Dayna Goldstein	A13

From the Editor: Digital Contingency

Vandana Gavaskar

In response to the burgeoning group of NCTE/CCCC members that it represents, *Forum* has been actively seeking to grow and expand its voice in new directions; I'm pleased to announce that now it will do so in Web 2.0 (in addition to the print journal that members rely on). In keeping with other digital scholarship, including blogs, news videos, digital narratives, and other forms of social media, *Forum—Online* will follow the strides already being made by new generations of NTT faculty. This issue is dedicated to the public work of such efforts and to the public intellectuals who use crowd-sourcing, e-newsletters, and blogs to narrate, activate, and consolidate.

Joshua Boldt (Adjunct Project) describes online collaborative data gathering, while Tracy Donhardt takes her advocacy for health insurance on her campus to a national level with the New Faculty Majority. Sarah Ghoshal describes how Web 2.0 may create a hybrid scholar, while Dayna Goldstein describes the Web 2.0 scholar in the knowledge market of Quark and Acabiz, where parallel, instantaneous knowledge making happens.

Editorial Board

Sue Doe, Colorado State University, Fort Collins
Megan Fulwiler, The College of Saint Rose,
Albany, New York

Dayna Goldstein, Georgia Southern University
Bradley Hammer, University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill

Amy Lynch-Binieck, Kutztown University
Bob Samuels, University of California, Los
Angeles

About *Forum*

Forum is published twice a year by the Conference on College Composition and Communication. The editor, Vandana Gavaskar, invites you to submit essays related to non-tenure-track faculty in college English or composition. Of particular interest are impacts on the professionalization of the field of rhetoric and composition, the creation of best practices models in diverse academic environments, and the impact of accreditation standards on contingency. Administrators of writing programs and scholars in the field are invited to write about the issues from their perspective.

Essays should address theoretical and/or disciplinary debates. They will go through the standard peer-review and revision process.

Submissions for the fall issue should be received no later than April 1; for the spring issue, the deadline is August 1. Note: Submissions will not be returned. Submit your work electronically and put the words “*Forum* article” in your subject line. Submissions should include your name, your title(s), your institution(s), home address and phone number, institutional address(es) and phone number(s), and if applicable, venue(s) where submission was published or presented previously.

For further information and to make submissions, please contact Dr. Vandana Gavaskar, Editor, *Forum*, at 252-335-3720 or vggavaskar@mail.ecsu.edu.

It is the policy of NCTE in its journals and other publications to provide a forum for the open discussion of ideas concerning the content and the teaching of English and the language arts. Publicity accorded to any particular point of view does not imply endorsement by the Executive Committee, the Board of Directors, or the membership at large, except in announcements of policy, where such endorsement is clearly specified. Similarly, opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the editor or the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

© 2012 by the National Council of Teachers of English. Printed in the United States of America. ISSN 1522-7502

This issue describes how local politics can be taken to the third space of Web 2.0. Look for Web 2.0 updates and CFPs for *Forum—Online* and please contact the editor with ideas, recommendations, and suggestions for this new venture.

**Introducing the Free Market
Educational Economy**

Joshua Boldt

The new career track for university faculty is that of the disposable professor. As we rely more and more on adjunct labor, we surrender our power on college campuses. Contingent faculty are powerless. Replaceable. No tenure, no bargaining rights, no contract, no voice. Adjuncts—faculty—have become products for consumption in our new free market university economy that—like the free market business economy—stresses the bottom line above all else.

With the rise of MOOCs and other new “free market professor” programs that auction off credit to the lowest bidder, the integrity of American higher education is at risk. To be clear, I do see value in some of these developments, but only if we professors take an interest in their implementation. We must monitor their progress and push back when we see that the free market of educational entrepreneurship begins to compromise the integrity of the systems and the people it purports to advance.

After all, this is what the free market does. Regardless of any benevolent intentions, when a situation becomes all about

making money and when a product enters the cutthroat world of pinching pennies to “beat” a competitor, it’s easy to toss integrity out the window. It’s easy to cut corners and compromise best practices in order to outmatch one’s opponent, which is essentially the definition of free market competition.

Adjuncts have seen this kind of competitive compromise for a couple of decades now—been the victims of it, that is. In order to stay competitive in a global education market—especially when the federal government is cutting funding left and right—university administrators have had to make some difficult decisions. Unfortunately, the easiest way to control costs is to cut the labor budget. Because it’s easy, many leaders often mistakenly take this path, at the expense of morale and productivity. Labor will only accept these cuts to a certain point, after which the workers begin to get restless.

But, we all know this. Old news. The question is how will we fix it?

My attempt to fix these growing labor issues began in February 2012 when I created a collaborative Google Document which eventually became known as the Adjunct Project. The document was completely open and editable for anyone who viewed it. I set out to crowdsource the departmental information (pay, benefits, contracts, etc.) which had been swept under the rug for decades by asking the adjuncts themselves to report it. No one knows the working conditions better than those who live them every day.

I set up the document as a Google spreadsheet, entered my own information for adjunct conditions at the University of Georgia (which, incidentally, are quite good compared to most schools), and began sharing. I remember thinking how great it would be if we could get a sampling of 100–200 different schools.

Little did I know just how important this simple document would become. One year and over 3,000 entries later, we have the most comprehensive database ever compiled on contingent academic labor. The Adjunct Project is now housed on servers maintained by *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, and a dedicated Web development team from the publication has designed a permanent home for the data which exceeds all of my early expectations. All 3,000 entries can be explored interactively at adjunct.chronicle.com. The site also hosts an adjunct-run blog, for which I am the editor.

Here’s what the data gleaned from the spreadsheet has revealed. The national average for instructor pay is less than \$3,000 per course. In many cases, it is far less. A quick scan of the spreadsheet reveals that many adjuncts, in fact, earn closer to \$2,000. Calculating these per-course pay rates annually exposes the stark reality that the average adjunct who teaches a 5/5 course load is barely cracking \$20,000. And that’s without health insurance or a retirement package.

The following statistics from the Adjunct Project will give you a better idea of how bad things are getting, particularly for our English and composition departments.

1. **English:** Almost two-thirds of all the respondents listed their department as English, composition, writing, humanities, or some variation of these fields—well over 1,000 entries. Just to give you an idea here, the next most-cited department is sociology, with about 100 entries.
2. **Lack of contract:** Only 86 people out of 1,891 listed that they have a contract longer than one semester or term. In other words, over 95 percent of adjuncts are working with basically no contract.
3. **Average pay:** \$2,900/course. This number is skewed slightly by a few of the high-paying outliers, but even taking that into consideration, average pay for a 5/5 course load is less than \$30,000 a year. Keep in mind that the MLA has recommended a rate more than double that at \$6,920 per course.
4. **Health insurance:** Just 318 out of the 1,891 have health insurance, either immediately or eventually. So, about 83 percent of Adjunct Project respondents indicated that they do not have health insurance through their employers.

Therefore, English departments are by far the worst offenders in the exploitation of adjunct professors. And, to make matters worse, our English departments have created a workforce that has no security and no long-term future, thereby effectively designing departments that are built on a foundation of sand and have no bargaining power in the university economy.

English departments are thus presented with an obvious problem. Our heavy reliance on adjunct labor makes our entire department tenuous. The whole department's existence is subjected to the mercy of market forces and to the budget in a way that just isn't true for departments with mostly tenured faculty members.

Therefore, the "adjunct problem" affects not just the adjuncts themselves, but everyone who teaches or works in a department dependent on contingent labor. Our silence will be our own undoing.

How can we take action to solve this problem?

The first step towards turning this trend is to demand contracts for our faculty members. We should never accept nor should we offer anything less than an annual contract. Contract length should rise with seniority—one year, then three, then five and so on. Adjuncts are professionals and they should not have to reapply for their jobs every semester and wonder whether or not they will be able to pay rent in January.

The other part of this equation is simple. Adjuncts should be paid a living wage in exchange for their work. In the past, most adjuncts were otherwise employed and taught one or two classes to supplement that income, but that is obviously not the case any more. If universities are going to employ adjuncts with a full-time course load, those adjuncts should be paid accordingly. It's time to stop pretending this isn't the case. In 2013, the MLA has recommended \$6,920 for every semester-long course, which is more than double the national average according to the Adjunct Project data. Clearly, adjunct pay will vary according to region, cost of living, and institution, but there is no excuse for any school to pay an adjunct less than \$4,000 per course.

The collaborative spirit of the Adjunct Project has opened the lines of communication among all university employees—the tenured, the nontenured, and even administrators and staff members. The data shows that our current path is unsustainable, if we didn't know it already. We have to rethink our reliance on the “disposable professor” because this system isn't working. It's time to create a new model that envisions the future of education and uses that foresight to establish a system with long-term sustainability, as opposed to the “just-in-time” labor model under which we currently operate.

Works Cited

Boldt, Joshua A. The Adjunct Project. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Web. 6 April 2013.

“MLA Recommendation on Minimum Per-Course Compensation for Part-Time Faculty Members.” *MLA.org*. MLA. Web. 6 April 2013.

Joshua A. Boldt is a writer and writing teacher in Athens, Georgia. He writes about the economics of American education, and his work is published on the website Order of Education, where he is the managing editor. Boldt is known for his work as a higher education advocate and for his creation of the Adjunct Project, a website dedicated to non-tenure-track faculty members. His work has been featured by National Public Radio, the New York Times, the Chronicle of Higher Education, Inside Higher Ed, Salon, Aljazeera, and the Modern Language Association.

New Faculty Majority: Using Technology to Reach, Relate, and Rally

Tracy Donhardt

Because of digital media, there's no shortage these days of articles, reports, personal testimonials, and surveys covering the issues of contingent faculty, who make up

two-thirds of all faculty at US colleges and universities and lack stability, and often even a voice because they are off the tenure track. They're also more often than not underpaid and generally face annual reappointments, among other issues. Included in this group are part-time faculty who lack stability because they are hired by the course and semester. They are grossly underpaid, excluded from the benefits of their universities, and fear for their jobs, so they rarely speak up against their exploitation.

Digital media is also being used to organize these groups of faculty, which include graduate students and other categories of employees that universities exploit as they focus on filling classroom seats as cheaply as possible. Advocating for the national and disparate group of contingent faculty is challenging, in large part because the numbers are huge—1.3 million contingent faculty, 700,000 of whom are part-time, according to the US Department of Education. In this essay I address the following:

- How does one advocate for these teachers, many of whom have no voice in faculty and university governance on their own campuses?
- How does one help those who lack health insurance because their universities choose to exclude them from benefits?
- How does one communicate with faculty who teach at universities and colleges across the country and who often teach at more than one university to make ends meet?

Website development and e-newsletters are just two ways to reach, connect, and provide services and a voice to contingent faculty. New Faculty Majority (NFM), which advocates for contingent faculty and has become a nationally respected voice on these issues, is doing exactly this sort of advocacy work. Three years ago, NFM decided to work on an issue common to many contingent faculty, especially most part-time faculty: benefits. It's true that most employers exclude part-time employees from benefits. It's also true that many part-time faculty work the equivalent of full-time teaching positions and have been with their university as long or longer than some full-time faculty, but are still excluded from benefits.

So NFM set out to correct this wrong by finding health insurance for its members. But not being an employer, NFM's options for group insurance, which generally provides cheaper rates than individual coverage, were limited. Not many brokers were interested, as NFM at the time was a fairly young organization with no required membership dues or membership requirements at all. These aspects made brokers and insurance companies hesitant to take the risk since insurance companies want to offer group coverage to a group they are sure will share in that

risk. The rationale behind this is that if only unhealthy members opted for coverage, the insurance company's risk would not be shared equally.

Still, one insurance company agreed to offer coverage, albeit only limited medical plans that pay a certain dollar amount for certain kinds of services. In fact, these kinds of plans are called Limited Medical Indemnity Plans. NFM's plan pays between \$65 and \$85 toward the cost of a doctor visit. (The difference is in the level of coverage elected; four plans are offered.) Surgeries and in-hospital stays have limits as well. While coverage in terms of payment amounts is limited, no medical questions are asked, so all members are eligible. Premiums, which are set regardless of age or gender, vary by level of coverage and family status. Another limit to these plans, however, is that not all states legally allow them, and thus NFM members who live in those states are not eligible for even this level of coverage. But for many members, some coverage is better than no coverage and that was NFM's goal with its health insurance initiative. But providing group health insurance of any kind for a group so scattered across the country and otherwise disconnected could only be done with technology that allows for online enrollment. NFM made this possible as well.

In the midst of these insurance negotiations, communication was key. But how to communicate this new benefit to members? This issue exposed another obstacle in advocating for contingent faculty: communicating with this huge group. It's important that contingent faculty understand that their situation is shared by hundreds of thousands of others and that a collective voice is a powerful voice. A newsletter can offer contingent faculty stories that provide evidence of what others are doing and can demonstrate that such a collective voice can effect change.

So NFM communicated its health care initiative and continues to communicate with its members via an e-blast newsletter. NFM newsletters include a variety of topics, including information about contingent faculty movements across the country, how to fight unemployment benefit denials, how to use a university's reaccreditation process strategically, and where to go for more information. Upcoming events and conferences might be highlighted in one issue, and another might discuss how to advocate for oneself.

Past issues are available on NFM's website, and they can be forwarded to others to reach an even wider audience. Recipients are encouraged to visit NFM's website, where a host of other information and resources reside and where membership can be obtained, which provides access to even more services.

Of course, none of this came about easily or quickly for NFM. In fact, these two initiatives—health insurance and the e-newsletter—are still works in progress. The

organization continually strives to improve these efforts to reach as many contingent faculty as possible.

Although NFM's initiatives are efforts to reach contingent faculty nationally, smaller groups at individual campuses can use technology and e-newsletters in similar ways to communicate with, advocate for, and rally their own contingent faculty. In fact, these things should be going on among groups at individual campuses because, again, only when individual groups rally to become a huge collective group will real change happen. It's true that this kind of advocacy is time-consuming and at times risky, as part-time faculty face the possibility of not getting teaching assignments if they are perceived to be making waves. But when NFM approached me to join their board, I had already decided to put in the time and take the risk on my campus. At the time, I had been a part-time faculty member for about five years, and I had formed a group of faculty seeking change and wanting to raise awareness of the issues there. We had obtained our own health insurance that did not require our employer to pay a share of the cost, but at the last minute were told we were violating university policy by doing so and were forced to halt what would have been an important benefit to all part-time workers on campus.

Today our group, the Associate Faculty Coalition, continues to raise awareness of these issues at our campus and to improve working conditions for part-time faculty. But we also continue to face the same challenges that national groups, like NFM, face doing the work more broadly. We struggle to find enough people willing to raise their voices and be heard because they fear losing their already tenuous positions or because they are overworked and overstressed working multiple jobs to make ends meet.

But the risk must be taken and the time found to contribute to the cause. The future of higher education and student learning are at stake. Without systemic change, the number of tenured lines will continue to decrease as the number of part-time and other contingent faculty increase, making the connections between students and faculty harder to maintain.

Tracy Donhardt teaches first-year composition and other first- and second-year writing courses at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. She taught as a part-time instructor for eight years before moving into a temporary, full-time position two years ago. She was made full-time lecturer as of the start of the fall 2013 semester.

My Terminal Degree Is Better Than Yours: A Brief Examination of the Creative Writer as Contingent Faculty

Sarah Ghoshal

“So, you’ve published creatively. That’s interesting. Have you published any scholarly work? Are you planning on getting a terminal degree?”

Let’s talk about why these two questions drive me crazy:

1. I have a master of fine arts in creative writing. Why doesn’t my creative work count toward a teaching position as much as scholarly work does? Why can’t my numerous creative publications translate into a position?
2. I have a master of fine arts in creative writing. It IS a terminal degree. Would you still like to call me Doctor?

Publishing is an important aspect of being part of the academic community. For me, however, it has always been creative. I have had mentors encouraging me for years to publish in literary journals and to apply for creative grants that require creative publications. I have focused on the *Paris Review*, the *New Yorker*, *Fence*. My graduate thesis is an 80-page collection of poetry that I am constantly revising and sending to publishers and presses. I have participated in workshops and summer programs, applied for grants and fellowships, all based on poetry. And now, after years of learning how to teach writing, years of working as an adjunct at several different universities in one semester, years of fighting for the full-time lecturer position I have now, I am competing against people with academic dissertations who get to be called “Doctor” and get paid more than I do because their terminal degree is apparently more accepted than my terminal degree. And somehow, I feel that I have to publish. And I’m talking in the scholarly world, which is apparently, to use an overused metaphor, a whole different ball game.

The frustrations of the creative writer in the academic community are well known. We must compete against one another for the rare creative position, based on our creative work, but we must also inject ourselves into the pedagogy of writing and of teaching writing, because we, above all else, are writers. I wear two very important hats: the composition hat and the poetry hat. I present at conferences about digital grading and hybrid teaching, and I sit home on Sunday mornings trying to figure out how to get my poetry collection published. I teach my students how to create arguable claims about literature and invite them to email me their creative work at the same time. And all the while, I wonder what would happen if

someone in a position of power in academia had to choose between me and someone called “Doctor.”

All of this being said, I did not have to remain an adjunct as long as some others have, and I, thankfully, ended up in a program that welcomes my initiative and my background in creative writing while still encouraging me to grow in the scholarly world. But recently, those teaching in my program learned that what were previously three-year, non-renewable full-time contracts are going to become permanent. The problem is that we don’t know how many permanent positions there will be.

And so begins the competition. Who has a PhD? Who has a master’s? What is terminal? How many conferences have you presented at? Do you have anyone’s ear? Are you the chair of your committee? Should we create a faculty development workshop, fly to a conference in another state, publish more creative work, or focus on the academic? Who do we turn into when full-time health benefits and parking permits are on the line?

Author Simon Marginson says that the higher education system “is an imperfectly integrated arrangement, characterized by uneven and changing patterns of engagement and communication; many zones of autonomy and separation; and stable and unstable hierarchies. Relationships are structured by cooperation and competition . . .” (1–2). We either team up or we compete; we respect or we resent. We are in constant competition when we should be looking to one another for inspiration and guidance. We are wary when we should be touting perfect ideals. We need those positions.

Of course the problem that stands in front of all of this is that there are not enough positions to go around. Academia is a fiercely competitive place, a place where “one encounters a broad disquiet among academic workers about the long-term prospects of their institutions” (Lee and Clery 2). We are not so much scared of one another, but of the fact that there are not enough long-term prospects. If we have even a semi-long-term contract, we hold onto it like money, riches, and security blankets. And so our credentials start to mean more than we ever imagined; regrets about missed opportunities or recent rejection letters come back to haunt us in the night; and letters get sent to the union, desperately requesting that they stop speaking for us even though we know they mean to help. So, how do we support ourselves, make ourselves known, break through the barrier of big words, stuffy parties, and old ideas? How do we find ourselves treading the waters of academia and brushing off respect?

So, what do we need to do? We need to take charge. But let’s not look at this as

if we are late-nineteenth-century American bandits hoping to sway the new law to our advantage. Adjuncts, lecturers, and other contingent faculty are not going to rise up and demand change, but we might influence small changes that allow us to be ourselves in an increasingly judgmental world. To compete with each other and with the rest of academia, we need to be a part of that world. But we also need to be heard. Is a merging of the creative and the academic an answer?

I am a huge advocate of this idea. Recently, some colleagues of mine, fellow composition lecturers with academic backgrounds in creative writing, presented three workshops to the writing program faculty at my institution about teaching poetry, fiction, and drama in composition classes. The merging of literature and composition is nothing new. Many universities have a two-part, first-year composition program in which the first course uses nonfiction, articles, essays, etc., as the primary sources to spur student writing, and the second course uses literature. But knowing that the people leading these workshops were creative writers themselves, I was reminded of the often-ignored connection between creative and academic writing. I was brought back to graduate school, where I workshopped poems with people who were focusing their studies in other areas, such as the teaching of writing or the examination of literature. In those moments, reading each other's pantoums and sonnets, we were all writers, all scholars, regardless of our concentrations. The separation that quietly exists in academia between the scholarly and the creative was nonexistent—the monster pushed under the bed.

Many of the poems that I worked on in those sessions are now published in literary journals. Although I have yet to publish my first full-length collection of poetry, my poems are widely published in print and on the Internet, and I have worked hard to make a name for myself in the creative world since earning my MFA in 2008. I have a website that does pretty well, and I have created a voice for myself online, using LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter, and Amazon. I have also made sure to get my academic writing out there in the form of a blog that I update regularly dealing with issues of teaching and academia. In doing so, I see myself finally merging the scholarly and the creative. During graduate school and after, I did what I thought I was supposed to do; I published. Then, I figured out that I had to publish, not just creatively but academically as well, to create a voice and a digital presence in order to be seen as an expert on matters of teaching pedagogy and composition.

I am actually a lecturer in a teaching-focused (as opposed to research-focused) program, and so the business of teaching, improving our teaching and creating new techniques for teaching composition, is actually more important than publishing academically. This is what it is all about, right? The writing. The teaching and the writing and the students. And yet, as contingent faculty, I usually feel that

even though no one *tells* me to publish, I should probably get my name out there; I should probably be a respectable scholar; I should probably research the intricacies of the craft that I am teaching. It is a black cloud hanging over us, stagnant and thick while my poems gather dust in the corner.

So, why don't these creative publications count as scholarship? "An act of intelligence or artistry becomes scholarship when it meets three criteria: first, it must be made public; second, it must be subjected to the critical evaluation of one's peers; and third, one's community must begin to develop and build upon the initial act" (Shulman as qtd. in Ochoa 101). I would argue that most creative publications meet these criteria, or at least the first two. And in a world where many creative writers teach composition and many composition specialists teach creative writing, we should appreciate the creative, MFA-saddled contingent faculty member for what he or she is—someone who can offer an entirely new viewpoint on the business of writing.

Finally, how does the scholar with the MFA in poetry and years of experience teaching composition compete in a world where that terminal degree is deemed no more deserving of tenure and higher pay than a traditional master's degree? How do we convince academia that the MFA (especially an MFA with extensive classroom experience and both academic *and* creative publications under his or her belt) is just as deserving of respect as a doctorate in Victorian literature or composition and rhetoric? We work. We publish and we publish and we present and we publish, and most of all, we teach so well that we go home at night knowing that our attempts to make our students better writers have not been in vain. We write poems about the unfairness of it all and publish them. We appreciate the programs that have taken us in and in some cases, helped us grow into composition scholars. We build websites for ourselves, write blog entries, become expert speakers. We work hard to straddle the line between artistry and academia, between Sonia Sanchez and David Bartholomae. And we wait for the day when all scholars are considered equal as a result of their dedication to teaching writers how to do what is most important to us all—write.

Works Cited

- Lee, John, and Sue Clery. "Key Trends in Higher Education." *American Academic* 1.1 (2004): 21–36. Print.
- Marginson, Simon. "Dynamics of National and Global Competition in Higher Education." *Higher Education* 52.1 (2006): 1–39. Print.

Ochoa, Amanda. "The Scholarship of Teaching: Yesterday, Today & Tomorrow." *Journal of the Professoriate* 6.1 (2012): 100–16. Print.

Sarah Ghoshal is a lecturer in the first-year writing program at Montclair State University. Her poems have been published widely, and she also has a memoir available on Amazon. Her academic interests are diverse, but most recently she has presented on consistency in the hybrid writing classroom and the challenges of digital teaching and learning. You can visit her website at www.sarahghoshal.com or her blog at www.professorghoshal.blogspot.com for more information and/or insight.

Web 2.0 and Contingent Faculty

Dayna Goldstein

For too long now, contingent faculty have been characterized by institutional policies and attitudes as an underclass of workhorse teachers who should ignore their epistemic and community-serving impulses and forego publishing in order to take home a paycheck. However, the new Web 2.0 generation of non-tenure-track rhetoric and composition faculty are on a path to rebalance, not only the idea of teaching at a university, but the intertwined value of service and scholarship. The scholarship, service, and teaching that comprise the winning triumvirate of an academic life that so draws all faculty, contingent or not, is finding a way, and now with digital media that way is becoming increasingly clear. Contingent workers comprise the majority of faculty in rhetoric and composition, and that phenomenon, the re-emergence of the triumvirate in a new form, is worthy of serious consideration. This group of 2.0 faculty can be situated in a context that details the pull of service and scholarly activity, illustrates the sea-change this represents, and migrates the intellectual heritage of rhetoric and composition scholars online.

What sets new generations of contingent faculty apart is their relative youth, their digital fluidity, and their years of teaching online that have helped them develop new relationships with students. The Web 2.0 generation of adjuncts are valuable thinkers, educated with master's degrees and PhDs. In other words, they carry within them the rich intellectual heritage that represents the best of modern academia: intellectual honesty and curiosity, a desire to teach, and a profound understanding of how to use deeply honed knowledge in service to their communities. They are committed to the foundational values of rhetoric and writing studies—that is, valuing the project of how we make meaning with print linguistic and other types of texts. As digital natives who never experienced teaching only as an offline

activity, they have had eight to ten years of teaching and relating to students online as their foundational experience. These contingent faculty, groomed in dedicated rhet/comp programs and now teaching digitally, realize that teaching online is as legitimate as teaching offline. They are now at the vanguard of rhetoric and writing precisely because they live electronically. Centrally, writing faculty 2.0 are notable for their opportunistic digital pedagogies that flow seamlessly onto the open Web, the rhetorical flexibility of their digital identities, and their commitment to the moment in scholarship and service; spurious truths are not their bailiwick.

Web 2.0 faculty want to keep intellectually active in a civic way that benefits them. Traditional academic publication counts for little in most of their circumstances; original manuscripts are not often accounted for in labor decisions. Since their primary activity is teaching, to continue to teach so much they must develop a value system that sustains them, one that values the centrality of teaching. Thus, the primary place that could make them matter, the institution, is ignoring both their research impulses and the value of the pedagogical effort. It's no surprise that contingent faculty feel disenfranchised. And while a previous generation of contingent faculty may have let that sense of disenfranchisement destroy them or eventually wear down their ambition, faculty 2.0 recognize that the networked world *is* their institutional home, so their ambitious reach is not first directed to the institution, but outside of it. They define their teaching as mattering outside of the academic hierarchy, in no small part because the academic hierarchy has already rejected them.

The relevance that the institution fails to provide in the life of the faculty majority 2.0 gets filled elsewhere. Faculty 2.0 define their teaching as mattering to the civically minded contingent. The institution is a place where they every once in a while show up, or where their paycheck comes from, but they teach online and their "office hours thread" on their course management system doesn't look that different to them than any other knowledge market. And knowledge markets change the value of academic life on the Internet.

Web 2.0 faculty are participating in knowledge markets, both formal and informal, as a way to be scholars of the moment in places where they and their legitimate expertise are appreciated. Knowledge markets are places where individual expertise and application are highly valued; they are vital to the information economy. A knowledge market can be thought of as a traditional economy in which scarce knowledge is an intellectual property sold to the highest bidder. Knowledge markets are compatible with the network economy because knowledge markets appreciate someone who can sift through the abundance of data to get to the relevant information quickly. Jennifer Hicks credits the genesis of the knowledge market for "crowd-sourced Q&A" sites like Quora, Aardvark, Stockoverflow, and others. The

knowledge market offers what faculty 2.0 desperately want: respect and credit for epistemic excellence.

A newer knowledge market named Acabiz is directly tapping faculty 2.0. Their business plan is to connect academics with “knowledge hunters” and thus skip the need for a consultant. Acabiz is a place where academic knowledge is directly put to use in the business and government sectors with pay and esteem. The highly specialized knowledge of rhetoric and writing professionals is valued in Acabiz and other similar knowledge markets. In earlier forums like Ask.com, rhetoric and composition experts were often offered homework-help types of questions that didn’t engage them beyond what their classroom practice already offered. Mature knowledge markets offer questions on technical writing practice, document design, form letter performance, and usability indicators, but also in rhetorical strategies, such as audience analysis, developing ethos in new markets, and creating new branding. Faculty 2.0 are the ideal resource for these questions because they have the depth of knowledge of academia, but the digital flexibility that characterizes their epistemic habits.

That academia is a storehouse of vetted knowledge is a widely accepted idea, but online knowledge markets are not interested in storehouses. The people on them want to know something at their point of need and no more. They are not looking for a theory to guide them to, in our case, a deep understanding of rhetoric. They want a solution at their point of need. Faculty 2.0 see this opportunity and migrate there, a place where their knowledge is appreciated, a place where their expertise nets them attention, respect, money, reputation, and connection—everything the academy refuses to provide.

Getting their epistemic impulse on the open Web where the hierarchies of academia are radically destabilized is a very attractive option to faculty 2.0. As contingent scholars, we are closest to our students, closest to the Net generation, closest to the academic circumstances of our students, closest to the institution without being insiders; that is, those ideally situated to make the greatest strides are not circulating their novel and interconnected ideas in the world of print journals. The Internet can be a very uplifting force in contingency. Further research is needed to reveal more of these stories.

Work Cited

Hicks, Jennifer. “The Rise of the Knowledge Market.” *Forbes.com Tech*. 27 June 2011. Web.

Dayna Goldstein is ABD at Kent State University and recently a visiting assistant professor at Georgia Southern University. Her scholarly interests include contingent labor, network theory, post-humanist rhetoric, and writing assessment. She is also a member of the CCCC Committee on Contingent Labor and the WPA Grant Committee. Ms. Goldstein currently resides in Statesboro, Georgia, where she works cooperatively with local skeptical and sex-positive networks to empower them in their communities.

**The Pro-Labor Writing Program/Center:
A Full-Day Workshop at the 2014 CCCC Annual Convention in Indianapolis**

Labor practices impact the quality and commitment of our administrative, scholarly, and pedagogical work in writing programs and centers and provide a context for the big changes sweeping higher education that affect both our work and the experiences of our students. Yet progress on labor issues can often feel far removed from the everyday processes of management and administration in a writing program and altogether unrelated from the pedagogical and ethical commitments undergirding institutions big and small. With such dizzying programmatic, geographic, and institutional diversity in mind, this participant-driven full-day workshop offers critical frameworks and practical opportunities for participants to develop and sustain labor-friendly practices in writing programs of all types and sizes. The workshop will capitalize upon and extend extant pro-labor efforts in order to help participants (re)articulate their work in terms of sustainable, committed labor justice. By day's end, workshop participants will come away with models and techniques for work in their own programs, as well as a living network of committed colleagues to help extend this work beyond CCCC 2014.

Facilitators of the workshop include Michelle LaFrance, Seth Kahn, Timothy Dougherty, Amy Lynch-Binie, Annica Cox, Brandon Fralix, and Vandana Gavaskar.

For more information, please visit the CCCC website at www.ncte.org/cccc or contact one of the facilitators.