Academic Labor: Research and Artistry

Volume 2

2018

Volume 2, Issue 1

Center for the Study of Academic Labor CSAL


Academic Labor: Research & Artistry

From the Editors

In this second issue of *Academic Labor: Research & Artistry*, you will find a variety of perspectives on contingent academic labor. The articles presented here demonstrate how adjunct faculty working conditions have and have not changed over the course of the past century; how activism can take the form of slowing down and acting purposefully, or taking to the streets for a radical approach; how time factors into discussions about academic labor; how a task force is currently working toward adjunct faculty reform; and processes involved in labor organizing. Time is a common theme in this issue: examining how faculty spent their time in the past, how they are currently spending their time, and how their time can be more highly valued in the future. The contributors examine the complexities of higher education's economies of value, and how these values manifest in what gets said about faculty work and faculty lives.

Megan Condis and Courtney Adams Wooten in "Collegiality as Surveillance? Implementing Collegiality Statements in Institutions of Higher Education" examine the collegiality statement as a genre that indicates much about the regimes of value that shape faculty experiences. Condis and Wooten warn that discussions about collegiality can lead to surveillance and a reinforcement of homogeneity among the faculty. Condis and Wooten argue that we "must insist that tenure and promotion discussions be centered around an individual's capacity to contribute to a department and institution, not whether they conform to traditional expectations of how a faculty member should look, be, speak, or act."

The ramifications of overworking and burnout are examined in a historical context in Rebecca Gerdes-McClain's "Rhetorical Listening and Strategic Contemplation as Research Tools." In the early 20th century, Edwin Hopkins was among the first to collect and share data on the labor demands of composition instructors. Hopkins sought national reform on composition instructors' workload but had limited success. His data demonstrated that composition instructors had double the recommended workload, leading to health problems in exhausted and overworked faculty—a scenario as familiar today as it was 100 years ago.

In "Terms of Time for Composition: A Materialist Examination of Contingent Faculty Labor," Jesse Priest examines time as a construct in the discussion of faculty work. Priest argues that time should be treated separately from labor and critiqued as its own issue. In particular, he points out that there is a disconnect between the most time-consuming parts of the job (e.g., grading, meetings) and the parts that faculty find most valuable. And there is further disconnect between what faculty value about their work and what their supervisors value about their work.

The next articles in the issue examine ideas of the "slow professor" that have been popularized by work such as Berg and Seeber's *The Slow Professor.* Patricia Welsh Droz and Lorie Stagg Jacobs warn that those on the tenure-track could be professionally damaged by a slow

approach. They recommend FAST professing. FAST is an acronym for embracing the Fear of not publishing enough, Assessing your stress, Surviving that stress (with strategies such as streamlining assignments and grading practices, being selective about committee work, and setting deadlines and boundaries), and sprinting toward Tenure, knowing that once tenure is achieved the Slow Professor can then take over.

In "The Praxis of Deceleration: Recovery as 'Inner Work, Public Act'," Marisol Cortez details her journey in finding the value in decelerating herself—slowing down for the sake of her own survival and learning to live with intention and focus. Her journey is one of "reimagining the scale and temporality of resistance" in order to protect one's health from the damage that can come from a constant focus on conflict and crises. Cortez suggests a form of activism that focuses on caring for the welfare of people and communities who have been undervalued and underpaid. Although she emphasizes a kind of care that is "liberatory," that rejects the demand to produce endlessly. This is not self-care in order to be a more productive worker, but rather a slowing-down so that we are in a better position to live with intention.

Alexander Gallas, of the University of Kassel, Germany, explains features of precarious employment in German higher education in his article, "Precarious Academic Labour in Germany: Termed Contracts and a New Berufsverbot," reprinted with permission from the January 2018 issue of the *Global Labour Journal* (*GLJ*). Gallas illuminates the many similarities and dissimilarities of the German faculty hiring model to the U.S. model. As Gallas points out, so-called "mid-level" faculty members in Germany, who compare to tenure-track probationary faculty in the U.S., must develop a secondary area of expertise during the probationary period and then, even when successful in meeting those requirements, are generally not advanced to the next level or conferred the equivalent of U.S. tenure but instead must re-compete for their positions. This situation persists despite union presence, resulting in a grassroots effort from the Network for Decent Work in Academic (NCANiss), which is pushing back against limits to the period of time a mid-level faculty member can be kept under contract and recommending five other concrete solutions to precarity in higher education. Yet, Gallas points out, "As long as full professors are privileged through these institutions … fundamental change is hard to envisage" (14).

The disconnect between faculty and supervisors can also be seen in Stephen Mumme's article, "Instructor Impermanence and the Need for Community College Adjunct Faculty Reform in Colorado." For this article we invited a forum of response and discussion that includes responses from two leading higher education administrators and a nationally renowned labor activist. Mumme points out that a lack of support and lack of incentives for adjunct faculty at Colorado community colleges serves to reinforce instructor impermanence. A CCCS task force offered recommendations for improving the adjunct experience, yet few changes in adjunct faculty working conditions have been implemented by the

CCCS Board. In her response, former CCCS President Nancy McCallin outlines that task force process in her review article, and the task force's recommendations are detailed in the AAUP policy letter within this issue.

Anne Wiegard's response to Mumme's article further supplies a case for the CCCS to implement the recommended policy measures offered by the task force. Wiegard argues for a "boots on the ground" approach in order to pressure politicians and administrators to reform adjunct faculty compensation and working conditions. She cites recent successes with the activists from the Parkland shooting and with teacher unions across the country. High-level administrators live in a bubble, says Wiegard, and it will take a radical approach to penetrate that bubble.

The final response to Mumme's article is written by Ken Lindblom, who provides his perspective as an administrator. He defends the position that administrators find themselves in, having to increasingly use adjunct faculty labor due to decreases in state funding and drops in student enrollment. While he would like to offer more professional development and training opportunities for adjunct faculty, he points out his reluctance to ask more of faculty without offering additional pay or incentives. Lindblom admits that there are currently few solutions to the adjunct faculty problem, but applauds Mumme and the AAUP and UUP for taking steps toward a solution.

This issue also contains our first book review. William Christopher Brown reviews Daniel Davis's *Contingent Academic Labor: Evaluating Conditions to Improve Student Outcomes* and Lisa del Rosso's *Confessions of an Accidental Professor*. These books, explains Brown, help to paint a comprehensive picture of adjunct faculty labor at both the macro level and micro level.

Finally, this issue offers our first curated interview with those working in the field, or as Anne Wiegard terms it, with "boots on the ground" in labor activism. Gordon Mantler and Rachel Riedner interview Seth Kahn and Kevin Mahoney who successfully organized the first strike of the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties (APSCUF) in response to a long series of activated and proposed degradations to faculty roles and agency. Mantler and Riedner explore how Kahn and Mahoney led efforts over a decade to create a culture of labor activism, where faculty came to see themselves as laborers. Their model, Mantler and Riedner suggest, demonstrates the long, difficult and essential work involved in organizing faculty for common cause across varied campuses and a wide geography.

We want each issue of *ALRA* to continue a conversation that will lead to meaningful change in higher education. We urge readers to consider the calls to action that our contributors forward. We thank the writers appearing in this second issue for being part of that work, and we again thank our generous peer reviewers. We hope you enjoy this second issue of *Academic Labor: Research and Artistry*! Coming up soon is a special topics issue on contingency in the technical communication context, edited by Lisa Melancon, as well as a call for proposals regarding

"end of career" among faculty and the implications of contingency on retirement, health, and financial stability.

Dr. Sue Doe
Colorado State University

Dr. Janelle Adsit
Humboldt State University

Mary Hickey
Colorado State University

Jillian Wojcik
Broward College Online – Florida's Global Campus

Collegiality as Surveillance? Implementing Collegiality Statements in Institutions of Higher Education

Megan Condis, *Texas Tech University*
Courtney Adams Wooten, *George Mason University*

Abstract
Collegiality is integral to the healthy functioning of any academic department and is a necessary professional attribute for new faculty, who often spent their graduate school careers with relatively little involvement in institutional politics, to develop. However, the recent trend to explicitly outline tenure and promotion requirements for collegial behavior gives us pause. We question if a collegiality statement for tenure and promotion could function as yet another obstacle between faculty from backgrounds that have historically been underrepresented in the academy (women, people of color, LGBTQIA+ individuals, people with disabilities, etcetera) and their bids for tenure.

Megan Condis is an Assistant Professor of Games Studies at Texas Tech University. Her book, *Gaming Masculinity: Trolls, Fake Geeks, and the Gendered Battle for Online Culture* was released in 2018 by the University of Iowa Press. You can find her online at https://megancondis.wordpress.com/ or on Twitter @MeganCondis.

Courtney Adams Wooten is an Assistant Professor and Director of Composition at George Mason University. She also serves as the book review editor for *WPA: Writing Program Administration.* She co-edited the collection *WPAs in Transition* and has published in *Composition Studies, WPA,* and *Harlot* as well as several edited collections. She is currently working on a book project about the rhetorical interventions of childless-by-choice women in gendered happiness scripts.

Collegiality is integral to the healthy functioning of any academic department and is a necessary professional attribute for new faculty, who often spent their graduate school careers with relatively little involvement in institutional politics, to develop (Baker). Research shows that one "bad apple" in the workplace can drastically affect the productivity of a group (Gardner), and this can be especially dangerous for workplaces where personnel have the guaranteed job security of tenure. Indeed, as Janet D. Stewedel put it in her blog post titled "Collegiality Matters," "People smart enough (in terms of both intellect and wisdom) that you'd want to be colleagues with them for 20 or 30 years are not going to happily grant tenure to someone who is an absolute pain in the ass, who shirks shared responsibility, or who poisons morale in your department." However, the recent trend to explicitly outline tenure and promotion requirements for collegial behavior gives us pause.[1] According to the AAUP:

> The current tendency to isolate collegiality as a distinct dimension of evaluation… poses several dangers. Historically, "collegiality" has not infrequently been associated with ensuring homogeneity and hence with practices that exclude persons on the basis of their difference from a perceived norm. The invocation of "collegiality" may also threaten academic freedom. In the heat of important decisions regarding promotion or tenure, as well as other matters involving such traditional areas of faculty responsibility as curriculum or academic hiring, collegiality may be confused with the expectation that a faculty member display "enthusiasm" or "dedication," evince "a constructive attitude" that will "foster harmony," or display an excessive deference to administrative or faculty decisions where these may require reasoned discussion. ("On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation")

In other words, there is a perceived danger that collegiality will be used as "a catchall for likability and other subjective qualities that some faculty advocates say can be used to punish departmental dissenters" (Flaherty, "Tenure's Fourth Rail"). On the other hand, some commentators such as Michael Fischer in his response to the AAUP, note the importance of collegiality to enabling "free debate" especially from "the most vulnerable faculty members – often newcomers with fresh perspectives and much-needed enthusiasm – who may shy away from departmental deliberations lest they jeopardize their personal futures. The motivation behind codes of conduct is not to make everyone agree but to let everyone feel free to disagree, allowing all voices to be heard". The central issue at stake here

[1] For a history of legal cases involving academic collegiality beginning in 1981, see Connell and Savage.

for all in this debate is whether collegiality policies will enhance or hinder the free speech of faculty.

Some researchers, like Robert Cipriano and Richard Riccardi, are working on ways to make the measurement of collegiality more objective by developing tools like the Collegiality Assessment Matrix and Self-Assessment Matrix, which include statements like "The faculty member speaks in a professional manner to others in his or her unit. For example, he or she avoids making remarks that are caustic, disparaging, undermining, or embarrassing" and "I behave in a professional manner toward others in my unit. For example, I avoid such behaviors as frequent displays of anger or irritability, contemptuous or dismissive conduct, or the refusal to grant others in the unit common courtesies" (Schmidt, "New Test"). While these kinds of measurements seem fairly innocuous, it is important that we deeply interrogate the subjectivity involved in determining what counts as a "professional manner," or what counts as "caustic" or "embarrassing" behavior. Other measures purport to measure collegiality according to how it affects the traditional three areas of faculty assessment: teaching, research, and service. However, we question why there would be a need for a separate tenure requirement for collegiality in the first place if this was the only way that it was to be used.

And what about controversies amongst faculty members? Would, for instance, the decision to push for a faculty union or to organize a labor action be potentially uncollegial? What about the choice to act as a whistleblower and point out misconduct on the part of a fellow faculty member? Will victims of racial discrimination or sexual harassment be told to stay silent lest they risk being thought of as "not a team player"?

Given the many problems with developing and implementing collegiality statements, faculty in institutions that already have such statements in place have more work to do than those in institutions that do not. However, regardless of whether or not such a policy is in place at a particular institution, we have to remember that discussions about collegiality are not *just* about whether or not someone is yelling in the halls or slamming doors in meetings (although such situations do occur). Instead, discussions about collegiality can easily lead to conversations about someone's embodied identity and political leanings that should not be the ultimate consideration of whether or not they can do their job. We must insist that tenure and promotion discussions be centered around an individual's capacity to contribute to a department and institution, not whether they conform to traditional expectations of how a faculty member should look, be, speak, or act.

Collegiality as Surveillance

Collegiality statements function very much in this regard as a system of surveillance. Michel Foucault theorizes surveillance in the much-cited book *Discipline and Punish.* Building on Jeremy Bentham's idea of the panopticon, Foucault argues that power functions as a "field of visibility" that nevertheless affects those within it, as they become both those being

surveilled and those doing the surveilling (202). The panopticon, a circular prison that has one guard in a middle tower whom prisoners cannot see from their brightly lit cells around the outside walls of the prison, creates the sense that the guard could always be watching even though it is unclear when, or if, that surveillance ever occurs. Similarly, the existence of collegiality statements make it clear that someone—colleagues, department chairs, people from other departments, upper administration—could be watching one's behavior at all times and determining whether he or she is collegial, even as it is possible that no one is watching in this way. The very existence of collegiality statements, however, asks faculty to police themselves and others to ensure that everyone behaves in an appropriate way, in whatever way appropriateness is defined for that particular department or institution.

In such situations, some faculty groups are more vulnerable than others. As such, we fear that, without careful consideration, a collegiality requirement could wind up transforming into an institutionally-backed surveillance tool designed to stand between faculty who hail from already-underrepresented backgrounds and their bids for tenure and promotion. For example, according to *The New York Times*: "a number of young professors, especially women, have recently contended that their bids for lifetime academic appointments were derailed" by this "slippery fourth factor" (Lewin). The AAUP's Martin Snyder described a troubling dynamic taking place in "'male-dominated departments that hadn't tenured a woman in a long time, or ever, and there's some language about how the woman 'just doesn't fit in.' What comes through is the sense that these are aggressive women who are seen as uppity'" (Lewin). For those from historically underrepresented backgrounds such as women, people of color, those who identify as LGBTQIA+, individuals with disabilities, and even less-considered populations such as atheists, the production and enforcement of collegiality policies can seem a landmine of possible roadblocks to tenure and promotion. Anu Aneja's argument in "Of Masks and Masquerades" is that calls for collegiality are in actuality calls for assimilation, especially from women of color, that "equate difference of opinion with atomization and conformity with collegiality" (144). Speaking of her own experiences as a third world immigrant in academia, Aneja claims, "Ethnicized by the legacies of cultural and postcolonial histories, she [the third world immigrant in academia] is offered a variety of costumes that she can freely choose from, but donning any one of them implies speaking with a certain voice, speaking for many others, speaking to an audience that is already awaiting her particular difference" (146). This type of tokenism holds dangers in that "too much" difference can run against notions of collegiality that are dependent upon academics, regardless of their subjectivities, conforming to common identities and beliefs. Especially since majority voices often dominate departments, colleges, and institutions, individuals from underrepresented groups such as Aneja can view collegiality statements as the subjective, floating

category that allows for their disenfranchisement and reinforces the powers operating upon them.

Such individuals often find that their bodies are always already under surveillance, heightening the impact of collegiality policies on them as opposed to white, cisgender men, especially those who identify with normative religious beliefs and whose bodies are seemingly unmarked with a disability (despite what we know about how bodies can belie the reality of mental illness). For women especially, pregnancy and motherhood can lead to behaviors – requests for maternity leave, adjusted class schedules, reprioritizing of tasks – that might be read as "uncollegial" by some. The many articles dedicated to searching for a job while pregnant, including Joseph Barber's "Searching While Pregnant" and Mieke Beth Tomeer's "Navigating the Job Market in the First Trimester," as well as cautionary tales seen in McKenzie Wood's piece "The 'Joy' of Pregnancy in Grad School" and Joan C. Williams and Jessica Lee's essay "It's Illegal, Yet It Happens All the Time," show how treacherous it can be for women to pursue academia while also pursuing motherhood. Emily Van Duyne discusses the mixed emotions she has as a woman seeking tenure:

> Despite the fact that I would, ultimately, love to have another child, another child would probably preclude the possibility of my securing tenure in a job that I love, and desperately need. So, like many women in academe, and particularly in the field of women's studies, I live in two worlds. In the theoretical world of my writing and teaching, I speak out actively on behalf of women's rights and against gender discrimination. But in my professional life, I find myself in an unsecure place as an untenured female faculty member for whom pregnancy now would almost surely mean certain death to my career.

Part of this problem is the conventional six-year timeline on which tenure is based and which Van Duyne, among others, notes overlaps with many women's fertile years. However, another part of this problem is that academia has not shown itself to be supportive to the problems women face as they try to become pregnant and then assume the role of mother. In a recent piece, Jessica Winegar recounts the pain she felt as she simultaneously struggled to get pregnant, went through a series of miscarriages, and worked to achieve tenure. As she notes, our culture at large is ineffective at helping those who go through miscarriages, and academia is no exception. The stresses of attempting to become pregnant, pregnancy itself, and motherhood all place additional pressures on women faculty – including often invisible physical and economic disruptions – that could lead to behaviors, actions, and attitudes viewed as uncollegial, and ultimately un-tenurable or un-promotable, by some. When opening up a space in which such judgments can be made through collegiality policies,

we have created a situation in which particular people whose bodies are already scrutinized are placed under additional surveillance.

Women seeking out motherhood are not, of course, the only populations at risk for discrimination based upon collegiality policies, nor will the same situations occur on each campus. As Laurie A. Finke wrote in a piece for the academic journal *symploke*, "The set of practices or performances that we collect under the term 'collegiality' is at once totally global and hopelessly local" (122), which means that the same behaviors might be viewed very differently at different schools or even within different departments at the same school. There is a subjective element in determining whether directly addressing a racist remark (and how) is "too confrontational," whether a queer faculty member is "too in your face" about being queer or having a same sex partner, whether sharing one's atheism is the same as sharing one's Christianity, whether asking for certain accommodations is "too much."[2] Aneil Rallin's experiences as a queer professor speak to these concerns. In "Taming Queers," he recounts his experiences being stalked by a student who sends multiple complaints to administrators and trustees at his institution and his Dean's responses to this stalker. Although the Dean supports Rallin, he argues that "The rhetorics of support produce normalizing effects because within the realm of what the University is willing to support only 'normal' is defensible; outrageousness/ queerness are not normal and not defensible" (157). In this instance, as in others such as Aneja's, normalcy is seen as collegiality's synonym; difference and diversity are not accounted for because surveillance depends on notions of normalcy.

At particular risk are any faculty who are part of the contingent academic workforce, a steadily growing and alarmingly large number of non-tenure-track faculty who have no contracts or short-term contracts with no promise of tenure and promotion. According to the AAUP, in 2015 40% of faculty members were part-time, 17% were full-time non-tenure-track, and an additional 14% were graduate students, while only 29% were either tenured or tenure-track. This is a huge shift from 1975 when 45% of faculty were either tenured or tenure-track and only 24% were part-time, 10% were full-time non-tenure-track, and 21% were graduate students. Marc Bousquet is a common critic of the exploitation all tenure-track and tenured faculty contribute to as those who profit from the low-paid labor of contingent faculty, particularly in English departments. In a study of non-tenure-track faculty, Nathan F. Alleman and Don Haviland found that while full-time, non-tenure-track faculty expect to be treated the same as tenure-track faculty in their departments, they often experienced differential treatment from tenure-track faculty in terms of acknowledgment from others, value in decision-making, and value as contributors to departmental goals (538). Such findings back up

[2] For more on disability in academia, see Jay Dolmage and Stephanie Kerschbaum's "Wanted: Disabled Faculty Members" in *Inside Higher Ed*.

Bousquet's arguments that division between tenure-track and contingent faculty is exacerbated by tenure-track faculty members' willing exploitation of contingent faculty. Collegiality statements are particularly fraught for contingent faculty because they have no security of employment and, therefore, a lot to lose if they are perceived as uncollegial. The implementation of any collegiality statement for contingent faculty is particularly suspect because of their tenuous positions, especially for those contingent faculty who also occupy status as an underrepresented group.

Faculty should also take into consideration whether a collegiality standard might be used as a tool to suppress undesirable political speech, even when it takes place outside of the classroom (Condis). For example, Professor Steven Salaita argues that this is how he was run out of his job before it ever began at the University of Illinois. Salaita, who issued many provocative tweets denouncing the Israeli occupation of Gaza from his personal account (Deutsch), was deemed "uncivil" by the university officials (AAUP, University's Attempt to Dismiss Salaita Suit Over "Uncivil" Tweets Rejected by Court"), though it was later uncovered that the university's decision was influenced by wealthy donors, who "threatened to withhold money from the university if it made good on its job offer to him" (Schmidt, "Salaita Goes After University Donors in Lawsuit Over Job Loss at Illinois"). This conflation of the need for professional courtesy with a requirement that university employees refrain from articulating certain political points of view should give us pause. What exactly about Salaita's tweets were uncollegial? The fact that they argued forcefully against Zionism? Was it their angry and strident tone? Might *any* action taken by a faculty member that stirs up public controversy (and thereby potentially damages the reputation of the university as a whole) or that provokes the ire of donors be considered uncollegial? If so, what are the implications for academic freedom?

When collegiality statements are produced and enacted, they are very much dependent on ideas about normal behavior, normal bodies, normal emotions, normal beliefs, normal faculty. And the issue with collegiality being built into tenure and promotion decisions is that this sliding scale of judgment, that more adversely affects underrepresented populations whose bodies are already monitored, is not explicit or self-reflexive. Instead, it is a subtle, if not entirely hidden means of policing academics so they conform to a homogeneous version of academia and the professoriate as much as possible.

A Case Study in Collegiality Statements at the University of North Dakota

Some questions about collegiality and its possible uses during tenure and promotion review arose in 2013 at the University of North Dakota. In this case, Sarah Mosher, a French Assistant Professor, was denied tenure on the basis of colleagues who claimed that she "lacked collegiality by rolling her eyes at faculty meetings, slamming doors, being argumentative and

competing for students" despite having fulfilled all tenure and promotion requirements (Flaherty, "Collegiality Not an 'Implied'"). However, a faculty grievance committee found that "collegiality was not an 'implied' criterion, according to departmental and college policies, and that Mosher had not been intentionally disruptive to the department" (Flaherty, "Collegiality Not an 'Implied'" n.p.). Eventually, Mosher was promoted to Associate Professor at the University of North Dakota, where she still teaches French.

Mosher's case points to additional complicating factors, however, in addition to personal behaviors that colleagues may find unacceptable. Speaking to her status as a young, untenured woman, the *Grand Forks Herald* reported that Mosher had filed a sexual harassment claim against a former colleague, which "'tainted' her reviews" because some of her colleagues did not want to be called as witnesses in that case ("Tension Over UND"). The case also brought to light other problems with the Department of Modern and Classical Languages and Literature, including "differing philosophies of education and collegiality, allegations of harassment and unprofessional conduct, and the strain of office politics and personality clashes" ("Tension Over UND" n.p.). Despite the testimony of her colleagues that she had fulfilled the tenure and promotion requirements, during the hearings they repeatedly cited unprofessional behavior and the creation of stress in the department as reasons they had denied her tenure and promotion.

It is difficult in this instance not to point directly to Mosher's sexual harassment case as a key reason that her colleagues tried to deny her tenure and promotion, particularly since it directly comes up during the hearing. This case, then, points out the dangers of collegiality statements and their use, particularly against vulnerable populations of instructors for whom collegiality will be used as a surveillance and policing mechanism. Jeffrey R. DiLeo makes a similar case in pointing out that many departments have "weasel clauses" that are lines hidden in tenure and promotion guidelines about how such decisions may not be based entirely on the academic triumvirate of research, service, and teaching. Instead of decrying collegiality statements, DiLeo argues that collegiality statements are needed so that the power structures inherent in academia become visible and hidden clauses cannot be used against faculty. However, such a position seems to ignore the ways that collegiality statements themselves will not serve to alter the conditions upon which faculty are judged but, instead, leave faculty more open to denials of tenure and promotion on the basis of subjective judgments about collegiality. In Mosher's case, had such a collegiality statement existed, it is possible her fight to regain her status as a tenure-track/tenured professor would have been denied despite such external factors as her pending sexual harassment case.

Much like Foucault's panopticon, collegiality statements can operate as invisible constraints on faculty members that force them to overlook illegal and unethical behaviors in the name of maintaining good

relations with others in their department. Given the propensity of sexual harassment cases to already be hidden and unreported, collegiality statements serve as further reasons for faculty—especially faculty who are untenured, women, people of color, or members of the LGBTQIA+ community or who hold unpopular beliefs—to suppress their identities and to fit into a department or institution at all costs. This is precisely the form of power that operates to suppress reports and actual changes in any system of oppression.

Collegiality Statement Toolkit

Given the high stakes collegiality statements hold for faculty, it is imperative for faculty to become acquainted with what policies are or aren't in place at their institutions and how such policies are implemented.

If your institution does already have a collegiality statement in place, we suggest taking a clear look at the policy and determining whether it is clear, explicit, and fair about the expectations it establishes for faculty. For example, stating that a faculty member must regularly show up to teach their classes and hold a particular number of office hours may seem explicit, but "regularly" leaves some room for subjective judgments about what this means. If a faculty member misses six classes per semester, is that regular? If a faculty member misses ten classes per semester, is that regular? In some cases, common sense may make such expectations seem transparent, but the need for context (Is this person sick? Have they set up alternative learning opportunities for students? Have they made arrangements with the chair and/or dean?) illustrates how difficult it can be to set a guideline for collegiality that is unilaterally applied to all faculty. While some subjectivity will always be present, a collegiality policy must be as explicit as possible in order for it to be applied fairly and equitably to all faculty members. If the language in your collegiality policy is not clear, we suggest bringing this up with colleagues in and out of your department to determine what the history of the policy is and how it might be changed.

If your institution does not currently have a collegiality statement in place but is in the midst of developing one, as our own institution was, we suggest that your department and/or institution try to achieve as diverse representation as possible when forming the committee(s) that will develop such a policy. Including members of underrepresented groups who nevertheless feel empowered to voice their opinions will help make sure that the language developed in the policy is as inclusive and explicit as possible. We also suggest that the policy include language about what the policy is NOT with a reference to employment laws against discrimination. Such a statement could include language like the following:

> This policy takes into account the anti-discrimination guidelines at our institution, which include race, color, religion, national origin,

> sex, age, disability, genetic information, citizenship and veteran status as well as sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression. The collegiality policy is not intended to hinder academic freedom, particularly the academic and creative freedom of faculty to speak in venues outside of our institution, including on personal social media sites. This policy also draws attention to the importance of paying attention to unacknowledged or hidden biases and issues of equality between different groups and ranks, including different faculty ranks, gender, race, etc.

While such a statement cannot prevent policy-based discrimination (Floyd-Thomas), it highlights the need for those implementing the policy to be particularly attune to the potential problems of such policies.

If your institution does not have a collegiality policy, and is not thinking about such a policy, it may still be useful to become familiar with collegiality policies at other institutions, particularly those at similar institutions if they exist. Despite the dangers of such policies, some institutions, such as our own, are in the midst of implementing them. Gaining knowledge ahead of time will serve faculty well if their institutions attempt to implement collegiality policies.

Addendum: Collegiality and a Shifting Departmental Environment

Our own department underwent a difficult past year—perhaps evidenced by both of us leaving for other institutions since the initial drafting of this article—and the collegiality policy is one sticking point that allows for administrators to include vague and unfounded comments in faculty reviews. Even in departments where this is not the case, changes in institutional structure, departmental structure, departmental governance, and colleague turnover can – and will at some future point necessarily – occur. Thus, we urge all faculty to take a proactive stance about collegiality policies that may or may not be in place at their institutions, keeping in mind that the department that exists today will not be the same department that exists in perpetuity. Our responsibility is to ensure that any collegiality policy we help build is as explicit and equitable as possible, so that current and future versions of our departments and institutions remain (or can become) truly supportive, communal, and responsive to all faculty.

Works Cited

AAUP. "On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation." *American Association of University Professors*, 2016, www.aaup.org/report/collegiality-criterion-faculty-evaluation. Accessed 18 May 2017.

--. "University's Attempt to Dismiss Salaita Suit Over 'Uncivil'" Tweets Rejected by Court." *American Association of University Professors*, 6 Aug 2015, www.aaup.org/news/university%E2%80%99s-attempt-dismiss-salaita-suit-over-%E2%80%9Cuncivil%E2%80%9D-tweets-rejected-court#. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Alleman, Nathan F. and Don Haviland. "'I Expect to Be Engaged As An Equal': Collegiality Expectations of Full-Time, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members." *Higher Education,* vol. 74, no. 3, 2017, pp. 527-542.

Aneja, Anu. "Of Masks and Masquerades: Performing the Collegial Dance." *symploke,* vol. 13, no. 1-2, 2005, pp. 144-151.

Baker, Kelly J. "Cruelty and Kindness in Academia." *Vitae*. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 11 Oct. 2016, https://chroniclevitae.com/news/1572-cruelty-and-kindness-in-academia. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Barber, Joseph. "Searching While Pregnant." *Inside Higher Ed*, 23 Feb. 2013, www.insidehighered.com/advice/2015/02/23/essay-pregnancy-issues-academic-job-searches. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Bousquet, Marc. "Composition as Management Science." *Journal of Advanced Composition*, vol., 22, no. 3, 2002, pp. 493-526.

Condis, Megan. "We Are All Public Intellectuals Now." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 3 May 2016, www.chronicle.com/article/We-Are-All-Public/236330. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Connell, Mary Ann and Frederick G. Savage. "The Role of Collegiality in Higher Education Tenure, Promotion, and Termination Decisions." *Journal of College and University Law,* vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 833-858.

Deutsch, Barry. "Steve Salaita's Controversial Tweets about Anti-Semitism, With Context." *Storify*, 2014, Accessed 18 May 2017.

DiLeo, Jeffrey R. "Uncollegiality, Tenure and the Weasel Clause." *symploke,* vol. 13, no. 1-2, 2005, pp. 99-107.

Dolmage, Jay and Stephanie Kerschbaum. "Wanted: Disabled Faculty Members." *Inside Higher Ed*, 31 Oct. 2016, http://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2016/10/31/advice-hiring-faculty-members-disabilities-essay. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Finke, Laurie A. "Performing Collegiality, Troubling Gender." *symploke*, vol. 13, no. 1-2, 2005, pp. 122-33.

Fischer, Michael. "Defending Collegiality." *Inside Higher Ed*, 30 April 2009, www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/04/30/defending-collegiality. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Flaherty, Colleen. "Collegiality Not an 'Implied' Tenure Criterion, North Dakota Panel Says." *Inside Higher Ed,* 17 October 2013, https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2013/10/17/collegiality-not-implied-tenure-criterion-north-dakota-panel-says. Accessed 30 April 2018.

--. "Tenure's Fourth Rail." *Inside Higher Ed*, 14 June 2013, www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/06/14/collegiality-experts-advocate-its-role-personnel-decisions. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Floyd-Thomas, Stacey. "The Problem That 'Lies'" Within : How 'Collegiality' Undermines the Academy." *Religious Studies News*, vol. 24, no. 4, Oct. 2009, p. 31, www.aarweb.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/About/Committees/SWP/RSNArticle2009-10OCT.pdf. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish.* Penguin, 1985.

Gardner, Nancy. "Rotten to the Core: How Workplace 'Bad Apples' Spoil Barrels of Good Employees." *UW Today*, 12 Feb. 2017, http://www.washington.edu/news/2007/02/12/rotten-to-the-core-how-workplace-bad-apples-spoil-barrels-of-good-employees/. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Lewin, Tamar. "'Collegiality' as a Tenure Battleground." *The New York Times*, 12 July 2002, www.nytimes.com/2002/07/12/us/collegiality-as-a-tenure-battleground.html. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Rallin, Aneil. "Taming Queers." *symploke,* vol. 13, no. 1-2, 2005, pp. 152-157.

Salaita, Steven. "Why I Was Fired." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 5 Oct. 2015, www.chronicle.com/article/Why-I-Was-Fired/233640. Accessed 18 May 18, 2017.

Schmidt, Peter. "New Test to Measure Faculty Collegiality Produces Some Dissension Itself." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 10 June 2013, www.chronicle.com/article/New-Test-to-Measure-Faculty/139695/. Accessed 18 May 2017.

--. "Salaita Goes After University Donors in Lawsuit Over Job Loss at Illinois." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 29 Jan. 2015, www.chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/salaita-goes-after-university-donors-in-lawsuit-over-illinois-job-loss/92975. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Stemwedel, Janet D. "Collegiality Matters." *Adventures in Ethics and Science*. *Science Blogs*, 15 Feb. 2010, http://scienceblogs.com/ethicsandscience/2010/02/15/collegiality-matters/. Accessed 18 May 2017.

"Tension Over UND French Professor's Tenure." *Grand Forks Herald,* 7 September 2013, http://www.grandforksherald.com/news/2198639-tension-over-und-french-professors-tenure. Accessed 30 April 2018.

Tomeer, Mieke Beth. "Navigating the Job Market in the First Trimester." *Inside Higher Ed*, 14 Oct. 2015, www.insidehighered.com/advice/2015/10/14/how-find-job-first-trimester-pregnancy-essay. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Van Duyne, Emily. "No, I Am Not Pregnant." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 8 May 2016, www.chronicle.com/article/No-I-Am-Not-Pregnant/236395?cid=trend_right_a. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Williams, Joan C. and Jessica Lee. "It's Illegal, Yet It Happens All the Time*." The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 28 Sept. 2015, www.chronicle.com/article/Its-Illegal-Yet-It-Happens/233445/. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Winegar, Jessica. "The Miscarriage Penalty." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 29 Nov. 2016, www.chronicle.com/article/The-Miscarriage-Penalty/238526. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Wood, McKenzie. "The 'Joy' of Pregnancy in Grad School." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 25 May 2016, https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-joy-of-pregnancy-in/236606?cid=rc_right. Accessed 18 May 2017.

Rhetorical Listening and Strategic Contemplation as Research Tools: Learning from Edwin Hopkins and Early Attempts at Labor Reform in Composition

Rebecca Gerdes-McClain
Columbus State University

Rebecca Gerdes-McClain is an Assistant Professor of English and the Director of First Year Composition at Columbus State University in Georgia. Her scholarly interests include the labor history of Composition and Rhetoric, feminist research methodologies, and Writing Program Administration.

Abstract
This paper is a personal and historical study of the labor conditions of composition teachers, in which I present the work of Edwin Hopkins, a professor at the University of Kansas from 1889 to 1937, who collected data on composition teaching between 1909 and 1915 in an attempt to reform the labor conditions of composition teachers. The paper is necessarily personal because I employ rhetorical listening, developed by Krista Ratcliffe, and strategic contemplation, developed by Jaqueline Jones Royster and Gesa Kirsch, as research methods for engaging with historical and archival research. Both of these methods require careful analysis of my personal interests in and motivations for this research. This analysis of my personal interests and motivation takes two forms: (1) narrative vignettes of my own labor experiences, which I use to facilitate rhetorical listening, and (2) descriptive analyses of my reactions to my research, which document how strategic contemplation was enacted through my reflective practices. The reader should therefore be prepared for the paper to alternate

between readings of Hopkins' work and reflections on my own teaching and research. Using rhetorical listening and strategic contemplation, I evaluate Hopkins' strategies for reforming labor conditions in the early twentieth century and what they offer compositionists interested in reforming our current labor conditions. I focus particularly on Hopkins' attempts to persuade those outside the composition classroom that labor conditions in those classrooms were untenable and directly related the "problem" of unsatisfactory student writing, looking for resonances—my term for connections and similarities—between attempts to reform modern labor issues in the composition classroom and Hopkins' strategies. Ultimately I argue that attempts at labor reform need to consider historical case studies, like Hopkins', when strategizing ways to improve the teaching conditions of writing instructors. Too often, attempts to improve labor conditions surrounding the teaching of writing ignore the rich and complex labor history of our field.

This paper is a personal and historical study of the labor conditions of composition teachers in which I analyze the work and legacy of Edwin Hopkins, a professor at the University of Kansas from 1889 to 1937, through close readings of: his published works, archival sources at the University of Kansas, scholarly histories of First Year Composition, my own lived experiences, and my emotional reactions to this research. Too often, contemporary attempts at labor reform ignore our history. In this article I demonstrate that historical case studies offer insights that can be usefully and strategically deployed to support contemporary efforts to reform the labor conditions of composition teachers. Hopkins is a significant figure in Composition Studies due to the fact he was (arguably) the first to collect and publish data on the labor required to teach First Year Composition, particularly in terms of the labor required to respond to student writing (Popken 631, "Edwin Hopkins"). He also collected data surrounding the costs of teaching First Year Composition with the goal of comparing those costs to the instructional costs of other disciplines. Hopkins believed that other faculty members, as well as most administrators, did not understand the labor conditions of composition instructors. He also believed that if presented with hard data to support his arguments for reform, other faculty members and university administrators could no longer ignore the serious overburden he experienced firsthand. This burden, he believed, was physically and emotionally disastrous for composition instructors. Hopkins himself was a victim of this overwork, illustrated most dramatically during the 1919-1920 school year when he was unable to teach due to a nervous breakdown (Popken 630, "Edwin Hopkins").

Though Hopkins' research was often delayed by his labor conditions and the poor health brought on by those conditions, he collected an enormous amount of empirical data over the course of fifteen years and shaped it into the argument of The Labor and Cost of the Teaching of English in Colleges and Secondary Schools with especial reference to English Composition (Popken 632, "Edwin Hopkins"). The findings of the report were damning:

> The committee report shows why [poor teaching happens]; it shows that under present average conditions of teaching English expression, workmen must choose between overwork and bad work; between spoiling their material or killing themselves; and the end for which the committee is striving is to place these painfully simple facts before the public so that the responsibility for the continuance of present conditions, if they must continue, may rest where it belongs. (Hopkins 70, "The Labor")

With the findings from this study in hand, Hopkins strove to alert those both inside and outside academia to labor conditions which he believed made achieving the goal of teaching students to write well impossible. In particular, he focused on the size of composition classes (often over 50 students), the total number of students a composition teacher taught a semester (at the beginning of his time at the University of Kansas teachers averaged 149 composition students, not including their other classes), and how these realities conflicted with best practices in the field (such as leaving personalized feedback for each student) (Hopkins 3-4, "Can Good"; Popken 621, 623, 634, "Edwin Hopkins"). Based on this data he also made concrete recommendations for rectifying the situation, arguing that teaching load should be determined not by number of classes but by number of students, and that composition should be reconceptualized as a "laboratory" class because of its emphasis on guided practice and frequent feedback instead of as a lecture class in which generalized instruction is seen as sufficient for student progress (Hopkins 5-6, "Can Good").[1]

Despite Hopkins' commitment to composition pedagogy and improving the labor conditions of composition instructors, the following article focuses on understanding how and why his work failed to create lasting change. In particular, Hopkins' goals of reconceptualizing composition as a laboratory class and determining load by number of

[1] After 1870, three styles of teaching were considered common: the laboratory, the lecture, and the seminar. According to Robert Connors, "The laboratory was conceived as a specialized scientific instructional form" (140, "Composition"). When Hopkins argues that composition courses are laboratory classes, he is arguing they are not (or should not be) lecture classes because of the one-on-one instruction that ought to happen through feedback. This kind of personalized feedback and one-on-one attention is seen as more analogous to the "instructional form" of laboratory courses.

students were largely ignored by administrators after the publication of his work (Heyda 248). Hopkins' goals were complex and ambitious; he wanted nationwide reform, ideally on the both high school and college levels. In light of the scope of his goals, it is impossible to blame him for what he failed to achieve. His accomplishments—presenting his research results, making improvements on his own campus, and bringing scholarly attention to the crucial role of labor conditions in composition teaching—should not be dismissed or downplayed. Nevertheless, I argue that certain of his rhetorical decisions had problematic and unforeseen consequences that are instructive for contemporary composition teachers and scholars as we attempt to achieve our own brand of labor reform. Today, as we attempt to persuade administrations, students, and the general public that labor issues, like the increasing reliance on contingent labor or the constant pressure to raise course caps on composition courses, are related to the type and quality of instruction we can give, Hopkins' experiences can help us prepare for these debates by providing argumentative strategies we may wish to copy and appeals to suffering we may wish to avoid.

While analysis of Hopkins and his work comprises the bulk of this article, my personal experiences as a composition teacher, as well as my emotional responses to this research, are also included and analyzed. These personal reflections not only make explicit my own positionality and how it informs my research, they also offer insights inaccessible through traditional scholarship alone. To analyze these personal reflections I employ rhetorical listening, developed by Krista Ratcliffe, and strategic contemplation, developed by Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa Kirsch. Both methods require careful analysis of my personal interests in and motivations for this research. This analysis of my personal interests and motivation takes two forms: (1) narrative vignettes of my own labor experiences, which I use to facilitate rhetorical listening, and (2) descriptive analyses of my reactions to my research, which document how strategic contemplation was enacted through my reflective practices. The reader should therefore be prepared for the paper to alternate between readings of Hopkins' work and reflections on my own teaching and research. Using rhetorical listening and strategic contemplation, I evaluate Hopkins' strategies for reforming the labor conditions of composition teachers in the early twentieth century and what they offer compositionists interested in reforming our current labor conditions.

I focus particularly on Hopkins' attempts to persuade those outside the composition classroom that labor conditions in those classrooms were untenable and directly related to the "problem" of unsatisfactory student writing, looking for resonances—my term for connections and similarities—between attempts to reform modern labor issues in the composition classroom and Hopkins' strategies.[2] Ultimately, I argue that attempts at labor reform need to consider historical case studies like Hopkins' when strategizing ways to improve the labor conditions of writing instructors.

Feminist Revisionist Methodology: Rhetorical Listening and Strategic Contemplation

According to Ratcliffe's work in Rhetorical Listening, rhetorical listening is a tool for hearing the responses and experiences of another which helps the listener avoid the impulse to create immediate identification (19). Ratcliffe imagines this tool as primarily pedagogical, helping students to engage in difficult discussions, particularly conversations about race and gender. This method asks students to first name their own experiences and emotional reactions explicitly, and to then name the positions and experiences of the speaker. In the process of this naming, students are asked to avoid instinctively identifying with arguments and ideas and instead to allow ideas to exist alongside one another (Ratcliffe 32). By resisting the impulse to identify, the listener can begin to consciously sift through moments of both non-identification and identification. Ratcliffe uses metaphors of sound (hearing) and space (distance) to illustrate how rhetorical listening makes it possible to map the (dis)connections produced by such conversations, a process which makes previously obscured areas of overlap or disconnection visible. The "hearing" reflects how rhetorical listening can be used as an invention practice because new "voices" are made accessible to the listener. The metaphor of space highlights the different outcomes that become possible when difficult discussions are based on "distance" rather than identification (Ratcliffe 46). While Ratcliffe posits rhetorical listening as a teaching and composing skill, the space for difference it fosters allows historians of Composition and Rhetoric to balance their personal connections to research subjects with the distance necessary for thorough historical work. Using rhetorical listening, historians are not asked to ignore or mask their personal connections; instead, they are asked to listen to them in order to critically

[2] In a 2012 *CCC* article, "Remapping Revisionist Historiography," David Gold challenges revisionist historians in Composition and Rhetoric to explicitly articulate connections between their historical work and the major conversations happening in the field today (24). As such, one of the goals of this article is to illustrate the value of understanding Hopkins' history as the field wrestles with how create supportive labor conditions.

consider the ways in which those connections limit or enrich their research.

Because rhetorical listening invites researchers to think about the complicated interactions between self and research, strategic contemplation is particularly well-suited to work alongside it. According to Royster and Kirsch, in their book Feminist Rhetorical Practices, strategic contemplation is a purposeful methodological technique which asks researchers to pause for intuition and unconscious thought in the hope that such ruminations will lead to new insights (86). They explain that:

> Contemplative moments seem to be a driving force for many scholars who have reported not only on how they have found passion in their work (a spiritual dimension) but also on how they have made chance discoveries and traveled down unexpected paths […]—all when they allowed themselves to pause, to wonder, to reflect, to see what else they might not have considered, and to articulate these moments in language. (Royster and Kirsch 86)

Strategic contemplation goes beyond simply thinking deeply about one's work. It is a methodological practice which supplements the hard work of gathering and analyzing research with the conscious choice to make time for unconscious thought. By inviting reflective thinking and following up on the leads that strategic contemplation suggests, researchers can deepen engagement and allow for new insights. While rhetorical listening requires researchers to grapple with the complexities of their connections and disconnections to their research, strategic contemplation "asks us to take as much into account as possible but to withhold judgment for a time and resist coming to closure too soon in order to make the time to invite creativity, wondering, and inspiration in the research process" (Royster and Kirsch 85). Together, these methods for engaging in research can push a researcher to notice different and additional connections and to make more complex arguments.

Attachment, Identification, and Scholarly Research

At their core, the methodologies I have just described ask researchers to name, and then critically consider, parts of the research process that are often unstated. Why are we, as individuals, drawn to particular questions, people, and theories? How have our personal experiences and interests shaped our reading of texts, sources, and situations? What assumptions and value systems underlie both our own inquiry and the creation of the texts we study? In the spirit of such questions, and of making explicit my experience of this research, in the following section I share both how I stumbled on Edwin Hopkins as a research subject and what about him that resonated with me.

When I first encountered Edwin Hopkins, I was looking for information about Barrett Wendell and Radcliffe College, or Harvard's

composition program in the 1880s and 90s, with the goal of reconstructing Wendell's labor as a composition teacher. Recognized as an important figure in creating the current-traditional pedagogy that exponentially increased the labor required to teach rhetoric by advocating for frequent student writing and teacher feedback to that writing, I wanted to see how Wendell himself responded to student writing and to gain a clear sense of how much time he invested in that labor (Connors 111, "Overwork"). I was particularly interested in three things: the kinds of comments Wendell left for his students, his classroom pedagogy, and the overall labor conditions that influenced his work (such as the number of students he personally responded to a semester). The day I "found" Hopkins, I was tired and frustrated; none of my sources were giving me the information I wanted about Wendell. I noticed an unusual title, "Edwin Hopkins and the Costly Labor of Composition Teaching." The essay, written by Randall Popken,[3] focuses on Edwin Hopkins, a teacher of composition in the early 20th century. The name was only vaguely familiar; I was suspicious that he was connected to my research on Wendell—after all, Hopkins was part of the next generation of composition teachers, working until roughly 1940 (Popken 619, "Edwin Hopkins"). While Wendell was part of the generation that created the First Year Composition course, Hopkins was part of the generation that followed, a generation in which First Year Composition became both ubiquitous on college campuses and dreaded by English professors who saw the class as a hell of mental drudgery and overwork (Connors 108, "Overwork").

Still, I scanned the first few pages: "[Hopkins'] ideal is that writing faculty should read their students' writing carefully and provide thoughtful commentary on it. Further, Hopkins promotes the individual conference" (Popken 621, "Edwin Hopkins"). I was surprised to see many of my own values represented so clearly and found myself wishing for a hard copy of the article to annotate. My reading slowed; I was no longer skimming: "As his career progressed, Hopkins ran headlong into the conflict between his sense of duty and the intense demands of his labor. No matter how many hours a day he spent and how much effort he put into his paper reading, for instance, he couldn't get everything done" (Popken 629, "Edwin Hopkins"). I thought of my psoriasis flaring up after a weeklong rush to respond to student papers; I thought of my Temporomandibular Joint Disorder (TMJ), and the painful swelling around my jaw that can leave me near tears if I grade too many essays in one sitting. Now, all my attention focused on the pages in front of me. I never found the connection to Barrett Wendell implicitly promised, but I had stopped reading for that. Something was reverberating inside me; I felt deeply drawn to Hopkins. In response, I printed off and annotated the

[3] Published in the June 2004 *CCC*, Popken explores how Hopkins' pedagogical commitments and religious beliefs fueled his calls for labor reform in First Year Composition classrooms.

essay. Unable to connect it to my research on Wendell, I filed the essay away in my desk, labeling it with a sticky note: "Come back to this!" I underlined the words three times. Given my frenzied schedule, I should have been frustrated to lose an hour of my time. That hour could have been filled with lesson prep, grading, committee work, or research that would contribute to my current project—all the things pressing down on me relentlessly and endlessly. Instead, I felt energized.

In a matter of months I was traveling to the University of Kansas archives, intent on learning more about Hopkins. I had read his published works and located him in the histories of our field, but I wanted more. I wondered about his teaching and his daily life. I also read Hopkins' personal journals, an unpublished manuscript of his theory of literary criticism, and other assorted papers. I was most interested in his journals, which he began keeping as a small boy and continued throughout this life. Hopkins' journals were very business-like and compact. One page might contain entries for an entire week, with tight scrawl listing time markers and the day's accomplishments, sometimes accompanied by brief commentary. I wrestled with his handwriting. One word in particular gave me trouble. It appeared over and over again. Usually, it followed "Classes and." Sometimes there were elaborations about a topic, but the handwriting, the cramped pages, and the deterioration of the paper combined to baffle me. I recognized it was the same word: the same jutting "h" near the beginning, the same slope, the same general size. Finally, after nearly three hours it dawned on me. Chapel. Classes and chapel.[4] Solving this riddle left me elated, as though I had cracked a code. Thumbing through his journals—seeing mentions of his wife, his teaching, his daily routines—Hopkins became very real to me. I imagined him as grandfatherly and felt fond of him in a personal way that surprised and, initially, unnerved me. What would it be like to research and write about a person that I felt connected to and even protective of?

As women and feminists make their mark on historical work in Composition and Rhetoric, they remind us that we should allow ourselves to feel "passionate attachments" to our research subjects (Royster 68). In "Reseeing and Redoing," Liz Rohan argues, for instance, that "While traditional methods encourage critical distance from a subject, scholars […] demonstrate that empathy and identification with a research subject can be integral to the research process; emotions can drive and inspire scholarly questions" (30). In her essay, Rohan talks about her own passionate attachment to her research subject Janette Miller.[5] It motivates

[4] When Hopkins began working at Kansas in 1889, chapel was only a nominally religious activity and served more as a daily assembly (Rudolph 75; 77).

[5] Janette Miller (1879-1969), grew up in Detroit Michigan, where she worked as a librarian. She later became a missionary in Africa. Rohan encounters her journals decades later and comes to both identify with and resist elements of Miller's experience (Rohan 233, "The Personal").

her; it leads her to surprising sources and to patient insights; it helps her push for a lovingly honest assessment of a complicated and imperfect individual. Jacqueline Royster, in Traces of a Stream, notices a similar connection, but one she attributes to spiritual ancestors (87). For Royster, African American rhetors erased or minimized in traditional histories represent a legacy of thought she can place herself within. By rescuing and reconstructing their histories, she can more fully understand and position herself. She argues that "people who do intellectual work need to understand their 'intellectual ancestry'" (265). Part of her attachment to her research subjects, then, is derived from her sense of their contributions to the world she currently inhabits. As a compositionist, understanding Aristotle and other important historical figures in rhetoric is certainly part of my intellectual ancestry. But what about my nearer ancestors, those teachers and thinkers of the past 150 years who also came before me? What about Edwin Hopkins—his messy handwriting and passionate attempts to reform the labor conditions of composition teachers?

What was it about Hopkins that reverberated in me? How can I understand my connection to this man separated from me by time and place? Why is understanding that connection important, not just to me but to others in the field? Early in this project, I feared my deep identification might be a hindrance. I saw our connections clearly and felt confident in my ability to develop them. Would I also be able to remain open to our differences, to the distance created by different historical contexts, different genders, and different values? How could I tease the purely personal connections from the professional ones? With these questions in mind, I applied Ratcliffe's concept of rhetorical listening to what I had found on Hopkins. Ratcliffe explains that "rhetorical listening signifies a stance of openness that a person may choose to assume in relation to any person, text, or culture" (1). Thus, I could use a stance of openness and a willingness to hear difference, as well as connection, as a method for invention. For this research project I wanted to push past my instinctive identification to better understand our distances and differences, while also investigating where my identifications might take me. Because Hopkins' work, both as a WPA and as a champion for labor reform, takes up key values of the field, understanding how labor concerns have evolved in the history FYC is important. Amy Heckathorn, theorizing the value of shared history to a discipline in "Moving Toward a Group Identity," argues that "Other than documenting and legitimizing the work of former WPAs, a history can and should inform current and future practices. Modern WPAs benefit greatly from the theorizing and evolution of a disciplinary identity" (211). Hopkins' research is dedicated to documenting the early labor conditions of our discipline, conditions that certainly affected the creation of our "disciplinary identity." In this way, part of what Hopkins offers me and, I argue, the field, is an in-depth look at the reality of teaching early in our history as well as a sense of our labor history. Many of the resonances that exist between Hopkins and I are personal, but others are signs and symptoms of engaging with layers of responsibility—as a teacher, scholar,

and administrator—and remain key preoccupations of our discipline. With these layers of personal and professional identification in mind, I returned to Popken's essay on Hopkins, the one which had so enamored me, and consciously worked to apply rhetorical listening.

Where did I hear identification? Where did I see myself and my concerns, as well as the concerns of my field, reflected in Hopkins' history? Popken goes to great lengths to document the material conditions that contributed to Hopkins' dissatisfaction with the labor conditions surrounding the teaching of writing, reporting that in the fall of 1890, Hopkins taught two composition courses with a combined total of 119 students, as well as three literature classes (Popken 623, "Edwin Hopkins"). Personally, I immediately identified with the overwork described here; I've also taught five and six classes in a semester. Like Hopkins, my response to demoralizing labor conditions was a new kind of awareness, a thrill of electricity jolting my consciousness: I must do… something about labor in my field. Professionally, the issue of overwork is a pressing reality the field discusses in its journals and professional organizations, though today the culprit is more likely to be adjunct labor spread among several institutions than lecture-sized classes.[6] Laura Micciche, in Doing Emotion, identities this problem as one prevalent among academics generally: "Surely, disappointment in relation to working conditions and employment opportunities is one of the most familiar contexts for diminished hope and cutting cynicism among academics" (73). While labor conditions in academia are often, as Micciche points out, disappointing, labor conditions in Composition and Rhetoric are recognized by most as particularly unpleasant, largely because of the ways our writing heavy curriculum and vulnerability to contingent labor leave us vulnerable to unproductive labor demands. Thus, today scholars like Marc Bousquet, Christopher Carter, and Tony Scott (to name only a few) are deeply invested in creating sustainable and supportive labor conditions for teachers of writing. Even Derek Bok, in his book aimed at a more general audience, Our Underachieving Colleges, writing about the problem of teaching college students to communicate on a university-wide level, devotes serious time and attention to the unproductive labor conditions of teachers of writing (87-91). Hopkins' descriptions of hellish overwork resonate with me personally, but they are also representative of deep and ongoing labor problems for teachers of writing.

But what about moments where a more careful mapping of our differences might be useful? This is where rhetorical listening became especially generative for me. Pursuing the strategy of rhetorical listening,

---

[6] The publication *FORUM: Issues about Part-Time and Contingent Faculty* sponsored by CCCC is a powerful example of the significance of labor issues to the field; the mission of this journal is to sustain and empower conversations around a single facet of labor debates, part-time contingent employment.

I discovered important moments of difference. For instance, Popken devotes a good deal of attention to Hopkins' personal investment in teaching writing, which he links to his religious dedication, explaining that "Hopkins' commitment to the teaching of writing and the labor it entailed was both theoretical and spiritual" (621, "Edwin Hopkins"). Theoretically, Hopkins was aligned with New Rhetoric composition pedagogies that rejected large lecture classes and called for personalized teaching (Popken 621, "Edwin Hopkins"). According to this pedagogy, careful response to student writing was integral to writing instruction. Spiritually, Hopkins believed that finding one's professional calling was a religious experience (Popken 622, "Edwin Hopkins"). Hopkins' religiosity is well documented in the archival materials at the University of Kansas. His personal diaries contain weekly references to attending church (where he played the organ), various church activities and groups, and a robust spiritual network (Hopkins, "Journal 14"). His personal papers also include addresses delivered at chapel, with varying degrees of religious inflection (Hopkins "Kansas Day in Chapel"). For Hopkins, then, his ideal pedagogy was grounded in the discipline of Composition and Rhetoric—before it was a full-fledged discipline—but it was made meaningful and worth the enormous sacrifices of time, and even health, by his belief in the religious rewards of this work. It is here that I am no longer comfortable; here, perhaps, that I need to look more closely and make space for difference.

I, too, ground my pedagogy in student-centered theories. But I cannot follow Hopkins into his religious zeal for his work. The religious rewards which come from identifying God's role for one's work may be termed as a kind of "psychic income." Eileen Schell, arguing about the feminization of composition and its disproportionate number of female contingent workers in Gypsy Academics and Mother-Teachers, notes that ideas about psychic pay, or the emotional and spiritual satisfaction one gets from one's work, have been used to support demeaning labor conditions (41). Schell points to the history of women who have taught composition part-time and/or for a fraction of the pay of their tenured male colleagues and argues that "nineteenth century gender ideologies that advocated teaching as women's true profession" helped to cement composition courses as women's work and as less rigorous and important than the masculine realms of research and literature (36). As a woman compositionist interested in improving the labor conditions of my field, I have come to bristle at suggestions that the emotional, religious, or "psychic" rewards of teaching somehow mitigate exploitative labor practices.

Such bristling is not unique to me; many women scholars have noted and bemoaned troubling ways our field equates the feminine with "lesser." In Composition in the University, Sharon Crowley argues that part of the move toward defining "English as a language from which its native speakers were alienated" was designed to "escape of the effeminacy" associated with English studies (60). Theresa Enos, building on this thread, has written at great length about how the feminization of

the field has marginalized scholars (especially women), a theme she elaborates on in Gender Roles and Faculty Lives in Rhetoric and Composition (4). My discomfort with this aspect of Hopkins' identity is based on my awareness of these particular scholarly conversations and my status as a woman academic in a "feminized" field. Yet, as an historical researcher, I must also be able to listen to Hopkins' reality, the position that helped to define his experience of his work and his activism for improving labor conditions, in spite of my own context—a context which encourages me to be highly suspicious of (and even hostile to) factoring "psychic income" into labor debates. By listening to experiences laid side-by-side, I can honor our differences and see connections that may otherwise be missed or over-simplified. In this moment, drawn deeply to many of Hopkins' experiences, I need to not see myself represented by or against him. Instead, I must listen attentively to the insights another history offers me.

There is tension for me in this moment. I want to critique Hopkins. I want to reject this part of his reality, to rush to judgment, so that I can close off this space of discomfort. Rhetorical listening has helped me to identify and think through a moment of non-identification, but strategic contemplation can help me resist the urge to come to closure too quickly. Strategic contemplation asks me to pause, to listen, and to refuse to rush to judgment. Royster and Kirsch, introducing strategic contemplation as a research method, argue that it is a method designed to "reclaim a genre of research and a scholarship traditionally associated with the processes of mediation, introspection, and reflection" (84). Part of Royster and Kirsch's book argues that in the current publish or perish environment of academia, historians can feel pushed to report findings and make arguments before they have had a chance to sit with information. While there is truth in this claim, I also find it difficult to process information which threatens my research goals or the trends I have already begun to trace. Because I felt immediately connected to and invested in Hopkins, moments of non-identification were uncomfortable for me. Rhetorical listening asks me to name and recognize these moments; strategic contemplation asks me to linger over them, giving myself time to process my reactions and listen for new insights.

The Labor of Response to Student Writing

As I've alluded to, much of my identification with Hopkins comes from my own experience of the labor surrounding teaching composition. In the four years immediately preceding my initial introduction to Hopkins, I worked as both a full-time visiting lecturer and an adjunct. Overall, I was lucky. There were several adjunct positions at my university but few lecturer positions. The majority of our First Year Composition courses were taught by adjuncts. I occupied a visiting lecturer position for three years. While I could not count on my job being renewed each year, once it was, I was safe for the entire year. My co-workers, my friends—even my partner—were adjuncts. One semester they might have three classes,

the next just one. They made less per class than I did, even though we held the same degrees. The unfairness of the situation—that others made less money for the same work, and that so many had to deal with a permanent lack of job security—was never lost on me. In this context, I was immensely thankful for my job. But I was also tired. In the fall I applied to Ph.D. programs, the fall before I began researching Hopkins, in addition to my 4-4 load at my home university, I taught courses as an adjunct at a local community college. In my full-time position I was not only teaching; I was serving on several committees, training new faculty, and working on a major program assessment. At the same time, I was completing graduate school applications, tracking down recommendations, and working on my conference presentations. My plate was full. Those responsibilities weren't what bothered me. What made me sick with stress and worry was responding to student essays, of which—with six classes—I simply had too many.[7] I had essays or drafts to respond to nearly every day. I was always responding to student work. I enjoy reading and thinking about student work. But evaluating and responding to it—for five and six classes worth of students and four preps worth of curriculum? I was exhausted.

This personal context—symptomatic of labor conditions in the field more generally—is part of why I found Hopkins such a compelling figure. Hopkins, teaching a comparable number of composition students to many writing teachers today, was physically overcome by the labor demands of responding to his students' writing. This helps to explain how, separated by nearly one hundred years, his descriptions of teacher fatigue and the never-ending deluge of student papers resonated with my own experiences. In fact, he comes to believe that the labor conditions surrounding the teaching of composition cause teacher burnout and substandard instruction (Hopkins 5-6, "Can Good"). To prove this, and to advocate for reforming those conditions, Hopkins turns to his empirical research study, publishing the final results in 1923. To compile these results, he sends two rounds of surveys to all colleges in the United States (Hopkins 22, "The Labor and Cost"). For the first survey, collected in the years 1909-1913, his goal is to "determine the labor necessary to meet current standards of English composition teaching." He reports receiving responses from faculty at approximately one fifth of colleges, representing 33 states, 96 colleges, and 345 teachers (Hopkins 22, "The Labor and Cost"). For his second survey, collected from 1913-1915, his goal is to "make a comparative study of cost." In this survey, he tries to find out how much it costs to staff English sections compared to other subjects, factoring in everything from equipment and classroom space to instructors

[7] Caps for my four classes at one university were 20 (for a total of 80 students) and caps at the community college were set at "how many they could fit in a room," typically maxing out between 25 and 30. I was fortunate that my specific sections were, by luck, closer to 20. Together, for semesters when I taught six composition classes, I had approximately 120 students.

and assistants. He reports that approximately ten percent of colleges responded (Hopkins 22, "The Labor and Cost"). Analyzing his results, Hopkins' finds that "the theme reading labor expected of a college freshman composition instructor is more than double (250 per cent) that which can be carried without undue physical strain" (Hopkins 20, "The Labor and Cost"). To support this, he explains that the average student writes 650 words a week; teachers can read student writing at an average rate of 2,200 words an hour; instructors can read for up to two hours a day (or ten hours a week) without "loss of efficiency," and, finally, the average instructor teaches 105 students a semester (Hopkins 20, "The Labor and Cost"). Ultimately, he argues that these labor conditions are the direct cause of two problems: that the "results of the work are unsatisfactory" and that "conscientious and efficient teachers are brought to actual physical collapse and driven from the profession" (Hopkins 21, "The Labor and Cost").

It is important to note here that Hopkins was not the only composition teacher in his era writing about labor, but the fact that composition was not recognized as a field hampered efforts at systematic or permanent reform. In 1918, Frank W. Scott, Joseph M. Thomas, and Frederick A. Manchester, in the "Preliminary Report of the Special Committee on Freshman English" for The English Journal, discuss critical issues facing composition instruction. They note that "the supply of competent teachers must be increased" (593) and that "if we sincerely desire to improve the quality of the teaching in Freshman English […] we shall do whatever is practicable to lighten the burdens and increase the opportunities of the teacher of the Freshman English and other similar courses in composition" (594). However, Composition and Rhetoric was not yet a generally recognized discipline, and teaching writing was widely considered to be the commonsensical application of grammar rules which any competent writer could drill into a student's head (Connors 110, "Overwork"). Without a dedicated field of fellow-scholars, support for research, and recognition that the labor of composition teachers was both specialized and important, Hopkins and the few others who did write about pedagogy and labor as they related to Freshman English, had no professional community with a clear identity to take up their findings, theorize ways to practically apply them, or advocate effectively for change. Hopkins, in carrying out and publicizing his findings, is impressive in what he was able to accomplish, and the fact that his findings failed to permanently alter the labor landscape of composition instructors, according to his recommendations, is at least in part due to the field's lack of disciplinary legitimacy.

Identification and Distance

"Lack of disciplinary legitimacy," "overwork," "failure to alter the labor landscape": these phrases—so appropriate for the clinical nature of much scholarly work—are also euphemisms that sanitize the human costs associated with the labor conditions surrounding writing instruction.

Popken, in his analysis of Hopkins, details these human costs explicitly. In Hopkins' journals and correspondence, Popken finds evidence of general nervousness, insomnia, eye strain, and depression in the years from 1890 to 1919 ("Edwin Hopkins" 629-30). For example, in a letter from Hopkins to his Chancellor Frank Strong, Hopkins writes about "eye and nerve strain which all my work entail" and which brought him "to the verge of breakdown" (qtd. in Popken 630). It was descriptions like this one that most resonated with me. This identification, the recognition of labor demands that leave physical scars, was responsible for my sticky note with three underlines and an exclamation point. At the time I "found" Hopkins I was a graduate teaching assistant (GTA), teaching two sections of composition as I took two graduate courses. At the same time, I was tutoring between twenty and thirty Chinese students applying to American colleges, and working for Educational Testing Services as an Advanced Placement Exam grader. Like Hopkins, I often felt "on the verge of breakdown."

Beaten down by my workload, my health suffered. I wondered with true panic: How can I do everything? How can I respond to my students the way I believe in responding to them—carefully, thoughtfully, fully? I graded through migraines, tears in my eyes. I would rationalize that I was almost through the busy part of my schedule, that I was managing things well. Then my body would remind me of the truth: my psoriasis would flare up, my TMJ would lock my jaw in place, my weight would balloon, and I would get strange headaches that lasted for days. When I "met" Hopkins, I immediately identified with his "nervous energy" and history of breakdowns brought on, in large part, due to his scrupulous response to student writing. The stress culminated in 1919, four years before Hopkins finished his fifteen years of labor documenting the labor conditions of composition instructors around the country, when Hopkins was hospitalized for "increasing nervous exhaustion with dental infection added" (Hopkins, qtd in Popken 630, "Edwin Hopkins"). Hopkins would spend the entire 1919-1920 school year recuperating while receiving a paid leave of absence. Though Hopkins returned to the University of Kansas the following year, he continued to struggle with the physical effects of the demands of his job (Popken 630-31, "Edwin Hopkins").

I could hear Hopkins because I could identify with him. As I pushed myself to not identify, I was still struck by the pathos of his situation. Even working not to see Hopkins as a representation of my own exhaustion, I sympathize with his situation. Thus, while in Hopkins' history I find many meaningful connections, I also find these connections troubling. Hopkins dedicates much of his professional energy to preventing just the kind of exhaustion and overwork that I identify with my own work life, a century later. Despite a tireless devotion to improving the labor conditions of composition teachers, Hopkins had limited success, at least in light of his stated goals—changing how teaching loads were determined and how the instructional system of composition was

conceptualized (Popken 18, "The WPA"; Heyda 247). It is true, however, that even with a hostile administration Hopkins is able to make clear improvements during this tenure on his own campus, reducing the student load per faculty member in composition from 177 in 1909 to 49 in 1925 (Popken 18, "The WPA").[8] Hopkins' larger goal, however, of national improvement, was not realized: in 1929 the average student load for composition was still 93 (Taylor 20).[9] Additionally, John Heyda points out that "[Hopkins'] study did not succeed […] in redefining definitions of load. Nor did it give rise to alternative models for organizing composition's delivery systems" (247). Again, this lack of success was at least partially due to the loftiness of Hopkins' goals, and the fact that there was no established disciplinary field to support and act on his findings. Yet, Heyda, looking at other writing roughly contemporaneous to Hopkins to analyze trends in Freshman English, notes "how little impact Hopkins' study had on administrators' thinking in the decade following his report's appearance" (248). Why was Hopkins unsuccessful? Given my shared values and history with Hopkins, what can I learn from him? More importantly, given the enduring nature of labor problems in teaching writing, what can our field learn from him?

Analyzing Hopkins' Arguments for Change

Understanding how Hopkins attempts to educate and persuade his readers can offer both models and cautionary tales for Composition and Rhetoric scholars attempting to tackle labor in its most recent permutations. In order to better understand why Hopkins' work fails to reform labor in composition, especially through gaining allies in other departments and in university administration, I return to his body of work and track the different arguments he makes for addressing his concerns.

When Hopkins first begins to advocate for better labor conditions for composition teachers in 1909 on his own campus, he focuses his arguments on the quality of work teachers are able to do, arguing "that large student loads diminish the quality of composition teaching" (Popken 625, "Edwin Hopkins"). This argument, that current labor conditions are linked to unsatisfactory teaching results, remains throughout Hopkins' work. In his final presentation of his research data in 1923, for example, he argues that:

> If the public now pays large and growing sums for Bad English and then complains of the badness of that English rather than of

[8] While this number is a clear improvement, it is important to remember that faculty were still teaching other courses (primarily literature) in addition to their composition loads.

[9] Warner Taylor's survey, published in 1929, looked into the "conditions in Freshman English" on a nationwide scale. One of the conditions he surveyed was class size. Hopkins, based on his research, recommends 35 composition students per instructor with 60 as the upper limit (4, "Can Good).

> the cost, it is at least possible that the same public may eventually […] be willing to make the necessary and reasonable addition to its present ineffective outline for the teaching of English expression, if thereby it may ensure the desired return. (Hopkins 37, "The Labor and Cost")

The underlying claim is that the reason the public is receiving "Bad English" is because teachers are not able to provide good instruction given their current labor conditions. This argument for improving the labor conditions of composition instruction is based on Hopkins' pedagogic commitments: instruction is failing because instructors are unable to effectively carry out the personalized pedagogy Hopkins' supports (2, "Can Good"). While this argument never entirely disappears from his work, he realizes early on that this argument alone is insufficient, as can be seen in the increasing complexity of his arguments detailed below.

When appealing to the needs of students and teachers fails, Hopkins devotes much of his argumentative energies to a scientific approach, both as an intrinsic good—a way at getting at the truth—and as a way to solve the problem. In presenting the findings of his nationwide study, Hopkins writes: "For two and half years an investigation has been in progress to ascertain what are the proper laboratory requirements for the efficient teaching of English expression" (Hopkins 747, "The Present Conditions"). This line both highlights the scientific value of his study and one of his main arguments in campaigning for better labor conditions for composition instructors: teaching writing is a laboratory subject.[10] Indeed, in his final 1923 report, Hopkins claims that "although not in agreement with tradition, it is now commonly even if reluctantly admitted that English composition is a laboratory subject" (36, "The Labor and Cost"). Hopkins, looking at composition classes through the lens of laboratory classes, makes it clear that "the system of determining teaching loads is wholly unjust," using scientific methods and calculations to allow him to offer a solution by inventing "a formula for determining faculty load that counts 'theme and exercising correcting' on same level [sic] as 'conducting recitations'" (Popken 626, "Edwin Hopkins"). By applying scientific arguments and formulas, Hopkins is able to argue for, and eventually carry out research into, composition instructors' labor conditions, while also suggesting solutions to alleviate the burden—solutions he positions as fair and unbiased. Another benefit of his scientific approach is that they allow him to present his arguments as factual and, therefore, unassailable by those of goodwill and good understanding. Before his recourse to a scientific study of labor problems faced by composition instructors, he laments that:

[10] See footnote 1

> [W]hen English teachers have stated these facts to educational authorities, they have not infrequently been called incompetent, ignorant, or even untruthful; while more often and perhaps more recently they have been assured that these matters, while possibly true, are after all unimportant and irrelevant; that they have no bearing upon the situation, or that they have nothing to do with the real problems of English teaching. (Hopkins 5, "Can Good Composition")

Hopkins believes that his scientific study will silence these kinds of responses. In relying on science for authority, Hopkins can quiet his opponents by representing them as unwilling to see reality. After arguing, for instance, about the maximum amount of student work an instructor could read in a day, Hopkins writes "Some, who perhaps do not wish to admit the truth, dispute this statement, but it can be disputed only by refusing to consider facts and figures" (Hopkins 747, "The Present Conditions").

Finally, Hopkins co-opts the language of business to reframe better labor conditions for teachers as commonsensical. Hopkins summarizes the current situation in terms of pointing to its absurdity: "Much money is spent, valuable teachers are worn out at an inhumanly rapid rate, and results are inadequate or wholly lacking. From any point of view—that of taxpayer, teacher, or pupil—such a situation is intolerable" (Hopkins 1, "Can Good Composition"). In this assessment of the problem, Hopkins argues not that the public is getting affordable education and exploiting teachers; he argues they are getting ineffective instruction because they are exploiting teachers. Although Hopkins' work is motivated by his pedagogical concerns, this framing of the situation implicitly reorients his argument in terms of profitable business practices. Is it worthwhile to expend more money for better results? Following this line of logic, Hopkins makes the case that, according to business values of costs and benefits, it is worthwhile to hire more English teachers. He asks why "if there is more English work than English teachers can do, there should not be more English teachers" and argues that before hiring more instructors can be dismissed as too expensive, administrators and the public must know "just what does English cost now, and what is the actual value of it, in relation to other subjects and the number of pupils concerned" (Hopkins 750, "The Present Conditions"). Hopkins works hard to argue that any additional costs associated with his suggested reforms will result in worthwhile benefits.

Ultimately, Hopkins makes purposeful rhetorical choices—focusing on the pedagogical justifications for his preferred "laboratory"-style instruction, the scientifically demonstrable need for improving labor conditions, and arguments that additional costs are justified by improvements in the writing skills of students—all designed to sway his audience. How is it, then, that these arguments failed to achieve his recommended reforms?

Insights from Strategic Contemplation

Earlier in this article, critiquing Hopkins' spiritual motivations as "psychic income," I used rhetorical listening to identify a moment in the research process where I was tempted to "rush to judgement" to avoid the tension of non-identification. I forced myself to name and then wrestle with that tension. But how did that that look? What did strategic contemplation and letting this moment linger in my mind add to my research process? Here, an illustrative narrative is useful. When I had written about a dozen pages of this article, I got feedback from a writing group. As I always do with such feedback, I read the draft start to finish, reacting to comments as they appeared in the text. I had several rounds of feedback, so I ended up reading through my draft three times. The comments were insightful and gave me useful ideas. But in the back of my mind I felt uncomfortable. I had "heard" something. This something was not written down, at least not explicitly. But I felt it. I made notes about avenues to explore. I got good ideas, made good plans. I went back to that uncomfortable feeling. I circled passages which badly needed editing and sat for a few minutes, thinking in an undirected kind of way. It didn't come to me, so I packed up, filed the feeling away in my brain, and went home. I asked myself to sit with the feeling, hoping it would germinate; I consciously made space for strategic contemplation.

Three or four nights later, as I was getting ready for bed, it came to me: I found the "problem" with my draft and the real reason why I had wanted to rush past—with easy dismissal—Hopkins' religious understanding of his work and his suffering for that work. Hopkins and I are annoying in our valorization of suffering. We take perverse pride in a work ethic that is physically exhausting, perhaps damaging. I have good defenses to this accusation. I do suffer, at times, from the physical effects of my labor, but I work hard because I believe in this work. However, if I listen, especially to my own story in this narrative, the things that drew me to Hopkins and the ways that I read him, I can hear pride in my willingness to go above and beyond, enjoyment in the struggle to do the impossible. I critiqued Hopkins for the spiritual dimension of his work. I worried that his religiosity allowed him to romanticize his debilitating overwork as a sign of "goodness." I said, not me. And yet. Me. Absolutely me. That is part of my connection to him. Whether or not Hopkins himself would own or articulate a tendency to romanticize damaging work conditions, I have to own it. I hear it when I my lay my experience alongside his, when I give myself time to reflect and withhold judgment.

This insight opens a new window into my analysis of Hopkins' argumentative choices. Hopkins tried to appropriate scientific and business arguments to be persuasive. But, perhaps, these arguments were undermined by his representation of the punishing nature of his labor. Like me, he probably did not intend to valorize his painful labor moments.

However, how might these representations of suffering have been read by faculty in other disciplines? By administrators? On the afternoon that I read a shorter version of this article three times, though I couldn't immediately identify it, I was bothered by the dramatic rendering of the personal costs of such labor. That doesn't mean that I think these descriptions of my (or his) labor conditions are inaccurate. But I felt annoyed by my own descriptions of a struggle between an ideal pedagogy and the material conditions that make this pedagogy either impossible or painful to enact. I can only imagine the reactions of a less sympathetic or invested reader. Isn't there a simpler way to teach effectively, to leave quality feedback? Is such a detailed level of response really necessary? Do you really grade through tears? In Colin Charlton et al.'s GenAdmin, they critique the trope of the suffering WPA noting that "images of suffering can be overwhelming" in the literature on WPAs (55). They argue tropes of suffering create a victim/hero dichotomy that downplays the evolution of Composition and Rhetoric—particularly related to issues of writing program administration—as a dynamic and evolving field with engaged and empowered actors (Charlton et al. 55). Hopkins cannot be critiqued for following this trend so much as insights from later scholars like Charlton et al., who have the benefit of a discipline and history to analyze, can help us see the limits of this approach. Hopkins—and to a large extent myself in parts of this article—frames himself and other composition teachers as victims unable to enact change without outside intervention.

Hopkins is right that without help from his administration and the general public his grandest vision could not be realized. However, he does not account for what he could and even did accomplish. Teaching loads at Kansas were reduced under this tenure (Popken 18, "The WPA"). He did carry out and publish his research. And while I am frustrated by my own and my colleagues' labor conditions, this awareness was part of my impetus for pursuing my PhD and working as a WPA, where I have more (though by no means total) power to positively impact the labor conditions of composition instructors at my university. By downplaying his and other composition instructors' agency, Hopkins' depiction of the extreme suffering and physical costs of the labor required to teach composition likely worked against him, because its impassioned nature allowed readers to focus on the emotional tone of his findings and not the scientific data he worked so hard to gather. For instance, when Hopkins' proposal for research into the labor conditions of composition instructors was rejected in 1909 by both his dean and chancellor, Popken notes that "The proposal even got Hopkins in conflict with faculty members who believed he was trying to get special favors for his program" (17-18 "WPA"). Even more telling, when Hopkins' returned from his leave of absence in fall of 1920, his new Chancellor Ernest Lindley worried about Hopkins' mental stability, writing "Dr. Hopkins is in an overwrought state which excites my deepest sympathy but I am frankly at a loss to know whether his judgement in certain essential matters is as excellent as it would be under normal circumstances" (qtd in Popken 630-631, "Edwin Hopkins"). This

reaction by other faculty and his administration to his pleas to remedy the labor situation surrounding First Year Composition suggest that rather than being moved by his descriptions of the labor conditions surrounding the teaching of writing, his audiences were alienated by and suspicious of the dramatic rendering of those descriptions, believing instead that he was either purposefully exaggerating the situation or hysterical and unstable.

Many of Hopkins' rhetorical choices make sense to me. Employ arguments that matter to your audience in order to persuade them; get data to support your position. In fact, I find Hopkins' decision to research and document the labor conditions he sought to improve a canny move. And using the values of your audience—in this case scientific data and economically justifiable recommendations—is rooted in a rhetorical awareness I find compelling. Even these moves, however, may not have been as effective as Hopkins (and some Composition and Rhetoric scholars today) assumes. Marc Bousquet, in his essay "Composition as Management Science" traces several of the ways composition has tried to deal with its labor problems in the recent past. He cites several "trends in the discourse," one of which he identifies as particularly problematic. He describes this as a move "away from critical theory toward institutionally focused pragmatism, toward acceptance of market logic, and toward increasing collaboration with a vocational and technical model of education" (Bousquet 13). Bousquet explains that while the adoption of arguments drawing on these values may feel pragmatic or persuasive, the end goal is counter-productive; we end up indirectly validating the attitudes that produced our damaging labor conditions. In effect, arguments for reform that remain dedicated to fixing a broken or exploitative system have already, by legitimizing that system, failed.

This critique can apply to Hopkins. When Hopkins appeals to the economic value of reorganizing labor in composition classes, he assumes that economic arguments are valid educational arguments. And by trying to reclassify composition as a laboratory subject, Hopkins assumes that laboratory loads in other disciplines were fairer and more manageable. Christopher Carter argues that "good bureaucrats" like Hopkins "in appearing to patiently work within [bureaucratic boundaries], sustain as reality political limits that are neither honest nor natural but simply the limit—ideas most useful to hierarchies of decision making and money-gathering" (188). In effect, Hopkins' close attention to the material conditions of English compositionists blinds him to solutions that either assume different material conditions or that consider what the limits of these conditions mean when crafting curriculum. And by focusing exclusively on trying to prove that composition instructors had a unique teaching burden in responding to student writing, Hopkins fails to consider or imagine different material realities faced by other faculty in other departments. Just because an instructor was not responding to student writing does not mean her labor conditions were reasonable or humane. By failing to consider how his arguments validate the current system or

reflect the labor realities of other faculty, he risks making enemies where he may, by employing more inclusive labor arguments, make allies.

Concluding Connections to Today's Changing Labor Conditions

While rhetorical listening helped me think about Hopkins' and his (dis)connections to my own experiences more critically, strategic contemplation gave me the space to generate insights about what Hopkins' history offers today's compositionists interested in reforming our labor conditions. Articulating my responses to my research on Hopkins—and then resting with and investigating those responses—helps me to see and imagine other ways to respond to Hopkins' work, ways that help me understand why he had limited long-term, nationwide success. The most enduring lesson from Hopkins may be that he failed to achieve his recommendations for reform. Hopkins relies on three argumentative strategies: pedagogical justifications, authority garnered from scientific research, and costs and benefits analysis. These moves, however, are undermined by the valorization of suffering seen in his descriptions of dedicated teachers of writing and his commitment to working within the systems that produced the hellish labor conditions he describes. Today, arguments that accept unchallenged the cost-saving values that have allowed contingent labor to be increasingly exploited in American universities, or which pragmatically attempt to work within or alongside structures of exploitation, are likely doomed to fail. Likewise, solutions that improve the labor conditions of one small segment of teachers within the university (or within a department) are likely to encounter unexpected adversaries. Histories like Hopkins' cannot be mapped easily onto today's landscape, but they can inform the decisions we make and warn us about potential pitfalls as we attempt to reimagine labor conditions in composition that support our best practices and ideal pedagogies. In the end, Hopkins both offers positive models and cautionary tales for those interested in reforming the labor conditions surrounding First Year Composition.

Thus, while the majority of this article looks at where and how Hopkins' failed, it is also significant that Hopkins had important successes. Both during his lifetime and today (as illustrated by my own fascination with his work) Hopkins convinces a particular set of people of the importance of his research and the value of his findings: teachers of writing. For this audience then, his rendering of the real emotional and physical costs of our labor not only validates experiences that are too often unarticulated or treated like unchangeable "facts of life," but his arguments for change are persuasive. And persuasive arguments like his are why today the Conference on College Communication and Composition has adopted the "CCCC Statement on Working Conditions for Non-Tenure-Track Writing Faculty" which recommends that NTT faculty, hired primarily as teachers and thus with the highest teaching loads in most departments, should have workloads "limited to a maximum of twenty students per semester per section of first-year and/or advanced

composition courses" and that "faculty should not teach more than three sections of such courses per term." Similarly the Association of Departments of English's "ADE Guidelines for Class Size and Workload for College and University Teachers of English" argues: "college English teachers should not teach more than three sections of composition per term. The number of students in each section should be fifteen or fewer, with no more than twenty students in any case." These numbers are directly in line with Hopkins' recommendation to limit the number of composition students per instructor per semester to between 35 and 60 (4 "Can Good"). And clearly, looking at my own rhetorical choices in this article, I expect that personal narratives and frank accounts of my emotional and physical experiences will not only resonate with readers but convince them of the importance of documenting, analyzing, and ultimately changing our labor conditions. Given one's audience and goals, then, appeals to suffering, and scientific documentation and analysis of our labor conditions can help determine just what the field's ideal conditions for carrying out a particularly pedagogy should look like.

At the same time, my close analysis of Hopkins' work and its reception offers two additional insights, particularly for arguments geared toward persuading those outside our discipline to reform the labor conditions surrounding First Year Composition. First, we would be well-served to avoid focusing on the emotional and physical toll of this work in ways that suggest the uniqueness of our plight. Instead, we should focus on labor arguments that position us within a system of labor exploitation that requires deep and systemic reform. Our solutions need to be more inclusive by moving across rank—benefiting all teachers of First Year Composition from graduate students and adjuncts to full-time lecturers and tenure-track faculty—and across disciplines—joining forces with others from physical scientists burdened by unrealistic formulas for determining course load to social scientists with crushing advising expectations. Whether taking the form of conversionist, reformist, union/collectivist or abolitionist solutions,[11] our outward facing discussions of labor need to recognize and make use of the dispiriting reality that, in many ways, our labor conditions are not unique. We must identify and make use of our potential allies.

The second important insight Hopkins offers us as we craft arguments to administrators and the public is that accepting the value systems that have produced our labor conditions as a persuasive tool is not

[11] Schell, categorizes four major approaches within the field for addressing contingent labor and tiered labor structures. The "conversionist solution" suggests converting contingent positions into tenure positions, the "reformist solution" recommends professionalizing the working conditions of writing instructors, the "union/collectivist solution" advocates unionization, and finally the "abolitionist solution" supports replacing first-year composition courses entirely with vertical writing curricula (taught by tenured faculty) (Schell 90-115).

an effective long-term strategy. In truth, this is the finding from my research that I struggle with the most. While my scholarly persona as a writer and researcher might be ready to burn down institutions and remake the world, my administrative persona—grappling with the daily minutiae of running a First Year Composition program and creating the most equitable labor conditions I can in an imperfect system—sees, to borrow a term from Bosquet, "institutionally focused pragmatism" as an expedient tool for achieving real and significant goals, like lowering course caps or getting more full-time lines. In that context, what would it mean to not accept the unstated values that allow First Year Composition teachers not only be continually exploited, but also that allow those of us in positions of authority—like WPAs—to participate in that exploitation? To be perfectly honest, I'm not sure where this insight will take us. I can offer, however, a personal example of how this insight has shaped the kind of work I am doing in my own program.

Recently our First Year Composition caps were raised—despite thoughtful, persistent, and noisy pushback from the both English Department Chair and myself. At the same time, as Director of First Year Composition I've been tasked with redesigning the Basic Writing and Composition 1 curricula. Heading into summer workshops to accomplish these redesigns, I'm asking myself what it means to resist the assumptions that have created a situation like this one—assumptions such as the capitalistic mantra that it is always possible (and preferable) to do more with less or the disciplinary commitments to ideal pedagogies and our students that result in teachers who can be counted on to work beyond reasonable limits because they believe in the vital importance of the work they do. In response, I've been mulling what I think is a radical question: if these course caps and loads are the labor conditions these courses will be taught under, what would curricula built for these conditions look like? In other words, rather than basing our course outcomes solely on established best practices and typical course outcomes, what would it mean to take the labor constraints of large sections and high teaching loads into consideration when deciding what the course can realistically accomplish given those constraints? In practice, this would mean things like fewer writing assignments and circumscribed curricular goals. And while part of me immediately balks—I want our students to have the best and fullest rhetorical education possible—another part of me thinks of what these changes would mean to the daily lives of instructors in my program with longing. Playing out the idea in my head, I also wonder what administrators will say in response to the announcement that we've changed the course—making it less complex and less in line with disciplinary standards—in order to ensure that we can achieve the teaching we do promise without physically and emotionally over-extending teachers. What would my colleagues at other institutions think—would they accuse me of abandoning students by limiting their exposure to ideas our field believes are crucial to their development as thinkers and citizens? Or, will they recognize the practice even if it has been unarticulated in

their own schools? I share this example not because I think it is the solution — right now, it is no more than an idea in response to the collision of this research with my administrative duties—but because I wouldn't be asking these questions if I hadn't done this research and thought hard about what I've learned by studying Hopkins and his calls for reform.

Today, as our modern labor issues—most pressingly an over-reliance on contingent labor and unmanageable teaching loads—and possible solutions are debated in the field, the value of revisiting Hopkins and our labor history cannot be overstated. Hopkins offers a glimpse into how our arguments are or might be structured and the possible outcomes of such decisions. Analyzing Hopkins' failures, particularly to convince other stakeholders to invest in improving labor conditions for composition teachers, is important to us today when we consider reforms like unionization, which depend on coalitions across departments in the university, and as we interrogate the assumptions that have allowed these labor conditions to exist for so long despite our awareness of their costs to teachers and students.

Works Cited

"ADE Guidelines for Class Size and Workload for College and University Teachers of English: A Statement of Policy." Association of Departments of English, 1992, https://www.ade.mla.org/Resources/Policy-Statements/ADE-Guidelines-for-Class-Size-and-Workload-for-College-and-University-Teachers-of-English-A-Statement-of-Policy. Accessed 25 June 2018.

Bok, Derek. "Learning to Communicate." *Our Underachieving Colleges: A Candid Look at How Much Student Learn and Why They Should Be Learning More, Princeton University Press*, 2008, pp. 82-108.

Bousquet, Marc. "Composition as Management Science." Bousquet, Scott, and Parascondola, pp. 11-35.

Bousquet, Marc, Tony Scott, and Leo Parascondola, eds. *Tenured Bosses and Disposable Teachers: Writing Instruction in the Managed University*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Carter, Christopher. "Bureaucratic Essentialism and the Corporatization of Composition." Bousquet, Scott, and Parascondola, pp. 186-192.

"CCCC Statement on Working Conditions for Non-Tenure-Track Writing Faculty." Conference on College Communication and Composition, April 2016, http://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/working-conditions-ntt. Accessed 25 June 2018.

Charlton, Colin et al. *GenAdmin: Theorizing WPA Identities in the Twenty-First Century*. Parlor Press, 2011.

Connors, Robert J. *Composition—Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1997.

--. "Overwork/Underpay: Labor and Status of Composition Teachers since 1880." *Rhetoric Review*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1990, pp. 108-26.
Crowley, Sharon. *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1998.
Enos, Theresa. *Gender Roles and Faculty Lives in Rhetoric and Composition*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1996.
Gold, David. "Remapping Revisionist Historiography." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2012, pp. 15-34.
Heckathorn, Amy. "Moving Toward a Group Identity: WPA Professionalization from the 1940s to the 1970s." L'Eplattenier, Barbara and Lisa Mastrangelo, pp. 191-219.
Heyda, John. "Industrial-Strength Composition and the Impact of Load on Teaching." L'Eplattenier, Barbara and Lisa Mastrangelo. 241-261.
Hopkins, Edwin M. "Can Good Composition Teaching Be Done under Present Conditions?" *The English Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1912, pp. 1-8.
--. "Journal No. 14." *Personal Journal,1896-1905*. Ms. Hopkins Archive, Series Number PP 73, Box 1. Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
--. "Kansas Day in Chapel": Transcribed copy of speech with written corrections. March 9 1906. Ms. Hopkins Archive, Series Number PP 73, Box 1. Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
--. "The Labor and Cost of Composition Teaching: The Present Conditions." *Proceedings of the NEA*, vol. 50, 1912, pp. 747-51.
--. *The Labor and Cost of the Teaching of English in College and Secondary Schools with especial reference to English Composition*. 16th ed. Chicago: National Council of Teachers of English, 1923.
Micciche, Laura R. *Doing Emotion: Rhetoric, Writing, Teaching*. Boynton/Cook Publishers, 2007.
Popken, Randall. "Edwin Hopkins and the Costly Labor of Composition Teacher." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2004, pp. 618-41.
--. "The WPA as Publishing Scholar: Edwin Hopkins and The Labor and Cost of the Teaching of English." *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration: Individuals, Communities, and the Formation of Discipline*, Eds. Barbara L'Eplattenier and Lisa Mastrangelo. Parlor Press, 2004, pp. 5-22.
Ratcliffe, Krista. *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2005.

Rohan, Liz. "The Personal as Method and Place as Archives: A Synthesis." *Working in the Archives: Practical Research Methods for Rhetoric and Compositions*, Eds. Ramsey, Sharer, L'Eplattenier, and Mastrangelo. Southern Illinois University Press, 2010, pp. 232-47.

--. "Reseeing and Redoing: Making Historical Research at the Turn of the Millennium." *Writing Studies Research in Practice: Methods and Methodologies*, Eds. Lee Nickoson and Mary P. Sheridan, Southern Illinois University Press, 2012, pp. 25-35.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones. *Traces of A Stream: Literacy and Social Change Among African American Women*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1994.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones and Gesa E. Kirsch. *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2012.

Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. Knopf, 1968.

Schell, Eileen E. *Gypsy Academics and Mother-Teachers: Gender, Contingent Labor, and Writing Instruction*. Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1998.

Scott, Frank W., Joseph M. Thomas and Frederick A. Manchester. "Preliminary Report of the Special Committee on Freshman English." *The English Journal*, vol. 7, no.9, 1918, pp. 592-99.

Taylor, Warner. "A National Survey of Conditions in Freshman English." *The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875-1925: A Documentary History*. Ed. John C. Brereton. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1994. Pp. 354-62.

Terms of Time for Composition: A Materialist Examination of Contingent Faculty Labor

Jesse Priest
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology

Abstract
Bruce Horner's seminal book, *Terms of Work for Composition: A Materialist Critique*, provided composition and rhetoric writing program administrators (WPAs) with a methodology for infusing our conversations about work and labor with a holistic understanding of how these reflect on the lived experiences of students, teachers, and administrators. Drawing on empirical data, including surveys of contingent faculty at a large northeastern research university, as well as textual analysis of teaching material and an NCTE position statement, I propose the inclusion of a materialist-oriented conceptualization of time to the discussion began by Horner and others. Using the lens of how time is allocated, I argue for a wider understanding of the separations between how institutions and contingent teaching faculty (including graduate teaching assistants) view the importance of their labor and discuss implications for departmental design and philosophy.

Jesse Priest directs the New Mexico Tech Writing Center and teaches courses in college writing and technical communication. His research interests focus on Writing Center Studies, as well as the relationship between academic knowledge and public engagement, particularly with regard to how scientists talk to people outside of their disciplines. He is also interested in writing assessment and composition pedagogy.

In the 2012 Call for Submissions for the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Program Chair Howard Tinberg bemoans that "public funding for higher education continues to decline… government initiatives have rewarded…those schools that demonstrate productivity. Progress toward learning is now measured not by achievement but by speed and mere completion." As an important touchstone for writing program administrators and the wider discipline of composition and rhetoric, the CCCC's Call inarguably represents an existential crisis in higher education that the field feels both directly affected by and compelled to address. Inherent to the anxiety present in the CCCC's Call is the sense that the work we do within our field needs to be justified, or possibly re-examined. While this anxiety reflects external pressures and constraints, it also manifests itself internally within writing programs themselves. This manifestation often takes the form of departments' growing reliance on contingent faculty labor to meet external pressures and institutional demands of course numbers, sizes, and number of students served. For the purposes of this project, I consider how contingent faculty, specifically graduate teaching assistants, view their labor and work valued by their institution with regard to their time. For my purposes, I am mostly sticking to Arendtian definitions of labor and work, where "labor" is a physical or mental action, and "work" is that action's production within the institution. I am also drawing on Bruce Horner's three meanings of work in composition studies, as paraphrased by Donna Strickland: "work as the workplace in which composition teaching is done; work as one's "own" work…and work as teaching" (Bousquet et al. 46). It is my belief that we, as writing program administrators, should not take for granted our own assumptions about labor and value. By engaging in self-reflective thought and discussions about the roles of labor and value within our own administration and pedagogy, we might be better equipped to address the broader anxieties represented in Tinberg's call and elsewhere.

Time, Labor, and Contingent Faculty

The issue of considering labor and value in the field of composition and rhetoric has been addressed by Bruce Horner in his now field-canonical Terms of Work for Composition: A Materialist Critique. I began this project with the idea of using Horner's work as an underlying influence rather than something I was directly responding to. What I began to notice while researching, however, is that among compositionists (and especially among graduate teaching assistants) there is a concern waiting to be addressed from a materialist perspective: the issue of time. Time is inseparably connected to labor in a variety of ways: we spend time, we engage in work while also engaging in time, and our institutions, our students, and ourselves put pressure on us to mediate our time in certain and specific ways. Time, however, has not yet been acknowledged as its own issue within materialist critiques of composition and rhetoric. "Time," for example, does not appear in the glossary of Horner's book,

and while I believe that traditional materialist perspectives would consider time to be an aspect of labor, I argue that when considering composition pedagogy and writing program administration, time deserves to be critiqued as its own issue with its own nuanced set of concerns. Citing Giddens, Horner writes that "structural determinist and individualist tendencies remove structures from their instantiation in time, eliding their material historiocity," (xix) an approach that Horner himself acknowledges as rendering individual agency to a binaristic extreme of either inflation or ignorance. "Time-space compression," as originally articulated by David Harvey, is no stranger to Marxist and material critiques; capitalist society compresses time and space by altering the means of communication and travel. In Horner's terms, however, the extension continues to traditional definitions of academic discourse, which "is imagined as existing and operating discrete from, rather than in relation to and with, other material social practices" (113). Instead, Horner argues for a "mutual dependence of structure and agency" (131) with regard to university practices. This re-placement of academic discourse, and the lived experiences of those who inhabit it, demands increased attention for the value-placement of various forms of labor, and, to extend Horner's argument: the ways in which structure and agency are not only mutually dependent but mutually influential.

Much of Horner's analysis throughout Terms is easily applicable to issues currently faced by many contingent teaching faculty. Horner draws a "distinction between intellectual and non-intellectual labor, [which] denies the location of 'mental' labor in the material conditions of available technological and other material resources" (2). The kind of work expected by tenure-line faculty, specifically their research and teaching of self-proposed and self-designed courses, is seen as intellectual labor, as it can only possibly arise from the individual teacher herself. As Horner writes, "a course developed by the author, and so ostensibly belonging to her, carries more exchange value than a course repeatedly assigned to her by an institution" (5). Contingent faculty who are frequently given or assigned courses from the university catalogue (not dissimilar, at times, to how students themselves enroll in these same courses) often inhabit an institutional context wherein the nature of their work is seen as inherently less valuable than courses proposed by their tenure-line colleagues, regardless of the material realities that went in to creating, planning, and teaching the courses. As Brad Hammer writes, "the belief that adjuncts and other 'contingent' instructors tend to be bottom-rung teachers can be seen in the policies of standardization that oftentimes demarcate a 'goals-centered' curriculum" (A1). Contingent faculty who teach multiple sections of the same course in a given semester and across multiple years engage in a constant institutional re-affirmation of this devalued commodification of their labor. Horner writes that "courses remain commodities, but they are more commonly the product of—owned by—institutions rather than individuals" (6). This commodification ignores the individual and semester-specific changes that make up the

reality of each course section under the institutional desire for a given course to count for the same end-product valuation as required by the omnipresent course catalogue.

As Jennifer Ruth points out, tenure-track faculty are increasingly recognizing "our shared identity with adjunct faculty as academic labor" (Ruth and Bérubé 81) due to the ever-increasing reality that TT faculty also feel "overworked and underappreciated" (82). As Ruth recognizes, however, such a shared identity, with regard to how we conceptualize our labor in relation to our contingent colleagues, should not come at the expense of recognizing the very real distinctions between the material realities faced by TT faculty and contingent faculty. A consideration of time as a component of labor demands a nuanced return to the site of material conditions, and a focus on the specific instructor teaching in a specific semester with a specific set of students and resources. By doing so, we might develop ways of explicitly addressing the shared concerns between TT and contingent faculty, while still recognizing the very real material conditions of labor that distinguish these different "tiers" (Ruth and Bérubé 89) of academic laborers. Contingent faculty, including graduate teaching assistants, are routinely subjected to what Horner describes as the "denial of materiality" (7) affected by the desire for institutions to commodify their courses. Contingent faculty are seen primarily as those who engage in non-intellectual labor, because the courses they teach are seen as belonging primarily to the university and emerging from the institutional context of that university rather than the individual instructor's own intellectual (abstracted) abilities. Meanwhile, Horner argues that TT faculty are subjected to the perils of the same distinction on the opposite end: "the distinction between intellectual and non-intellectual labor is embodied by the commodification of intellectual labor, which belies the location of that work in time as ongoing, processual, and social" (9). The "work" of tenure-line faculty is seen as intellectual work and therefore not subjected to the same materialities embodied by their contingent faculty colleagues. To combat this false dichotomy, Horner argues that "we need to approach the 'academic' as a material site for various sorts of work practices" (106).

Disciplinary Representation in a Position Statement

One crucial indicator of the way our field conceptualizes academic labor is the position statement, a genre that has recently received more critical attention for how it conveys disciplinary assumptions with regards to academic labor (see McClure et al.) As such, before discussing my study, I will first turn to the National Council of Teachers of English's (NCTE) 2010 "Position Statement on the Status and Working Conditions of Contingent Faculty," performing some textual analysis with regards to what this document says about labor and the institutions where it is performed. This analysis is foregrounded by the materialist perspective offered by Fedukovich et al. and their recognition of an "internal disciplinary paradox: the field's persistent striving for ethical—equal?

—

working conditions for the contract faculty who teach in writing programs and its recognition of the reality of the institutional contexts in which these faculty teach" (127-128).

As I noticed with Horner's text, the NCTE Position Statement contains no explicit references to "time," beyond some references in the section regarding "Fair Working Conditions" to certain things happening "in a timely manner." The first claim regarding "Fair Working Conditions," however (and also the first statement made in the entire position statement), is that "appointment/offer letters should clearly describe the position and identify workload distributions." As one of the leading bodies in the field of writing pedagogy, the NCTE is articulating to its publics that it values clarity on behalf of the institutions that respect/follow it. The entirety of the "Fair Working Conditions" section focuses, at least indirectly, on the issue of clarity more so than establishing how it is defining either "fair" or what might make certain working conditions fair or unfair.

Beyond the first section on "Fair Working Conditions," the NCTE Position Statement has three other sections: "Fair Compensation," "Involvement in Shared Governance," "Respect and Recognition," and "Security of Employment." I am concerned here largely with the second and fourth sections, "Fair Compensation" and "Respect and Recognition," as I believe they have the strongest implications about institutional values of labor and time. The section regarding "Fair Compensation" opens with the line that faculty "should receive a salary that reflects their teaching duties and any duties outside the classroom they are asked to assume." However, the NCTE Position Statement does not define its own terms, leaving each individual institution free to ultimately interpret how each faculty's salary "reflects their teaching duties," as well as how those teaching duties themselves are defined. Furthermore, all labor performed in the time outside of the classroom is compressed into the sweeping general category of "any duties outside the classroom," which echo Horner's critique of the denial of materiality in composition labor (23, 29). Fedukovich et al. describe the oft-present problem of criteria that are not specifically outlined in disciplinary position statements, which naturally allow for institutional ignorance or abstraction (Fedukovich et al. 133). Ritter extends this notion to academic labor by suggesting that contingent faculty themselves may have to re-conceptualize some disciplinary assumptions about the writing and grading processes in order to manage their time: "writing teachers are increasingly pressured to be agents of literacy instruction and agents of personal care. We may need to decide which of these roles we want to prioritize if we expect to have reasonable working conditions for our already-undervalued writing faculty" (412). Inherent in the NCTE Position Statement's decision to leave "teaching duties" and "fair" salary as things that are entirely institutionally-defined

is a claim regarding how institutions are free to decide what divisions of time make up each faculty members "teaching duties."

In the "Respect and Recognition" section of the NCTE Position Statement, the authors write that "faculty members serving in contingent positions should be viewed and treated as a valued and integral part of the academic faculty." As I will discuss later, this ideal does not reflect what the teaching assistants in my study observed about their own status within the university. This statement also says something significant about the intended audience of the Position Statement; it implies that the Position Statement is written both by and (largely) for the "academic faculty" that might need to be told to value their contingent colleagues. This section is engaging in a rhetorical move common to the genre by leaving its most important terms (in this case, "valued and integral") as things that can be entirely institutionally-defined. The Statement is also casting contingent faculty in positions where they are always already valued and integral, while ignoring the material conditions faced by individual contingent faculty. An institution could easily claim to be following the NCTE Position Statement by treating their contingent faculty as "valued and integral," while not having an established set of criteria for justifying in what ways that is actually happening. In the same section, the Statement claims that "faculty members serving in contingent positions should have access to most, if not all, of the resources and services that are available to tenure-line faculty." The obvious and intended reading of this statement is that contingent faculty be guaranteed certain resources; however, the statement also makes it quite clear that institutions are free to deny resources to contingent faculty. In that sense, any institution is following the Position Statement as long as it is offering some of its available resources to contingent faculty.

A time-oriented materialist addition to the Statement would include a more nuanced and defined categorization of "duties outside the classroom," or a direct call for individual faculty and departments to at least define these meanings on their own terms, as contingent faculty are especially subject to what Horner describes as "the institutional framing of that work delegitimizes it in relation to its official, already degraded exchange value as the fulfilling of a requirement" (142). Hassel and Baird Giordano call for a position statement to "have the power to inform material conditions for instructors" and "establish the relationship between teaching conditions and student learning outcomes" (Hassel and Baird Giordano 149). The NCTE Position Statement places the institution above the individual, even where it seeks to guarantee certain conditions for the individual. This valuation happens in part because of the lack of established criteria for benefit or larger conceptualization of individual labor. With the Position Statement contextualizing the disciplinary realities faced by contingent faculty with regards to their academic labor, a more localized discussion is necessary to identify how and where these

larger problems play out in the lived experiences and material realities dealt with by contingent faculty's use of time.

The Study

Foregrounding individual contingent faculty's material conditions allows for a translation of disciplinary concepts into lived ones, specifically the ways in which time is tied to implicit labor valuation at the level of the individual's relationship to their institution. Implicit labor valuation refers to things like wages, curricula, teaching workloads, assessment, and individuals' own internalizations and perceptions of their labor, and how it is valued within the institution. In that sense, implicit labor value refers to the institution addressing itself. To begin my examination of the "institution addressing itself," I created an online survey which asked three graduate teaching associates at a large research university in the Northeast United States (hereafter "Research University") a few questions about how they see their jobs, as well as how they believe their administrators view their jobs. By beginning my examination with a focus on graduate TA's views of labor and value, I am attempting to somewhat redress Steve Parks' claim that "the 'we' of composition often gets represented by the work of full-time, tenured compositionists" (122). Similarly, I follow Jennifer Ruth in recognizing that the working conditions of graduate students is often representative of those faced by contingent faculty, or simply that graduate students are contingent faculty (Ruth and Bérubé 62). Applications of this project will include addressing issues of teaching workloads, the separation of teaching and research being seen as work, and the subject positions that writing programs create for their teachers, specifically contingent faculty. Lived experiences of faculty and students—like those of all humans—resist generalization, and I encourage administrators to re-approach the suggestions I offer here in their own departments rather than reading my analysis as suggestive beyond the scope of its data.

I emailed the Research University Writing Program's Graduate Teaching Assistant Listserv, and, potentially as a result of this study happening near the end of the semester, I received three responses from teaching assistants who were willing to participate in the survey. Each respondent was randomly assigned a number (initially 1, 2, and 3) that I asked them to include with their survey response and later used to correlate their responses on the second survey with the first. While the small sample size of the survey made it difficult to draw programmatic generalizations, the use of two surveys (discussed below), relying entirely on open-ended responses from the same three respondents', places this more closely aligned with what Lauer and Asher call "qualitative descriptive research," (32) as it seeks to identify participants' understanding of their own contexts. As such, I refer to the survey respondents throughout as

Respondent A, B, and C, and much of my analysis focuses on putting their responses to different questions into conversation with one another.

Survey 1

1. What part of your job do you find the most "valuable" in terms of your own work?
2. What part of your job do you think your supervisors value the most?
3. What part(s) of your job do you find to be the most time-consuming?
4. How do you think you see your job differently than your supervisors see your job?
5. What do you find to be the biggest difference between what you thought your job would be before you started, and the practical day-to-day work of your job?

In my research process, reading the results of this survey taught me two things: one lesson about my methodology and one about the direction I wanted this project to take. I noticed an underlying focus on time being an important issue in the responses, which led me to decide to focus this project more directly on a materialist examination of time (as a more specific direction than simply labor), as I've already outlined. I felt that the first survey led to responses that largely focused on grading, and so I also wanted to see what other kinds of issues could be addressed or were perceived as problematic by teaching assistants. Secondly, as MacNealy writes regarding surveys in Strategies for Empirical Research in Writing, "not surprisingly, purpose affects question content and design" (152). I believe that my initial survey was driven by some of my own underlying purposes, and so I decided to revise the survey and asked the same three teaching assistants to fill it out again. The second survey focuses more explicitly on time as its purpose.

Survey 2

1. What part of your job do you find most valuable?
2. What would you rather spend time on as a teacher?
3. Are there parts of your time that you feel are wasted/not well-spent?
4. Where do you feel the pressure to spend your time the way you do comes from?
5. Do you feel the investment of your time is compensated fairly? Why or why not? ("compensation" might mean things other than pay, although you can answer it to only include pay).

Following Haas, Takayoshi, and Carr, I created an inductive coding scheme using emergent categories (54), which I then used to identify frequencies and significant correlations across the survey responses. The most prevalent data codes based on frequency and relation to my research

question were "Teaching," "Writing," "Students," "Time," "Work," "Self," and "Program." My identification of frequencies allowed me to "understand our object of study in a way that mere description did not" (55). Table 1 below reflects the frequency distribution of pronoun usage, contention between self and supervisor, commonly used referents, and cross-referents across both surveys.

Table 1: Frequency Distribution Among Survey Responses

Respondent	Frequency of first person pronouns	Frequency of perceived contention between self and supervisors	Most commonly used referents	Most frequent cross-references
A	Low (14)	High	Students (11), Writing (10), Work (11), Time (8)	"Time" and "Work," "Self and "Work"
B	High (46)	Low	Teaching (18), Time (11), Work (12), Students (10)	"Teaching" and "Students," "Self" and "Teaching"
C	Low (16)	High	Work (13), Students (10), Teaching (7), Writing (6)	"Work" and "Job," "Program" and "Teaching"

Respondent A and C, for example, both used few first-person pronouns in their responses, while at the same time expressing a strong degree of perceived contention between themselves and their supervisors. Respondent B, meanwhile, had the highest frequency of first-person pronouns, while at the same time expressing a relatively low degree of perceived contention between themselves and their supervisors. These responses were consistent with each respondents' commonly used coding referents, as Respondents A and C used more referents related to their own work or writing in correlation with perceived difficulties or contention

between them and their supervisors. Respondent B also used the highest number of first-person pronouns throughout all of their survey responses.

Results

The first observation I'd like to discuss from the surveys is the response to question #4 on the first survey: "what part(s) of your job do you find to be the most time-consuming?" Every teaching assistant who responded to this survey indicated that "grading," (Respondent A) "grading, definitely, and responding to drafts," (Respondent B) or "logistical stuff—grading…mandatory meetings" (Respondent C) was the aspect of their job they found to be the most time-consuming. While this as a phenomenon is not surprising, I want to contrast this to question #2 on the survey: "What part of your job do you find the most "valuable" in terms of your own work?" Respondents said things such as "learning from my students' writing," (Respondent A) "connecting research projects… [to] teaching," (Respondent B) and "[our] community of fellow educators and scholars" (Respondent C). Yet again, these responses are not themselves surprising (nor do I think they are atypical); however, I want to draw attention here to the fact that the thing graduate TAs have identified as the most time-consuming part of their job is never once identified as the thing they find most valuable about their job. As teachers and administrators, we might consider the implications of how time spent on our labor can be viewed as completely separate from what we believe is valuable about our work. As Horner argues about writing, "the 'work' of writing may signify not the activity of production, distribution, and consumption but the commodity, removed ("alienated") from the social relations and means of its production" (209). As my respondents suggest, their academic role may be the institutionally-valued commodity of labor or their own perceptions of why that work matters.

Question #3 on the second survey asked respondents to identify parts of their time they believe are not well-spent. Interestingly, the emphasis that all three respondents placed was not on formal evaluation and assessment, although this was mentioned directly once and indirectly once. Respondent A wrote "Grading," followed by other issues such as office hours and training sessions. The same respondent identified another issue with the time spent on grading: the "time explaining to my students that grades are not the most important thing." Another respondent wrote that less time could be given to the peer response process, and another respondent identified "commenting on student writing," which implies a component of the grading process, if not the formal act of evaluation itself. One respondent also wrote that "graduate students who can separate their work-work from their school-work can better prioritize their time," representing an internalization of the problematic divide between what teachers see as their "work" and the labor of teaching. The institutional pressures placed on this individual TA may have led him or her to further

this division as a means of coping with what they see as unreasonable institutional demands.

Our typical perception of assessment as a partly subjective aspect of our teaching is reflective of the anxieties discussed earlier in Tinberg's 4C's Call. When we feel obligated to justify or defend our work (to the public, to other disciplines, to university administrators, and sources of funding), the thing that we have largely internalized about that work—primarily the thing that we spend time on—is something that places us in a highly individual, subjective position. Gerald Graff writes that college instructors "are generally oblivious to the teaching of their colleagues. How long would most institutions survive if their workers knew as little about one another's tasks as we academics know about our colleagues' teaching?" (153). Most of our time spent as educators is engaged in something individual, isolated, subjective and of uncertain value, as Mark Gellis writes that "providing feedback to students through written comments is often a waste of time" (416). While Gellis' claim is by no means representative of general feelings toward assessment, there is obviously a disconnect between time spent and perceived value gained. Respondent B expressed a similar concern about their students' perceived value of the field-canonical peer-review process. As educators and administrators, we are compelled to manage and spend our time in certain ways, regardless of what we believe is the value gained through that time expenditure. And yet, it's something that we feel compelled to devote time to, something we feel anxious about when called upon to defend it. Ann M. Penrose writes that "the role of material conditions in shaping professional identity cannot be overstated," (119) which is especially troubling when our relationship to those material conditions are uncertain or knowingly unvalued.

Each respondent's answers on the second survey show emphasis on the pressures of the institution. The issue of the "rigid" curriculum was brought up twice, and two of the three respondents wrote that they felt their level of compensation was not "fair." These answers show a significant amount of tension between graduate teaching assistants and their institution. Respondents A and C saw a large gap between what they value about their work, and what their supervisors value about their work. Not surprisingly, these two respondents also identified a sense of feeling like they were doing the "dirty work" of teaching, and every respondent believed that their supervisors weren't able to understand the importance of or the time and energy required to do their jobs. Jennifer Ruth describes this as an especially troublesome component of the contingent faculty/institution relationship: "people anxious to secure employment even as an adjunct do not believe that the circumstances in which they work are fair or healthy (because they aren't), and so a substantial percentage of the faculty have at best an ambivalent relationship to the university" (Ruth and Bérubé 70). My respondents' answers show that this ambivalence can be attributed at least in part due to the ways in which not only their labor is valued by the institution, but how that labor is further

conceived with regards to time. Citing Joe Berry, Jennifer Ruth notes that many contingent faculty make less than what would translate to an hourly minimum wage, which excludes very real labor such as commuting time (Ruth and Bérubé 60). However, as Fedukovich et al. point out, "contract faculty are conducting the same kinds of professional activity as their tenured colleagues, but without departmental support or recognition and, in many cases, with a dramatically increased teaching load" (134). When graduate teaching assistants reflect on the time they spend teaching, for example, they are responding to a large amount of institutional pressure that often gets metonymized as their direct supervisors. It is interesting to note Respondent B's usage of first-person pronouns, which reflected the fact that Respondent B perhaps felt more recognized as an individual than A or C, who both had a much higher frequency of perceived contention between themselves and the program. Institutional apparatuses such as standard syllabi, textbooks, grading, and teaching policies exist to ensure a minimum level of job performance among graduate teaching assistants, but they also function to force TAs to manage their time in certain ways. Therefore, an institutional heuristic necessarily carries with it a push towards professional conformity, which at any level is going to create points of tension where TAs might have different pedagogical or philosophical values of time. Horner argues that student writing should be seen as a site where "pressures get negotiated," (242) although I would also apply that to the practice of teaching. By examining the specific and numerous ways our teaching and administration do represent sites for negotiating pressures, we may be better situated to critique and improve otherwise implicit issues.

Discussion: Contingent Labor and the Institution

One of the recurring issues I noticed at each level of analysis here was a tension between administrator expectations and graduate teaching assistant responses/perceptions of those assumptions. In that sense—and I'm thinking especially of the NCTE Position Statement—administrators should be as transparent as possible with their expectations and the reasons behind them. It is in the nature of bureaucracies and institutions to silently move away from transparency and towards an already-established sense of communal expectations. It may be in the nature of individual instructors to respond to those expectations by resisting in opaque ways. As administrators and as teachers, we might benefit from more open discussion of our reasoning behind our expectations and our deviations from institutional expectations. One way to enact such an endeavor would be for academics of any station to pay closer attention to their own use of time, especially with regards to which components of their labor are treated as quantified (paid) time and those which are not. As far as my survey respondents are concerned, institutions may not actually be paying contingent faculty for the labor they perform and are instead paying them for a faux-intellectualized labor that has already been cast as non-intellectual—abstracting the concept of their work while refusing to

abstract the work itself. In this regard, my survey respondents are also not atypical and instead reflective of other examinations of contingent faculty labor (see Hendricks, Penrose, Bérubé).

Furthermore, the relatively high degree of contingent faculty teaching our first-year writing courses (Fedukovich et al. 133), coupled with the perception of these courses as non-intellectual or removed from "real" academic work (Horner 135), contributes to the marginalization of composition within the institution. Hassel and Baird Giordano draw attention to a component of this marginalization, which is the "encroachment of an increasingly stratified labor force in composition, one with multiple tiers of employees who experienced varying degrees of status, benefits, and resources" (147). One obvious way to mitigate this stratification is for program administrators to increasingly recognize the labor performed by contingent faculty as intellectual labor, as well as increased recognition of graduate students as contingent faculty. Hassel and Baird Giordano, among others (Ruth, Bérubé and Ruth), turn this claim to program development: "the criteria that departments should prioritize when working on program development are evidence of instructors' reflective practice, professional activity, and institutional citizenship, not their employment status" (155). As Steven Shulman points out, the rise in contingent faculty is largely removed from financial constraints and is instead reflective of "the priorities and values of administrators who ultimately drive hiring decisions" (11). This claim necessitates that administrators recognize the myriad ways in which contingent labor in their departments is not simply a budgetary or administrative bugbear but, rather, a touchstone for institutional valuation of our discipline itself.

Conclusions

Problematic issues regarding how individual instructors were cast in relation to their institution often took the form of underlying institutional assumptions regarding time. Authors of all writing program publications, both ones that involve addressing ourselves and our audiences/publics, then, might benefit from more careful consideration of how individual instructors are imagined, and what subject positions we create for them. With my critique of the NCTE Statement in mind, I think it's important to say here that I'm not necessarily calling for more discipline-wide standardization, but perhaps simply more open recognition of each individual institution's role in creating subject positions for their faculty. I especially admire Jennifer Ruth's reflexivity regarding the ease regarding which we, as administrators, can often fall victim to the tantalizing allure of short-term solutions and budgetary shortcuts. If we are to suggest resisting the false dichotomy of intellectual and non-intellectual labor present in our academic workforce, then we must also recognize the work of the administrator as reliant not on intangible disciplinary or institutional

abstractions but on specific material realities and conditions that our day-to-day actions constantly re-engage and re-create.

Furthermore, administrators might consider ways that contingent faculty in our departments could become more openly involved in the creation of departmental expectations and not just the reception of them. This could be done not simply for the sake of getting each individual instructor's feedback and opinions but also for helping contingent faculty see places where inflexibility and standardization might be necessary. Bérubé and Ruth remind us that "faculty working conditions are student working conditions," (138) and institutional challenges and material realities will invariably affect our students' experiences in our classrooms. This itself is a localized, individual reality, one which will depend more on department-level collaboration than discipline-wide position statements, although their interdependence is ever-present. This concern rings especially true for graduate teaching assistants, who are constantly navigating the difficult realm of disciplinary becoming (see Curry) and a large number of what Christine Pearson Casanave calls "invisible 'real-life' struggles" (102-111). Sue Doe remarks that tenure alone need not be seen as the "sole mechanism to professional fulfillment and success in the academic setting," (61) but rather the degree to which any faculty, contingent or otherwise, is able to control their labor and find respect from their localized institutional communities.

We might benefit from more formal structuring and discussion of how time influences and affects our roles as administrators, teachers, and as students. As I have argued here, time is an important consideration that should be treated separately (if not entirely independently) from labor, especially within materialist perspectives. At the very least, such a perspective would help give us a more nuanced and productive set of terms and criteria with which to address and critique our own work. That is the extension of this project, and I believe engaging in such work would help us become better prepared to address what I referred to as the "existential crisis" of writing pedagogy in higher education. Horner advocates having "students investigate the impact that being students...has on their writing" (243). No amount of self-reflexivity on the part of faculty and administrators is too much, and that part of the way we can begin enacting this self-reflexivity is by openly and critically examining the role our own distributions of time have on our work. As a teacher and administrator, engaging in this project has already changed my own notions of time and labor value in my own work. I humbly submit that we keep doing so, regardless of difficulty, and I boldly proclaim that there is no better time to begin than now.

Works Cited

Bérubé, Michael and Jennifer Ruth. *The Humanities, Higher Education, & Academic Freedom: Three Necessary Arguments.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Casanave, Christine Pearson. "What Advisors Need to Know about the Invisible 'Real-Life' Struggles of Doctoral Dissertation Writers." *Supporting Graduate Student Writers: Research, Curriculum, & Program Design*, edited by Steve Simpson, Nigel A. Caplan, Michelle Cox, and Talinn Phillips. University of Michigan Press, 2016, pp. 97-116.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. "Call for Program Proposals: The Public Work of Composition." National Council of Teachers of English, 2013. Howard Tinberg, 2013 Program Chair.

Curry, Mary Jane. "More Than Language: Graduate Student Writing as 'Disciplinary Becoming.'" *Supporting Graduate Student Writers: Research, Curriculum, & Program Design*, edited by Steve Simpson, Nigel A. Caplan, Michelle Cox, and Talinn Phillips. University of Michigan Press, 2016, pp. 78-96.

Doe, Sue. "Opportunity and Respect: Keys to Contingent Faculty Success." *Rewriting Success in Rhetoric & Composition Careers*, edited by Amy Goodburn, Donna LeCourt, and Carrie Leverenz. Parlor Press, 2013, pp. 51-68.

Fedukovich, Casie J., Susan Miller-Cochran, Brent Simoneaux, and Robin Snead. "A State of Permanent Contingency: Writing Programs, Hiring Practices, and a Persistent Breach of Ethics." *Labored: The State(ment) and Future of Work in Composition,* edited by Randall McClure, Dayna V. Goldstein, and Michael A. Pemberton. Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 126-146.

Gellis, Mark. "Grading with an Attitude." *Pedagogy,* vol. 2, no. 3, 2002, pp. 416-419.

Graff, Gerald. "Why Assessment?" *Pedagogy,* vol. 10, no. 1, 2010, pp. 153-165.

Haas, Christina, Pamela Takayoshi, and Brandon Carr. "Analytic Strategies, Competent Inquiries, and Methodological Tensions in the Study of Writing." *Writing Studies Research in Practice: Methods and Methodologies*, edited by Mary P. Sheridan and Lee Nickoson. Southern Illinois University Press, 2012, pp. 51-62.

Hammer, Brad. "From the Editor: The Need for Research in 'Contingency Studies.'" *Forum: Newsletter for Issues About Part-Time and Contingent Faculty*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2010, pp. A1–A3.

Hassel, Holly, and Joanna Baird Giordano. "Contingency, Access, and the Material Conditions of Teaching and Learning in the 'Statement of Principles.'" *Labored: The State(ment) and Future of Work in Composition,* edited by Randall McClure, Dayna V. Goldstein, and Michael A. Pemberton. Parlor Press, 2017, pp. 126-146.

Haswell, Richard H. "Quantitative Methods in Composition Studies: An Introduction to Their Functionality." *Writing Studies Research in Practice: Methods and Methodologies*, edited by Mary P. Sheridan and Lee Nickoson. Southern Illinois University Press, 2012, pp. 185-196.

Hendricks, Bill. "Making a Place for Labor: Composition and Unions." *Tenured Bosses and Disposable Teachers: Writing Instruction in the Managed University*, edited by Bousquet, Mark, Tony Scott, and Leo Parascondola. Southern Illinois UP, 2004, pp. 83-99.

Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *College Composition and Communication,* vol. 53, no. 4, 2002, pp. 594-630.

Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Royster, and John Trimbur. "Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach." *College English,* vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, 303-21.

Horner, Bruce. *Terms of Work for Composition: A Materialist Critique*. State University of New York Press, 2000.

Lauer, Janice M. and Asher, J. William. *Composition Research: Empirical Designs*. Oxford UP, 1988.

MacNealy, Mary Su. *Strategies for Empirical Research in Writing*. Longman, 1999.

National Council of Teachers of English. "Position Statement on the Status and Working Conditions of Contingent Faculty." 30 Sept. 2010, http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/contingent_faculty.

Penrose, Ann M. "Professional Identity in a Contingent-Labor Profession: Expertise, Autonomy, Community in Composition Teaching." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2012, pp. 108–26.

Ritter, Kelly. "'Ladies Who Don't Know Us Correct Our Papers': Postwar Lay Reader Programs and Twenty-First Century Contingent Labor in First-Year Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 63, no. 3, 2012, pp.387–419.

Shulman, Steven. "Contingency in Higher Education: Evidence and Explanation." *Academic Labor: Research and Artistry* vol. 1, no. 1, 2017.

Strickland, Donna. "The Managerial Unconscious of Composition Studies." *Tenured Bosses and Disposable Teachers: Writing Instruction in the Managed University*, edited by Bousquet, Mark, Tony Scott, and Leo Parascondola. Southern Illinois UP, 2004, p. 46-56.

Appendix A: First Survey, "Labor, Value and Pedagogy"

1. What is your current job in higher education?

All. Teaching English 112 to freshmen at [Research University]

2. What part of your job do you find the most "valuable" in terms of your own work?

A. Learning from my students' writing and the mistakes they make, and apply it to my own writing.

B. I consider my teaching and my research/grad student stuff both to be "work." I think my current research project gives me insight into my teaching, but I don't find that my teaching relates directly to my research. This could change with other projects.

C. The community of fellow educators and scholars with, for, and from which I am able to develop my ideas about pedagogy and my own work and writing.

3. What part of your job do you think your supervisors value the most?

A. My ability to keep the class focused, motivated, and facilitate student participation.

B. I think they probably value whatever it is that I do to fulfill my contractual responsibilities and teach FYW as well as I can. I don't get the impression that they value conferencing, say, more than they value responding to student work. I've always gotten the sense the Writing Program recognizes that teaching FYW has multiple facets. I think the Writing Program recognizes that I am also a graduate student, but I am not a graduate student in their department—that part of my life is not something they're supervising (it's kind of like I'm working for someone else). I consider being a student my job, too, but it's not work I'm getting paid for (directly). I have another job outside higher ed, and I don't expect them to value that equally with the work I do directly for them.

C. That graduate students shoulder the burden of teaching the most onerous and tedious of classes to teach seems very valuable to them.

4. What part(s) of your job do you find to be the most time-consuming?

A. Grading.

B. Grading, definitely, and responding to drafts. I used to spend a ton of time on lesson planning, but as I have taught longer, that's taken less time.
C. The logistical and program-wide stuff: grading, preparing lessons, acting as disciplinarian in the former case; and the mandatory meetings, review sessions, and supplementary training seminars in terms of the latter.

5. How do you think you see your job differently than your supervisors see your job?

A. I think I expect a bit more from my students than my supervisors. I believe the students can process more in a class period than the current expectations.

B. I don't get the impression that I see my job differently than my direct supervisors. Everyone in the Writing Program staff teaches FYW (or has taught it recently), and they have all been graduate students. Probably some parts of the graduate student experience are less vivid to them the longer they have been out of graduate school, but I've never felt like their experience was totally different from mine. Everyone is balancing their own writing/research/admin work and teaching. I don't know if higher level administrators who have never taught writing have the same sense of my job as I do. I haven't had much interaction with higher-level administrations, and when I imagine them, I think they probably assume I teach a lot about proper semi-colon use. But I don't know that for sure.

C. I don't think, as an educator, that I am a purveyor of a commodity or commodities. Not that this is the conscious way in which my supervisors would articulate what I am doing, but the emphasis on a general set of "takeaways" from writing classes — certain kinds of subjectivity/interiority (which are distinctly liberal in the pejorative sense), the ability to write a "successful" college essay which means effacing its difference from other essays (conforming to a kind of model) even as we emphasize the aforementioned subjectivity/interiority and "uniqueness" of each student in their essays: in short the continuation of a process of interpellation and internalization of disciplinary/regulatory mechanisms and discourses that begins with public/primary/compulsory education — the fact that my supervisors stress this and in the way they do suggests to me that there is an undercurrent of subject-production (and interpellation) which I see as pernicious and even something to work against, however difficult or impossible that may be.

6. What do you find to be the biggest difference between what you thought your job would be before you started, and the practical day-to-day work of your job?

A. I thought the job would be less challenging and stimulating than it actually is. I'm very pleased it exceeded my expectations.

B. I didn't realize how much time and energy teaching would take. During the semester, most of my energy goes toward teaching. Finding a balance was harder when I was in coursework because I HAD to balance the two more equally. Now that I'm out of coursework, I tend to devote more time to teaching during the semester and more time to writing outside of the semester (when I'm not getting paid by [Research University]).

C. Most surprising was the total falsity of the idea that as graduate students we should prioritize our own work over and above our work as teachers. A whole system of mechanisms — part of them manifested as the busywork I described in earlier answers — gives the lie to this oft-repeated mantra which I was led to believe, foolishly, were a possibility as a graduate student writing teacher.

Appendix B: Second Survey, "Time, Labor and Pedagogy"

1. What part of your job do you find most valuable?

A. The community of colleagues with whom I can share and develop pedagogical and theoretical ideas to advance my own career as both a teacher and a thinker.

B. Conferencing and written feedback. These allow me to interact with students as individual writers and talk to them directly about their work (Of course, valuing written feedback this highly also leads me to spending lots of time on i.).

C. The in-class discussions which vary from being on the topic of writing to much larger ideas/issues/concerns are most valuable for both me and the students.

2. What would you rather spend more time on as a teacher?

A. Foregrounding in discussion the political concerns inherent in all writing — the relation of writing to power relations, writing as power relation, the ways in which it is a site of exploitation and also resistance — to put it briefly. I also wish I had more time to work on more difficult texts, or at least to dive into difficult texts more thoroughly with students. The close reading skills, though arguably the most important thing in the class, often get set aside for things like "sentence-level writing" or "grammar" or "writing with authenticity."

B. I wish I had the time to conference twice a semester when teaching two sections. When I teach one, I conference in Units II and III. With two sections, I can't do that without sacrificing time that should be dedicated to my own academic work.
C. One-to-one or small-group meetings.

3. Are there parts of your time that you feel are wasted/ not well-spent?

A. Grading. Office hours where students don't attend. Militantly mandatory training sessions. All the time explaining to my students that grades are not the most important thing.

B. Sometimes I wish we had less emphasis on peer review in our syllabus. I feel like I have to make room for it every unit, but my students seem to consistently feel that peer review doesn't help them as writers as much as other assignments.

C. Commenting on student writing takes a lot of time, so I have been trying to figure out ways to make it more productive for both me and my students.

4. Where do you feel the pressure to spend your time the way you do comes from?

A. The shockingly rigid given curriculum, and the ways in which I'm unable to deviate — as I recently found out — from certain constraints such as paper length. This leads me to spend a great deal of time crafting assignments that don't undermine what I think most important about college and life — which can also be read as a preservation of the vital politics in and of the classroom space — but which also pander to the extant goals of the writing program. I am also encouraged to introduce complicated, "fun" activities into the class (to make learning "fun" for people who in many cases have no choice but to go to college to get a marginally self-sustaining job — thanks, capitalism) that take up more of my time than is worth the marginal difference in student response. I could go on. But there is an entire ideological apparatus at work in the writing program as I have experienced it which encourages us to focus on our own work but then at the same time to do increasingly complex activities with students to be "good" teachers.

B. I want to keep my students happy with the course so they stay engaged, and I want them to feel that they're learning. This leads to spending way too much time on written feedback.

C. Because I am actually interested in my work as a teacher (since it influences my work as a student), there is pressure to apply myself equally to both jobs, which is a lot. Graduate students who can separate their work-work from their school-work can better prioritize their time.

5. Do you feel the investment of your time is compensated fairly? Why or why not? ("compensation" might mean things other than pay, although you can answer it to only include pay).

A. No. I am paid a pittance to do the dirty work of teaching introductory English in a way that takes away from time I need as a graduate student to pursue my various interests. These interests do not matter to the people who employ me. My union is rendered powerless by state and university measures. The rights the union is trying to protect do not matter to the people who employ me. My students do not think I am a good teacher when I do what I am supposed to do — teach them writing — and I do not give them good grades for doing mediocre work. As a non-professorial educator, I do not matter, for all intents and purposes. I am a placeholder. But at least I'm aware of it.

B. No. I spend more than twenty hours a week on teaching-related tasks on a fairly regular basis when teaching two sections. The increase in time spent on teaching-related work during the two-section semester should warrant a proportional increase in paid compensation. If I'm going to be forced to neglect my academic work in order to teach, I'd at least like to be paid more for it.

C. I am earning a degree and a stipend by teaching, which is fair.

FAST Professor: Strategies for Surviving the Tenure Track

Patricia Welsh Droz, Ph.D.
Lorie Stagg Jacobs, Ph.D.
Assistant Professors of Writing
First Year Composition Co-Directors
University of Houston – Clear Lake

Patricia Welsh Droz (droz@uhcl.edu) is Assistant Professor of Writing and Linguistics at University of Houston-Clear Lake, where she teaches first-year writing, writing for the social sciences, language & gender, and the sociolinguistics of writing. Since 2018, she and Dr. Jacobs have co-directed the UHCL First-Year Writing program. Patricia's research interests include gender and workplace communication, first-year writing, and computer-mediated discourse. She was the 2017-2018 co-recipient of the Marilyn Mieszkuc Professorship in Women's and Gender Studies for her corpus linguistic work on Hillary Clinton's secretary of state emails.

Lorie S. Jacobs (jacobsl@uhcl.edu) is Assistant Professor of Writing at University of Houston-Clear Lake, where she teaches first-year and professional writing courses. She is also the Faculty Fellow on Writing Across the Curriculum, coordinating construction and leadership of faculty professional development in the teaching of writing campus-wide. She and Dr. Droz are the current co-directors of First-Year Writing. Lorie's research interests include discipline- and profession-specific writing curriculum, labor issues in academia, first-year composition, and student persistence.

Abstract
In response to Maggie Berg and Barbara Seeber's 2016 manifesto on academic deceleration, *The Slow Professor*, the present article posits that the slow approach is dangerous for those seeking tenure, but is nevertheless a fruitful resistance philosophy to be adopted once tenure is achieved. For those seeking tenure, we advise an alternative philosophy, FAST professing, as a means to mediate workplace stress and offer to those on the tenure-track a pragmatic alternative to premature slow professing. We outline the nature of stress in today's academic climate, suggest identifying the major sources of stress, and finally, offer strategies to streamline the workday and maintain life work balance en route to tenure.

When friends and colleagues Maggie Berg and Barbara Seeber published *The Slow Professor,* their 2016 manifesto on academic deceleration, they were praised for giving voice to the thousands of academics who similarly felt pushed to do more with less in the neoliberal university. Recalling the months following the release of their book, Berg and Seeber summed that they had "hit a nerve" with their colleagues in all the disciplines (Charbonneau). With sales upwards of 22,000 in various formats, Berg and Seeber hit a nerve, indeed. Several of those 22,000 copies found their way to the shelves of our own university's brand new Center for Faculty Development, which chose *The Slow Professor* as the inaugural text for its newly started faculty book club.

Weekly, the same professors who labored in our university's culture of budget cuts, neoliberal values, and expediency, would take refuge in a small room to resist the dark forces eroding their sanity and scholarship and to instead learn how to fight back by slowing down. In reading *The Slow Professor,* our faculty took in Berg and Seeber's practical advice, strategies, and systemic critiques. Chief among their advice was to "act with purpose, taking the time for deliberation, reflection, and dialogue, cultivating emotional and intellectual resilience, [and become] able...to hold our 'nerve'" (85). However, the general consensus among the junior faculty in the group was that "holding our nerve" may not be the best advice for those on the tenure track.

In the Preface, Berg and Seeber suggest their book is for everyone, including graduate students, although they also offer a brief acknowledgement that their primary audience is tenured faculty. They admit their book is "idealistic in nature" (ix) and purposefully hopeful. In many ways we deeply appreciate the hope and the advice given by Berg and Seeber. Indeed, we agree with nearly everything in *The Slow Professor* and hope one day to earn the type of job security that makes following

their advice possible. We also appreciate their calls to tenured faculty to protect junior colleagues.

In this article, we answer their call "to foster greater openness about the ways in which the corporate university affects our professional practice and well-being" (ix). We also wish to provide a survivalist philosophy, primarily for those who are pre-tenure, and also for those who are unable to adopt the philosophy of the slow professor without serious consequences. Indeed, we would like to argue that slow professing may even be dangerous advice for those working toward tenure or tenure-track jobs. For untenured faculty, to actively resist the bureaucratic nature of the corporatized university is the fastest way to lose a good job. And yet, succumbing fully to the pressures of the fast lane may result in sacrificing a quality life outside of academia.

As junior faculty and working mothers, we hope to find a middle ground that is tolerable. In this paper we hope to voice our own concerns as junior faculty regarding slow professing, concerns that have been shared by others in similar situations (e.g., Carrigan & Vostal). This is not to say that the ideals put forth by Berg and Seeber are problematic in and of themselves—we hope our senior colleagues take up their torch and use it to light fires on campuses far and wide. Instead, we hope to offer our reflections on the realities for junior faculty in today's university workplace and offer to those on the tenure-track a pragmatic alternative to premature slow professing: FAST professing on the tenure track.

The FAST Philosophy

F – Fear Is Real. Embrace It.

We are fans of zombie lore. Collectively, we are attracted to the horror genres, especially cross-genre, humor-filled horror like *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (1996-2003), *Shaun of the Dead* (2004), and *Zombieland* (2009). It occurs to us that zombies are an apropos metaphor for neoliberal creep and the corporatized university. The zombie consumes mindlessly. Neoliberalism favors the free-market above all else. Zombies, in most depictions, move slowly but ruthlessly, and similarly to the corporatization of the academy. Zombie-ism, typically characterized as a relatively easily contracted virus, spreads rapidly and soon becomes an uncontrollable epidemic, wiping out reason and values. That certainly sounds familiar. Sometimes it seems as if reason and value are abandoned entirely in the administration's endless hunt for more student flesh to feast on.

As *Zombieland* progresses, the central character, played by Jessie Eisenberg, lists his rules for survival and strategies to evade the brain-eaters. The first rule is Cardio. Jessie Eisenberg's voice explains that the number one rule is to outrun the zombies. If you are slow in this world, you will be the first to get eaten. Thus, regular cardiovascular exercise is required. Often at a dead sprint.

It seems to us that life on the tenure track is not all that different from *Zombieland*. In the quest for tenure, speed is quantified by the

numbers and prestige of publications. Hurry up and publish or "perish" as is so often stated. Slow professing, then, for us, is equivalent to a slow career death.

After many long conversations about the *feeling* that our careers are constantly on the line, we decided to investigate. At our university, part of the fear comes from undefined publication guidelines and a university identity crisis, as our traditionally "teaching" institution strives towards becoming a "research" institution. The lack of clarity about publication expectations is particularly problematic in light of a trend of ever-increasing demands on junior faculty and is also striking in light of a phenomenon that we believe deserves more attention than it gets—the emotional labor of being pre-tenure. Meanwhile, there is not much data available on typical publication requirements in our field. Thus, we distributed a survey at a national conference in our field in order to quantify publication guidelines in the context of course load among tenure-line professors. We found that "teaching" institutions generally require about half of the publications required by research institutions. But there was another element revealed in our survey: uncertainty. A significant number of our tenure-line respondents were not able or willing to articulate publication requirements at their home institutions. Sentiments like "I don't know" and "there are no specific guidelines" were hand-written on the survey instrument. Further, since we collected data in person, we engaged in several conversations with respondents who explained that even though they had committed to a number on the paper, in reality, they were unsure.

We were at once relieved to discover that we are not the only ones completely dismayed by unstated or unclear tenure expectations and also disheartened by the spread of unease and fear amongst our colleagues. While our study targeted tenure-line faculty, we imagine the situation is just as bad or worse for NTT and contingent faculty. Publication guidelines are equally unclear or nonexistent for them as well, and this group is even less likely to have university support for research. Incidentally, we have little support to count on ourselves, but what else would you expect in the zombie apocalypse? At least the grocery stores are still open.

Some choose to stand back and resist, to Slow Profess as an activist stance. Others choose to hit the ground running in fear of the zombies. While it is neither brave nor ideal, you will survive! You will not perish! We suggest you do your cardio. Embrace your *Zombieland* reality and get on with it. After all, publishing (or not) is not your only source of stress. Figure out what the sources of tension are and find ways to manage them so you can live a life.

A - Assess your Stress

Tomes numerous enough to fill the Royal Library of Alexandria have been written to name, denounce, and strategize against the workplace stressors of tenure-track professors. Indeed, a simple search of "workplace stress"

on the *Chronicle of Higher Education* sends one down a rabbit hole to dozens of articles and dissertations on synonymous categories: among them, "occupational stress," "emotional labor," and "faculty burnout." Collectively, the literature suggests that the level and nature of one's stress is dependent upon the faculty member's time in his or her job position, workplace climate, and increasing job responsibilities. And, it will come as no surprise, the pressure to publish is cited as "the highest perceived stress factor" across faculty rank (Sanders qtd. in Carr 27).

Clearly, we are stressed out and freaked out. But, of course, you already knew that, didn't you? If you work in the academy and eke it out as faculty, you are aware of the hard data available on academic workplace stress. You have talked about it with colleagues informally in watercooler chats, and formally in meetings; you have read about academics' stress in journals, and while scrolling the Internet late at night — searching for another line of work, no doubt. None of this is news.

New, we hope, is the realization that knowledge about the source of academics' collective stress, while paliative in its promise of shared suffering, cannot account for, nor mitigate long term, your own personal sources of stress in and out of work. If leaving this career is not something you actually want to do — heck, you are not really qualified to do much else any more, are you? — then you have to find a way to make this work *feel* better. Therefore, your second task in fast professing is to assess your own *personal* sources of stress. To demonstrate how to assess your individual sources of stress, we will do a FAST job of assessing our own.

The primary source of our home stress is the daily grind of working motherhood. With young children incapable of tending to their own basic needs — food, clothing, shelter, and safety — and spouses with schedules that require early rises, late nights, and time away from home, we carry the family load a disproportionate amount, albeit the right division of labor, given our families' dynamics. On top of negotiating all of that, we have to manage the emotional labor required for the incessant battle between impressions of ourselves as good/bad workers and mothers. While we are busy writing our grocery lists in faculty meetings, we are similarly busy thinking of our grading-load while our children are recounting their days at school. That disconnect is stressful.

So, what are your individual sources of stress? Might it be the four-year-old who will not stop interrupting your evening writing time? The spouse who promises to make dinner at least once during the workweek but arrives home well-after the dinner hour? Possibly it is the ever-growing mountain of laundry, or the countless household tasks that seem to be getting away from you. Whatever it is, name it, denounce it, and strategize against it.

The primary source of our workplace stress is teaching. We both have a hard time turning that part of work-life off. Long after we first identified it was the time-sucker of time-suckers, we were still doing the same bad things: taking too long to grade, writing detailed emails, constantly reinventing assignments or changing the calendar. Only since

FAST-ing have we really gotten it under control. Why? Because even though we knew we needed to cut down on comments and reinventing assignments, we were flooded with guilt, thinking that we were not giving our students the good education they paid for. We would lie in our beds at night worrying about how the last lesson went, or if the comments we wrote on that paper were constructive. It was a shared, but personal battle. We had to decide that other things — like research — were more important, and let ourselves off the hook - which at first just meant lying to ourselves: Students would rather do less work. Students hate schedule changes. Until one day we finally believed it. Such deliberate thinking, or active measures to master the subtle art of not giving a f***, were some of the strategies we implemented in our efforts to FAST.

We outline a few more below by tackling the "S" of FAST: Survive & Thrive. But before you get to managing the stress, take the time to diagnose the source and function of your stress. Identify the time sucks; monitor your processes; find the source of your tension, especially emotional tension, because that is the stuff that eats away at you.

S - Survive & Thrive

Let's be real here: current junior faculty want to earn tenure. To get it, they will have to both survive and thrive. For now, it is the junior faculty member's job to mediate stress and ensure the number of hours spent working are productive. To that end, we have compiled a list of strategies we have used to balance our time between work and home. The strategies that follow are, admittedly, primarily shortcuts in teaching, research, and service that will help you FAST toward tenure, after which you can Slow profess with the best of them.

The best stress relief at this career stage is to get the job done faster. Some readers will likely be bound by certain constraints, and thus, what has worked for us will not likely work for everyone, such as contingent faculty. And to be honest, we don't know for sure that these strategies work for us either - our tenure alarm clock won't ring for another year or two. (Where's the snooze button?) We are not going to tell you to find a mentor — you know that already. Instead, in the spirit of "everyday acts of rebellion" (Berg & Seeber 56) we would like to share some of the strategies we employ daily to stay productive and progressive in all areas of evaluation: teaching, service, and research/scholarship.

Teaching efficiently starts with the schedule. After identifying sources of stress and time-wasting above, give thought to a teaching schedule that will best support time-saving and a productive research agenda. We teach a 3/3 load. Therefore, one big time-saver is a single prep. Teaching multiple sections of one course cuts down on preparation time prior to the start of the semester and throughout. Take that further and teach the same course several semesters in a row, virtually eliminating prep after the first or second semester. If you are unable to reduce to a single prep, choose the courses you have already developed and resist the temptation to tinker with the syllabi one more time. Think about teaching

days and times as well. If you work with a collaborator on scholarship, make sure teaching schedules allow times to work together. Identify whether you are a "little bit each day" writer or a "need large blocks of time" writer and schedule teaching accordingly. Opt for course times that leave your most productive time of day open for research, align with your writing style, and still get you done in time to pick up the kids, and get dinner on the table, most days at least.

Of course, such strategies may limit the options of NTT and contingent faculty, the folks who will be left with the times and courses refused by tenure-stream faculty. These hardworking people have families and obligations, too. We encourage our NTT colleagues to speak up and argue for their own schedules as much as they can, but recognize they may have little choice in these areas. Like the survivor who volunteers to gather resources that will support the entire community, we hope to pay it back when tenure is earned: take more course preps and some less stellar timeslots *after* we earn tenure. And we hope our more senior colleagues already aim to make scheduling choices more amenable for all. The adjunct schlepping between universities could use the break. Until tenure, though, keep running and survive by any means possible.

It is quite common for graduate students in Writing Studies to teach as instructor of record for the bulk of graduate school. Indeed, many of us work as adjuncts or lecturers while completing graduate work. Therefore, teaching is one area where we as co-authors felt comfortable from the start. Perhaps too comfortable. By the time we graduated we had a combined total of fourteen years of experience teaching our own courses. Teaching came naturally by the time we landed our respective tenure-track jobs. Still, this is not to say there were no hiccups. Learning the intricacies of a new student population took time. In addition, there were some things we needed to unlearn. Both of us were "brought up" at large state schools. We soon discovered we had too many assignments on the course calendar and assigned more reading than our new commuter-college students were used to. We had to streamline our courses considerably to meet student needs. The first tip, then, is to meet your students where they are. It may be better to cover twenty pages more thoroughly than forty pages at the surface level. Similarly, taking the time to complete three assignments in-depth may outweigh completing five for the sake of completing five.

Even after streamlining courses by reducing page count, we both still found we were spending too much time grading. To some degree this is par for the writing course, in which students write pages upon pages of material that must be read and graded. Still, it was helpful to set clear boundaries for grading: no more than twenty minutes per paper and restrict feedback "to no more than one or two things your student can do" (Haswell 17). Turns out there is pedagogical value here: researchers like Ferris, Haswell, and Lunsford, have determined that too many comments on papers can overwhelm students, impact confidence, and leave them apprehensive. Make it clear that students who want more feedback can always ask for it during office hours. Writing across the curriculum experts

like Bean also suggest seeing yourself as more of a "responder" than a "corrector," asking questions about their ideas or encouraging students to develop ideas further (242). Whatever you do, do not edit student papers. Know that grammar and mechanics are rhetorical and "error" is more often a reflection of the professor's pet peeves than correctness (e.g., Ferris and Roberts). Language fluency improves naturally over time, meaning your incessant pointing to subject-verb disagreements has very little impact. One last suggestion to limit grading time is to ask for earlier drafts or encourage revisions so that students benefit from feedback while the ideas are still in development, and it frees you to ignore drafting mistakes, as Bean suggested.

One of the best things we have done for our students and ourselves is to make the big final project a team assignment. The math here is simple: grading time is quartered if four people turn in one assignment. This, too, has pedagogical value. In 2015, the AAC&U reported that employers expect students to be well-practiced in teamwork upon graduation. Yes, some students will groan when the team assignment is first mentioned, but there are plenty of ways to structure team projects so that students are graded fairly even if one member is less productive. It is also advisable to scaffold the team project so that students turn in small parts of it throughout the semester, thereby limiting procrastination opportunities and making the workload more manageable for all of you.

Service commitments can get out of hand quickly. Therefore, common advice is to "say no" to committees/administration/service pre-tenure. But that's not exactly good advice for tenure track faculty. We are evaluated on service, too. Further, in some institutions and for some job descriptions, it is a necessity to take on administrative roles such as the First-Year Writing Director, for example. Wherever possible, turn down time-consuming projects and say yes to highly visible, low commitment service work. Look for one-day service events, or events that happen during a finite window: orientation, graduation, faculty assembly. Sign up for things that are recognizable to every level of the university, such as the parking committee and space allocation committee. Consider work that comes with a course release, if the required work can actually be completed within the time allotted by the course release. Apply for award-based service, so as to double-dip into the recognition pool, like a faculty fellowship of some kind. If you must choose a high-commitment service option, make sure it is one that is chaired by the dean or some other higher-up—talk about visibility! Let regional and national professional organizations know you would like to serve. They will find something for you, no doubt.

It is easy to put research and scholarship in the back seat when students are clamoring for attention, and the New University Committee plans to meet semi-monthly. We, like many, find it is hardest to stay on top of a productive research agenda when school is in session. The ideas above should help free time to focus. We don't want to simply echo decades of advice for getting research done or being a productive writer.

The 15-minutes a day strategy does not work for us. But we have found things that have:

First, listen to Jesse Eisenberg's Columbus from *Zombieland* and follow Rule 8: Find a partner — or better yet, find several. We find we work well as co-investigators on our projects, that together ideas are refined and strengthened. We were lucky enough to find each other within our own department, but if that's not possible, multidisciplinary topics are really hot right now. Find a collaborator in another field and pair two (or three!) brilliant minds. Partners help maintain a regular writing schedule and hold all parties accountable. A writing partner can also be someone who simply agrees to write at the same time. For this, we are taking a page from tried and true diet/exercise advice. It is harder to skip a workout if you are meeting someone at the gym. The same is true for writing: A writing buddy can help you with your cardio and keep your fear of the zombies in check. So, check in with each other via Skype or meet at the coffee shop to keep each other on task. Collaborators and writing buddies can also make for a strong support system, providing a place to vent about frustrations and find support.

Second, look for scholarship opportunities amidst the things already on the to-do list. For example, can students help with a research project? This will be a no-brainer and part of the regular curriculum for some fields, but is less common in the Humanities. Why not borrow from our social science colleagues and make our own research agenda the topic and central project of the course? Students are also good sources of data for projects investigating teaching and learning. Similarly, if you find yourself voluntold to take part in a huge university endeavor, ask if you can co-author the report, and then list it on your CV. We were tasked with marketing our department's new minor, and that turned into a study of workplace writing that is forthcoming in *Technical Communication*.

Third, choose projects with specified deadlines. For us, there is nothing like a firm deadline to stimulate productivity. Open-ended deadlines yield lackadaisical work. But a due date at the end of the week? That will get us in front of the keyboard pronto. Deadlines also help to prioritize. As researchers, we often have multiple projects in progress at the same time, making it hard to decide which to focus on next. A deadline solves that problem.

Our last bits of advice are overarching, applicable in all areas of professorship. Nominate yourself for every award opportunity. Even if there is no way you will get it, do it anyway. This advice is especially important for women in academia: Haynes and Heilman suggest we have a harder time bragging about ourselves than our male colleagues. If you absolutely cannot do it yourself, follow the advice of *Feminist Fight Club* author Jessica Bennet and get a "boast bitch," a colleague who boasts for you and you boast for her. If you both do this, you will look better to everyone else in the room and like a team player, too. It has been demonstrated that in workplace settings, women's voices are sometimes tuned out, interrupted, or co-opted (e.g., Hancock and Rubin; Karpowitz

and Mendelberg; Solnit). To mitigate this dilemma, we suggest that you become an amplifier and find one of your own, someone who will echo good ideas and give you credit to make sure the idea is heard multiple times. Find another junior colleague. Amplify all of her good ideas and ask her to do the same for yours. Nominate each other for award and recognition opportunities, as Smith and Huntoon suggest.

Finally, it is important to make sure all of the above is done within confined blocks of time. Family time is important. Having fun with friends is important. Neglecting them will not make you more productive and will likely make you a stressed out and isolated basket case who cannot get anything done. Make a no-work policy and stick to it. Each family is different and each job is different, so this will vary for everyone. One of our rules is no work on weekends and family dinner every day. Weekends are strictly, 100% family/friend time; 6pm-8:30 pm is strictly family time. To make this work, we typically work 8:30am – 6:00pm during the week, working through lunch, and occasionally for an hour or so after the kids are in bed. Someone else might decide not to work over the summer, but work near constantly when school is in session. Decide what is right for your family and your preferred work style. It is a tradeoff, and it is worth it. We may not get to attend every school event, but we definitely get to hear about it at dinner.

T – Tenure: Sprint Like You Mean It

The fear is real. The stress is real. And there will definitely be times the road to tenure seems like it winds through an undead dystopia. Perhaps the biggest stress reliever of all is knowing that you probably will earn tenure. There is little research on promotion and tenure rates, but where we do find it informally, the promotion and tenure rates are somewhere between 75%-90% (See Fox, 2014). Anecdotally, we hear more stories about approvals for tenure and promotion than otherwise. We do recognize, however, that the concern is wrapped up in whether or not you and I will be the first ones to be eaten in the zombie apocalypse — that we will be the unfortunate percentage to perish. The only paliative to that anxiety is to FAST profess. Do your cardio and sprint until you get tenure. As Jessie Eisenberg's Columbus advises, "Rule 20: It's a marathon, not a sprint. Unless it's a sprint, then sprint" (Fleischer). You can slow down and return to your ideals in teaching, research, and service in the marathon that is your career once you achieve tenure. Until then, haul ass and survive.

Fear is real. Embrace it.
Assess your stress.
Survive and thrive.
Tenure: Sprint Like You Mean It.

Works Cited

AAC&U. *Falling Short? College Learning and Career Success*. Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2015. *Google Scholar*, http://search.proquest.com/openview/5d0808413f83319ebb94e24eac5c91f8/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=35401.

Bean, John C. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. Second edition, Jossey-Bass, 2011.

Bennett, Jessica. *Feminist Fight Club: A Survival Manual for a Sexist Workplace*. Reprint edition, Harper Wave, 2017.

Berg, Maggie, and Barbara K. Seeber. *The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy*. University of Toronto Press, 2016.

Carr, Amanda R. *Stress Levels in Tenure-Track and Recently Tenured Faculty Members in Selected Institutions of Higher Education in Northeast Tennessee*. 2014.

Carrigan, Mark, and Filip Vostal. "Not so Fast! A Critique of the 'slow Professor.'" *University Affairs*, https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/not-so-fast-a-critique-of-the-slow-professor/. Accessed 2 Aug. 2018.

Droz, Patricia Welsh, and Lorie Stagg Jacobs. "Genre Chameleon: Email, Professional Writing Curriculum, and Workplace Writing Expectations." *Technical Communication*, forthcoming.

Ferris, Dana, and Barrie Roberts. "Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes: How Explicit Does It Need to Be?" *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 10, no. 3, Aug. 2001, pp. 161–84. *ScienceDirect*, doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X.

Ferris, Diana R. "Responding to Student Writing: Teachers' Philosophies and Practices." *Assessing Writing*, vol. 19, 2014, pp. 6–23.

Fleischer, Ruben. *Zombieland*. 2009. *www.imdb.com*, http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1156398/.

Fox, Jeremy. "Don't Worry (Too Much) about Whether You'll Get Tenure, Because You Probably Will." *Dynamic Ecology*, 21 July 2014, https://dynamicecology.wordpress.com/2014/07/21/dont-worry-too-much-about-whether-youll-get-tenure-because-you-probably-will/.

Hancock, Adrienne B., and Benjamin A. Rubin. "Influence of Communication Partner's Gender on Language." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, vol. 34, no. 1, Jan. 2015, pp. 46–64. *SAGE Journals*, doi:10.1177/0261927X14533197.

Haswell, Richard. "The Complexities of Responding to Student Writing; Or, Looking for Shortcuts via the Road of Excess." *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning, and Academic Writing*, vol. 3, 2006, p. 23 pp.

Haynes, Michelle C., and Madeline E. Heilman. "It Had to Be You (Not Me)!: Women's Attributional Rationalization of Their Contribution to Successful Joint Work Outcomes." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, vol. 39, no. 7, July 2013, pp. 956–69. *SAGE Journals*, doi:10.1177/0146167213486358.

Karpowitz, Christopher F., and Tali Mendelberg. *The Silent Sex: Gender, Deliberation, and Institutions*. Princeton University Press, 2014.

Lunsford, Ronald F. "When Less Is More: Principles for Responding in the Disciplines." *Writing to Learn: Strategies for Assigning and Responding to Writing across the Disciplines*, Jossey-Bass, 1997, pp. 91–104.

Sanders, Thelma Smith Patterson. "The Perceptions of Stress among Faculty Members in Higher Education at Six Selected Tennessee State Board of Regents Universities." *ETD Collection for Tennessee State University*, Jan. 1989, pp. 1–312.

Smith, Jessi L., and Meghan Huntoon. "Women's Bragging Rights: Overcoming Modesty Norms to Facilitate Women's Self-Promotion." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 4, Dec. 2014, pp. 447–59. *SAGE Journals*, doi:10.1177/0361684313515840.

Solnit, Rebecca. *Men Explain Things to Me*. Updated edition, Haymarket Books, 2015.

Whedon, Joss. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. *www.imdb.com*, http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0118276/. Accessed 13 Apr. 2018.

Wright, Edgar. *Shaun of the Dead*. Universal Pictures Home Entertainment, 2013.

"The Praxis of *Deceleration*: Recovery as 'Inner Work, Public Act'"

Marisol Cortez
Community-Based Scholar and Co-Editor, *Deceleration*

Marisol Cortez, Ph.D. occupies the space between activist, academic, and artistic worlds. Originally from San Antonio, she got her start as an activist in local environmental justice campaigns, which informed her doctoral research at the University of California at Davis. After graduating in 2009 with her Ph.D. in Cultural Studies, she returned to San Antonio, where she worked as the climate justice organizer at Southwest Workers Union. (cont. p.2) In 2010, she received the American Council of Learned Societies New Faculty Fellowship, which enabled her to teach for two years in the American Studies Department at the University of Kansas, after which she returned home to San Antonio to write and teach as a community-based scholar. She has previously worked at Esperanza Peace and Justice Center as coordinator for the Puentes de Poder community school, a popular education program aiming to support local organizing efforts. She currently works by day at URBAN-15, a grassroots cultural arts organization, and by night continues her work as a creative writer and community-based scholar, all in service of collective efforts to protect *la madre tierra* and create alternatives to parasitic forms of urban "development." Alongside environmental journalist Greg Harman, she co-edits *Deceleration*, an online journal of environmental justice thought and practice. For more on her previous publications and current projects, visit marisolcortez.wordpress.com.

Abstract
Originally published in *Deceleration* and presented at the 2017 meeting of the Association for the Study of Literature and the Environment, this short essay details the vision and praxis behind an online journal of environmental justice co-edited by the author alongside environmental journalist Gregory Harman. In this essay, I situate the evolution of this project in relation to our precarious institutional positions as writers with disabilities who consequently work in the spaces between academia, journalism, activism, and creative writing. This positionality has in turn placed *Deceleration* in conversation with degrowth and allied movements around the world, which challenge the disabling productivism that regulates the temporal rhythms of not only academia and everyday life but also our modes of activist resistance. Inspired by these challenges, *Deceleration* envisions new ways of responding to environmental and political crises, grounding writing, thinking, and acting in a reinhabitation of biological time.

When I wrote the abstract for the presentation that became this essay, I imagined that by the time the conference rolled around, I would have long finished a project that absorbed most of my time and energy and kept me from working on *Deceleration*, which is what I proposed I'd be thinking and writing about for the conference panel. I imagined that I would have put behind me a mode of thinking and writing and activism that required me to neglect my family and health in the pursuit of justice, peace, and earthcare—an unsustainable way of doing sustainability work, a praxis of crisis. I imagined that I would have begun to embody the alternative mode of thinking and writing and activism that *Deceleration* was formed to imagine and invoke, so that I might have something concrete and useful to share with those reading and listening.

As you may have gathered by this intro, it didn't quite happen like that. The project I was working on, a 100-page report bearing witness to the impacts of a devastating mobile home community displacement in my hometown of San Antonio, didn't conclude until early May of this year, after two years of steady work and a final grueling homestretch in which I worked non-stop for several months, in the cracks of time between day job and parenting responsibilities. In the last two months before its release, I became pregnant and then miscarried, but I kept going—kept going to my day job, kept writing, kept pushing myself. I felt like I had to—it was the only way a project that size and with those stakes would get done, the only way we would be able to release it in an impactful way, before city elections. I finished the report, but I lost the pregnancy: it felt like a message from the universe, a message to slow the fuck down. A message

to reinhabit the rhythms of biological time denied both by the exigencies of paid labor but also the intensities of community organizing, the pressure, internal and external, to do more and do it faster, in an era of multiplying crises. After I finished the report last month, I spent several weeks doing very little beyond just going to work and getting my daughter to and from school.

When I found myself ready to start writing about *Deceleration*, then, I found myself at the beginning of something looking forward, rather than in the middle or at the end reflecting back. But that is arguably just as valuable. What I want to do in this short essay, then, is use it as an opportunity to think out loud about what *Deceleration* was supposed to be, is, could be—as a writing project and as a way of approaching writing. Being between projects is in many ways the ideal time to reflect not only on what you do, but more importantly how you do it. It is the ideal time to reflect on praxis, the theory that informs the practice, but also the doing and the being, the living, that emerges from shifts in how we see and think.

Deceleration is a website, an online journal that began as a collaborative project between my partner Greg Harman, a long time environmental journalist, and myself. For my part, I am trained as an academic in the environmental humanities and have taught within university settings, but I've also long worked as a community organizer within social movements, both paid and unpaid, and as a nonprofit worker in the cultural arts. Both of us write—academically, journalistically, and creatively.

Because at the time we launched *Deceleration* I was committed to finishing the report I mentioned earlier, Greg and I did some collaborative visioning, but much of the early scaffolding of the project, the site design as well as its content, was his. It grew out of shifts in his own work, after a debilitating depression that left him disabled for several years forced him to move from full-time journalism to the precarity of freelancing. As he recovered, he moved from freelancing to a graduate program in International Relations; and as he recovered further, he began *Deceleration* in part to register shifting understandings of the news media's role in responding to climate change. For almost two decades, Greg's career as a journalist had catalogued various environmental disasters and their origins in policy failure and structural violence. But within International Relations, what he found himself gravitating toward was emphases on conflict transformation and peace studies. He began *Deceleration*, then, as a way of re-imagining environmental journalism as environmental peacemaking.

For Greg, it was important that *Deceleration* move away from just local and regional reporting to more global and theoretical considerations, particularly the intersection of Indigenous and migrant rights with movements for climate and conservation. But for Greg, as well as myself, *Deceleration* as a project also embodied a cultural and a personal standing down. In his words, to decelerate is to slow the machine for the sake of survival; it is to throttle down a panic response so as to recover one's

senses and think clearly, so that we might continue to act/write at all. Thus the tagline of the site: *building peace/writing beyond despair.*

In my case, I had come to this project after leaving academia to embed my intellectual and creative work more directly in social movements, only to find that the organizational culture of social justice nonprofits is deeply ableist in its productivism, internalizing self-injuring narratives about the valor of exhaustion and working beyond one's capacity, both individually and organizationally. So much of community work, not unlike academic work, is grounded in assumptions that we are autonomous—wholly free to give our lives wholly, as though we were not also embedded in social ecologies of interdependence, responsible and responsive to the needs of others. For those who live with chronic mental or physical illness, or for those who do caregiving work, the assumption that our bodies and minds can sustain constant conflict, constant confrontation, constant crisis in the name of justice or sustainability is a disabling one. Eventually, I too got sick and had to leave my job as a paid organizer and community-based scholar for my own survival.

There's an image I have for this praxis, this putting of theory into action, which lies just beyond the horizon of language—of a metabolism or timescale or temporality that is all action and no reflection, moving from fire to fire: all day and no night, all frenzied growth and production without the intermittency of darkness, the fertility of lying fallow. The logic of capitalist extraction runs deep in non-profit-based activism as much as academia or working at McDonald's (all of which I've done). It is a logic that is hostile to the temporality of the body, its seasons of health and illness; it is a logic that denies the cyclical, pulsing, waxing and waning rhythms of biological time in pursuit of an unbroken, linear trajectory of growth and expansion.

These are not new ideas, necessarily, but *Deceleration* is borne out of them nonetheless, out of a search for an institutional home for environmental justice writing after the failure of traditional institutions to accommodate the embedded, embodied realities of our lives. Where do you go to do your work when the places that are supposed to fit...don't? Or when you, your body-mind, doesn't? How do you work and write differently, so that even amidst a struggle to protect planet and people from predation you preserve your own life, your own health, your relationships? How do you survive the work of confrontation or witness? Beyond mere resistance, how do you create? For my part, I wanted *Deceleration* to embody this turn in my own life from manic reactivity to deliberate and intentional creation, from a writing and action grounded in productivism to one grounded instead in a reinhabitation of ecological time. *Poco a poco.*

This is a thread that has run through my work from the beginning. As a graduate student, my dissertation research had been about normative understandings of the excretory body, the shame and disgust that surrounds ordinary aspects of human biology within Western cultures, and the accompanying desire to displace that materiality both psychologically and

geographically. What has persisted from that earlier work is my lived feeling that economies of extraction and accumulation centrally depend upon a denial both of embodiment and the ecological embeddedness of bodies, and more specifically on a displacement of responsibility for the work of caring for embodiment, as Mary Mellor has articulated so powerfully in *Feminism and Ecology* (1997).

In both its thematic content and creative process, then, *Deceleration* represents a praxis grounded in recovery. In much of humanities work, we talk about recovery in the sense of salvaging—retrieving texts, lives, and traditions that have been overlooked or devalued and bringing them to light for careful consideration. But as I've been suggesting throughout, *Deceleration* pulls from a second layer of meanings familiar to anyone who has undergone any kind of rehabilitation process, be it 12-Step or physical therapy. Here recovery means a slow, uneven, never-complete process of restoration to health, a moving from disequilibrium to harmony. For those who, like myself and Greg, live with the chronicity and cyclic nature of mental health issues, recovery means the continual press to survive recurrent crises by recognizing our unconscious life-denying patterns without illusion; it means learning to live differently with these patterns and respond differently and deliberately.

Pulling all of these threads together, I view *Deceleration* as a praxis of environmental justice, and an institutional location for that praxis, which responds to climate and human rights crises while insisting on health and spiritual grounding. Based in our own lived experiences of disability and recovery, *Deceleration* seeks to cover unseen or undervalued stories not simply of conflict and resistance but of lived alternatives of peacemaking and peacekeeping, toward a collective recovery from colonialism and petroculture.

But as the name suggests, this is also, crucially, about reimagining the scale and temporality of resistance. In this respect, for me, *Deceleration* is an opportunity to dialogue with concepts from degrowth and allied movements around the world, which have had little intellectual or practical purchase in the U.S., as far as I can tell.

This is regrettable. I'll define degrowth shortly but first want to share just a little about its evolution as an intellectual and social movement. Its origins are largely European, arising first in France and Italy. The original term was "decroissance," coined by French thinker André Gorz in 1972; other foundational thinkers include Romanian economist Nicolas Georgescu-Roegen, whose 1971 book *Entropy Law and the Economic Process* pioneered the field of ecological economics. Another key text was the Club of Rome's "Limits to Growth" report, written following the oil crisis of the 1970s.

As peak oil fears receded and neoliberalism ascended, public discussion of degrowth waned, but then resurged in the early 2000s, galvanized especially by critiques of "sustainable development" as these claims had been belied by actual development policy in the Global South.

Throughout the 2000s, degrowth flourished both within universities and in the streets, with demands for a scaling down of production and consumption by way of things like worksharing, basic income guarantees and income caps, community currencies, time banks, cooperatives, and ad busting. In 2008, the first international degrowth conference was held in Paris, at which the English word "degrowth" was used for the first time; and in 2010, the second international conference took place in Barcelona, linking European academic communities largely based in ecological economics with Latin American intellectual and social movement networks rooted in political ecology, environmental justice, and *buen vivir*.

In the first comprehensive analysis of the movement published in English just last year, editors Giacomo D'Alisa, Federico Demaria, and Giorgos Kallis define degrowth as, "first and foremost, a critique of growth":

> [Degrowth] calls for the decolonization of public debate from the idiom of economism and for the abolishment of economic growth as a social objective. Beyond that, degrowth signifies also a desired direction, one in which societies will use fewer natural resources and will organize and live differently than today. ... Our emphasis is on different, not only less. Degrowth signifies a society with a smaller metabolism, but more importantly, a society with a metabolism which has a different structure and serves new functions. Degrowth does not call for doing less of the same. The objective is not to make an elephant leaner, but to turn an elephant into a snail (3-4).

To understand degrowth, it helps to quickly define growth and the twin concept of development to which it is wedded. Since the late 1940s, the global goal has been for countries to continually increase the total value of goods and services that they newly produce from year to year, as measured in GDP. To do so is to be "developed," along a single, linear trajectory of progress whose apex is industrial production and consumption, held up as standard for the developing and the undeveloped. The inherently colonial associations between growth, development, and improvement have become unquestionable not simply in our public policy but in the cultural imaginary of the West.

Growth's connection to capitalism is equally key here. Capitalism is of course centrally defined as an economic and social system driven by the quest to produce profit or surplus value as the outcome of economic activity. However, from a degrowth perspective, the most fundamental aspect of capitalism is, according to Diego Andreucci and Terrence McDonough, the "'productivist' imaginary [that] underpins it" (62). The problem with capitalism is not simply the drive to produce and accumulate a surplus, but to reinvest it in further production—to grow—in a process of "continuous self-expansion — 'accumulation for accumulation's sake'" (60). But historically, socialist states too have been productivist, founded

on a central contradiction which assumes that unbroken, continuous material growth is not only desirable but necessary, and—on a more basic level—possible.

Degrowth is, emphatically, not sustainable development or the greening of capitalism or technology. It is radical critique of "development" itself as a cultural and policy paradigm and a concomitant search for post-development models of wellbeing, or as Fabrice Flipo and Francois Schneider put it, "imaginaries and concrete practices that are alternative to productivism, both local and global, in different places on the planet, within or outside the major knowledge producing institutions" (xxv).

The other key set of concepts from the degrowth movement that inform *Deceleration* cluster around the notion of social metabolism, a concept drawn from ecological economics, or "bioeconomics," as originally conceived. Nicolas Georgescu-Roegen's central insight was that "the economic process, having physical and biological roots, cannot ignore the limitations imposed by the laws of physics: in particular, the law of entropy" (Bonaiuti 26). What this concept does is denaturalize capitalism further than the standard formulation which understands it as an historically-specific mode of production. Bioeconomics suggests that *all* modes of production are in turn ecologies, and cultural ones at that—historically-specific ways, according to ecological economist Joshua Farley, of "transform[ing] energy and raw materials provided by nature into economic products that generate service to humans before eventually returning to nature as waste" (49). Based on the extraction of non-renewable energy and material inputs, the industrial ecology of capitalism is characterized by a metabolic rift that leads to the ever-increasing levels of entropy we experience as crises of climate and biodiversity: "Fossil fuel combustion," writes Farley, "is a one-way process that transforms useful energy into dispersed energy and waste by-products, such as carbon dioxide and particulate matter" (49).

Significantly, for Georgescu-Roegen and later degrowth activists, this metabolism has a cultural undergirding in what the *Degrowth* anthology's editors call the "growth imaginary." The multiple crises we encounter today do not simply result from economic activity exceeding biophysical limits of nature, but from the "cultural and institutional premises that characterise growth economies," according to Mauro Bonaiuti (27). Productivism has a cultural and psychological logic, in other words: the "Protestant ethic" that Weber described is, according to Andreucci and McDonough, the "cultural and political deployment of profit" (60). It is the internalization of this "never-enoughness" that makes the culture and operations of social justice non-profits, and much unpaid activism too, so deeply disabling. The idea that we should always be doing more, working harder and faster and more urgently is not the solution to the crisis of growth; it is, rather, growth imperatives infecting our activism, our writing, our thinking.

From a degrowth perspective, and as channeled by *Deceleration*,

one solution is to re-politicize imaginaries that have been colonized by paradigms of growth and development. Geographer Erik Swyndgedouw draws a distinction between "the political" as the "public terrain where different imaginings of possible socio-ecological orders compete" and the realm of politics or policy (90). Whereas politics and policy have been effectively de-politicized under neoliberalism—that is, alternatives to growth and development have been foreclosed and rendered altogether unthinkable—"the political" exists in the realm of the imaginary and is always agonistic. What Swyndgedouw suggests ultimately is that resistance to the current order is not enough:

> Politics understood merely as rituals of resistance is doomed to fail politically. Resistance and nurturing conflict, as the ultimate horizon of many social movements, has become a subterfuge that masks what is truly at stake, i.e. the inauguration of a different socio-ecological, post-capitalist [and post-growth] order. ... Re-politicization ... marks a shift from the old to a new situation, one that cannot any longer be thought of in terms of the old symbolic framings (92).

I would put it this way: resistance is not enough, because "resistance" as it has come to be practiced actually participates in, internalizes and recapitulates, the unsustainable not-enoughness we need to move away from in our engagement with crisis. I suppose, then, that what *Deceleration* inaugurates is an exhaustion with "resistance" alone—because it *is* exhausting and debilitating, from the standpoint of our bodies, but also maybe because—here I feel somewhat heretical in saying this—it is boring and joyless. Again and again, to go to meetings and exhort the heads of commissions and councils and utilities, to argue and to fight, to weather the inevitable infighting wrought by the divide and conquer tactics deployed by those with power—when I don't even know the names of all the plants or birds in my yard or the names of all my neighbors. What is activism, what is writing-as-activism, when it is grounded in the careful, slow, deliberate work of reinhabitation rather than simply resistance?

This arrives ultimately at a final keyword central to the imaginary of degrowth and *Deceleration* alike: care, "the daily action performed by human beings for their welfare and for the welfare of their community," according to the *Degrowth* editors (63). This daily action is, specifically, care for the *bodies* of others, human and nonhuman—the undervalued and frequently unpaid labor of social and ecological reproduction necessary to sustain unsustainable production, the daily labor of biological time historically performed by women, people of color, immigrants, and the earth itself.

From a degrowth perspective, it is not the dignity of work but the dignity of care that needs to be made central to politics and economy. We have already seen this shift in Indigenous framings of anti-extraction struggles, in the subtle but profound distinction between protesting a

pipeline and protecting water, as at Standing Rock. We might extend this framing to all our work, wherever it is located institutionally, centering what D'Alisa, Deriu, and Demaria describe as "the experience of the vulnerability of bodies' needs. ... Working to lessen the vulnerability of others allows everybody to experience their own vulnerability and reflect on its characteristics. This is a first important step toward abandoning narcissistic affirmations of the self as a guard against weakness, or in other words, abandoning the anthropological essence of growth society" (65-66).

It is important to underscore that when I talk about care, I am not talking about self-care, necessarily. Or, at least, I am not talking about the individualist articulations of self-care that the unnamed author of a remarkable zine published by the anarchist collective Crimethinc calls "a sort of consumer politics of the self" (i.e. tea, yoga, candles, bath beads). Nor am I talking about the ways self-care is often deployed in non-profit-based activism, where it becomes one more thing to do when the work day is done—versus actually doing less or refusing to work from a place of frenzy or compulsion.

On the other hand, as stated in the *Self as Other: Reflections on Care* zine, I'm not *not* talking about self-care. Although "self-care rhetoric has been appropriated in ways that can reinforce the entitlement of the privileged, ... a critique of self-care must not be used as yet another weapon against those who are already discouraged from seeking care" (6-7). The deeper critique presented in this zine, one closer to the point I want to offer as well, maintains that what is at issue is not appending "self" to "care," but rather the *kind* of self constituted by the performance of care. To be liberatory, "care" (of self or others) must involve a transformative rejection of the demand to produce endlessly; it cannot simply be a way to "ease the impact of an ever-increasing demand for productivity" (8). What we long for is not simply to sustain selves constituted through productivity and a denial of interdependency, but rather to transform this self and its constitution: "[W]e have to shift from reproducing one self to producing another" (8):

> Your human frailty is not a regrettable fault to be treated by proper self-care so you can get your nose back to the grindstone. Sickness, disability, and unproductivity are not anomalies to be weeded out; they are moments that occur in every life, offering a common ground on which we might come together. If we take these challenges seriously and make space to focus on them, they could point the way beyond the logic of capitalism to a way of living in which there is no dichotomy between care and liberation (11).

Kazu Haga, a Kingian non-violence trainer based in Oakland, puts it similarly in an article entitled "The Urgency of Slowing Down," written shortly after Donald Trump's inauguration. "As we confront the urgency

of the moment," he writes:

> How do we ensure that we are not organizing from a place of panic? ... There is no doubt that this is not a moment to procrastinate, but a time to act, as King reminds us. But the frenzied pace that we do our work in is oftentimes a habit that has been ingrained in us by a capitalist system functioning with a different time frame than we do. ... I can still hear the voices of the elders at Standing Rock, reminding us that we need to slow down. That for indigenous peoples, struggle is nothing new. We've been here before. That for them, everything they do is ceremony, prayer, ritual. And those are not things that you rush. You do it with intention, with all of the time and respect that it deserves.

As project and as praxis, *Deceleration* is grounded in these central concepts, emerging from a lifetime of unsustainable engagements in sustainability work–with those in power, with others, with self–and arriving at a present understanding that ours is, ultimately, the work of "spiritual activism" called forth by Gloria Anzaldúa: "now let us shift … the path of conocimiento … inner work, public acts" (540).

Works Cited

Andreucci, Diego and Terrence McDonough. "Capitalism." *Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era,* edited by Giacomo D'Alisa, Federico Demaria, and Giorgos Kallis. Routledge, 2015, pp. 59-62.

Anzaldúa, Gloria E. "now let us shift...the path of conocimiento...inner work, public acts." *This Bridge We Call Home: Radical Visions for Transformation,* edited by Gloria E. Anzaldúa and AnaLouise Keating, Routledge, 2002, pp. 540-578.

Bonaiuti, Mauro. "Bioeconomics." *Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era,* edited by Giacomo D'Alisa, Federico Demaria, and Giorgos Kallis, Routledge, 2015, pp. 25-28.

D'Alisa, Giacomo, Marco Deriu and Federico Demaria. "Care." *Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era,* edited by Giacomo D'Alisa, Federico Demaria, and Giorgos Kallis, Routledge, 2015, pp. 63-66.

Farley, Joshua. "Steady State Economics." *Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era,* edited by Giacomo D'Alisa, Federico Demaria, and Giorgos Kallis, Routledge, 2015, pp. 49-52.

Flipo, Fabrice and Francois Schneider. "Foreword." *Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era,* edited by Giacomo D'Alisa, Federico Demaria, and Giorgos Kallis, Routledge, 2015, pp. xxiii-xxvi.

Haga, Kazu. "The Urgency of Slowing Down." *Waging Non-Violence,* January 25, 2017, https://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/urgency-slowing-down/. Accessed 7 July 2018.

Kallis, Giorgos, Federico Demaria, and Giacomo D'Alisa. "Introduction: Degrowth." *Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era,* edietd by Giacomo D'Alisa, Federico Demaria, and Giorgios Kallis, Routledge, 2015, pp. 1-17.

Mellor, Mary. *Feminism and Ecology.* New York University Press, 1997.

"Self as Other: Reflections on Self-Care*." Crimethinc*, https://cloudfront.crimethinc.com/pdfs/self-as-other_for-screen.pdf.

Swyngedouw, Erik. "Depoliticization ('the political')." *Degrowth: A Vocabulary for a New Era,* edited by Giacomo D'Alisa, Federico Demaria, and Giorgos Kallis, Routledge. 2015, pp. 90-93.

Precarious Academic Labour in Germany: Termed Contracts and a New Berufsverbot[1]

Alexander Gallas
University of Kassel, Germany

Abstract
The author examines how precarity is produced in German academia and explores how labour activists are trying to combat it. The focus is on mid-level faculty. In the first part, the mechanics of precarisation are explained; in the second part, the institutional supports of the status quo blocking change in favour of labour are identified, and in the third part, the demands and strategies of two organisations are analyzed that have made headlines in recent years by exposing the proliferation of precarity in German academia: the Education and Science Workers' Union (GEW) and the Network for Decent Work in Academia (NGAWiss).

Dr. Alexander Gallas belongs to the mid-level faculty at the Department of Political Science, University of Kassel, Germany, and has a termed contract. He is active in an initiative that facilitates the self-organisation of precarious academic workers. Furthermore, he is a rank-and-file member of the Education and Science Workers' Union (GEW). He serves on the editorial board of the *Global Labour Journal* and has authored a monograph called *The Thatcherite Offensive: A Neo-Poulantzasian Analysis* (Haymarket, 2017). [Email: alexandergallas@uni-kassel.de]

[1] This is a slightly revised version of an article that was first published as part of a section on 'The Proliferation of Precarity in Academia' in the January 2018 issue of the *Global Labour Journal* (GLJ). I would like to thank Simone Claar and Anil Shah as well as my fellow editors at the GLJ for helpful comments on a draft. The usual disclaimers apply.

The German term Berufsverbot entered the lexicon of international political debates in the early 1970s. It referred to a law enacted in West Germany that banned people from working in the public sector because they were aligned with what were deemed anti-constitutional organisations such as the pro-Soviet German Communist Party (DKP), for example. The expression made a comeback in recent years in a completely different context: mid-level faculty in academia use it to protest against the legal regulation of termed contracts.[2] Notably, in 2015 academic labour activists included it in an open letter directed to the Minister of Education and all members of the Federal Parliament. The MPs had drawn the ire of the activists because they were in the process of amending a law regulating termed contracts in academia, and it had transpired that a majority were not prepared to repeal its most controversial provision. This provision limits the employment period of people in mid-level positions who are on termed contracts. Mid-level faculty can only work in state-funded positions for six years before the completion of their PhD and for another six years after that point. The frustration of the activists results from the fact that permanent positions in the medium bracket of academia are incredibly rare, and that it is very difficult to attain full professorships, which is the standard way to obtain a secure job. Many academics have to leave their profession altogether once they have reached the end of the six-plus-six-year period – often after having spent roughly two decades of their lives studying and working in higher education institutions.

In this article, I will examine how precarity is produced in German academia and explore how labour activists are trying to combat it. In so doing, I will focus on mid-level faculty. First of all, I will explain the mechanics of precarisation; second, I will identify the institutional supports of the status quo blocking change in favour of labour; and third, I will analyse the demands and strategies of two organisations that have made headlines in recent years by exposing the proliferation of precarity in German academia: the Education and Science Workers' Union (GEW) and the Network for Decent Work in Academia (NGAWiss).

[2] When I speak about "mid-level faculty", I refer to what is called *Mittelbau* [intermediate structure] in German, a technical term that points to an ill-defined intermediate layer of scientists employed by universities, who are neither students nor full professors. Some of the members of this status group are still in the process of completing a PhD programme (PhD candidates are not necessarily considered students in Germany), others are post-docs, and some are teaching or research fellows or coordinate research projects.

The Mechanics of Precarisation

In the German higher education system, mid-level faculty are faced with two peculiar challenges, which result both from the mode of operation of higher education institutions and from recent political interventions. First of all, there are very few open-ended positions in the intermediate stratum of academia – of the under-45s who are mid-level faculty, 93 percent are on termed contracts (BUWIN127). This scarcity of permanent jobs reflects the fact that mid-level positions are seen as transitory: their institutional function is to facilitate the passage of younger academics to a full professorship.

Second, reaching this goal is a daunting task. In order to qualify at all, mid-level academics are usually required to have completed a second thesis after their PhD (Habilitation), which is dedicated to a new, separate topic. In the social sciences and humanities, this thesis is typically comparable to a fully revised book manuscript; in the natural sciences, it is commonly a collection of peer-reviewed articles. Aspiring full professors have to tackle this challenge on top of carrying out all the tasks that secure the functioning of higher education institutions on a day-to-day basis: teaching, the supervision of BA and MA dissertations, the mentoring of students, committee work, writing applications for research funding, and research and publication activities that are unrelated to the second thesis. Importantly, however, achieving the qualification needed to obtain a full professorship is not in any way linked with being offered a permanent position. Whereas assistant professors with tenure-track positions in the United States (US) automatically advance into permanent jobs at their home institution once they have met tenure requirements, German mid-level faculty who have successfully defended their second thesis and have reached the end of their six-plus-six-year period find themselves out of their jobs. They compete for full professorships in the job market, and the number of openings is strictly limited. In 2014, for example, the ratio of people appointed to a full professorship to those who had successfully completed their second thesis was roughly one-to-five. On average, only one in twenty-three applications for a full professorship was successful (BUWIN194).

These extreme numbers reflect a recent development that has been created through higher education policies. Whereas state funding for PhD and post-doc positions has increased significantly in recent years, the same cannot be said of full-time professorships. The result is “most extreme competition” (Ullrich392) for jobs at the highest level – in particular in the social sciences and humanities, where it is difficult to switch to new careers once people have spent a long time inside the system (Ullrich408;

BUWIN188).[3]

In any case, people are relatively old when they finally become full professors or have to leave academia for good. The average age of people appointed to full professorships is 41 (BUWIN: 59). Consequently, many female academics face the challenge that pregnancy and childbirth fall into their highly insecure "qualification period." Some respond to the insecurity surrounding their jobs by choosing not to have children at all or to leave academia altogether (Schürmann139–40; Von Gross). Likewise, precarity at the intermediate level discriminates against people with working-class and immigrant backgrounds. They often lack family networks supportive of an academic career as well as financial resources and thus find the thought of having to switch to a new profession in one's late thirties or early to mid-forties even more daunting than others (Lange-Vester and Teiwes-Kügler). Put differently, the existing institutional configuration in academia reinforces relations of social domination – be they gender, class, or race relations.

In sum, academic career paths in Germany are characterised, in the words of the 2017 National Report on Junior Scholars, by a "bottleneck problem" (BUWIN27).[4] This is why activists argue that the law regulating termed contracts amounts to a de facto occupational ban for many academics: if they have not advanced into a full professorship during the

[3] All quotations from German-language texts have been translated by the author.

[4] Significantly, there are plenty of academics in Germany who even fail to secure termed mid-level jobs and try to make ends meet with sessional teaching. In 2016, there were 100,000 sessional lecturers in the country, compared to 50,000 full professors. They cover a significant amount of teaching, among it compulsory modules that are offered on a regular basis. In Berlin, where exact numbers exist for the 2013–2014 winter semester, sessional lecturers covered roughly between 10 and 50 percent of all hours taught at their respective institutions (Oberg3). Usually, they earn between 20 and 55 Euros per hour taught. Importantly, if time for preparation and marking is factored in, wages per hour worked are significantly lower than nominal remuneration (Scholz; Ullrich390). Peter Grottian, a Berlin-based political scientist, estimates that sessional lecturers "often work for three Euros an hour" (roughly 3.50 US Dollars at the time of writing). Furthermore, they are formally self-employed, which means that they have no job security whatsoever and no statutory entitlement to holidays, sick pay and minimum wages. Likewise, no work is available for them during the break periods, which extend to almost six months a year at German universities. In sum, sessional lecturers are in a far weaker position in the academic labour market than those who have the threat of the de facto occupational ban hanging over them. But it is important to note in this context that precarisation in higher education does not just affect academics: increasing numbers of staff are on termed contracts and university managers across the country create precarious jobs through outsourcing cleaning and other service work to "cheap" third-party providers.

six years of employment after their PhD, their chances of continuing to work in academia are slim.[5]

Institutional Supports of the Status Quo

The Berufsverbot is just one facet of a higher education system that brings together, in the view of activists and critical scholars, the worst of all worlds. The organisational structure of German higher education institutions is characterised by a curious mix of feudalism and neo-liberalism (Ullrich393; van Dyk and Reitza,b). On the one hand, there are steep internal hierarchies that date back to medieval times and have survived all the deep ruptures in German history. These hierarchies are visible in the fact that full professors are heavily privileged vis-à-vis mid-level faculty, members of staff, and students. This concerns not just their pay and job security but also their decision-making authority. One example is that professors usually have the absolute majority of votes in search committees and other key working groups tasked with institutional self-administration. Another is the chair-based internal organisation of departments (Lehrstuhlprinzip). Every full professor typically occupies a chair; that is, they are the head of a subdivision defined by a research field that reflects their specialism. The subdivision also consists of one or several mid-level positions. Importantly, the decision of whom to appoint to these mid-level positions lies with the chair, not the department, and mid-level faculty report, in the first place, to their chair, not to the head of department. As almost all contracts are termed, this means that chairs can regularly change the people working for them. Against this backdrop, it is unsurprising that demands to phase out termed contracts are met, from the side of full professors, with ambivalence at best. There is a systemic connection between precarity and privilege that Silke van Dyk and Tilman Reitz (2016b: n.p.) describe: "So far, the precarious careers and paths (which have been taken by almost everyone) often have been protecting feudal privileges because the latter are seen as a legitimate compensation for years of dependency, insecurity and exploitation and are therefore not given up easily" (van Dyk and Reitz).

In recent years, on the other hand, politicians, university managers, representatives of business, and lobbyists have successfully propagated the neo-liberal principle of the "entrepreneurial university." This is visible, for example, in higher education funding. Adjusted for inflation, basic

[5] A study by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) highlights that the number of German academics working outside their home country is in the tens of thousands, and that their main motive for emigrating are career opportunities (OECD, 2015: 120–21, 130). In light of this, it appears that in Germany, an important individual strategy for academics of dealing with insecure employment prospects is to move abroad.

state funding for higher education institutions per student and year has decreased from €7,268 in 2004 to €6,361 in 2013 (Baumgarth, Henke, and Pasternack44). This funding shortfall is partly made up by the fact that third-party funding has increased significantly. In 2004, it was €3.4bn overall; in 2013, the number was €7.1bn (Statistisches Bundesamt, email communication).[6] Significantly, the largest share of this money comes from public, tax-funded agencies like the German Research Foundation (DFG), the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), and the European Research Council (ERC) (DFG). Consequently, this process of funding substitution, which is driven by the neo-liberal belief in the efficiency of permanent competition, produces insecure, short-term, project-based work (van Dyk and Reitzb). Many staff and mid-level faculty positions are created just for the duration of a research project, which may run for far less than the six years enshrined in the law, and many mid-level academics are faced with the task of creating their own jobs by acquiring external funding. At the same time, it is highly doubtful that this system makes academics more efficient workers: a lot of their working time is clogged up by writing research proposals that are often turned down by the funding agencies; this means that they never get to do the activities they were aiming to do, and many are unwilling to take risks with externally funded teaching and research projects because they feel to have to please their potential supporters.

Importantly, the flanking of feudal hierarchies with a neo-liberal mode of allocating resources through constant competition produces and reproduces the precarity of mid-level faculty. The privileges attached to the hierarchies invite full professors to defend a status quo based on job insecurity for their junior colleagues. The competitive pressures atomise mid-level faculty and create strong incentives for people to embrace strategies of individual instead of collective advancement – that is, to focus entirely on making headway in one's career instead of organising around precarious working conditions. In sum, the traditional and novel facets of the German higher education system complement each other in blocking avenues for change.

Campaigns and Interventions

The Education and Science Workers' Union

The existence of institutional mechanisms in higher education that reproduce the status quo gives rise to the question of where and how activists can intervene to challenge it. This is why it is important to

[6] The numbers for third-party funding are not adjusted for inflation.

examine the strategies of academic labour organisations in the field, in addition to the constraints, opportunities, and dilemmas they are facing. The biggest organisation that has been working to expose precarious academic labour and the insecurity of mid-level faculty in recent years is the Education and Science Workers' Union (GEW). The GEW is affiliated with the German Confederation of Unions (DGB), the biggest union umbrella organisation in the country. Like other big union apparatuses, the GEW is not homogeneous. There are sometimes profound differences between regional and local union bodies and the national leadership. Some of the former take a more radical line than the high-level officials. In what follows, I will focus on the strategic line of the national leadership.

The GEW is first and foremost a schoolteachers' union; relatively few of its members are employed at universities or research institutions: Out of 280,000 members in 2016, 176,000 worked in the schools section (roughly 63 percent) and only 18,000 in the higher education and research section (roughly 6 percent) (GEWa13). Considering the number of people working for German higher education institutions in academic jobs was 242,000 in 2016 (Statistisches Bundesamt, email communication), it becomes clear that the unionisation rate among academics employed at higher education institutions is rather low.[7] This problem is further aggravated by the fact that the vast majority of mid-level members of faculty are on termed contracts, which means that many of them leave the higher education sector, either temporarily or permanently. Consequently, the social base of the union in the higher education sector is not just small, but also unstable.

This turns into a problem for academic labour on two fronts. First of all, collective bargaining in the public sector is usually not separated by branch, which means that GEW negotiates on behalf of all its members and joins forces with other public-sector unions in the process. As a result of the low unionisation rate in higher education, there is a strong incentive for the union to prioritise other groups of workers during the bargaining

[7] There are two other large, nation-wide organisations representing the interests of people working in higher education. The first is the public and service sector union ver.di, which is also affiliated with the DGB. It has an "education, science and research" section, but not all of its members work in higher education. Ver.di does not publish membership numbers of its sections, but what is known is that the union is much stronger among staff than among faculty. Second, there is the German Higher Education Association (DHV), an organisation that avoids referring to itself as a union, but nevertheless claims to stand up for "the professional interests of university teachers vis-à-vis society and the state" (DHV). It has 30,000 members (DHV) and has a reputation for prioritising the needs and interests of full professors.

process, in particular schoolteachers. As a result, collective negotiations have rarely delivered much that addresses the specific grievances of mid-level faculty. Second, the lack of a strong and stable base means that the union has limited clout when it comes to threatening strikes or protesting against university management. This is further aggravated by the fact that, according to the dominant understanding of labour law in the country, full professors, similar to teachers and other state personnel, do not enjoy a right to strike. The legal reasoning is that their tenured status, which means, among other things, that they must not be made redundant under normal circumstances, obliges them to refrain from industrial action.

Despite the limited base of the GEW in the higher education sector and the lack of a broad academic labour movement demanding change, the union has been working actively to address precarious working conditions, in particular through discursive interventions such as the publication of demands and campaigns. The fact that the director of the union's higher education division, Andreas Keller, is also a vice-president of the union shows that the GEW is taking the sector seriously. In recent years, the union has been building a reputation for commenting critically on working conditions in higher education and for recommending practical changes that address precarity. In so doing, it has been batting above its average: although its membership base in the sector is limited, it has still managed to influence political discourse to a degree. This is reflected in the fact that it receives ample coverage in the news media whenever academic labour is discussed.

The first intervention of the GEW (2011) was the Templin Manifesto, which was published and disseminated widely in 2010. It served as the starting point for a campaign that promoted "dream job[s] in science." The Manifesto was a short text attacking "fixed-term contracts and ... precarious employment." It criticised that many academics "lack the leeway they need for independent teaching and research and are denied reliable career prospects," and argued that "effective teaching and research ... and decent working conditions and career prospects ... are two sides to [sic] the same coin" (GEW). The Manifesto contained a list of ten demands addressing different aspects of academic precarity and related areas, among them the democratisation of university self-administration, gender-sensitive quotas for new appointments, collective bargaining coverage for everyone employed with a higher education institution, and the creation of a system which allows mid-level academics with a PhD to qualify for permanent positions at their own institution without having to become full professors. Obviously, this last demand calls for a change that would improve the situation of mid-level academics, but the question remains why they still have to qualify for a permanent position if they already have a PhD.

In subsequent years the GEW made several interventions based on the Manifesto. In 2012, it published the Herrsching Codex, a catalogue of suggestions as to how universities can improve working conditions. The Codex was an attempt to get universities to commit themselves to fixed rules concerning academic labour. The demands enshrined in the Codex reappeared in the Köpenick Appeal 2013, which was launched in the run-up to the general election of the same year. Four years later, the union launched kodex-check.de, an online tool that allows users to check working conditions at all German public universities against the criteria set out in the Codex. Apart from that, the union organised a "week of action" in November 2015, where local branches staged small events and protests criticising working conditions in academia.

In 2017, the GEW (b) published a pamphlet called Science as a Profession, which lays out how academic employment should be reformed in order to combat precarity. In this pamphlet, they modified their position vis-à-vis permanent positions insofar as they now demand the implementation of three separate career tracks: one that allows people without a PhD to apply for permanent positions; one that enables people with a PhD to apply for permanent roles with more far-reaching decision-making capacities; and one that institutes a US-style tenure-track model leading to a full professorship. To ensure this did not reproduce the traditional hierarchies in German academia, the union flanked this demand with a call to end the "chair" principle and the privileges of full professors attached to it.

Obviously, all of these steps would contribute significantly to driving back precarity in higher education. And yet, they may not go far enough. First of all, a tenure-track model would not remove insecurity. After all, it does not guarantee a job. In the US, tenure requirements often push candidates to their breaking points because a significant number of people in tenure-track positions are denied tenure. There are numerous academics without a job after several years of having worked very hard and under a great deal of pressure. This suggests that there is a real danger of such a three-track, three-tier system quickly becoming hierarchical again, all the more since it can be presumed that the positions on the different tracks diverge significantly in terms of responsibilities, pay, and resources. Against this backdrop, many full professors would probably argue that they have taken a high risk and have worked incredibly hard to get where they are, which is why their privileges need to be reinstated. This would then create a constant pressure to inch back towards the status quo ante. In light of this, a more lasting solution may be the simple and radical option of only differentiating, in terms of academic rank, between people without and with a PhD, and automatically offering permanent positions to the latter.

The activities of the GEW reflect a dilemma the union is faced with: Due to its weak membership base in higher education, the union leadership focuses its activities in the sector on discursive interventions and small symbolic protests. In line with the "social partnership" approach dominating labour relations in Germany, it makes these interventions while presenting itself as a "respectable" partner in dialogues over higher education policy, and taking an approach that offers practical, piecemeal solutions. This leads to a moderation of demands and a dialogue-oriented approach that is at odds with the formation of a rank-and-file movement pushing for fundamental change.

This dilemma is visible in the official reaction of the GEW to the amendment of the Act discussed in the opening paragraph of this article. In contrast to the initiatives mentioned in the introduction, the GEW on the whole painted it in a positive light: It issued a statement that the amendment was a "success." The reason was that the amended law contained provisions somewhat re-regulating the conditions under which contracts can be termed. What the statement failed to mention, however, was that the de facto Berufsverbot was fully left intact.

All in all, the GEW has had some success in exposing precarity in academia, in particular the precarity of mid-level faculty. However, the need to appear respectable, which is part of the discourse-centred strategy of the union, also limits the degree to which the status quo is openly criticised. There is also a risk that the interventions of the GEW could become integrated into a top-down push for "reforms" that leave the existing hierarchies intact and do little to remove insecurity.

The Network for Decent Work in Academia

The Network for Decent Work in Academia (NGAWiss) is a new initiative in the field of academic labour activism. It was established in January 2017 in Leipzig and is a nation-wide platform of individuals and groups that are fighting against the precarious working conditions of mid-level faculty. At the time of writing, it was supported by twenty-three grassroots initiatives hailing from all parts of the country. Some of the groups represent mid-level faculty at individual universities or are committees that form part of disciplinary associations; others are smaller, locally based activist networks. The aim is to facilitate collective agency at the national level – that is, to develop, "at least, joint PR strategies and the capacity to launch campaigns, maybe even the capacity to go on strike" (NGAWiss). As of 2017, NGAWiss has formulated six key demands:

1. An end to the law regulating termed contracts in academia and the creation, across the board, of permanent positions for scientists who have a PhD and are employed with universities.

2. Contracts with a six-year term for PhDs who are employed with universities.
3. The abolition of the second thesis after the PhD.
4. Adequate remuneration for sessional lecturers.
5. The abolition of the chair-based system and the democratisation of the self-administration of higher education institutions.
6. The expansion of basic state funding of higher education at the expense of third-party funding.

In comparison to the agenda of GEW, the demands of NGAWiss are more straightforward and far-reaching. In line with my critique of the three-track system proposed by the GEW, they are also assuming that academics should advance into permanent positions after they have completed their PhD.

So far, NGAWiss has held a number of national events aimed at drawing attention to the precarious working conditions of mid-level faculty. The first one was the founding congress of the network, which was attended by more than a hundred people from thirty-four higher education and research institutions (NGAWissb). In the run-up to the general elections in September 2017, NGAWiss used the Federal Press Conference, the key forum for media correspondents in Berlin, to present its aims and comment on the position of the main political parties on higher education. In November 2017, the network, together with the GEW, organised a one-day workshop in Berlin on decent work in academia. NGAWiss members also used the event to join forces with other academic labour activists and paid a visit to the bi-annual conference of presidents of higher education institutions, which took place at the same time in nearby Potsdam. Twenty-three activists, some of whom were carrying banners, gathered in front of the conference venue to protest and distribute flyers. They then entered negotiations with the conference president, who agreed that they could address the conference plenary for five minutes. Inside the venue, a representative of NGAWiss read out a short speech detailing the demands of the network; upon leaving, the activists chanted a slogan:"Who is doing the work? We are, we are, we are."[8]

NGAWiss is a young initiative. So far, its most important achievement has been to facilitate a conversation between activists at the national level, and to ensure that there has been some media coverage and discussion of the precarious working conditions of mid-level faculty.

[8] This information comes from two activists who are members of the NGAWiss steering committee and were present at the protest. I conducted an unstructured interview with them in Berlin in December 2017.

Furthermore, the network can be credited with having produced a catalogue of six clear-cut demands, which are open enough to cater for the potentially diverging needs and interests of the target group. But substantial challenges remain. Despite the fact that the relationship between GEW and NGAWiss appears to be amicable, the two organisations use competing organisational models. Whereas GEW pursues a unionisation effort and through its activities integrates academic workers into public-sector unionism and organised labour in general, NGAWiss is mainly reaching out to mid-level faculty as a status group. The two organisational models are not mutually exclusive, but the question remains of how to ensure they reinforce each other rather than divert attention from one another, and whether a status-based approach can be part of a broader agenda for change in the field of academic labour relations. After all, mid-level faculty are badly affected by precarisation, but they are by far not the only status group in higher education facing this problem.

Conclusion

There are some interesting activist interventions in the field of academic labour in Germany, but it would be premature to announce the birth of a unified movement. I see three strategic challenges that activists will have to tackle if they want to advance their cause. First, demand for academic jobs – even at the intermediate level – does not seem to be dwindling, and this is despite the fact that these jobs are precarious, and the labour market situation in the country is not totally bleak. This does not justify exposing people to precarious work, but it weakens the hand of academic workers in dealing with employers. In light of this, it seems to be imperative not to focus efforts exclusively on specific status groups such as mid-level faculty, but to build coalitions with sessional lecturers and student assistants. This would allow activists to counter the race for jobs with demands for the creation of new positions. A close cooperation between GEW and NGAWiss could go some way towards ensuring that this issue is addressed, but local initiatives will also have to find ways of collaborating across status groups.

Second, a key question remains whether to bank on a traditional model of unionisation as pursued by GEW or to create networks that do not follow a trade-union model, as NGAWiss does. Despite all efforts thus far, no large movement has emerged, and there is room for experimentation and perhaps different strategies. Undoubtedly, it is positive that there is cooperation across different activist platforms. Nevertheless, there may be competing claims and strategic choices, and the different organisations have to find ways of dealing with these differences in a constructive manner – one that does not compromise the joint project of driving back precarious work in academia.

Third, it appears obvious that fundamental change does not just

require changing working conditions, as they are enshrined in collective bargaining agreements and legal regulations, but democratising the institutions of self-administration that underpin the status quo. As long as full professors are privileged through these institutions vis-à-vis all status groups, fundamental change is hard to envisage. Consequently, the fight against precarity is also a fight for democratisation, as both GEW and NGAWiss highlight in their demands.

Obviously, the campaigns and interventions of GEW and NGAWiss are only first steps in preparing the ground for a broader movement. And to some, it may seem inconceivable that things will change fundamentally in the near future. But it is important to note that in recent years higher education in Germany has been the site of a major victory over promoters of the "entrepreneurial university" and the neo-liberalisation of higher education. In the mid-2000s, seven federal states of Germany introduced tuition fees; in 2014, Lower Saxony was the last state to abolish fees again, which means that higher education is free once more in the entire country.[9] Part and parcel of the process were several waves of student protest. Obviously, the conditions of struggle for academic workers are fundamentally different from those of students, but the example shows that there can be unexpected changes.

Works Cited

Baumgarth, B., J. Henke and P. Pasternack (2016) Inventur der Finanzierun des Hochschulsystems. Working Paper Studienförderung, no. 001. Düsseldorf: Hans Böckler Foundation.

Bundesbericht Wissenschaftlicher Nachwuchs (BuWiN) (2017) Statistische Daten und Forschungsbefunde zu Promovierenden und Promovierten in Deutschland. Bielefeld: WBV.

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) [German Research Foundation] (2012) DFG stellt „Förderatlas 2012" vor: Wettbewerb um Drittmittel als „selbstverständlicher Alltag". Available at http://www.dfg.de/service/presse/pressemitteilungen/2012/pressemitteilung_nr_24/index.html [accessed 6 December 2017].

Deutscher Hochschulverband (DHV) [German Higher Education Association] (Undated) Aufgaben und Ziele. Available at: https://www.hochschulverband.de/aufgaben-und-ziele.html# [accessed 6 December 2017].

[9] This claim needs to be qualified somewhat. Free higher education is available all over the country for students from Germany and the EU who are studying for the first time for an undergraduate or graduate degree. In some federal states, there are fees for students who study a second time, and the state of Baden-Württemberg decided in 2017 to introduce fees for international students who are not from the EU.

Deutscher Hochschulveerband (DHV) (2016) Deutscher Hochschulverband seit heute 30.000 Mitglieder stark. Press release, 5 October 2016. Available at: https://www.hochschulverband.de/pressemitteilung.html?&no_cache=1&tx_ttnews[tt_news]=245&cHash=a2b9c0357f5eac3191a632eab1dde877# [accessed 6 December 2017].

Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft (GEW) [Education and Science Workers' Union] (2011) Templin Manifesto. Available at: https://www.gew.de/index.php?eID=dumpFile&t=f&f=23382&token=bcefe9e3c357fb74eec9e8fee9492dde766c8fd6&sdownload=&n=Templin_Manifesto.pdf [accessed 6 December 2017].

Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft (GEW) (2012) Herrschinger Kodex. Available at: https://www.gew.de/index.php?eID=dumpFile&t=f&f=23364&token=eb34f9f476def2bb0331c8045ce6b6583fcb59a6&sdownload=&n=Bro_Hersch_Kodex_web.pdf [accessed 6 December 2017].

Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft (GEW) (2013) Köpenicker Appell. Available at: https://www.gew.de/index.php?eID=dumpFile&t=f&f=23374&token=959f158f2c648d7bd5b9aa6e79fbfea3e89d7c67&sdownload=&n=Koepenicker_Appell_neu.pdf [accessed 6 December 2017].

Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft (GEW) (2016) Wissenschaftszeitvertragsgesetz. Available at: https://www.gew.de/wissenschaft/wissenschaftszeitvertragsgesetz [accessed 6 December 2017].

Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft (GEW) (2017a) Gender-IST-Analyse: Analyse zur Partizipation von Männern und Frauen in der GEW. Frankfurt: GEW.

Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft (GEW) (2017b) Wissenschaft als Beruf: Personal- und Karrierestruktur an Universitäten. Available at:https://www.gew.de/fileadmin/media/publikationen/hv/Hochschule_und_Forschung/Beschluesse_Gewerkschaftstag/GEW_Personal-Karriere_148x148_2017-web.pdf [accessed 21 January 2017].

Grottian, P. (2016) Lehrbeauftragte arbeiten oft für drei Euro pro Stunde. Der Tagesspiegel, 6 December. Available at: http://www.tagesspiegel.de/wissen/prekaere-beschaeftigung-in-der-wissenschaft-lehrbeauftragte-arbeiten-oft-fuer-drei-euro-pro-stunde/12923226.html [accessed 11 December 2015].

Lange-Vester, A. and C. Teiwes-Kügler (2017) Habitus und milieuspezifische Strategien: Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiter_innen unter prekären Beschäftigungsbedingungen. Berliner Debatte Initial, 28(1): 122–132.

Netzwerk für Gute Arbeit in der Wissenschaft (NGAWiss) [Network for Decent Work in Academia] (Undated) Selbstverständnis. Available at: http://mittelbau.net/selbstverstaendnis-2 [accessed 6 December 2017].

Netzwerk für Gute Arbeit in der Wissenschaft (NGAWiss) (2017a) Für faire Beschäftigung an deutschen Hochschulen!: Forderungen des Netzwerks für Gute Arbeit in der Wissenschaft. Available at: http://mittelbau.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/51/2017/09/Forderungen_NGAWiss._31.8pdf.pdf [accessed 6 December 2017].

Netzwerk für Gute Arbeit in der Wissenschaft (NGAWiss) (2017b) Mittelbautagung. Press release, 21 January. Available at: http://mittelbau.net/mittelbautagung [accessed 6 December 2017].

Oberg, L. (2014) Situation der Lehrbeauftragten an den Berliner Hochschulen, kleine Anfrage und Antwort. Abgeordnetenhaus Berlin, 27 January. Available at: http://www.fu-mittelbau.de/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/KL_Anfrage_17-12848_LB_140210.pdf [accessed 11 December 2017].

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2015) Talente im Ausland: Ein Bericht über deutsche Auswanderer. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Scholz, A.L. (2016) 100.000 Lehrbeauftragte, 50.000 Professoren. Zeit Campus. Available at: http://www.zeit.de/2016/33/hochschulen-professoren-gehalt-lehrbeauftragte-vorlesungen-seminare [accessed 6 December 2017].

Schürmann, R. (2017) Karrierewunsch trifft Realität: Aufstiegslogiken von Frauen und Männern im akademischen Wissenschaftssystem. Berliner Debatte Initial, 28(1): 133–145.

Ullrich, P. (2016) Prekäre Wissensarbeit im akademischen Kapitalismus. Soziologie, 45(4): 388–411.

Van Dyk, S. and T. Reitz (2016a) Projektförmige Polis und akademische Prekarität im universitären Feudalsystem (Teil 1). Sozblog. Available at: http://soziologie.de/blog/2016/06/projektfoermige-polis-und-refeudalisierung [accessed 6 December 2017].

Van Dyk, S. and T. Reitz (2016b) Projektförmige Polis und akademische Prekarität im universitären Feudalsystem (Teil 2). Sozblog. Available at: http://soziologie.de/blog/2016/06/projektfoermige-polis-und-refeudalisierung-teil-2 [accessed 6 December 2017].

Von Gross, F. (2017) Unikarriere oder Kinderwunsch. Die Zeit, 17 March. Available at: http://www.zeit.de/karriere/beruf/2017-03/wissenschaft-vereinbarkeit-familie-beruf-frauen [accessed 21 January 2018].

Instructor Impermanence and the Need for Community College Adjunct Faculty Reform in Colorado

Stephen Mumme
Colorado State University

with Marki LeCompte, Caprice Lawless, Myron Hulen, Don Eron, William Timpson & Nathaniel Bork

The open-access Colorado Community College System (CCCS) serves138,000 students annually and functions as Colorado's gateway to post-secondary education and college success. In 2016 the CCCS reported awarding a total of 11,560 CTE certificates and degrees from its 13 member colleges (CCCS, Fact Sheet. For the 2015 calendar year, CCCS reported that 11, 049 of its students transferred to public and private 4-year institutes (CCCS, Fact Sheet). CCCS member institutions also served 22,117 high school students in undergraduate coursework, facilitating their advancement to post-secondary education (CCCS, Fact Sheet). CCCS colleges also served 24,370 students with some form of remedial education designed to prepare them for college-level coursework (CCCS, Fact Sheet). There is no dispute that CCCS colleges provide an essential post-secondary springboard to success in the state of Colorado. Nor can there be any dispute that CCCS has a substantial beneficial impact on the Colorado economy, contributing 5.8 billion USD annually to the state's economy (CCCS, Fact Sheet).

Yet there is a dark side to CCCS service and success. While enrollments and instructional demands on the System have grown steadily over the past decade, investments in instructional personnel have not.

Stpehen Mumme is Professor of Political Science at Colorado State University and Co-President of the American Association of University Professors' Colorado Conference.

The System's regular instructional staff, the key to its existence and performance, has grown modestly, while reliance on part-time staff, adjunct instructors, has spiked (see Table 1). Since 2007 CCCS institutions have added 169 full-time instructors, a 17% increase, while during the same period they added 1425 adjuncts, a 44% increase—most of this growth has occurred since 2014. Adjunct instructors now number more than 4600 individuals, constituting 80 % of CCCS's instructional workforce.

Table 1. CCCS Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty, 2007 and 2015

CCCS Faculty	2007	2017	Percent Increase
• Full-Time	983	1152	17%
• Adjunct	3242	4667	44%
Total Faculty	4226	5819	
Adjuncts as percent of total faculty	.767	.802	

Source: AAUP CORA request to CCCS, 2017.

This clear shift to adjunct-based instruction follows national trends in college and university instructional employment over the past couple decades. It is evident at Colorado's 4-years institutions as well. Essentially, enrollment growth in higher education has been sustained and supported with temporary instructors.

Until recently, little attention has been paid to the circumstances attendant to this instructional shift, a marked shift towards greater instructor impermanence. CCCS, like many of its peers, justified this change as driven by financial necessity, evident in declining state per-capita student support and growing public demands on its resources. As community colleges have historically relied on temporary instructors to a greater extent than 4-year institutions, the temptation to address new challenges by markedly expanding the adjunct workforce is obvious (O'Banion). Adjunct instructors worked for less—less wages, less benefits, and less support. Adjunct instructors worked at-will, allowing administrators maximum personnel flexibility in serving variable student demand for instructional services. Lost in the personnel calculus was an appreciation of the professional, academic, mentoring, and advisory values that regular, stable, full-time faculty bring to student learning and career development.

The Colorado Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has been concerned with this problem for better than a decade (Hudson). The current disinvestment in full-time instructional staff has serious unintended effects that are particularly consequential in terms of diminished learning outcomes for students, and the institutional ability to meet the public's reasonable expectations that a

community college degree is every bit as worthy as one conferred by a 4-year public college or university (Humphreys). The effects have not been as yet adequately studied and understood but can be logically extrapolated from what we know about student learning. The only viable solution for mitigating these adverse effects is strengthening investment in regular and adjunct faculty, restoring professionalism in instructional delivery, and ensuring that a strong pool of highly qualified, institutionally committed faculty are available and invested over the long-term in advancing student success at each CCCS campus.

Data and Interpretation

While there is some reason to suppose that CCCS collects and retains more detailed data on adjunct instruction, little of this, aside from annual reports on number of adjunct instructors employed at particular institutions, is made publicly available. Comparative data on adjunct instruction at all levels of Colorado's public higher education system is likewise unreported and generally unavailable—nor is such information to be had from the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE). We have been unable to find any information examining the impact of adjunct instruction on learning outcomes in Colorado. In the following report it has been necessary to rely heavily on the observations of individual faculty respondents at Colorado's higher education institutions. Despite this substantial reliance on anecdotal observation, we argue that the effects of instructor impermanence can be logically extrapolated from what we know about student learning based on the accumulating evidence of the differential impact of adjunct versus regular and tenure-track faculty that is now available in the scholarly literature on student learning outcomes in higher education.

The Problem of Instructor Impermanence

The colleges that comprise the CCC System are not unique in placing a good deal of the instruction load on adjunct faculty. The practice is nearly as old as the modern (post-World War II) community college system in America. It is no secret that America's community colleges emerged and rapidly grew after 1945 in the interstice between K-12 and 4-year institutions in an effort to provide affordable, locally accessible post-secondary training for a rapidly expanding national workforce (Cohen, et al.). The community college education model that emerged was predicated on the assumption that much, if not most, of the student clientele needed vocational training for in-demand careers, allowing seamless transition to the workforce—just a fraction of these students would seek an Associate of Arts degree for the purpose of transferring to 4-year universities (Cohen, et al.)

By the 1970's this assumption was put to the test as larger numbers of community college students sought 4-year degrees. Today, as evident in presidential pronouncements (Smith), the community college role as a launching pad to 4-year college degrees is more pronounced than ever.[1] This development has fundamentally altered the original occupational/vocational model for faculty employment, one where a typical faculty member might be regularly employed in some vocation while teaching a clinical course at the community college. Today, professionally trained humanities, social scientists, and STEM disciplines faculty are needed and hired part-time without any reasonable capability of alternative employment during the instructional period.[2]

If Colorado's community colleges are to launch students towards 4-year degrees, a foundational axiom of Colorado's General Transfer Pathways protocol (GT-Pathways), then the issue of instructional impermanence acquires greater importance. The governing assumption here is that a passing grade in a GT-Pathways course is directly equivalent to a passing grade in an equivalent course offered at a 4-year institution. Performance is assumed to be transitive, of equivalent quality. But is it?

Consider the circumstances (see Table 2). We know that CCCS's urban colleges have rapidly grown their adjunct workforce since 2010, and that these adjunct faculty are at-will employees. Although CCCS makes no data on adjunct faculty turnover available (and it is not clear if this data is collected), anecdotal information available to AAUP suggests there is a high rate of instructional turnover in GT-Pathways courses. Multi-year contracts, even relatively short-term contracts of 1-3 years, are simply unavailable to adjunct faculty. While some highly committed adjunct faculty have sought to make careers of college teaching in the face of the high uncertainty and risk of non-renewal, there is absolutely no institutional incentive baked into the present system of adjunct faculty employment to do so. Thus, with few exceptions, GT-Pathways courses across the board suffer from instructional impermanence (Humphreys). The same cannot be said of GT-Pathways courses at 4-year institutions

---

[1] The ability of community colleges to actually serve this transfer function successfully is a matter for debate. The most thorough study to-date found that bachelor's degree attainment by community colleges transfer students lagged significantly behind those students who entered a 4-year institution as freshmen. This can be taken as evidence that community colleges should attend to the quality of their programs and not just access, retention, and graduation rates. See, Alfonso (873-903).

[2] It is true that some instructional faculty teach classes after normal working hours or on weekends. But the majority of CCCS curriculum is offered during the 8am-5pm working day, Monday-Friday. These instructors have no real option of alternative work and, if working a 3 to 4 course load, have little time available for alternative work even if an alternative employment was available.

which rely less heavily on adjunct faculty instruction and, even at the adjunct faculty level, provide greater incentives in the form of wages, professional supports, and the availability of multi-year contracts (up to 3 years under state law) to career oriented adjuncts (see Table 2).

Table 2. Instructional Conditions in 4-year and Community Colleges

Condition	4-Year College or University	Community College
Instructor Credentials	Ph.D./M.F.A./M.A.; greater likelihood instructor is research active in field and institutionally incentivized to do so.	M.A./M.F.A. dominant; little likelihood and no institutional incentive to be research active in field (though some are).
Instructional Autonomy (design of syllabus; assignments; material requirements)	Considerable autonomy (not counting GTAs)*	Little autonomy for adjunct instructors (Syllabi and often instructional strategies imposed and predetermined; texts predetermined; materials predetermined)
Professional Office Availability for Faculty	Available (usually including adjunct faculty)	Provide for regular faculty; rarely available to adjuncts
Adjunct Faculty Mentoring Opportunities for Students	Variable but more likely to occur given other supports	Generally low owing to absence of other supports, including office space
Professional Development	PD supports widely available for regular faculty and some support for adjuncts	Some support for regular faculty but little to no PD support for adjuncts
Access to Computers and Copiers	Provided to regular faculty and usually available for adjunct faculty	Provided to regular faculty but often unavailable for adjunct faculty
Adjunct access to college information and data streams	Variable but generally high	Variable but generally low

*Graduate Teaching Assistants

The prevalence of instructor impermanence in the CCC System is reinforced by the lack of incentives for improved instruction and mentoring presently available for adjunct faculty. All elements of the adjunct instructional experience are conducive to instructor turnover and transience. With modest exceptions, adjunct instructors at CCCS colleges

are denied regular office space, lack private space to counsel students, dedicated access to computers and office supplies, and professional development opportunities, are docked pay for health related and professional development related absence from the classroom, and are seldom credited for mentoring or for extracurricular investments in student success.[3] These realities limit the capacity for adjunct faculty to meet with, provide instructional feedback, or otherwise counsel students concerning academic performance, academic opportunities, and career options that are vital to student success.[4] While some of these services are provided by professional counseling offices at CCCS institutions, these are no real substitute for effective faculty-student engagement in and out of the classroom (Kezar & Maxey).[5] Experienced instructors are essential and non-substitutable for providing scholarly guidance and feedback on student learning and mastery of course materials. They are considerably more likely than generic counselors to know of innovative learning techniques, of developments in their disciplines, and useful knowledge about networks and resources students can avail themselves of to boost their performance and success in a particular course. These supports are of particular help to GT-Pathways students whose aim is to transfer to a 4-year institution. While counselors may explain admissions requirements, skilled instructors will understand and explain the practices, expectations, and challenges facing students in specific disciplines and areas of instruction and may provide letters of recommendation and specific contacts for accessing programs that students can obtain nowhere else. The key, of course, is enabling adjunct faculty instructors to perform these roles and tasks.

A further stimulus to instructor impermanence is found in the treatment of adjunct instructors who may find themselves in professional disagreement or circumstantial conflict with college administrators. All adjunct instructors in Colorado public colleges and universities are vulnerable here, but the worst cases are found in the CCC System. The System's encouragement of top down, hierarchical, and standardized approaches to pedagogy, approaches that limit instructor discretion in the development and application of course syllabi and instructional techniques, violate many of the assumptions associated with notions of pedagogical autonomy and academic freedom in American higher education. They also contrast with prevailing practices in 4-year

[3] Select interviews with adjunct faculty members at Front Range Community College, Community College of Aurora, Red Rocks Community College, and the Community College of Denver.

[4] Various studies document the adverse impact of such deficits on adjunct instructor performance (Kezar & Gerke; Kezar, 586).

[5] This is particularly true for minority students and students of color. See, Kezar & Maxey (29-42).

institutions where greater instructor autonomy is allowed, and even encouraged, for its essential value in advancing academic freedom and the development of human knowledge. While these strictures are rationalized by administrators in part as providing quality assurance and facilitating a seamless GT Pathways student transition to 4-year institutions, they also generate reasonable and professionally grounded differences among instructors regarding the best practices for instructional methods and implementation. Adjunct instructors face dismissal or non-renewal for expressing concerns about these matters and have little recourse to grievance procedures, dispute settlement, or other means of resolving differences. Such a situation recently led to an AAUP censure of the Community College of Aurora for abruptly dismissing a well-regarded adjunct instructor (AAUP, Academic Freedom). Such instances draw adverse publicity and are demoralizing, especially for adjunct instructors who have good reason to believe they are treated with indifference and a general lack of respect for their professional views and concerns. These conflicts also draw attention to the difference between cookie cutter pedagogical approaches and the independent pedagogical approaches and higher expectations of mastery of a given subject that tend to prevail in 4-year institutions. Such lock-step pedagogy can be a potential roadblock to successful transition from community college instruction to instruction in the 4-year institutions.

In sum, instructor impermanence, a pedagogical environment dominated by the high turnover and transience of adjunct faculty instructors, is an undeniable long-term problem and one that has thus traveled far under the radar screen of CCCS priorities. In addition, the working conditions under which adjuncts labor are not conducive to high quality teaching and learning. Any argument that today's CCCS GT-Pathways instruction is as reliable and robust as same-course offerings at 4-year colleges has the burden of proving that instructor impermanence is no matter of serious concern when the goal is, and should be, improving the reliability of transfer student success to 4-year institutions. It simply makes sense for CCCS to seek measures that reduce instructor impermanence as a barrier to student success—and, by extension, the overall success of CCCS contributions to the GT-Pathways program.

Institutional Conditions Sustaining Instructional Impermanence

The AAUP is well aware that CCCS has resisted actions to improve the conditions of adjunct faculty employment. CCCS has justified its position on the basis of financial resource limitations, coupled with a reluctance to raise student tuition to cover the projected cost of boosting adjunct faculty compensation and/or investing additional resources in adjunct faculty instruction. While we have previously demonstrated (Fichtenbaum), and continue to believe, that CCCS has the capacity to address many of these issues through a modest reordering of priorities, we also understand the Board's aversion to increasing its exposure to financial risk considering

its long history of prudent financial management. The financial stability of the current outmoded business model is only achieved by slighting the instructional mission. This makes no real sense, cannot be a source of pride and commendation for CCCS as an institution, and is not likely to contribute to gains in GT-Pathways student transfer success over the long run.

The CCCS Board and administration, at least tacitly, acknowledge that adjunct instructors deserve better treatment, although to date, they have yet to acknowledge that instructor impermanence may compromise certain aspects of the community college instructional program. In November 2014, a task force convened by CCCS released 10 recommendations intended "to achieve the goals of improving the experience of adjunct instructors and effecting change to a culture of great inclusion and support across all CCCS colleges" (SBCCOE, Topic). In February 2015, the Board accepted 8 of the 10 recommendations but not the need for a substantial rise in compensation (SBCCOE, Topic). Subsequently, in November 2015, the CCCS President reported on system-wide implementation of these recommendations (CCCS, CCCS Adjunct Task Force Recommendations). Unfortunately, as AAUP documented in February 2016 (AAUP Chapters), not much had changed in regard to the working conditions for the 80% of CCCS faculty who are adjuncts. This is especially true in regard to pay and benefit equity,[6] shared governance, academic freedom, and professional development opportunities. It is hard to avoid concluding that the administration's efforts were little more than public relations aimed at staunching public criticism and deflecting attention from the serious structural problems associated with instructor impermanence. For the record, little has been done to strengthen the conditions of adjunct instruction since the 2015 initiative.

As the AAUP had previously reported, and as we have mentioned above, the conditions of adjunct instructional service that sustain instructor

[6] For example, though the CCCS Adjunct Task Force recommended a 28% increase to adjunct compensation, adjuncts received just a 3% raise in 2016. Since then, adjuncts have received another 3% raise. The problem here is that this rate of increase does not keep pace even with inflation. A hypothetical example will suffice to illustrate this point. If average adjunct compensation was $2,500.00 per course in 2010, that same course should today be compensated at $2844.00 in 2017 just to keep pace with inflation, according to the Department of Labor's CPI Inflation Calculator (U.S. DOL). Even with two consecutive 3% raises since 2010 totaling $150.00, the per-course compensation fell $194.00 short of matching inflation. While there may have been other raises since 2010 that we are not aware of, this simple exercise suggests that CCCS adjunct pay increases are not, in fact, increases. At best they may have kept adjunct pay current to inflation, at worst adjunct compensation is steadily declining.

and instructional impermanence fall into several distinct categories, including: 1) wages and benefits; 2) pedagogical and professional supports; 3) due process deficits; and 4) shared governance deficits.

Wages and benefits

Remuneration rates for CCCS adjuncts vary some from discipline to discipline, and across colleges, but remain almost uniformly low, averaging roughly $2500 per class,[7] or around $20,000 annually for instructors teaching four classes a semester for two consecutive semesters.[8] This is just half the level of remuneration for adjuncts teaching at leading 4-year institutions, which, if we take Colorado State University as a point of comparison, pays $4600+ per class to adjunct instructors, or $36,800 annually for a four class load over two consecutive semesters (see Table 3).[9] The low rate of CCCS adjunct compensation is an obvious disincentive to instructor retention, falling well below any reasonable "living wage" minimum floor.[10] CCCS administrators have long argued that adjunct wages are meant to be supplementary wages and not the basis for full-time employment. As we have argued above, this argument is disingenuous. Taken at face value, it is nothing less than an argument for instructional impermanence. CCCS institutions continue to benefit from a roster of adjunct instructors who have sought to cobble together a living by teaching a full roster of classes each semester. This practice is tacitly encouraged by CCCS administrators who implicitly understand that a reliable corps of experienced, professionally motivated instructors committed to their institutions for a longer term is, in fact, a highly

---

[7] The $2500.00 figure for per course compensation is roughly the median of the three steps for instructor compensation per credit hour at Front Range Community College in 2017-2018. We use the FRCC data as a proxy for adjunct faculty compensation at CCCS colleges even though it may overstate actual compensation at various other institutions (FRCC, 13, *Compensation*).

[8] A four course per semester teaching load is usually regarded as a normal teaching load for college faculty who have no other research, administrative, or advisory responsibilities.

[9] Colorado State University President Anthony Frank has publicly stated that a full-time adjunct instructional load should warrant no less that a wage of $40,000 annually, with benefits, and ability to participate in university governance. Frank addressed the importance of adjunct instructors in his 2013 presidential address (Frank).

[10] At $15.00 an hour, the 2015 annual compensation level thought to allow a single individual a minimum living wage as a nation-wide average, would total $31, 200 USD. Calculated and adjusted for Colorado the 2016 living wage is less, at roughly $12 dollars an hour, or $24, 584.00 annually for a single individual. It bears noting that many CCCS adjuncts support at least one child, which in Colorado, in 2016, required $53,452.00 annually as an adequate wage minimum. See, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).

desirable instructional foundation that complements the limited number of full-time instructors. Actual practice, then, points to administrative acknowledgement that full-time or near full-time adjunct employment is a desirable basis for curriculum delivery. Were this not so, administrators could have placed a draconian cap on the number of courses any instructor could teach and a cap on the number of semesters they could teach those courses. That they have not done so may be taken as administrative acknowledgement of the need for a reliable corps of adjunct instructors, particularly those tasked with delivering GT-Pathways courses.[11]

Table 3. Adjunct Faculty Compensation Rates at Leading Colorado Colleges and Universities*

Institution	Per course average compensation	Per semester compensation based on 4 course load per semester	Annual compensation (2 semester full-time, 4-course load)
Denver University	$4000.00-$6000.00	$16,000.00-$24,000.00	$32,000.00-$48,000.00
U. Colorado-Boulder	$4,500.00	$18,000.00	$36,000.00
U. Colorado, Colorado Springs	$2,700.00-$5,000.00	$10,800.00-$20,000.00	$21,600.00-$40,000.00
U. Northern Colorado	$3153.00-$3,783.00	$12,612.00-$15,132.00	$25,224.00-$30,264.00
Mesa State U.	$3,126.00-$3,501.00	$12,504.00-$14,004.00	$25,008.00-$28,008.00
CSU-Pueblo	$3000.00	$15,000.00	$30,000.00
CSU-Ft. Collins	$4,800.00+	$19,200.00+	$38.400.00+
Colorado School of Mines	$5000.00-$8,000.00	$20,000.00-$32,000.00	$40,000.00-$64,000.00

Sources: Information provided by AAUP member faculty at each of the mentioned institutions (See Appendix 2 for list of names).
*Before tax.

[11] In fact, after federal enactment of the Affordable Care Act in 2010 some CCCS colleges did cap the total course-loads available to adjuncts, and eliminated office hour requirements, precisely to avoid the 30 hour a week threshold obligating institutions to pay health benefits to adjunct instructors.

Pedagogy and Professional Supports

Reflecting common practice nationwide, colleges within the CCC System have set pedagogical standards for instruction of particular subjects that are consistent with disciplinary expectations. Likewise, full-time faculty, usually consulting with unit heads, have normally selected textbooks and certain instructional materials to be used by faculty (including adjuncts) in teaching specific subjects. The GT-Pathways protocol, in fact, assumes that a certain baseline of knowledge and skills will be sustained in particular subject areas by faculty at all Colorado higher education institutions (CCHE).

Such practices are accepted as reasonable conditions for pedagogy of certain introductory subject matter by the AAUP, subject to the caveat that all faculty, including adjuncts, should enjoy the freedom to teach and present the materials they are professionally qualified to teach (AAUP, The Freedom). However, they are not without complication. Adhering to them means that faculty must have a good deal of input into the design of syllabi, assignments, and all elements of the evaluation process. Unfortunately, some CCCS colleges are now asserting ever greater control over syllabi design and assignments, particularly in GT-Pathways courses, in an effort to improve retention, graded achievement, and graduation rates.[12] These efforts have included reducing the number of assignments and assessments required and enforcing rules about the percentage of students who must pass the course. While this has been done with the support of the affected full-time faculty, and appears to be in technical compliance with the letter of the GT-Pathways protocol, there is some risk that the quality of student success may be compromised, burdening 4-year institutions with transfer students unprepared for rigorous instruction at this level (Alfonso). This greater administrative intrusion into faculty authority for syllabi construction and pedagogy, in violation of long-standing assumptions concerning the freedom to teach, is a matter of growing concern at the AAUP.

That CCCS adjunct faculty labor with fewer professional supports than their full-time faculty colleagues is well known. These conditions have arguably improved in recent years but continue to lag behind those enjoyed by adjunct instructors in 4-year institutions. Teaching faculty (full-time or adjunct) require certain facilities for effective professional performance. These facilities include reliable access to office space, meeting areas, computers and WIFI, printers, telephones, office supplies, and secretarial assistance. Unfortunately, adjunct faculty state-wide have variable access to these resources, and CCCS adjuncts appear among the worst off. An informal canvas of adjunct faculty at various CCCS

[12] This initiative is called "Gateway to Success" at the Community College of Aurora (Prendergast). At Pueblo Community College it goes by the label "Gateway to College" (Pueblo CC).

campuses suggests that office space, when provided, consists only of a single shared or common office with a variable number of non-dedicated computers, printers, and telephones available on a first-come, first-served basis. Such facilities are sub-optimal at best. Adjunct faculty are compelled to queue and compete with each other for space. Space for student-faculty consultation is entirely public[13], non-conducive to discussing grades, programs of study, and other U.S. FERPA (1974) protected subject matter with students. There is little space available for quiet preparation or reflection on pedagogical matters beyond libraries and student centers. Lacking office telephones, CCCS adjuncts effectively subsidize the colleges they serve by using personal cellphones rather than dedicated land lines.

Adjunct faculty serving CCCS colleges also lack access to professional development opportunities. We should note that certain institutionally necessary learning activities, such as attending workshops on how to fill out CCCS paperwork, learning how to evacuate a classroom in response to a shooter or respond to a tornado drill, learning to use Excel software, and learning the online grading system, etc., do not qualify as professional development. These are requisite administrative skills unrelated to a faculty member's professional expertise or pedagogy. They are, however, often the only "professional development" provided.

Professional development encompasses faculty learning and research opportunities that enable teachers and researchers to remain abreast of developments in their scholarly fields, acquire new pedagogical skills, familiarize themselves with new instructional technologies, and advance their own research and scholarship in professional societies. This is an area where adjunct faculty at most 4-year institutions have at least some opportunities in the form of travel funds, compensated absence for participation in unit approved professional conferences or symposia, and access to unit compensated learning activities. But few such opportunities are extended to CCCS adjuncts. At least one CCCS college hosts a "Teaching with Technology" day-long in-service training event at one of its several campuses, but reports from adjunct faculty suggest minimal incentives are given for participation (FRCC, Teaching with Technology).[14] Other colleges host short in-service events but offer no compensation or financial supports for participating. In fact, the opposite appears to be true: adjunct faculty, if missing class to take advantage of

[13] Public space should be understood to include hallways, coffee shops, library rooms, or even the adjunct's motor vehicle, -- a circumstance which may be hazardous.

[14] There is an individual Teaching with Technology Award given annually to a faculty member that makes no distinction between regular and adjunct faculty (FRCC, Teaching with Technology).

such events, have their wages docked on a pro-rated basis for time lost to in-class instruction. This is certainly a disincentive to adjunct faculty professional development and suggests that CCCS accepts little responsibility for insuring that adjunct faculty, even long-serving adjunct faculty, have the knowledge and resources they need to stay current and succeed in their chosen professional fields. When adjunct faculty account for more than 80% of all instruction in the System, students are arguably disserved by this indifference to the professional needs of adjunct instructional staff.

Due Process Deficit

Effective due process is an essential condition of academic freedom and a valuable tool for resolving disputes in academic settings. The CCC System sustains a due process mechanism for resolving disputes between administrators and full-time faculty but makes no dispute resolution procedure available to adjunct faculty (SBCCOE, BP 3-20). It was this circumstance that led to an AAUP censure of the Community College of Aurora in June 2017 in the case of CCA's dismissal of Nathanial Bork (AAUP, AAUP Adds). The AAUP has long maintained that all faculty actively employed by a higher education institution, inclusive of adjuncts, must have access to due process when disputes arise that might lead to their dismissal (AAUP, Recommended Institutional Regulations). Mr. Bork's dismissal in mid-semester, while he was on payroll, was a clear violation of AAUP's longstanding institutional recommendations bearing on dispute settlement.

Because they lack due process protections, adjunct faculty are placed in a precarious situation should pedagogical differences arise with full-time colleagues, unit heads, and/or other administrators. While in-contract dismissal is unusual, it is not unusual at all for college administrators to simply refuse to re-hire an adjunct faculty member once the semester is over or discourage their continued employment by offering them fewer classes (and corresponding reduced remuneration) than that to which they are accustomed. No cause need be provided, nor is any face-to-face discussion required for a non-renewal decision. The same circumstances that apply to a first-semester adjunct also apply to one with 15 years of nearly continuous service. It does not require much imagination to appreciate how this contractual precarity can stifle meaningful dialogue between adjunct instructors and their superiors on professional matters. The absence of meaningful due process procedures underscore and reinforce these dysfunctional circumstances. It is hard to argue that adjunct faculty enjoy academic freedom when the risk of dissent or professional disagreement is loss of a job with no recourse to dispute resolution procedures. And it is harder still to suppose that discouragement of the professional voices of an instructional group that comprises the overwhelming majority of CCCS faculty is not a substantial loss of professional expertise to CCCS' colleges.

Shared Governance Deficit

The participation of the faculty in the governance of higher education institutions in matters related to their professional expertise is widely viewed as an essential condition for the practice of academic freedom. This is the long-held view of the AAUP (Statement on Government). The CCC System appears to lack a uniform policy supporting faculty inclusion in institutional governance, though various member colleges have established procedures, including the creation of faculty senates and other advisory bodies. Adjunct faculty may be represented in these bodies, though anecdotal evidence available to the AAUP suggests these representatives are disproportionally few in number and selected by administration rather than adjunct faculty on those campuses.

Various other consultative mechanisms appear to be employed on an ad hoc basis, including administrative "listening" sessions and ad hoc committees convened by unit heads to address particular issues. These committees may or may not include adjunct faculty. The irregularity of such mechanisms, the absence of established and regularly scheduled procedures for eliciting adjunct faculty views, and the patronage-like quality of these solicitations, when coupled with the absence of any due process protection for adjunct faculty and the low compensation of these individuals, practically ensure that adjunct faculty are discouraged from any meaningful participation in shared governance at these colleges.

Pathways to Reducing Instructional Impermanence:
AAUP Recommendations to the SBCCOE

Reducing and mitigating instructor impermanence in the CCCS is, and ought to be, a matter of serious concern as the System transitions to new leadership in 2018. Efforts to establish a more stable instructional workforce can only enhance the effectiveness, quality, reliability, and ultimately, the prestige of and public confidence in the educational outputs of CCCS colleges. Importantly, such efforts will enable CCCS to fend off potential criticism of its administration of the GT-Pathways protocol. This latter concern should, in our view, weigh heavily in CCCS Board thinking about the long-term sustainability of its transfer curriculum and public confidence in that process.

As noted above, CCCS administrators have, to date, argued that fiscal constraints constrain them from investing in improvements in adjunct faculty employment conditions short of taking a few small incremental measures favoring adjunct conditions that are largely symbolic in nature—the recent $70 a course per semester wage increase for long-serving adjunct faculty being a case in point. Such claims are belied by the data. In the last five years, while the CCCS has raised administration salaries 30-50%, and its full-time faculty salaries 20%, the adjunct faculty have received each year a pay raise that averages $4.80/week. Indeed, the wages the CCCS pays its adjunct faculty have

been the subject of numerous press reports, including not only Westword, but also The Guardian, Daily Kos, Jezebel, KGNU Radio and the Boulder Daily Camera. The so-called "tiered-pay" schedule that some of the colleges have instituted reflects accurately the low estate of adjunct faculty within the CCCS System. If we take FRCC's instructor pay matrix as a proxy, according to the chart, an adjunct faculty member with more than a decade of CCCS experience (Step 3 instructor) qualifies for compensation of $86 per semester credit hour more than an entry level (Step 1) instructor with no prior experience for a net gain of $5.73 a week (FRCC, Compensation). This translates to a gain of $1032 a semester for a four course load or $68.00 a week. This Step 3 instructor makes $21,288.00 annually. Compare this to the recent 20 percent increase the full-time faculty recently received that averages $188/week (FRCC, Compensation), on top of base salaries ranging from $53,000.00-$57,000.00 annually (with benefits) (FRCC, Compensation 5), and the difference is plain enough to see. As the AAUP has documented, adjunct salaries are so low that many must rely on food stamps, food banks, and renting out rooms in their domiciles to survive (Awad).[15]

The AAUP Colorado Conference remains convinced the System can and should do more even if it not ready to embrace a single payment schedule for all CCCS faculty—which is the natural and affordable solution to instructor impermanence. Accordingly, we propose that the CCCS Board demonstrate its commitment to addressing instructor impermanence by adopting policy measures that contribute to strengthening the adjunct faculty workforce.

Wages and Benefits

- We encourage the Board to revisit the 2015 Adjunct Task Force recommendation that adjunct faculty receive a 28% increase in per-class compensation. A 28% increase to per-class, per semester compensation of $2400 equals $3072, still well below compensation rates for adjuncts at most 4-year Colorado colleges and universities.
- We also encourage the Board to encourage System colleges to favor the retention of highly qualified, long serving adjunct faculty by offering these faculty a full-time or near full-time semester course load that qualifies them for any health benefits for which they may be eligible.

[15] There is an individual Teaching with Technology Award given annually to a faculty member that makes no distinction between regular and adjunct faculty (FRCC, Teaching with Technology).

Pedagogy and Professional Supports

- Pedagogy. We encourage the Board to review the current practice at some colleges now exerting greater supervision over syllabi construction, learning objectives, and student evaluation in the interest of maintaining a high-quality curriculum. If certain "streamlining" practices, whose effect is to attenuate the rigor of classes, are adopted for some courses, separate, more exacting sections should be set aside for GT-Pathways transfer oriented students.
- Professional Supports. We encourage the Board to insist that the System's college presidents allocate additional dedicated space for adjunct use. These should include dedicated cubicle space for student consultation and mentoring. These spaces should be supplied with computers, WI-FI and internet connections, and telephone services that enable adjunct faculty to work more efficiently at less personal cost in class consultations and student advising.
- Professional Enhancement. We encourage the Board to adopt a policy that allows an adjunct faculty member teaching at least a half-time load for several consecutive semesters the time to attend at least one professional meeting related to their professional competence at year, missing a maximum of two consecutive class sessions per class, without having their wages docked for absence if substitute arrangements are made for class coverage.
- Professional Enhancement. The Board should encourage each college to establish a competitive fund for professional development dedicated to adjunct faculty instruction.

Due Process

- Dispute Resolution. The Board should consider adopting a common published policy for dispute resolution that at minimum extends to in-contract adjunct faculty. We also believe that any adjunct faculty who served three or more terms within a span of three years should be entitled to a written explanation for any discontinuance, sufficient advance notice of discontinuance, and an opportunity to have that decision reviewed by a dispute resolution panel.

Shared Governance

- Common Faculty Handbook. It is time the Board addressed the need for a common faculty handbook, or set of core handbook requirements that can be adapted to individuals colleges, that addresses the need for inclusion of adjunct faculty in college

governance (see justification and key elements in Appendix 1 below).

Works Cited

AAUP. "The Freedom to Teach." Nov. 2013. www.aaup.org/report/freedom-to-teach.

AAUP. "Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure." *AAUP Redbook*, 11th ed., Johns Hopkins, 2015, pp. 79-90. https://www.aaup.org/report/recommended-institutional-regulations-academic-freedom-and-tenure.

--. "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, April 1967." *AAUP Redbook*, 11th ed., 2015, Johns Hopkins, pp. 117-122. https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities.

--. "Academic Freedom and Tenure: Community College of Aurora (Colorado)." March 2017, https://www.aaup.org/report/cca-colorado.

--. "AAUP Adds 2 Institutions, Removes 2 From Censure List." 19 June 2017, https://www.aaup.org/content/aaup-adds-2-institutions-removes-2-censure-list.

AAUP Chapters of the CCCS. "Response to CCCS Adjunct Instructor Task Force Recommendations and Their Implementation." AAUP Colorado Conference, 10 Feb. 2016.

--. "CCCS Salary and Wage Information," AAUP Colorado Conference, https://sites.google.com/site/coloradoadjunctswiki/home/cccs-salary-chart-2012.

Alfonso, Mariana. "The Impact of Community College Attendance on Baccalaureate Attainment." *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 47, Dec. 2006, pp. 873-903.

Awad, Anne. "Colorado's Part-Time Professors Brace for Another Year with No Raise." *Morning Edition*, KUNC Radio, 28 Feb. 2017, http://www.kunc.org/post/colorados-part-time-professors-brace-another-year-no-raise#stream/0.

Cohen, Arthur M., et. al. *The American Community College*. 6th ed., Jossey-Bass, 2014.

Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE). "Required Course Syllabi Language: GT Pathways and System." 2016, https://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/.

Colorado Community College System (CCCS). "Adjunct Instructor Task Force." Nov. 2014.

--. "CCCS Adjunct Task Force Recommendations Actions Report. Work Session I.I." Nov. 2015. Stephen Mumme's personal copy, available on request.

--. "Fact Sheet." 2017, https://www.cccs.edu/about-cccs/cccs-colleges/.

Fichtenbaum, Rudy. "National AAUP President Rudy Fichtenbaum Testifies before the Colorado Legislature on Behalf of HB14-1154." AAUP Colorado Conference, 16 Feb. 2014, https://aaupcolorado.org/2014/02/16/national-aaup-president-rudy-fichtenbaum-testifies-before-the-colorado-legaislature-on-behalf-of-hb14-1154/.

Frank, Anthony. "Presidential Address, Colorado State University." *You Tube*, 2013, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h0Jt5JjJRTg.

Front Range Community College (FRCC). *Compensation Handbook*, 2017, pp. 5-13.

--. "Teaching with Technology Internal Service Award descriptions refers to the annual Teaching with Technology conference." FRCC, 2017, http://akela.frontrange.edu/frccinternalawards/.

Hudson, Suzanne. "Proposal for a Unified Faculty at Colorado's Community Colleges." *AAUP Colorado White Paper*. AAUP Colorado Conference, 18 July 2015.

Humphreys, Debra. "What's Wrong with the Completion Agenda and What We Can Do About it." *Liberal Education*, vol.98, no. 1, Winter 2012, https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/whats-wrong-completion-agenda%E2%80%94and-what-we-can-do-about-it.

Kezar, Adrianna. "Examining Non-Tenure Track Faculty Perceptions of How Departmental Policies and Practices Shape Their Performance and Ability to Create Student Learning at Four Year Institutions." *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 54, no.5, 2013, p. 586.

Kezar, Adrianna & Don Maxey. "Faculty Matter: So why doesn't everyone think so?" *Thought and Action*, Fall 2014, pp. 29-42.

Kezar, Adrianna and Sean Gerhke. "Creating a High-Quality Place to Teach, Learn, and Work." *Peer Review* (American Association of Colleges & Universities), vol. 15, no.3, 2013. www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/creating-high-quality-place-teach-learn-and-work.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology. "Living Wage Calculator for Colorado." 2017, http://livingwage.mit.edu/states/08.

O'Banion, Terry. "The Community College Completion Agenda: Our Andy Warhol Moment." *Association of American Colleges and Universities*, The LEAP Challenge Blog, 16 April 2012, https://www.aacu.org/leap/liberal-education-nation-blog/community-college-completion-agenda-our-andy-warhol-moment.

Prendergast, Alan. "Did a community college plan to pass more students fail its teachers?" *Westword*, 1 August 2017, https://www.westword.com/news/community-college-of-aurora-may-pass-more-students-but-did-it-fail-teachers-9317325.

Pueblo Community College (PCC). "Gateway to College." http://www.pueblocc.edu/CommunityOutreach/GatewayToCollege/.

Smith, Ashley A. "Obama unveils new push for national free community college." *Inside Higher Ed*, 9 Sept. 2015, http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/09/09/obama-unveils-new-push-national-free-community-college.

State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education. *Colorado Community College System (CCCS) Adjunct Instructors Task Force Report Review*, 11 Feb. 2015.

--. "BP 3-20 – Due Process for Faculty" SBCCOE, 7 June 2002, https://www.cccs.edu/policies-and-procedures/board-policies/bp-3-20-due-process-for-faculty/.

U.S. Department of Labor. "Consumer Price Index Inflation Calculator." 2018, https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm.

U.S. Department of Education, *U.S. Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974*, 2018, https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html.

Appendix 1

We believe the CCCS should adopt a common faculty handbook applicable to its member colleges. This handbook should be adopted utilizing the follow procedures:

- It should be drafted by a committee that meaningfully represents the faculty at the institution and across CCCS. This means that, since adjuncts constitute about two-thirds of the faculty, about two-thirds of the faculty committee members should be adjuncts. It goes without saying that, in order to achieve meaningful instructor representation, instructors should be paid for their time and service on such a committee.
- Committee members should be primarily or exclusively faculty. The administration, we are sure, will revise or add to the document the committee drafts; however, we feel it is essential for representative faculty members to play a lead role in drafting the document. Changes the administration makes should be made fully available to all faculty, preferably in an email or public notice summarizing all such changes.
- The handbook should be adopted in a secret vote by all faculty members at the institution, which is conducted by an online, third-party vendor. If the faculty do not vote in favor of the handbook, modifications should be made to the document addressing the concerns of the faculty. The handbook that is finally adopted should be one which has the support of a majority of the faculty.
- To be a meaningful document, the handbook must be available to all faculty. We would recommend that it be freely available on the college's web site. As an alternative, it could be emailed to all current faculty and then emailed to new hires, preferably at the time they are offered their first classes. We do not see a need for the CCCS to pay for printing the handbook so long as an electronic version is available to all faculty.
- If changes are made to the handbook to accommodate unforeseen circumstances, the revised handbook should be emailed to all faculty along with a summary of the changes in the new document.

Creating a faculty handbook for all CCCS faculty would have the following benefits:

- It would avoid confusion among the faculty— confusion which, under the current way of doing things, is almost unavoidable, even for veteran instructors— as to what the institution's policies are and what rights and responsibilities the faculty members have.

- It would prevent inconsistencies, such as those outlined above in the discussion of Recommendation #10, between colleges in terms of how policies are implemented and how pay, support, and resources are made available to instructors.
- It would, we hope, set in place fair and consistent employment conditions for all faculty throughout the CCCS.
- It would spell out exactly what the differences are, as the CCCS sees them, between instructors and other faculty, again avoiding confusion.
- It would mean that the rules and standards for how the administration deals with faculty, instructors in particular, would now be in writing and available to all instructors.

Appendix 2: List of AAUP Faculty Contributing Adjunct Compensation Data

Dr. Laura Connolly, Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, University Northern Colorado

Dr. Tom Acker, Sociology Department, Colorado Mesa University

Dr. Sue Doe, English Department, Colorado State University, Fort Collins

Dr. Heather Albanesi, Sociology Department, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

Dr. Aaron Schneider, Korbel School of International Studies, University of Denver

Dr. Jonathan Rees, History Department, Colorado State University, Pueblo

Dr. Suzanne Hudson, English Department. (Retired), University of Colorado, Boulder

Dr. Wendy Harrison, Interim Vice-President for Research and Technology Transfer, Colorado School of Mines

Appendix 3: AAUP Contributors to this Letter (Writers, Editors, Readers)

Tom Acker, Sociology, Colorado Mesa University

Nathanial Bork, Political Science, Colorado State University

Don Eron, Rhetoric (Retired), U. of Colorado

Raymond Hogler, Management, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins

Myron Hulen, Accounting (Retired), Colorado State University, Ft. Collins

Suzanne Hudson, English (Retired), U. of Colorado

Marki LeCompte, Education (Retired), U. of Colorado

Jonathan Rees, History, Colorado State University, Pueblo

William Timpson, Education, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins

Response #1 to AAUP Statement

Nancy McCallin, Ph.D.
President, *Colorado Community College System,* 2004-2018

The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education (SBCCOE) and the Colorado Community College System (System) value the adjunct instructors and the important role that they play. In 2014, the System administered the CCCS Adjunct Instructor Survey and commissioned the CCCS Adjunct Instructors Task Force. This Task Force was composed of adjunct instructor representatives from each urban System college and Colorado Community Colleges Online, as well as two regular faculty members, and one representative from each administrative group. In addition, in Fall 2014, Dr. Linda Bowman visited each rural institution and conducted focus groups with adjunct instructors.

The Task Force held three, day-long sessions during Summer 2014, examining key issues identified by Task Force members in their review of the survey results, literature, reports, and informal interactions. Subcommittees were formed to perform the important work of researching the issues and making recommendations to the full Task Force, which in turn made recommendations to the System President and the SBCCOE.

On November 12, 2014, the Task Force presented its findings to the SBCCOE in a formal agenda item. The Report included a Preamble and Guiding Principles, 10 recommendations with implementation strategies, and the 2014 CCCS Adjunct Instructor Survey results.

Dr. Nancy J. McCallin assumed the role of System President of the Colorado Community College System (CCCS) in October 2004. As CCCS president, Dr. McCallin led the state's largest system of higher education, which serves more than 137,000 students annually at 13 colleges with 40 campuses across the state. After 14 years of dedicated work and leadership, Dr. McCallin retired in July of 2018. Under her leadership, CCCS added 41,000 new students over the past five years – 2013 to 2018, created a constitutionally-dedicated funding stream for the state's community colleges, and shepherded legislation designed to increase affordability and access opportunities for students, especially those from underserved communities.

In January 2015, at the request of the SBCCOE, a President's Review Committee convened to consider the Task Force recommendations and provide feedback to the SBCCOE at its February 11, 2015 meeting.

As required by the SBCCOE, on November 11, 2015, the System reported on actions taken by the colleges, CCCOnline, and the overall System to meet the eight recommendations by the Task Force that were accepted by the SBCCOE.

In Spring 2016, the CCCS administered the biennial Survey of Adjunct Instructors to all adjunct instructors across the System. In order to interpret the results of the survey and compare them to the 2014 survey results, the CCCS convened a focus group representing adjunct instructors from all 13 colleges and CCCOnline, as well as one regular faculty member representing SFAC and one college president, college vice president for academic affairs, and vice president for administration and finance. On September 14, 2016, the survey and focus group results were reported to the SBCCOE.

In Spring 2018, the biennial survey of Adjunct Instructors was again administered to all System Adjunct Instructors. The results of the survey were distributed to and discussed by a focus group of adjunct instructors from the colleges, CCCOnline, two regular faculty members, a department chair, and one each of the following: college president, college vice president, college dean, and college vice president for administration and finance.

CCCS Formal Plan of Support and Inclusion

In 2014, the State Board for Community Colleges (SBCCOE/Board) and the Colorado Community College System (CCCS/System) initiated a formal plan of support and inclusion for the adjunct instructors throughout the System. Acknowledging the differences among the colleges regarding size, nature of the adjunct workforce, budgets, program and course offerings, facilities, and logistics, the SBCCOE directed the System and its colleges to implement eight recommendations made by the 2014 CCCS Adjunct Instructor Task Force.

> The "AAUP COLORADO CONFERENCE POLICY LETTER TO THE STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION (SBCCOE)" (Policy Letter) contains a combination of inaccurate data, anecdote, and opinion. The assertions that students have "diminished learning outcomes" due to the employment of adjunct instructors, and that there is a lack of professionalism in instructional delivery, is not supported by data. The systematic improvements in support for adjunct instructors, especially since the 2014 CCCS Adjunct Instructor Task Force recommendations, have been documented. The Policy Letter

inaccurately states compensation increases. The five-year cumulative increase in adjunct pay was 22.9%, compared to 12% for administrators.

Since 2014, in response to the work of the CCCS Adjunct Instructor Task Force, the colleges and System have implemented and reported on the eight action items, as accepted by the SBCCOE, that follow:

1. Provide opportunities for adjunct instructors to participate in curriculum development, department meetings, all-college meetings, and other areas of instruction as needed, such as advising. Develop compensation criteria for participation that is appropriate for each type of activity.
2. Increase access to, participation in, and compensation for professional development, including campus or System-based workshops and training, and off-campus seminars, workshops, or conferences.
3. Establish recognition and appreciation activities that reward excellence in teaching and service. Extend employee discounts, free programs, services, and other perquisites to adjunct instructors.
4. Balance enrollment management and student needs by developing strategic scheduling, class assignments, and class cancellation processes that consider the impacts on adjunct instructors in terms of course preparation and work schedules. To encourage reasonable class cancellation deadlines and scheduling practices, we recommend a policy that adjunct instructors assigned to classes that are canceled within 14 calendar days of start date be paid 10% of the total course compensation.
5. Improve support and access to resources for adjunct instructors.
6. Design adjunct instructor advancement programs with teaching, student learning, and performance evaluation components.
7. Each CCCS college should annually increase its average instructor compensation by at least the same percentage as it increases the average salary for all other employee groups.
8. Provide the first paycheck to an adjunct instructor by the first possible pay date after the adjunct instructor's class has started.

It is accurate that two Task Force recommendations were not accepted by the SBCCOE. Of the original 10 recommendations, #3, "Develop mentor programs to assist adjunct instructors in navigating the colleges' systems and procedures, share knowledge of best practice for teaching and

learning, and support adjunct instructors in undertaking new goals or challenges," was not implemented due to the recognition of two issues: many colleges do not have the personnel to establish formal mentoring systems across all departments, and many colleges have in place other processes that serve these purposes.

Original recommendation #8,"Ensure the ability of CCCS colleges and CCCOnline to attract and retain the best adjunct instructors and deliver the best education to students. Raise the adjunct instructor pay level at each college by 28% by the academic year 2016-2017, in order to create a competitive scale for adjunct instructor compensation that considers compensation levels of other Colorado institutions of higher education that offer parallel educational opportunities" was not implemented, as this would require an ongoing, not one-time, and significant source of revenue. Based upon examination, it was clear that such support would not be forthcoming from policy-makers.

In summary, and based upon the data collected via surveys and focus groups, the CCCS has made significant progress in its support for adjunct instructors and the students they serve. This continues to be a priority for the SBCCOE, the System, and college leaders.

Response #2 to AAUP Statement

Anne Wiegard
State University of New York, Cortland

As a contingent faculty member and activist, I needed no convincing that the Colorado Community College System Board should adopt the policy measures outlined in "Instructor Impermanence and the Need for Community College Adjunct Faculty Reform in Colorado." The pathway Stephen Mumme laid out for the board is the right thing to do. Indeed, I believe the gist of these measures (equitable compensation, due process rights, opportunities for advancement, and a voice in faculty governance), that in sum comprise the common ground in our academic labor movement with regard to contingent employment, should be implemented at all higher education institutions.

At the risk of appearing to sidestep these specific common sense proposals, I will comment on the subtext here — politics. I speak not as a representative of any organization, but as a veteran of the teacher wars deeply concerned about the ongoing degradation of our profession.

For eleven years I taught as an adjunct faculty member at various institutions (always more than one concurrently) in New York and California, and for the last nineteen years in a full-time, non-tenure-track position. Though I am appointed for limited terms I must reapply for, and though my wages are considerably less than those of my tenured colleagues who have been working for the same length of time, the difference between their terms and conditions and mine is far less than the difference between my adjunct colleagues' terms and conditions and my own.

Anne Wiegard (B.A. in English, Vassar College; M.A. in English Literature and M.F.A. in Poetry, George Mason University) is a full-time, non tenure-track faculty member of the English Department at SUNY Cortland and a United University Professions (AFT Local 2190) delegate. A member of UUP's Executive Board from 2013-2017, she was appointed to the AFT Higher Education Program and Policy Council in 2017. One of the founding members of the New Faculty Majority board of directors, she served as the chair of the NFM Foundation board 2011-2016. In 2017 Wiegard coordinated the national mAsk4CampusEquity (campusequity2017.com) arts based campaign.

I feel keenly the huge disparity between my own compensation and job security and those of my adjunct colleagues who perform exactly the same work as I do. I know it is the same because there is no difference between the work I did in adjunct positions and the work I do now. It's arguably the same work all teaching faculty do.

Because I feel this unjust disparity so keenly, I have done what I can to improve the status quo. I helped organize a collective bargaining unit at a community college. Within a mature local, I have served as a union delegate, task force chair, statewide officer, and as a member of two negotiating teams spanning five years of active bargaining with the State of New York. I have presented on this topic at disciplinary conferences, at COCAL conferences, and at NEA and AFT higher education conferences and conventions. I have spoken in person to local boards of trustees, to state legislators, to Congressional staffers, to a U. S. Senator and to a Cabinet Secretary. I have been part of the teams that coordinated the national Campus Equity Week campaigns in 2013, 2015, and 2017. I have researched and analyzed conditions, submitted resolutions approved by national affiliates, and written many reports, articles, and position statements. These actions have eventually accrued power that was leveraged within my local to produce positive internal change; these actions simultaneously accrued power within relevant external organizations that was leveraged to influence academic unions from the outside.

I am not the only one who has worked steadfastly and strategically for many years to persuade administrations to treat contingent faculty more equitably. I am part of a decades-old and growing army of contingent activists and allies. Despite our best efforts, change has been slow and hard to come by. For example, it has taken several cycles of collective bargaining over twenty years and concerted political pressure by my local (the largest higher education local in the U.S. with about 38,000 members), assisted by our affiliates, to finally manage to institute statewide contractual minima for adjunct faculty in our new tentative agreement signed May 24, 2018. The long-awaited minima are an historic gain; however, the dollar amounts are disappointingly and infuriatingly far less than the pro-rata amounts we had aspired to achieve. Nor were we able to secure longer terms of appointment. The precarious nature of contingent faculty is a famously hard nut for any union to crack. Faculty who are largely responsible for higher education are not being treated with the respect they deserve as the learned professionals they are. Why is progress so elusive when it's plain to see that current employment practices are not aligned with long-term institutional priorities?

No rational, educated person would disagree with the premise that frequent faculty turnover is detrimental to good student outcomes. Nor is it hard to disprove an oft heard claim that fiscal hardship prevents administrations from raising salaries, given ample evidence such as that presented in this instance as well as historically widespread instances of

extravagant, non-instructional expenditures, some scandalously ill conceived. There is no legitimate reason for not paying academic workers equitably. Why then, is it so difficult to persuade administrators to adopt reasonable reforms?

One would like to think that political appointees and elected officials responsible for oversight of the public trust would attend to both the rational and the ethical dimensions of their administrative decision-making, especially when a strong case can be made that the proposed changes will actualize their institution's mission statement, but such is not the case. While management all too often seems ready to jump on the bandwagon of the latest harebrained "innovation" dreamt up by a chancellor or campus president looking to establish a prestigious national reputation, my experience tells me that no matter how much rational authority (much less moral authority) reformers on the ground display, the powers-that-be, whose attitudes about academic workers are often misguided by unwarranted assumptions, prejudices, and sometimes corrupt motivations, won't agree to adopt even the most beneficially transformative changes proposed by labor unless forced to do so by public pressure, and more importantly, by pressure from powerful individuals and interest groups. They have no inherent incentive to do the right thing.

One cannot overstate the significance of the power imbalance of the status quo — the political context in which college and university administrations operate, a context that makes them primarily respond to power dynamics among their wealthy donors, celebrity faculty, and administrative peers and superiors, not the rational arguments put forth by underlings, sad to say. Though some high-level administrators are well intentioned, they do not regularly hear from even a small percentage of the citizens to whom they are accountable. Like the rest of the 1%, they live in a bubble the 99% do not penetrate. Sometimes I think we ought to abandon restrained, rational persuasion altogether in favor of radical methodologies.

The authors of this article surely appreciate the political challenges informing higher education in Colorado. The AAUP doesn't just publish scholarly reports about the state of academia and position statements that articulate desirable reforms. I recently attended the AAUP Summer Institute (July 18-22) in New Hampshire in the company of AAUP activists, leaders, and national staff from all across the country. The sessions I attended were helpful and motivational, focusing on organizing and mobilizing union members. Wearing T-shirts with the logo of the University of New Hampshire Lecturers United, we all marched across the Durham campus and gathered for a large group photo in support of our hosts' efforts to negotiate a fair contract. Actions such as these do bring about change. How will Colorado AAUP move from scholarly to practical political persuasion?

Those seeking sweeping reform must expand efforts to close the gap between intellectual aspiration and practical instigation. We can build

on positive signs of change and some significant successes, such as the December 2016 publication of the Department of Labor's Unemployment Insurance Policy Letter 05-17 that resulted from a coalition effort initiated by New Faculty Majority, the national non-profit advocacy organization. This guidance letter clarifies what "reasonable assurance" of continuing employment for contingent academic workers really is and is not, ensuring that it should be much easier for adjunct faculty everywhere to receive unemployment compensation between terms. If every eligible person applied, institutions would have to pay a much higher price for their "management flexibility." I suspect more people have applied this summer. More and more adjunct faculty are organizing and demanding equitable compensation and due process rights. More stories about detrimental higher education employment practices are appearing in mainstream media. "Adjunct," with its connotation of exploitation, is now a household word.

I am hopeful that the force of the arguments made in this well-researched article, combined with community organizing and political pressure, including strategic, publicized disruption of the sort that has been practiced so effectively by the Parkland students over the past few months, will result in the CCCS Board's adoption of the worthy recommendations set forth by Stephen Mumme. How potent such a combination can be! Supported by their families and the unionized teachers of Broward County, the Parkland activists have indicted our whole society, saying, "you're supposed to protect us, but you've failed and now we're going to have to protect ourselves by changing laws or changing the lawmakers who refuse to change the laws." We have seen the far-reaching impact of their marches and social media presence. The November mid-terms will bring out millions of young new voters focused on the issue of common sense gun law reform. The blunt, consistent messaging of Parkland is a lesson for all of us looking to influence public opinion and public policy.

Let's speak truth to power in ways that ensure our message will be heard far and wide and taken to heart. People listened this spring when striking teachers effectively made the case that any teachers who are treated badly aren't able to do their best for their students. Maybe the mantra over the airwaves in Colorado should simply be this:

> "Our college board is supposed to ensure the high quality of public education, but the board is failing us because it does not invest enough in the faculty whose working conditions are the students' learning conditions."

Couching an academic argument for equity in the language of popular discourse is a good first step toward mobilizing the public, but we can't stop there. Let's reach out to family members, friends, neighbors, and members of organizations we belong to, in an ever-expanding wave of influence and "boots on the ground" activism. Let's motivate every

concerned citizen to demand change. Let's get the word out and exert enough political pressure to persuade the CCCS Board to do the right thing.

Response #3 to AAUP Statement

Ken Lindblom
Stony Brook University, State University of New York

Not all adjunct faculty situations are created equal. Some adjunct faculty—probably the most ethical manifestation—are full-time specialists, who agree to teach a class in their specialty. Because these faculty have full-time jobs, they teach at the college level for enjoyment, for prestige, and/or to give back to the community. The low salary they are paid isn't really right—as their hard-earned expertise is certainly worth more—but no one is really getting the shaft. While I was dean of the School of Professional Development at Stony Brook University (SUNY), we employed many faculty who fit this description, especially in our Human Resources Management and Higher Education Administration programs (please note that in this response I do not represent Stony Brook University).

Close to this situation is another manifestation: the retired professional. These colleagues had finished a full career and were interested in teaching a class or two to keep themselves sharp and to give back to their community. They also no doubt appreciated the prestige of teaching at the college level, and they made good use of the modest salary, which they often referred to as "dining out money." We employed many faculty members who fit this description, especially in the Liberal Studies program and the program that leads to K-12 administrative certification.

Ken Lindblom is Associate Professor of English at Stony Brook University, SUNY. His latest book, *Continuing the Journey 2: Being a Better Teacher of Authentic Writing*, co-authored with Leila Christenbury will be published by the National Council of Teachers of English in fall 2018. Ken was active in United University Professions, as a delegate and board member, before he was appointed a dean in 2017.

Because we have a strong faculty-staff union in SUNY (the United University Professions, or UUP), adjunct faculty who teach at least two courses in a semester earn benefits, including dental and vision, which retired teachers often find very helpful enhancements. Again, the value these colleagues bring to the school far exceeds the salary they are paid, but everyone gets something valuable from the relationship. It's mostly symbiotic.

A third situation for adjunct faculty is different. These are colleagues who have developed high-level expertise and have survived increasingly competitive searches to teach 3, 4, 5, or even more courses per semester in a "part-time" capacity. Many of them have terminal degrees, and the great majority of them have honed their professional skills such that their students receive expert instruction comparable to (or exceeding) full-time faculty. These faculty would prefer full-time status—indeed, they have cobbled together for themselves teaching loads that can surpass full-timers' loads—but full-time positions are not available to them. They earn low salaries, excruciatingly low given their experience and ability, but because they are willing to do it, and because institutions are willing to allow them to do it, they remain in underfunded, underappreciated, and over-exploited employment situations. Stephen Mumme and his colleagues do an excellent job of pointing out problematic issues that arise for these colleagues. We hired many faculty members in this frame in the School of Professional Development, as well, and as dean, the situation was for me, I'll put it mildly, uncomfortable.

Adjunct faculty in the last instance are often in fields that have large numbers of people willing and able to teach in them—such as my own field, English, and other areas in the humanities, or in core subjects like basic math and science. Since students generally pay the same tuition for courses, there is no foundational reason why colleges and universities should not be able to fund full-time faculty to teach these courses. Rather, adjunct faculty should, theoretically, be hired only in cases when there is an unexpected course section that is needed due to a resignation, a death, a leave, an unexpected over-enrollment of students, or some other urgent exigence.

And yet, as Mumme et. al. put it, a "dark side" has arisen: Adjunct faculty have over time been allowed to fill the teaching ranks at colleges and universities, and those institutions have gotten used to depending, quietly, upon that, frankly, exploited labor. The growth in adjunct faculty nationally is not much different from those Mumme et. al. report for Colorado. If current trends continue, adjunct teaching will outpace full-time, tenure-line faculty.

I have been a tenure-line or tenured college faculty member since 1997. From March of 2017 till mid-July 2018, I was appointed as a dean, and for the first time in my career, I was responsible for programs that depended on a high percentage of adjunct faculty, many of whom have the credentials and experience to be employed full time and who would like

to be. The School of Professional Development (SPD) is the university's agent for professional development and for professional master's degree programs in areas in education, human resources, and more. From my perspective, the school's mission is to provide high quality professional education, and to make as much revenue as possible for the university to use elsewhere to fund its research, teaching, and service missions.

As state funding has decreased, the need for institution-wide revenue generation has also increased. The drop in student enrollment—which happened dramatically in education fields nationally in 2009-2011 and has not recovered—has been a tremendous blow to SPD and similar schools. As a result, at SPD we have had to ask fewer faculty to do more work for the same salary. Our colleagues are unhappy about this, of course, but they remain committed to the mission and the students, and they do what is needed.

It would be wonderful to get adjunct faculty more involved in pedagogical decisions and to offer them more professional development and communication together as a faculty group. But, how much time is appropriate to ask poorly-compensated employees to put in on top of the hours they are being paid for? How many meetings should they be asked or required to attend? How much time (and gasoline and parking fees and child care fees) should they be asked to contribute? On the other hand, how much easier should we make their work? Should we provide them with a lock-step syllabus, so they don't have to plan instruction? Should we simply hand them policies and instructional practices, so they don't have to work them out themselves? How much of our colleagues' autonomy and creativity should we cash in for their convenience?

Putting all this together, even the best-intended managers have a difficult time enhancing adjunct faculty salary, status, autonomy, and input while maintaining necessary and expected revenue. That said, the very idea that quietly depending on unfairly-treated colleagues was ever even an option is somewhat sickening. In short, a systemic discrimination has been baked into the ways in which too many colleges and universities operate. This allows chairs, deans, and provosts to throw up their hands in apparently-inescapable surrender (if they choose to do so), while adjunct faculty continue to prop up the very institutions that depend on their exploited labor. There aren't many ways out of this dim labyrinth:

- Colleges/universities can voluntarily choose to decrease their revenue by hiring more full-time faculty and making due with less revenue, shrinking their missions and impact.
- Adjunct faculty can quit the profession—all at once—forsaking years of experience and hard work and giving up extremely satisfying and important work.

- States can better fund higher education by either moving funds from other areas or raising taxes and/or tuition.
- Faculty groups—with their unions when possible—can work together to obligate institutions to make improvements in the situation.

Clearly, the fourth bullet is the most likely, and as Mumme and his colleagues discuss, AAUP recommendations make a good start. UUP has also done good work in its most recent negotiations by including minimum adjunct faculty salaries in its recent tentative contract.

These changes are also challenging. Full-time faculty, like others in the university, can also silently benefit from the exploited labor of others. Too many full-time faculty—especially at research institutions—can occasionally be heard questioning why adjunct faculty should have the unions' attention. Too few may be willing to share professional development funds—scant as they are—equitably. Too many put their heads down into their own work, not looking around closely enough to see the cost of their comfortable working conditions. Doing nothing perpetuates the problem.

We must also be careful how we make arguments for improvements. Mumme et. al. raise important points regarding the quality of the student experience and teaching expertise at Colorado Community Colleges; however, it is important that we not undercut the quality of adjunct faculty members themselves. If such instructors are unqualified, they should never be hired, period. But if systemic discrimination prevents adjunct faculty from performing at their peak, we should take pains not to imply that these faculty members aren't fully-qualified and aren't delivering excellent instruction. Rather, we must point out how they are being prevented from achieving the best they have to offer, and how the students are being denied the best they can get.

Colleges are communities. There is room for a great many kind of contributor. They need not all be full-time, and they need not be experts of the same type. But each contributing member should be appropriately compensated to at least the degree of value they bring to the institution's mission. Ethics, the rules of fair play, and community decency demand that we look at the situation of adjunct faculty who provide full-time labor and who would prefer a full-time load. Thank you to Mumme et. al., AAUP, and UUP for moving in the right directions.

Reviews of Daniel Davis's *Contingent Academic Labor* and Lisa del Rosso's *Confessions of an Accidental Professor*

William Christopher Brown
Midland College

Abstract
This review covers Daniel Davis's *Contingent Academic Labor: Evaluating Conditions to Improve Student Outcomes* and Lisa del Rosso's *Confessions of an Accidental Professor*. Davis's book offers a rubric for evaluating the working conditions of contingent academic laborers. del Rosso's *Confessions* is a memoir of her experience as a contingent academic laborer.

Davis, Daniel. *Contingent Academic Labor: Evaluating Conditions to Improve Student Outcomes*. The New Faculty Majority Series, series foreword by Maria Maisto, foreword by Adrianna Kezar, Stylus, 2017.

del Rosso, Lisa. *Confessions of an Accidental Professor*. Serving House Books, 2017.

William Christopher Brown earned his doctorate in English from Indiana University Bloomington. He currently is an Associate Professor II of English and Technical Writing at Midland College. In 2018-2019, he will serve as Chair of the Modern Language Association's (MLA) Committee on Contingent Labor in the Profession. He also serves as Chair of the MLA Liaison Committee for the Association for Business Communication (ABC). Additionally, for the ABC, he serves on the Diversity and Inclusion Committee, the Technology Committee, and the Conference Proceedings Editorial Review Board.

The two books under review complement each other well. Daniel Davis's *Contingent Academic Labor: Evaluating Conditions to Improve Student Outcomes* offers a rubric for universities and colleges to measure whether contingent academic laborers are treated equitably or not. Lisa del Rosso's *Confessions of an Accidental Professor* is a memoir that describes the author's experience as a contingent academic laborer in for-profit, private, and public sectors of higher education. Davis presents a largely macro level view of the iniquitous treatment of contingent academic laborers, while del Rosso shares a micro level view of her own lived experience as a contingent academic laborer. Read consecutively, the two books provide a comprehensive understanding of the value of contingent academic labor to higher education and offer a condemnation of the systemic under-valuing of workers central to the lives of undergraduate learners.

Davis's *Contingent Academic Labor*

Davis's concise volume (126 pages) is divided into three parts:

- Part One: Contingent Academic Labor in Broader Contexts
- Part Two: Illustrating the Range of Work Conditions
- Part Three: The Contingent Labor Conditions Score

In the following pages, I will describe each part briefly and then discuss the value of the book.

"Part One: Contingent Academic Labor in Broader Contexts"

Davis opens the book with the research context for understanding the scope of part- and full-time contingency across higher education. He then discusses the "Categories of Contingent Faculty": "Career Enders," which refers to people in semi-retirement; "Specialists" in the field who adjunct in addition to their full-time jobs, "Freelancers" who work part-time to keep their schedule open for other activities; and "Aspiring Academics" who desire a tenure-track position (Gappa and Leslie qtd. in Davis 7-8). Katherine V. Wills provides an excellent critique of the first three types of contingent faculty in "The Lure of 'Easy' Psychic Income." "Psychic income" refers to "the perceived personal, social, and cultural compensation that a job brings to an individual above and beyond wages" (Wills 201). For Wills, the contingent faculty in the first three categories, who work primarily for "psychic income," are a problem because they inadvertently "support managerial and institutional reliance upon and control over other workers who were economically dependent on their wages" (203). Davis notes that "Aspiring Academics," whose academic labor is their main source of income, make up the largest number of contingent faculty (8). He closes Chapter 1 by noting that current discussions of contingency fall into two different frames. Frame A refers to "Contingency as Voluntary, Flexible, and Empowering" (13); it reflects

the situations of careerists, specialists, and freelancers. Frame B, the situation that reflects the *new faculty majority*, describes "Contingency as Exploitation" (13).

As Chapter 2 suggests, contingency exploits both faculty and students because "[f]aculty working conditions are student learning conditions" (Maisto qtd. in Davis xv). Poor working conditions include lack of access to office space, as well as the necessity for some contingent faculty to be "freeway flyers," teaching at multiple institutions at a distance from one another (Davis 13). Contingent faculty are also particularly vulnerable to unfair course evaluations (15). Davis discusses recent research on the long-term effects of faculty working conditions on students. Students taught by contingent faculty without job security or benefits are less likely to remain in a major or stay at their university (Davis 16). Conversely, students at Northwestern University that took classes with contingent faculty who had job security "score[d] higher in subsequent courses in that major than the students who were taught by tenure-track faculty" (16). Davis also reports on the long-term earning potential of students taught by a majority of part-time faculty versus a majority of full-time faculty. Students who are taught by full-time faculty with greater job security earn more in the ten years following graduation (19-21). Davis infers that this greater income reflects the importance of job security (22). Contingent faculty whose jobs are determined by high course evaluations do not have the same academic freedom to challenge students (22).

Chapter 3 reports on an idea that Adrianna Kezar, the author of the foreword to the book, found particularly important: "'cooling out' among contingent faculty" (qtd. in Davis xii). Davis takes the idea of "cooling out" from a 1960 article by Burton Clark, a scholar of higher education (Davis 23). Davis finds Clark's work useful for understanding contingency because it "examines the tension between a society that promotes college for all and a career system that sharply rations opportunity" (23). Individuals are given an illusion that education will "ensure a path to middle-class success. But at the same time, many of these graduates are systematically denied access to the career opportunities that would fulfill such promises" (23). In the case of Aspiring Academics who desire a job on the tenure-track, "their ambitions are … heated up, but then must be cooled out" (23). Provocatively, Davis contextualizes Clark's work on the "cooling out" in an academic setting with the "cooling out" period of a person who has been conned into investing money in a scheme by "confidence (con) artists" (23). In this investment swindle, the con artist tricks "a mark or victim" into investing money; after a series of investments, "[s]uddenly, because of a mistake, the mark's entire investment is lost" (23). To keep the victim from going to the police, someone "cools out" the mark by explaining the "'philosophy of taking a loss'" (Goffman qtd. in Davis 24). Part of this process of "cooling out" involves convincing the mark that "he" has "compromised himself, in his

own eyes if not in the eyes of others" (Goffman qtd. in Davis 24). As Davis notes, "cooling out" within the context of contingency has "no single moment of hot rejection, only a slow cooling out of ambition" (26). Contingent faculty have access to the "alternate achievement" of being informally called professor or faculty within the context of contingent academic labor, even though they may have little benefits or status (26). They disengage gradually through "extended postdocs, multiple one- and two-year visiting scholar jobs, or repeated years of freeway-flyer teaching assignments" (26). The working conditions of contingent academic labor also create a sense of "objective denial," in the sense that over time they end up with weaker CVs than their tenure-track colleagues (26). "Agents of consolation," in the form of "tenure-track faculty members [and] administrative colleagues" help to "cool out" contingent faculty by "kindly suggest[ing] that they redefine success or look for different goals" (27). Davis suggests that administrators are particularly important in this process of "cooling out," or "ambition management" (28). Successful "cooling out" of contingent faculty impedes "feelings of hot rejection and resentment" that have the potential to "transform into fuel for mobilization, union activity, and media publicity" (28). Davis concludes this section by urging administrators to consult his Contingent Labor Conditions Score to move from the culture of sly "cooling out" to an ethical culture that benefits contingent faculty and students alike (28).

"Part Two: Illustrating the Range of Work Conditions"

The next section, "Illustrating the Range of Work Conditions," has three chapters that focus on, respectively, *material equity*, *professional equity*, and *social equity*. This chapter discusses many of the most common problems that affect contingent faculty.

Material Equity

Material equity focuses on "pay parity," "job security," and "benefits." Davis recommends that full-time contingent faculty receive 75% of what an assistant professor makes because an assistant professor has research duties unrequired of contingent faculty (32). Davis does not really address pay parity for long-term contingents who have worked as long as associate or full professors, so his recommendation still has problems that need addressing. *Job security* challenges are more intricate than the pay parity section. Problems with job security include rehire rights, consistency of assignment, breaks in service, cancellation compensation, and grievance processes (Davis 36-39). Material equity includes health and retirement benefits, which are quite rare in most part-time contingent positions. Davis recommends the Vancouver Community College System as a model for material equity (44-45) (for further reading, see Cosco and Longmate; see also Cosco).

Professional Equity

Professional equity includes access to professional development, opportunities for advancement, and academic freedom (Davis 47-52). Davis also notes the challenges that faculty have to their identities as instructors, when they have to take on part-time work to supplement their meager income as contingent faculty (52-54).

Social Equity

Social equity emphasizes the importance of diversity on the faculty, by both race and gender. Equitable gender ratios should be close to 50/50 (Davis 61). Davis recommends that racial diversity should be consistent across contingent, tenure-track, and tenured ranks (61). Further, racial diversity should correspond to "three sources: rates of diversity among the student population, in the country, and in the state" (Davis 61).

"Part Three: The Contingent Labor Conditions Score"

This final part of the book puts the information in the previous part into rubric form. The publisher's website, Stylus Publishers, LLC., has a PDF version of the Contingent Labor Blank Scorecards, as well as Excel Contingent Labor Conditions Scorecard Worksheets (see "Contingent Academic Labor"). Davis frames these scorecards as primarily for administrators to gauge how they need to change the culture of the campus to improve contingent academic labor conditions, but activists on campus could also use the scorecards to critique administrative practices. I will leave it to the readers to investigate how their campuses measure in these rubrics.

The Value of Davis's Monograph

Davis's *Contingent Academic Labor: Evaluating Conditions to Improve Student Outcomes* is a valuable resource for higher education professionals interested in improving working conditions for contingent faculty. It compares favorably to Marc Bousquet's stringent critique *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation*. In particular, Davis's section on the "cooling out" of contingent faculty reminded me of Bousquet's condemnation of graduate programs for rendering graduate students as "the waste products of graduate education" (21). "Cooling out" helps explain why it is so difficult to see "products of graduate education" as the leftover "waste" of systemic exploitation. Davis's book is particularly valuable because it adds to its scholarly explication a rubric that puts contingency in qualitative terms. Administrators and Boards of Regents can view their schools' performance through the lens of qualitative spreadsheets and use the results as a guide for changing the culture of exploitation on their campuses.

del Rosso's *Confessions of an Accidental Professor*

Upon reading Lisa del Rosso's title *Confessions of an Accidental Professor*, readers interested in issues related to contingent academic labor may recall the anonymously authored book by Professor X, *In the Basement of the Ivory Tower: Confessions of an Accidental Academic* (2011), which also exposes the working conditions of adjuncts. Interestingly, both del Rosso and Professor X frame their subsistence level teaching careers as "accidental." Professor X (MFA in Creative Writing) taught first-year composition classes in addition to his regular job to supplement his income to help pay for an expensive house (xiii); to use Davis's terms, Professor X fits Frame A's "Specialist" contingent academic laborer category. del Rosso's does not neatly fit into any of the four categories Davis describes (i.e., "Career Enders," "Specialists," "Freelancers," and "Aspiring Academics"), though she exemplifies Frame B, "contingency as exploitation." del Rosso calls attention to the limitations of those categories because she wants to teach full-time with benefits, but a tenure-track research position is not necessarily her goal; rather, she would like a livable wage with benefits (38 and 182-187). Unlike Professor X, who received training in graduate school to teach first-year composition, del Rosso initially learned to teach on the job. She started out as a performer and earned a post-graduate certificate in theatre from the London Academy of Music and Dramatic Art (LAMDA), but her performance career was cut short after she was diagnosed with epilepsy (del Rosso 14). She earned a BA in Creative Writing from Empire State College (116) and worked in the Writing Center (16); later, she earned an MFA from Fairleigh Dickinson University-Florham Campus ("Lisa del Ross," *LinkedIn*). Interestingly, her teaching career began before she finished her bachelor's degree (del Rosso 13). del Rosso discusses aspects of her personal life, in addition to her life as an "accidental professor," but I will focus only on her experiences as a contingent academic laborer.

Teaching at a For-Profit College

Her career as a contingent academic laborer began "accidentally" when she met a faculty member at the for-profit school Berkeley College, and he recommended her to his department chair (del Rosso 17). Although she had not yet completed her BA when she began teaching, she was hired to teach first-year composition, based on her completion of the LAMDA degree (unaccredited) (17-18). del Rosso succinctly describes her training before teaching her first class in 2004:

> We sat down in his office, and [the department chair] began explaining the course: Writing. He showed me the book, *Grassroots With* [sic] *Readings*. He told me there would probably be a lot of students but not to be alarmed. He told me a few of the problems that could come up, mentioned controlling

> the class, discipline and what the college would not tolerate with regard to student behavior. He asked very few questions. I asked fewer, due to shock. … After I … had the book in hand, [the department chair] showed me around the college: classrooms, copy center, administrative offices, lounge. (17-18)

With that "training" out of the way, she began her career as an adjunct writing instructor. del Rosso taught three years at Berkeley College (35) and left because students lacked the preparation to perform as well as expected. She notes, "The difficulties outweighed the good: missed work, missed deadlines, and too many absences. It was exhausting chasing down so many students for their papers. Frustrated, I didn't know how to change it. I walked around in a state of perpetual annoyance" (35).

Teaching at a Private, Non-Profit Research University

In 2008, del Rosso began teaching at New York University (NYU), and as of 2018, according to her *LinkedIn* account, she still teaches there ("Lisa del Rosso"). The opportunity to teach at NYU arose as "accidentally" as the opportunity to teach at Berkeley College. A friend of a friend mentioned del Rosso to a chairperson at NYU, and they met for brunch (127). The interview with the chair consisted of a conversation about "teaching style, literature, classes, authors [del Rosso] liked (128). The chairperson sought to replace "two other professors … 'because I did not hand-pick them, and things don't go well when I do not hand-pick my people'" (128). After an interview with an associate dean, she began working for NYU as an adjunct professor (128). del Rosso noted the difference in Berkeley College, a for-profit college, and NYU, a private nonprofit research university. Berkeley College largely serves "Black and Hispanic inner-city students, very few white students, and approximately 2% foreign students. The median age [is] about 24 years old" (del Rosso 18). Tuition in 2007 was approximately $14,000 and rose to 24,000 in 2017 (18). The students at NYU contrasted greatly with her previous experience: "students were mostly white, privileged, went to private or charter schools, had tutors, and every advantage one could think of" (37). Rather than "chase down students for their papers" at Berkeley, NYU students "were rarely absent, made all deadlines, completed all homework, asked for help, asked to do additional drafts, and complained when they got a B+ instead of an A-" (37-38). del Rosso describes the differences non-judgmentally and notes how "economics and coming from a culture of education" influence students' performance in school (42).

Teaching at a State University

In 2011, she added the Fashion Institute of Technology (FIT) to her teaching load, though NYU was the most important to her because the

private university paid more than FIT (del Rosso 35). At FIT, she experienced more troubled students than NYU, much like her experience at Berkeley College. Students were coming to her for advice for their personal problems; del Rosso lists fifteen different examples in one chapter and alludes to fourteen additional young women who shared with her that they had experienced some form of sexual assault (51-55). She heard so many problems that she "fe[lt] like a priest without the benefit of heavenly guidance" (51). She notes that her chair told her, "[']you can't be doing this, it's too much['] … but he didn't tell how to handle it all, or what to do about it, and I was already in the middle of it" (53). del Rosso then describes two examples in detail of helping students who were dealing with sexual assault (56-62). del Rosso's echoes a *Chronicle of Higher Education* article on a similar topic, Myra Green's "Thanks for Listening." Green notes the frequency with which students came to her in tears to discuss their problems, and that women often "tak[e] on this kind of care-work at colleges and universities" (par. 10). Green also notes the sense of responsibility that she feels for students, which echoes del Rosso's descriptions:

> Often, however, this kind of care-work turns into a lot more than just one conversation. After the person tells the story, cries, and we talk through the issue, there can be much follow-up work to do: Find resources; talk to the department chair, consult counseling services, or visit another administrator or campus office; have a second meeting (or third) to follow up and provide new information; perhaps attend a meeting with an administrator or campus office with the person or on his/her behalf. (par. 13)

del Rosso's experience is more harrowing, though, because the stress of teaching sixty students and helping so many in need took its toll on her physically: she lost 15 pounds and her hair began to fall out (62). Fortunately, through the NYU health centers, she found a therapist that offered professors six sessions free, and that helped her (62). Bitterly, she notes that FIT actually offered free counseling through an Employee Assistance Program, though no one shared this with her until much later than she originally needed the assistance (63).

del Rosso's time at FIT ended after she had a disagreement with a tenured professor/assistant chair. del Rosso was offered a creative non-fiction writing class that she was highly qualified to teach; however, the tenured professor/assistant chair attempted to micromanage the class and wanted to oversee the syllabus, textbook, and content of the class (94-99). del Rosso was rightly offended at the attempt to stifle her academic freedom and was supported by the chair of the department (100-101). A year later, the chair stepped down and the assistant chair "'assumed programming responsibilities'" (101). The assistant chair dispensed with del Rosso's services, and she no longer had classes to teach at FIT (101-

102). del Rosso did not note this point, but as I read about her arbitrary dismissal, I was reminded of the circumstances that led to her being hired at NYU—i.e., the department only wanted to work with adjuncts she had chosen personally. Arbitrariness led to her teaching at NYU and arbitrariness led to her non-renewal at FIT.

The Value of del Rosso's Memoir

I have focused primarily on del Rosso's experience as a contingent academic laborer, though she writes eloquently about her personal life and parallel professional life as a freelance writer as well. The focus of this review does not allow me to describe more deeply other equally compelling parts of her memoir. Scholarship on contingent academic labor is rightly contextualized in qualitative research that shows the extent of higher education's reliance on contingent academic labor; however, her story is important to read because it shows a complete human being living under the constraints of an adjunct's salary.

Throughout the memoir, del Rosso shows her value as an instructor, and not simply through the course evaluation quotations that serve as the epigraphs of each chapter. In the middle of the book she alludes to the mental cost of the stress of caring for her students; however, her second and final chapters frame a dramatic and important question for readers to consider: "If You Change a Student's Life, Is It Worth It?" Her answer is telling: "Of course it is. But there's a caveat: Of course it is, but not for the long term. Because in the long term, I can't afford it, emotionally or financially" (182). Currently, she is only able to afford to teach as a contingent academic laborer because she shares an apartment with her ex-husband in a rent-controlled apartment (del Rosso 184-185)—she has written about this arrangement in more detail in a *Modern Love* series essay in the *New York Times*. Both del Rosso and Davis remark that someone in the service industry is paid more than an adjunct. del Rosso's roommate is a waiter (12); Davis alludes to an anecdote about an adjunct who earns more as a bartender (33). del Rosso is open about the salaries she receives for adjunct teaching. When she worked at FIT, she received "roughly $2500" per course (del Rosso 86). At NYU, she earns "roughly $5760" per course (85), for an annual salary of $23,040" (184). When she worked at both places, she generally taught two semesters per course at each institution (85). Both places fall far short of the "MLA Recommendation on Minimum Per-Course Compensation for Part-Time Faculty Members": "$10,700 for a standard 3-credit-hour semester course" (par. 2). She ends the book in true precariat fashion: she earned $350 more in 2015; this pushed her into a higher tax bracket and caused her to lose Obamacare subsidies, which gave her a tax bill of more than $2000 (182)—for more on the precariat, see Daniel's "Freshman Composition as a Precariat Enterprise." As of this writing, she is still teaching at NYU, but the fact that she has published her confessions suggests that she is not "cooling out."

Works Cited

Bousquet, Marc. *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation*. NYU Press, 2008.

"Contingent Academic Labor." *Stylus Publishing, LLC.*, October 2017, https://sty.presswarehouse.com/books/BookDetail.aspx?productID=412424. Accessed 15 June 2018.

Cosco, Frank. "The Vancouver Model of Equality for College Faculty Employment." *Equality for Contingent Faculty: Overcoming the Two-Tier System*, edited by Keith Hoeller, pp. 200-225, Vanderbilt University Press, 2014.

Cosco, Frank, and Jack Longmate. "An Instructive Model of How More Equity and Equality Is Possible: The Vancouver Community College Model." *Embracing Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Changing Campuses for the New Faculty Majority*, edited by Adrianna Kezar, pp. 55-83, Routledge, 2012.

Daniel, James Rushing. "Freshman Composition as a Precariat Enterprise." *College English*, vol. 80, no. 1, 2017, pp. 63-85.

Davis, Daniel. *Contingent Academic Labor: Evaluating Conditions to Improve Student Outcomes*. The New Faculty Majority Series, series foreword by Maria Maisto, foreword by Adrianna Kezar, Stylus, 2017.

del Rosso, Lisa. *Confessions of an Accidental Professor*. Serving House Books, 2017.

--. "Saying 'I Don't' to Release the Anger." *The New York Times*, 20 January 2011, https://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/23/fashion/23Modern.html. Accessed 19 June 2018.

Green, Myra. "Thanks for Listening." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 19 October 2015, https://www.chronicle.com/article/Thanks-for-Listening/233825. Accessed 19 June 2018.

"Lisa del Rosso." *LinkedIn*, 2018, https://www.linkedin.com/in/lisa-del-rosso-46a18b17. Accessed 18 June 2018.

"MLA Recommendation on Minimum Per-Course Compensation for Part-Time Faculty Members." *Modern Language Association*, May 2017, https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Staffing-Salaries-and-Other-Professional-Issues/MLA-Recommendation-on-Minimum-Per-Course-Compensation-for-Part-Time-Faculty-Members. Accessed 19 June 2018.

Professor X. *In the Basement of the Ivory Tower: Confessions of an Accidental Academic*. Viking, 2011.

Wills, Katherine V. "The Lure of 'Easy' Psychic Income." *Tenured Bosses and Disposable Teachers: Writing Instruction in the Managed University*, edited by Marc Bousquet, Tony Scott, and Leo Parascondola, foreword by Randy Martin, pp. 201-206, Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Neoliberal Higher Education: Background of the Pennsylvania State College and University Faculty Strike of 2016

Gordon Mantler
Rachel Riedner
The George Washington University

Dr. Gordon Mantler is Director of Writing in the Disciplines and Associate Professor of Writing and of History at the George Washington University. His first book, Power to the Poor: Black-Brown Coalition and the Fight for Economic Justice, 1960-1974, was the inaugural volume in the Justice, Power, and Politics series at the University of North Carolina Press. His current research focuses on multiracial electoral politics and community organizing in Chicago in the 1970s and 1980s, as well as public history narratives and memorialization in Washington, D.C. His work has been supported by GW, Duke University (where he received his PhD in 2008), the Andrew Mellon Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Humanities Center, and the Black Metropolis Research Consortium.

Dr. Rachel Riedner is Professor of Writing and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at the George Washington University where she serves as Executive Director of the University Writing Program. Dr. Riedner's research brings analysis of global circulation of gendered and racialized rhetorics to an interest in transnational feminist activisms. With Kevin Mahoney, she is the author of Democracies to Come: Rhetorical Action, Neoliberalism, and Communities of Resistance (Lexington Books 2008). She is also the author of Writing Neoliberal Values: Rhetorical Connectivities and Globalized Capitalism (Palgrave MacMillan 2015) as well as multiple essays and book chapters. In the late 1990s, Rachel worked as a labor organizer for the United Auto Workers (UAW), organizing part time faculty and graduate student workers.

In October 2016, more than 5,000 faculty members and coaches in the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties (APSCUF) walked off their jobs in the first ever strike in the union's thirty-four-year history. Representing faculty at fourteen campuses, APSCUF struck for three days until a settlement was reached with the Chancellor of the state system, Frank Brogan. The strike pushed back the Chancellor's efforts to institute operational changes that included a recalculation of who could be considered part-time faculty and the ability for the system to move tenured professors from campus to campus. Concessions included higher health care contributions. "Three Days in October: APSCUF Strong," ed. David Chambers, Erika Frenzel, Nadene L'Amoreaux, Jamie Martin, and Robert Mutchnick, Works and Days 35 (2017).

In April 2018, we had an extensive conversation with two of the faculty leaders of the strike, Seth Kahn from West Chester University and Kevin Mahoney from Kutztown University, both professors of rhetoric and composition, to discuss how the union developed a culture that was able to effectively push back efforts by a new generation of administrative leaders to degrade faculty positions. As Kahn and Mahoney explain, the strike was a decade in the making, beginning with a new, more neoliberal leadership in the state system, who negotiated what union leaders called a "barebones contract" in 2004. Starting then, a new generation of faculty leaders, including Kahn and Mahoney, steered the APSCUF leadership to start mobilizing for fights over faculty contracts. This new generation of leaders created a culture around organizing that responded to changes in higher education that is part of neoliberalism: policies that value and advocate for strong property rights, "free" markets, trade policies and local and international agreements that claim to assure individual and social freedom. In fact, as economic policy, neoliberalism means withdrawal of the state from social services such as education or health care, and the upward redistribution of wealth.[1] In higher education in Pennsylvania and other states, neoliberalization took the form of administrative efforts to save money by hiring more contingent faculty and shifting more costs to workers, particularly around health care.

In the late 20th and 21st centuries – under administrative appointees who were both neoliberal Democrats (a term that Kahn and Mahoney discuss) and Republicans – academic labor has moved, like other industries, to a more casual model. This shift in higher education policy prompted higher education professionals far more comfortable with

[1] For further discussions of neoliberalism, see Rachel Riedner, *Writing Neoliberal Values*, xii, (London and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015); Lisa Duggan, *Twilight of Equality* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004); David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005).

traditional academic research to turn their research expertise and energy to their own working conditions. That turn to analyze labor was a process through which faculty in the Pennsylvania State system learned labor literacies – another term that Kahn and Mahoney extensively discuss.

In the following excerpts from our interview, Kahn and Mahoney discuss how they got to the point where a strike was possible – a long personal process of learning about labor and injustice, to when they joined APSCUF as junior faculty members. After becoming faculty leaders, and after a series of disastrous contracts, Kahn and Mahoney were central figures in a cultural process and change through which faculty came to think of themselves as workers.

This interview focuses on events leading up to the strike, including a discussion of Kahn and Mahoney's lives before APSCUF, rather than the strike itself. Our interest is in the emergent labor literacies that enabled Kahn, Mahoney, and others to build a labor culture within and across the 14 campuses of APSCUF that span the entire state of Pennsylvania where some campuses are hundreds of miles apart. Kahn and Mahoney pointed out in conversation that the strike was successful, *but* the work of pushing back against administrative efforts to degrade contracts and faculty working conditions continues. Excerpts have been edited for length and clarity.

Personal Labor Histories and Mentoring

We asked Kahn and Mahoney to provide a brief introduction that addresses their personal histories and connections to labor organizing that they developed before they were hired as full-time faculty in the Pennsylvania State system.

Gordon Mantler: Do you come from a political family? Is your interest in labor organizing something that is strictly out of your experience and where you find yourselves in your jobs, or are there antecedents to this where it comes to your mom and dad, or the kinds of political conversations you had or did not have at home?

Seth Kahn: My family was a textbook, upper middle class, suburban, Jewish, Democratic family, so hell-raising around the kitchen table, but not especially activist. I don't know what it was that made me do this, but when I was like sixteen or seventeen years old, I started writing letters to the editor of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution that never ever got published. [Laughter] But I just felt it.

I just felt like saying things. I didn't really start doing activist things in any meaningful sense until college. The summer before my senior year, I got a job working for Greenpeace. The first ten minutes that I spent in that office, I thought "How the hell did I not know this beforehand?" I had no idea that activism was a thing. Ever since then, it feels really intuitive and

obvious to do that kind of getting out and talking to people and organizing. That's what you do, or you lose.

Kevin Mahoney: For me, politics became an answer to questions that I had growing up. My parents were divorced when I was five, and both my parents were teachers in public school. My dad left teaching shortly before my parents were divorced when he got involved with the unionization efforts in Utica public schools. He went on to become both an organizer with NYSUT, the New York State United Teachers, and then a negotiator. There's a long line on my dad's side of union involvement. My grandfather was one of the organizers for a printer's union in Rotterdam, New York. Labor had always been in the background.

Right before my parents were divorced, my sister became mentally handicapped as a result of the measles-mumps-rubella shot. She was one in a million, literally—we have court documents showing exactly this—in response to the shot. She was a completely normal kid, and because of both a doctor pressuring my mother to give her the shot, even after I had a severe reaction to it when I received the shot, and then medical malpractice after that, she became mentally handicapped.

My mom had to leave work to care for my sister full-time. That meant we went very quickly into poverty. If it had not been for my dad's union position for medical insurance and things like that, that health care would have been gone. I grew up with food stamps, with negotiating public services for how to deal with handicapped kids. I have distinct memories of shame, both of my sister, trying to negotiate her differences, and then, of my mom having to pay with food stamps at the grocery store and so on.

Long story short, I'd always been interested in the world, and I'd always get upset when I'd see injustices, although I wouldn't have called it that at the time. In high school, I became just more and more of an angry kid. The story that I always tell—I even tell this to my students—is that it was punk rock music that saved my life because that was the first time that I had a political language to help understand systems, but then also the anger and the rage and the shame in a positive way. I mean I was lucky. A kid came skateboarding down my street [laughs] with a Dead Kennedys thing on and said, "Hey, how are you?" It's literally how it happened. James Gigliotti, who's a lawyer now. So, thank God for him.

From there, it became a process of finding spaces. In high school, I'd write little treatises with my punk rock crew. When I got to college in the late 1980's, I connected with a great group of people that were interested in alternative media to doing solidarity work with Central American refugees. We had direct affiliations with the Revolutionary Student Front of El Salvador and started thinking about that kind of mobilization in a

broad base. Most of my politics until then were about U.S. government policy and protests against tuition increases on campus. It wasn't until graduate school when I really started seeing the intersections of what I was doing with labor issues in higher education, in part because in the field I ended up in, Composition and Rhetoric, labor was one of the front and center discussions at that point.

SK: I was about halfway through my Ph.D. program when a bunch of my friends started to organize the T.A.s at Syracuse University. I knew they were organizing, but I wasn't involved with it. One friend knew I had done activist work and had been trained well. They said to me, "We need somebody who knows how to do just like the nuts and boltsy stuff, like how to organize a protest and how to write a petition." Activism 101 stuff. They asked if I would come to one of their core group meetings. The meeting was another one of those epiphany moments where I listened to them for fifteen minutes talk about what they were doing and why, and it was like [slaps forehead], "Duh?!" [Laughter] And I started working with them. It was ultimately a failed effort, but that was when it clicked for me: we organize or we lose.

KM: The first time I got arrested for direct action was in Washington, D.C., trying to block a vote that was going to approve additional funding for Central American death squads. At that time, to give you a sense of where I was, the police would drag us away, and we would fight to get away from them to get back to lock down the doors. At one point, they actually had to bring four different black jump suited people over to pull me away, one on each arm and one on each leg. The guy in the white shirt, the captain or whatever, comes over and says, "Now, son." He called me son—mistake. "Now, son, this is a nonviolent protest." I looked him straight in the face and said, "Whoever said I was nonviolent?" [Laughter]. Not what I should have said! That's when the zip ties got really tight on my hands.

Rachel Riedner: How long have you been a member of APSCUF, and why did you join? Then, after you were hired as a faculty member, what was the moment where you joined APSCUF?

KM: I applied to Kutztown University because I knew of APSCUF. I had a summer internship at the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) when I lived in Washington, D.C., during the late 1990s. As part of working in the Higher Education Office at the AFT, I did background research for an updated report on adjunct faculty. My job was to call people who were in the previous report, as well as other names that had been given to me, and ask if there had been any updates in contract language and/or new innovations that would support contingent faculty rights.

At this time, Rachel [Riedner] and I were at George Washington University, teaching part-time, and were actively organizing graduate teachers and adjunct faculty. The AFT internship was a great fit. I did background research, and everyone I called kept saying to me, "You've got to read the APSCUF contract. That's the gold standard." I had no idea what APSCUF was or what the Pennsylvania state system was. Like most people, when I heard "Penn State", I heard, "There's Penn State, Nittany Lions."

At that time, the Pennsylvania State system had the strongest protections for adjunct faculty of any faculty contract. That's what put the Pennsylvania State system on the radar for me. The only question for me when I was hired at Kutztown was, "When's the first meeting?" There was no question about whether or not I would join the union. It was just like how quickly could I get myself to a meeting.

It was remarkable, because that August when I called the local union office and I asked, "When is the first general membership meeting?" I was told, "We don't have general membership meetings generally." I was like, "What are you talking about?" My first conversation with the office manager at APSCUF! But, joining the union was a no-brainer. This was just the next step in a trajectory that had already been there.

SK: I signed my card during the faculty orientation. There was never any question about signing. What enabled my mobilization was our chapter president who had an office four doors down from mine. Every time I walked by Linda Myriades' office, I would say, "What have you got for me?" Often times it wasn't actual work, because she didn't want an untenured brand-new person to work, which I appreciate. But, I got an awful lot of history from her and explanation about what the contract is and does.

In retrospect, the stuff she told me is a lot more cautious and institutional than I would have liked for it to be, coming from the president, but I learned a hell of a lot from her. She's the person who introduced me to people and got me into the union structure. I could walk by her office three or four times a day and, every single time, she would stop what she was doing. She would say, "Alright, here's a lesson for you," thinking, "I've got somebody who wants to hear it."

GM: So, you were quite aware of what APSCUF had been able to accomplish in the terms of the contract. You didn't know that until you got here, but you learned it quickly from your colleague, right?

SK: I knew that there was a strong union presence, but I didn't know particular details about it. I had a good friend in my Ph.D. program who

had done his master's in the English Department at West Chester. Because of him, I knew a whole bunch of the Composition and Rhetoric faculty before I got here. There were five or six people who I was already friends with, and they had been talking with me about the union for years. When I interviewed for the job, one of the conversations we had at a meal was like, "Union—awesome!" I got pitched on the union and had a very viscerally irritated reaction with the dean when she started telling me about what a pain in the ass the union is. I said [speaking curtly], "Okay, I get it. I'm sold. I want the union." [Laughter] "You just sold it. I like them better than you! See you in a month."

KM: I'd come out of D.C. with President Stephen Joel Trachtenberg at George Washington University who basically wrote the book on why faculty in higher education are basically the worthless part of the higher education system. Trachtenberg was nothing special. He just gave voice to tendencies that were going on in higher education at that point. I had been trained through the union organizing at George Washington University, from the folks at United Auto Workers (UAW) about how you talk to colleagues, how you build a rap, and why training and organizing is important.

Shift to Neoliberal Model

We asked Kahn and Mahoney to discuss the change in administrative leadership in the Pennsylvania State system, particularly a new strategy that began with the appointment of Chancellor Judy Hample in 2001 bringing in chancellors from Florida who had worked with Republican state leadership. These new chancellors were invested in a strategy of shifting costs away from the state by cutting positions, salaries, and health care costs. These neoliberal politics worked in part by creating political consensus by supporting "liberal" social policies such as domestic partnership benefits – a shift from conservative social politics that was accompanied by attacks on social services.[2] This new generation of chancellors were a shock to faculty union culture that had previously enjoyed an uncontentious relationship with upper administration. Kahn and Mahoney discussed new chancellor John Cavanaugh who came from the Florida system in 2007.

KM: Before the arrival of Judy Hample in 2001, there was a culture in the state system of higher education where faculty would go up through the ranks, and then eventually become chancellors. There had been an experience and a support for the state system organically from faculty.

[2] For a discussion of the connections between liberal social ideologies and neoliberalism, see Lisa Duggan, *Twilight of Equality*.

Obviously, there was always conflict between management and workers. That's going to happen. But, before 2001, there was a general commitment to the state system. The story was always told that faculty and management would get together and then solve problems.

Up to this point, APSCUF leadership had been about reasonable defense of the contract. I think that for a long period of time, and the story was always, after APSCUF formed that there'd be fights and people would be rattling their swords. Then, the APSCUF president and the head of the state system of higher education would go into the back, dark room, and they'd come out, and they all had their hands around each other, drinking bubbly, smoking cigars. [Laughter]

That was kind of always the image, the backroom thing, and the solutions were generally quite good. If you talk to some of the older members when we first came in, they say that they didn't feel like the backroom deal sold them out. Actually—the backroom deal was made, and faculty came out okay. This system preserved the contract.

It wasn't until three chancellors ago, when we saw a break with that deal-making culture. The Board of Governors decided to go outside the system and start tapping into the Florida higher education system. That's when we started seeing the divergence.

RR: From your perspective, what's the effect of going outside the system and bringing people in, particularly from Florida? What did that mean to the union?

SK: Then-governor Tom Ridge is a very close friend of the Bush family, which is very well-connected in Florida. That's where I think the pipeline got built.

KM: There were changes happening, probably on the Board of Governors, and there was a turn to market-based approaches that was happening at the state level. In Pennsylvania, these changes followed a pattern in higher education administration that was happening across the country. At this point, now business folks were on the board of governors who think they know better about higher education than anybody else does.

The contract expired on June 30th, 2004 was when things really began to change. This contract was the first contentious contract. This was the first time the deal-making story got contested. The union leadership was really caught off guard and they were unprepared. I'm not disparaging them. They were unprepared for what they were about to face.

Judy Hample was the first chancellor to come from Florida. She went after the union. It was like "Okay, I'm the outside CEO coming into a state-owned higher education system, and I'm looking for ways to maximize its efficiencies and stuff." She had no personal connections to anyone in the system. Those relationships were gone.

I'll never forget the contract that came out of those negotiations in 2004, where there were those of us who were younger, or newer, we said, "We should be organizing!" But organizing wasn't happening within the union. I was really frustrated. I'll never forget when that contract was done, it was a really bad contract if you stack it up to the ones beforehand.

I'll never forget (in 2004) there was a press conference where Bill Fulmer, the APSCUF president, stood up and—it almost looked like he was about to cry— and he said, "We recognize this is a barebones contract." That was the language that he used, and he was clearly shook. I think Bill was shook, in part, because he felt that he let people down. On the other hand, Bill and the union leadership knew they didn't have any other option. What are you going to say? Are you going to strike? How?

RR: You weren't ready to strike?

KM: No organizing had been done for a strike, and so there was no other option. I will never forget the look on that guy's face. That was the turning point for me.

RR: Seth, you said, "There was a division between people who were in love with Chancellor Cavanaugh's social politics and the rest of us." Can you describe that division?

SK: With Cavanaugh, in pretty short order, many of us started to feel like, "This is really bad." I was seeing Cavanaugh's labor history and what he had done to the faculty on his campus at the University of West Florida. His record was really clear. As an example, a colleague who I have endless respect for otherwise, this person…was like, "I'm so glad that we have a chancellor here who's interested in talking about domestic partner benefits. The last chancellor (Judy Hample) wouldn't even [discuss domestic partner benefits]—she would blanch if somebody even used the phrase." He'd say, "I love this guy because he's willing to consider domestic partner benefits." And I'd say, "I hate this guy because he's a fucking monster, and the fact that he gets one thing right doesn't absolve him!"

RR: That's the neoliberal Democrat.

SK: Yeah!

KM: That's exactly it.

KM: I think Cavanaugh's politics were especially effective with faculty, too, because, people are writing and researching about identity, and those politics are important and carry a lot of weight. However, faculty don't have an analogous education in academic labor. We're trained in issues of identity, issues of culture.

Preparing for Strike: Labor Literacy and Union Culture

As a series of chancellors hostile to labor moved through upper administration, contracts were weakened. Starting in 2007, Kahn, Mahoney, and other campus leaders began creating the ground work for a potential strike. They successfully ran for leadership positions in the union, replacing a previous generation of union leaders who had enjoyed a collegial relationship with previous chancellors with new leadership who recognized that management/labor relationships were shifting because of the neoliberal model. We asked Kahn and Mahoney to discuss how, over time, they created faculty culture where a strike was possible.

SK: How you do not just the outreach and getting people to join, but how do you keep people working? How do you develop a leadership chain? How do you get your department reps to do something besides show up at the meeting and grade papers?

KM: I would think even—this is—again, this effort to develop faculty participation goes back to GW. When we were organizing there, I kept on thinking about breaking just through that first step, that barrier of feeling that people have with organizing. Faculty think, "Okay, I don't know how to do this. I feel uncomfortable." And, then I remember from GW getting people past that first step where you're feeling, "I can do this."

What's always stayed with me and all through this process of learning to organize is that you cannot underestimate the importance of treating people like people in those first organizing moments and helping them work through discomfort. You need to find real ways of getting people past their fear and discomfort, because it's not just a question of will. Believe me, I came to that conclusion the hard way.

SK: It's true, that human piece of it. We all have full-time jobs, and people have their complicated personal things that they're dealing with. There's a lot of moving parts here, in terms of trying to get any kind of union activity (besides paying dues and voting) to happen, and they're complicated.

RR: That's what happened when we were organizing at GW. Preparing ourselves to organize meant a reorientation, at least to GW people, from one kind of identity—a graduate student identity of critique and analysis—to identity of self-confidence and activism and labor, where people hadn't had a labor consciousness beforehand.

KM: Yeah.

RR: The steps that the UAW organizers took us through at GW were very physical. You have to literally have your body moved around, to change its orientation to be more assertive and active.

KM: I'll never forget—even doing like the exercise of going up and knocking on someone's door, and how unusual that activity is in a faculty-academic environment, to go up and knock on the door of someone you don't know, and you're there to ask something of them. [Laughs]

SK: We have these kinds of communications channels set up like Raging Chicken Press, and because I'm a pretty obsessive blogger, and that we're both social network junkies. We spend a lot of time just talking to people and listening. We walk up and down the hallways and have these conversations.

RR: What was the narrative that came out of this moment of organizing? I know from my own higher education colleagues that organizing and building a union is not what we've trained to do. As labor leaders, you prepare colleagues for organizing by building relationships through which you can prep them for organizing.

KM: Right, you have to prepare them. The shift to organizing is like anything else. A leader can lay out all the facts in the world, but until you've got a story and a narrative to frame it for folks, to give them a handhold into what you're actually talking about, it doesn't mean anything.

What was really useful at that point is that that was the kind of move we were making. It wasn't about trying to assemble the facts. We said to our colleagues, "You led with the story." "Here's the background." Of course, you've got the facts, you've got the research, you've got stuff behind it if people want to dig in. But, you know, the narrative is what we had down at that point, and that became absolutely critical for people to kind of buy into quickly.

The conversation we had locally at Kutztown and even at legislative assembly was, "Here's what [Chancellor] Brogan is." People would raise questions, "Well, how do you know? Maybe—he seems like he might be

okay." "Well, no, he's not." "Well, how do you know that?" I was able to say like, "Well, because I called the union guys down at Florida Atlantic University where he was at and I asked them."

You could see people's face go kind of like, "Oh."

RR: That's labor literacy.

KM & SK: Yes.

RR: Faculty get it. But you have to bring them there. You have to create a narrative that they can attach themselves to. In some cases, for example with scientists, you have to say, "Okay, I've done research or I have data. I can back up what I'm saying." The strategy differs, depending if you're talking to a scientist or a humanist or whoever you're talking to. But you have to create those literacies and bring faculty to an understanding of what organizing entails.

KM: Yes. I think there's two aspects to this process. In getting trained as an academic, you're getting trained to be an expert in a particular area, so you're learning about your own importance.

I'm not saying that we all think about ourselves actively in that way. But when it comes to asking people to organize—it is a different kind of story than faculty are used to telling. At the same time, it's the kind of practical stuff that Seth talked about with the strike manual. It's saying, "What does this work look like in a practical way? What does it look like to ask a person to do a particular task that will get them past an organizing threshold." It's saying, "I'm not going to say that you suck because you don't know how to knock on someone's door.'" I'm going to say, "Hey, look, we can do this! And here's how we do it."

SK: Another piece of our efforts was a talk that we wrote together for the 2013—the strike workshop that we did after the big protest outside the chancellor's office. The workshop addressed how you recruit members into positions where they're good at—how do you effectively get people to work?

We sent out a survey that asks faculty to give us off-campus contact information, and here's some other things we'd like to know. There is work that needs to get done at various times, so if you're good at clerical things, if you're good at art, if you want to show up at rallies, if you like making phone calls, there's just a checklist. The survey asked faculty to check all the things that they're willing to do and check a box that tells us about how many hours a week we should expect to ask you for.

I have a spreadsheet that's set up where I have the answers to all these questions, and if I need somebody to do tabling for something, then I can search in the database for the word "tabling," and everybody who told me that they would do that just gets highlighted. When I send out emails, I'm not sending out emails to nine hundred people saying, "Can somebody do this task?" I'm sending emails out to forty people who have said, "You told me that you're willing to do this. I need you. I need you for this long, I need you on this day, I need you in this place." The more specific the ask is to people who have already told you that they'll say "yes", the more likely they are to say "yes". Just like those kind—so like those kinds of moves. That's a lot of what infused the revisions to those basic organizing moves.

Instead of holding people accountable, the question was, "How do we help everybody get involved. Because, we have a charge.

KM: Instead of it, saying, "Hey, this is what we're doing." We'd start with cross conversations as well. "How did you guys do this?" Or, "What do you do about this?"

SK: We'd say, "Let's all talk about what we do."

KM: It was cool. We'd do round robin check-ins, campus by campus, and each campus would report what they're doing. Very early on everyone was a bit anxious, they'd say, "I'm not doing what I'm supposed to be doing." But there was little judgement at the beginning, and it was about saying, "Oh, you might want to think about this strategy." It was really a space for conversation.

SK: As an organizing committee, we have a formal charge, and the model was, "How do we make sure that everybody can actually take up the charge?" If we trust our charge, then the business of the committee is to make sure that it happens, rather than busting people's chops for not doing it.

KM: At least at Kutztown, there hadn't been an organizing culture, it certainly wasn't something that we were trained in or talked about as a union: how you actually continually activate new members, how you bring new people in, not just have them sign cards to become new members, but actually do things.

SK: You have to learn how to listen to people. When I said earlier that a lot of what I learned was how to soak up people's freak outs, that's one example. I didn't understand how weird organizing was for many of the pre-tenured junior faculty until I was having lunch one day with a colleague who I was mentoring. She was in her second year, and she told

me pointblank, “There’s a lot of junior people who feel like we can’t even read the emails coming from state anymore, because they’re just so angry, and they don’t mean anything to us. If you want to tell me the important things I’m supposed to have learned from all those updates in the last six months, what would they be?” I said, “To read your email.”

Then, I realized what she was telling me was important. I think that conversation compelled more careful listening. This listening included more day-to-day work of explaining what was happening, why we were asking people to do tasks, and what the permutations were. I began to be a lot clearer about why we couldn’t promise people stuff.

KM: Exactly. This is the moment when we really ramped up. We started this ramp up at the end of that 2016 spring semester. All through the summer, every Wednesday, I held small group meetings, similar to mobilization meetings. Everyone had signups that would go out ahead of time. Half of our conversation, I can tell you now—I wouldn’t have said this out front like to everybody at that point—was performative in the sense that there’s a place to go where faculty can get questions answered. At these meetings, the same faculty who would show up, including some of the local leadership. Some of the newly-elected leaders were getting really annoyed with me. They said, “It’s the same conversation and questions every single week.” My response was, “But that’s the point.”

Every time there would be a new update, I would get a big sheet of paper, it would be taped up on the wall, with some of the highlights of points, and we’d talk it through. Invariably what would happen over the course of like several months is that there were people who had been there more often, and then it wasn’t just me explaining what was going on. Other people in the room could also help faculty answer questions. Faculty brought really good questions—some of them were extraordinarily technical, but you need to work through that.

You spend that time.

As much as it was frustrating for some of us who had been there like every single week, that time was extraordinarily valuable. Faculty knew that there were places to go. In the meetings, we didn’t say, “Buy into this program and be an automaton. March, ants, march!” But rather, “How are we in this together?” If we are going to kind of actually do what we’re promising from the strike manual and the mobilization committee, it’s important to build points of connection with faculty. This strategy turned out to be hugely important.

SK: On our campus, we didn’t do that organizing by meetings, because in addition to a giant faculty, people live anywhere from a hundred yards to

a hundred miles away. Getting twenty people in a room at once is almost impossible. There were as many as half a dozen of us who just live in social media. If you looked at my Facebook at any point during that time, you would have seen conversation after conversation after conversation, many of which were the same people asking the same questions. "If we go on strike, where am I supposed to park?"

Those kinds of conversations. But talking with folks on social media was less routinized, but the level of access was equivalent to meeting. People knew that they could ask questions. I lost my patience with people about the parking question a couple of times, but that happens. [Laughs]

KM: The conversations were also important on my end about getting comfortable in telling people that there were clear lines.

SK: There was also a moment in there for me, like early in the fall of 2016, six to eight weeks before the strike, as I was getting a lot of questions such as what do we do about student teacher supervision? People were asking me those kinds of detail questions. I got really frustrated by getting asked the same question seven or eight hundred times. And then, one day I finally realized, "You know, people are asking me these questions because they want to get it right." They're not looking for reasons not to do things. They're not trying to generate excuses, and they want to make sure that they do right by as many people as possible. They're not looking for loopholes. Everything changed for me that day. It was just like that put me back to position where my job was to train people.

KM: At the time, one of the things I told people was a story my dad told me about the first strike that he ever worked when he was a negotiator at the Westmoreland School District in New York. The teachers were pissed off. It was going to be a really bad contract, the administration were being complete assholes, and all the teachers were geared up to strike. My dad told me, "We had a meeting where we had to decide: Are we going to go on strike or not?" In New York State, public teachers are not allowed to strike, it's against the law. He said, "Okay, look. If you strike, we got it. But this is what a strike might mean. If we go on strike, it's potentially against the law. That means some of you actually might spend a night in jail. Some of you may lose your jobs. Yes, you're protected. This is a protected right, but you may lose your job. There's no guarantee.

There are people that are going to be yelling at you. There's going to be a contentious situation on your campus afterwards, because there are going to be some people who are going to cross the line. So, if you decide to go on strike, this is what you need to know that could happen. I'm not saying it's going to happen, but these are potentials."

If you vote yes, we're in it one hundred percent." [Laughs] And my dad said the vote was decisive. "Ninety-nine percent vote: Yes, we're going on strike!" The point of that story was that you lay it all out, because you can never be in a situation where something's going to happen afterwards, and they're going to come back and say, "You told me this couldn't happen!"

You break your solidarity, you break your trust. And so, you lay it all out there, especially once you've built enough of a background, and that was part of the mantra. So, don't sugarcoat. Say, "Is this a possibility? Yes. How likely is it? Not very likely, but this is a possibility. You could lose your job. And we will fight it. But you're going to make this decision. Do it with eyes open." For me, it's one thing to talk about that going on as a principle. It's another thing having those conversations with groups of faculty over and over again, where part of the reassurance is that you're going to be honest with them, not that everything is going to be just normal, and going on strike is not a big deal.

SK: I'm a different person than I was October fifteenth of 2016. One of the ways in which I'm different is that I will never forgive the people who made us go on strike. It's unforgivable that the people who run our system were so fucking stupid and incompetent that they drove us to that. They were so reckless and irresponsible.

RR: What were they reckless and irresponsible about, exactly?

SK: They lie about finances. They lie about the conditions in the universities. They lie to the press about what the union contract does and doesn't say. They lie about the faculty and what our workload is. They lie to the legislature about what we do and don't do, and how expensive we are and how much the system needs.