

Mapping the Terrain: The Two-Year College Writing Program Administrator

> Jeffrey Klausman

By reimagining traditional WPA work in the context of a two-year college, we can begin to identify unique challenges and opportunities for a two-year college WPA.

For five years, I have been advocating a writing program administrator (WPA) position at my two-year college. While our vice president of instruction has been sympathetic, the issue has been funding, as it always is around here where our budget decisions often come down to what is needed to open the doors. But this year, with the sudden departure of a tenured faculty member and with enrollment flat or down, enabling the reduction of some class sections, the vice president was able to cobble together enough funding to offer 25 percent reassigned time to create the position of WPA, at least for this academic year; whether the WPA funding will continue as part of the permanent general budget remains to be seen, but I'm hopeful. In the meantime, as a means to prepare and to justify the WPA's continuing existence, I've set to work mapping out the terrain, trying to anticipate the contours of the job, the pitfalls, and the aims. I think this work has helped me see that the WPA at the two-year college (and perhaps at small four-year colleges without a graduate program in English) is not only an essential function but is significantly different from the WPA position at universities and larger colleges. In what follows, I hope to clarify the differences while outlining the major issues I and other two-year college WPAs face; at the same time, I want to address what Victoria Holmsten has found: "The written record of the WPA in the community college appears to be virtually non-existent" (430). I hope this article can begin to alleviate this serious gap.

The Need for the WPA: Classes Do Not a Program Make

When my vice president gave me the news that he was determined to come through with the funding this year somehow, I jokingly asked, "So you actually want a writing program and not just a bunch of writing classes?"

He stared a moment and then said, "That is the most loaded question!"

Loaded, yes, for it assumes there is a difference between offering writing classes and a writing program. A program, I believe, is characterized by an explicitly expressed coherent curriculum with integrated faculty development and assessment (cf. Fulkerson 680). Lacking that, we have only classes loosely related by too-often unspoken and, most likely, conflicting assumptions about aims, means, and purposes.

My question is also loaded because it assumes that without someone to administer a program, one will not exist, or at least not for long. As Edward M. White, in “The Damage of Innovations Set Adrift,” reminds us of writing-intensive programs, “Without faculty development, faculty in the disciplines can teach only what they already know about writing (which isn’t much)” (5). Furthermore, without “support and substructures,” says White (5), such a program will drift off course and become a shell of what it was—no longer a program. I think it is reasonable to believe that without the support and substructure a WPA provides, many two-year college faculty even in English will teach “only what they already know about writing” and in their own peculiar ways, and that writing classes will never quite become a writing program but something else entirely. Consequently, I believe that most two-year colleges—lacking a WPA¹—have a collection of writing classes, not a program.

This lack, however, rather than merely denoting an absence, also connotes for many of us a negative: we do not just lament a lack of a program but actually fear a “bad program,” one which Charles I. Schuster would call a “complacent composition program,” one characterized by uncoordinated practices and inconsistency across sections and possibly (or probably) even within the same class—as Richard Fulkerson says, “It’s easy to create a course that is self-contradictory and thus baffling to students” (680). I think it is no stretch to imagine a collection and especially a sequence of courses that are contradictory and thus baffling to students or, worse, harmful.² What, then, would a good writing program in a two-year college look like?

The “Program” in the Two-Year College: Elitism, Service, and Liberation

A WPA at a two-year college that seeks to create a program from classes necessarily has to have a sense of where and how a writing program fits into his or her particular college community, where the lines of force are, so to speak, and where they intersect, for “to teach at a community college,” says Howard Tinberg in *Border Talk*, “is to be ‘in translation’ or between places.” (vii). Tinberg suggests that this is in contrast to the sense of destination often associated with universities—the place our students want to go, the place most students want to be. Since our students are almost always going elsewhere—transferring to a four-year college or university, entering a new profession—Tinberg says we as teachers have “a complex purpose” (vii). A composition program in a two-year college must, then, also have a complex

purpose, and identifying the components would seem a key priority of a two-year college WPA. The purposes that distinguish a two-year college writing program from a four-year college or university writing program seem to be either (1) unique to two-year colleges, such as vocational and technical program needs, or (2) exaggerations of purposes and conflicts shared with four-year and university writing programs, such as service versus disciplinary integrity, curriculum integration, and faculty preparedness.

First, are we in two-year college composition even more service oriented or do we adhere as much to our own agenda and curriculum as do programs in universities? Raines, in 1990, found that the most frequently cited purposes for courses among two-year college English departments she surveyed were “preparation of students to write for other courses and to transfer, preparation for employment, and development of basic skills” (155). What a new generation of two-year college English teachers would say, however, is unknown. Still, some aspects of the service orientation are unique to two-year colleges, especially the emphasis on basic skills, employment, and technical classes, which students must connect to their humanities courses with the help of faculty, according to Nist and Raines (63). The American Association of Community Colleges reports that 270,000 certificates are awarded annually against 550,000 associate degrees (AACC “Fast Facts”). How many of those students in certificate programs are served by composition courses is not reported, but it is safe to say, I believe, that the need to serve such students is unique to two-year colleges.

Nonetheless, my sense is that the student body of community colleges is changing as tuition at universities continues to climb and as admission requirements become more stringent. My own students are roughly 90 percent transfer bound, possibly since we have an independent technical college in town that offers vocational programs. Still, half of our incoming students take our bridge course, English 100, prior to English 101; moreover, we have a separate developmental English program that offers its own series of courses prior to English 100. Thus, even as more of our students may be “in translation” on their way to a baccalaureate institution, our attention to basic skills doubtless remains greater than at a university (cf. Royer and Gilles 263).

Moreover, we are cognizant of what Nist and Raines claim about a community college: a “non-elitist, non-hierarchical philosophy of education drives the mission of two-year colleges, which is to serve our diverse population” (59). The choice of terms is interesting: “non-elitist, non-hierarchical,” I would guess, is more a wish than a reality. Each year at our graduation, our president asks all first-generation college students to stand for recognition. And every year, I meet or hear of several women and occasionally men for whom going “even” to a community college is seen as an act of rebellion against their family, who see a college education as superfluous at best, self-indulgent or “immoral” at worst, colleges in the minds of some coming down on the wrong side of America’s culture wars.

My college’s “primary mission” is “effective quality education designed to foster the development of students’ knowledge, communication and critical think-

ing skills, personal integrity, global understanding, and appreciation of diversity” (“Mission”). This can easily be seen as “elitist” language, especially the latter two phrases. I have difficulty imagining the families of many of my lower-income students having as goals or values “global understanding” and “appreciation of diversity,” though I can easily imagine such phrases alienating them (perhaps I’m suffering from classism here, but my experience suggests not). Also, each year our faculty are encouraged to attend graduation dressed in full academic regalia, and many take pride in doing so, an obvious show to the audience assembled in the gymnasium of the world the graduates are just now entering and the world many in the bleachers—removed, sidelined—never will. Us and them.

What does this say about composition programs? Yes, we in the community college are egalitarian but we are not non-elitist, not non-hierarchical: we want to offer students power, to help free them from the economic and social margins (to move down out of the bleachers and into the warm company of the faculty). One of the goals of composition, then, would seem to be liberatory, but only loosely in the Freirean sense: to help students “write” their own places in the world and out of the more marginalized classes rather than being written by cultural forces, however we construe them.

But there is another constraint. Our students may chafe at the term “liberated” even if they believed that such liberation were possible or desirable. As Fulkerson says, “[. . .] the public who pay tuition and taxes, the deans, presidents, and politicians who demand accountability, and the students themselves” hold a “different view of what we [in composition] should be up to than we do” (680)—and there are those, like Jeffrey Zorn, who would have us admit that the side that’s “right” is “the world” (753) and that our talk of liberatory pedagogy is misguided, to say the least. These are reasonable observations. As David Bartholomae reminded us years ago, one of the functions of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) was to enable “the expression of a fundamental anxiety about ‘required English’” (44). That is, we must remember that our composition classes are *required*, the only courses, along with math, in my college’s transfer degree and professional programs required of all students. Whatever we may believe our mission in composition to be, our students come largely without choice: someone or something sends them to us for a purpose, however vague. Since we accept this arrangement and ignore the occasional call to make English 101 an elective or to revamp it seriously (see Smit’s *The End of Composition Studies* for an intriguing recent argument), we must also accept the debt that we owe a service and acknowledge the legitimacy of that claim.

Yet, a paradox of service exists for English departments at community colleges. The “service” relationship between composition and other courses clearly exists as a perception and yet the entity supposedly giving the service is usually the largest and most powerful single power bloc on campus. At universities, composition programs are situated in relation to the academy as to “a more powerful Other,” in Carol Hartzog’s terms (qtd. in Janangelo 3). Thus, university writing programs are the marginalized “other.” At two-year colleges, however, English departments,

dominated by composition courses, are near the center if not *the* center in terms of size and power.

No other single department on my campus, possibly with the exception of math, has the power we have to influence hiring, budgeting, and scheduling decisions. Our power is muted, of course, since there are so many other programs and departments vying for scarce resources; but as a single entity, English is the behemoth. We have about forty faculty, full-time and adjunct, whereas the nearest competitor, math, has about half that; no other department or program has more than ten.

Our sense of service, then, is less to our “more powerful Other” on campus and more to the academic community as a whole: I suspect that at two-year colleges, composition courses serve the vague aim of helping students learn to write “in the academy” or “in the professional world,” and not “in their majors,” for which courses do not exist on our campus, nor for other disciplines, which are disparate and relatively small.

So we have identified two key forces that shape our conception of a composition program and that call for our attention: liberation and service, which in our new student body are likely conjoined. First, there is the liberatory notion, though not in the critical/culture studies tradition of James Berlin and Alan France, for instance, but in the sense of empowerment that authority in academic discourse promises—almost an anti-Freirean move in which those on the economic margins (from our “feeder” courses in developmental education and precollege basic writing) are trained in the rhetoric of academic discourse as a service to their stated (or unacknowledged) aims and needs: college degrees and the success and lifestyle promised. (And here is the elitist, hierarchical attitude for which we in the academy are at times loathed.) Second, there is the service notion, which conflicts with the critical/cultural studies aim of “‘liberation’ from dominant discourse” (Fulkerson 660) and yet oddly coincides with it in that our mission seems to wish to help students “evolve as socially just students” (Stanforth, qtd. in Fulkerson 664). Apparently, then, our programs should help students learn academic discourse as a means of entering the privileged classes while enhancing our students’ sense of themselves as world citizens. Our work as two-year college WPAs, then, is cut out for us.

The Role of the Two-Year College WPA: *Hic et Nunc*

Susan McLeod says a WPA must be a “change agent” (qtd. in Schuster xi). What kind of change? Like a writing-across-the-curriculum coordinator, a WPA must work indirectly, upon the curriculum and the faculty rather than individual classes (in the latter role, the WPA would be an instructor). Nonetheless, we are dealing with people and people’s lives. In Stuart C. Brown’s formulation, as WPAs we must “position ourselves as actively engaged in the development [of] and reflection upon the moral and ethical assumptions implicit in our roles as agents and arbiters” (157). As we have seen, the nature of the forces guiding our assumptions of how a writing program should be situated in community colleges is abstract; the consequences of

our actions, however, are concrete: they affect to some degree the real, lived experience of thousands of students. We must balance, therefore, the real and the imagined, the practical and the theoretical, the particular and the general. But where to start?

There is odd agreement on where to start—the here and now of our students and institutions. From a self-described “current-traditionalist” (see Zorn 752) to a champion of the “liberatory” and “emancipatory” pedagogy (see Ira Shor 162) to an expert in program assessment (White; see Royer and Gilles 264), the message is the same: begin here and now. As Mary Rose O’Reilly, author of *Radical Presence: Teaching as Contemplative Practice*, says, “Let methodology follow from the particular (this student, this hour, this blue spruce) rather than from the world of theory” (14). So we begin with these faculty, these students.

Composition Faculty in the Two-Year College: The “Who” Factor

The backgrounds of faculty at my college could hardly be more diverse. We have or have had faculty with a Master of Fine Arts, a Master of Arts in Imaginative Literature, a Master of Arts in English, a Master of Education, a doctorate in literature, several ABDs, and some former high school teachers. We have very few people who specialize in composition/rhetoric but even fewer who have no graduate-level training in teaching composition. Yet the diversity goes deeper. We have many from our neighboring university, whose composition program we are very familiar with and whose writing pedagogies are in agreement with ours; but we have many others from universities across the country—from California to Georgia. We have faculty with newly minted Master of Arts degrees and we have ABDs from twenty years ago. We have a few who keep up with the field (attending the CCCCs and regional Two-Year College English Association [TYCA] conferences), and one who is a leader in the writing center community, but many whose interests lie elsewhere (creative writing, gender or film studies). We have some who are not sure that teaching writing will be their careers (see Winans’ discussion) or how long they’ll stay. Clearly, we cannot adopt what Lester Faigley and Susan Romano call the “convenient fiction” of a “common curriculum” when such diverse backgrounds must surely impact in a dramatic way how curriculum guidelines are interpreted, implemented, or ignored. Instead, “moving discord” is the term Joseph Janangelo offers (6), though I’m guessing that “moving” does not imply any clear aim nor steady progress.

If we accept Lynn Z. Bloom’s claim that WPAs “can and should take charge of training those who teach in the writing program” (74), we must move carefully, for we cannot assume that diversity means ineffectiveness. We might ask, along with Ellen Strenski, “How can these different pedagogical beliefs be exploited for mutual enrichment and reinvention?” (95). Strenski offers observations, focused group reading, creation of a teaching portfolio (96), but, in Kristine Hansen’s words, “in ways that avoid devaluing lore and the practitioners who worked in the field before certified professionals arrived” (32).

The word “professionals” here is telling, I think, as it suggests an ideal toward which the training—perhaps the entire role of the WPA—ought to be oriented. Composition, of course, has long suffered from a sense of not being respected as a professional field, though in the two-year college that is probably less the case, at least among our fellow faculty. The teaching of English composition is not looked down upon since none of us at the two-year college is evaluated (or judged) primarily by publications or grants. So not being seen as “professionals” is not an issue for us (except inasmuch as we work at a community college with all the stigma attached), though I think that not actually behaving as a professional may well be.

As I mentioned above, the diversity of preparation and currency in the field might be cause for concern: Can we say that a person with a Master of Arts in Imaginative Literature and little graduate training in composition, who is not current in the field and does not read the journals or attend the conferences, who relies upon lore primarily in his or her teaching, is a “professional” in composition? It would be difficult to say so. And this raises an even more difficult question: How do we approach this person? Hansen suggests “face-to-face” encounters to change views—not memos or reports or letters (37). Nonmandatory meetings, as nearly all are at my college since we cannot pay adjuncts to attend, are rarely attended by the less engaged. So the WPA in the two-year college must work on a personal, individualized basis. This clearly marks the two-year college WPA as different from the university WPA who often oversees an assembly of TAs: the faculty we nominally oversee are not graduate students and not technically “under” us at all. We must work with our faculty to establish common goals and then work to achieve them. As “change agents,” we must be colleagues, catalysts, and leaders simultaneously, a difficult balancing act.

But where do we lead our faculty? While we can conveniently borrow an aim from our college mission statement and the stated goals of our students—transfer to a university, do well there, and get a degree—as professionals, we cannot sidestep a fundamental disagreement in our field about the focus of writing courses: those who promote the teaching of academic discourse rhetoric and those who promote critical literacy.

Fulkerson’s “Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century” opened a debate that highlights a split in our field, between advocates of what might be called “the rhetoric of academic discourse” and advocates of “critical pedagogy.” As Dickson says, “critical pedagogy (and other alternative rhetorics)” contests “the assumption that *functional* literacy is more important than *critical* literacy” (733). Of course, there is no monolithic theory or approach that can adequately present “critical pedagogy,” but Dickson describes a focus on “discourse” rather than “rhetoric,” where discourse emphasizes, among other things, “the historical and material histories” (735) of the writers and writing. Those who emphasize the rhetoric of academic discourse (manifest, perhaps, by such works as David Rossenwasser and Jill Stephen’s *Writing Analytically* or Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein’s *They Say, I Say*) would focus on the rhetorical moves that signify or create authority within the academy and, by extension, the professional world.

It may be that we can reduce this split to a matter of emphasis, but as Dickson points out, there is a real question about how much can be accomplished well in a quarter or semester: When something has to give, what is it? And who decides? What do “we” want—in our college, our department, our program? My guess is that we, as WPAs in two-year colleges, must face the challenge of forging a theoretical center from which to work, encouraging all faculty to participate, but finding ways of working with or replacing faculty who are theoretically opposed or merely indifferent. Undoubtedly, coming from an egalitarian perspective as we in the community colleges like to believe we do, this may be an unsettling realization.³

However, as we have found repeatedly thus far, there are conditions and concessions that must be considered. In many places, my college included, there simply are not enough well-qualified, theoretically informed adjunct faculty to staff all of our classes. One year as chair, I hired six adjunct faculty from a hiring pool of seven. (I was fortunate that most of the six turned out to be very good in the classroom.) But the reality remains that we often have to “take a chance on unknown teachers,” as Brown says (156). Even worse, as Sharon Crowley points out, there is no built-in assurance that people hired to teach writing really know anything about it (qtd. in Schell 183). When people with such diverse views and training come together, says Peter Griffin, an English instructor at Bristol Community College, we “may see disagreement about the way we teach the use of evidence or logic in our writing courses” (qtd. in Tinberg 60)—to say the least.

Beyond training and background in composition and rhetoric, there are other factors that make the prospect of creating a unified faculty seem almost impossible. The faculty shifts every year, with new faculty coming on and other faculty leaving. The material realities of adjunct life—teaching at multiple campuses, poor salaries, poor support—often “compromise a teacher’s ability to [. . .] internalize a deep understanding of a curriculum” (Schell 185). We could add “gender-specific problems” that affect how women faculty teach (Ferganchick 332), since on most campuses women are the majority in composition. The problem of training and professionalism is not, then, merely a matter of determining what and how; the “who” of faculty has become incredibly complex.

Community College Student Writers: A Broader Spectrum

The other key part of the *hic et nunc* of the WPA existence is the students. Nancy Sommers and Laura Saltz express succinctly an insight most of us have felt: “Whether they enter college as strong or weak writers, freshmen voice the challenge of writing in an unfamiliar genre—the genre of academic writing—in similar ways. On the threshold of college, freshmen are invited into their education by writing” (127). I like the phrase “invited into their education,” as it is in keeping both with the community college mission and with my view of the function of first-year writing courses (gate-openers rather than gate-keepers). But who is it that we are inviting in? And by what means?

“Students as writers,” I think, is the qualification we must remember when we speak of our students at two-year colleges. Our students doubtless come with complicated lives, and those lives impact their performance in our classes (cf. the PBS documentary *Discounted Dreams: High Hopes and Harsh Realities at America’s Community Colleges*). Nationally, 27 percent of full-time students also work full-time (AACC “Student Enrollment”), many are single parents, many are returning to school years after leaving high school or a first attempt at college. Another portion are current high school students, participating at my college in our Running Start program, which allows them to earn college credits while completing their high school education (cf. AACC “Student Enrollment”). In terms of age and socioeconomic class, these students are all mixed with “traditional” students, the kind of students my colleagues at our neighboring university tell me constitute the vast majority in their first-year writing courses.

The makeup of the student body at my college challenges the creation of a writing program that is inflexible and unresponsive to student perspectives on education. Since for many, a college education is something “other” to their lives and their families’ lives—seen as “not for them” because they “are not smart enough” or because they “messed up” their first time, or as “beyond them” because they are young and inexperienced—a WPA must forge a writing program that always keeps the current students’ tenuous position at the margins in mind; we cannot assume, as colleagues with a more uniform student body may be able to, that our students form any kind of bloc. What we must do is help students write their way into belonging from whatever position relative to the academy they now hold.

We must, then, be wary of pedagogies that appease discomfort, that seek to minimize or assuage conflict. As Min-Zhan Lu reminds us, neither acculturation nor accommodation are viable options for basic writers—and half of incoming students are “basic writers,” and I might argue that the majority of all first-year community college students face similar challenges. Rather, we must contextualize our pedagogy in the conflicted experiences of our students, constantly seeking those areas of conflict or tension at the intersection of students’ lived experiences and the educational environment they have now entered. In our composition courses, this may well influence focus of inquiry, such as class issues in colleges and universities or special challenges of students who are working and attending college. I believe that if we make students’ lives their own subject of analysis, the writing can be transformative, can put the student “in the center of their own liberal arts education” as Sommers says (“Shaped”), and can help them be an active agent of change in their own educational lives, possibly for the first time.

Transformation and the WPA in the Two-Year College

In summary, it is clear we in two-year colleges need a WPA to shape a collection of courses into a program that responds to the needs and expectations of our particular institutions and the academy at large, and to work with a diverse faculty to define that program and to move the faculty toward greater professionalism. But

such a WPA must also recognize that the student writers we teach have complicated lives, impacted by class issues, among others. Finally, the two-year college WPA must be cognizant of the ongoing arguments and research shaping current composition theory and pedagogy, as well as expectations of our programs from our colleagues in other disciplines and the broader community.

But there's so much more that impacts the job of a WPA in a two-year college: budgets, teaching loads, class sizes, shifting demographics of community college students. In order to avoid becoming overloaded or overwhelmed, I think it wise to step back and remember a most common refrain: "Consider doing more listening [. . .] to staff, senior colleagues, and our central administrators," Janangelo suggests (18). Listening to what end? Here is Thich Nhat Hanh on dialogue:

In a true dialogue, both sides are willing to change. We have to appreciate that truth can be received from outside of—not only within—our own group. If we do not believe that, entering into dialogue would be a waste of time. If we think we monopolize the truth and we still organize a dialogue, it is not authentic. We have to believe that by engaging in dialogue with the other person, we have the possibility of making a change within ourselves, that we can become deeper. Dialogue is not a means of assimilation in the sense that one side expands and incorporates the other into its "self." Dialogue must be practiced on the basis of "non-self." We have to allow what is good, beautiful, and meaningful in the other's tradition to transform us. (9)

Transformation is what we seek, I think, though perhaps one that is gentle, attentive, caring—for students, faculty, and all involved: we wish to move from disorder to order, from disparate agendas to a common vision and practice. So perhaps the position of Writing Program Administrator is inappropriately named at the two-year college, suggesting as it does something a bit static by the last term. Instead, something more dynamic can be envisioned, something like a field of being in which the two-year college WPA stands at the center and listens, "listening people"—and programs—"into existence" (O'Reilly 29). What that is or may be remains for me just beyond the horizon.

Notes

1. In 1990, Helon Howell Raines surveyed two hundred two-year colleges and found that only 13 percent have "a director of writing" and only 7 percent have "a coordinator of writing directing a separate program" (154). Over a decade later, Holmsten pointed out that "it is possible that this work has existed, but has taken on different names and forms in the context of different institutions" (430). However, Raines says she "did hope to find a pattern, to see some model of community-college writing programs emerge" but "none did" (152).

Replicating some of Raines's work, Tim N. Taylor in 2007 surveyed 107 colleges and received twenty-one responses and found a more complicated arrangement: four with designated or de facto WPAs, and sixteen with some

combination of chair or “team leader” or collaborative effort. Taylor concludes that “out of necessity” collaborative efforts arise with “enormous responsibility but sometimes very little power.” So Taylor’s findings support Raines and Holmsten, though Taylor offers a different take on the findings, suggesting that two-year college English faculty are already enacting a “post-masculinist direction” via collaboration. Still, Taylor confirms Holmsten’s findings, that many faculty fulfilling a WPA-like role are still teaching a full load (431).

By contrast, the Portland Resolution, adopted by the Council of Writing Program Administrators in 1992, offers guidelines for the WPA position including the need for a clear statement on “equivalence” between administrative duties and teaching that would impact reassigned teaching duties. It seems clear that the vast majority of two-year colleges very likely do not have anyone remotely meeting the working-condition guidelines outlined in the Portland Resolution but most likely have someone or some persons who has or have, in the words of the resolution, “unrealistic workload expectations with little credit for administrative work.”

2. And here’s the second main reason a WPA is needed in two-year colleges: size. Nearly half of all undergraduates in American colleges and universities are enrolled in two-year colleges (AACCC “Fast Facts”) and half of all students taking composition in America do so in two-year colleges (Raines 151). At the majority of the community colleges in my state, most composition courses are taught by adjunct faculty, many without sufficient support of or commitment to the department. Without a designated WPA, it’s unlikely that coordination of so many people’s activities can be possible, and so a programmatic level of commonality among individual sections of even the same course cannot be assumed.

3. The composition community expects that the experiences students have in different sections of the same class be relatively the same. At universities with WPAs, such is certainly the case. At New Mexico State, Brown claims that students should have “close to the same curriculum” across sections, with the first-year course there “scripted” with a standardized syllabus, assignments, etc. (156). While there’s no need to assume that such rigidity is needed to ensure consistency across sections, the desire for such consistency remains, as it does for Fulkerson, who was moved to question the bases of the field of composition as he was “selecting texts and devising a syllabus for [his] teaching assistants to use in multiple sections” (654). In the WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition, the Council of Writing Program Administrators states: “To some extent, we seek to regularize what can be expected to be taught in first-year composition.” So it’s clear that consistency across sections is desired by the profession, if only “to some extent.” ◀

Works Cited

- AACC. 2006. "Fast Facts." American Association of Community Colleges. 20 Apr. 2007 <<http://www.aacc.nche.edu/>>. <http://www2.aacc.nche.edu/research/index.htm>
- . "Student Enrollment and Characteristics." American Association of Community Colleges. 20 Apr. 2007 <<http://www.aacc.nche.edu/>>. http://www2.aacc.nche.edu/research/index_students.htm.
- Bartholomae, David. "Freshman English, Composition, and CCCC." *College Composition and Communication* 40:1 (1989): 38–50.
- Bloom, Lynn Z. "Making a Difference." *Resituating Writing*. Janangelo and Hansen 73–81.
- Brown, Stuart C., Theresa Enos, and Catherine Chaput, eds. *The Writing Program Administrator's Resource: A Guide to Reflective Institutional Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.
- Brown, Stuart C. "Applying Ethics: A Decision-Making Heuristic for Writing Program Administrators." Brown, Enos, and Chaput 155–64.
- Dickson, Alan Chidsey. "Interchanges." *College Composition and Communication* 57:4 (2006): 730–38.
- Faigley, Lester, and Susan Romano. "Going Electronic: Creating Multiple Sites for Innovation in a Writing Program." Janangelo and Hansen 46–58.
- Ferganchick, Julia K. "Contrapower Harassment in Program Administration: Establishing Teacher Authority." Brown, Enos, and Chaput 331–40.
- Fulkerson, Richard. "Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century." *College Composition and Communication* 56:4 (2005): 654–87.
- Graff, Gerald and Cathy Birkenstein. *They Say/I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2006.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. *Living Buddha, Living Christ*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1995.
- Hansen, Kristine. "Face to Face with Part-Timers: Ethics and the Professionalization of Writing Faculties." Janangelo and Hansen 23–45.
- Holmsten, Victoria. "This Site Under Construction: Negotiating Space for WPA Work in the Community College." Brown, Enos, and Chaput 429–38.
- Janangelo, Joseph, and Kristine Hansen, eds. *Resituating Writing: Constructing and Administering Writing Programs*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1995.
- Janangelo, Joseph. "Theorizing Difference and Negotiating Defferends: (Un) naming Writing Programs' Many Complexities and Strengths." Janangelo and Hansen 3–22.

- Lu, Min-Zhan. "Conflict and Struggle: The Enemies or Preconditions of Basic Writing?" *College English* 54 (1992): 887-913; Rpt. in *Academic Reading: Reading and Writing Across the Disciplines*. Ed. Janet Giltrow. Peterborough, Ontario, Canada: Broadview Press, 1995. 121-50.
- "Mission Statement." Whatcom Community College. 10 Apr. 2007 <<http://www.whatcom.ctc.edu/content/AboutItem.phtml?art=201>>.
- Nist, Elizabeth A., and Helon H. Raines. "Two-Year Colleges: Explaining and Claiming our Majority." Janangelo and Hansen 59-70.
- O'Reilly, Mary Rose. *Radical Presence: Teaching as Contemplative Practice*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1998.
- "Portland Resolution, The: Guidelines for Writing Program Administrator Positions." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 16.1/2 (Fall/Winter 1992): 88-94. 10 Apr. 2007 <<http://www.english.ilstu.edu/Hesse/portres.htm>>.
- Raines, Helon Howell. "Is There a Writing Program in This College? Two Hundred and Thirty-Six Two-Year Schools Respond." *College Composition and Communication* 41.2 (1990): 151-65.
- Rossenwasser, David and Jill Stephen. *Writing Analytically*. 4th ed. Boston: Thompson/Wadsworth, 2006.
- Royer, Daniel J, and Roger Gilles. "Placement Issues." Brown, Enos, and Chaput 263-74.
- Schell, Eileen E. "Part-Time/Adjunct Issues: Working Toward Change." Brown, Enos, and Chaput 181-202.
- Schuster, Charles I. "Forward." Janangelo and Hansen ix-xiv.
- Shor, Ira. "Why Teach about Social Class?" *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 33:2 (2005): 161-70.
- Smit, David W. *The End of Composition Studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.
- Sommers, Nancy. *Shaped by Writing: The Undergraduate Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Expository Writing Program, 2002 (video).
- Sommers, Nancy, and Laura Saltz. "The Novice as Expert: Writing the Freshman Year." *College Composition and Communication* 56:1 (2004): 124-49.
- Strenski, Ellen. "Recruiting and Retraining Experienced Teachers: Balancing Game Plans in an Entrepreneurial Force-Field." Janangelo and Hansen 82-99.
- Taylor, Tim N. "Writing Program Administration at the Two-Year College: Ghosts in the Machine." CCCC. Hilton New York, New York. 24 March 2007.
- Tinberg, Howard B. *Border Talk: Writing and Knowing in the Two-Year College*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1997.

“WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition.” Council of Writing Program Administrators (2000). 10 Apr. 2007 <<http://www.english.ilstu.edu/Hesse/outcomes.html>>.

White, Edward M. “The Damage of Innovations Set Adrift.” *AAHE Bulletin* 43:3 (1990): 3–5.

Winans, Sherri. “From Part-Time to Tenured Faculty at a Two-Year College: Entering the Conversation from the Margin.” 10 Apr. 2007 <<http://faculty.whatcom.ctc.edu/swinans/winans.htm>>.

Zorn, Jeffrey. “Interchanges.” *College Composition and Communication* 57:4 (2006): 751–56.

Jeffrey Klausman is currently WPA at Whatcom Community College in Bellingham, Washington, where he has been on the faculty since 1996, after earning a Doctor of Arts in English at Idaho State University.

TYCA SECRETARY TO BE ELECTED BY MAIL BALLOT

The Two-Year College English Association (TYCA), the national organization of two-year college English faculty within NCTE, has named the following candidates for the position of **Secretary** in the spring elections (one to be elected; term to expire in 2011): **Jeffrey Andelora**, Mesa Community College, Arizona; and **Clint Gardner**, Salt Lake Community College, Utah.

SEARCH FOR NEW CCC EDITOR

CCCC is seeking a new editor of *College Composition and Communication*. The term of the present editor will end in December 2009. Interested persons should send a letter of application to be received no later than **June 2, 2008**.

Letters should be accompanied by (1) a vita, (2) one published writing sample, and (3) a statement of vision, to include any suggestions for changing the journal as well as features of the journal to be continued. Do not send books, monographs, or other materials which cannot be easily copied for the Search Committee. Applicants are urged to consult with administrators on the question of time, resources, and other services that may be required. NCTE staff members are available to provide advice and assistance to all potential applicants in approaching administrators about institutional support and in explaining NCTE's support for editors. The applicant appointed by the CCCC Executive Committee in November 2008 will effect a transition in 2009, preparing for his or her first issue in February 2010. The appointment term is five years. Applications or requests for information should be addressed to Kurt Austin, CCC Editor Search Committee, NCTE, 1111 W. Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801-1096; (217) 328-3870, extension 3619; kaustin@ncte.org.