

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Dissertations, Theses, and Student Research:  
Department of English

English, Department of

---

6-2017

# TILTING AT WINDMILLS: REFIGURING GRADUATE EDUCATION IN ENGLISH TO PREPARE FUTURE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS

Darin L. Jensen

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishdiss>



Part of the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#), [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

Jensen, Darin L., "TILTING AT WINDMILLS: REFIGURING GRADUATE EDUCATION IN ENGLISH TO PREPARE FUTURE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS" (2017). *Dissertations, Theses, and Student Research: Department of English*. 132.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishdiss/132>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Student Research: Department of English by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

TILTING AT WINDMILLS: REFIGURING GRADUATE EDUCATION IN ENGLISH  
TO PREPARE FUTURE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS

by

Darin Lee Jensen

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of  
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska  
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements  
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: English

Under the Supervision of Professor Robert Brooke

Lincoln, Nebraska

June 2017

TILTING AT WINDMILLS: REFIGURING GRADUATE EDUCATION IN ENGLISH  
TO PREPARE FUTURE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE PROFESSIONALS

Darin Lee Jensen, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 2017

Advisor: Robert Brooke

This dissertation makes recommendations for the reform of graduate education to better serve current and future two-year college English instructors. The author undertakes historical and archival research to write a history of how English instructors have been prepared for the distinct profession of two-year college teaching. In addition, the author interviews two-year college English instructors from around the United States to chronicle their preparation narratively and how said preparation has affected their working experience. Drawing on the historical, narrative and current practices found in the research, the author details specific interventions, in the form of equity-centered partnerships, to improve preparation of community college writing faculty, including partnerships between graduate programs and two-year institutions, explicit and specific graduate coursework, and recognizing and promoting two-year college composition research as a discipline. In addition, the author examines how reform movements surrounding graduate school should incorporate these equity-centered partnerships into their programs to move English graduate education's locus toward equity with two-year college English.

## **Dedication**

This labor is dedicated to Sara. This labor is for Max, Ian, Lindsey, and my students.

## **Acknowledgements**

To my dissertation committee:

I would like to acknowledge the importance of your work and my appreciation for your time and insight. The Two-Year College English Association's 2016 *Guidelines for Preparing Teachers of English in the Two-Year College* has as one of its recommendations the support of graduate students' dissertation projects which are relevant to the two-year college. By engaging with this project, each of you are part of an important reform movement. Thank you.

Thanks to Robert Brooke for his willingness to take on a non-traditional graduate student who had a non-traditional project in mind. I appreciate your experience and wisdom.

Thanks to Stacey Waite for two summers of dissertation camp.

Thanks to Elaine Chan for an introduction to narrative research.

Thanks to Shari Stenberg for her insight and ability to broaden my thinking.

Thanks to Christie Toth for early morning writing sessions, and for taking the two-year college show on the road and for showing me how it is done. I am certain you didn't sign up for this when we met in a snowstorm in Lincoln, but I'm so grateful you were game for our collaboration. I appreciate your mentorship.

To my friends, colleagues, co-conspirators:

I would like to acknowledge the work, thinking, comradeship and support of the people who helped make this dissertation a reality:

Dan Boster—I appreciate beer, mindfulness and teaching anytime, but especially with you.

Frank Bramlett—Thank you for your steadfast friendship and clear thinking.

Susan Ely—Thank you for taking on the Basic Writing Externship with me. We made a good program and it is the most satisfying work I've done yet.

Helen Fountain—I appreciate our conversations, your vision, and your wisdom.

Brett Griffiths—Thanks to my writing partner and friend for helping to guide the way through.

Cheri Lemieux Spiegel—Your work and your commitment make me believe in the power of two-year faculty to make change.

Christopher McLucas—Thank you for the lesson of putting our butt in the chair and writing and for the months of writing together at the Omaha Public Library. You are one of the serious.

Bernice Olivas—Your vision of justice inspires me.

Mark Reynolds—My conversations with you connected me to the history of our profession in a profound way.

Patrick Sullivan—Thank you for articulating the concept of teacher-scholar-activist. It is what we need at this moment and I hope this work adds to it.

Emily Suh—Your energy and commitment astound me. I work to live up to your level.

Each of the folks above influenced the intellectual work in this dissertation. They all helped guide my thinking in some way.

## Table of Content

<b>List of Figures</b>	7
<b>A Polemical Introduction: Establishing Ethos, Values, and Vision</b>	8
<b>Chapter 1--Encountering the Community College: A Neoliberal Dream? Democratic Opportunity?</b>	28
Overview	28
Introduction	28
Positioning the Importance of the Community College	31
Briefly, the Nature and the History of the Community College	34
Ideological Origins of the Community College	39
Governance in the Community College	43
Our Exigent Moment	46
Teaching in the Two-Year College	48
What about Writing Teachers?	53
<b>Chapter 2—An Examination of the English Instructor in the Two-Year College: A History of Incomplete and Uneven Professionalization</b>	57
Overview	57
Introduction	58
The Work of Two-Year College English Instructors: Broad Generalists, Interdisciplinary Literacy Workers, Cook, and Bottle Washer	59
Two-Year College Faculty: A Distinct Profession Incompletely Professionalized	61
The History of Graduate Preparation for Two-Year College English Faculty	67
Rapid Proliferation	69
Lost Program Archaeology	72
Certificate of Authenticity?	75
Torpor and Transition	77
Claiming Identity and a Rising Tide	80
Finding What’s Out There Now	81
Current Efforts	83
Conclusion	88
Overview	90
Introduction	91

Methodology and Validity	92
15 Narratives, Summarized and Analyzed	95
Connecting the Literature	109
Insight One: Specific Coursework	115
Insight Two: Outside Experience as Preparation	117
Insight Three: Articulating Needs	118
Conclusion	119
Overview	121
Introduction	121
Toward a New Theory of Partnership	124
Two examples of Equity-Centered Partnerships	125
A Teaching Externship: Bringing the Graduate Student to the Two-Year College	126
Coursework Taught in Collaboration by Community College Professionals: Bringing the Expert to the Graduate Program	128
Sustainability	130
A Seat at the Table	132
Future Imagining	134
Works Cited	137
<b>Appendix A IRB Protocols for Externship Project</b>	148
<b>Consent Letter for Extern Project</b>	148
<b>Interview Questions for Externship</b>	149
<b>Appendix B Externship Reading Lists</b>	152
<b>Appendix C IRB Interview Questions for Case Studies</b>	155
<b>IRB Approval Letter</b>	155
<b>Case Study Interview Questions</b>	156
<b>Appendix D Syllabus for Cheri Lemieux-Spiegel Class</b>	161



## **List of Figures**

Figure 1: AACC 2016 Fact Sheet

Figure 2: Chart of Extant Graduate Programs

Figure 3: Participants Names and Experience

Figure 4: Reciprocal Equity-Centered Partnership

## **A Polemical Introduction: Establishing Ethos, Values, and Vision**

I have chosen to title this a “polemical introduction” after Northrop Frye’s *Anatomy of Criticism*, where he argues:

This book consists of "essays," in the word's original sense of a trial or incomplete attempt, on the possibility of a synoptic view of the scope, theory, principles, and techniques of literary criticism. The primary aim of the book is to give my reasons for believing in such a synoptic view; its secondary aim is to provide a tentative version of it which will make enough sense to convince my readers that a view, of the kind that I outline, is attainable. The gaps in the subject as treated here are too enormous for the book ever to be regarded as presenting my system, or even my theory. It is to be regarded rather as an interconnected group of suggestions which it is hoped will be of some practical use to critics and students of literature. Whatever is of no practical use to anybody is expendable. (Frye)

My work in this dissertation is synoptic in that it attempts to bring together historical and practical strands of the community college’s mission and function, graduate preparation, intervention, and thinking about the democratic purposes of education. It is an essay using the older conception as it is an attempt, certainly an incomplete one, to bring these topics together. Finally, I too, offer an “interconnected group of suggestions” that I hope to be of practical use.

However, I am a good postmodernist and know that many lenses are left out of this dissertation. The subject of class is not examined critically in this dissertation. There is work to be done to understand how first-generation and working class graduate students frequently end up teaching in community colleges. There is work to be done in understanding the ideological constructions of literacy education and how those constructions inform pedagogy. Moreover, race is not critically examined in this

dissertation. Finally, gender is not examined critically in this essay. Women do most the teaching in English departments at community colleges. Without doubt, there are several reasons for this fact. Community college faculty, while teaching arguably the most diverse set of students, are less diverse than their four-year college and university counterparts (Suchor, personal communication, (NCES, *Race/Ethnicity of College Faculty*). This fact is troubling and deserves more investigation than it has received thus far. Class, race, and gender are important components of the story of who ends up teaching in the community college English classroom. They are not parts of the story told in this dissertation though. Instead, I am looking at how community college are prepared for what Mark Reynolds has named the “distinct and significant profession” of community college teaching (Reynolds). I offer a synoptic view of how mission, graduate preparation, and the narratives of fifteen community college instructors create a case for the interventions I describe. I do not think these are the only interventions needed. But I do think they are attainable interventions. Therefore, my choice in promoting them is pragmatic and tactical.

This dissertation insists that graduate faculty must reform graduate education in English so that it can meet the needs of community college instructors of the present and future. I write this introduction because I want to establish my ethos. I have been a teacher and an administrator at community colleges for fourteen years at the time of this writing. I have taught as an adjunct, a full-time instructor who had the equivalent of tenure, and as an adjunct again. I have taught dropouts and honor students, hard luck cases and murderers. I have been a subject-matter coordinator, a department coordinator, and a director. I have hired nearly 100 adjuncts as well as full-time instructors and a

couple of deans, too. I have sat on governance committees and participated in Higher Learning Commission projects. I have a deep respect for what the community college does, as well as a deep ambivalence about how successful we are. I believe in the vision first established by the Truman Commission in 1947 that the community college is about equity and democracy. But I have seen students being “cooled out” (Clark) and shunted into low-level work. I have heard students called “customers” by well-meaning administrators who seem unconscious of their neoliberal rhetoric.

I first began working in a community college in the fall of 2003. I had a master’s degree in English from a large state university in Kansas and had returned home to Omaha where, for a variety of personal reasons, I was place bound. My master’s degree had a teaching practicum of a somewhat innovative design—the graduate students took a small class each semester that discussed methods of assignment design and portfolio assessment among other things. In the second year, students worked on CVs and teaching philosophies as they prepared to go on to other degree programs or enter the workforce in some way. Looking back, the program was a good one, but lacked any mention or preparation for teaching in a community college—an institution about which, to my knowledge, none of the professors knew of or ever mentioned. That isn’t to say that there wasn’t discussion of community colleges. At a Halloween party, I had my first introduction to this conversation when a graduate student, dressed as Sir Philip Sydney no less, lamented that all our MA was preparing us for was to teach at a community college. I wondered at his assertion. I didn’t understand it to be honest. Later, I found out that other students, as they finished their MAs often moonlighted at the community colleges within driving distance to the state university. These were place-bound students

who could not have left for another degree or who were doing low-residency MFAs and using the teaching at the local community colleges for modified version of a teaching assistantship, or to make enough money to eat. Looking back, I see my ignorance of community colleges to fit in with the scholarly conversation captured in Grubb's *Honored but Invisible*, a book published in 1999, which is a comprehensive examination of teaching in the community college. Grubb found that other than a "few smaller empirical pieces" there wasn't much extant scholarship on "what teaching looks like in the 'teaching college'" (Grubb and Worthen 11). It was not a wonder then that in 2001, I was unaware of the community college.

Later, when it turned out that my family and I couldn't move to pursue my doctoral studies, I began to look for a teaching job. I applied at community colleges and some other places. I heard nothing. Getting desperate to have a job that fall, I applied to an ESL adjunct position at a community college that was a 30-minute drive from my home. I didn't have any coursework in second language acquisition or linguistics. I talked my way into the position because I had been a high school Spanish teacher and the group of students I would be teaching would all be native Spanish speakers at the college on a grant program. Because it was a grant and not in an academic department, I was paid per contact hour—23.00 per hour for 20 hours of classroom teaching per week, I think. This, situation, too, I was to find to be common in the literature of the community college. Reynolds and Holliday Hicks' volume, *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College*, chronicles many such instances over the forty-year span from the 1970s onward. In that volume, Marilyn Smith Layton writes about following her husband to Michigan and earning an MA there and only hearing about the profession of the

community college from an advisor (Smith Layton 28). She also recounts being given “two classes of composition—English 101” with just three days to prepare to teach the class (28). Smith Layton also recounts one her first evaluations where a student told her that she was a good teacher, but that she knew “nothing about the lives your students live” (29). While my working-class background gave me a keener insight into the lives my students led in some respects, much of what Smith Layton rings true for my experience and for the experience of many community college teachers. We are not prepared.

In that first position, there were no benefits or sick days or retirement or anything else. I loved the students and I was certainly getting a crash course in teaching, but I needed a real position because my wife and I had a baby on the way. I tried to pick up more adjunct work in the English department there, but the union rules wouldn't allow me to have more teaching than what I already had. I was exploited labor—“adjunct scum” as I came to think of myself. On the plus side, I gained my first knowledge and experience in teaching ESL. I parlayed that ESL experience into a job as an international admissions advisor at the local state university. After a year and a half, the community college program called me back and invited me to apply for a position running their international programs—the very program where I had been an adjunct. I took the job. This moment of the narrative seems like a good one, after all, I was working hard and getting raises. I finally had benefits and a retirement account. Yet now I was hiring adjuncts and writing grants while managing mundane activities like getting students to and from the airport as well as assisting them with their immigration documents. It was challenging work and the students were great for the most part. However, I wasn't a

teacher and that's what I wanted to be. What's more, I was hiring part-time ESL instructors into the same kind of half-life where they are not only not valued at their place of employment, they also do not earn enough to achieve financial security. I had gotten out of it just as soon as I could and hiring folks to that position made me feel complicit with an unjust system.

To cut a long story short, by 2009 I was in the middle of a second graduate degree—this time in language teaching. I was hoping to finagle my ESL and international experience to get a full-time teaching position. Luckily, another position opened in English at the urban community college in Omaha and I made it through the application process to the second interview and teaching demonstration. Somehow, out of more than 140 applicants, I landed the job and began as a full-time instructor at a community college that fall. I had been hired as an English instructor who would have half his load in basic writing. I had made sure to look up and read about basic writing and reading pedagogy on the web before my interview and I made it through. It is worth noting here that this was the second time that I had been given a position to teach a marginalized population without proper training or professional preparation. I came to learn through my work teaching and through my research that this situation is commonplace. I think like many people who arrive in this situation, especially knowing what we know about the job market, that I was right to feel like I'd hit the lottery. I was getting a raise of a few thousand dollars, I wouldn't have to punch a clock, and I'd have summers off to camp and raise my children. Really, I had arrived.

When I got to my community college, though, I quickly found that I knew very little about the institutional type, the mission, the student population, the tensions

between the transfer and job preparation missions And I immediately found that what I didn't know very much about was the teaching of basic writing or developmental education. What's more, as I began my full-time teaching there, we were in the middle of the great recession and every class was full. People believed that if they could get an education, or survive on financial aid long enough, that things would turn around for them. I had classes full of profoundly different students who were at vastly divergent levels. There were students who had just come from prison. I even had a student who had been a reality TV star that first quarter. My lessons from being a TA helped. My experience advising students helped. My experience teaching ESL was especially helpful, but none of them prepared me for the distinct profession of teaching English at the community college. I blamed myself for this. I think this is a common move. Clearly, I hadn't taken the right classes. I was a fraud. There, of course, is also a tendency to blame students. Why aren't they prepared? Why aren't they serious? Do they have an ability to benefit? Maybe college just isn't for some people anyway.

However, I quickly came to learn that most of my students were earnest, if unprepared. They didn't know the game of education, its language or discourses. And their circumstances were often astonishingly difficult. I encountered poverty as I never had before. I encountered students who had been abused or who were recovering addicts (or not recovering). I encountered men who had worked hard, but whose job was gone or whose body couldn't do the work anymore. They were all there to make a new start. These second chances fit neatly with Mike Rose's work on the community college, which he sees as a second chance institution (Rose *Possible Lives*; Rose *Back to School*). But it wasn't the whole story.



Frankly, the experience began to radicalize me. It began to bring me to my own class consciousness. I could see in these students' struggles with opaque systems that seemed designed to confound them rather than empower them; these were some of the same frustrations I had encountered as I worked my way through my undergraduate and graduate degrees. I was beginning to see systems as barriers and a much more significant source of trouble than I previously had. My students shared the same "bootstraps" narrative I had once had, but it began to ring false. I was coming, as Patrick Sullivan does to believe that "our work is about education, reading and writing, and literacy, of course, but it is also about class, gender, and race, and inequality and poverty. It is about freedom, social justice, and the ideals of a democracy"(Sullivan, "Teacher, Scholar, Activist", 332). But I didn't have access to the rich history of thinking about this at the time. I was frustrated and just beginning to attempt to contextualize my students' and my experience. Of course, while I felt alone in this regard, Grubb's examination of teaching at the community college showed that many instructors struggled with the broad demands of their profession which included "core areas of academic preparation, occupational instruction, remedial/developmental education [...] short-term job training, workforce development, and community service" all the while being committed to a vast array and diversity of students and student ability (Grubb and Worthen 6).

In a parallel way, I found that I hadn't been well prepared by the system of education either. I found that I needed a whole new education. Luckily, I was finishing my second MA and had the chance to take a course in Composition and Rhetoric—being introduced to the discipline as well as educational methods, discourse analysis, and linguistics in other courses gave me a concrete set of tools to use with my students. I was

learning things on Monday or Wednesday night that would make it into the next week's lesson plan. I began talking about discourse communities and registers in specific ways to my students. I was explicitly discussing the interlocking systems in which we interact and live. Like my former classmates in Kansas, I was designing my own teaching assistantship while educating myself. But still, this education lacked any direct coursework on the community college, its students, or its purposes and history. There was a great deal missing to be honest. I needed to understand and access the notion, as Sullivan puts it, that "open admissions two-year colleges are dedicated to the proposition that it is unacceptable for any American to be trapped by his or her history, by class or race, or by a higher educational system designed to perpetuate privilege and wealth (Sullivan, "Teacher, Scholar, Activist", 335). I needed this to develop my professional identity and to help my students move forward in their lives.

Nell Ann Pickett described the community college as democracy in action and this is a rhetorical construction that most of my colleagues who are engaged in ongoing professional dialogues in organizations like TYCA want to propagate (Pickett). However, the modern community college, which emerged after World War II as an institution aimed at providing educational access to all, struggles. Encapsulated best in the 1947 Truman Report, the mission of the community college has been development of access to education and development of democracy. To summarize, the commission, appointed by President Truman in 1946, had the mandate to find a new direction for American higher education. It called for "the establishment of a network of public community colleges that would charge little or no tuition, serve as cultural centers, be comprehensive in their program offerings with emphasis on civic responsibilities, and would serve the area in

which they were located” (Truman Commission 33-34). It is a deeply progressive and expansive vision. Sullivan and Toth name this time as the “moment when the modern two-year college—with its mandate to democratize the nation’s postsecondary system—was born” (Sullivan and Toth 3) Over time this mission has become muddled, and has transformed into what Harbour identifies as its normative vision, from access to completion (Harbour). Cohen, Bawer, and Kisker call this change the vocationalization of the community college (Cohen, Bawer, and Kisker 39; see also Brint and Karabel). Whichever is the case, these narrow visions complicate the democratic vision because narrow instrumentalist market-based notions of the purpose of education do not necessarily maintain democratic principles and their development as necessary. The democratic vision is further complicated by the rise of market-based logics over the last thirty-plus years. By market-based logics, I mean the ideology of neoliberalism, which can be defined as a “set of economic principles and cultural politics that positions the free market as a guide for all human action” (Stenberg 4). The idea of the public good is under deep duress—state funding for community colleges at the state level has dropped precipitously, tuition has risen, students go into debt. Harbour’s analysis of available research over the last three decades shows a nearly 40 percent drop in state support of community colleges (Harbour). Community college tuition has risen 24 percent over the last five years alone (Covert). All of this contributes to the more than 1 trillion-dollar student loan debt that Americans have, a figure categorized as a crisis by many. Access to educational opportunity is expensive and is becoming more so every year. Notably, this is all true at a time when income inequality is variously described as being the worst since either the Great Depression or the Gilded Age (Lindert and Williamson). We might

categorize all of these changes as a product of neoliberalism, an ideology which posits all individuals as “rational economic actors” who are individually responsible for everything in their lives (Stenberg 5).

Patrick Sullivan challenges two-year college professionals to change the dominant narrative about community colleges, to share the many successes we have (Sullivan, "Teacher, Scholar, Activist", 340). This dominant narrative centers around a narrowed purpose of education that prizes education for workforce development to the exclusion of other traditional purposes of education such as the development of human beings and the development of citizens. Sullivan's assertion resonates strongly. However, as I'll point out in the following chapters, it isn't just that we must challenge the dominant narrative about community colleges, it's that we must acknowledge the competing narratives and missions of the two-year college. A 2012 American Association of Community College AACC report points to seven areas where the community college is struggling. The first is the low completion rate, which according to the National Center of Educational Statistics is 29.4% for the Fall 2010 cohort (AACC, 2016 Fact Sheet). It should be noted that time to graduation is calculated by NCES at 150%, so the figure means that of students who began school at a two-year school in 2010, that only 29.4% had graduated in three years (National Center for Educational Statistics). Others include lack of community support, reduced state funding, underprepared students, a debate over remedial education (its place, efficacy, role as a barrier, and even its continued existence), lack of collaboration between school and a graduate skill gap. The Completion Agenda, asserts Harbour in *John Dewey and the Future of Community College Education*, is the paramount driving force in the current reform movement for the

two-year college. This reform movement has several components, including the completion agenda, the reform and elimination of developmental education, and a further concretizing of the link between education and workplace preparation. This agenda, argues Harbour, replaces the first vision of community colleges (espoused in the Truman Commission), with an economic normative vision.

My dissertation provides a mechanism in Equity-Centered-Partnerships (described in chapter four in detail) which allows for many of the problems the AACC identified in their report to be addressed, while helping to push for a democratic normative vision of the community college. I have chosen to locate that challenge and that work within the context of preparing teachers to work in the community college. I have chosen the phrase equity here for a couple of reasons. One definition of equity is fair and just. I am asserting that partnerships between two-year colleges and graduate programs could be fair and just. But equity can also mean ownership, or a share of ownership and this connotation is important in my configuration of these partnerships as well. Both graduate programs and two-year colleges must own graduate education for the sake of its future, utility, and effectiveness. For too long two-year colleges have had no equitable stake in the configuration of the training of graduates. To be brief: I envision equity-centered partnerships as reciprocal local agreements and programs wherein two-year college English departments and graduate programs collaborate to create meaningful, sustainable reform that prepares graduate students for the two-year college classroom and the distinct challenges of that institution type.

The dissertation operates from some assumptions that readers may or may not share. I believe the purpose of education is to prepare people in their own best interests. I

want to stop for a moment and unpack this notion of who names these best interests.

Patrick Finn in *Literacy with and Attitude* spends a large portion of his book discussing this idea. For him, an education in students' own best interests requires that education make students aware of their "three categories of citizenship rights": civil rights, political rights, and social rights (Finn 157-8). To go further, Finn critiques the U.S. school system, which he sees as reproducing class, rather than creating class fluidity. He does this through a compelling analysis of Anyon's landmark work critiquing school systems. In the community college, the narrow instrumentalism of reproducing class or mere job preparation of managing Clark's "cooling out" is not in the students' best interests. What is in students' best interests is to be in an educational environment where they can interrogate the school system they find themselves within, explicitly learn about their rights as citizens, and negotiate and work for a curriculum that allows them to make informed decisions about their future. To be clear, this work is Freirean in nature in that it should ask the students and the community what it is that the students want and need. The community that receives attention in the community college in my experience is given voice through organizations like the chamber of commerce, which in my estimation reduce the purpose of education to instrumentalist and economic purposes rather than a broader more holistic conception of education.

Finn argues persuasively that powerful literacy is a teachable skill and that teaching it is a "matter of justice" (Finn ix). My years teaching in the community college have led me to commit to this work wholeheartedly. I believe, too, that education is about helping citizens engage in democratic processes. Here I follow Rose, Gallagher, Dewey,

Pickett, Sullivan and a host of others who predicate the two-year college as an important site of human and democratic development. Rose writes:

while acknowledging the importance of the economic motive for schooling, our philosophy of education—our guiding rationale for creating schools—must include the intellectual, social, civic, moral, and aesthetic motives as well. If these further motives are not articulated, they fade from public policy, from institutional mission, from curriculum development. Without this richer philosophy, those seeking a second chance will likely receive a bare-bones, strictly functional education, one that does not honor the many reasons they return to school and, for that matter, one not suitable for a democratic society” (Rose, *Possible Lives*, 185-86).

So, educating students in their own best interests is also the work of building a democratic and equitable culture and society. This philosophy guides my work in the classroom, my scholarship, and my community activism.

Further, I believe firmly in the potential of writing studies and writing classrooms to be a site where students can engage in this kind of critical work for their own betterment and the betterment of their community. It is important that betterment be defined by the students and community themselves. Mary Louise Pratt’s configuration of working in the contact zone is well known. She defines contact zones as "spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery or their aftermaths as they are lived out in the world today" (Pratt 34). The community college classroom and the institution itself is a contact zone where class, types of literacy and the contested ideologies of democracy and neoliberalism meet. In my estimation, preparing teachers to work in these contact zones is of vital importance to students and the country.

I understand these are contested ideas in our larger culture. Few ideas are without their critics. However, I do not come to them naively as I hope my experience illustrates.

Rather, I have come to see these contested ideas as values which should be struggled for in our classrooms and institutions. In his essay “Virtuous Arguments,” John Duffy explicitly discusses how the writing classroom is a site of democratic development. He argues that first-year writing “is a well-organized, systematic, and dedicated effort taking place each day to promote an ethical public discourse grounded in the virtues of honesty, accountability, and generosity” that it is the one guaranteed place in the curriculum where a student can engage in a course of “ethical communication” (Duffy). I agree with Duffy and wish to amplify his sentiments by arguing that the first-year writing course is also the site where students can begin to engage in powerful literacy which can help them to understand, resist, and the discourses that shape their lives. While Duffy is arguing specifically for the first-year writing course, the democratic mission of the community college makes his argument directly applicable to the context of this dissertation. Again, I do not argue this naively—I have taught more than 100 sections of first-year and developmental writing and know this is hard work. It is also hopeful and necessary work. These are values worth the struggle.

This dissertation chronicles the mission and history of the community college. It looks at the incomplete and uneven professionalization of the two-year college English instructor drawing on scholars such as Tinberg, Andelora, Sullivan, among others. I have spent a chapter synthesizing the lived experience of teachers who work in this environment. The point of this dissertation, my PhD program, and my involvement with the profession over the last five years has been to become the teacher-scholar-activist that Jeff Andelora and Patrick Sullivan assert as our potential identity. I believe this is the whole new education I was looking for as I encountered the difficulties of being a teacher



at the two-year college. My work, here, is influenced, too, by the TYCA—the Two-Year College English Association, a group of engaged teacher-scholar-activists, connected to NCTE and CCCC who have charted the evolution of the profession of teaching English in the two-year college. Over time and through interactions with these voices, I have built an identity that fits, for me, the ethos I've been searching for in my work and education.

As I said earlier, I have been teaching and working in community colleges for 14 years. I have written about community college issues and teaching for publication in national peer-reviewed journals. Over the past several years, I created a program with Susan Ely to provide graduate students with training and professionalization in basic writing and community college teaching. This program addresses a need found in Hassel's article "Research Gaps in Teaching English in the Two-Year College." Hassel found that just 3% of articles in the flagship peer-reviewed journal on community college English were concerned with the preparation of future teachers (Hassel 355). This number included the first two iterations of the professional guidelines produced by national committees. Further, I have served on a national professional committee to revise and rewrite the 2016 Two-Year College English Association *Guidelines* which are meant to shape our profession in the preparation of future teachers. This document is the third iteration of the guidelines and the committee of authors chose to specifically concentrate on graduate preparation in this instance. The committee identified four goals for graduate programs, including collaboration, raised visibility, the development of curricula, and the preparation of graduate students to be engaged professionals (Calhoun-Dillahunt, Carolyn et al., n.p.). My dissertation and the research and program development surrounding it work to enact each of these goals. Thus, my work on

graduate preparation fits with the nationally asserted need and serves to provide coverage for an identified gap in our field.

I have partnered with community colleges across Nebraska to create a needed professional organization to provide the professionalization and community needed for developmental educators. I have travelled across the United States to conferences at the state, regional, and national levels to discuss these guidelines and the need for graduate programs to take up their ethical responsibility to educate and train graduate students for the specific contexts of the two-year college institution and the discipline of two-year college composition studies. I have served on a national professional committee to revise and rewrite the Guidelines which are meant to guide our profession in the preparation of future teachers. I realize the world is awash in dissertations where graduate students make arguments about how a discipline ought to be intervened in and changed or reformed to be better. It is a common genre, really. However, I wish to credit myself here by saying that not only have I argued for this, but I have lived it, taught it, and advocated for it in every available space. This final chapter details interventions and the hard work that lays ahead if community college English professionals are to be completely professionalized and finally be accorded an equal status at the table of English Studies. In that chapter, I frame the concept of Equity-Centered Partnerships as a way forward in harmonizing and sustaining the relations between graduate education and community colleges.

I have chosen reform of graduate education because I believe it is possible, although Sisyphean. We know the academy faces an intractable labor crisis. We know that the community college mission has been largely usurped by the Completion Agenda and vocationalization, which are material manifestations of neoliberal logics and market

ideology. What's more, universities are in similar straights, with the humanities and English studies looking for students, failing to have tenure lines replaced, diminishing enrollment and more. But I chose graduate education reform not just because I am most familiar with it, after all I've been a graduate student in some fashion for 10 years of my life, but rather because I argue that graduate reform holds the possibility of sustainable change.

Chapter one of this dissertation looks at the mission of the community college. The *American Association of Community Colleges*, in its recent report "Reclaiming the American dream: community colleges and the nation's future: a report from the 21st-Century Commission on the Future of Community Colleges" asserts that community colleges have an undefined mission. This finding is misguided. The mission is not undefined—it is contested. In my chapter, I historically chronicle the mission of the community college, which I identify as not one mission, but competing missions. This chapter establishes the exigent moment of the community college and its neoliberal trajectory. I choose the metaphor of Janus, the Roman God of beginnings and transitions. Janus usually is represented with two faces. The two faces of the community college—the Completion Agenda driven by neoliberal logics and the democratic agenda—compete with one another, creating a great deal of institutional and instructional tension.

Chapter two of this dissertation looks at the history of graduate preparation of community college instructors. This chapter is a historical overview and a current cataloging of programs which exist to train future and current community college English teachers. The chapter draws on research I began for the 2016 "TYCA Guidelines for Preparing Teachers of College English." Some of this research made it into the article

Toth and I wrote discussing the historical development of graduate preparation for two-year college English instructors. The chapter reveals a cyclical hodgepodge of programs over the last forty years, which include everything from the Doctor of Arts to certificates and internships and externships created by two-year college faculty. The training has a wildly inconsistent history and demonstrates a paucity of resources and attention to the instructional workforce of English studies that makes up half the profession.

Chapter three synthesizes and reports on fifteen case studies of community college professionals from across the United States. These case studies demonstrate that the unclear mission of the community college, coupled with poor graduate preparation places community college instructors in a precarious position where it is difficult to sustain professionalism. The chapter reveals how community college professionals draw on other professional experiences, relationships with other teachers, and homemade professional networks to cobble together a professional identity. The chapter looks at the case studies through the lens of literature on professional development in the two-year college. The analysis of the chapter again demonstrates an inconsistent profession containing everything from highly professionalized instructors to what I call fossilized instructors who are not engaged with the profession.

Chapter four introduces and develops the concept of Equity-Centered-Partnerships. I build this notion from Gallagher's concept of Pedagogy-Centered Outreach in *Radical Departures* where he argues that "academics will need to reimagine and renegotiate their authority relationships in order to create pedagogy centered outreach" (Gallagher 186). He sees that both "pedagogically and politically" that "the vitality" of English studies "may well hinge on our ability to forge creative and mutually

respectful alliances with our P-12 colleagues” (187). My refiguring of his concept concentrates on the equitable necessity of partnerships between graduate programs and community college English departments to create systemic sustainable reform to better prepare graduate students. In this chapter, I offer two examples of these partnerships which already exist. These two emblematic programs show the potential for action-research oriented partnerships to create authentic reform, which I argue inject more than a note of equity into the hierarchy of graduate education. The first is a program that I co-designed and deployed with Susan Ely for three years at Metropolitan Community College in Omaha, Nebraska (Jensen and Ely, "Externships"). This externship model serves as an example of a locally responsive Equity-Centered partnership. Here graduate students teach at the community college. The second model is a graduate course taught by a two-year college professional at Marymount College in Virginia. This model allows for community college professionals to teach graduate students and to share their expertise with four-year faculty. Having two-year college experts teach within graduate schools is another manifestation of professional equity. I chose these examples because they are pragmatic and possible interventions. As I explain in the chapter, they are not easy for a variety of political and bureaucratic reasons, but they are more feasible than other interventions.

## **Chapter 1--Encountering the Community College: A Neoliberal Dream? Democratic Opportunity?**

### *Overview*

Chapter one begins with an assessment of the community college as an institution ripe with democratic and transformative possibility. This potential is complicated by competing rhetorics and ideologies, particularly neoliberal ideologies. This complication arises from the historical origin and position of the community college, especially its competing missions of democratic access and workforce development. This mission has ideological origins, which I summarize by drawing on Dougherty, Harbour, and Gallagher's work. The unique mission and history of the community college has also led to a distinctive governance structure, where in most cases, the administration is dominant. All of this has brought community colleges to an exigent moment where they are receiving a great deal of focus from government and business entities. This attention, couched in neoliberal rhetoric and ideology, threatens to diminish and possibly eliminate the community college's democratic possibility. This change has implications for teaching in the two-year college and for writing studies in the two-year college. This is especially true because writing classes are often presented by writing teachers as sites where critical thinking is developed.

### *Introduction*

I love the community college. I love the community college as an institution because it is frequently a place where students who would not otherwise be able to engage in post-secondary education can do so. I love these colleges because, like Mike Rose, I see them as second chance institutions where students can begin again the work

of building a life for themselves and their community (Rose). I love community colleges because I see them as a democratic institution—one that has great promise to lift students out of poverty, to help them become better citizens, and to become change agents in their communities as well as enter the economic workplace with more capital whether it be social, economic, or cultural.

The Two-Year College English Association takes up the work of advocating for the professional role and development of two-year college instructors as part of its support and shaping of the national conversation about English Studies in the two-year college. In just the last three years, TYCA committees have authored position papers on placement reform, preparation of future instructors, and developmental education. This work is emblematic of the work that Hassel and Giordano ask that composition studies pay attention to in their 2013 CCC article “Occupy Writing Studies: Rethinking College Composition for the Teaching Majority.” The authors “call for a scholarly reimagination that repositions two-year college teaching at the center of our disciplinary discourse about college composition” (Hassel and Giordano 118). These position statements offer important national contributions to the discussions of the material, political, and scholarly direction of composition studies. Importantly, these discussions affect millions of students and the majority of teachers who teach writing in post-secondary environments and thus deserve serious attention from all institution types.

Unfortunately, it is an understatement to say that the community college is *not* universally seen through the lens of my experience or the larger lens of TYCA. In fact, it is safe to claim that most college administrators, legislators, and members of society at large view the community college very differently from those in TYCA. It is these

differences I wish to explore through ideological and historical lenses in this first chapter. In this chapter, I will look at the mission and the purpose of the community college, both historically and in this moment, which I believe is an exigent one. I do this to set the stage for a larger examination of two-year college English faculty, including their preparation and experience. These examinations lead to a final call for intervention and reform so that students and faculty can claim an education and education system that is in their own best interests as determined by the students and the communities in which they live.

My thinking moves in this chapter are informed by two concepts: rhetoric and ideology. In *Rhetoric and Reality*, James Berlin sifts through rhetorical tradition, concluding that rhetoric predicates reality, that reality is mediated and shaped by language (Berlin, 177). The language that many politicians, administrators, board members, the business community and others use about community colleges and their purposes is just such a predication. It is a reality wherein the purpose of education is to serve the market by training workers for the new economy. This language is then neoliberal, meaning that is a market-based and market-driven ideology. This notion brings me to my second term: ideology. Here I draw on a definition from scholar Teun Van Dijk. In “Ideology in Discourse Analysis” he argues that ideologies are defined within a multidisciplinary framework combining a “social, cognitive, and discursive component” (Van Dijk, 115). That is to say, systems of ideas we engage in come from our social actions and thinking, among other influences. In looking at the current rhetorics of community colleges, one can only conclude that the dominant rhetorical ideology is a neoliberal one that predicates the reality of community colleges as job



training sites meant to prepare workers to engage in the just-in-time economy in which the United States is increasingly enmeshed, leading to the preservation of social inequality and extant power structures (Ayers; Dougherty; Levin, Kater, and Wagoner).

Of course, this neoliberal language is not the only discourse enacted by actors in an attempt to shape the reality of community colleges, their purpose, and the subjects (both student and teacher) who occupy them, but this language is the most dominant on a national level because it is used in national dialogues about community colleges in programs like Pathways to Success from the AACC, funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, or the Completion Agenda. There are other languages and vocabularies which shape and have shaped the community college over its 100-year history and they are worth looking at to discover that community colleges, while a contested ideological space, are worthwhile and valuable even though they are often devalued in traditional academic hierarchies. Community colleges have been traditionally thought of as being valuable because they were democratic because they provided access to more groups of students. These other languages form a rhetoric of resistance, and draw their ideological and rhetorical origins from many places, including progressive education and critical pedagogies.

### *Positioning the Importance of the Community College*

I want to emphasize the importance of the two-year college. Community colleges have grown immensely since the first one opened in 1901. The American Association of Community Colleges 2016 Fact Sheet reckons that 45% of all undergraduate students attend college at the 1108 two-year institutions across the United States. The number of institutions has remained steady since the late 1970s when community colleges had

saturated the geography of the United States and were within short driving distance for most people (Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker). In the fall of 2014, 12.3 million students attended a community college (American Association of Community Colleges, *2016 Fact Sheet*). Importantly, this group of students includes many who are traditionally marginalized. Nearly six in ten students were women; nearly 4 in 10 students were first generation college students. Community colleges have significantly higher proportions of African American and Latinx enrollment as well. In fact, most non-white students in the U.S. who go on to postsecondary education attend community colleges--62% of Native students, 57% of Hispanic students, 52% of Black students (AACC, *2016 Fact Sheet*). In addition to this diversity, and many other factors, the community college's mission is multi-faceted as well. Two-year colleges, over the last decade, have rapidly expanded dual- and concurrent-enrollment options bringing college credit classes to high school and even middle school classes.

Further, there shouldn't be any doubt that the free community college movement gains a great deal of its motivation in training a future workforce. In a *Chronicle* article from the 11th of January 2015, Mangan and Supiano trace the origin of Obama's free college plan. The authors trace this initiative to *Complete College America*, a nonprofit funded largely by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Welch and Scott's *Composition in the Age Austerity* places emphasis on the rhetorical bait and switch of the Obama administration's higher education policy, where Obama acknowledges how opportunity has not been equally distributed or realized, and then replaces authentic holistic opportunity with more market-driven ideologies described as "pathways"; this is a vital message to educators everywhere. And it's one we can see playing out in our

states and institutions almost daily as Welch and Scott declare when they observe that “Basic Writing and the National Writing Project” are “casualties of the neoliberal assault on higher education” (Welch and Scott 14). Harbour identifies the completion agenda a new “normative vision” for the community college, one that subordinates its traditional mission of access (Harbour). The rhetoric of access and opportunity remain, but are put into service of neoliberal ideologies.

David Leonhardt in *NYT* and Katherine Mangen and Beckie Supiano in *Chronicle of Higher Education* articles trace all of this back to a book called *The Race Between Education and Technology*, which was written by two Harvard Economists (Leonhardt, “The Roots of Obama’s Ambitious College Plan”; Mangen and Supiano). While progressives’ advocacy for access to higher education may have wanted free college education for decades as a way of addressing social inequality, it didn’t become an issue of national discussion until it was couched in economic terms. Importantly, this spotlight on the community college is squarely focused on the economic potential of community colleges. This rhetorical ideology is in direct conflict with much of the rhetorical positioning two-year college faculty, especially the ideological positioning English faculty have in their work, especially when that ideological orientation points toward critical pedagogies rather than skill-based pedagogies. It is important to note here that two-year college English faculty are ideologically diverse in this work, too. While I rely on the TYCA national statements for establishing what two-year English faculty want in their practice of the discipline and enactment of the profession, not all two-year college English faculty are part of these professional organizations.

In looking at the historical and ideological orientations of the community college, we see an institution that is at cross purposes. Certainly, all institutions have competing interests and tensions within them, but the functionalist, instrumentalist Marxists, and the institutionalists, according to Dougherty, are frequently not aware of each other and create a muddled purpose. This fact means that even though there are competing interests and ideologies, they are not transparent and manifest, which in turn means that they are not easy to suss out and address in any meaningful way. Add to that the fact that these ideologies are mired in what Gallagher describes as competing progressivisms (more on this later) and that members of the different camps all employ similar language and rhetorical tropes to achieve very different purposes, and a fractured picture begins to emerge. This language is why different audiences hear both a neoliberal assimilation of education and a socialist plot in Obama's free community college plan. Neither of those extremes are true, but it is true that all the ideological positions and the different progressivisms are present and constantly working with and against each other in the enterprise known as the community college.

### *Briefly, the Nature and the History of the Community College*

If the community college had a patron god in the pantheon, it would be Janus, the two-faced god of Roman mythology. Janus is the god of beginnings and transitions and seems a perfect fit for an institution that is a beginning or a transition for so many people in the United States. Richard Williamson, in his chapter "The Lesson Plan" tells his readers that "from the beginning, the community college has [...] sprouted variously as a trade school, as an ennobling 'people's college,' and as a last resort for potentially lost generations. Sometimes it has flowered as all of these at once." He goes on to quip that if

a community college “were a person, we would say that it has grown up with an identity problem” (Williamson 38). It might be true that the community college has an identity problem, but it comes from having two main purposes that have driven it for more than one hundred years. This fact is why Janus is an apt metaphor for the community college because it, like Janus, has two faces. These faces or purposes go back to the very origins of the community college in the “early years of the twentieth century” (Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker 1). Those two purposes are: democratic opportunity and economic opportunity. These two purposes are not dualistic, and point to only two of the many purposes of education. However, I name them here because the emphasis on economic opportunity has devalued democratic opportunity in the community college.

Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker in their sixth edition of what has come to be the standard text on community colleges, *The American Community College*, find “the social forces that contributed to its rise” were varied, but included “the need for workers trained to operate the nation’s expanding industries; the lengthening of adolescence, [...] and the drive for social equality and greater access to higher education” (Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker 1). These are transitory functions designed to move people from one set of circumstances to another.

Similarly, statues of Janus were located at the doors of homes and temples in ancient Rome. They were gatekeepers and signified transitions—always between in and out. Community colleges, as we will see, occupy a liminal space between democracy and industry, between access and gatekeeping, between social justice and neoliberalism, between secondary schools and universities. Two-year colleges have been positioned and rhetorically and ideologically reimagined by a variety of actors and ideologies in these

transitory positions over the last 115 years (see Tinberg's discussion of the two-year college as borderlands).

Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker frame the historical moment community colleges arose from, saying "the ideas permeating higher education in the early twentieth century fostered the development of these new colleges [...]" noting that "science was seen as contributing to progress" with a prevailing notion that "the more people who would learn its principles, the more rapid the development of society would be" (1). This moment is the age of progressivism, the philosophy attuned to progress through science and technology to benefit social and economic development. Mark Reynolds and Sylvia Holladay-Hicks in the preface to *The Profession of English in the 2-Year College* tell their readers that "the two-year college is uniquely American: No other institution of higher learning is dedicated to fulfilling the educational needs and goals of all the people in the community" (Reynolds and Holladay, vii). The community college is still largely an American institution with just a few examples in Canada (although other countries like India are beginning to take up the model). And looking at Reynolds and Holladay Hicks' assertion about the notion of serving "all of the people" we can clearly fit it into the progressive notion of progress and social betterment (economic too). Amplifying this is Dougherty. He agrees with this position, arguing "these public two-year colleges play a crucial role in American higher education, and, indeed, American life" (Dougherty, 3). Again, the assertion is that the community college is an institution for the betterment of "American life;" a progressive trope. These three positions encapsulate the democratic purpose of community colleges and fit squarely with a Deweyan notion of progressive education. Reynolds goes on to say that the two-year college is the "single most

important element in what has been called the democratization of American higher education” (Reynolds and Holladay, 4). Reynolds believes this is true because two-year colleges have made significant contributions in teaching non-traditional students and in the “teaching of writing and reading to the unprepared student” (Reynolds and Holladay, 9). Here we can see the democratic ideology of the community college.

Further, part of the history of the community college is that it is malleable. For much of its history, it has been an open-access or open admissions institution. The origin of community college can be located at beginning in the 19<sup>th</sup> century as normal schools, ostensibly extensions of high schools, as in the case of Juliet Junior College in 1901, or as teacher colleges. The Community College, even at its origin, was supported by both elite institutions of education, local business and political leaders and progressives like Dewey. Some elite institutions of education saw the junior college as a means to eliminate lower level study, placing it elsewhere (Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker 6-8; DeGenaro). Cohen also notes that some believe that the junior and community college was founded so that businesses would have a “ready supply of workers trained at the public expense” (9). However, Cohen settles on the fact that the “best answer might be that since its founding the United States has been more dedicated to the belief that all individuals should have the opportunity to rise to their greatest potential” (10). The community college, then, has always been flexible and has worn many faces. Harbour in *John Dewey and the Future of Community College Education* describes access as the most prominent aspect of the institutional type’s original mission. This fact is perhaps the most radical democratic idea of the two-year college because it meant that the only criterion for admission was a GED or high school diploma. Open Admissions was

pioneered in the 1960s and 1970s in the CUNY system. Much about this set of institutions, its time, and open admissions' eventual demise at CUNY has been written (for a summary see Gleason, "Remediation Phase-out at CUNY: The 'equity versus Excellence' controversy"). Instructively, the field of Basic Writing emerged from this moment as a response to students who did not come to college already able to perform academic language and forms. Basic Writing is a part of a larger field identified as Developmental Education by organizations such as the National Association of Developmental Education (NADE), and the National Center for Developmental Education among others. It, along with a host of other types of education, including liberal arts transfer, community education, and vocational education all coexist in the community college, allowing for transitions and transformations for many millions of students. Open access and meeting the student at their ability level are all part of the democratic rhetoric surrounding two-year colleges. For many of the community college's advocates, this access is its democratic purpose writ large.

Of course, this democratic mission isn't without its critics. Many argue that community colleges reproduce social inequalities. Burton Clark's famous essay "The Cooling-Out Function of Higher Education" is the most classic example of this argument. In the article, he discusses how community colleges "cool out" the desires of the larger population to receive the kind of education that would allow them to achieve the Horatio Alger dream of pulling oneself up by the bootstraps. Ira Shor, in his critique of Basic Writing, argues that community college developmental education is harmful to students. He sees composition and basic writing as gatekeepers and community colleges as institutions which manage the aspirations of people, while preserving the status quo and



power relations. Mary Soliday in the *Politics of Remediation* charges that “the unselective institution exists in order to maintain democratic access without damaging selectivity in a hierarchical system” (Soliday 13). Soliday argues that remedial education serves as a kind of pressure release helping to regulate admission, which is a clear echo of Clark’s argument that two-year colleges cool out ambition. Other scholars look at this charge, too. For example, Dougherty examines this idea in *The Contradictory College* noting that “the advocates and critics of the community college” have argued over the “effects of the community college” asking whether it is an “avenue of opportunity for its many working-class, minority, and female students, or is it a blind alley blocking off equality?” (Dougherty 15). And given poor graduation rates and the vocationalization of two-year colleges, this argument has merit. Dougherty identifies these tensions as ones that pull on the original purpose of community colleges and its future mission, especially given 30 years of vocationalization in the face of the pressures of a rhetoric couched in neoliberal globalization. Again, the metaphor and image of Janus is a powerful organizing symbol here. The community college is at cross purposes, it is transitory, it serves multiple purposes. It is a gateway to further study and to the workplace.

### *Ideological Origins of the Community College*

In *The Contradictory College*, Dougherty examines the ideological origins of community colleges. Dougherty divides those who study community colleges into three groups, the functionalists, the Marxist instrumentalists, and the institutionalists. Dougherty’s argument locates functionalism in the “social sciences” and says that its “advocates describe the community college as serving several central needs of society” which include “providing college opportunity, training middle-level workers, and

preserving the academic excellence of [...] universities” (17). Functionalists see access as “democratizing” and see the “vocational emphasis of community colleges” as a service to the economy (17). All of this sounds good in theory, but Marxist Instrumentalists see the institution and its purposes differently. Dougherty describes this strand of ideology about community colleges as one that argues that the functionalist perspective isn’t accurate and that “the community college’s real social role is to reproduce the class inequalities of capitalist societies” (18). The word Dougherty uses is “vitalize,” which means to spoil or impair the quality of a thing, to make it faulty. Clarke’s work on the cooling out function of community colleges, which Shor argues community colleges are still taking up, would fit into this instrumentalist Marxist camp, as would much critical pedagogy. The narrative of the instrumentalist Marxist is that the community college “ideal of equality” has been corrupted by a “capitalistic society” and that its “real social role is to reproduce class inequalities” and doesn’t really serve its students or true democratic purposes (18). This reproduction of class fits with a long line of critiques leveled at the community college.

Finally, Dougherty identifies the third position as “the institutionalist critics”. This position posits that “community colleges functions to finesse the contradictions between the conflicting values in American society” (20). The institutionalist critics see the community college as participating in a “diversion effect” moving students out and away from the university to preserve the status of those institutions (20). Dougherty’s analysis of this position both agrees and disagrees with this assessment. He notes that the diversion effect is real and measurable, but rather than “the desire of universities to

narrow their doors or of business to secure employee training [being] inimical to the needs of society or of students” it is necessary for both sectors and for students (23). Mary Soliday in *Politics of Remediation* makes a similar claim about remediation in universities--unprepared students are allowed or not allowed into the doors of postsecondary education, not based on readiness, but based on capacity--a capacity which is politically created.

Whatever the case, Dougherty finds that none of these ideological positions explains the community college completely. Functionalists say the driving force behind community colleges has been parents and students, Marxists see it as business and institutionalists see the driving force as the state university. None of these perspectives is wrong. They are incomplete, while all having the element of truth in them. Dougherty finds that local governments have had a great deal to do with community colleges as well. The important takeaway from this discussion is that the community college has no one ideological origin and that these competing ideologies have led it to be a contradictory institution.

To this adroit explanation of the ideological forces at work in the two-year college, I would like to add an examination of community colleges through the lens of progressivism, which I believe help to better delineate the ideological forces at work in the two-year college. Chris Gallagher in his book *Radical Departures: Composition and Progressive Pedagogy* writes “progressive politics (variously defined, to be sure) have always played a crucial role in how writing has been taught in U.S. secondary and postsecondary schools” (Gallagher xi). Gallagher goes on to define two important faces of progressivism: pedagogical progressivism and administrative progressivism. In his

analysis, Gallagher argues “early progressives shared an abiding faith that education would serve social progress” (12). Pedagogical progressives framed that social progress as putting “the schools in service of democracy and social justice” (12). Drawing on Cremin, Gallagher defines administrative progressives as setting schools in the service of “industrialization and urbanization, placing most of their emphasis on ‘efficient’ management” (12). One of Gallagher’s conclusions in his book is that “modern composition was born in a cauldron of competing ‘progressive’ agendas (xviii). Because community colleges come from a coterminous moment of history with the progressive movement, this analogy is usefully extrapolated into these institutions. Turning again to Dougherty’s analysis of community colleges, we can see how progressivism fits in with his competing ideologies of community colleges. The Progressive age dealt with industrialization, while the community college currently engages with post-industrialization and globalization, but the driving question is the same: what is the purpose of schooling and how should we develop and use human capital?

Gallagher’s insight into the development of progressivism in schools is important in relation to Dougherty’s categorizations of the ideological origins of the two-year college because it accounts for the progressive historical origins of the community college. The Truman Commission calls for “the establishment of a network of public community colleges that would charge little or no tuition, serve as cultural centers, be comprehensive in their program offerings with emphasis on civic responsibilities, and would serve the area in which they were located” (Truman Report 33-34). Scholars recognize this moment as the one when the modern community college is created “with its mandate to democratize the nation’s post-secondary system” (Sullivan and Toth 3).

The community college as envisioned by the Truman Commission turns away from that model to a Deweyan progressive notion of education. In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey argues that democracies have a stake in providing people access to “deliberate and systematic education” (Dewey). Harbour’s examination of the community college and Deweyan philosophy reveals that “democratic societies have a vital interest in preparing citizens” to do the work of correcting “the injustices in their society” as part of the social interaction arising from democratic living and education (120). Gallagher’s examination of progressivism in P-12 education when applied to the community college and Harbour’s analysis makes the case for the community college as a historic progressive institution type. Progressivism is a philosophy that can be employed to serve either or both functionalist or instrumentalist and even democratic aims. The philosophy, because of its orientation toward progress is ideologically flexible enough to be turned to several ends. Therefore, while progressivism is one of the important origin stories of the two-year college, the enactment of progressivism by faculty, administrators, students, and the community can arise from different ideological positions.

### *Governance in the Community College*

Levin, Kater, and Wagoner in *Community College Faculty: At Work in the New Economy* “view community colleges as inextricably tied to economic globalization through their emphasis on local markets and dependency on the government for resources and authority.” Their study on shared governance in the community college finds that it has changed from “a historical right to a commodity.” This commodity is the subject most often of collective bargaining agreements between faculty and administrators. The assessment fits with Gallagher’s analysis that the “history of national standards and tests

movement demonstrates clearly that politicians, corporate leaders, and educational ‘experts’ have conspired to wrest control of education from those who actually participate in it” (48). Gallagher’s examination of the history of education in the U.S. and of composition revealed that “while pedagogical progressives saw composition as an opportunity to practice child-centered pedagogy and to argue for inclusive, democratic educational and social reform, administrative progressives saw composition as a chance to practice skills-and-drills instruction and to argue for a top-down, bureaucratic, ‘efficient’ educational and social reform” (xviii).

All of this is a troubling instantiation of seeing higher education as a business. Robert Haight, in his essay “The Business Metaphor and Two-Year College Writing Instruction” further delineates what Gallagher calls administrative progressivism. Haight writes of our current moment in that “The two-year college is in the business of education. Promotional campaigns attempt to attract new students through radio and television advertising. Programs are targeted to emerging markets including on-site education opportunities at businesses, retaining workers for growth occupations, international course work aimed toward a global economy, and distance learning to bring classwork into the home” (Haight 74). Haight notices, as have many others, that “growing numbers of part-time faculty provide their temporary service for a fraction of the cost of their full-time counterparts” (74). He concludes the paragraph by arguing that “assigning the terminology of business in [administrators’] communication with college employers is an appropriate vehicle” because colleges are “literally, in the business of education” (74). I assert that the “pervasive business metaphor” emanates from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century’s administrative progressivism and is exacerbated by neoliberal ideology

which began to develop in the 1970s. It affects, significantly, the governance of the institution and the execution of the mission of two-year colleges.

Haight and Gallagher both discuss the idea that the student is conceived of as a product. The labor of the instructor creates a product in the student. As Haight writes “the product metaphor mirrors the conceptualization of an industrial manufacturing economy” (Haight 75). I would go further and examine the metaphor of student as customer.

Customer: a word that comes from the concept of custom house and has the connotation as one who buys or consumes. The metaphor here in a post-industrial society is that an education can be bought or consumed. This, too, fits neatly with neoliberal marketization of education. Interestingly, in the model of student as consumer, the student is exhibiting agency, whether conscious or not, and is choosing to be “manufactured by the educational institution” (Haight 75). The end customer for the product that the student has become is the business that hires them. What’s at issue then is who community college English teachers are educating students for--are they in the two-year college educating students in students’ own interests, or are they educating students with a lack of awareness that they are conceived of as products to be snapped up and installed into the globalized economy, or are we training them unconsciously? Of course, all of this is probably happening simultaneously and is experienced differently based on students’ backgrounds and positions. Nonetheless, the results are perhaps depressingly the same. It is this tension, though, that will later emerge in chapter three when looking at how the community college instructors rationalize their own profession.

Levin, Kater, and Wagoner sum up the problem and its troubling implications arguing that “although faculty claim that they are central to both the institutional

functioning and institutional purpose [...] their goals for the institution are unrealized because economic goals, including training for a competitive global economy, and policies as well as accountability measures from governments are pursued as priorities” (13). They go on to paint a bleak future, writing “unless faculty can extricate themselves from these conditions and what we see as their corporatized identity or change institutional actions and the underlying corporate culture, this new environment of employee compliance with institutional purposes of a high productivity and market-oriented institution many constitute a more lasting norm for the community college” (13). All of this is to say that while there are indeed competing ideologies of access, social equity and democracy versus a corporatized instrumentalist education, that the power of the moment rests within the forces of globalization.

### *Our Exigent Moment*

On January 3, 2017, award-winning National Public Radio correspondent, Claudio Sanchez presented his audience with his predictions for the coming new year. He wrote “Community colleges will finally get more of the attention they've been clamoring for” because the incoming president will see them as a means to help his jobs agenda (“Five Education Stories to Watch for in 2017”). This prediction isn’t surprising given that community colleges are having an extended moment in the spotlight. President Obama and his predecessors, Presidents Bush and Clinton, have positioned the community college in national dialogue as a place for Americans to get the job skills they will need for the 21st century. For example, the Official Blog of the U.S. Department of Education calls community colleges “America’s economic engines” and goes on to say that these institutions are “gateways to middle class jobs” (U.S. Department of



Education). Moreover, community colleges were one of President Obama's domestic initiatives in his 2015 State of the Union Address. In it, he proposed a "government program to make community college tuition free for millions of students" a plan which *New York Times*' columnists called "ambitious" (Hirschfeld Davis and Lewin). Many see this as an attempt to address the ever-increasing wage gap in the United States (Leonhardt, "Obama's Community College Plan: A Reading List.").

Similarly, President George W. Bush in his 2004 State of the Union address proposed "increasing support for America's fine community colleges, so they can train workers for industries that are creating the most new jobs" (Bush, "State of the Union Address"). This discussion of community colleges wasn't a one-time election year fancy for Bush, either. It came up, too, in his debate with Senator Kerry in October of 2004, where he asserted that he wanted people "to start their career with a college diploma," going on to say, "here's some trade adjustment assistance money for you to go to community college in your neighborhood, a community college which is providing the necessary skills to fill the jobs" (Bush "United States Presidential Debate").

Further, in 1998 President Clinton "underscored the importance of making education through grades 13 and 14 as universal as a high school diploma" (Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker 14). As mentioned earlier, presidential interest in community colleges has been traced back to the Truman Commission report. The report "articulated the value of a populace with free access to two years of study more than the secondary schools could provide" (Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker 14). Thus, some have argued that Obama's call to make community college free isn't a new idea, but rather a return to roots of sorts. Whatever the case, these brief examples of rhetorical presidential

positioning demonstrate community colleges' "centrality to higher education" and the ways that many have envisioned them as the "way to exten[d] college opportunity in a systematic and cost-efficient way" (Dougherty 3). Importantly, the current spotlight is certainly "formalizing the institution's place in the global era of the 21st century" as well (Ostman 3).

### *Teaching in the Two-Year College*

A pressing question, then, is what is it like to work and teach in the rhetorical and material environment of the community college as it is steeped in neo-liberal ideologies and run under a philosophy of administrative progressivism. Levin, Kater, and Wagoner sound an alarm for faculty, arguing that "community college faculty, committed to institutional mission, have become captive to the corporate culture that relies upon neo-liberal practices" (Levin, Kater, and Wagoner 2). Even though it is true that faculty are in some way "captive" to the competing missions and ideologies of the community college, faculty, and, in particular, writing faculty, have done much work over the last forty years to create a distinct profession.

First, we should examine the material work of faculty. Full-time instructors at community colleges, because they labor under administrative progressivism, which is a means of achieving progress through ever-increasing efficiency, and neo-liberal ideology—a set of ideas privileging marketization, have exceptionally high teaching loads. The average is five classes per semester. Or in the case of a quarter-based system, such as the one at Metropolitan Community College (MCC) in Omaha, Nebraska, the instructor teaches 11 courses per year. Levin, Kater and Wagoner note that "community college faculty are a major labor force in the United States and constitute one third of all

postsecondary faculty” (3). This incredibly high teaching load fits squarely into what North calls “English Teaching, Inc.” and what Alford calls the “composition industry”(North et al.; Alford and Kroll v).

Community college English faculty who make up slightly more than 33,000 of post-secondary English instructors according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Bureau of Labor Statistics). As an aside, the BLS expects the total percentage of community college faculty to grow more than 10 percent over the next decade. A common calculation of teaching hours is contact hours formulated as class hours multiplied by students multiplied by courses. The AACC estimates the average class size at community colleges to be 25. Even considering that most of these instructors aren’t full-time the number of instructional hours per year is probably in the millions. This number does not include grading, administrative, or managerial work. As we can see, the community college instructor works a great deal. Rosser and Townsend found that full-time community college instructors spent 85 percent of their week teaching with an average workweek of 50 hours (Townsend and Twombly 37).

Further, community college instructors, because they work in an institution that has its origins both in the high school model and the university model straddle different professional models. Community college faculty do not have the same professional profile as what many see as the normative model of postsecondary educators. Howard Tinberg traces discussion of this in between position to 1965 to a document called the *Tempe Report* written by Albert R. Kitzhaber, an influential English Professor in the middle of the 20th century. The report begins with what Tinberg calls the “obvious” that “the two-year college, as we all know occupies an uneasy position between the high

school and the four-year college, and sometimes appears to be so dominated by the one or the other that it loses a clear identity of its own” (Archer qtd. in Tinberg 138). In fact, many argue that community college faculty do not have all the hallmarks of a professional because of their reduced autonomy and confused mission. Levin, Kater, and Wagoner argue that community college faculty have lost authority in what they call the *nouveau college*, meaning a college firmly entrenched in neoliberal ideology. Further, Ellen Knodt makes the claim in “Graduate Programs for Two-Year College Faculty: History and Future Directions” that “because elite research universities put so much emphasis on research, [...] an institution whose mission is teaching is not accorded the same status” (Knodt 125). She goes on to say that community colleges are “by definition accorded this inferior status in the academy” (Knodt 125). I believe that the “lower” status she identifies here relates to the conception that community college teaching is a lesser profession. Townsend and Twombly in their book *Community College Faculty: Overworked and Undervalued* “do not view community college teaching as a unique profession, but as one that finds itself in the middle position on the continuum of teaching as a profession between high school and university teaching” (Townsend and Twombly 124). Importantly, they find that this position is held not because of the “weakness” of the faculty, but because of the “mission of the community college and the nature of [its] students” (124). Therefore, the graduate programs that train community college faculty and the institutions within which they teach have not conceived of two-year college teachers as having a professional status. To be clear, this devaluation comes partly from the liminal borderlands space community college teachers occupy between levels. Community college teachers are in a curious third space where

their invisibility to the profession and lack of established professional development routes long established in secondary teaching leave them without consistent professionalization or development. This topic is covered in detail in chapter two of the dissertation.

The combination of a high teaching load and mitigated autonomy means that the community college teacher's profession is materially and politically distinct from other teaching professions. Moreover, the profession is in between the secondary and postsecondary in terms of credentials as well. The entry credential for the two-year college teacher is typically the master's degree. Further, the expectations that institutions have of two-year college instructors are different. Townsend and Twombly note that instructors are not typically expected to engage in research. They use Boyer's 1990 definition of research which is "scholarship of discovery" (qtd. in Townsend and Twombly 37). They go on to find that only five percent of faculty in a survey reported that research was expected of them. Mark Reynolds in his essay "Two-Year College Teachers as Knowledge Makers" acknowledges this expectation, noting that "faculty members in the vast majority of two-year college jobs have not had to conduct research or publish to get or keep a job" (Reynolds and Holladay-Hicks 1). In "Teaching English in the Two-Year Colleges: A Review of Selected Studies," Howard Tinberg argues that "the challenge for two-year college teachers of English (and their colleagues elsewhere in the curriculum) is to see themselves as knowledge makers (qtd. in Tinberg 143). He recognizes research such as Boyer's call for recognition in the academy of a "scholarship of teaching" and Thomas Angelo and K. Patricia Cross' advocacy of classroom research as having important implications for two-year college faculty's development (Boyer qtd. in Tinberg 143). Taking these factors into consideration, Tinberg argues "if recognition

for such work is granted, two-year college faculty will gain a certain measure of prestige” from English Studies (Tinberg 143).

Not having this expectation or time to conduct research can lead to the fossilization of teaching strategies, curricular burnout, and a lack of faculty engagement in both the institution and the discipline. Again, to draw on Vaughn and Boyer’s research, we are searching for a scholarship of teaching which is “for faculty members’ intellectual vitality” (Vaughn and Boyer qtd. in Townsend and Twombly 40).

Labor is an important concern when thinking about teaching in the two-year college as well. The January 2017 report, “The Shifting Academic Workforce: Where are the Contingent Faculty” has as one of its key findings that 80% or more of faculty at two-year colleges are considered contingent, which they define as full- or part- time faculty not tenured or on a tenure track (Hurlburt and McGarrah 2). This report agrees with Peter Schmidt’s 2013 *Chronicle of Higher Education* article where he reported that “full- and part-time adjuncts, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows account for well over three fourths of all faculty appointments” (Schmidt n.p.). In addition to these reports, the September 2016 CCC article by Cox et al., entitled “The Indianapolis Resolution: Responding to 21<sup>st</sup> Century Exigencies/Political Economies of Composition Labor” focuses on instructional labor for writing teachers and concludes that the “current *kairotic* moment not only *enables* positive efforts on behalf of labor equity but also *demands* them” (Cox et al. 61). While both documents concentrate on four-year institutions, they demonstrate that labor is a serious concern for all post-secondary teachers.

### *What about Writing Teachers?*

For a fuller understanding, we must look at how Composition as a discipline and profession has functioned within the two-year college. Composition is an important field to examine in relation to the two-year college because it too grew up in progressivism, has been a mere instrumental service (or at the least, perceived as such) and has many competing ideologies within it. The picture that begins to emerge in my estimation is a multi-faced and faceted discipline and profession growing and operating with a complex institution that is also multi-faced and faceted.

Mark Reynolds and others point out that the “teaching expertise” of two-year college English instructors is something that “the academy might well learn most” from in many cases (Reynolds and Holladay-Hicks 8). Community college instructors, as we know, teach the most vulnerable students and are expected to teach a great number of them all the time. This fact, paired with the notion that the community college teacher is meant to be committed to the success of the kind of students who attend the community college, means that two-year college teacher has produced a great deal of valuable knowledge about first-generation, non-traditional, and other marginalized students (Reynolds and Holladay 9). Two examples that come to mind are the field of basic writing which began with remedial students at CUNY’s SEEK (see Shaughnessy; Rich) program in its lower divisions or the Accelerated Learning Program program founded by Peter Adams at Baltimore County Community College in the 1990s (see Adams et al.). Both programs are examples of how, even though it isn’t privileged in the two-year college profession, knowledge-making scholarship still emerges from these institutions. Barbara Stout tells us in her essay “Evolution of a Writing Program” that the history of

two-year college writing program is “reflective of the evolutionary efforts [...] to serve their students most effectively [...]” (Stout 59). Action research which meets local needs seems to be a hallmark of two-year college writing studies scholarship.

Many compositionists, social scientists, and education scholars who have studied the community college point to the “ambivalent and ambiguous role occupied by the community college in the academy” (Tinberg 138; see also Brint and Karabel; Dougherty; Townsend and Twombly; Ostman). These researchers point, too, to the ambivalent and ambiguous role occupied by the community college faculty. Obviously, these are related problems. The nature of the community college with its comprehensive and vocationalized mission, and its democratic and neo-liberal purposes creates a tension that may not be resolvable. Beach in *Gateway to Opportunity: A History of the Community College in the United States* writes “the community college instructor’s position is always in the midst of these tensions” (Beach xiv). And since these tensions are not always explicitly stated, instructors’ work and sense of purpose can be muddled. Am I teaching to make better citizens or employees? Are these the same things? How do I know? Do I teach academic writing for transfer students or technical writing? Do I mix them in each class? What kinds of literacy skills do students need? If I don’t give students critical literacy skills, am I aiding in cooling them out and limiting their possible advancement in society? These questions and more are what is at stake for the writing instructor at the community college.

Part of the answer lies in what we might see composition as doing in the 21st century and what it should do in the two-year college now. Part of this is a turn away from neoliberal ideology to a broader view of education. This work takes a sober



assessment of the history of education. Beach notes that, “prior to the 20th century, higher education was centered on moral and civic inculcation with a specific focus on training elites for sociopolitical leadership” (120). He goes on to say that “the traditional purposes were gradually replaced during the 20th century with a new end: training all Americans for work. This trend has been labeled the vocationalization of American education” (120). Compositionists especially can use movements such as the social turn in composition from the 1990’s to resist the totalizing globalization faced presently. Trimbur exemplifies this resistance in “Taking the Social Turn: Teaching Writing Post-Process” when he asserts that we must make our “arguments not so much in terms of students’ reading and writing processes but rather in terms of the cultural politics of literacy” (Trimbur et al. 109). To turn away from functionalism and a reductive curriculum and to return to an education that is democratically purposed and in students’ best interests, we must center the profession of English instructor in the two-year college on arming students with an awareness of the ideological and cultural functions on education (more on this in chapter 4).

I agree with Barry Alford in his introduction to *The Politics of Writing in the Two-Year College* when he argues that “from this perspective, the differences between both the practitioners and the institutions that comprise the composition industry are an important site of critical analysis. Nowhere are the differences more pronounced and less discussed than in the two-year colleges, where composition often occupies a very different social pedagogical space than it does in four-year institutions”(Townsend and Twombly; Kroll, Alford and Kroll v-vi). This work is the re-visioning of the distinct profession of the two-year English instructor that I will take up in chapter four. Finally,

Alford points to research on the connection between “literacy and democracy” arguing that since “50 percent of all first-year college students and 40 percent of all undergraduates tak[e] composition in two-year colleges” that they are a “likely place to start asking ourselves what kind of literacy the composition requirement promotes” (Alford and Kroll, vii-viii). Again, what’s at stake is language and education itself. These stakes are the reason why writing teachers in the community college are so important.

## **Chapter 2—An Examination of the English Instructor in the Two-Year College: A History of Incomplete and Uneven Professionalization**

“If I love you, I have to make you conscious of the things you don’t see.”

—James Baldwin from *The Fire This Time*, 1963

“Their labours were lost to the ages in which they lived”

—London Medical Gazette, 1829

### *Overview*

In chapter two I discuss the English instructor at the two-year college in detail. First, I examine the profession of teaching in the two-year college, which spans across disciplines. To be clear, I am defining a discipline as a body of knowledge. A profession is how that knowledge is enacted and regulated in practice. In the profession of two-year college English teaching, Basic Writing, Reading, and Writing Studies are disciplines that come together and are enacted in the carrying out of the profession of two-year college English faculty (for further discussion of professional identities of two-year college English instructors see: Toth, Griffiths, and Thirolf; Griffiths).

I examine the notion of the two-year college instructor as a distinct profession that is incompletely and unevenly professionalized. Finally, I examine the reasons for this incomplete and uneven professionalization, which include the institutional opacity, invisibility to the larger profession, and labor conditions. The history, work, and incomplete professionalization form a comprehensive snapshot of two-year college English instructors.

In the second half of the chapter, I examine the history of the preparation of two-year college English instructors. This examination is archival in nature and catalogs past and present programs as much as is possible. Given the working conditions of faculty and the itinerant and inconsistent preparation programs, this chapter establishes exigence of this dissertation and my proposed intervention in the chapter four.

### *Introduction*

I want the profession of teaching English in the two-year college to be completely professionalized, but it isn't. Scholars and practitioners have been asserting for more than four decades in scholarship and in the iterations of the TYCA Guidelines that it is a distinct profession. Further, scholars like Reynolds, Andelora's assert an identity (Reynolds and Holladay; Jeff Andelora; Jeffrey Andelora, "The Professionalization of Two-Year College English Faculty: 1950-1990"; Jeffrey Andelora, "Forging a National Identity: TYCA and the Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar"; Tinberg; Sullivan and Toth). However, there are several factors that prohibit it from achieving complete and fully realized profession. To have this full rich profession would mean that English faculty at the two-year college would be recognized as equals and that their work would be recognized as central to development of the discipline. It would entail, as Hassel and Giordano argue in "Occupy Writing Studies" a repositioning of the work that happens at two-year colleges at the center of composition studies (Hassel and Giordano 18). It is strange to write to wrestle with that notion as I spent seven years as a full-time English instructor at a large urban college. While there, I was the coordinator of the department for three years and coordinator of the Basic Writing program for two, travelled to conferences, presented at conferences, earned a second MA and most of a doctorate, but I

believe that I was an outlier. I was an outlier because I pursued an ambitious course of self-professionalization. In this chapter, I will examine the profession and professionalization of two-year college English instructors in three ways. First, I examine the material working conditions of two-year college English instructors, including their workload and responsibilities outside the classroom. Next, I argue that their professionalization is incomplete by using Bucher and Sterling's widely accepted dimensions of professional identity and other literature as an analytical frame. Following that, I examine the history of graduate preparation for two-year college instructors through the lens of three documents written over the last 45 years. Importantly, preparation sets the foundation for faculty members to enact their profession. For the sake of simplicity, I draw my definition of profession from Merriam Webster's dictionary, which defines the word as "a calling requiring specialized knowledge and often long and intensive academic preparation." These documents predicate a vision for the profession and argue for specific training for graduate students.

*The Work of Two-Year College English Instructors: Broad Generalists, Interdisciplinary Literacy Workers, Cook, and Bottle Washer*

Two-year College English instructors teach a lot. More than that, they teach many courses, typically ten or more per year. They might teach first-year writing, literature, technical and professional writing, developmental writing, grant writing. They might do all of this in a week. In a recent survey of TYCA members, ninety percent of respondents reported regularly teaching first-year writing, but 61% also taught literature (Toth and Sullivan 270). Furthermore, Toth and Sullivan found that 49% taught basic/developmental writing, 45% taught research writing, 21% taught developmental

reading, 19% taught professional or technical writing, 18% taught general humanities, 15% taught creating writing, and 6% taught English as a second language. In addition, the article notes that they worked in their colleges' writing centers, too (Toth and Sullivan 270). While the authors argue that this isn't a representative sample, my interviews with two-year college faculty in the next chapter and my decade of experience align with this finding. Toth and Jensen conclude that "two-year college English instructors' teaching duties often transcend the disciplinary identities and divides that characterize English studies at most universities" (Jensen and Toth, "Two-Year Colleges and the Future of English Studies"), a finding that demonstrates a need for diverse pedagogical preparation for two-year college English instructors. As Hassel and Giordano point out in "Occupy Writing Studies," the instructors at two-year colleges have "[...] comparatively heavy teaching loads" while they work in open admissions environments that mean students are differentially prepared (Hassel and Giordano 118). Complicating this high teaching load of widely prepared students is the fact that two-year college.

Above and beyond teaching, these full-time instructors are also called on to engage in administrative and committee work at both the departmental and college level. While adjuncts are sometimes called on to do this work, it is rarer, so I have chosen to concentrate on full-time faculty. At some institutions, they are also asked to be advisors, even when they are not advising within a major. Simultaneously, though, these instructors might have limited or nonexistent funds for professional development or membership in professional organizations. In addition to that, community college instructors, especially part-time professionals, may not have the same access to library

resources that a faculty member at a four-year institution does (Toth and Sullivan).

Hassel and Giordano point out that “a lack of equal access to resources essentially results in instructors with the least professional support working with the most at-risk and underprepared students” .

*Two-Year College Faculty: A Distinct Profession Incompletely Professionalized*

Community college professionals and practitioners of the disciplines of English studies, as it is uniquely created within the two-year college, cannot be secure in their professional status because of the competing institutional missions of transfer and vocation, instantiated through functionalist, instrumentalist, or democratic means. While the TYCA Guidelines and champions of the profession like Mark Reynolds have claimed ardently that teaching in the two-year college is a distinct and significant profession (ix), the lack of shared governance, faculty autonomy, incomplete professionalization, and troubled and often invisible disciplinary engagement, make the profession, and the discipline in which the profession engages, contested in most institutions. Scholars have pointed out the troubled identity of two-year college professionals (Townsend and Twombly; Dougherty; Toth, Griffiths, and Thirolf). For a discussion of professionalism, many scholars draw on Bucher and Sterling’s dimensions of professional identity to examine the nature of a profession. That analysis is worth applying here so that I can interrogate exactly what we mean by a professional. Bucher and Sterling set up five discrete features of a profession:

1. A definition of the field—its boundaries, the problems with which it is concerned, and its basic tools and methods;

2. A sense of mission—i.e. beliefs about the large social values served by the field;
3. The proper conditions for doing work in the field;
4. The relationships which should be obtained between people in the field and others with whom they interact—colleagues, clients, and workers in other fields; and
5. The relationship of the field to larger publics and institutions.(Bucher and Stelling 27)

Each of these have been examined to some extent in regard to community college faculty in general, but I want to take some space to look at English faculty in two-year colleges in particular.

First, I want to examine the notion that the field has been defined for two-year college instructors. Looking at the 2004 and 2016 TYCA Guidelines gives us some clue, but doesn't tell the whole story. In the 2004 document, the teacher in the two-year college is described as an expert generalist who can teach a variety of courses including composition and literature. That document calls on two-year college instructors to be pedagogical handymen and women who can fix/teach whatever is thrown their way. The profession, though, because it has this jack-of-all-trades aspect to it, is a contested space because it has so many disciplinary homes. While I don't want to conflate basic writing and the two-year college, since basic writing instruction happens in other spaces, it is useful to look at Gleason's article "Reasoning the Need: Graduate Education in Basic Writing." In it, she argues that "basic writing's central mission merits the attention of every professional in composition and rhetoric" and goes on to say that basic writing "may be emerging as a distinct discipline" (Gleason, "Reasoning the Need: Graduate



Education and Basic Writing” 49-50). This construction is interesting because she is claiming a disciplinary status for a professional category. However, the two-year college teacher engages in composition as a discipline and probably basic writing as a discipline. Gleason goes on to discuss adult literacy and “pre-college ABE and GED programs” (50). Andragogy, the teaching of adults and the programs around them, is an instructional task that often falls to two-year college teachers. Gleason’s argument is that these disciplines should be taught in graduate programs. Gleason brings these multi-disciplinary concerns together by discussing the master’s degree program in Language and Literacy at CCNY, which has its roots with Mina Shaughnessy in the 1970s. While this might seem like an aside, it is germane to the issue of defining the nature of the profession of two-year college writing as it seems to draw on fields across the boundaries of English studies, andragogy, literacy, developmental education, and reading. It begs the question: what is the profession or field of two-year college teaching? The first requirement of being a profession in the definition I have chosen is that it knows its boundaries and knows the problems it faces and knows which tools and methods it should use. The nature of the guidelines, show an evolving definition of the field, coupled with the disciplinary boundary crossing and lack of a consistent and explicit set of training programs, lead me to the conclusion that the first requirement of a profession is not a settled one for the two-year college English teacher.

In the first chapter, I discussed at length the competing missions of the community college—democratic and neoliberal. Turning again to our scheme for defining the profession we see another problem. The second requirement is a “sense of mission” including “beliefs about the larger social values served by the field” (27). Given

the findings of the first chapter, we find the community college to be a fraught profession. Is the two-year college meant only to provide workplace skills or is it meant to have a transfer mission as well? What about larger concerns under a Deweyan conception such as the democratic function of education? What is the mission, the purpose, exactly, of English studies courses and writing courses within the two-year college? In Keith Kroll's 2012 *TETYC* essay "The End of the Community College English Profession" he makes the argument that English instructors' ability to influence the larger social good is already receding at the two-year college. He argues that the community college will change over the next twenty years with the "grand experiment of the community college as that of 'Democracy's College' [...] coming to an end" and with that end he envisions the "end of the community college's academic function" which he sees as providing a real education (Kroll, "The End of the Community College English Profession" 118). Kroll does not elaborate his article with a definition of education, and Jeff Andelora's response to Kroll argues that he's overstating his argument, but Kroll's concerns about the neoliberal business model and the consumerization of education have only seemed prescient over the last five years. Even though Kroll's position is challenged, the fact remains that the values and mission of the two-year college are a contested space, which makes the possibility of a full-realized profession unstable. I hasten to add that the lack of explicit preparation of graduate students for this environment and the mission of the community college further undermines instructors' abilities to realize their profession fully.

The third criterion in the definition we're using to test the two-year college profession is whether the profession has the "proper working conditions for doing work

in the field.” What are the proper working conditions? From the TYCA Guidelines and various NCTE and CCCC statements, I have gleaned criteria which include: class size, instructional autonomy, academic freedom, contingent labor, union representation, funding for professional development, which includes travel and professional memberships and more. Here again, the profession is contested. The most recent report on contingent labor places 67% percent or more two-year college professionals as non-tenure track and estimates on non-full time employment are nearly as high (Kezar and Maxey). If we look at seminal documents like the Wyoming Resolution or the Indianapolis Resolution, there is a large consensus in writing studies that this situation is anything but the proper working condition for the field. Further work like Tinto’s *Completing College* and a 2005 Higher Ed article point out that there is some evidence that student outcomes, including graduation, are not as good when students have adjunct instructors. Clearly, working conditions cannot be proper if the workers are not sufficiently trained and supported. We must also consider governance as a condition for work. Both Kroll and Andelora call for reasserted shared governance in the community college. However, I believe that the examination of the history of the community college reveals this argument to be rhetorical rather than based in fact. Given the administrative progressivism, lack of tenure status, and connection to secondary school models of governance, it is unclear that there has ever been a consistent model of shared governance in the community college.

The fourth category on Bucher and Stalling’s list centers on with the relationships professionals have with people in their field, including “colleagues, clients, and workers in other fields” (Bucher and Stelling 27). What immediately springs to mind in analyzing

this criterion in relation to the two-year college English professional, is their relationship with the larger discipline of English Studies. Unfortunately, the history of the community college English professional has been one of unease as the “thousands of newly hired faculty members [...] were betwixt and between, finding a sense of belonging in neither the ranks of K-12 teachers nor within the university professoriate” (Palmer 39). This fact has often meant the relationship has been difficult. Lovas, Hassel and Giordano, and others have pointed out that even though half of writing courses are taught at the community college, much fewer than half of scholarship on writing comes from two-year college professionals, which is seen variously as invisibility, snobbery, a consequence of high teaching loads, or a combination of these. It is not a stretch to point out that the two-year college English instructor has historically had a strange position within education; a position that many would argue has made it difficult to develop fully as a discrete profession. TYCAs work within NCTE has allowed faculty to use the organizations to “establish inquiry into education at the community college as a legitimate and important line of scholarship that advances their disciplines” (Palmer 41). The latest TYCA guidelines work from the position that graduate programs usually do not recognize this fact and thus fail integrate it into their curriculum.

Finally, Bucher and Stelling look at professions in relation of the field to “larger publics and institutions” (Bucher and Stelling 27). As I noted in the first chapter, it is this relationship with the public and its perceptions of the two-year college that require the most advocacy and activism on the part of the two-year college English professional. Community college English professionals discuss this in their journals and in sessions at conferences, and are forming what might be a consensus of professional identity—one

that is choosing the full identity of teacher-scholar-activist. Teacher-Scholar-Activism as an identity to be enacted by two-year college professionals may be the most promising prospect of engagement with these larger publics and institutions in ways that foster values engaged professionals believe are good for their students, profession, discipline, and the public. Patrick Sullivan built the concept of Teacher-Scholar-Activist in his 2015 article “The Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar-Activist.” He argues that “It may have always been the case that two-year college English teachers have had to be “activists” in one way or another” because of the nature of the community college. He goes on to argue though that given the current trends toward what he identifies as a regression in education that the community college teacher must embrace “the inescapably political nature of our work” (Sullivan 327). While this identity is not a consensus among community college English faculty, especially because not all English faculty engage with TCYA, the identity expands possibilities for the profession.

As we can see from this analysis, two-year college English professionals have each of the features that Bucher and Stelling describe as part of a profession. However, these professionals do not have each feature or a firm grasp on any one of them. Thus, the profession is distinct and incomplete. Part of this professional position emerges from the origin of community colleges as well as from resources and reward structures at these colleges. However, a large part of this professional position is maintained because there is a lack of consistent training and development for these professionals in their graduate programs.

### *The History of Graduate Preparation for Two-Year College English Faculty*

The history of how English instructors have been prepared (or not prepared) to

teach in the two-year college is perhaps best encapsulated by looking at the guidelines created by our national disciplinary professional organization for preparing teachers in the two-year college. There are three iterations of the Guidelines, published in 1971, 2004, and 2016. The first was organized at the behest of the CCCC Executive Committee in 1970. The second and the third guidelines documents were put together by the Two-Year College English Association (TYCA), an organization under the umbrella of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) founded in 1996. In a series of recent articles and presentations studying the history and preparation of two-year college English faculty, Toth and I argue that each represents a particular turn or moment in the thinking and professional trajectory of the two-year college English instructor (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns”). This trajectory is: teacher, teacher scholar (identified as an expert generalist who benefits from scholarship), and now teacher-scholar-activist (Andelora, Sullivan, Jensen and Toth, Toth and Jensen). Andelora in “The Teacher/Scholar: Reconstructing our Professional Identity” found that it was only in the 1990s that scholars like Kroll McPherson, Tinberg, Rains, Holladay-Hicks and Reynolds began “writing themselves into the professional conversation”, even though community college professionals were involved in some of these discussions and work from the beginning (307). This move began an assertion and claiming of professional identity as well as disciplinary relevance. More recently, as reform pressures from outside the academy—stemming from foundations and legislators among others—community college faculty have begun to address their work outside of the academy. This new move, described in Sullivan’s “The Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar-Activist” brings together this trend, noting an “emerging consensus about the urgent need for focused,

coordinated, and intentional activism from teachers of English at the two-year college” to answer these outside (and often ill-informed) pressures in a way that fosters the democratic mission of the community college (Sullivan 344).

This arc is one that Toth and I examine in our July 2017 *College English* article “Unknown Knowns: The Past, Present, and Future of Preparation for Two-Year College English Faculty.” That article, part of which was researched while I was on sabbatical in fall 2015, involved surveying TYCA members, archival research of past graduate programs, conversations with long-term community college faculty members and sending out a request for information about present or past programs to more than 1000 TYCA members via email.

### *Rapid Proliferation*

What I found from this research process was an intermittent and cyclical history of preparation for two-year college English instructors. I want to be cautious here and note that I am drawing on information available in archival research and that it may not reflect programs that have been lost to history. Originally, my hypothesis was that there had not been explicit preparation for community college teaching in English. However, corresponding with the 1971 guidelines and with the initial boom of community colleges in the late 1960s and into the mid 1970s, there were a substantial number of graduate programs with offerings aimed at two-year college faculty, which included specialized master’s degrees, certificates, and the doctor of arts program (DA). After those programs subsided, largely because the number of community colleges had stabilized, and partly because of other reasons such as the adjunctification of instructional labor, these

programs dissipated. In some cases, programs like the DA at Carnegie Mellon and SUNY Albany became PhDs in Composition and Rhetoric (Reynolds; North et al.)

One of the earliest examinations of teaching English in the community or junior college that I could find in print was Barton and Beacher's 1970 volume, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*. This book is one of the first written by two-year college faculty for two-year college faculty, other early works on the two-year college include Roger Garrison's books from 1967 and 1968. True to the moment, the cover of Barton and Beacher's book shows rows of neatly arranged students looking onto a screen at the front of the class where the instructor, a white man in a tie of course, is using an overhead to give a lesson. The authors of this early volume inform their readers in the introduction that they "were unable to find a single publication which attempted to bring together the interrelationships of the burgeoning community college, the multi-faceted discipline of English, and the differing needs of students" (Barton and Beachner v). They go on to say that their book should serve as a "primary source" for "departments in four-year colleges and universities which have responsibilities for preparing teachers of English and for developing courses [...]" (v). A current teacher in the two-year college would immediately recognize the topics of the book, which include reading instruction, remedial and developmental writing, evaluation (we would call this assessment), and a section on language development. The table of contents lay out disciplinary, pedagogical, and professional concerns that have endured for fifty years. This first book on teaching in the community college, coupled with the 1971 Guidelines, set the stage for the continuing concerns the discipline and profession have today.



The 1971 Guidelines, authored by a committee chaired by Gregory Cowan, and published in *College Composition and Communication*, asserts that the programs being created by universities to train graduate students for teaching in two-year colleges “must produce teachers willing to take a strong position against conventional approaches adopted merely because they are conventional, against false and irrelevant standards merely because such standards have traditionally prevailed” (Cowan, “Guidelines for Junior College English Teacher Training Programs” 303). The committee writes that their suggestions were created to reflect what community college teachers had been saying for a decade (304). These standards are essentially a list of competencies accompanied by some quantitative data on what community college teachers teach. The competencies include linguistics, reading, rhetoric, teaching skill, writing, assessment, public speaking, and literature. There is a call for internships and suggestions on how these might be arranged, too. These competencies and the desire for internships form a broad list of desired skills that the 2004 *Guidelines* echo and which my interviews with instructors in the third chapter show as still unfulfilled by graduate programs. The call for teaching skill precedes the 2014 *MLA Report of the Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature* by 43 years and can only now be prescient. The document is astonishing—it even prefigures of the 1974 *Students’ Right to Their Own Language* statement, asserting that “all dialects are equally valuable and that the academic insistence on a so-called ‘standard’ English for all situations is an unrealistic political and social shibboleth based on unsound linguistic information” (305-6). Steve Parks’ book *Class Politics: The Movement for the Students’ Right to their Own Language* discusses the relationship between these two documents, a relationship that isn’t common

knowledge and emphasizes how two-year college scholars' work is often erased. Further, the *Guidelines* call for two-year college faculty who “understand how to work within the academic system in order to change the system” (306). That these calls, the guidelines, and the directories were unknown to generations of scholars and two-year college instructors shows the invisibility of community college professionals in the larger literature of English Studies.

### *Lost Program Archaeology*

It is useful to look at the two directories Cowan prepared in 1978 and 1979. These two documents revealed three main kinds of programs that universities offered: The Doctorate of Arts, a Master's degree that emphasized community college teaching, or a certificate program. In the first year, the survey had a simple list of programs, with the degree or certificate offered, a length and cost section, a description, a history, a list of outstanding features gathered from direct quotes taken from the responses, and a name and address to write to for additional information. In the second year, Cowan built on the work and categorized the program into two groups: programs specifically for the Jr/community college and programs particularly applicable for Jr/community college teaching (Cowan 179). I want to emphasize the nature of Cowan's research work here. There were no websites for Cowan to look at in his work. Each of the programs chose to self-report and he took their survey information and put it into his directories. Finally, all this work was done through the U.S. mail. There was no electronic mail available. Taking all of that into account, the directories are remarkable documents that must have taken considerable time and energy to assemble.

One of the first questions that emerges from looking at this list is: are these programs still extant? The answer is complicated. I examined the lists from Cowan's directory, then went to the websites of the corresponding universities to see if we could still find them. After that, I tried to examine the course listings over the past three semesters to see if there was coursework that corresponded to preparing future two-year college faculty.

Finally, I could match some of what we found out through this research with correspondence Toth and I received from our queries to the WPA listserv and TYCA members. The work was difficult because programs that I thought of as English programs were sometimes now located in other departments. For example, the survey has SUNY Binghamton, in 1978, as reporting an M.A. in Two-Year College Teaching. In 2016, SUNY Binghamton has a graduate certificate in Community College teaching, which is comprised of three four-credit courses with a "GRD" prefix, meaning the classes are offered through the graduate school rather than an academic department. The website claims that "Binghamton University was one of the first schools in the U.S." to offer a certificate in college teaching (SUNY Binghamton). Without Cowan's survey, I would never have known to look at that school and still have no way of investigating their claim. And even with that knowledge, it took time to uncover the program because the program wasn't located in a place where someone in English Studies would look. This obscured program was not atypical, but is rather one example of many like it.

Other stand-alone programs mentioned in the directory like ones at Central Michigan and University of Iowa are gone. In the case of Iowa, where there was a program that was an MA and Ed. S degree totaling 60 hours, there is now a Graduate

Certificate in College Teaching, which seems significantly smaller in scope than the program described in Cowan's directory. Further, it's unclear if the program is aimed across disciplines or how it interacts with academic departments. In the case of Central Michigan, Gary Bays, a graduate of the program, confirmed in correspondence that it is shut down not long after he graduated in the early 1980s (Bays). The reasons for the discontinuation of the program, like many others on the list, are unclear.

Of the 43 programs mentioned in the 1978 directory, five were Doctor of Arts programs. The Doctor of Arts (D.A.) founded in 1932 was a prominent degree choice as community colleges experienced rapid expansion in the 1960s and 1970s. It was a terminal degree meant to be on par with the Ph.D.; unlike the Ph.D. with its emphasis on research, the D.A. focused on the practice of teaching. In the *American Community College*, Cohen et al. relates that "the doctor of arts was promoted by the Council of Graduate Schools and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education" in the 1960s (Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker 86). White and McBeth found that more than 15,000 D.A.s had been granted through 2003 (White and McBeth). However, for a variety of reasons, D.A.s have disappeared over time, with notable programs like Idaho State becoming a PhD program in 2009 and SUNY Albany discontinuing its DA in 2004. In fact, the national organization representing D.A.s has been inactive since at least 2004 (Jarvi). Currently, the D.A. program at George Mason University is no longer accepting applicants and the English department plans to launch a new PhD with a teaching concentration in 2016 (Armino, personal communication). The 2014 *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature* cites Saint John's University in Queens, NY as the last D.A. in English (Modern Language Association,

2014 Report 23). But at the time of this writing, the program can no longer be found on the English department's website and links now directly to the Ph.D. program. In an email, Steve Mentz, the Director of Graduate Studies at St. John's, confirmed that they began offering the Ph.D. in English in 2015, and that there were only a few D.A. students finishing their degree (Mentz, personal communication). Toth and I concluded that the DA was gone. However, in MLA job list in the fall of 2016, Murray State had posted a job hiring a tenure track position for its new Doctor of Arts program. This program seems to be a practitioner degree for K-12 teachers, but the job ad specifically called for community college experience. This might suggest that the program at Murray State is expanding to take on community college teacher preparation

In most cases, the D.A. became a Ph.D. program, largely due to the second-class status of the D.A (North et al.; Stenberg, *Professing and Pedagogy*), but also because the Ph.D. may be a more versatile degree. Further, we wonder if PhD's in Rhetoric and Composition could take on some of the pedagogical and practitioner functions of the D.A. However, I know of no research directly addressing this as it relates to English Studies and these reasons should be explored in much greater detail.

### *Certificate of Authenticity?*

Interestingly, in the past, entire states have become involved in credentialing of two-year college teachers. For many years, the State of California required a specialized certification for teaching at community colleges. In 1988, however, the state passed a law eliminating this certification, and by 1990 the minimum requirement to teach was a master's degree in the subject. Rather than disappearing, many of those programs still exist in some form today. While not full-scale degree programs or certifications, there are

a handful of graduate certificate and internship programs that focus on preparing graduate students to teach or work in a community college. As with the Cincinnati program, many of these programs are housed outside of English departments. For example, the program at California State University Dominguez Hills resides in the College of Extended and International Education. There are also programs situated within English departments. However, not all of them focus exclusively on two-year college teaching. Another example of a statewide requirement takes place in Minnesota. Per Kimberly Johnson, who is Director of Faculty and Instructional Development for Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, there are “required courses and training” for community college faculty (Johnson). The training is both for credit and non-credit. These kinds of requirements may be postgraduate.

There are programs that appear to more specifically address two-year college contexts. Seattle University and UNC Wilmington both offer specialized programs that require a master’s degree and provide their coursework through Education departments. The UNC Wilmington program requires a course called Social Justice Topics in Education and Seattle University requires a theoretical coursework specific to adult learners. Other graduate programs focusing on the preparation of two-year college faculty, like the one DePaul University, are in the English Department. Such programs often include some sort of internship program where graduate students teach in a two-year college setting with a mentor. Sean P. Murphy’s work with DePaul at College of the Lake provides a good example of such internships (Murphy; Murphy, Aiossa, and Winter). However, programs like this are rare, and there is little published research on them.

While the existing programs work to fill a major gap in graduate student preparation, there are no established best practices for these programs. Likewise, there is no published research on how many students seek out certificates of this nature or even if these certificates help lead to full-time employment. And finally, these programs, to our knowledge have not been assessed for effectiveness. Some of these programs do not remain viable and have been subsumed into other programs or certificates.

Overall, certificate programs may exist to fulfill certain gaps in local communities or meet the needs of exigent circumstances, but do not appear to be deeply involved with disciplinary professional organizations or national dialogues surrounding two-year colleges. Toth and I argue that the graduate preparation of two-year college English faculty should be the subject of disciplinary research and professional collaboration between faculty in two-year colleges and graduate programs in English studies

### *Torpor and Transition*

By the late 1970s and early 1980s, the rapid expansion of the community college reached an end. Community colleges had reached geographic saturation. Further, coupled with the casualization of teaching labor, this stabilization meant that full-time jobs became scarcer. In fact, the number of institutions has held relatively steady for more than thirty years. Jo Ann Buck and MacGregor Frank in “Preparing Future Faculty: A Faculty-in-Training Pilot Program” explain that “there was less demand for two-year college faculty training programs when teaching positions became unavailable. Most of these specialized programs simply withered away” (Buck and MacGregor 242). While this accounts for some of the programs disappearing, others are gone for unaccounted

reasons. This shift was the result not only of fewer new institutions, but also the adjunctification of the two-year college teaching force. In “Graduate Programs for Two-Year-College Faculty: History and Future Directions, Ellen Knodt asserts, “the fact that community colleges employ almost twice as many adjuncts as full-time faculty...may account for a decline in the demand for the D.A., because adjuncts have few incentives and no financial support to enter graduate programs” (Knodt 130). This reasoning would seem to apply to other specialized programs, as well. However, this withering of specialized programs did not relieve the need for instruction, training and preparation for the specific disciplinary and instructional contexts in the two-year college.

In response to that need, a second wave of attempts at creating preparation programs emerged in the 1990s. One of the factors that may account for this wave is the retirement of many first-generation two-year college instructors. These programs were more likely to be internships or programs created by community college faculty themselves, often in partnership with universities. The number of such internships was never accounted for, but the March 2001 *TETYC* issue was devoted to scholarship detailing several of them. These programs were hard to sustain, in part because of what Jensen and Ely in “A Partnership Teaching Externship Program: A Model that Makes Do” categorized as a lack of funding, lack of recognition for university faculty in their participation and the difficulty of navigating the bureaucratic difficulties of inter-institutional partnerships at the administrative level (Jensen and Ely; Murphy; Murphy, Aiossa, and Winter). Importantly, this second wave, as Toth and I argue, represented in scholarship by Buck and Frank and Murphy among others “held in common a belief that two-year college instructors are the experts in their own profession and that building



inter-institutional disciplinary partnerships with university colleagues benefits both faculty and students” (Jensen and Toth, MLA). These programs fronted teaching experiences in two-year college classrooms. These scholars wrote about the advantages of mentorship from working two-year college professionals (Elder et al.; Buck and MacGregor; Cowan, Traver, and Riddle; Murphy; Murphy, Aiossa, and Winter).

The second guidelines document, published three years after the *TETYC* issue on internships and other scholarship by community college teaching, addresses that need, while echoing the broad competencies first articulated in the 1971 Guidelines. In addition to taking up versions of these competencies under the moniker of “expert generalist,” the authors of the 2004 Guidelines also call on graduate programs to embrace their responsibility for preparing community college teachers by explaining that “recent graduates of master’s and doctoral programs are often applicants for [full-time] positions, yet many have not been appropriately prepared by traditional English graduate degree programs to confront and address effectively the needs of two-year college students” (TYCA “Guidelines” 2004). Toth’s and my analysis of the 2004 Guidelines shows that more than a quarter of the pages are “devoted to explaining the distinct institutional mission and student demographics at two-year colleges, outlining major theoretical developments in the field of rhetoric and composition that ought to inform pedagogy in this setting, and providing a detailed list of desirable coursework from the bachelor’s degree through master’s and/or doctoral programs” (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns”). Thirty-one years after the initial Guidelines, the 2004 Guidelines cover similar ground, while providing even more detail for a wide range of audiences, including

graduate faculty, graduate students, current two-year college teachers, and administrators. This document seemed aimed at the largest possible number of readers.

Two-year college professionals were broadening “the scope of professionalization beyond the classroom” (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns” 573). The 2004 Guidelines assert a nascent professional vision wherein “future two-year college English faculty should be equipped to engage in lifelong professional development, including producing scholarship and participating in professional organizations” (TYCA "Guidelines" 2004). These Guidelines fit into the work scholars like Andelora, Tinberg, Reynolds and others whose work, as Andelora describes it, is the culmination of a “campaign to recast [two-year college English faculty] as experienced teachers of writing whose pedagogies and programs were not only worthy of study, but were in fact central to the discipline”. Finally, the 2004 *Guidelines* explicitly asked graduate students to “lobby for change in institutions where ‘reformed’ graduate programs are unavailable” (TYCA "Guidelines 2004 15-16). This tactical move set the stage for the next iteration of the guidelines and the continuing evolution of the how two-year college English professionals identified themselves.

### *Claiming Identity and a Rising Tide*

The most recent wave of preparation efforts engages in the present moment by taking on the “public turn among two-year college faculty” (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns”). These faculty, taking up calls by leaders such as Patrick Sullivan and Jeff Andelora, “are increasingly identifying themselves as ‘teacher-scholar-activists’” (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns”). Toth and I argue that this professional identity responds to the exigencies of our moment, including the revocationalization of the college through

neoliberal ideology, austerity measures, the push for developmental education reform, and the continued adjunctification of the profession. The 2016 Guidelines and a growing number of scholars call for “professionals who are not only equipped to teach diverse student populations but also prepared to *advocate* for their students, their disciplinary knowledge and values, and their professional authority in institutional and public contexts” (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns”). Importantly, the guidelines challenge graduate programs to take up their ethical responsibility and duty in preparing future community college teachers, and in making the community college English profession visible through complete professionalization.

#### *Finding What’s Out There Now*

My archival research for the 2016 TYCA Guidelines and the College English article I co-authored with Toth allowed me to find and create a list of programs currently offering graduate preparation of some kind for the two-year college. This new list is the first to be compiled since Cowan’s in the late seventies. The new list is most likely incomplete as Toth and I had a received few responses to our query for information to TYCA members and the rest relies on my own research of program websites. First, I followed up on the programs which were listed in the 1977 and 1978 Cowan directories. Next, I sifted through the results of the TYCA survey, corresponding with graduate and community college faculty across the country. One of the programs I found emerged from the interviews I conducted for chapter three. This list cannot possibly be comprehensive, but it is instructive that it was so difficult to compile at all as it demonstrates that the professionalization of community college English teachers, including their disciplinary training, remains somewhat invisible or unaddressed. A future

research project that needs to be taken up is the creation of an up-to-date resource, perhaps housed on the NCTE website, that is public and easily changed as new information becomes available. Another important point here is that these programs exist, but no one has, to my knowledge, evaluated these programs.

One of the narratives or pieces of lore that I encountered as I began this project was that there weren't many programs designed to specifically prepare future teaching professionals to work in the two-year college environment. Scholars provide several narrative for this trajectory, including the narrowness of departments and their tendency to replicate scholars much like themselves, the perceived low status of the community college, and the adjunctification of the academic workforce, leading to the perception of few or no full-time positions in two-year colleges (Modern Language Association; Grubb and Worthen)

My research found this lore to be somewhat accurate, but not nuanced in a way that provided a more complete and accurate accounting. Over the past 40 years there have been several programs explicitly designed to prepare future two-year college faculty. However, the scattered nature of the programs, across departments and colleges, coupled with a lack of clarity about their continued existence, made it exceedingly difficult to catalog, much less to understand their goals. What emerges might charitably be called a confused mixture of programmatic responses to the needs of two-year college English faculty that haphazardly responds to local needs, sometimes with excellent results. Many programs discussed in the literature or that I found through correspondence were defunct or had changed dramatically in the 39 years since they had been cataloged. This may be in part attributable to the pervasive use of part-time instructional labor, which has gone

from 21.7% of the instructional workforce to 66.5% in forty years (Kezar and Maxey). There is little incentive for institutions to train graduate students for a workplace which has specialized instructional and institutional contexts but where there are few full-time jobs for the students. Nonetheless, there are programs across the United States attempting to provide that preparation. This fact is important because, as the TYCA 2016 Guidelines point out, “the instructors who secure full-time faculty positions at two-year colleges are those who have prepared themselves in ways that align with the unique demands, expectations, and values at these institutions” (TYCA "Guidelines" 2004 2).

### *Current Efforts*

Toth's and my research has revealed a total of 21 extant programs (see Figure 2 below), seven of which are housed in English departments. These represent a variety of programs, but are mostly certificates. The one Doctor of Arts on the list—Murray State—is a relatively new program and is the only one in the country of which we are aware. In some cases, examining the programs and curricula available on the websites led us to conclude that the course work in these programs are traditional English courses, and that courses specifically relating to community colleges are “farmed out” to education departments. This fact is interesting in that it might signify a split between a disciplinary specialization and pedagogy. A few programs, like Cincinnati's, CCNY's and SFSU offer specific literacy and reading courses that have been called for since the first guidelines in 1971.

A program I found notable is the CCNY English Department's Master of Arts in Language and Literacy, which traces itself back to Mina Shaughnessy's commitment to

open admissions teaching (Gleason, “Reasoning the Need”). The program’s website shows a program designed to accommodate multiple professional trajectories; importantly, community college teaching is on the list. Moreover, there are courses devoted to language and literacy learning from pre-college to post-secondary levels, including courses on andragogy and Basic Writing (City College of New York English Department). In “Reasoning the Need: Graduate Education and Basic Writing,” Barbara Gleason, who is the program director, describes the MA program, including its unique history and mission. She argues for the importance of graduate courses in Basic Writing theory and practice. Gleason invokes the TYCA 2004 *Guidelines*, which call for relevant graduate coursework, too. The program Gleason describes helps graduate students fulfill the aspiration of being the expert generalists the Guidelines invoke as ideal. Gleason notes the importance of making basic writing preparation available “for graduate students aiming to teach at two-year colleges” (Gleason 61). Toth and I found that “CCNY’s program is admirable for its variety of relevant courses and its attention to the literacy experiences of diverse adult learners” (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns” 577).

A program that came up several times from the query of TYCA members was the University of Cincinnati's Certificate in Postsecondary Literacy Instruction (PLI). This program, founded in 2007, was originally designed as professional development for “in-service literacy teachers” (Theado). Connie Kendall Theado, the director of the program, notes that it concentrated on adult learners who are “often left out of traditional teacher preparation programs”(Theado). This program can be completed as part of a degree program. Interestingly, like several of the programs that we encountered, this one is within an Education department. This placement may speak to the value or positioning of

teaching or pedagogy within institutions, perhaps pointing to assumptions made about the value of teaching in general. Professor Theado explained this by saying that her program “believe[s] strongly that our positionality brings the interrelated disciplines of reading education and writing education into critical conversation”(Theado). This reasoning seems to support the notion that teaching in a two-year college is a distinct profession that draws upon multiple disciplines to conduct its work.

Finally, in our article, Toth and I concentrated on the program in the Department of English Language and Literature at San Francisco State University (SFSU). This program “models a flexible hybrid approach, offering multiple M.A. options in literature, composition, linguistics, and TESOL, as well as three graduate certificates in the Teaching of Composition, Teaching Post-Secondary Reading, and Immigrant Literacies” (San Francisco State University Department of English Language and Literature). We were heartened that this program had multiple audiences, comprised of “aspiring and practicing teachers across multiple sectors, including community colleges” (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns”). An examination of the curriculum at SFSU demonstrates that it meets the call of the first two sets of guidelines by including “coursework in integrated reading and in writing across the curriculum” (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns”) Grounded in English studies, SFSU’s programs combine coursework relevant to two-year college English instructors’ teaching across the multiple disciplines with “preparation for working with diverse student populations” through preparation in TESOL and coursework in literacy (Jensen and Toth, “Unknown Knowns”). Programs like this answer the calls for professionalization and coursework in the Guidelines and in

Gleason's article and they also address many of the concerns the teachers raise in my chapter three interviews.

Toth and I emphasize the programs above because we believe they model practices that should be emulated. We argue that "these programs acknowledge two-year college English teaching as a legitimate professional trajectory: two-year colleges are clearly visible and valued in these programs" (Jensen and Toth, "Unknown Knowns"). I argue that they are designed to respond to the reality that many two-year college English faculty like myself return to graduate school seeking more specialized coursework to understand the institutional and instructional contexts in which we find ourselves. Second, these institutions offer courses that cover a "range of contemporary teaching and professional issues that two-year college faculty face, but they are also flexible enough that graduate students can create programs of study that meet their interests and needs. They are not so much teacher training as teacher-scholar professional development" (Jensen and Toth, "Unknown Knowns").

Importantly, these programs are within English departments; they are not merely literature or composition programs with teaching courses one can take in the Education department. This emphasis on situating the important work of teaching in the context of the two-year college within the institutional home of English studies cannot be emphasized enough. Again, this situating is the necessary centering of the discipline at the site where most of the teaching and most of the teaching of the most vulnerable students takes place (Hassel and Giordano).

Below is the list of programs, including the new Doctor of Arts at Murray State.



<b>Institution</b>	<b>Institutional Home</b>	<b>Credential</b>	<b>Title</b>
<b>Arkansas State University</b>	College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	Specialist Degree	Specialist in Community College Teaching
<b>California State—Dominguez Hills</b>	College of Extended and International Education	Certificate	Certificate in Community College Teaching
<b>California State—Fullerton</b>	College of Education	Certificate	Community College Certificate
<b>California State University—Long Beach</b>	College of Education	Certificate	Graduate Certificate in Community College
<b>Central Michigan University</b>	Graduate School	Certificate	Graduate Certificate in College Teaching (post MA or PhD)
<b>University of Cincinnati</b>	College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services	Certificate	Certificate in Postsecondary Literacy Instruction
<b>City College of New York</b>	English Department	Master of Arts	Language and Literacy
<b>DePaul University</b>	Department of English	Certificate	Teaching English in the Two-Year Colleges
<b>Drew University</b>	Arts and Letters	MLitt DLitt	Teaching English in the Two-Year College Concentration
<b>East Carolina University</b>	College of Education And Department of English	Certificate  Certificate	Community College Instructor Certificate  Teaching English in the Two-Year College
<b>Iowa State University</b>	College of Education	Certificate	Community College Teaching Certificate
<b>University of Iowa</b>	College of Education	Certificate	Certificate in College Teaching
<b>Marymount University</b>	Department of English	Certificate	Teaching English at the Community College

<b>Minnesota State Colleges and Universities</b>	Academic and Student Affairs	Coursework	Coursework required to teach in a community college
<b>Murray State</b>	Department of English	Doctor of Arts	Unknown
<b>University of North Carolina—Wilmington</b>	College of Education	Certificate	Certificate in College Teaching and Learning
<b>Northern Arizona University</b>	College of Educational Leadership	Certificate	Community College Teaching and Learning
<b>San Francisco State University</b>	Department of English	Certificate	Certificate in the Teaching of Composition  And  Certificate in Teaching Post-Secondary Reading
<b>Seattle University</b>	College of Education	Certificate	Post Master's Certification in Community College Teaching
<b>SUNY Binghamton</b>	Graduate School	Certificate	Certificate in Community College Teaching
<b>Texas A&amp;M University</b>	Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development	Certificate	Certificate in College Teaching

### *Conclusion*

The history of two-year college teacher preparation shows that the profession has received intermittent and incomplete professionalization for a variety of reasons. Chief

among them is English Studies' graduate programs' inconsistent and negligent approach to a group of professionals who teach nearly half the students in the country. Some of these problems emerge from the low status of two-year colleges, a status reinforced by these policies, while some of it emerges from elitism, and some of it comes from the narrow replication of graduate students as explained in the 2014 MLA report on doctoral reform.

### **Chapter 3--The Process of Making Do: A Narrative Exploration of 15 Case Studies Of Two-Year College Teachers' Preparation and Professionalization**

“The most erroneous stories are those we think we know best--and therefore never scrutinize or question.”

--Stephen Jay Gould

#### *Overview*

This chapter synthesizes and reports on fifteen case studies of community college professionals from across the United States. These case studies demonstrate that the unclear mission of the community college, coupled with poor graduate preparation, places community college instructors in a precarious position where it is difficult to sustain professionalism. The chapter reveals how community college professionals draw on other professional experiences among other variables to cobble together a professional identity.

The chapter looks at the case studies through the lens of literature on professional development in the two-year college. The analysis of the chapter again demonstrates an inconsistent profession containing everything from highly professionalized instructors to what I call fossilized instructors who are not engaged with the profession. These abbreviated case studies allow for the examination of the lived working conditions and experience of two-year college professionals.

My analysis shows three main findings: 1) faculty that I interviewed had no specific preparation to teach at the community college; 2) faculty gained much of their experience for teaching at the community college through work experience and teaching experience; and 3) that nearly every one of the faculty, regardless of experience or

geographic location, could articulate a set of competencies that they wish they had been given.

### *Introduction*

The first two chapters demonstrate that two-year college English professionals teach in institutions with a specific set of problems for which they are not prepared, namely the competing missions of the community college and the historical lack of consistent graduate preparation. The inconsistencies and challenges facing the two-year English instructor include neoliberal ideologies and rhetorics often brought to bear through administrative progressivism, invisibility, and reduced status. These professionals' reduced status at graduate schools and within English arises in part from replication model of graduate studies and elitism, both conscious and unconscious.

I will draw on the narratives of fifteen working community college English teachers from five states. I selected the participants through my own social networks of teachers with whom I'm acquainted. I use the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), an annual survey conducted by the school of Education at the University of Texas—Austin, and NCTE membership profile data to analyze my cohort as being somewhat representative in terms of years of service and race of the national make up of two-year college English professionals. Further, I use the available recent literature to analyze and draw some conclusions from each of the narratives the instructors shared with me.

## *Methodology and Validity*

I want to take some time to discuss my research methodology and to talk about why I chose to do narrative research. I have employed narrative research methodology following the work of Clandinin and Connelly. Clandinin and Connelly found in their work on narrative inquiry that telling the story of the participants and the story of the phenomena allowed people whose “experiences were largely silent” to be heard (123). I wanted the teachers who I knew and respected at community colleges to have a chance to tell their story—the story of how they became teachers at two-year colleges, what that identity and role means for them, and what the challenges are in creating and maintaining that identity in their estimation and experience. Clandinin and Connelly had their early work challenged and were keen to think about what can be learned about “phenomena by engaging in narrative inquiry that will be special and unique” (123). Given that Lovas, Grubb, Andelora, Hassel and Giordano, Nist and Rains, McPherson and many other researchers have talked about the lack of voice given to community college instructors, the telling of their stories *is* unique and important. Further, as a person who teaches students who often prefer story over abstraction, I’ve come to value story to teach and learn.

It should be noted that only two of the teachers whose stories I recorded set out to be community college English teachers. It’s interesting, then, to find out how members of this profession become members of this profession. Clandinin and Connelly write that “narrative inquiries are always composed around a particular wonder, a research puzzle” (124); I wondered how these teachers ended up where they were. I wondered how we could have made the process clearer and better for them. Therefore, I asked, I listened as

best I could, and have thought about their stories here in this chapter. Narrative inquiry, Clandinin and Connelly tell us, draws on the Deweyan notion of seeing “research as the study of experience” so I attempt to present their experience (Clandinin and Connelly xxii).

I gathered the stories of my fifteen participants through interviews. I wrote the interview questions and the UNL IRB approved the study. The interview questions from which these case studies, along with the corresponding IRB consents, are available in the appendices. I conducted the interviews in person if possible or I conducted them via video chat, using both Skype and Google Hangout. I implemented Clandinin and Connelly’s suggestion to “collaborate with participants by actively involving them in the research” (qtd. in Creswell 75). The participants got to read the questions, and in some cases, they resisted or reframed them. After I recorded their answers, I transcribed the interviews and sent them to the participants as vignettes. Each could change, add to, amplify or clarify their answers in any way they chose. I wanted these teachers to feel that I had accurately told their story. None of the participants made changes to my field notes. I chose the participants’ pseudonyms for the study, choosing them from various literary works.

The fifteen teachers were selected with the intent to represent a full variety of professional experience. Toth in her 2014 *TETYC* article “Unmeasured Engagement: Two-Year College English Faculty and Disciplinary Professional Organizations” noted a drawback in her research population because it had no adjuncts and most of the participants were highly involved (characterized by involvement in professional organizations and scholarship) faculty. Therefore, I sought out part-time faculty for my

sample. Approximately five of my fifteen participants are part-time faculty. Therefore, my research group is not totally representative, given that estimates of adjunct employment at English departments in community colleges are as high as 75%, but it is more representative than much of the literature on two-year college teachers. Eight of the fifteen teachers are female. Two of the fifteen teachers self-identified as racial minorities, specifically African-American and Korean-American. The teachers represent institutions in six different states and represent both rural and urban institutions. Each of the institutions represented are considered comprehensive community colleges, meaning that they have both a career and transfer mission. Finally, the distribution of race in the CCSSE survey was 78% white/non-Hispanic. In my cohort, it was 87% white/non-Hispanic (CCSSE). This figure makes my cohort somewhat less representative than the national one, but is probably a reflection of the fact that I primarily surveyed faculty in Midwestern states.

We can consider my cohort to be representative of “engaged professionals” if we take NCTE membership to be a measure of engagement. The NCTE data comes from an analysis of membership profiles conducted by Kristen Suchor. She found that of the 8,026 NCTE members who identified the scholastic level of their main professional work, 783 of those identified as two-year college or 10%” (Suchor, Kristen). This number represents just 2.3% of the number of two-year college instructors if we take the Bureau of Labor Statistics count of community college faculty as accurate. It is worth noting that NCTE does not claim that its records are complete. Of those 783, their ethnic breakdown is as follows: Black/African American to 6%, White to 81%, .4% American Indian or Alaskan Native, 1.4% as Asian, 1.9 % as Latino/Hispanic. 7% preferred not to answer.



This NCTE cohort matches my cohort closely in terms of ethnicity. My cohort is 7% African American and 7% Asian. In all, the number of case studies, fifteen, while small, is mostly representative of two-year college faculty.

Although I believe community college teachers are a distinct profession, I can't claim that there is a shared culture of a group that spans nearly 1200 institutions across fifty states. They don't even have the same disciplinary home, many come from education, or creative writing, or literature in addition to composition. From the CCSSE study and the narratives I recorded, focusing on shared features of institutional and professional culture and that patterns do emerge can help us to equalization and improve the professional position of community college writing instructors.

#### *15 Narratives, Summarized and Analyzed*

The literature on the professionalization and professional identities of community college instructors is relatively scant. Most of the writing on the subject has come in a series of articles over the last twenty years, However, this body of scholarship has informed many of the themes I have used to make sense of the difficult task of transforming 15 sets of field notes from my interviews into usable prose. My major findings were 1) the faculty that I interviewed had no specific preparation to teach at the community college; 2) this faculty gained much of their work experience and teaching experience at the community college through work experience and teaching experience; and 3) that nearly every one of the faculty, regardless of experience or geographic location, could articulate a set of competencies that they wish they had been given. As per the IRB protocol, the participants have been assigned a pseudonym. I have also changed the names of the institutions to better mask the participants' identities.

In the first part of the interview, I asked a series of questions to ascertain the experience of each of the participants in their teaching lives. I was interested in how they began teaching, how many years they had been teaching, at what type of institutions they had been teaching, and whether the participants had K-12 teaching experience. I wanted to find out if the teachers' primary preparation came from being a TA during graduate study. Much community college literature on the origins of the institution discusses how many schools were organized by secondary schools and that many teachers at community colleges came from secondary schools. I wanted to know if this was still true, as it was my sense that it was no longer so.

The teachers had a range of experience, from 4 years to 45 years of teaching experience. Four of the teachers with whom I spoke had been teaching at the community college for more than 30 years. In the CCSE survey, 8.8 percent of the more than 12,000 respondents had this level of experience. For the teachers I spoke with, 26.6 % of the instructors had this level of experience. Part of the reason for this difference is that I sought out teachers who had been at community colleges for long periods of time so that I would have a sense of history and of the history of preparation. While this might seem to have provided a dated portrait of preparation, my interviews provide a significant teaching time span and accurately reflect the landscape of preparation.

Other instructors' teaching experience came mostly from graduate assistantships in their MA or PhD programs. Interestingly, only two of the teachers had been high school instructors. Another had considered it and began her undergraduate work in education, but decided that it wasn't for her. Several of the respondents strongly stated their antipathy to teaching in a K-12 environment, noting that they wanted to teach adults

specifically or that the institutional culture wasn't suited to them. Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker's describe many community colleges beginning as secondary schools or being organized by K-12 districts and that many of the original teachers came from the secondary level. While this may have been true at the founding of the community college, the experiences of community college teachers I interviewed contradicts this assertion. Further, the CCSE faculty survey didn't capture K-12 teaching experience and no other study I could find did either.

From this tiny sample, I infer that community college teachers do not typically come out of the K-12 system. Conducting a large-scale study of NCTE and TYCA members to understand their experience and teaching origins of community college instructors should be a future line of inquiry. To suggest some possible avenues here, two areas might be looked at: the feasibility of obtaining a teaching certificate after obtaining a master's degree in a content area and the poor pay adjunct instructors receive. Many former TAs who have a master's degree in English want full employment and look to secondary school as an option. However, going back to get the requisite hours in a college of education and completing the intensive student teaching process may serve as a significant barrier. Further, transitioning to two-year college teaching as an adjunct is financially insecure. For example, Metropolitan Community College pays 2050.00 to teach an 11-week section of college English. Des Moines Area Community College pays 2700.00 for a 15-week section of English. In both cases, the instructor can never teach more than the equivalent of 30 instructional hours per week, preventing the instructor from receiving benefits. In contrast, a new secondary school teacher in Nebraska receives between 28,000 and 37,000 dollars with benefits depending on the district. However, the

mechanisms of how and how often teachers move from one institution type to another, or how often adjuncts become full-time faculty, is unresearched to my knowledge. Below is a table which visually orders some of the pertinent information I obtained during the interviews.

Pseudonym	Years Teaching at a CC	Graduate Preparation for CC work	Comp and Rhetoric Writing Pedagogy	Professional Development	Other Experience
Hermione Gryffindor	17	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eustacia Vye	17	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Emily Whitman	16.5	No	No	No	Yes
Verruca Salt	9	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Silas Smith	38	Yes	Yes	No	No
Randall Flagg	15	No	Yes	No	Yes
Arthur Dimmsdale	37	No	No	No	Yes
Angela Argo	17	No	No	No	Yes
Ramona Quimby	45	No	No	No	Yes
Nancy Cho	12	No	No	Yes	Yes
Dirk Bently	4.5	No	No	No	No
Monroe Starr	6.5	No	Yes	No	No
Frodo Underhill	4	No	No	No	No
Donnie DeLillo	32	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Michael Valentine Smith	16	No	No	No	No

**Figure 3.** List of Participants and Information

In the second part of the interviews with the teachers, we discussed their graduate preparation to be teachers at community colleges. The teachers and I discussed their

graduate degrees, teaching experience, the kind of information they were given about community colleges and the kind of information they were given about developmental education. I was interested in the gaps (if any) they felt were present in their graduate school experience and what they felt would have filled those gaps. Finally, I asked about their preparation as a writing teacher and what kinds of experiences, both in and out of traditional teaching environments, had informed their teaching. The results are striking and complex.

Of the fifteen teachers that I spoke to, ten had what they described as master's degrees in English with an emphasis in literature. Three of the teachers had master's degrees in creative writing, one of which was an MFA. Importantly, 13 of the 15 teachers had training in other areas than what they teach at their community college. One of the instructors had a master's degree in teaching ESL (TESOL), while one had a master's degree in Community College Teaching. Of the fifteen, three had doctorates—two PhDs and a DA. The PhDs were in Creative Writing and English and Education, respectively. Two of the other instructors had PhDs in progress—one in Composition and Rhetoric and one in Education. Only two of the 15 instructors had degree programs designed specifically for the community college, the DA and the MA in Community College Teaching. Both of those programs are now defunct and follow patterns of historic graduate development that I discussed in chapter 2.

While I am making the point here that the interviewees were not trained to teach in the context of the two-year college, it is important to acknowledge that most four-year instructors do not receive explicit instruction in the teaching of English either. Many had training only through the experience of being a teaching assistant. Ten of the fifteen

instructors were TAs of some type during their graduate experience. These experiences ranged from being a teaching fellow for one semester to teaching for years as a graduate assistant. Arthur Dimmesdale, an English instructor at an urban community college in Nebraska for more than 30 years, related a story of being a teaching fellow at a Midwestern Jesuit university in the 1970s. He taught “intro to fiction and intro to drama with no preparation whatsoever offered by the department”. He was given the catalog description of the course and told to “get his book orders in to the secretary” (Dimmsdale). Of course, not all the teaching preparation was like that. Randall Flagg described taking a composition teaching practicum at Kansas State university for two credits each of his four semesters during his master’s degree. There were a variety of speakers, the faculty held norming sessions, and the faculty and the graduate students worked on assignment design, assessment, and using portfolios all within the confines of the for-credit practicum (Flagg). These experiences, thirty years apart, seem to be two ends of the spectrum for graduate teaching preparation.

Nearly universal though was the lack of information given to graduate students about teaching at the community college. When I asked Frodo Underhill, an adjunct at a Midwestern urban community college, if community college teaching were discussed in his graduate program, his eyes widened, and he said “oh, no” as if it were an inconceivable question (Underhill). Randall Flagg reported that his PhD program provided no information about teaching at a community college, going on to lament that “in fact there was erroneous information about teaching in the community college” (Flagg). He reported that he was told “nothing about the mission or any of the important stuff”. He found it “infuriating” and believes it wasn’t “helpful to graduate students”

because there wasn't sufficient or accurate information. He went on to report that a friend of his had a dissertation chair who discouraged her from applying to a community college. This kind of story isn't isolated. Dirk Bently, a community college instructor and PhD student in a smaller Midwestern city, said that not only was there no information about teaching at a community college, "but that there were rarely discussions about them in general" (Bently). He went on to report that when they "did have discussions, it was with other graduate students who were secretly moonlighting at the local CC to make extra money" (Bently). While the moonlighting isn't uncommon—there are many anecdotal examples of it—the practice hasn't been examined to my knowledge. These are examples of the invisibility of community colleges, their erasure, and what might be an elitist attitude toward them. Another anecdote that fits with this narrative is Emily Whitman's story of only one professor telling her anything about community colleges, but he was the professor who was identified as "rogue" by the department and the other graduate students, thus reinforcing the notion that community college teaching is in some way outside of traditional graduate studies. Arthur Dimmesdale reported that in the late 1970s, if a graduate student wasn't going on to a PhD, it was assumed that you would go to a community college (Dimmsdale). The hierarchy was certainly present. Thirty-five years later, three recent graduates all reported that the point of the MA was preparation for the PhD and that it was the rare graduate faculty member who acknowledged other career paths. This finding is in keeping with the 2014 MLA's report on doctoral reform which called for reform of graduate preparation for other careers (Modern Language Association). This conception of the MA's role is coming under

increasing scrutiny and reformation of the MA is an intervention worth examining that I take up in chapter four.

There were some teachers' experiences in my group who didn't fit into this type of narrative. First, Ramona Quimby who began her graduate program in 1974, which she reports as the same year that the first community college opened in Nebraska. She felt that it was highly unlikely that her state university would even have known what a community college was at the time (Quimby). That stance isn't reported in the early literature, especially since the first directory of graduate programs for community college preparation would appear just four years later, but in an age before massive and easy dissemination of information, there may have been many programs such as the one Ramona describes.

And still further away from the dismissal or ignorance some of the interview subjects experienced in their desire to teach at the two-year college was the experience of Silas Smith and Donnie DeLillo who both had graduate programs designed to prepare them to teach in the community college. Donnie DeLillo, who received a graduate degree in community college English teaching at an upper Midwestern state university, describes a program that had him "ready to walk into the classroom on day one" (DeLillo). The program consisted of eight core classes, including a seminar in teaching in the two-year college. Coursework contained explicit instruction on continuing education, writing across the curriculum, developmental education, adult students and andragogy. He was prepared to teach technical writing and had coursework in linguistics as well. He explained there were reading experts and that graduate students in the program took a class on reading theory and strategies. Donnie mentioned that there lots of opportunities



to teach in front of people and that the program had great advising. Finally, each of the students had a teaching internship at a community college. Donnie reported that while the students were at the internship, the graduate advisor and school mentor would observe the teacher/graduate student. Then his advisor sent him every ad or the next year, even critiquing them and giving inside information to help the graduates get jobs. Placement was about 100 percent for full-time positions, if the candidate was willing to move (DeLillo). This kind of preparation seems groundbreaking today and is what I originally wanted to argue for in my dissertation.

Silas Smith obtained his Doctorate of Arts at Carnegie Mellon, which was the model for the DA for many programs (see my discussion of the DA in chapter 2 and North's *Refiguring the PhD in English* for one story about its demise as a degree). Smith might be called a nontraditional student, but he followed a path that many community college instructors, including myself have followed, which is to say he became a teacher first and then pursued a terminal degree while teaching. Silas earned his BA and MA from a southeastern school and began teaching at a community college in the 1970s. After five years, he decided to pursue the D.A. at Carnegie Mellon, a program that many report as being excellent (Reynolds). While his traditional MA hadn't prepared him to be a community college instructor specifically, the D.A. did. The program appears to have worked in a cohort model with the students in the first year taking proscribed courses and then collaborating with faculty to design courses for the subsequent years. Courses were in the summer so that faculty could teach during the year and continue their program in the summer. Smith reports excellent preparation from this program.

Tellingly, the information that graduate students received about developmental education and basic writing was even more scant than the information they received about two-year colleges. I want to be sure to assert here that I am not conflating basic writing and developmental education solely with community colleges. However, the large majority of developmental education classes and basic writing classes are taught at community colleges and English instructors are often expected to teach them even though they may not have any training in the discipline. Only one of the fifteen teachers whose experience I recorded reported receiving direct, explicit training in basic writing or developmental education. As Jensen and Ely report in “An Externship in Basic Writing: A Model that Makes Do”, this omission defies reckoning as millions of students are ushered into basic writing classes annually which are under attack from a variety of entities for being either a barrier or ineffective. It would seem logical then that there would be explicit instruction in the theory and practice of developmental education and basic writing in English studies. Three of the teachers with whom I spoke mentioned that they read part of Shaughnessy’s text on basic writing or that it was briefly glossed over as a very small part of a larger composition and pedagogy course. It’s interesting to hear this because Shaughnessy’s seminal work has gone in and out of fashion over the last four decades and remains controversial for its concentration on error. I would say that its chief value is historic at this point and that there are several other articles on basic writing that would provide a better introduction to the subject such as Adams, Gearhart, Miller and Robert’s essay on the ALP program at Baltimore County Community College, or Sanchez and Paulson’s work on critical literacy. These and others provide a current view in best practices and the current conversation around developmental education. It may

also be worth mentioning here that it may be that Basic Writing is taught as part of disciplinary history in composition and rhetoric, but that it isn't examined as a "living" body of work which graduate students may need to know about.

Sometimes the faculty reported that there was discussion about different levels of preparation, but not specifically basic or developmental writing. Verruca Salt, an urban community college teacher who had been a high school teacher previously noted that there wasn't "discussion of differentiated syllabi, courses, assignments and only a passing mention of ESL" (Salt). Arthur Dimmesdale responded to the question by relating that the only thing that he ever got in the way of being prepared for struggling students was in the last semester they assigned graduate students in his program individual undergraduate students that we would tutor because the faculty thought it would prepare him and his colleagues for the kind of teaching that we would have to do. He reported that "We weren't even instructed in how to do that that—we were just assigned students" (Dimmsdale). All in all, the faculty I spoke to reported not being prepared to teach in the community college, and being even less prepared to teach students in a developmental education classroom.

Given these facts, I was curious about the gaps these instructors perceived in their own educational preparation. After all, one of the reasons that I began a PhD program was because I realized that I was catastrophically underprepared to help the students at the community college where I'd been hired. Interestingly, many of the instructors reported gaps in being able to help students to read (Argo; Vye). English graduate students are typically strong readers and encountering a set of students who have not had the same experiences with literacy can be disquieting.

Frodo Underhill found that he had gaps in the mechanics of teaching. He wanted “organizational things, leadership things,” to “understand students’ needs and empathizing—learning how to have better dialogue with the students to understand what they’re going through more. Literacy development—models of development. I have had to learn from observing and conversations with colleagues. Understanding students is a huge weird mess in trying to figure out your values, what the students need, and how it all fits into a larger picture, including a civic dimension. Learning how to balance group and individual needs. Troubleshooting course designs.” (Underhill). Of course, these issues could easily be conceptualized as general issues of teaching. However, developmental pedagogy, andragogy—the teaching of adult students—working with first-generation students and students who have not been socialized to the discourse communities of education at the two-year college are concentrated at two-year school by design and mission. Randall Flagg echoed many of these concerns, while providing a laundry list of gaps that included training in developmental education, non-cognitive issues, classroom management, developing a teaching persona, and “actual methodology for teaching fundamentals and language” (Flagg). Randall felt all of this was the case because he came from a program where faculty were more concerned with their research rather than best practices (Flagg).

Verruca Salt, too, noted developmental education as a gap, but also commented that she didn’t have a sense of the mission and vision of the community college (Salt). Hermione Gryffindor echoed this sentiment as well. Because community colleges are invisible and underrepresented in the literature (Lovas, “All Good Writing Develops at the Edge of Risk”; Hassel and Giordano) there isn’t an opportunity to develop a sense of

what they do and what they are as institutions. Emily Whitman humorously lampoons the rhetorical orientation present in her and her graduate program when she relates that “the other big gap was the assumption that everyone in graduate school was on a track to become a professor who wrote papers on literature and who taught small groups of students—wearing Birkenstocks and really long hair while living in a 19<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse with the occasional duck walking through the house. I was a head in the clouds graduate students. One summer I went to Emily Dickinson’s garden and read poetry to a cat and I read to ducks at Walden Pond.” She finishes her memory noting “no wonder I was surprised there weren’t any jobs for me” (Whitman). Dirk Bently confirms this in a way with his own story telling me that his MA in creative writing didn’t match up at all with his experience in teaching at a community college (Bently). These gaps predicated by a lack of curriculum and discussion of community college teaching seemed to mount to indefensible ignorance perpetrated by oblivious graduate faculty.

I wondered then what they thought would fill the gaps in their education.

Hermione Gryffindor, a faculty member and administrator at a community college in the upper Midwest, had several suggestions. She wanted for faculty have a “history of the two-year college, perhaps even more broadly conceived as an introduction to the organizational strategies and structures of educational institutions” (Gryffindor). She continued, asserting that “composition programs generally across the country don’t have enough curricular focus on linguistics,” and that graduate programs “need an offering where students can encounter and negotiate home language and non-standard dialects in a productive way.” Finally, she asserted that her “million-dollar idea was that graduate students in composition should be doing internships in the two-year colleges because

internships increased level of intellectual engagement” (Gryffindor). It is internships like the one that she suggests that are working at schools like the University of Nebraska at Omaha (Jensen and Ely) and DePaul University. Unfortunately, these are rare and have such an intermittent history (see previous chapter), that many faculty and graduate students are unaware of them.

Many of the faculty I spoke with felt that specific coursework would have filled this gap. Several faculty mentioned coursework in reading pedagogy as they indicated that many students, even students who test into first-year writing, weren’t really reading at a “college-level” (Argo; Vye; Whitman). Eustacia Vye asked for a course in “special education” even though she “hated using that term” (Vye). This sentiment was echoed by others who felt they had not received training for the special needs of students whether they be non-cognitive issues or what many call learning disabilities. Several also mentioned developmental education pedagogy as one of those gaps. In addition, less experienced teachers like Bently and Underhill explicitly asked for teacher training and methodology, especially in the areas of understanding course design and assessment.

Another area I wondered about in this section of the interview was the preparation that my colleagues had to be writing teachers. The results were disparate. Frodo Underhill is emblematic of teachers who had only one course in composition and pedagogy. He felt that the one course didn’t really prepare him to transition into the role of assuming leadership in a class (Underhill). Many teachers, though, fell into the position Monroe Starr did where, as graduate students, there was a course in composition pedagogy and some course or practicum for teaching. She felt that her theory and

pedagogy course had “lifted the veil and helped with the work of turning things into actual curriculum” (Starr).

It is important to consider that so many of the two-year college instructors cited other professional preparation as being important for their development as writing teachers. Verruca Salt told me that she had been best prepared by her time as a hall director in a student dormitory and that this was where she had learned to work with students who had issues outside of the classroom as well as the place that she came to understand the nature and the importance of student services (Salt). Angela Argo had worked in corporate communications environment and Donnie DeLillo had been a technical and speech writer for Chrysler (Argo; DeLillo). Both teachers cited these professional experiences as important ways that they came to understand the writing students would have to do in the workplace. Arthur Dimmesdale, Nancy Cho, and Randall Flagg all honed their teaching of students with wildly divergent abilities in classrooms full of non-native English speakers. Dimmesdale cut his teeth on teaching ESL to Vietnamese refugees while both Cho and Flagg were English teachers in Asia. Gryffindor and Bently engaged in community literacy work either with AmeriCorps or in a community literacy center. Whatever the case, half of the fifteen teachers with whom I spoke cited these experiences to be some of, if not the most, important experiences in preparing them to teach at the community college.

### *Connecting the Literature*

Jeff Andelora claims the conflicted identity of two-year college professionals is a “crisis of confidence” more than anything else and has led to two-year college faculty not engaging with scholarship more (Jeff Andelora 311). I disagree with this assertion. It is

obvious that factors like the unclear and competing missions of two-year colleges, lack of preparation by graduate programs in addition to elements such as time constraints and resource scarcity are even more significant factors than a lack of confidence. On the contrary, several community college instructors who engage in research like Lovas and Tinberg note that two-year college instructors have vast experience teaching, which gives them as much or more to say. Not only does the narrative research I conducted support this perspective, so does most of the body of literature written about teaching at the community college as a profession.

Foundationally, Lewiecki-Wilson and Sommers' article "Professing at the Fault Lines: Composition at Open Admission Institutions" is a good place to begin examining the ongoing conversation about professionalism in the community college. Their landmark essays posit several foundational concepts that have held true in the years since its publication. They explore the notion that composition/rhetoric is not completely formed as a discipline, calling on research that examines the tradeoff between theory and practice. Further, they look how rhetoric and composition as a discipline reproduces graduate teachers. This call is again taken up in 2014 by the MLA taskforce on doctoral reform. While these two observations and critiques are common to composition and rhetoric, the authors' next two observations emerge from two-year colleges. First, they track what Soliday calls the politics of remediation, noting attempts to curb open admissions in the late 1990s such as Mayor Giuliani's elimination of remedial courses in New York City. This anecdote is emblematic of the reaction against open admissions, and by proxy democratically available education in the United States. Lewiecki-Wilson and Sommers take these features—the tension between theory and practice, the tendency



to reproduce graduate students, and the persistent neoliberal attacks on democratic education—to call for a refiguring of how compositionists view their discipline. They argue “that rather than regarding [open-admissions education] as at the ‘margin’ of our profession” we should “consider the teaching of writing in open admissions sites as central to the historical formation and continuing practice of composition studies” (Lewiecki-Wilson and Sommers 60). The authors call this an inversion of perception meant to create a “crisis of representation.”

Andelora says in “The Teacher/Scholar: Reconstructing” that “two-year college faculty have long felt marginalized by our university colleagues, and evidence suggests that this perception isn’t entirely unwarranted. This is in large part because of the institutional culture of two-year colleges, which historically have cast faculty as teachers, not researchers or scholars” (307). Andelora makes the argument that two-year college teachers’ professional identity has been “constructed [...] in defiance of our institutional culture” (308). His claim here fits in with my argument that the reform of graduate preparation to better prepare two-year college faculty is vital.

In “Unmeasured Engagement” Toth further supports the argument that the ‘perception [of marginalization] isn’t entirely unwarranted’ when she explores engagement at the community college level. She writes about a subset of highly engaged community college professionals and she found a large number whose engagement is either not measured or who do not choose to be engaged at all (Toth). I found this to be true in the interviews with faculty that I conducted, too. There was one faculty member who had subscriptions to *College English* and *TETYC*, but who had only been to one professional conference in his 30+ year career (Dimmsdale). And that was only because

the regional TYCA was held in his city that year. Another faculty member reported that she hated to go to conferences largely because she felt there was a lot of posturing and ego and not a great deal of useful knowledge (Vye). However, in relating her own process of professionalization to me, she described spending a year at a time reading the literature of a topic and changing her practice based upon what she found there. In the last few years, she had professionalized herself in developmental education, online learning, and assessment. Lewiecki-Wilson and Sommers report that many narratives about teaching at open access institution are constructed in a way to give the impression that vital intellectual work doesn't happen there (Lewiecki-Wilson and Sommers 439).

Other voices in this conversation, including Andelora, Toth, Sullivan, Griffiths, Lovas, Hassel and Giordano and others, frame the complex professional identity of teacher-scholars at community colleges. Toth, Griffiths, and Thirolf examine how “two-year college faculty experience unique challenges when enacting their professional identities in both disciplinary and institutional contexts” (Toth, Griffiths, and Thirolf 91). Sullivan reframes that identity as teacher-scholar-activist suggesting that community college instructors “deliberately frame our professional identity, in part, as activists—accepting and embracing the revolutionary and inescapably political nature of our work (Sullivan "Teacher-Scholar-Activist 327-329). My interview subjects desire to serve their students well, in spite of poor preparation and support, would seem to offer evidence for the need for this engagement.

Andelora points out that not only is there a call for community college instructors to engage in research, but there is also a concomitant call for “university comp/rhet faculty to study” or partner with two-year college faculty (Jeff Andelora)). Here, the

metaphor of the Rubik's cube is apt. One facet of the puzzle cannot change without the other also turning and emerging. Later, Andelora claims the community college is an important "site where the issues, complexities, and politics facing the teaching of composition are so well represented [...]" (318). This assertion, too, fits with the interviews I conducted where the subjects discussed the working conditions, the issues of assessment, the training, and support which permeate the literature on composition.

The sheer amount of teaching, along with the diversity of students, makes it incumbent for researchers and the two- and four- year level to give more attention to the community college. Lovas agrees with this sentiment in an ADE Bulletin, writing "to capture and transmit the body of knowledge developed in community college teaching will require new kinds of cross-institutional efforts, combining the university resources for research with the rich diversity of language learning problems and opportunities in the community colleges" (Lovas, "Playrooms" 45). Work like this is already being done (Jensen and Ely; Murphy; Murphy, Aiossa, and Winter), but needs to be expanded and systematized into graduate English studies across the discipline.

Documents like the MLA report on doctoral reform call for greater attention to community colleges and preparing graduate students to teach in two-year institutions, but Andelora and Lovas go further, calling for graduate faculty to partner with community college faculty, to put them on committees and for two-year faculty to help plan graduate curricula (319). Obviously, this relationship refiguration would mean a reassessment in the perceived power and hierarchies in these institutions, but I believe the would lead to better outcomes for graduate students and the students who will be taught by them in the future at the two-year college. I take up this call in my final chapter.

Finally, Andelora and others claim that it isn't rare for long-term community college faculty to become "estrang[ed] from their discipline" (Jeff Andelora). This fact seemed to be borne out in the interviews. Some of the faculty felt slighted by their university peers, while others were suspicious about the level of knowledge that faculty without their teaching load and institutional conditions could have that would be beneficial to them. While Toth's research in "Unmeasured Engagement: Two-Year College English Faculty and Disciplinary Professional Organizations" found many instructors who chose not to engage in professional organizations like TYCA or NCTE, she concluded that there were many "rich and largely undocumented forms of engagement" among community college faculty.

In sum, the faculty I interviewed, when looking back with their years of experience across the country, felt that they needed specific preparation in their graduate programs that they didn't receive in their coursework. They have made do by drawing on a variety of professional experiences outside of the academy, some contact with professional organizations such as TYCA, and by speaking with their colleagues. It is an admirable hodgepodge in that these are teachers who are deeply engaged in the learning of their students, many of whom I've worked with and known as successful teachers.

To think that only two of the fifteen instructors planned on this career is astonishing when one considers that there are more than a million instructors at post-secondary institutions in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics). Unfortunately, this fact is probably accounted for largely through adjunctification. Casualization of the teaching workforce, coupled with the invisibility of the discipline, which fosters a double bind creating teachers who are more likely to be exploited. The instructors I spoke with

talked about original career ambitions or the lack thereof in fascinating ways. Always funny, Emily Whitman talked about her secret ambition to be “a female Indiana Jones” because he “was a teacher at a university who wrote things about books, wrote books, and had adoring students” (Whitman). Hermione Gryffindor echoed this telling me that her “first career choice was to write a novel and to go on Oprah—I was young” She went on to report that as she didn’t “think I really wanted to work with community colleges until [she] read Patricia Bizell’s academic critical thinking—*Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*” (Gryffindor). This book made her want to work with the students who are most disenfranchised from higher education. Monroe Starr reported wanting to teach but that community colleges weren’t “on the radar” (Starr). She went on to tell me that “teaching in the community college is like this clandestine thing—always phrased as ‘if you ever have to teach...’”(Starr).

### *Insight One: Specific Coursework*

I agree with Starr who in her third year of teaching at a community college has come to “think the only real way to fill the gap is with specific coursework”. They wanted specific coursework during their programs to prepare them for the work of the two-year college and they felt that it would best come from graduate programs because the professional development they receive is not something they value or feel is effective. Starr discussed this layered problem in her interview, asserting that she felt “like the teaching of writing is less bang for their buck as is evidenced by the lack of a rhet comp certificate/track at my alma mater. They assume that professional dev is the same as coursework and it isn’t” (Starr). This finding fits with the both what others in my interviews say and and Toth’s article on professionalization. Both claim that many

faculty at two-year colleges have what one interviewee called “fossilized pedagogy,” meaning that their pedagogy has stopped growing or changing at some time in the past. This closely matched what some of my interviewees indicated as well.

College-wide professional development is often resisted because it is presented from a top-down perspective rather than generated by the faculty, their interests, and their experience. Significantly, the interviewees named the power of writing center work in preparing graduate students for work in the two-year college. Five of the interviewees found working in the writing center to be key for their ability to work with students. For example, Starr told me that the writing center was great professional preparation at both the undergraduate and the graduate level. She felt the experience made her a better writing teacher because it allowed her to learn the role of consultant instead of teacher, thus allowing for different and often better advice (Starr).

Clearly there is a significant disconnect between what administrators offer as professional development and what instructors want from professional development. Most of the interviewees from different institutions didn’t find the professional development offered at the college-level to be effective. In fact, several were hostile to it and felt that it only touched on the “buzz word” or problem of the moment. Professional development at colleges, the interviewees reported, often devolved into two reductive practices. The first might be called classroom management. Interviewees reported going to teaching workshops, only to be disappointed that the content centered on controlling behavior. The other type of professional development falls into the camp of reform. Workshops on the issue of the day provided by an administrative perspective failed to address issues of disciplinary, or other valuable teaching strategies such as best

practices in andragogy, differentiation for disabilities or best practices for online teaching.

### *Insight Two: Outside Experience as Preparation*

The most unanticipated insight from the interviews with the instructors was that they felt better prepared to teach in the two-year college because of professional experiences and non-traditional academic experiences than they did because of the graduate preparation they received. Emily Whitman felt her time working as an editor of literature guides and her time as a retail employee for a national bookstore chain was more valuable in getting her ready to teach than her graduate work at a Big 10 university. Flagg, Cho, and Dimmsdale all felt that their teaching experiences with ESL outside of the academy in international programs or refugee programs was more valuable than their graduate preparation. Argo spent several years working in a communications position in a corporate environment and felt this was the defining preparation for her work in the two-year college.

Several of the instructors cited customer service experiences, especially bartending and waiting tables as some of the best preparation they had for entering the classroom. Frankly, I was unprepared for this response even though it resonated with me a great deal. Perhaps the most interesting response about professional work as preparation came from Hermione Gryffindor. She was a social worker for eight years before returning to graduate school to earn a doctorate. She worked in group home with autistic people so she worked with them on “language development and life skills.” She also worked in a temporary foster care system as part of her job as a social worker. However, Gryffindor came back to the notion of the service industry noting she have

been a bartender which she said was “the same job as teaching” in that it too required “identity and emotional management” (Gryffindor).

Simply put, I didn’t know what to make of this insight and I still don’t. However, it appeared so frequently that I could not ignore it. This finding is one that needs further research, but I believe it points to the fact that on some level, the relational and management skills needed for long-term success in the classroom seem to be built from a set of practices these teachers learned outside of the classroom and then applied as a means of being resilient. This fact might point to a need for reformation of the graduate practicum, or simply that people draw on all their life experience to inform the work they are presently engaged in doing.

### *Insight Three: Articulating Needs*

The third insight I take from the data was that the faculty could clearly articulate what would have made their preparation better. In the interviews the two-year college faculty asked for specific coursework to be included in their graduate programs more than 20 times. They wanted coursework on reading and literacy, coursework on basic writing, more composition and writing studies courses, courses on special education and learner differentiation. Of interest were comments like Hermione’s where she articulated a deep lack of understanding of the mission, purpose and function of the community college:

I didn’t understand how the college was organized. To be fair I don’t think people understand how their universities are organized. The structure you have to understand at a university is departmental. It is inter-departmental at CCs. I don’t think I understand the funding model of community colleges. In some ways, it is informed by K-12. There is a market drive at community colleges that perpetually disrupts the knowledge conversation and



no one told me that. I didn't know the history of the community college—I had no understanding of the organizational history—the conflict between workforce development and academic transfer. When I started, I brought a four-year assumption. Binary—two teams at the college. Neither side understood the other side. We didn't understand the history and where the tensions come from. History of college formation.” (Gryffindor)

This well thought out assertion of the need to understand the institutional context is powerful and demonstrates the absolute need, I think, to go beyond the current preparation paradigm present in graduate preparation.

### *Conclusion*

In 1999 Lewiecki-Wilson and Sommers pondered whether the “broad-based social commitment to educating open-admissions students” was ending” (Lewiecki-Wilson and Sommers 77). This call is echoed over the intervening years, notably in Keith Kroll’s 2012 screed “The End of the Community College English Profession” where Kroll, perhaps with a hyperbolic flourish, paints a portrait of neoliberal dystopia in English studies in two-year colleges. But the struggle is significant, and as Toth, Griffiths, and Thirolf found, professional footing is difficult to establish. The faculty I interviewed seemed to be committed, engaged professionals at different stages of their careers. They encompassed different statuses as well. Nonetheless, commonalities emerged from the interviews which coincided with recent literature on professionalization and which evoked the three broad findings I identified.

I argue that there is clearly evidence that supports a clear need for graduate reform in both professionalization and coursework. Further, the attitudes and elitism present in two-year college instructors’ interactions with four-year faculty is sometimes troubling

and unhelpful. This footing is made incredibly more complex by the marginalized position that both graduate faculty and neoliberal policies place two-year faculty in today. In the next chapter, I forward the notion of Equity-Centered partnerships as a means of providing the coursework and professionalization needed as well as providing a space to address an equitable place at the table for two-year college faculty.

## **Chapter 4 Pedagogy Centered Partnerships: Toward Localized Visibility and Equity**

“Established power seldom is moved by what is rational, good, or ideal for the majority”—Lee Artz

### *Overview*

In this chapter, I develop the concept of Equity-Centered partnerships as a means of creating an equitable and reciprocal cycle of knowledge and expertise sharing between two- and four-year colleges. I examine two case studies of programs engaged in this type of partnership--one which brings graduate students to community colleges for teaching practicums, and one that brings community college faculty to the graduate school classroom as an expert. I assert this kind of partnership as pragmatic intervention in the cycle of invisibility and under preparation of community college faculty.

### *Introduction*

Chris Gallagher in *Radical Departures* arrives at some important conclusions in his work examining P-12 partnerships with universities. He believes that university professors have “much to learn from our colleagues in the public schools—about teaching, about learning, about writing and (maybe especially, at this political moment) about developing institutional literacy to combat reductive understandings of our work” (178). He goes on to note how the story of composition is usually the story of university composition, citing Irvin Peckham’s work on this history of composition as being a history of the “upper classes” (Peckham qtd in Gallagher 179). Gallagher sees this “class-

based academic economy” as part of a long history of Composition and Rhetoric’s “vexed place/space within English studies and the academy in general” (179). What’s more, Gallagher sees as his “most important conclusion” that “even where there is a strong English education presence, teacher preparation is rarely a significant or visible part of English curricula” (181).

It is no stretch, I think, to extrapolate these very same notions about the fraught relationship between P-12 instructors and university professionals to the relationship between community college instructors and university graduate programs. As covered in my chapter on the history of graduate preparation, much of the last forty years has been spent by community college English instructors articulating the distinct profession of teaching English in the two-year college. The Two-year College English Association has fleshed out the profession and its needs through three documents detailing preparation over that time and numerous scholars have written on the subject. What’s more, scholars have pointed out the inequity and invisibility faced by two-year college English studies professionals—that half of the work is performed at the community college, but that extraordinarily little by comparison is written about it (Lovas, “All Good Writing Develops at the Edge of Risk”; Hassel and Giordano; Grubb and Worthen). And practitioner-scholars like Hassel and Giordano have called for a re-centering of Writing Studies to reflect the teaching majority—that is, to reflect the actual material circumstances of the profession which have been ignored by the “upper classes” of university professors (Hassel and Giordano)

Obviously, this work will not be done out of altruism. Instead, I suggest that what we want to help achieve is Harbour’s normative democratic vision of the community

college and that this can be done through what I am calling Equity-Centered partnerships. Because they teach some of the same courses and are trained in the same departments, the connection between the two-year college professional and the university professional should be strong and clear. As we know from earlier chapters, this isn't the case. In Gallagher's work, he sees the "omissions (inadvertent or not) as symptomatic of the invisibility of public school teachers" to the field of composition (178). As I've noted, this invisibility or failure to acknowledge the community college teacher is well covered by research in the field (Lovas, "All Good Writing Develops at the Edge of Risk"; Grubb and Worthen). However, as Gallagher argues, the political moment makes this even more pressing. And that was a dozen years ago. If anything, austerity and neoliberal logics instantiated through the completion agenda are even more omnipresent in community colleges. Reductive understandings of education, which have led to an attack on developmental education and the broader educational mission of the community college, have national momentum. Yet recent important books in the field, for example *Composition and Austerity* or *Very Like a Whale*, make no mention of community colleges. This fact is important because issues of austerity and assessment are paramount at community colleges. Leaving them out silences half of English faculty—tellingly the half who serve the most vulnerable students. Labor issues and adjunctification are even more pressing problems in the community college. Yet the Indianapolis Resolution and the CCC article discussing it make no mention of community colleges (Cox). For the most part, community college professionals remain invisible in vital conversations at this moment. To be fair, *Contingency, Exploitation, and Solidarity: Labor and Action in English Composition*, edited by Khan et. al., contains two chapters authored by

community college faculty. Further, while I don't see Equity-Centered Partnerships as a panacea for all these ills, the sustained, local, program to program collaboration of community colleges and English graduate programs will be a significant means to begin to address the necessary reconceptualization of a hierarchy which serves neither community college professionals or graduate programs. More importantly, the maintenance of the status quo of hierarchy does not serve the fostering of the normative democratic vision of education which is under sustained pressure at all levels.

### *Toward a New Theory of Partnership*

I am using the data from chapters two and three of this dissertation as a call for a sustained, coordinated set of partnerships between two-year college professionals and graduate programs. I believe the outcome of these partnerships is beneficial on several levels—it refigures the inequity of status between the two institutional types, it addresses many of the issues in the graduate preparation pipeline, and allows for solidarity. These three values then set the stage, I believe, for a the more effective serving of students through reaffirmation and support of a progressive democratic vision for education.

Further, the idea of equity-centered partnerships aligns well with the 2016 TYCA Guidelines which call for inter-institutional partnerships. Twice in these Guidelines, which represent two-year college English faculty nationally, the authors call for partnerships. First, the Guidelines' authors aim to bring graduate students to the two-year college. They recommend that university educators “Partner with area two-year colleges to create teaching and writing center practica that will give graduate students hands-on experience in two-year college settings” (TYCA "Guidelines" 2016 2). This kind of work is exemplified by the externship program I delineate below.

Second, the TYCA Guidelines aim at graduate programs, writing that “graduate programs whose students regularly seek employment in two-year colleges” should establish mentorship networks, collaborative partnerships, and the integration of readings across institution types (7). They go further asking for the ability to contribute to graduate work relevant to their institution type, writing that universities might “invite interested doctorate-holding two-year college faculty to teach select graduate courses and/or serve on those students’ thesis and dissertation committees” (7). While I do not have an example of a program where two-year college faculty are invited to sit on a thesis or dissertation committee, the example I provide below of a two-year college faculty member teaching a graduate course aimed at giving graduate students foundational knowledge of teaching in the two-year college is certainly a move in the direction of reciprocal partnership. While I have made the case for the need for preparation and partnerships throughout this dissertation, it is a call that TYCA makes nationally, too.

### *Two examples of Equity-Centered Partnerships*

Below are two examples of the kind of projects where Equity-Centered-Partnerships are occurring. I offer each of these as a model that can be replicated and scaled across institutions. In the first example, we bring graduate students to the community college to make the college, its mission, and its particular instructional practices visible. In the second, we bring the expert practitioner to graduate departments to make the distinct profession of the community college visible to both faculty and graduate students. These kinds of partnerships require an ability to foster inter-institutional partnerships in a manner that challenges the bureaucratic systems of colleges and universities. Both programs represent extended pilots in my estimation. They need to

be formalized, supported, and will necessarily need to be adapted to local contexts. They require a refiguring of how work is counted and they require faculty to articulate to and persuade administrators of the value of this kind of work. It is naïve to say that any of that will be easy. However, these kinds of partnerships represent the best, most logical, and most feasible set of actions available at this moment.

*A Teaching Externship: Bringing the Graduate Student to the Two-Year College*

The first example of an Equity-Centered-Partnership is a Teaching Externship Susan Ely and I created at Metropolitan Community College in collaboration with the University of Nebraska at Omaha. The project is not unique in that other internships exist and have existed (see chapter three of the dissertation). However, this model, while imperfect, is emblematic of the potential of these kind of partnerships.

The MCC/UNO partnership, now in its fifth year, takes graduate students in English from UNO and partners them with a faculty member at MCC. The student and instructor co-teach a basic writing class and work through a series of readings together. Other activities include co-assessment and planning. The graduate student takes an independent study with a faculty member at UNO and creates a portfolio assignment, which includes a substantive reflection, the co-created instructional artifacts from the class, and a statement of teaching philosophy. Susan Ely and I offered our “model as one that demonstrates a way to build a program that meets the need of community colleges in hiring qualified instructors, that prepares graduate students for careers beyond graduate school, and that helps universities make important reforms in graduate programs to move beyond merely replicating scholars for research institutions” (248).



Susan Ely and I designed the program around basic writing because there was an exigent need for qualified instructors who simply did not exist at Metropolitan Community College (MCC). At MCC, like in most community colleges, it is easy to find many instructors experienced with first-year writing, even though those instructors, as demonstrated in my case studies and the literature, almost always lack knowledge of the institutional, instructional, and student contexts of the community college. Further, Ely and I knew, that two-year college faculty are expected to teach other developmental courses such as reading courses and learning skills courses without adequate graduate preparation or professionalization. As we designed the externship program, we found our problem to be a common one. For example, Holly Hassel and Joanne Baird Giordano tell readers in “Occupy Writing Studies” of the difficulties faced by new instructors at the community college. They note the “adjustment to teach this student population” as well as the areas in which the instructors were trained presented significant challenges (134). Hassel and Baird Giordano argue that more scholarship is needed from “open-enrollment institutions” to provide the knowledge base these teachers need (134).

When Susan Ely and I began, we saw the externship as merely meeting our local need, but the model also enters, and draws attention to a national need and is an example of an Equity-Centered partnership. Further, Ely and I designed this program to be activist in nature. Here we drew on Patrick Sullivan for inspiration. He eloquently argues that teachers in the two-year college engage in the noble work of democratizing American higher education (Sullivan "Teacher-Scholar-Activist" 327). Ely and I concluded “that training teachers for the important context of open admissions institutions makes that work possible” (Jensen and Ely 249). In the context of this dissertation then, the

externship program is an example of local actions which work against the market-driven hiring practices of the community college and is one that provides a model for Equity-Centered-partnerships between two- and four-year institutions. Because of the way that the externship allows graduate students the opportunity to work directly with two-year college teachers and for two- and four-year college teachers to partner, this externship creates a refiguring of professional equity and allows two-year instructors a seat at the table of graduate education.

*Coursework Taught in Collaboration by Community College Professionals: Bringing the Expert to the Graduate Program*

Another important facet of this kind of Equity-Centered Partnership will be bringing community college professionals directly to graduate programs to teach the courses that graduate students and community college professionals need. Given the state of the job market, it is unlikely a reasonable request that graduate programs in English studies hire specialists in community college research. While this might be possible for some programs, there are many qualified community college instructors who can offer this service. Ironically, this usage might be a more appropriate and ethical use of adjuncts.

While Toth and I found several examples of these kinds of courses, our article highlights the one at Marymount University. Marymount's Literature and Languages Department offers a specialized certificate in two-year college English instruction. The program has both current graduate students and professionals seeking an additional post-

graduate credential as its audience. Many of the students in the program are already instructors at Northern Virginia Community College (NOVA). Bess Fox, a Marymount English professor, spearheaded the certificate's development. In designing the program, when Fox sought the input of area community colleges, ultimately partnering with TYCA leader Cheri Lemieux-Spiegel of Northern Virginia Community College (NOVA) to develop relevant coursework and learning experiences.

The curriculum for Marymount's Teaching English in the Community College Graduate Certificate includes applied grammar, composition theory, and teaching with technology. As an adjunct, Lemieux-Spiegel offers a special topics course on The History and Evolution of Community College Writing Instruction, one of the few graduate courses Jensen and Toth identified that explicitly examines the institutional and instructional contexts of two-year colleges. For their practicum, Marymount students have the option of teaching at NOVA under a faculty member's mentorship (Lemieux-Spiegel).

Lemieux-Spiegel designed the course to not only introduce graduate students to the history and mission of the community college, but also to professionalize students into the distinct profession of two-year college teaching. She built the class upon the foundation of a traditional Composition Theory course, which is probably a staple of most graduate programs at this point. Having this curricular scaffolding, Lemieux-Spiegel argues, is a way to examine what she sees as the parallel histories of the development of composition as a discipline and the development of two-year college English teaching (Lemieux-Spiegel, personal communication and unpublished mss). Importantly, Lemieux-Spiegel allowed the students to look at what she sees as two

“foundational stories” (personal communication). The readings for the class (see appendix B) parallel many of the readings chosen for Sullivan and Toth’s *Teaching Composition at the Two-Year College*, the first collection to take up scholarship directly aimed at the discipline of two-year college writing studies. The course includes assignments which analyze the journal, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, comparing the mission statements of community colleges and four-year universities. The students looked at 10-year chunks of the journal, identified key words, and created a narrative showing how concerns and focus of two-year college instructors changed over time. Assignments like these allowed the students to create “rough and dirty grounded theory” which began to contextualize the instructional and institutional issues which are particular to the two-year college context (Lemieux-Spiegel, personal communication).

This certificate program at Marymount is an instructive example of an English graduate program drawing on veteran two-year college English faculty’s knowledge, experience, and professional networks to offer meaningful professionalization for students aspiring to teach in these settings. It is an example of Equity-Centered partnerships as I theorize them at the beginning of this chapter.

### *Sustainability*

An issue in both partnerships is sustainability. In the case of the UNO program, Dr. Tammie Kennedy is making the program work at the university level through the creation of independent studies. Her work for creating a new course, partnering with another institution, mentoring two students, and evaluating their work is not really accounted for in this model. In my original interview with her, she indicated that this work wasn’t easy to categorize for her promotion and tenure review. Our difficulty arose

from the fact that there was no system in place to facilitate the partnership. What we settled on for our first year was a scheme wherein the interested graduate students would take an internship course at the university where we served as the site of the internship. This proved to be a problematic model because the graduate students were not really interns, but were student-teachers. Further, the model was problematic because the graduate students did not produce a paper or academic project. In the subsequent years, Dr. Kennedy at the university took the students on in an independent study. In this version, the graduate students created a portfolio of the teaching materials they had co-created and used while in the externship, as well as a teaching philosophy aimed at a community college audience and a new CV. We found this model more useful for students. Dr. Kennedy works with us at the end of the semester to determine a grade for their externship.

Dr. Kennedy receives no financial remuneration for this work. She found that the work is difficult to categorize in terms of quantifying it as part of her workload and “affects compensation and/or how the work counts in terms of teaching/scholarship/service,” which is a significant and enduring issue (interview). Others have suggested that we have a memorandum of understanding with the university, but such an agreement would not provide a solution for how this work should be counted. The truth is that community college teaching, because of its low value in the university, is a hard sell. We also found little support from our college. Even though the authors were essentially mentoring, co-teaching, and facilitating discussion on the theory and practice of teaching writing, no release time was made available for this work. Susan Ely and I negotiated a \$500 stipend as compensation. Importantly, “We make this point not to elicit

sympathy, but to demonstrate the difficult realities of inter-institutional work and of making institutional and systemic change. Ironically, while we were attempting to facilitate this experience for the graduate students, we were also learning how difficult it was to actually create such a partnership and have the work valued” (Jensen and Ely 252)

Lemieux-Spiegel has only taught her course one time. She is scheduled to teach it again in the summer of 2017. However, the enrollment challenges which have beset many graduate programs, may put this in doubt. And there is a question of priority as well. Will a department allow an adjunct to teach the course if it directly competes with a course another faculty member wants to teach? It becomes a question of values and hierarchy. What is more important: training graduate students for a professional and institutional context that many of them will surely need, or offering a graduate course in a more specialized topic from a tenured faculty member? These are not easy conversations to have. But they are necessary if Equity-Centered-partnerships are to move forward. And frankly they are necessary if graduate programs wish to embrace the reform vision in the 2014 MLA Report on Doctoral Reform or the 2016 TYCA Guidelines on Graduate Preparation.

### *A Seat at the Table*

One of the key features of Gallagher’s work in his description of Pedagogy-Centered-Outreach was to create a dialogic rather than hierarchical relationship between teachers in P-12 environments and university scholars (139). He found that Composition and Rhetoric had retreated from “alliance building with schoolteachers” for a variety of reasons, but that “cross-institutional partnerships” like the Nebraska Writing Project continued” (184). He argued that the “vitality of our profession” might “hinge” on the

ability of P-12/university partnerships. I believe this to be the case and assert that it is even more true for community college and university programs, especially in writing studies.

The kind of partnerships I've mentioned above "reimagine and renegotiate" the relationship between community colleges and universities. Rather than seeing community colleges as a second-tier institution and job, which the research undeniably demonstrates is a prevailing attitude, these partnerships will allow for the sharing and production of highly specific knowledge which will benefit the university community, the community college, and graduate students. The real benefit, and I would argue the one that is most closely tied with the democratic normative vision of the community college, will come from the richer instruction students at these institutions receive from instructors who have been better prepared. These partnerships create an equitable reciprocal relationship as shown in the figure below. The very image here is non-hierarchical, and shows how knowledge and expertise can flow back and forth between the two institutions types.



#### Figure 4. Reciprocal Equity-Centered Partnerships

##### *Future Imagining*

The truth is that there are more than thirty-three thousand community college instructors. We know that eighty percent of them are adjuncts or part-time. We know that these instructors teach the most vulnerable of our students by most reckonings. As I have argued throughout this dissertation, the work of the community college should be the work of democracy and access. This theme and purpose is first argued in the Truman Commission and has been argued for throughout the history of the community college. It's a good mission. But we know that the mission of the community college and its rhetorical orientation isn't currently pointed only at democratic uplift—it is also enthralled to neoliberal logics.

The question, finally, is what does the discipline of Composition and Rhetoric writ large and the profession of teaching English in the Community College have to do with that vision? I think a great deal. It is a moral and ethical obligation to help our students be ready to participate in a democratic society. And while I think this is moral work in that it is good for graduate students, addresses inequities, and better prepares teachers to teach and serve the most vulnerable students, I also think this work is good for English studies, which, by all accounts, is in trouble. Gallagher draws again on Peckham, noting that “our work with schools has been written out of our official story, perhaps because its yield is so low in the academy” (184). I believe that the existential yield is what we must concentrate on here—without these kinds of partnerships, the very future of English Studies is in doubt.



Holladay-Hicks and Reynolds in their *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College* argue that the “challenge” for two-year college instructors is to see themselves as “knowledge makers” (141). I wholeheartedly agree that this is the case. There is a need for community college teachers to see their pedagogy and practice, which is locally situated and constructed, as valuable. However, I also know that this work has already been going on for decades in the community college. What is needed is to plant the seed and help shape future practitioners’ praxis so that they can join the community of two-year college work more quickly and effectively. Barry Alford and Keith Kroll in their *The Politics of Writing in the 2-Year College* call for their collection to be a “serious reconsideration of composition in the two-year college and the creation of a new type of intellectual work in and about two-year colleges” (v). I, too, take up the call for a reconsideration of composition in the two-year college, especially in the preparation of its future teachers. Given the previous chapters where we’ve examined the political and institutional structure of the community college, the role of composition studies in the two-year college, and the extant experiences of a group of two-year college English instructors, Equity-Centered partnerships as a reciprocal model is such a reconsideration. It is a good pragmatic solution, one that can be implemented locally in several imaginative ways and one that can have immediate benefits for both institution types. Further, it addresses long standing inequities in the discipline of English studies and will allow composition and rhetoric scholars to envision a discipline across institution types with the goal of serving students and a democratic vision of education.



## Works Cited

- Adams, Peter et al. "The Accelerated Learning Program: Throwing Open the Gates." *Journal of Basic Writing* (2009): 50–69. Print.
- American Association of Community Colleges. *2016 Fact Sheet*. n.p., 2016. Print.
- . *Reclaiming the American Dream: Community Colleges and the Nation's Future: A Report from the 21st-Century Commission on the Future of Community Colleges*. American Association of Community Colleges, 2012. Print.
- Andelora, Jeff. "The Teacher/Scholar: Reconstructing Our Professional Identity in Two-Year Colleges." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 32.3 (2005): 307. Print.
- Andelora, Jeffrey. "Forging a National Identity: TYCA and the Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 35.4 (2008): 350. Print.
- . "The Professionalization of Two-Year College English Faculty: 1950-1990." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 35.1 (2007): 6. Print.
- Argo, Angela. Interview. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Armino, Jan L. DA Programs in Community College Education. 11 Dec. 2015. E-mail.
- Ayers, David Franklin. "Neoliberal Ideology in Community College Mission Statements: A Critical Discourse Analysis." *The review of higher education* 28.4 (2005): 527–549. Print.
- Barton, Thomas L, and Anna M Beachner. "Teaching English in the Two-Year College." (1970): n. pag. Print.

- Bays, Gary. Central Michigan MA Program. 5 Oct. 2015. E-mail.
- Beach, Josh M. *Gateway to Opportunity?: A History of the Community College in the United States*. Stylus Publishing, LLC., 2012. Print.
- Bently, Dirk. Interview.
- Berlin, James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. SIU Press, 1987. Print.
- Brint, Steven, and Jerome Karabel. *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985*. Oxford University Press, 1989. Print.
- Bucher, Rue, and Joan G Stelling. *Becoming Professional*. Sage, 1977. Print.
- Buck, Jo Ann et al. "Guidelines for the Academic Preparation of English Faculty at Two-Year Colleges." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 34.1 (2006): 7. Print.
- Buck, Jo Ann, and Frank MacGregor. "Preparing Future Faculty: A Faculty-in-Training Pilot Program." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 28.3 (2001): 241. Print.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2014: English Language and Literature Teachers, Postsecondary*. n.p., 2014. Print.
- Calhoon-Dillahunt, Carolyn et al. "TYCA Guidelines for Preparing Teachers of English in the Two-Year College." *NCTE* (2016): n.p. Print.
- City College of New York English Department. "Master of Arts in Language and Literacy." n.p., 4 Feb. 2016. Web.
- Clandinin, D Jean, and F Michael Connelly. "Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research." (2000): n.p. Print.

- Clark, Burton R. "The 'cooling-Out' function in Higher Education." *American journal of Sociology* (1960): 569–576. Print.
- Cohen, Arthur M, Florence B Brawer, and Kisker. *The American Community College*. 6th ed. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, 2014. Print.
- Covert, Bryce. "The Cost of Public Four-Year College Has Risen 27 Percent Over Five Years." Organization. n.p., 14 Aug. 2013. Web. 9 Apr. 2017.
- Cowan, Gregory. "1978 National Directory of Graduate Programs for Junior/Community College English Teachers." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* (1978): n. pag. Print.
- . "Guidelines for Junior College English Teacher Training Programs." *College Composition and Communication* 22.3 (1971): 303–313. Print.
- Cowan, Toni, Joyce Traver, and Thomas H Riddle. "A TA Perspective of a Community College Faculty-in-Training Pilot Program." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 28.3 (2001): 251. Print.
- Cox, Anicca et al. "The Indianapolis Resolution: Responding to Twenty-First-Century Exigencies/Political Economies of Composition Labor." *College Composition and Communication* 68.1 (2016): 38. Print.
- Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. Sage publications, 2012. Print.
- DeGenaro, William. "The Junior College Movement: Corporate Education for the Working Class." (2002): n. pag. Print.
- DeLillo, Donnie. Interview. 11 Jan. 2016.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. Courier Corporation, 2004. Print.

- Dimmsdale, Arthur. Interview. 26 Feb. 2016.
- Dougherty, Kevin James. *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College*. SUNY Press, 1994. Print.
- Duffy, John. "Virtuous Arguments." *Inside Higher Ed* 16 (2012): n.p. Print.
- Elder, Dana C et al. "Community Colleges Train the Professoriate of the Future." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 24.2 (1997): 118. Print.
- Faculty Survey (CCFSSE) Reports: CCFSSE 2015 Cohort Overview*. Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2015. Print.
- Finn, Patrick J. *Literacy with an Attitude: Educating Working-Class Children in Their Own Self-Interest*. Suny Press, 2010. Print.
- "Five Education Stories to Watch for in 2017." n.p., 3 Jan. 2017. Television.
- Flagg, Randall. Interview. 15 Jan. 2016.
- Frye, Northrop. "Anatomy of Criticism (Princeton, 1957)." *According to Frye, this frequently occurring dramatic device is a reminder of the demonic, dangerous elements that lurk beneath comedy's surface* (1979): 179. Print.
- Gallagher, Chris W. *Radical Departures: Composition and Progressive Pedagogy. Refiguring English Studies*. ERIC, 2002. Print.
- Gleason, Barbara. "Reasoning the Need: Graduate Education and Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* (2006): 49–75. Print.
- . "Remediation Phase-out at CUNY: The 'equity versus Excellence' controversy." *College Composition and Communication* 51.3 (2000): 488–491. Print.

- Griffiths, Brett Megan. “‘This Is My Profession:’ How Notions of Teaching Enable and Constrain Autonomy of Two-Year College Writing Instructors.” (2015): n.p. Print.
- Grubb, W Norton, and Helena Worthen. *Honored but Invisible: An inside Look at Teaching in Community Colleges*. Psychology Press, 1999. Print.
- Gryffindor, Hermione. Interview. 12 Jan. 2016.
- Haight, Robert. “The Business Metaphor and Two-Year College Writing Instruction.” *The Politics of Writing in the Two-Year College*. Ed. Barry Alford and Keith Kroll. *Cross Currents*. Portsmouth: Boynton (2001): 74–85. Print.
- Harbour, Clifford P. *John Dewey and the Future of Community College Education*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015. Print.
- Hassel, Holly. “Research Gaps in Teaching English in the Two-Year College.” *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 40.4 (2013): 343. Print.
- Hassel, Holly, and Joanne Baird Giordano. “Occupy Writing Studies: Rethinking College Composition for the Needs of the Teaching Majority.” *College Composition and Communication* 65.1 (2013): 117. Print.
- Hirschfeld Dave, Julie, and Tamar Lewin. “Obama Plan Would Help Many Go to Community College Free.” *The New York Times* 8 Jan. 2015. Web. 15 Jan. 2015.
- Hurlburt, Steven, and Michael McGarrah. *The Shifting Academic Workforce: Where Are the Contingent Faculty?: A Report for the American Research Institution*. N.p., 2016. Web.
- Jarvi, Jane L. *The Status and Perceptions of the Value and Viability of the Doctor of Arts Degree at the Beginning of the 21 St Century*. Idaho State University, 2008. Print.

- Jensen, Darin, and Susan Ely. "A Partnership Teaching Externship Program: A Model That Makes Do." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 44.3 (2017): 247. Print.
- Jensen, Darin, and Christina M Toth. "Two-Year Colleges and the Future of English Studies." Philadelphia: n.p., 2017. Print.
- . "Unknown Knowns: The Past, Present, and Future of Graduate Preparation for Two-Year College English Faculty." *College English* 79.6 n. pag. Print.
- Johnson, Kimberly. Community College Training. E-mail.
- Kezar, Adrianna, and Daniel Maxey. "The Changing Academic Workforce." *Trusteeship Magazine* 2013. Web. 8 May 2017.
- Knodt, E. "Graduate Programs for Two-Year-College Faculty: History and Future Directions." *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College* (2005): 125–136. Print.
- Kroll, Keith. "The End of the Community College English Profession." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 40.2 (2012): 118. Print.
- . *The Politics of Writing in the Two-Year College*. Boynton/Cook, 2001. Print.
- Lemieux-Spiegel, Cheri. Marymount Program. E-mail.
- Leonhardt, David. "Obama's Community College Plan: A Reading List." *The New York Times* 9 Jan. 2015. Web. 15 Jan. 2015.
- . "The Roots of Obama's Ambitious College Plan." *The New York Times* 8 Jan. 2015: n.p. Print.
- Levin, John S, Susan T Kater, and Richard L Wagoner. *Community College Faculty: At Work in the New Economy*. Springer, 2006. Print.



- Lewiecki-Wilson, Cynthia, and Jeff Sommers. "Professing at the Fault Lines: Composition at Open Admissions Institutions." *College Composition and Communication* 50.3 (1999): 438–462. Print.
- Lindert, Peter H, and Jeffrey G Williamson. "Unequal Gains: American Growth and Inequality since 1700." *Juncture* 22.4 (2016): 276–283. Print.
- Lovas, John C. "All Good Writing Develops at the Edge of Risk." *College Composition and Communication* (2002): 264–288. Print.
- . "Playrooms, Hodgepodges, Soulless Monsters: Why I Can't Imagine Having a Better Job." *ADE BULLETIN* (2001): 43–48. Print.
- Mangan, Katherine, and Beckie Supiano. "The Players Who Influenced Obama's Free-College Plan." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 11 Jan. 2015: n.p. Print.
- Mentz, Steve. Doctorate of Arts. 9 Jan. 2016. E-mail.
- Modern Language Association. "Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature." *New York: Modern Language Association* (2014): n.p. Print.
- Murphy, Sean P. "Improving Two-Year College Teacher Preparation: Graduate Student Internships." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 28.3 (2001): 259. Print.
- Murphy, Sean P, Elizabeth Aiossa, and Mary Mugica Winter. "Preparing Future Faculty: Ten Years Later." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 37.4 (2010): 350. Print.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. *Graduation Rate from First Institution Attended within 150 Percent of Normal Time for First-Time, Full-Time Degree/Certificate-Seeking Students at 2-Year Postsecondary Institutions, by*

- Race/Ethnicity, Sex, and Control of Institution: Selected Cohort Entry Years, 2000 through 2010*. n.p., 2014. Web. 3 May 2017.
- . *Race/Ethnicity of College Faculty*. n.p., 2013. Print.
- North, Stephen M Et al. *Refiguring the Ph. D. in English Studies: Writing, Doctoral Education, and the Fusion-Based Curriculum*. *Refiguring English Studies*. ERIC, 2000. Print.
- Ostman, Heather. *Writing Program Administration and the Community College*. Anderson, South Carolina: Parlor Press, 2013. Print.
- Palmer, James C. "Scholarship and the Professional Identity of Community College Faculty Members." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 2015.171 (2015): 37–48. Print.
- Pickett, Nell Ann. "The Two-Year College as Democracy in Action." *College Composition and Communication* 49.1 (1998): 90–98. Print.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession* (1991): 33–40. Print.
- Quimby, Ramona. Interview. 21 Jan. 2016.
- Reynolds, Mark. DA Program at Carnegie Mellon. 20 Sept. 2015. E-mail.
- Reynolds, Mark, and Sylvia A. Holladay. *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College*. Heinemann Educational Books, 2005. Print.
- Rich, Adrienne. "Teaching Language in Open Admissions." *On lies, secrets, and silence: Selected prose* 1978 (1966): 51–68. Print.
- Rose, Michael Anthony. *Back to School: Why Everyone Deserves a Second Chance at Education*. The New Press, 2012. Print.

- Rose, Mike. *Possible Lives: The Promise of Public Education in America*. Houghton Mifflin, 1995. Print.
- Salt, Verruca. Interview. 25 Jan. 2016.
- San Francisco State University Department of English Language and Literature. "Graduate Programs." n.p., n.d. Web.
- Schmidt, Peter. "AAUP Proposes Giving Contingent Faculty a Much Bigger Role in College Governance." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 28 June 2012. Web. 14 Jan. 2017.
- Shaughnessy, Mina P. "Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing." (1979): n.p. Print.
- Smith Layton, Marilyn. "Lives Worth Fighting For." *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2005. 27–37. Print.
- Soliday, Mary. *The Politics of Remediation: Institutional and Student Needs in Higher Education*. University of Pittsburgh Pre, 2002. Print.
- Starr, Monroe. Interview. 18 Jan. 2016.
- "State of the Union Address." n.p., 20 Jan. 2004. Television.
- Stenberg, Shari J. *Professing and Pedagogy Learning the Teaching of English*. ERIC, 2005. Print.
- . *Repurposing Composition: Feminist Interventions for a Neoliberal Age*. University Press of Colorado, 2015. Print.
- Stout, Barbara. "Evolution of a Writing Program." *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2005. 52–59. Print.
- Suchor, Kristen. Personal Communication. Aug. 2016. E-mail.

- Sullivan, Patrick. "The Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar-Activist." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 42.4 (2015): 327. Print.
- Sullivan, Patrick, and Christie Toth, eds. *Teaching Composition in the Two-Year College: Background Readings*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2017. Print.
- SUNY Binghamton. "Teaching College/University." n.p., 1 Mar. 2017. Web. 9 May 2017.
- Theado, Connie. Graduate Programs for Community Colleges. 5 Jan. 2016. E-mail.
- Tinberg, Howard. "Teaching English in Two-Year Colleges: A Review of Selected Studies." *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College* 137 (2005): n.p. Print.
- Tinberg, Howard B. *Border Talk: Writing and Knowing in the Two-Year College*. ERIC, 1997. Print.
- Toth, Christie. "Unmeasured Engagement: Two-Year College English Faculty and Disciplinary Professional Organizations." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 41.4 (2014): 335. Print.
- Toth, Christie, and Patrick Sullivan. "Toward Local Teacher-Scholar Communities of Practice: Findings from a National TYCA Survey." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 43.3 (2016): 247. Print.
- Toth, Christina M, Brett M Griffiths, and Kathryn Thirolf. "'Distinct and Significant': Professional Identities of Two-Year College English Faculty." *College Composition and Communication* 65.1 (2013): 90. Print.
- Townsend, Barbara K, and Susan B Twombly. *Community College Faculty: Overlooked and Undervalued*. Jossey-Bass Inc Pub, 2007. Print.

Trimbur, John et al. "Taking the Social Turn: Teaching Writing Post-Process." (1994): n.p. Print.

Underhill, Frodo. Interview. 19 Jan. 2016.

"United States Presidential Debate." n.p., 8 Oct. 2004. Television.

United States, President's Commission on Higher Education. *Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education*. U.S. Government Printing Office: n.p., 1947. Print.

U.S. Department of Education. "Community Colleges: America's Economic Engines." Government. *The Official Blog of the U.S. Department of Education*. n.p., n.d. Web. 1 Sept. 2015.

Van Dijk, Teun A. "Ideology and Discourse Analysis." *Journal of political ideologies* 11.2 (2006): 115–140. Print.

Vye, Eustacia. Interview. 13 Feb. 2016.

Welch, Nancy, and Tony Scott. *Composition in the Age of Austerity*. University Press of Colorado, 2016. Print.

White, Stephen R, and Mark K McBeth. "A History of the Doctor of Arts Tradition in American Higher Education." *Education* 123.4 (2003): 770. Print.

Whitman, Emily. Interview. 24 Jan. 2016.

Williamson, Richard. "The Lesson Plan." *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College*. Ed. Mark Reynolds. Boynton/Cook, 2005. 38–51. Print.

## Appendix A IRB Protocols for Externship Project

### Consent Letter for Extern Project



DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

#### *Participant Informed Consent Form*

**Title:** Basic Writing Apprenticeships: A Model for Teacher Training

**Purpose:**

This research project will aim to describe participants', facilitator's and the sponsor's experience with the Basic Writing Apprenticeship Training (BAT) Program.. You must be 19 years of age or older to participate. You are invited to participate in this study because you have been involved with the program as a participant, facilitator or sponsor.

**Procedures:**

You will be asked to answer questions in writing, in an in-person interview, and perhaps in a follow up interview about your experience with the BAT program. The procedures will last for approximately two hours, and will be conducted via email and at local coffee shop. I will audio record in person follow up questions if such in person follow up questions are necessary.

**Benefits:**

There are no direct benefits to you as a research participant. However, this study will hopefully describe an effective teacher training model, which will help future students who are preparing to be teachers, and provide students with better trained teachers, thus improving learning outcomes.

**Risks and/or Discomforts:**

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

**Confidentiality:**

Any information obtained during this study which could identify you will NOT be confidential because the sample size is small and common experience will make participants identifiable to each other when their experience is described in print. The data will be stored in a locked cabinet in the investigator's office and will only be seen by the investigator during the study and for 5 years after the study is complete. The information obtained in this study may be published in journals, presented at meetings, or used in a dissertation or a book.

Participants will have the option to appear in any published material under a pseudonym that the participant specifies.

**Compensation:**

You will receive no compensation for participating in this project.

**Opportunity to Ask Questions:**

You may ask any questions concerning this research and have those questions answered before agreeing to participate in or during the study. Or you may contact the investigator(s) at the phone numbers below. Please contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6965 to voice concerns about the research or if you have any questions about your rights as a research participant.

**Freedom to Withdraw:**

Participation in this study is voluntary. You can refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without harming your relationship with the researchers or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, or in any other way receive a penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

**Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:**

## **Interview Questions for Externship**

### **A. QUESTIONS FOR THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE EXTERNSHIP PROGRAM**

(2-4 of the participants will answer these questions)

1. Did the apprenticeship program help you become a more reflective practitioner in the classroom? Please explain.
2. Did the apprenticeship program help you become a teacher-scholar? Please explain.
3. Did the apprenticeship program help you to better understand diversity, including ethnic diversity, socio-economic diversity and, and diverse ability learners? Please explain.
4. Did the apprenticeship program help you build better pedagogy to serve students? Please explain.
5. Did the apprenticeship program help you to ground your teaching in theory and research? Please explain. I would also be interested to know here if you felt that there were gaps present after the apprenticeship or if the apprenticeship pointed you to any new areas of research inquiry?
6. Did the apprenticeship program help you to develop curriculum either on your own or collaboratively? How was/is the curriculum developed different than other curriculum you had previously developed?
7. Did the apprenticeship program help you to serve your college and community or perhaps help you see how you might serve your college and community differently? Please explain.
8. Did definitions of teaching change for you because of the apprenticeship program? If so, can you explain how?
9. Would other members of your graduate school cohort have been helped if they had taken this program? If yes, how would they have been helped?
10. Would you recommend that this kind of apprenticeship be a part of the mandatory course of study or a track in a graduate program? Will you please explain your answer?
11. After this experience, do you see the mission of higher education differently? Please explain.
12. What about the apprenticeship attracted you to it?
13. What were the best aspects of the apprenticeship?
14. Did you feel that the apprenticeship provided preparation in theory, practice, and research that you would not have otherwise gotten in your graduate program? Please explain.
15. If you are working in higher education now, did the apprenticeship give you knowledge and skills that made you better prepared for the position? Please explain.
16. What did you learn about higher education policy and the politics of education during the apprenticeship?

I will ask follow up questions for the sake of detail and clarification when needed. However, all questions will center around the participant's experience with the apprenticeship.

#### B. QUESTION FOR THE TEACHER-FACILITATORS OF THE EXTERNSHIP PROGRAM

1. What were your goals and outcomes for the apprenticeship? Why did you choose them?
2. After facilitating the apprenticeship, how has your own teaching changed, if at all?
3. Did you have an opportunity to engage in an apprenticeship like this when you were a student? If not, would you have if it had existed? Please explain.
4. Why did you found the apprenticeship?
5. What does the apprenticeship provide that a traditional graduate assistant teaching position cannot? Please explain.
6. What did you teach the students about the community college, institutional contexts and other items that might fit under the notion of higher education politics?
7. What components did you include in the apprenticeship? How did you prioritize them in your work with the apprentice?
8. What were your guiding principles for your work with the apprentice? Why did you choose those principles? For example, did you think it particularly important to demonstrate a student-centered classroom, or that explicit instruction was important?
9. How did engaging in and facilitating the apprenticeship aid in your professional development as a teacher? Please explain.
10. What were the challenges of the apprenticeship? Scheduling? Institutional support? Please explain.

I will ask follow up questions for the sake of detail and clarification when needed. However, all questions will center around the facilitator's experience with the apprenticeship.

#### C. QUESTIONS FOR THE FACULTY SPONSOR OF THE EXTERNSHIP PROGRAM

1. Why did you think this was an important program to bring to your institution?
2. Can you describe your experience with community colleges?
3. What do you think the typical faculty member's experience is with community colleges is in your department and institution?
4. Did the program aid in your students' professional development? Please explain.
5. Is there a need to address preparation for teaching in the two-year college or teaching basic writing in your department?
6. How has that need been traditionally met?
7. How would this need be ideally met?



8. If you had the opportunity would you have all graduate students engage in a teaching experience apprenticeship like this one? Please explain.
9. What were the challenges in sponsoring this apprenticeship experience? Were they academic? Institutional? Financial? Please explain.

I will ask follow up questions for the sake of detail and clarification when needed. However, all questions will center around the sponsor's experience with the apprenticeship.

## **Appendix B Externship Reading Lists**

Sample Graduate Student Reading Lists from the Externship Project

### **2013 Reading List for Teaching Developmental Writing Darin Jensen and Susan Ely, Facilitators**

#### **Texts:**

Bernstein, Susan Naomi. *Teaching Developmental Writing: Background Readings*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: Bedford St. Martin's, 2007. Print.

Rose, Mike. *Lives on the Boundary*. New York: Penguin, 1990. Print.

#### **Jan 29 Introduction**

Mike Rose. *Lives on the Boundary*.

#### **Feb 14 Who is the Basic Writer**

Jane Maher. "“You Probably Don't Even Know I Exist”: Notes from a Prison College Program”

Pages 56-71 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Ann E. Green. “My Uncle’s Guns.”

Pages 73-82 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Valerie Kinlock. From “Revisiting the Promise of Students’ Right to their Own Language: Pedagogical Strategies”

Pages 40-55 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

#### **Feb 25 Thinking about Assessment**

Dana Ferris. “One Size Does Not Fit All: Response and Revision Issues for Immigrant Students.”

Pages 83-100 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Patrick L. Bruch. “Interpreting and Implementing Universal Instructional Design in Basic Writing”

Pages 164-174 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

CCCC. CCCC Position Statement on Assessment.

Pages 391-400 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

### **Mar 15 Literacy**

Glynda Hull and Mike Rose. “‘This Wooden Shack Place’: The Logic of an Unconventional Reading.”

Pages 246-259 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Barbara Gleason. “Returning Adults to the Mainstream: Toward a Curriculum for Diverse Student Writers.”

Pages 214-238 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Adrienne Rich. “Teaching Language in Open Admissions.”

Pages 191-205 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

### **Apr 5 ESL and generation 1.5**

Ilona Leki. “Reciprocal Themes in ESL Reading and Writing.”

Pages 121-143 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Yu Ren Dong. “The Need to Understand ESL Students’ Native Language Writing Experiences.”

Pages 370-380 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Beth Hartman and Elaine Tarone. From “Preparation for College Writing.”

Pages 381-389 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

### **May 10 Program Structures**

William B. Lalicker. “A Basic Introduction to Basic Writing Program Structures: A Baseline and Five Alternatives.”

Pages 15-25 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

Karen Uehling. “Creating a Statement of Guidelines and Goals for Boise State University’s Basic Writing Course: Content and Development.”

Pages 27-38 in *Teaching Developmental Writing*

## 2016 Reading list for Basic Writing Apprenticeship

### January 15 1:30—3:30 PM—community colleges, the work, and the profession

<i>Author</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Format</i>
Mike Rose	Lives on the Boundary	Book
TYCA	Guidelines for preparing...	Web
Burton Clarke	Cooling out function...	PDF

### January 29 1:30-3:30 PM—developmental writing and remediation

Naomi Bernstein	Introduction	Purple book
Adrienne Rich	Teaching Language...	Purple Book
Mike Rose	Remediation...	Purple book

### February 12 1:30-3:30 PM—ESL writing and writers

Dana Ferris and Michael Hedgecock	Ch. 1 and 2	PDFs
Ann Johns	Socioliterate Approaches	PDF
CCCC	Statement of Second Language Writing and Writers	Web

### February 26 1:30-3:30—class and education

Patrick Finn	Chapters 1-12	Book
--------------	---------------	------

Spring classes begin on March 10<sup>th</sup> so you will have to arrange a time to develop a syllabus with your partner instructor.

#### *Books to be bought:*

Rose, Mike. *Lives on the Boundary*

Bernstein, Naomi. Ed. *Teaching Developmental Writing*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition (purple book)

Finn, Patrick. *Literacy with an Attitude*

# Appendix C IRB Interview Questions for Case Studies

## IRB Approval Letter



### Official Approval Letter for IRB project #15741 - New Project Form

January 22, 2016

Darin Jensen  
Department of English  
111 S. 49th Ave. Omaha, NE 68132

Robert Brooke  
Department of English  
ANDR 210, UNL, 68588-0333

IRB Number: 20160115741EX  
Project ID: 15741  
Project Title: Case Studies on the Preparation and Professional Development of English Faculty at Two-Year Colleges

Dear Darin:

This letter is to officially notify you of the certification of exemption of your project for the Protection of Human Subjects. Your proposal is in compliance with this institution's Federal Wide Assurance 00002258 and the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46) and has been classified as exempt.

You are authorized to implement this study as of the Date of Final Exemption: 1/22/2016

- o Review conducted using exempt category 2 at 45 CFR 46.101
- o Date of Exemption: 1/22/2016
- o Funding: N/A

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of the following events within 48 hours of the event:

- \* Any serious event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, side effects, deaths, or other problems) which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to subjects or others, and was possibly related to the research procedures;
- \* Any serious accidental or unintentional change to the IRB-approved protocol that involves risk or has the potential to recur;
- \* Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim result or other finding that indicates an unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research;
- \* Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or others; or
- \* Any complaint of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the research staff.

This project should be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines and you should notify the IRB immediately of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project. You should report any unanticipated problems involving risks to the participants or others to the Board.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 402-472-6965.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Becky R. Freeman".

Becky R. Freeman, CIP  
for the IRB



## **Case Study Interview Questions**

### *Part 1: Teaching Experience*

1. How many years teaching experience do you have?
2. How many years teaching experience in a community college do you have?
  3. Do you have K-12 teaching experience?
4. If you have K-12 teaching experience, how did that prepare you or not prepare you to teach in a two-year college?

### *Part 2: Graduate Preparation*

1. What graduate degree(s) do you have?
2. While in graduate school did you teach courses for the school in which you were receiving your degree?
3. Did your graduate program provide professional development for teaching?
4. Did your graduate program provide information about or coursework in teaching in two- year colleges?
5. Did your graduate program provide coursework in the teaching of developmental/remedial/basic writing?
6. How well did your graduate training prepare you to teach in a community college?
7. In retrospect, are there any gaps in your training that you have identified?
8. What would have filled those gaps?
9. Please describe your training and preparation to be a writing teacher in detail.
10. Did you have other professional preparation outside of the academy that you felt prepared you to be a community college teacher? If yes, please describe.

### *Part 3: Community College*

1. Before teaching at a community college, did you have any coursework in writing pedagogy?
  - a. If yes, what was the title of the course?
2. Was becoming a community college teacher your first career choice?

### *Part 4: Professional Development*

1. When you were hired at your community college, did the college provide any development or training to prepare you to teach?

2. Does your college support professional development such as travel to conferences?

3. Is this available to both full- and part-time faculty?

4. If so, please describe the professional development opportunities that your college currently provides you and other instructors?

For example, how many conferences do you attend a year?

Do you have subscriptions to, or read professional journals? Which ones and how often?

5. Please describe your professional development trajectory as a community college teacher.

6. Does the culture at your community college support professional development? Scholarship?

7. Does your college support professional development by funding travel and/or research? Is the funding adequate? Why or why not? If these resources are available, do faculty use them well and consistently?

8. How do you keep yourself current in the field?

9. What goals do you have as a writing educator?

10. How do you identify yourself as a professional? How do you define your professional identity?

11. When and what was the last conference you attended?

12. Does your college have professional development or ongoing training centered on making instructors better teachers?

### *Part 5: Teaching Conditions*

1. How many classes do you teach in an academic year?



2. What classes do you teach in a year?
  
3. Are you on a quarter or semester schedule?
  
4. Do you teach in the summer?
  
5. What is your typical class size?
  
6. Do you have a union or bargaining unit who advocates for you?
  
7. Please describe how governance is shared at your institution?
  
8. What voice do you have in decision making?

*Part 6: Demographic information*

1. What gender do you identify with?

2. What race do you identify with?

3. What is your age?

4. What social class do you place yourself in?

5. Are you a full- or part-time instructor?

## Appendix D Syllabus for Cheri Lemieux-Spiegel Class

### Marymount University

2807 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22207-4299

(703) 284-1560

FAX (703) 284-3859

School of Arts and Science

### COURSE SYLLABUS

<b>Course Number</b> EN 561	<b>Course Title</b> Topics in College Composition: The History and Evolution of Community College Writing Instruction		
<b>Fall Semester</b>	<b>Spring Semester</b>	<b>Summer</b> X	<b>Year</b> 2015
<b>Name of Instructor</b> Dr. Cheri Lemieux Spiegel			
<b>Meeting Day, Time, and Room Number</b> Monday, Wednesday & Thursday from 6 – 9 pm, St. Joseph's Room G103			
<b>Final Exam Day, Time, and Room Number</b> --			
<b>Office Hours, Location, Phone</b> Monday, Wednesday & Thursday from 5:00 – 6:00 pm, Butler Room G123, 703-323-4212			
<b>E-mail</b> cheri.spiegel@marymount.edu			

### UNIVERSITY STATEMENTS

#### Academic Integrity

By accepting this syllabus, you pledge to uphold the principles of Academic Integrity expressed by the Marymount University Community. You agree to observe these principles yourself and to defend them against abuse by others.

### Special Needs and Accommodations

Please advise the instructor of any special problems or needs at the beginning of the semester. If you seek accommodation based on disabilities, you should provide a Faculty Contact Sheet obtained through Disability Support Services located in Gerard Hall, (703) 284-1615.

### Access to Student Work

Copies of your work in this course including copies of any submitted papers and your portfolios may be kept on file for institutional research, assessment and accreditation purposes. All work used for these purposes will be submitted anonymously.

### Student Copyright Authorization

For the benefit of current and future students, work in this course may be used for educational critique, demonstrations, samples, presentations, and verification. Outside of these uses, work shall not be sold, copied, broadcast, or distributed for profit without student consent.

### University Policy on Snow Closings

Snow closings are generally announced on area radio stations. For bulletins concerning Marymount snow or weather closings, call (703) 526-6888. Unless otherwise advised by radio announcement or by official bulletins on the number listed above, students are expected to report for class as near normal time as possible on days when weather conditions are adverse. Decisions as to snow closing or delayed opening are not generally made before 5:00 AM of the working day. Students are expected to attend class if the University is not officially closed.

## 1. Broad Purpose of the Course

Provides an in-depth study of one issue important to the field of composition studies. The course will examine the historical significance of this issue as well as its current theoretical and pedagogical debates. Special attention will be paid to analyzing research studies about the issue. Specific topics will rotate and the course may be taken more than once, provided the student selects different topics. (3)

## 2. Course Objectives

Through this course, students will:

- Assess and evaluate key theories related to the field of composition studies;
- Critique central debates in the history of community college writing instruction;

- Evaluate theoretical and pedagogical debates in the history of community college English studies;
- Apply theoretical lenses to the creation of philosophy of teaching for the community college writing classroom;
- Present, in a paper and a presentation, original research on one issue related to the history of writing instruction in community college English studies

### 3. Teaching Method

This specific section provides an overview of writing instruction in the community college setting. This course introduces students to the historical and evolving questions and concerns of composition in the community college environment and includes a comparison and contrast of 2-year and 4-year writing programs, examining how they develop and address key issues. Students will collaboratively trace the evolution of two-year college concerns as represented within *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*. Independently, students will produce projects analyzing the development of a core issue in community college writing instruction.

Together we will:

- Articulate and compare the missions of 2-year and 4-year institutions;
- Trace key moments in the field of composition and community college history;
- Identify the key debates and issues in community college writing instruction;
- Analyze the evolution and development of the *TETYC* journal over the course of its history; and
- Research core issues in community college writing instruction.

This course is built upon the core principles of Andragogy (Malcolm Knowles). In keeping with Knowles' philosophy, much of the activity in this course will be self-directed, with your peers and me providing help and support as you navigate the course material. The class discussions as well as the collaborative assignment (Major Assignment 4) will provide the class the opportunity to work together to co-create course knowledge. Early in the course (through Major Assignments 1 and 2), you will have the opportunity to chart out specific goals and the means in which you will fulfill a majority of the assignments described in this syllabus (Major Assignments 3, 5 and 6).

### 4. Grading Policy

Your grade will be determined using the grading scale provided above and based upon the following assignments and weights:

1. Introductory Assignment (5%)
2. Proposal (5%)
3. Reading and Thinking Notes (20%)
4. Collaborative Project – *TETYC Journal* (15%)
5. Individual Project Presentation (10%)
6. Reflections and Portfolio, to include Individual Project (45%)

### **Introductory Assignment (5%)**

This assignment will give you the opportunity to introduce yourself to me and reflect upon your current understanding of writing instruction and two-year colleges. Through this assignment, you'll articulate your background, your goals for being in this course and where you see your career path going in the future. This assignment will help me tailor the overall course path to the unique interests of the participants.

### **Proposal (5%)**

For this assignment, you will have the opportunity to carve out your plans for the semester. First, you'll articulate how you will approach the Reading and Thinking Notes and the thread you anticipate you'll explore for your individual project and presentation.

### **Reading and Thinking Notes (20%)**

In courses such as this one, you'll work through quite a bit of reading material in a short space of time. These assignments will give you the opportunity to reflect upon chunks of the reading and synthesize the ideas presented within them.

### **Collaborative Project – *TETYC Journal* (15%)**

During the third week of class, you'll work in groups to analyze the contents of *TETYC* journals over a specific period of time. You'll use a grounded theory-like process to make notes about the trends in the journal's development over its history. Each group will examine a different period in the journal's history and share with the class so that together we can construct a bigger picture of the major moves in the journal's history.

### **Individual Presentation (10%)**

For this project, you'll select one of several paths to further investigate a topic or issue presented within our course. This investigation will allow you to look more deeply into the subject than we will have space to explore together in class. At the end of the semester, you will present your findings to your peers via a short conference style presentation. The larger write up of this project will be assessed as part of your final portfolio.

## Reflections and Portfolio (45%)

You'll pull together the artifacts you've produced within this course into a final course portfolio. This portfolio will include:

- Introductory Assignment with an end of the semester update;
- Reading and Thinking Notes (4) with an end of the semester reflection;
- Narrative description of your contributions to (memos) and takeaways from the collaborative project;
- A teaching philosophy draft; and
- Individual Project Write Up with reflection.

## Grading Scale

The following is a brief explanation of the letter grades that will be used within this course:

<b>A</b>	A (100 – 93%) or A– (92.9 – 90%)	Superior, outstanding scholarship and intellectual initiative.
<b>B</b>	B+ (89.9 – 87%), B (86.9 – 83%) or B– (82.9 – 80%)	Satisfactory performance.
<b>C</b>	C+ (79.9 -77%), C (76.9 – 70%)	Deficient but passing.
<b>F</b>	F (69.9% and below)	Failure to meet minimal standards.

## Attendance and Participation

Because of the collaborative nature of this course, students are required and expected to attend every class. If you must miss a class for any reason, you are responsible for making up any missed work. Please be aware of the following guidelines related to your attendance and participation:

- **You are allowed the equivalent of two absences, excused or unexcused.** More than two absences will result in a letter grade reduction (one per additional class missed beyond the second).

- **Late arrivals and early dismissals** will be tracked throughout the term. Students with the equivalent of ninety-minutes or more of missed class time in this fashion will receive one absence for each ninety-minute period.
- Should an **emergency** arrive causing you to be unable to attend in person, you are encouraged to speak with me regarding the possibility of attending class via video conferencing software. Students should not expect to attend more than two class periods in this fashion.
- In addition to attending every class, you should plan to come prepared and ready to **actively participate** throughout the class duration.

## 5. Class Schedule

Class 1: Monday, June 29

**Topic:** Course Introduction and Foundation Concepts

**Assignments Introduced:** Introductory Assignment and Reading and Thinking Notes

**Readings (In-Class):**

- NOVA English Composition Course Content Summaries.
- CWPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition.

Class 2: Wednesday, July 1

**Topic:** Types of Institutions and the Terrain Rhetoric and Composition

**Assignments Introduced:** Proposal, Individual Project/Presentation, and Portfolio

**Assignments Due:** Introductory Assignment (due at 6 pm); bring the college mission statement from an institution of your choice.

**Readings:**

- Thelin, John R. and Marybeth Gasman. "Historical Overview of American Higher Education." *The Student Services Handbook*.
- Boggs, George R. "Democracy's Colleges: The Evolution of the Community College in America."
- Hutcheson, Philo A. "The Truman Commission's Vision for the Future." *Thought and Action*.
- "A Brief History of Rhetoric and Composition." *The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing*:  
<http://www.macmillanhighered.com/Catalog/static/bsm/bb/history.html>.

Class 3: Thursday, July 2

**Topic:** Mission of the Community College

**Reading:**

- American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). "Fast Facts" and other research briefs.



- Cain, Michael Scott. "The Wal-Mart of Higher Education" *The Community College in the Twenty-Frist Century*.
- Pickett, Nell Ann. "The Two-Year College as Democracy in Action." *College Composition and Communication*.
- Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. "Background: Evolving Priorities and Expectations of the Community College" *The American Community College*

Class 4: Monday, July 6

**Topic:** Historical Moments in Rhetoric and Composition

**Assignments Due:** Reading and Thinking Notes 1 (due at 6 pm)

**Readings:**

- Horner, Winifred Bryan. "The Roots of Modern Writing Instruction" *Rhetoric Review*
- Berlin's "Contemporary Composition: The Major Theoretical Pedagogies." *College English*.
- Haynes, Cynthia. "Rhetoric/Slash/Composition." *Enculturation*
- CCCC's Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing

Class 5: Wednesday, July 8

**Topic:** Historical Moments in the Community College

**Assignments Due:** Proposal

**Readings:**

- Alfred, Richard, Christopher Shults, Ozan Jaquette, and Shelley Strickland. "Three Ps for the Future: Prospect, Pitfalls, and Potency" *Community Colleges on the Horizon*.
- Cain, Michael Scott. "Four Generations of Confusion." *The Community College in the Twenty-Frist Century*
- Cain, Michael Scott. "The Community College in the Twenty-Frist Century." *The Community College in the Twenty-Frist Century*

Class 6: Thursday, July 9

**Topic:** Recent Concepts and Viewpoints in Rhetoric and Composition

**Readings:**

- Blaauw-Hara, Mark. "Transfer Theory, Threshold Concepts, and First-Year Composition: Connecting Writing Courses to the Rest of the College." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*.
- The New London Group. "Pedagogy of *Multiliteracies*."
- Matsuda, "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in US Composition" *College English*.

- Downs, Douglas and Elizabeth Wardle. “Teaching about Writing, Righting Misconceptions: (Re)Envisioning ‘First-Year Composition’ as ‘Introduction to Writing Studies’” *College Composition and Communication*.

Class 7: Monday, July 13

**Topic:** Key Moments in the Community College / Grounded Theory

**Assignments Introduced:** Collaborative Project – *TETYC Journal*

**Assignments Due:** Reading and Thinking Notes 2 (due at 6 pm)

**Readings:**

- Selections from *Community Colleges on the Horizon*.
- Sullivan, Patrick. “Measuring "Success" at Open Admissions Institutions: Thinking Carefully about This Complex Question.” *College English*.
- Summers, Jeff. “Complexities of ‘College Success.’”
- Spiegel, Cheri Lemieux. “Using Rhetorical Media to Meet Outcomes and Satisfy Stakeholders.” *Computers and Composition Online*.

Class 8: Wednesday, July 15

**Topic:** Two-Year College Professional Engagement and Preparation

**Class Meeting:** Our class will be held via WebEx this evening; I will be attending from CWPA.

**Readings:**

- TYCA Guidelines for the Academic Preparation of English Faculty at Two-Year Colleges
- Miller, Susan Kay, Shelley Rodrigo, Veronica Pantoja, and Duane Roen. “Institutional Models for Engaging Faculty in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.” *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*.
- Toth, Christie. “Unmeasured Engagement: Two-Year College English Faculty and Disciplinary Professional Organizations.” *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*.
- Andelora, Jeffrey. "The Teacher/Scholar: Reconstructing Our Professional Identity in Two-Year Colleges." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*.

Class 9: Thursday, July 16

**Topic:** *TETYC*

**Class-Time Assignment:** Collaborative Project – *TETYC Journal* (Write-up and Presentations due Monday, July 20)

Class 10: Monday, July 20

**Topic:** Student Preparation, Affective Issues and Effective Teachers

**Assignments Introduced:** Teaching Philosophy

**Assignments:** Reading and Thinking Notes 3 (due at 6 pm)

**Readings:**

- Wilson, Smokey. "What happened to Darleen? Reconstructing the life and schooling of an underprepared learner." *Two-Year College English*.
- Leonhardy, Galen. "Transformations: Working with Veterans in the Composition Classroom." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*.
- Selections from Cox, Rebecca D. *The College Fear Factor*.
- Framework for Success in Post-Secondary Writing
- TYCA's Characteristics of a Highly Effective Two-Year College English Instructor
- **Supplemental:** Lockhart and Roberge's *Informed Choices*

Class 11: Wednesday, July 22

**Topic:** Enduring Issues

**Assignments Due:** Individual Project Drafts (due at 6 pm) and Presentations

**Readings:**

- Blaauw-Hara, Mark. "Mapping the Frontier: A Survey of Twenty Years of Grammar Articles in *TETYC*" *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*.
- Brearey, Oliver. "Understanding the Relationship between First- and Second-Semester College Writing Courses." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*.
- White, Ed. "My Five-Paragraph Theme Theme." *College Composition and Communication*.
- Jenkins, Rob. "AP Literature vs. College English *Chronicle*." Selections from *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*.

Class 12: Thursday, July 23

**Topic:** Developmental Education and Acceleration

**Assignment Due:** Collaborative Project – *TETYC Journal* (Presentations in-class)

**Readings:**

- Bailey, Thomas. "Challenge and Opportunity: Rethinking the Role and Function of Developmental Education in Community College." *New Directions for Community Colleges*.
- Adams, Peter; Sarah Gearhart, Robert Miller, and Anne Roberts. "The Accelerated Learning Program: Throwing Open the Gates." *Journal of Basic Writing*.
- Cho, Sung-Woo, Elizabeth Kopko, Davis Jenkins, and Shanna Smith Jaggars. "New Evidence of Success for Community College Remedial English Students:"

Tracking the Outcomes of Students in the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP)."  
CCRC Working Paper No. 53.

- TYCA White Paper on Developmental Education Reforms

Class 13: Monday, July 27

**Topic:** Current Issues – Labor Concerns

**Readings:**

- Worthen, Helena. “The Problem of the Majority Contingent Faculty in the Community College.” *The Politics of Writing in the 2-Year College*.
- Klausman, Jeffrey. “Not Just a Matter of Fairness: Adjunct Faculty and Writing Programs in Two-Year Colleges.” *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*.
- Twombly, Susan, and Barbara K. Townsend. “Community College Faculty: What We Know and Need to Know.” *Community College Review*.

Class 14: Wednesday, July 29

**Topic:** College Writing Program Administration in the 2-year College

**Assignments:** Reading and Thinking Notes 4 (due at 6 pm)

**Readings:**

- Klausman, Jeffrey. “Mapping the Terrain: The Two-Year College Writing Program Administrator.” *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*
- Janangelo, Joseph, and Jeffrey Klausman. "Rendering the Idea of a Writing Program: A Look at Six Two-Year Colleges." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*
- Klausman, Jeff. “Toward the Definition of a Writing Program in a Two-Year College: You Say You Want a Revolution?” *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*
- Blaauw-Hara and Spiegel/Spiegel and Blaauw-Hara, unpublished article and forthcoming chapter

Class 15: Thursday, July 30

**Topic:** Future Turns and 2-Year Hiring

**Assignments Due:** Final Portfolio with Reflections due Friday, July 31 at noon.

**Readings:**

- Sydow, Debbie and Richard Alfred. “Shape of the Future.” *Re-Visioning Community Colleges*.
- Spiegel, Cheri Lemieux. “From Here to Fulltime: Observations from an Adjunct turned Fulltime.” FORUM: The Newsletter of the Committee on Contingent, Adjunct, and Part-time Faculty (CAP).
- Jenkins, Rob. “Can a Community College Job Be a ‘Steppingstone.’” *Chronicle Vitae*.

- Jenkins, Rob. “How the Job Search Differs at Community Colleges.” *Chronicle*.

## 6. Required Texts

While there are no required textbooks for this course, required readings will be posted on Blackboard for each class period. Students should have access to print or electronic copies of the appropriate readings during each meeting.

## 7. Suggested Readings and Audio-Visual Materials

- *The American Community College* by Arthur M. Cohen
- *The College Fear Factor: How Students and Professors Misunderstand One Another* by Rebecca D. Cox
- *What the Best College Teachers Do* by Ken Bain
- *Discounted Dreams: High Hopes and Harsh Realities*  
(<http://digital.films.com/play/H6FQCW>)

## Learning Resource Center (LRC) – English Writing Support Services

All writing, however strong, can benefit from a careful reader’s response. In addition to feedback from your instructor and your classmates, writing assistance is available from peer tutors in the Learning Resource Center. LRC tutors can help at any stage of the writing process – from getting started to final editing. They can help you figure out an assignment, overcome “writer’s block,” or discover your thesis. Remember, however, that tutors are not allowed to revise or edit students’ papers for them. All changes, revisions, or corrections must be your work.