

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

LaGuardia Community College

2010

Welcome to the Land of Super-Service: A Survivor's Guide. . .and Some Questions

Phyllis E. VanSlyck

CUNY LaGuardia Community College

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/lg_pubs/110

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Over Ten Million Served: Gendered Service in Language and Literature Workplaces.
Katie Hogan and Michelle Masse Editors. (New York: SUNY Albany Press 2010).

Welcome to the Land of Super-Service:
A Survivor's Guide . . . and Some Questions

Phyllis van Slyck
LaGuardia Community College, CUNY

First, A Little History

It is a truth (almost) universally acknowledged that if you want to have an academic career devoted to teaching and service, you should apply for a job at public community college. Here are a few more generally acknowledged truths about community colleges in the United States. From the 1960's through the 1990's these institutions have traditionally attracted and retained women faculty, though, consistently, they have been paid less than their male colleagues.¹ Community college faculty have accepted, and continue to accept, high service demands as necessary for tenure and promotion. The kinds of service undertaken include departmental administration, writing program coordination, college-wide professional development leadership, coordination of women's centers, direction of Phi Theta Kapa programs, development/coordination of special academic programs such as learning communities, advisement of students and mentoring of new faculty. Except for administrative work such as that of department chair or writing program director, much of this service is considered part of the job and is, therefore, uncompensated—or very modestly compensated. From the 1960's to the present, women faculty at community colleges have helped to define and deepen this

extraordinary, and in many ways valuable, emphasis on service. Yet they have accepted service on the job in the same way they have long accepted it in the home--without much struggle for recognition of their work.

Because, for many years, community colleges hired faculty who had Master's degrees rather than Ph.D.s, service was implicitly, and often explicitly, understood as a substitute for scholarship. However, since faculty at community colleges have also consistently been required to teach more courses than faculty at four-year institutions, it is clear that service has never been considered as arduous or time-consuming as scholarship. And even though community college faculty have contributed substantially in the last two decades to traditional scholarship, to the field of composition and rhetoric, and to the scholarship of teaching, as Ernst Boyer has noted, the latter, especially, is regarded as second tier to traditional scholarship in literature, for example—a kind of distinction that perpetuates the second class status of many community college faculty.²

As community colleges have expanded and diversified their mission, and as students, increasingly, have come to these colleges with the intent of transferring to four-year schools, there has been a parallel (and appropriate) increase in the kinds of scholarly demands placed on faculty; and many new faculty are being hired with Ph.D.'s in hand. While expecting faculty to be active scholars in their fields is a good thing, the problem confronting growing numbers of community college faculty is that the demand for service has also increased. Add to this the fact that community colleges are the last place where there is genuine open admission for students, and that class sizes are often larger than at four-year institutions, and we have an almost perfect recipe for faculty stress and

burnout—especially in departments such as English where faculty teach 4-5 courses each semester and are required to give as many as 8 essays per semester in writing courses.³

I teach in an institution where these realities are evident, Fiorello H. LaGuardia Community College of the City University of New York. Women faculty and administrators have consistently played a major role in defining the quality of teaching and service at our institution: women outnumber men, both in my department and in the college; a majority of current department chairs are women, and the highest ranking administrator, the president, is a woman.⁴ And while the student population (64% female; 36% male) may not seem *directly* related to the service issue, it is important because faculty, women faculty in particular, are modeling for women students what it means to be an academic. At LaGuardia, excellent teaching is the faculty's primary responsibility, but substantial service to the institution has always been an explicit part of our contract.⁵ When LaGuardia first opened its doors in the 1970's, professional scholarship was not particularly encouraged as it was believed it would interfere with our primary responsibilities of teaching and service; however, in the last 5-7 years professional scholarship has been deemed essential for tenure and promotion, and LaGuardia's junior faculty in English, as well as in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, have a strong commitment to publishing in their professional fields.⁶ Despite this new emphasis on scholarship and despite significant changes in student goals (80% of students entering LaGuardia plan to acquire higher degrees than the A.A.) and in faculty credentials (50% of current LaGuardia faculty have Ph.D.s),⁷ service expectations for new faculty have become even greater than they were in the 70's and

80's. Our English Department rarely considers a candidate who does not have the Ph.D. in hand, or nearly in hand because the combined teaching and service demands are so great that most would not be able to complete their degrees before a tenure decision is made, and we would be condemning them to failure.⁸

As LaGuardia faculty are mentored in the march towards tenure, they are expected not only to excel in the classroom and to contribute substantial service to their departments but also to find a particular “niche” or significant project that will define their contribution to the larger college community. But a new emphasis on scholarship has been added to this already substantial set of service demands. Recently, a faculty member who had an excellent teaching record and who had performed superior service over more than a decade, including a significant administrative position, was denied a promotion because she had failed to publish adequately. Conversely, a junior faculty member whose scholarship was more than adequate and who took a year's leave because of the demands of child-care (breaking her march towards tenure), was discouraged from returning on grounds that her service to the college had not been significant. (Our university does not have paid maternity leave.)

The message to faculty at institutions like mine is that they had better do all three things well--teaching, scholarship, service—and not complain, if they hope to earn tenure and promotion. But the culture of our college community offers little room for an open discussion of service issues and concerns: untenured faculty and even tenured junior faculty do not feel comfortable indicating to their chairs or to tenured colleagues that they are overwhelmed by the teaching load, by service, or that they are anxious about finding

time to pursue their scholarship—but the stress level is palpable.

This profile of faculty expectations at LaGuardia may differ from national norms, but I would like to suggest that it represents the direction community colleges are headed; as such, our situation raises a number of important and difficult questions. How can new and junior faculty begin to address the competing demands and the fundamental inequities of their situation—specifically, that they are asked to teach, perform service, and publish while teaching two to four more courses, annually, than their colleagues at four-year institutions? How will the generation of women currently being hired at community colleges address issues of child care at institutions that, despite extraordinary professional service demands, have not acknowledged personal service demands? What steps can new faculty take to challenge the status quo without risk to their positions? And how can leadership at community colleges today become more responsive to the multiple demands being placed on faculty? How might senior faculty, department chairs, and even college-wide administrators, be encouraged to support this generation and to understand the pressures they are facing?

Equally important, how can junior faculty themselves begin to take greater ownership of the priorities and vision of public community colleges? Women faculty at community colleges have traditionally taken a leadership role in defining—often re-defining—approaches to pedagogy. Student-centered learning, deeply connected to feminist scholarship, and revitalized and re-envisioned since Dewey, in large measure by the women's movement, has changed the way faculty at community colleges think about teaching and the way they mentor new colleagues. Collaborative pedagogy, combined

with attention to the social and cognitive aspects of learning, have been embraced by those of us who teach first generation college students (the vast majority at community colleges) and by scholars advocating attention to diverse students' learning styles; yet this pedagogy's association with feminist privileging of "community" over "competition" has associated it with "soft" scholarship, with second-tier institutions, and with community colleges. How can faculty at community colleges begin to challenge these perceptions? And might taking on this challenge become an instance of meaningful service? In other words, what kinds of service, especially for women in the profession, would decenter assumptions about community colleges and help to promote a deeper understanding of the significant role these colleges play in educating students for transfer to four-year institutions?

My Story

Hired in the early nineties at LaGuardia, I did all the things required of me as a faculty member and more; I did them, for many years, as a single parent without questioning or challenging any of the priorities being set for me. Despite a heavy teaching load, I found service both inspiring and career defining precisely because that service was directly related to the kind of teaching I was learning to value. I became involved, initially without really knowing its roots, in a deeply feminist attention to student learning. In faculty professional development seminars we read and discussed constructivist learning theory from Dewey to Kolb; Schoen's work on reflective practice;

Belenky's ideas on women's ways of knowing and Shaughnessey's critique of errors and expectations for basic writers; MacIntosh's reflections on white privilege, Palmer's "inner landscape" of the teacher's life, and hooks's ideas about teaching in community. We immersed ourselves in these inquiries because we hungered for conversations about teaching: we were engaging with students for whom college was an entirely new, or entirely different, kind of territory from their past educational experience, and we needed to find the best strategies to reach them.

My colleagues and I were, and are, aware that there is widespread suspicion, at least at the senior college level, about the value of scholarship devoted to student-centered learning, that some of our four-year colleagues feel we would be better off failing students who have difficulties learning in a traditional classroom. But these approaches helped us improve the involvement and retention of first-generation students, and, contrary to assumptions that there is a tremendous *difference* between community college and public four-year college students, the community college population today constitutes 49% of the total U.S. college population; increasingly, these *are* the students who will be entering the four-year college classroom at both public and private institutions.

Attention to teaching methodology is a political, gendered, equity issue for all of us, most of all for our students. Emily Lardner, Co-Director of the Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, recently summarized the inequities for economically disadvantaged and minority students who arrive at senior colleges: "at four-year colleges 26% of freshman drop out before their sophomore year; only 7 percent

of young people from the lowest-income families earn four-year degrees by age twenty six; 59% of white students earn a bachelor's degree within six years of entering college versus 39% of African Americans and 37% of Latino students" (12).⁹ We would all be well advised to reflect on our positions as educators in the face of these statistics—and to consider the wisdom about student success that has developed—through attention to pedagogy and professional development related service—at two-year institutions. Community colleges are especially aware of student equity issues precisely because the gendered model of service that they have defined and promoted focuses attention on alternative curricular structures and fosters valuable dialogue about teaching and learning.

My interest in pedagogy led me to learning communities, a curricular and pedagogical initiative guided and refined by women in the profession from the seventies through the nineties.¹⁰ Teaching in learning communities led to service work: for almost two decades I have coordinated, expanded, and assessed learning communities on our campus. Learning community leadership not only gave me opportunities for personal and intellectual growth; it connected me with a community of like-minded individuals within the college and university who were deeply committed to service. The importance of these relationships is rarely discussed; yet it is something we should support more purposefully in our profession. I developed connections with faculty and administrators from other disciplines and colleges across the country whom I would have been otherwise unlikely ever to know, and some of these connections developed into meaningful professional and personal relationships.

Because much of my service helped me hone my understanding of pedagogy and provided me with valuable opportunities for dialogue with colleagues on my campus and nationally, it contributed substantially to my own professional advancement—a significant benefit I did not anticipate when I began this work. The kinds of service I became involved in at LaGuardia led to national presentations, first at conferences, later in venues we created for ourselves in both regional and national networks. These networks, combined with LaGuardia’s long-standing reputation in the learning communities field, led to invitations to give workshops on campuses across the country and to a variety of pedagogical publications in monographs and refereed journals. I now regularly encourage new faculty to find the kind of service that will do “double duty,” that is, contribute broadly and deeply to their professional growth—and to their resumes.

At different stages in my career I received a modest amount of released time for the coordination of learning communities, for professional development seminars, and for co-coordinating a writing program, but a good part of my service, both to my department and the college was, and continues to be, voluntary. So, was it possible to perform service, to teach effectively, and to pursue my scholarship? Yes, but it was not always easy: I produced articles in both my “scholarly” field (Henry James studies) and in pedagogy (composition studies and learning community design and assessment). But to publish at all, I had to learn how to set limits on service demands, to say no to meetings held on days I wasn’t on campus, for example. I also worked to create a teaching schedule that gave me a block of time several days a week for writing; and I learned not to answer any kind of communication until I had put in the requisite 3-4 hours writing 4-5

days a week. However, I could only afford to do these things after I was tenured, and I earned tenure primarily on the basis of my service, something that would not be possible now. Today, many of our new hires have arrived with a number of articles already published and book contracts within their first two years, but their commitment to scholarship is seriously challenged once they begin teaching and service at LaGuardia. Junior faculty tell me that they get up at 4am to complete writing projects and then put in a full day of teaching and service at the college; even with a three-day teaching schedule most put in 4 day weeks because of service commitments. We need to come up with better solutions.

Challenges Today for Junior Faculty at Community Colleges

Let me return to my initial questions about service at the community college. If I have made my peace with the balance between service, teaching and scholarship, as I mentor new faculty, I wonder how they are going to balance and fulfill demands which are much greater than those I faced. I wonder how young women, particularly, are going to confront increasing demands for meaningful service, demands for visible scholarship, a heavy course load and large class sizes, and a continued lack of support for family concerns. In my department, three junior women faculty currently coordinate our very large writing program (and two of them have not finished their doctorates). Another half dozen have taken on substantial committee work that involve such things as the development of an English major articulated with a four-year sister college, development of a series of literary lectures for our English major, coordination of a common reading

program for all entering students (this includes the development of a website, teaching materials and faculty seminars), and facilitation of year-long faculty development seminars on a variety of pedagogical topics. Junior faculty at LaGuardia today are less likely to be given course release for the service or professional development that I received (the money is simply not available), and though they may receive a stipend, there is no getting around the fact that such service only increases the workload.

I am concerned about the pressures we place on new faculty, that we will lose them to institutions where the demand for service is lower and where they will be better able to pursue their scholarly interests. New faculty at my college are afraid to speak about “service overload,” or what some have come to call “shadow workload.” How do you say no to service without putting yourself at risk, they ask. Will department chairs listen, or will they insist that new faculty simply learn to do more? (Faculty at our four-year sister colleges who are publishing scholars receive released time from teaching for their professional work, something community college faculty have never been granted.)

New faculty at LaGuardia have told me, in confidence, that their first and second year feel like a kind of “hazing” process, an experience designed to test their stamina and commitment: they move from graduate school with its intermittent stress to continuous high stress and a work environment that seems to have hidden rules: they learn quickly that there is a difference between the letter of the law and the actual way things work. If you follow the letter of the law in our writing program, for example, teaching 4 composition courses per semester and requiring 8 essays plus revisions in each course

(with a class size of 28-30), you would be grading between 5-10 hours a day: it simply can't be done. Yet faculty recognize that they are being taught not to question the cultural norms of the institution: the message they are getting from faculty one step ahead of them is, "I went through it, so you can too!" Service pressures are so great that competition is subtly replacing a spirit of collaboration. The need for junior faculty to be visible and self-promoting also creates what is perhaps an unfair resentment of "superstars" who "set the bar too high;" this, too, fosters a competitive spirit that clashes with the kind of genuine collegiality and support we espouse in our work. Faculty who perform extraordinary service without complaint, and who are playing into the corporate agenda are often rewarded, ironically, by being given more administrative projects. Junior faculty need to examine the political implications (not to mention the professional consequences, i.e. less time for scholarship) of playing by these new rules.

Equally problematic is the fact that there is no real internship period: you are hired, you sign the papers; everyone is welcoming; then, suddenly, you must hit the ground running. Yes, you receive mentoring in some departments, and you are welcome to visit your colleague's classes but the emphasis on performance, both in the classroom and college-wide, tends to promote a sense of inadequacy. Recently a junior faculty member commented that a new faculty member's recently announced service project made her feel somewhat anxious: "I didn't do anything like that in my first year; should I have?" At both two and four-year institutions in CUNY we are beginning to examine the effects of service and teaching overload. A study of one of our sister four-year institutions revealed that they were retaining less than 44% of new faculty. Between 2000 and 2007

LaGuardia hired 184 full-time faculty; only 100 are still with us—though the reasons for departure vary.¹¹

The hiring of large numbers of new faculty in the last 7 years has also created complex and subtle tensions as new faculty confront old traditions in the culture of the college in general. Some of this is inevitable, and we know that it is a nationwide issue as 30% of the senior faculty at both two and four-year institutions will retire over the next decade.¹² The tensions that arise in an institution with large numbers of new faculty will affect service and collegiality in numerous ways, yet so far this remains a privately discussed but publicly unacknowledged issue.

In a well meant effort, LaGuardia's administration initiated a new kind of unnamed service a few years ago, a required year-long professional development seminar for faculty in their first year at the college, designed to acculturate them to teaching in our community. While the seminar offers beneficial discussions of pedagogy, and helps to create a community and network for new faculty, it is time-consuming (Fall, Winter and Spring institutes in addition to bi-monthly meetings), and some faculty complain, privately, that they have too much work to do to make this additional commitment; that they would become acculturated more effectively if they could devote themselves more thoroughly to teaching in their first year.

What Conversations to We Need to Have and Who Should Initiate Them?

Having examined what I see as some major problems related to service at my institution, I want to state that if faculty were to cease to be involved in service, a very

important part of the culture of the community college would be lost. Service provides vision, new directions, and grows the leadership of the institution; it helps faculty think together about what is most pressing, about changes in our student population, about the kinds of pedagogical initiatives that will best address student needs. Most important, service also offers the necessary space for deep community to develop; ideally it creates faculty-centered leadership both within departments and college-wide.

Today, perhaps as never before (though this is always a naïve assumption), the radical changes in information technology, to give just one example, are having a profound impact on teaching methodologies as well as scholarship itself: from blackboard to blogs to second life.com, faculty are having to catch up with a techno-savvy generation.¹³ This is not to say that we should in any way be abandoning our commitment to traditional forms of scholarship, but rather that we need to meet students where they are—to have a deeper understanding of their language—if we hope to inspire them. The profound shift in the *means* of communication that is taking place will need to be incorporated into the academic community. Who will help faculty understand this shift, these tools, and how to use them, if not the newest generation entering our departments? This *could* be an extremely valuable kind of service.

Junior and senior faculty need to work together take on the challenge of communicating the need for various kinds of support, from intellectual validation to released time. LaGuardia's English department recently created a "State of the Department" committee so that faculty will be able to talk about these kinds of issues. As a first step we are inviting faculty to respond—anonously—to a questionnaire in

which they describe their best experiences in the department (and at the college) and what they are most concerned about; we are also soliciting suggestions for change. In what might be a good model for other community colleges, the CUNY Union, the Professional Staff Congress, achieved an important victory in its most recent contract: all new faculty receive 24 hours (the equivalent of 6-7 courses) of released time to pursue scholarship; this is spread over a 5 year period and may not be taken in a large block, but it is a beginning. (However, this same Union conceded a move in the tenure clock from five to seven years—a change that will inevitably increase the service demand for new faculty.) A group of mostly, but not exclusively, junior faculty is also fighting for better family leave policies from the university, in coordination with the union. The inequity in the teaching load between junior and senior colleges, however, remains unaddressed.

There is a fundamental disconnect between the requirements being placed on faculty and the messages faculty are receiving about how best to achieve them. Part of this disconnect is based on a widely discussed shift to a corporate management model at both public and private institutions of higher education.¹⁴ Recently, our college president notified one of our Union representatives that she could no longer use college email to send out notices of Union meetings—because “Union business is not part of the performance of an employee's duties and responsibilities.” This ban is currently being challenged in court by our Union. Why is it threatening for faculty to seek better conditions, conditions that will enhance their ability to teach, to perform service, to do their scholarship—precisely those things that are being demanded of them? An increasing tension is emerging at LaGuardia and elsewhere between an original faculty-centered

culture and an administratively driven set of strategic goals that demand measurable results (such as high pass rates in basic skills courses within a semester—regardless of the level of proficiency with which students enter a given course). From the administration’s point of view, only such measurable results translate into “productivity.”¹⁵ But faculty know that this kind of pressure to provide successful “data” interferes with good teaching practice.

A related problem at two-year colleges is a new emphasis on service related scholarship—to the exclusion of other kinds of scholarship. Senior administrators (including, in some cases, department chairs) who have long since ceased to be publishing scholars, tend to privilege service research over scholarly research. Sabbatical proposals that promise research into new pedagogies that will be piloted on campus, for example, are more easily approved than scholarly projects whose direct application to teaching at a two-year college is less obvious. While my colleagues and I have completed many pedagogy based research projects, we know that our scholarly projects are equally valuable and worthy of support. Students at community colleges need and deserve the same exposure to current intellectual currents and methodologies, and their history, as their peers at four-year institutions. For administrators to argue that such scholarship is not relevant to community college students is simply a belated form of colonialism: it patronizes and diminishes them.

Despite these problems, new directions in national leadership are already visible. I was heartened to note that the December 2007 MLA Convention offered a panel discussion on released time, teaching, and publication at community colleges and that a

national organization of community college faculty is also forming through the MLA. I was also pleased to see that the MLA is considering revising the format of the annual convention. Proposals for this new format suggest a heightened attention to service (and its implications) in the college and university, including “workshops focused on the vast range of professional interests, responsibilities, and proficiencies—pedagogical issues, institutional facilitation (preparing dossiers for tenure cases, mentoring graduate students and junior faculty members), disciplinary and administrative issues (academic freedom, gender and diversity, departmental governance), and so forth—.”¹⁶

The assumption on the part of our four year colleagues and our college administrators that community college faculty do not need time to pursue scholarly interests may well be tied to the long-standing bias that this group of faculty, especially its majority of women faculty, are primarily committed to service. So we need to move beyond discussion and consider actions we can take to support junior faculty on our campuses. An important local step would be for us to begin to address the extraordinary multiple demands being placed on community college faculty. But if we want to change the culture at the community college, we are going to have to mobilize and to win the hearts and minds of new colleagues who, for the most part, have evinced little interest in Union activities. We all want, and our students deserve, college faculty who are not only current in their scholarly fields but also conversant in the best pedagogical practices for a changing student population; we also want college administrators who are supportive of their faculty—in relation to teaching, to scholarship *and* to service. Most important, we want college communities in which everyone has a voice; communities that are

committed to open and thoughtful dialogue about the major changes in leadership and vision that are already taking place in our institutions. This anthology of writings offers the beginning of a broader, deeper conversation about service for women, for all faculty, at both two and four-year institutions.

¹ “Gender differentials in salary remain a problem: Male professors at community colleges average \$66,030, compared to \$62,357 for female professors” (American Association of Community Colleges, 2005. CHECK Cited in National Profile of Community Colleges: Trends and Statistics [Eds. Kent A. Phillipe and Leila Gonzalez Sullivan], 2005), 98.

² See Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (Baltimore: Carnegie Foundation, 1997). At my institution, the scholarship of teaching has been explicitly encouraged as “preferable” to traditional scholarship because it is considered more “relevant” to the kind of teaching we do, though this assumption is being challenged.

³ The class size for basic or pre-college level writing at LaGuardia is 28, almost twice that recommended by the National Council of Teachers of English. One third of entering students need ESL courses, and more than half need pre-college writing and math courses. (Students at LaGuardia come from 150 countries and speak 115 languages).

⁴ “Women now constitute nearly 27% of public and private community college presidents, up from 11% in 1991” (National Profile 2005), 97.

⁵ Article 15b of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Professional Staff Congress and the City University of New York (2002-2007) reads, in part, “Employees on the teaching staff of the City University of New York shall not be required to teach an excessive number of contact hours, assume an excessive student load. . . it being recognized by the parties that the teaching staff has the obligation, among others, to be available to students, *to assume normal committee assignments, and engage in research and community service*” (italics mine), 26-27.

⁶ Currently, department chairs at LaGuardia explicitly urge new faculty to publish, in addition to their regular commitments to teaching and service. This message is reinforced at college-wide tenure and promotion information meetings for new faculty. In contrast, a former chair of my department in the 70s and 80s told me of this illuminating exchange with the then Dean of the Faculty. "How much does publication count in promotion decisions?" Long, long pause. Then the irony-free answer, "Well, it won't really hurt them." The chair also explained that giving talks at conferences was accepted as the equivalent of publication.

⁷ 2007 Institutional Profile. Office of Institutional Research. Division of Information Technology. LaGuardia Community College. The City University of New York (ix).

⁸ Our President, like other presidents at CUNY, has indicated to department chairs that she will no longer reappoint instructors who have reached the tenure decision year without completing the Ph.D. Previous presidents often appointed these faculty as Lecturers with a tenure equivalent, the Certificate of Continuing Education, allowed under the Collective Bargaining Agreement between our Union, the Professional Staff Congress, and CUNY.

⁹ See “The Heart of Education: Translating Diversity into Equity.” In Diversity, Educational Equity, and Learning Communities (The Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, The Evergreen State College, Olympia, Washington. Summer 2005): 1-35.

¹⁰ Learning communities are courses clustered around a common theme and taught to the same cohort of students within a given semester; they encourage a high degree of integrated, and interdisciplinary, learning. The founder of the learning community movement in the United States was Alexander Meiklejohn who established the Experimental College, a school within a school, at the University of Wisconsin in 1927. But the faculty who advanced and disseminated the pedagogy we associate with learning communities from the seventies through the nineties were (and continue to be) predominantly women. See, for example, Barbara Leigh Smith et al. Learning Communities: Reforming Undergraduate Education (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2004).

¹¹ LaGuardia Office of Institutional Research, personal email from Erez Lenchner (29 Nov. 2007).

¹² “Full-Time Faculty’s Years to retirement by College Type 1999-2000” (National Profile 117).

¹³ In this context, see, for example, Michael Berube, Sven Birkets and blogs such as bitchphd.com.

¹⁴ See, for example, Cary Nelson and Stephen Watt, “The Corporate University,” in Academic Keywords: A Devil’s Dictionary for Higher Education (London and New York: Routledge, 1999). More recently, see Marc Bousquet, How the University Works (New York: NYU Press, 2008).

¹⁵ A recent English Department faculty meeting was devoted, almost entirely, to the question of how to improve the pass rate in our Basic Writing courses. Some of our newer colleagues expressed dismay at the illogic of this administratively driven goal, especially when told that smaller class sizes were not an option that would be considered.

¹⁶ See interim reports submitted to MLA Executive Council and Delegate Assembly on Proposed Changes in the Convention Structure at www.mla.org.