

CHAPTER 1

SILENT SUBVERSION, QUIET COMPETENCE, AND PATIENT PERSISTENCE

Carol Lind

Illinois State University

Joan Mullin

University of North Carolina Charlotte

Threads: Organizing Within and Across Ranks; Protecting Gains, Telling Cautionary Tales¹

Contingent faculty often have the same experience and research curiosities as their tenure-track counterparts, but rarely have the same opportunities to continue their professional growth. Reduced workloads, access to travel funds, and other internal resources are seldom available to non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty, even those with terminal degrees: contracts usually specify their primary responsibility as teaching, and workloads leave little time for extensive scholarly pursuits. While tenure-track (TT) faculty can seek reassignments and resources by claiming the necessity of continued research, NTTs often cannot, even though they would agree with Judy Olson, chair of the NEA's Contingent Faculty Caucus, that

[p]articipating in scholarship makes us better teachers, traveling makes us better teachers, reading and taking classes make us better. We cannot help students understand how to participate in academic conversations unless we participate ourselves. College teachers who only teach can become drained of their creative and intellectual nutrients without a source of replenishment. All students deserve to have teachers who have their own creative wells to draw from. (44)

¹ The threads are meant to guide you to other chapters in the collection that speak to related issues. Sometimes the chapters that we've threaded together agree or extend each other; at other times they contest or complicate each other. For a complete list of the threads, see the Introduction.

Olson continues to reason that “well over half of all the faculty members students now encounter in their classes are off the tenure track and generally not eligible for sabbatical leaves. Students deserve to have teachers who have access to all the resources that we know make people better teachers, regardless of tenure status” (44). The authors of this chapter were part of an effort that began to address this need to create a research opportunity for contingent faculty within what has been a traditionally resistant academic culture. This narration traces the development of an NTT “reassignment award,” perhaps not as rich a sabbatical as it should be, but a step towards practicing the equity about which English department tenure line faculty often try to teach their own students. Here, we outline a one-semester course release, the fears that had to be overcome in the process of integrating it into academic culture, the negotiation of departmental politics that occurred, and the affective and professional effects that resulted from its success. Collaboratively written by the then-chair of the department and an NTT, it is also a story of silent subversion, quiet competence, and patient persistence, pointing not only to the difficulties of achieving equity in the academy, but also to the need for mutual trust and a mutual commitment to ethical action. We begin with our narrative and then, drawing upon some of the recent commentary on contingent academic labor, we ask that all academic workers reconsider the stakes that necessitate supportive collaboration, recognition, and rewards, stakes that affect our collective efforts to teach, research, serve and model the democratic practices we teach. We suggest here that to enact policies of fair treatment, all faculty need to face histories, attitudes, and fears that arise from their prior experiences.

CAUTIOUS STEPS AND AGENCY

Out of seventy faculty and staff in the department described here, there were thirty-eight TT, a handful of adjuncts, eighty teaching assistants and nine full-time NTTs. After teaching 4/4 loads for ten consecutive semesters in the institution, NTTs earn “status” and are scheduled for courses before non-status NTTs and adjuncts. Several of the NTTs referred to at the time had “status” and others were on their way to earning it, so they were a fairly long-term and committed working group. The planning for a course reassignment program took place in the fall of 2010 after a meeting between the department chair (Joan) and the NTT faculty working in the English department. Joan had recently become chair of the department, and this meeting was one of many that she held with different groups of faculty and staff in an effort to get a feel for the needs and concerns of those working within the department. There was no way for the NTTs at the meeting to know Joan’s own history as a marginalized academic, or of her previous advo-

cacy for contingent faculty; and, sitting there with the group, Joan could already see the distrust leveled at her as chair—with good reason.

Within her first weeks as chair, Joan had heard TT faculty in one breath praise some NTTs in the room for their well-regarded teaching, and then follow it with a criticism of their abilities as academics in the next, with implied—or direct, pointed—comments: *NTTs don't understand what it is like to research and teach; some are home grown* [said as a negative]; *they cannot serve on search committees, even when the search is for one of their direct supervisors, because they have no real stake in the department.* Pleasant and collegial in public, several faculty had already approached Joan in private about limiting NTTs' current voting rights on general matters affecting the whole unit; about reducing the number of NTTs hired (perhaps by increasing graduate student teaching assistantships); and about creating a protocol for determining which courses could only be taught by TT faculty, full time NTTs with status, and graduate students. While TT faculty agreed many of the contingent faculty could expertly teach not only first year writing, but writing and literature courses, and had done so successfully, there was also an expressed fear that continuing to do so meant TT faculty would be giving up their control over the curriculum. While this latter fear was only that—a fear—it was often tied to the idea that giving privileges/equity to NTTs meant TTs would lose more of their own autonomy and control over curriculum.

It would be unfair to characterize all of the thirty-eight TT negatively, or to even characterize many of those who made these comments as overtly malicious, since issues of academic privilege, especially in humanities departments, often cause faculty to feel their usefulness, status and resources attacked on every side. While there was also a good deal of camaraderie among TT and NTT and an understanding among the TT that NTTs' loads allowed the TT to teach more graduate and upper division courses, historical feelings that NTTs could not be considered equal intellectual partners prevailed, often tacitly.

Given this context, one that simmers under collegiality, it is not surprising that at Joan's first meeting with them, NTTs stated that they would feel more valued if assigned courses based not only on departmental needs, but upon their own experience, training and/or publications. They noted that over half have terminal degrees (M.F.A. and Ph.D.), are published, read in their fields, and participate in faculty development. They could redesign the writing and general education literature courses that they regularly teach as much as they managed, but they wanted the time to further research even these areas, to incorporate new material, and to improve their theoretical and pedagogical knowledge. As they spoke about their desires and possibilities, it became apparent that every NTT seated around the table had an idea for a radical redesign of an existing course,

but had no time to create, let alone an opportunity to implement, such a reimagined course. Lecturers lamented that they were being more often pigeonholed into the most rudimentary teaching assignments, often teaching the same four courses every semester. The department sometimes struggled to offer enough advanced courses across its nine sub-disciplines to its seven hundred majors, and when the schedule was really pressed, select NTTs did teach advanced courses, often either those NTTs married to TT faculty, or one or two home grown former graduate students. Overall, however, lecturers were not regularly assigned to teach courses other than general education requirements, since the unstated belief was that the graduate and upper division curriculum belongs to TT faculty; NTTs were equipped for and hired to teach “service courses.”

Joan agreed that given NTTs’ current workloads, it was difficult to pursue their own professional development. She asked whether a course release award process could be created for them, whereby they would apply for a semester’s “reassignment” in order to do research and course development; “reassignment” was institution-speak for release time and would parallel the term given to TT course releases. The response was positive of course; the meeting broke up, and then the chair did something that none of the NTTs really expected her to do—she followed up on the idea by asking them to come up with an award plan that she would then submit to the Advisory Council for approval. The surprise was not based upon Joan’s personal credibility; the NTTs knew very little about her, but they did have a great deal of experience with well-spoken chairs and TTs in the past, particularly with those in power positions within the English department. They had met at different times with several candidates applying for departmental administrative positions. Each and every one of these expressed their genuine intention to work closely with the NTTs in order to better integrate them into the rich and varied work of the department. Once hired, however, those “intentions” were forgotten as quickly as promises made during a heated political campaign. Because of this, the NTTs had (and still have) a healthy skepticism toward such promises.

Since the NTTs are a small community within the department, they are a very close-knit group, working together almost daily to address issues within classes, the department, and the university at large. Many are involved members in the NTT union on campus, helping make great strides in some areas, and refining the union rules (such as they are). What may be visible, but less acknowledged, is their active participation on departmental and college committees, as allowed, or their mentoring of first year students who come to know them and turn to NTTs as mentors. In each of these roles, they demonstrate their commitment to students and colleagues and believe they help promote a more collegial workplace for all faculty, be they tenured, tenure-track, or NTT. Nonetheless, there was a great deal of discussion concerning Joan’s invitation

in the “NTT hallway,” a spur off the main floor office areas, where most NTT offices are located. Certainly, there was astonishment that someone in authority had actually followed-up on the meeting, but there were several other reactions as well: happiness; a new sense of purpose; curiosity; and—it must be said—a good deal of skepticism and suspicion.

The first question Joan’s proposal produced was, “Why?” Why would she offer us this boon? What motives could she possibly have in doing so? It was suggested by one of the members that she might be doing it in order to get NTT support within a department that is rife with intrigue and infighting. However, since NTT support really doesn’t mean much more than the proverbial hill of beans, that motive seemed unlikely. Torn between their own desires to be in the community as equals and by their consciousness of their treatment over the years, NTTs also feared being caught in their own siege mentality; so while they wanted to support one another, they also knew they suspected the motives of anyone who was not part of their NTT community.

For that reason, the thesis that gained the most traction was more conspiracy theory than anything else: perhaps Joan was putting this program into place in an effort to divide the lecturers, to put them into competition with one another as they vied for the coveted award.

This seemed most likely since each person had ideas about redesigning a course, and there would only be one course reassignment per semester. Would choosing to prioritize one course proposal over another put the lecturers at odds with one another and make them easier to control? It seemed that all the NTTs harbored that fear to some degree, and were at least a little suspicious about the proposal. It was such a great opportunity, however, that they felt the risks would be worth going forward: what more did they have to lose? So, working together, the NTTs drafted the course release proposal in September of 2010:

We propose that a course release should be awarded each semester in order to enable an NTT to develop or redesign a course in his/her area of expertise, to be taught within the next calendar year as part of the NTT’s regular teaching assignment load. This course release would be used to plan course readings and content, explore new modes of delivery, and to develop assignments and assessment tools. It would be a rotating opportunity for NTT faculty modeled, in part, upon the research sabbatical offered to tenured and tenure-track faculty. This course release would be used to redesign a course already on the books, not to develop new curriculum.

The chair's first response to the NTTs' proposal was a strong recommendation that the name of the program be changed to "course reassignment" rather than "course release." This was common institutional language for a course reduction, and maintaining that language would avoid possible backlash from TT faculty, who might object to the department granting the NTTs a release from any of their standard four-four commitment (as compared to TT's three-two, two-two, two-one, or one-one). Any course release contractually granted to an NTT might also mean a faculty member would have to pick up an additional class, should it be needed. A "reassignment" signaled that the NTT was doing work for the department. This proved a prescient rename, for one member of the Advisory Council did approach the chair before the award was approved at a meeting, asking whether the department could "afford" a course release: "What if we need someone to teach a course at the last minute?" Assured that such occasions were rare, the TT member replied, "Oh, so if there were an emergency, the NTT could just delay her award until the next semester." (Chairs' noncommittal comments to such replies are an art form.)

The next step was to create a group that would oversee the selection process. It was decided that the committee would be made up of the department chair, the associate chair, the director of the writing program, and one NTT. These selections were not made randomly, but were intended to create a committee that would be TT heavy, yet, at least with the current administrators in those positions, would be comprised of people known to be respectful of the process and respectful of those submitting applications. The members appointed to the committee would also make sense to TT faculty administratively, since the chair was the direct supervisor of the NTTs, and the associate chair was in charge of course assignments; and, since it was assumed that many of the proposals would concern courses within the writing program, the director of writing could also best evaluate the contribution of proposals to the program. Carol was selected by the NTTs to be their first representative on the committee, with the understanding that thereafter each award recipient would rotate onto the selection committee, and then off as the next took his or her place.

Though the NTTs felt it was vital to have an active role in the selection, implementation, and evaluation of the reassignment award, that decision was met with some apprehension within their community. Certainly, they were happy to be part of the decision-making process and preferred that idea over having only tenured faculty members evaluating proposals, but there was still a great deal of concern that choosing one proposal over another might cause a rift within the group. Carol assured them that she would make her work on the committee as transparent as possible and would see that the decision represented the

NTTs' best interests as individuals and as a group. The fact is, though, that she approached the committee work with a good deal of trepidation of her own, concerned that any disgruntlement over who received the assignment might be aimed at her. Carol had a good relationship with her colleagues, which is why they chose her to represent them, but she didn't want to jeopardize that camaraderie for the sake of this program. Fortunately, when she expressed her concerns to the NTTs, they assured Carol that they trusted her to make an impartial decision and to represent their best interests. With that assurance, a fellow NTT and Carol designed the call for proposals and, after receiving committee approval, sent out the initial email to their peers (see Appendix A).

Of course, not everyone submitted a proposal that first go-round. Some weren't ready to submit a proposal at that time and others preferred to sit back and see how the program went before throwing their hats in the ring. Since Carol served on the committee, she didn't submit a proposal during that first call, but two other NTTs did. One proposal, submitted by Anne Norton, was for a redesign of English 145.13—Composition II for Business and Government. In it, Anne noted that the current course was in serious need of revamping.

This course has always had close ties to the College of Business, which has some relatively firm expectations for what its students will have learned and accomplished, and the writing skills that they will carry on into the “real world” of their business careers. While it allows for a certain amount of academic freedom for the English instructors who teach it, it is not a course to be blindly kicked around just for the purpose of playing with pedagogical theories of composition.

For the last few years, there has been little to no direct collaboration between the English Department Writing Program and the College of Business to make certain that 145.13 stays current with the college's needs and expectations. For the proposed re-design, it was *crucial* to reinstitute that collaboration.

Anne realized that the department's business writing courses had become stale over the years, employing business writing models that were out of date and far removed from the current reality. She would use her reassignment to reevaluate the course material through meetings with the university's department of business and with local business leaders.

The second proposal came from Elizabeth Hatmaker, who proposed a redesign of a course in Interdisciplinary Studies—IDS 121.47: Film and the Artist, a general education course she often taught for the department. In her proposal, Elizabeth outlined her work in the course and the challenges that she faced teaching a class in which some students were technologically advanced, while others were much less so. She had very clear ideas of what she'd like to do with the time that a course reassignment would afford her:

It is my hope to use this course release opportunity to learn digital technologies such as MovieMaker, Photoshop, and Audacity. I also hope to shoot some film footage with which I hope to illustrate to students in class how basic editing practices work. I hope to use these technologies not necessarily to teach filmmaking per se, but to engage students in the practice of editing so that they might develop more sophisticated skills interpreting films.

Having had some time to examine both proposals, the committee shared their opinions with each other via email and ultimately came to the decision to approve Anne's proposal, based upon departmental needs. Although Elizabeth had submitted a strong proposal, the committee felt that Anne's redesign of her writing class would be more beneficial to the work of the department. (Elizabeth did resubmit her proposal a couple of semesters later and was approved for the course reassignment at that time.) The committee contacted Joan, who sent the congratulatory email to Anne.

Anne's reassignment was in the spring semester of 2011, and she taught her redesigned course in the fall of 2012. The information she gleaned from working within the Business College was layered into a redesign of that course, and tangentially contributed to the composition curriculum.

Since Anne was granted the first reassignment, she became the NTT representative on the committee charged with overseeing the program, and helped make the decision about who would receive the next reassignment, which would take place in the fall semester. Because Carol was no longer the NTT representative on the committee, she decided that this would be a good time to submit her own proposal to redesign an existing face-to-face general education course (English 110: British Literature and Its Contexts) into one that could be taught completely online. The university, the college, and the department were all desirous of offering more online courses in the summer, so this redesign would prove beneficial not only to them, but to Carol's pedagogical interests, as well. (Not to mention the students who could take a general education course wherever they happened to be during the summer semester.) In order to redesign the course, Carol needed to learn how to deliver information and evaluate performance in an online setting—a time consuming task if she were teaching three other courses, but an impossibility if she were teaching four.

Without the course reassignment, Carol would have never had the time or opportunity to do such a radical redesign of that class. In fact, she would probably not even be teaching anything but the same course in first year writing every semester. Carol feels deeply indebted to those in the department who gave

her the opportunity to teach a course that never fails to delight her, as does her 2010-11 University Teaching Award. Such delight and recognition should be any university instructor's just reward within academic systems that claim to value teaching. The opportunity for NTTs to pursue their passions, and the personal benefits that accrue as a result, contribute to their own sets of personal and professional growth, but the program has generated several important curricular contributions for the department, including:

- A redesign of a "Grammar for Writers" course that had stagnated over several years of neglect;
- The creation of new course material for a text and context course that will focus on labor history and working class issues; and
- A face-to-face course in the English education program redesigned to be taught online.

The process itself hasn't changed much since the program's inception. The only major change is that proposals are accepted in the spring for the following fall and spring semesters; that way, the submission process only needs to occur once a year, rather than every semester.

UNPACKING THE PROBLEMS

Finally, there is the silence that always seems to go along with the work that NTTs do within departments. The call for proposals states,

Following the semester of teaching, the faculty member would submit an outcomes statement (two page maximum) to the Chair of the Department that will document the process of the course and reflect on successes and revisions to the course based on assessments such as student comments and peer review.

This aspect of the program has never been completed by any of the NTTs who have been granted course reassignments. Such a statement has not been requested, which appears to imply a lack of respect (and curiosity) about the work the NTTs are doing within their classrooms and this program. And to some extent that is true. Even in Joan's mind, the program was not part of the culture of the department, so it was left to the NTTs to remind the chair that the annual call should be sent; the committee should meet; the decision should be made. The problem, though, is not as simple as a lack of respect, but perhaps backhanded respect: the NTTs are the most reliable to perform the usual and expected work assigned, the least (publicly) complaining, and therefore, the easiest

to overlook. Speaking on behalf of contingent labor, Angela Billa notes:

Our institutions value [contingent labor] mostly in the utilitarian role we play: we fill the holes, we quiet the masses, we deal with the charge to fix the problems that underprepared high school graduates bring to college. We are the mechanics in the assembly line, plugging in little parts. (387)

Since NTTs do mind their own work and do not demand the attention that TT faculty and students do—since NTTs know their jobs and realize that their course assignments (and possibly their careers) are at risk if they speak out—a vicious cycle continues; they often don't remind others of obligations and promises.

If we combine the facts of contingent academic labor conditions made clear by statistical data and anecdotal evidence (like that of Schell and of Vincent Tirelli) with theories about how the human mind shapes an identity, we can begin to see that the isolation and exile of contingent faculty common across the disciplines and across institution types creates a body of faculty who are likely to see themselves as outsiders and outcasts, taking on and expressing all of the psychological traits thereof (Jacobe 380-81).

Jacobe's observation of isolation and exile could sadly apply to any number of campus communities; that is, it could apply unless there is a persistent commitment on the part of all faculty to bring about real change. Although the NTTs in our department were aware of the risk of victim mentality, and Joan and other TT track faculty sought to reassure them, that assurance could easily have been read as patronizing protection and could have fed the perceived and actual academic bullying of contingent faculty. In "Workplace Bullying in Higher Education," Lester names treatment of and "exclusion of contingent faculty" as "behaviors [that] are constant and continuous and show a pattern of abuse that causes psychological harm to the victim" (ix). Lester pulls together the work of other experts, noting that such conditions prevail in academe and nurture too many TTs' "big egos, an individualistic ethic, and tolerance for behaviors not accepted elsewhere" (1).

Rank and privilege, with the accompanying hierarchy, exclusion and abuse, continue to trump democratization and collegiality, even as that privilege is fast disappearing through the "emergence of the modern research university as a fundamental site of struggle over the corporatization and privatization of knowledge" (Gilbert 34). Gilbert's critique is pertinent here, for he calls for a new strategy for preventing corporatization, one that depends on the creation of a public sphere. Essential to our point, he notes:

The landscape of intellectual work in the age of the corporate casualized university is increasingly defined by a dangerous

hierarchy in which tenure and job security are reserved for a select few and non-tenured, casual workers conduct a disproportionate amount of the instruction. (37)

That the fight for status, the exclusion of contingent faculty, and negative and bullying behaviors are too often engaged in by the very faculty teaching Marxism or social justice demonstrates the double standard that exists within tenure-track faculty. Those fighting social justice through their scholarship and classrooms don't always recognize as injustice the position of lecturers in their own departments. One of these TT faculty members made an appointment with Joan to explain why NTTs should not have even a marginal vote in the department. Her logic? If we keep hiring NTTs, their votes and voice may outnumber that of tenured faculty. She insisted that NTTs don't understand the academy like TTs do. This may be true in some ways given the differing contractual work of each group; but in the process of privileging TTs, this woman excluded the rights and perspectives of the NTT group whose labor enables the TTs to teach fewer classes and engage in research. Another TT advocate for feminist issues assured the female NTTs that if they voted for her for Advisory, a body that made decisions for the department, she would continue to advocate for their rights and privileges. She was later overheard by an NTT telling another tenured feminist faculty member that "over [her] dead body would those NTTs get any more power in this department." She wanted to be on Advisory to stop the "encroachment" of NTTs.

As Gilbert rightly notes, movements to rectify such inequities in the academy do not usually come from TT faculty, but rather from recently organized graduate students who understand that change will only come "alongside other workers and as part of broader publics. . . . [through] an academic community built in collaboration with democratic concerns and constituencies" (44). There are, however, tenure-track faculty willing to join forces. In the case outlined here, while there were several TT supporters of the reassignment award, they proceeded very carefully: assuming that a conversation about the conditions that existed in our department would be doomed and, in turn, doom the proposal, the TT administrative awards committee members strategized how to downplay the reassignment proposal as it proceeded through the department. This was especially important since at that time TT faculty were also demanding course releases to serve as departmental library liaison, or for volunteering to advise students, or "because I research a lot and publish." Asking to give the "workhorses of the department" a course release required cautious diplomacy because of these faculty requests, and because TT faculty attempting to foster this award at best risked their standing with their TT peers, and at worst feared at least one mem-

ber in the department might file a faculty grievance against them. As it turned out, the proposal passed through the department without an overt whimper. There were covert personal consequences that accrued to TT members, and the grumblings continued about NTT voices in the department, as did the suggestions to remove what little voting rights they had and the plans to replace NTT lines with graduate students.

TO BE CONTINUED . . .

Beyond the NTT community, this award program has not, to date, significantly impacted the culture of the department. Yet in the case we describe here, the agency taken by the NTTs has continued. Had they and supporting faculty not persisted, the obligations and promises could have easily been forgotten, and prior fears reasserted themselves. With the NTTs' encouragement, Carol did propose the creation of an online class, and was granted a course redesign award. She also gave a professional development talk about designing online courses in April of 2014. It was well attended, and since then she has had several TT attendees ask her for advice on designing and maintaining their own online courses. Her redesigned course is now regularly scheduled, enrolls quickly, and is seen as an asset to the department curriculum. This example of NTT recognition and collaboration represents the kind of work that needs to happen in the academy, a breaking of barriers that demonstrates, rather than just theorizes, that issues of social justice and equity are what we practice in our own backyards. Gilbert concludes that to save higher education, TTs have to realize that "[t]he mode of being of the new intellectual can no longer consist in eloquence, which is an exterior and momentary mover of feelings and passions, but in active participation in practical life, as constructor, organizer, 'permanent persuader' and not just a simple orator" (44). We have to work collectively, enacting equity among ourselves instead of merely speaking about equity—while fighting together to maintain fair distribution of resources. We can't call this one project an unqualified success in shifting attitudes, but we do see it as a success: it continues.

The reassignment award also continues to be important to NTTs, to their morale, and to their continued growth as teachers; and yet they live with the possibility that those in control—in a department in which they have limited voice—might decide at any time that it is not a good use of departmental resources. A recent change in administration has unfortunately created a somewhat chilly climate for contingent faculty. In spite of this setback, the NTTs continue to listen to each other, pat themselves on the back, and walk into the classroom just a little more excited, a little more prepared, and a lot more creative than they would have been had there been no follow-up on that original

meeting. Quiet though they may be in public, word of their enthusiasm and of their teaching accomplishments does ripple through all the hallways. There is a sense that the course reassignment award benefits the university, the NTTs, their students, and the department members as a whole, although the latter do not always acknowledge the exciting, innovative work going on in that little NTT hallway at the corner of the building. They should, though, because as the course reassignment program continues, the NTT competency is more noticeable; the subversion is a little less silent, and the patience of this hard-working group of educators—although often tried—persists.

WORKS CITED

- Billa, Angela, et al. "Forum on Identity." *Contingent Faculty*, special issue of *College English*, vol. 73, no. 4, 2011, pp. 379-95.
- Gilbert, Daniel A. "The Generation of Public Intellectuals: Corporate Universities, Graduate Employees and the Academic Labor Movement." *Labor Studies Journal*, vol. 38, no. 32, 2013, pp. 32-46, www.citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.825.3768&rep=rep1&type=pdf.
- Lester, Jaime. *Workplace Bullying in Higher Education*. Routledge, 2012.
- Olson, Judy. "Sabbaticals: Why not for adjunct faculty too?" *NEA Higher Education Advocate*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2012, p. 44.
- Palmquist, Mike (chair), et al. "Statement on the Status and Working Conditions of Contingent Faculty." *Contingent Faculty*, special issue of *College English*, vol. 73, no. 4, 2011, pp. 356-59.

APPENDIX A

CALL: NTT COURSE DESIGN PROPOSAL

Proposals are being solicited from NTT faculty interested in developing or redesigning a 100 or 200 level course in his/her area of expertise. The redesign should address an existing English or Interdisciplinary Studies course currently listed in the ISU catalog. The applicant chosen would use one-course reassigned time to plan course readings and content, explore new modes of delivery, and to develop assignments and assessment tools.

At the end of the semester for which the reassignment is given, the selected applicant will submit a copy of the course syllabus and reading list to the Proposal Committee, noting in brief, the reasons for the changes that have been made (one page maximum). Consistent with curricular needs, during the next academic year, the department would schedule this faculty member to teach the redeveloped course. Following the semester of teaching, the faculty member

would submit an outcomes statement (two page maximum) to the chair of the department that will document the process of the course and reflect on successes and revisions to the course based on assessments such as student comments and peer review.

Applicant Criteria: All Department of English status NTTs or full time probationary NTT faculty who have completed six semesters of instruction.

Application Materials: Applicants should complete the attached form and a current cv.

Application process: Applications are due, electronically, to [the Administrative Assistant] by 4:30 p.m. November 19, 2010.

Proposals will be reviewed by the appointed NTT representative, the chair of the Undergraduate Committee, and a faculty representative of the Writing Committee, who will make a recommendation to the Department Chair. Applicants will be notified by December 3, 2010.