

FORUM

NEWSLETTER OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTINGENT, ADJUNCT, AND PART-TIME FACULTY (CAP)

9.2 SPRING 2006

CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

INSIDE

From the Editor	A1
From the Co-chair	A3
A Perfect FIT: Adjuncts Assess a Faculty-in-Training Program Liz McNamara	A5
Impecunious? Teach English with Materials of Minimal Cost Nancy McMahan	A11
Part-Timer: Blessing in Disguise Bill Sammons	A12
Book Review Joanne Cordón	A13

From the Editor

Janice Albert

With this issue of *FORUM*, I am happy to announce the appointment of my successor, Evelyn Beck. Evelyn has written a bimonthly column on distance education in the *Adjunct Advocate* for the last five years and recently published *Going the Distance: A Handbook for Part-Time & Adjunct Faculty Who Teach Online*. She was an adjunct instructor at Clemson University for three years and at Tri-County Technical College for four years before joining the permanent faculty at Piedmont Technical College in 1990, and she has continued to work as adjunct faculty for distance learning courses for Cerro Coso Community College (CA), the University of Phoenix, the University of Northwestern Ohio, Limestone College (SC), and Kaplan College (FL). She has been an officer in her regional TYCA and the president of Piedmont's faculty senate. In addition, she received the Democracy in Higher Education Prize from the National Education Association in 2002 and was named Educator of the Year by the South Carolina Technical Education Association in 1996. As you can see, she is amply qualified to inspire new writers and to execute the tasks of the editor in bringing *FORUM* to CCCC members twice a year.

This is also my opportunity to recognize the writers, friends, NCTE professionals, and fellow editors who have helped me during my term of editorship. To my fellow editors, those who host the newsletter between the covers of their own journals, Howard Tinberg of *TETYC* and Deborah Holdstein of *CCC*, thank you so much. To Carol Schanche of NCTE Publications, I proclaim for all to hear that I could not have done it without your patience and wisdom. To Jim McDonald and Laurie Delaney, co-chairs of the CAP committee on whose behalf the newsletter is pub-

About *Forum*

Forum is published twice a year by the Committee on Contingent, Adjunct, and Part-Time Faculty (CAP) of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. As editor, I welcome you to submit news items, book reviews, editorials, and/or articles related to non-tenure-track faculty in college English or composition courses.

Submissions for the fall issue should be received no later than May 1; for the winter issue, the deadline is September 1. Note: Submissions will not be returned.

Submit your work electronically via e-mail or an e-mail attachment. Address your work to beck.e@ptc.edu and put the words “*Forum* article” somewhere in your subject line. Submissions should include the following information:

- your name
- your title(s)
- your institution(s)
- home address and phone number; institutional address(es) and phone number(s)
- if applicable, venue(s) where submission was published or presented previously

For additional guidelines or information about *Forum*, contact Evelyn Beck, *Forum* editor, Piedmont Technical College, 620 N. Emerald Rd., Greenwood, SC 29648 or phone 864-941-8450.

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, the Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Special Interest Group, or the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

© 2006 by the National Council of Teachers of English. Printed in the United States of America.
ISSN 1522-7502

lished, thank you for finding writers, sending out queries, and writing your own portion of the newsletter. Special thanks to members of the search committee who found our new editor: Sharon Mitchler, Chair, Jennifer Beech, Deborah Holdstein, Renee Major, James McDonald, Irvin Peckham, and Howard Tinberg. And, of course, my thanks to Doug Hesse for taking on the task of establishing a precedent for the editorial search for *FORUM*.

I am proud that over the past four years, *FORUM* has included many first-time writers. For example, in the present issue, we feature an article by an adjunct speaking for a group who finds much to recommend in a training program they experienced together. I’m also proud that writers and reviewers have represented the full range of composition teaching faculty: graduate students, high school teachers, two-year college faculty (tenured and not), and four-year college and university faculty (tenured and not). Our reviewers represent varied disciplines—history, political science, sociology, etc.—that give depth to our conversations about the conditions under which we work and what the future might hold.

I hope an increasing number of readers will contribute articles and book reviews to make *FORUM* even more relevant to the adjunct population. Serving the purpose of the CAP Committee is an important goal of the newsletter, and one I’ve been proud to be entrusted with. And finally, on behalf of our entire membership, a heartfelt thanks to the Conference on College Composition and Communication for its continued funding and support.

From the Co-chair

Laurie Delaney

The Committee on Contingent, Adjunct, and Part-time Faculty invite you to attend our Special Interest Group session at this year's CCCC in Chicago (March 22–25). NCTE and CCCC can seem very alienating to part-time and contingent faculty, many of whom are already marginalized by their institutions and the profession. This year's CAP SIG, "Making CCCC More Useful and Accessible to Contingent Faculty," will address this concern. The session will allow contingent faculty to express the ways in which CCCC and NCTE could more effectively reach out to them.

One problem that the CAP Committee has been dealing with since its inception is constituency. Part-time, adjunct, and contingent faculty make up a very large and very diverse group. Some part-timers actively seek full-time positions while others are content to be part-time. Some faculty see teaching as a job while others see contingent work as one step in a career path that will eventually lead to a full-time tenure-track position. All share a dedication to teaching first-year writing students, but pedagogies, writing programs, and institutions (two-year, four-year, liberal arts, technical) vary widely. Meeting the needs of a community with such disparate membership is truly a challenge. What are our common concerns? How can we meet the needs of our group and not forget matters that affect small numbers of us?

The problem of access also exists as a major stumbling block to participation in CCCC. Part-time, adjunct, and contingent faculty not only tend to make significantly less money than their full-time, tenure-track colleagues, but they also tend to receive little or no institutional support for participation in professional organizations and activities. Our committee has addressed this issue in a variety of ways. We have begun working with NCTE's Executive Committee to explore lowering the costs of NCTE membership and CCCC registration for part-time, adjunct, and contingent faculty. I also recently served on CCCC's Ad-Hoc Committee on the Professional Equity Project (PEP). As interest and participation in this program (which provides small monetary grants for CCCC attendance) has grown, our committee has recommended that we explore ways to expand the program. Finally, Jim McDonald, my co-chair, has begun a project to improve access to NCTE through regional affiliates. These local groups tend to have lower costs for membership, and because conferences are closer, travel expenses tend to be significantly lower. Because part-time, adjunct, and contingent faculty are often the least able to afford participation in NCTE and CCCC, we must continue to find ways to address their financial concerns.

Another reason many part-time, adjunct, and contingent faculty do not participate in CCCC is competition. Many of our constituency feel left out of the profes-

sion, sensing that our colleagues perceive us as failures who can't get a real job. This attitude is often the result of power struggles to preserve tenure lines. Administrators facing constant budget cuts foster competition for faculty lines, salary and benefits, and participation in governance. Changing attitudes toward higher education only exacerbate the problem as government funding of higher education continues to shrink. We are beginning to see the negative effects of legislative initiatives on the state level, as in the recent funding crisis for colleges and universities caused by Colorado's TABOR (Taxpayer Bill of Rights). Yet many states are considering similar legislation that will cut even more drastically already dwindling state money dedicated to higher education. At the federal level, changes in federal dollar distribution through reform of The Higher Education Act in HR 609 will also dramatically cut vital financial resources for many institutions, especially by pitting liberal arts and large state institutions against two-year and technical colleges. Additional direct competition from corporate, for-profit institutions also drains limited resources. NCTE and CCCC have a history of advocating for the teaching of writing and for writing teachers. How can we as an organization nurture collegiality and coalition among writing teachers in a system designed to foster competition and divisiveness?

One final problem we want to address is usefulness. Why increase the participation by contingent faculty? What do they have to gain, and what do NCTE and CCCC have to gain? NCTE and CCCC work to support the teaching of writing as a legitimate field of scholarship. However, many part-time, adjunct, and contingent faculty feel disconnected from this scholarship. Certainly we do not see this work as unimportant, and certainly we realize that such research can have a huge impact on us as teachers in the classroom, from the textbooks we use, to our pedagogy, to shaping the curriculum design of the courses and programs within which we teach. At the same time, this work often seems drastically disconnected from what goes on in our classrooms on a day-to-day basis. Faculty who travel from one campus to another, teaching writing course after writing course, develop a pragmatism. We look for ideas that can make our jobs easier and make us better teachers. We are concerned with faculty development, but often lack institutional support for such endeavors. We have learned that our colleagues are great resources. We rely on each other for help in making our classroom work. How can we make NCTE and CCCC useful in the same way? It's not easy to look through the pages of *College English*, *CCC*, *TETYC* or the CCCC conference program and find information that we can truly use. How can the connection between theory and practice be clarified? How can we call attention to useful information about assignment construction, grading, improving teaching, and classroom practices in a manner that is efficient?

Ultimately, we want to explore ways CCCC can be more inviting and inclusive

to part-time, adjunct, and contingent faculty. This is quite a bit to try to tackle in a one-hour session. Our goal is not to resolve all of the issues raised here but to begin what we hope will become an ongoing conversation about how NCTE and CCCC can be more helpful to contingent faculty as workers and teachers. We hope you will join us Wednesday, March 22, from 6:30–7:30 p.m. Consult your program for the exact location.

A Perfect FIT: Adjuncts Assess a Faculty-in-Training Program

Liz McNamara

“The days of simply handing a schedule and a textbook to a master’s graduate and telling them to have at it with a group of students are gone, and we have this kind of excellence-in-teaching program to thank for it.”

—Paul Buck, TA

As we neared completion of a year’s apprenticeship in teaching—the fourth group to take part in this program—I asked my fellow adjuncts-in-training what they thought had been the best and most helpful aspects of the Faculty-in-Training program for their professional and personal development. They were always generous, and after some writing and discussion, a consensus emerged on the opportunities FIT yielded to us. That’s what we want to tell you about.

But first, some background. In 1998, the English Department at Guilford Technical Community College (GTCC) in Jamestown, North Carolina, created the Faculty-in-Training program (FIT). The goals of the program were two-fold: 1) to provide a pool of well-prepared adjunct instructors for the department; and, 2) to promote a tradition of excellence in teaching at community colleges. The department initially recruited advanced master’s-level students from graduate programs at local universities and colleges who were developing an interest in teaching. During the past four years, the FIT program has expanded to include departments of History/Political Science, Graphic Arts, and Computer Science.¹

Once selected for the program, Teaching Associates participated in a two-week orientation seminar during the summer. They were introduced to lesson planning, cooperative learning strategies, and various technologies including Web enhancements. Several full-time faculty volunteered to mentor individual TAs for the school year. Associates then taught two or three classes each semester while also attending

¹ The pilot program is described fully in *TETYC* 28.3 (Mar. 2001): 241–50 and further described in two succeeding essays, *TETYC* 28.3 (Mar. 2001): 251–58 and *TETYC* 31.1 (Sept. 2003): 40–49.

weekly seminars on related teaching issues, such as grading, learning styles, and presenting engaging lectures.

From a larger perspective, one of the debates in education today is how to encourage and integrate into teaching people who have degrees in a specific subject, such as History or English, rather than a degree in education. A consensus seems to be emerging that such teachers will contribute to increased mastery of the subject by students.² This is of particular concern to leaders of high schools and community colleges. Although there is much discussion throughout the United States today regarding possible avenues for drawing in content-oriented teachers, the actual opportunities for a transition to teaching are limited. Candidates who applied to the FIT program tended to come to teaching not from a desire to “teach” per se, but rather from a deep and lively interest in English or Art or Political Science and the desire to share that interest.

One of the most attractive features of the FIT program for the TAs is that it provides that elusive, sideways transition into teaching for a non-education major. Teaching associates in the fourth year of the program, when asked to assess the most positive aspect of FIT, named the meshing of excellence in subject with growing expertise in pedagogical skill. This expertise develops through opportunities for consulting and reflection.

Journaling, Meetings, and Observations

First instances for consulting and reflection among TAs arose from three formal elements of the FIT program: journaling, weekly meetings, and observations. As individual TAs wrote weekly journal entries, they reflected on their teaching for that week and engaged in an extended conversation between themselves and the program director, who read the entries. One TA wrote, “Journaling allowed me to explore my classroom dynamics and relate them to how I performed as a teacher. This aspect motivated me more because I was glad to have someone to hear and monitor my progress, and to give feedback and validation. I plan to continue teaching; I have found it to be my passion. Journaling through my first year teaching, my first experience teaching, will allow me, later on down the road, to go back to see what it was like for me. It will remind me how I began.”

Another wrote, “One of the more difficult yet rewarding required tasks of the FIT program was the weekly journal entries. These journal entries provided the opportunity to reflect on where we once were compared to where we are now. This additional insight will be carried forward for years to come.” A third associate wrote, “Meetings and the journal entries that accompany them serve to open the

² There is a good discussion of this issue in Dianne Ravitch, ed., *Brookings Papers on Education Policy: 2004* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2004).

lines of communication while encouraging the TAs to reflect upon their teaching experiences throughout the year.”

Teaching Associates attended weekly seminars in which they recounted that week’s adventures in teaching and were then led in a discussion of some aspect of teaching by faculty. Many TAs found our weekly seminars fruitful and restorative. The effect of these meetings compounded the benefits of experience. Said one TA, “Participants could learn from others’ experience and benefit by not making the same mistake. The weekly sessions provided a forum where otherwise revealing questions could be asked without embarrassment. There was always an attitude of freedom that allowed members to freely express their mistakes and triumphs on a regular basis; [it] provided an atmosphere that encouraged success. We triumphed in the success of others and felt the pain when certain teaching strategies failed.” Noted another TA, “There was a lot of laughter as we related a lesson plan, an experiment that went well, or one that went comprehensively wrong, and then dissected, en masse, the reasons for either outcome.”

Not only were multiple experiences related during seminar, enhancing the sense of living through several teaching lives, they were also cross-disciplinary. “We explored various aspects of pedagogy during which participants in the FIT program debriefed one another. It has been incredibly beneficial to hear members of the program from other disciplines talk about their challenges. This is an excellent, self-validating time during which we all realize that our problems transcend the borders of our disciplines. [These debriefings] are instrumental for each of us to understand that the issues we are struggling with are the same ones encountered by everyone else. *Everyone* is forced to constantly experiment with teaching methods and *everyone* is faced with the same feelings of insecurity,” concluded another TA.

Over the course of two semesters, several different types of observations between TAs and faculty took place. In one, TAs were evaluated by their mentors while teaching a class. Mentors and TAs then met, discussing how class objectives had been met substantively and stylistically. Although the feedback offered by this type of observation was helpful, most TAs found in two other types of observations greater opportunities for reflecting on teaching.

In a second venue, TAs observed a class taught by regular faculty. These observations aided in creating instructional strategies, in integrating technology, and in developing rapport with a class. One TA noted a pattern of “teaching, observing, conferring, applying; then teaching, observing, and conferring again . . . not only were teacher’s objectives and expectations unobtrusively evident, they created an atmosphere hospitable to asking and answering questions, to going out on a limb intellectually.” Another wrote that observation “gave insight into the newest teaching philosophies available in the classroom. The philosophies were brought by the youngest participants in the program, as many of them were enrolled at the

local university. Having opportunity to review and reflect on the newest as well as some of the more traditional teaching philosophies provided a good basis for developing teaching strategies that succeed in today's classrooms."

Another type of observation took place with the videotaping of a short "mock" class, followed by critique from other TAs. While universally regarded as nerve-racking and painful, most also saw its usefulness. Said one TA, "Each demonstration is videotaped so the tape can later be reviewed and constructively evaluated by the program director(s) and TAs in a *cooperative* setting." Another reflected, "I actually saw myself teaching and interacting with a class. The stiffness I saw in myself, the awkwardness, and the interminable deadly silence when I lost my place, were more eye-opening than any pedagogical training I'd ever received. There isn't a class that I teach where I don't think about that videotaping. The stiffness, awkwardness, and deadly silences, whenever they pop up, melt away in conscious self-correction. I am a better teacher for it." Another mused, "During the videotaping sessions, we each had opportunity to allow others to review our work. This caused some anxious moments yet yielded some powerful and long-lasting learning experiences . . . participating was a real blessing."

Mentors

The mentor/mentee relationship straddles the line between formal and informal aspects of the program. Although each TA is paired with a mentor, the relationship is fluid. Some pairs met on a regular basis and found great satisfaction in an expansive and companionable association, while others preferred briefer or less regular communications. Again, consultation is key. Noted one TA, "Mentors are not overbearing or intrusive. On the contrary, mentors prove to be a valuable resource that TAs can call upon when problems or questions about teaching arise. Thus, the "safety net" never becomes a "spider web" in which the TA feels trapped or entangled; it merely provides the TA with the limited-but-crucial support that many first-year instructors naturally want/need."

A different TA happily wrote, "My experience with my mentor influenced me greatly and helped build confidence in me as a teacher and as a person. My mentor and I worked very closely together. It was great to have someone to turn to about classroom dynamics, implementation of lesson plans—whether they worked or didn't—and for advice on how to adjust accordingly. This collaboration provided me with a sense of comfort and security because we used each other as sounding-boards and shared . . . professional development."

Another TA cautioned, "Nuanced pedagogy is a significant component of instruction. I find limited-but-frequent discussion with my mentor preferable to extended meetings. Shortly before class begins, I spend several minutes advising

my mentor as to the approach I am taking to a particular subject, soliciting feedback, and just as important, seeking interesting oddities and little-known facts that will enhance the natural inquisitiveness in our students. I find my mentor's historical 'tidbits' and insights a welcome aid in pursuit of educational excellence. Without this insight, I would confront the dreaded boredom syndrome ('Oh no, not history!')."

Sardine Tin

The third avenue for consulting and reflecting came about informally. Eight teaching associates from four disciplines shared two glossy-gray offices, one large and one small, and so found themselves working in close proximity to one another. Together for several hours most days, discussions ranged from "What might be a good group activity to introduce x?" to "Why didn't the English execute Napoleon?" to "That was my worst class ever."

Two benefits resulted. "In those daily interactions, we converse often about our challenges, problems, and successes. We have found that our FIT colleagues, just like our mentors, are an invaluable source of information; they often provide us with excellent suggestions for handling situations they also struggled with. They can also tell us how they were unsuccessful in similar situations so that we can avoid repeating their mistakes. The simple fact that all members of the program are equally inexperienced and are easily accessible . . . provides infinite opportunities for professional and personal growth. In friendship 'there is always a sympathetic ear.'" "Over time," another wrote, "we felt a oneness that encouraged success."

Evaluation

The result of all this consultation and reflection was a growing sense of expertise. TAs expressed more confidence in themselves and their students. One TA commented on her "full submersion into faculty work . . . I was given a leadership role and treated like an equal to other faculty members. Our department chair nominated me to head the committee." Another observed, "Associates are free to design their courses within broad parameters acceptable to their respective department heads. No indications are given to the GTCC students or staff that the TA is anything less than a real classroom teacher. This inspires confidence in the TA and enables him/her to make decisions with authority, experiment with various teaching techniques, and generally shape the class to conform to the instructor's individual personality and style." Noting progress toward the end of the school year, another TA commented, "This semester, I feel more like a colleague. I have been designing lessons and sharing them with my mentor so she can use them if she wants. Today I check in . . . not really asking what to do but to share the status of my class." TAs

discovered a beneficial side to teaching courses imperfectly aligned with their area of expertise. "The simple fact is that we will not always have a choice in what we will be asked to teach. Sometimes we have to educate ourselves as we educate others. . . . I have simply put in the extra time and study for adequate class preparation. I am learning as much as the students."

Finally, the totality of the FIT program focused Teaching Associates' appreciation for the challenges and rewards of community college teaching. One TA pursuing the leap from high school to college teaching observed, "All social-economic boundaries were addressed, from the adult learner to those who identify with different cultures as well as ability levels." Another said, "Coming directly from graduate school, [being] a FIT teacher actually helped me downshift (not dumb down) my approach toward freshman history classes, to maintain a current of interest, and to achieve positive results." One associate summed up, "Because it is located in a community college setting, the FIT program provides valuable exposure to two realities of modern education: a diverse student body and distance learning technology. TAs learn to be both sensitive and flexible regarding the many needs of the community college student who, unlike the 'traditional' college student commutes to school and also has a variety of demands on them outside the classroom, including work and family. TAs are forced to balance their idealized views of higher education against the complex realities that are involved in teaching community college students."

Participants found the Faculty-in-Training program to be an enormously positive experience. Teaching Associates advanced on two fronts: teaching prowess and, surprisingly, subject expertise. One TA remarked, "The program respects the desire of the TA to experience a reasonable approximation of the freedom and responsibility that regular faculty enjoy, while at the same recognizing that the TA has little or no prior teaching experience and will therefore need some support."

Finally, concluded one TA, "Access to skilled and talented teaching professionals has greatly contributed to our preparation for the academic job market. [The FIT program] should be extended and all potential faculty members of the community college system should be required to participate."

For the past 18 months (since graduating from the FIT program), Liz McNamara has been teaching classes in Comparative Politics, her area of expertise, and in Political Ideologies at UNC-Greensboro. She also wishes to acknowledge her fellow FIT graduates as contributors to the article: John Bladel, Paul Buck, Jim Carrier, Allison Cooper, Jym Davis, Meagan Gurgon, Meri-Ellen Lynott, and Frank Meacham.

Impecunious? Teach English with Materials of Minimal Cost

Nancy McMahon

Impecunious students? Impecunious teachers? Time and money, key to education, are in short supply for most of us. Don't squander time examining that stack of sample texts—use materials we already read and are truly familiar with. Standard texts are expensive for my working-class students, so I now require students to buy only *A Pocket Style Manual*, 4th ed., by Diana Hacker, under \$20.00. Other materials used in my entry-level classes are school publications, free local papers, and current periodicals.

I teach credit classes for one- or two-year program students and for college transfers. The vocational program students need more emphasis on business and basic writing skills, while the college-transfer classes need more of an academic focus. The college provides outlines of instruction for these courses, but individual teachers select materials and provide teaching techniques. Years of adjunct teaching have taught me that some of the most effective and inexpensive materials are those close to home.

Consider the college catalog and handbook. For an assignment on writing a summary, I have students read, discuss, and summarize (in writing) the section of the catalog on student rights and responsibilities, as well as the handbook's explanation of the grade-appeal processes. Students who might never look at that section on their own will now be aware of the Madison Area Technical College (MATC) policy and procedures. Sometimes, even adjuncts don't take the time to read the school's policies and procedures, but this exercise will familiarize everyone with essential items and can be used to good purpose every semester.

The free papers available in most communities are another often-overlooked resource. Madison has the weekly *Isthmus*, which focuses on local political and cultural events and is readily available to MATC students on campus, at libraries, in convenience stores, etc. Students are assigned to bring the latest *Isthmus* to class each week for use in writing assignments; I might ask them to prepare an *argument* about some current issue, such as proposed funding changes, or do an *analysis* of a review of a movie, concert, or local restaurant. The advertisements and cartoons are worthy of *comparison/contrast* writing assignments and considerable discussion. We also take advantage of *The Onion*—free, humorous, and read by students weekly. In addition, I use material from *Newsweek* (like Anna Quindlen's "Life of the Closed Mind," May 30, 2005), *Parade* (Lynn Brenner's "How to Land Your First Job," June 12, 2005), or other more vocation-specific periodicals appropriate to the curriculum. I search out items that these students will actually read—an increasing challenge in entry-level classes.

Most MATC students have little spare time and very little money, so they appreciate making the best use of their time and resources. As adjunct faculty, I have often felt that we have even less time and money in proportion to educational expectations. Using free and readily available materials can help with both problems, and as an added bonus, look at the space we free up when we're not storing stacks of barely used textbooks!

Nancy McMahan, a PEP recipient and frequent contributor to FORUM, teaches at Madison Area Technical College.

Part-Timer: Blessing in Disguise

Bill Sammons

Those last days in graduate school were a bit frightening, except for the help of my university, one of many that support grad students by offering them teaching and research assistantships in an effort to prepare them more fully for their "first" academic position. I was very thankful for their support and encouragement.

After graduation, my choices for full-time employment were limited, at least if it mattered to me where I went. And it did. Although I had some very good offers in the Midwest, I didn't want to live there. My spouse was offered a full-time position in California, so, as part of the offer, I opted to take an adjunct position at a state school there. The unwritten promise by the administration of the school was that I would be the first considered for a full-time position when and if it became available. Well, as luck would have it, a hiring freeze ensued for five years.

This is where the blessing comes about. As a part-timer, I was free from many of the full-timer obligations, such as committee meetings, research requirements, and student counseling. As a result, I could focus on my own interests. One of those was grant writing. My adviser in graduate school had taught me the inherent value of writing for grants and I had been a coauthor on several successful research proposals. Now it was time for me to try to do it alone.

I wrote about 40 grant proposals in a five-year period and, fortunately, a few of them were successful. Once the money started coming in, the administration took a new stand with me and offered a full-time administrative position as director of a new program. Of course, my grant proposals had included the funds for such a position, so the institution only had to commit to facility space and minimal resources for 5 years, after which the program had to be institutionalized. I accepted the "temporary" position, developed the program, and then decided not to accept the permanent position at year three: I wanted freedom again.

Adjunct status helped me to blossom and maintain my personal interests, which, I realized, was more important to me than other goals. I do not believe that I could have accomplished this feat had I been a full-timer. I feel now that I was fortunate to have had the freedom to explore my own personal academic interests without the burdens imposed by full-time status. Indeed, a blessing in disguise.

Bill Sammons teaches online and also works with Online Scoring Network of the Educational Testing Service.

Book Review

Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line: The Marketing of Higher Education

by David L. Kirp, Harvard University Press, 2003

Reviewed by Joanne Cordón

In *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line: The Marketing of Higher Education*, David L. Kirp argues that the path of higher education for the past three decades reflects the business metaphor that has been superimposed over colleges and universities: “For better or for worse—for better *and* for worse, really—American higher education is being transformed by the power and the ethic of the marketplace” (2). Responding to the fiscal realities of the 1970s and declining government support for higher education, the architects of higher education borrowed from business its key principles and its language; as a result, higher education has been reimagined as a market. Kirp does not romanticize his subject, imagining some golden age in which monetary concerns never surfaced as scholars roamed their sumptuous campuses, reclining on artfully designed sofas, fanned by devotees busily adorning their velvet lapels with flowers and perfuming the air with quotations from Shakespeare. He acknowledges that money has always been a factor in higher education, but recently the emphasis has shifted: “What *is* new, and troubling, is the raw power that money directly exerts over so many aspects of higher education” (3). Money changes from one factor among many to the primary factor in the American university.

The “market” view of the university shapes the path of American higher education to such a degree that Kirp calls its new prominence a revolution. Linking his analysis to the often-revised classics—Riesman and Jencks’s *The Academic Revolution* (1968) and Kerr’s *The Uses of the University* (1964)—he characterizes the current state of American higher education as the second wave of a revolution:

A “revolution” is how David Riesman and Christopher Jencks, writing in 1968, characterized the shift from Mr. Chips’s tranquil pre-World War II world of the

academic village to Clark Kerr's teeming "multiversity"; and "revolution" is at least as good a description of the present, what Kerr himself has called "the greatest critical age of higher education." New educational technologies; a generation of students with different desires and faculty with different demands; a new breed of rivals that live or die by the market; the incessant demand for more funds and new revenue sources to replace the ever-shrinking proportion of public support; a genuinely global market in minds; taken together, these forces are remaking the university into what has variously been called the side of "academic capitalism," the "entrepreneurial university," and the "enterprise university" (6).

This "remaking" or reinvention of the American university is the real subject of the book. The implications of this shift in ideas—expecting a place such as, say, the University of Michigan to respond to the implementation of business principles just like a toothpaste factory would—is the story Kirp documents. Outlining the story of the reinvention, Kirp takes a case study approach to document what has happened at a range of institutions across the United States.

In presenting the case of a college or university, Kirp traces the pivotal moments in a school's reinvention. He gives a loosely chronological account of each case, including the school's history and often the path of its most critical administrators, and documents his subject carefully. In analyzing what happened at Dickinson College, for example, the author looks at the near-death experience of a Pennsylvanian liberal arts school at the end of the 1990s until the arrival of president Bill Durden, an academic with considerable business success. The president, an alumnus, knows that the school offers a good liberal arts education, but does not have the reputation of prestigious schools such as Smith or Williams. Finding the right niche for the school has been Durden's success. With a college motto of "Distinctively Dickinsonian," the president has been emphasizing what makes Dickinson College stand out from the crowd. He assembled a task force to clarify the college's identity or "brand" within one academic year, and created simple, visual cues to the school's identity by distributing laminated wallet cards enumerating the college's key goals. Dickinson hired a marketing consultant to come up with a phrase that clarified the school's identity: "Reflecting America, Engaging the World" (59). The global "engagements" are a central part of Dickinson's brand: "Dickinson runs thirty-two programs on six continents. Eighty percent of its students spend at least one semester abroad, at campuses from Bologna to Nagoya" (58). The new initiatives are not all positive; for example, between 1999 and 2002, the college did not "reflect" America, especially poorer America, and the percentage of first-generation college students has dropped from 22 to 12 percent. The student demographics may show a disturbing trend, but the liberal arts school seems to be doing well, and its "brand" is clearer than ever. Another example of what sets Dickinson apart is its heritage, and citing the college's champion and

Declaration of Independence signer Benjamin Rush, the college considers itself the first “revolutionary college” (59).

Kirp’s implicit agenda shapes his analysis, but he is clear (yet often subtle) in arguing that the university has “values that the market does not honor” (7), ideas such as the importance of the community of scholars, intellectual openness, and a humble pursuit of truth. For example, he describes the star-studded strategy that led to the refurbishment of New York University. Following some serious fund-raising and a financial windfall in the 1980s, NYU decided to spend the money it raised, rather than merely adding to its endowment. The university spent a lot of its money on luring academic stars to NYU by offering dramatically increased annual salaries (\$150,000 and up) and other perks, such as reduced teaching loads. The resultant dramatic rise in reputation is particularly evident in the law school and the philosophy department. Kirp uses the image of a rejuvenated snake to couch his analysis of what the star-system effects at the university: “NYU sloughs off a great deal of its teaching onto part-timers. Twenty-seven hundred adjuncts, almost the same in number as the tenure-ladder faculty, teach 70 percent of the undergraduate classes, a figure considerably higher than at comparable universities” (69). The language of numbers is matter-of-fact, but the imagery casts the university as a reptile. Often Kirp merely lists salient facts; for example, he presents his critique of the retreat from undergraduate teaching in the inventory of the university’s decisions. Often Kirp will highlight his own point by quoting a source whose vision matches his own. For example, a former member of the NYU philosophy department, Douglas Lackey, criticizes NYU with a rhetorical question: “How long a profession can survive while starving its young and throwing perks at a few older celebrities remains to be seen” (88).

The weaknesses of this book are the weaknesses of the case study method. If the author wants to assemble a book that its reader is able to lift without mechanical support, its scope must be limited, but Kirp does not explicitly state the principle of selection in choosing the schools he writes about. He includes schools from most regions of the country: Associated Colleges of the South, Columbia University, Darden Graduate School of Business Administration, DeVry University, Dickinson College, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, New York Law School, New York University, Open University, University of California at Berkeley, University of Chicago, University of Michigan, University of Southern California, and University of Virginia. As the list suggests, the selection is dominated by state universities, schools on both coasts, or schools with prominent names. He alludes to a wider array of schools in his analysis; for example, in tracing the career of Rick Matasar, president and dean of the New York Law School, the author examines Matasar’s tenure at his earlier posts, Chicago-Kent and the University of Florida. Of course, schools with plummy endowments, especially Harvard and Yale, thread through

the entire discussion.

Ultimately, Kirp argues that the American university needs to be re-imagined. In contrast to the “enterprise university,” Kirp has a different image of what a university should be. While he admits that market forces sometimes can play out to improve a particular school, he argues that imagining a university as only an “enterprise” is too narrow, for a university has values that transcend the balance sheet. Instead of a balance sheet, the ultimate goal of a university is a contribution to the common good. As a result, Kirp asks if the public can be shown that the university “contributes to the development of knowledgeable and responsible citizens, encourages social cohesion, promotes and spreads knowledge, increases social mobility, and stimulates the economy” (263). The last few paragraphs of the work suggest his un-sunny outlook. With no one to champion this enterprise, the university might eventually be more than imagined as a market; it might be one. Kirp ends with a plaintive question that will take more than a book to answer: “If there is a less dystopian future, one that revives the soul of this old institution, who is to advance it—and if not now, when?” (263).

Joanne Cordón is an instructor in the English Department at the University of Connecticut.

Don't Forget the Spring CAP SIG Meeting

CCCC meets in Chicago March 22–25, 2006. We hope you're there and planning to attend the Wednesday evening CAP Special Interest Group meeting from 6:30–7:30 p.m. (see program for exact location) where we will discuss how CCCC can address the extremely diverse needs of part-time, adjunct, and contingent writing teachers, improve access to its support and resources, and analyze how CAP members and the larger CCCC membership can benefit from coordinated efforts. Join us for and lend your voice to this critical discussion.

See you there!

**To secure complimentary offprints of *Forum*,
contact NCTE's Customer Service at
(217) 328-3870 or (877) 369-6283; or jbartlett@ncte.org.**