Editor’s Note: In my continuing effort to introduce our readers to Forum’s editorial board, I have given over the duties of composing this issue’s introduction to Steve Fox of Indiana University—Purdue University, Indianapolis.

A Fractured Field
Steve Fox

In this issue of Forum, we publish one longer article rather than two or more shorter articles. The editor and editorial board believe that occasionally featuring such an article helps advance the kind of conversations Forum was designed to highlight. In “Identity Crisis: Daring to Identify as More than ‘Just’ Adjunct Composition Instructors,” Gina Hanson and Chloe de los Reyes explore the important question of how contingent composition faculty perceive themselves and are perceived by their colleagues. Are such faculty “compositionists”? Do they belong to and contribute to the discipline of composition, or are they merely practitioners of the knowledge and theory created by tenure-track faculty?

I don’t want to over-simplify Hanson and de los Reyes’s arguments or steal their thunder. They make their case eloquently, and they demonstrate in this article that they are indeed part of our field, contributing to its conversations, whether others acknowledge their identity or not. But can one fully embrace a professional identity if others do not recognize that identity? What makes one visible in a crowd? Publication or conference acceptance might shine a light on someone’s professional identity. But no doubt many contingent faculty return from a conference at which they presented and were fully engaged, only to find themselves still categorized back home as “instructors” and not as “professors” of a discipline. Then there are
contingent faculty who engage in scholarly teaching but do not present at conferences or publish in journals. After all, they are not required or expected to disseminate their work in those ways, and seldom do they receive time, money, or other resources that enable such dissemination.

As a field, we should join the conversation that Hanson and de los Reyes have invited us into. In fact, higher education faculty in all disciplines need to have this conversation. As philosophy lecturer Chris Nagel observes, higher education faculty face a crisis of professionalism. Professions are granted the right to set their own standards and review themselves, but they are also expected to serve the public. That public has expressed some doubts about our profession, doubts of course fueled by people with various agendas. However, as Nagel points out, we as a profession have lost our own way and do not fully understand the work that we do. Nagel argues that our claim to be a profession that seeks and disseminates truth is undercut by the splintering of faculty roles, so that contingent faculty—the majority of the faculty workforce—are not seen as full members of the profession. Nagel rightly calls for putting our house in order so that we can address a skeptical public with confidence:

[Faculty addressing one another as peers, as members of the same profession, would constitute the faculty—the whole faculty—as just that kind of self-consciously organized group who could speak with genuine authority about who they are, what they do, what they value, and to what standards they hold themselves. (13)
I will follow Hanson and de los Reyes in identifying myself professionally. I am a tenured full professor, a longtime Writing Program Administrator (WPA) in a large writing program at a public university. Our writing program faculty include four tenure-line faculty, fifteen full-time lecturers and senior lecturers, and twenty-five “associate faculty” and “senior associate faculty” (part-time lecturers who have no contracts and few benefits but who sometimes teach for us for ten or more years). We are a collegial group and have worked over the years to include everyone in program decisions, curricular development, assessment, and professional development. With scarce resources, we encourage non-tenure-track faculty to attend and present at conferences and to write and publish, but such professional involvement is not required in the same way it is for tenure-line faculty. At our program workshops, we discuss scholarly articles and book chapters.

I’m sure those realities are not always enough to enable our contingent faculty to feel part of the field, to feel that their status in the program, department, and university is respected and equivalent to that of their tenure-track colleagues. As WPA, I have advocated for improved working conditions and status for NTT faculty in my program for all of my twenty-six years here. I have co-presented and co-written with my NTT colleagues. I argued for scholarship to be included in all full-time department faculty’s annual review guidelines—not with the expectation that lecturers have to publish, but with the expectation that we will support and encourage scholarly work for all faculty. I myself was tenured and recently promoted to full professor with teaching as my area of excellence, and the same is true for many of my department colleagues. Our School of Liberal Arts was the first unit on campus to develop a promotion policy for associate (adjunct) faculty, and several writing program instructors received that promotion two years ago; more will be applying for it in 2019, as the program was reactivated after a budget-crisis-induced suspension.

I say all this not to tout my bona fides or my “wokeness,” but to describe the professional community within which I work. Many compositionists could name similar characteristics of their programs and departments and their own work. None of that is sufficient.

The field remains fractured, with too many of our colleagues not granted the privileges and opportunities of professional status. Tenured compositionists often favor their PhD students over longtime adjunct faculty (not to say that doctoral students aren’t mistreated, but they suffer such indignities as part of a process of attaining tenure-track status). Tenured compositionists aren’t sure what to make of NTT position requests that “prefer” applicants have a PhD in the field, or how to integrate longtime colleagues who have graduate degrees in other fields (literature,
creative writing, education, journalism). Tenured compositionists sometimes move away from teaching first-year writing while continuing to supervise the curriculum of those courses and “train” the faculty who teach them. As Hanson and de los Reyes note, professional organizations like CCCC and AAUP argue for the value of tenure, but in doing so can end up treating their non-tenure-track colleagues as second-class outsiders. They do this often while decrying the poor working conditions of these NTT colleagues and expressing the utopian wish that enough tenure-line faculty could be hired to eliminate NTT positions. If asked why all faculty need to be tenure-line, they sometimes point to what NTT faculty lack.

So how can we act as one faculty, recognizing that all of us can be members of a profession and a discipline, working together as theorizers and practitioners, as scholars and teachers? Can we advocate that our NTT colleagues be on the bus without throwing them under the bus in the process? Read Hanson and de los Reyes and see what you think. Let Forum know what you think, too.

Work Cited

Identity Crisis: Daring to Identify as More than “Just” Adjunct Composition Instructors
Gina Hanson and Chloe de los Reyes

In “Complicating Composition,” the introduction to Under Construction: Working at the Intersections of Composition Theory, Research, and Practice, Christine Farris and Chris Anson write: “Composition, in seeking a disciplinary identity, is questioning the ways it creates and mediates knowledge and the ways in which that knowledge informs and is informed by various contexts for research and practice” (1). Farris and Anson credit the rapid transformations of the field to “the inevitable burgeoning of a theoretically interdisciplinary field with a strong orientation toward self-reflection” (1). This article, thus, will focus on how our act of self-reflection illuminated the transitional and transactional phases that were so critical to our developing identities as composition practitioners. In particular, we are interested in exploring how the label “compositionist” informs the institutional status and pro-
fessional identities of those who do, don’t, or even perhaps aren’t allowed to claim it. We hope this article will provoke discussions on how the field of composition often constructs non-tenure track faculty, as not only adjuncts to the institution but as—even more problematically for us—adjuncts to the field of composition studies.

**Adjunct Teaching**

The negative aspects of the adjunct professor experience have garnered much attention, but perhaps the most disheartening part of our research for this article was discovering that so little has seemed to change in the adjunct experience from what has been described in scholarship from decades past. In Eileen Schell’s *Gypsy Academics and Mother-Teachers*, published in 1998, we see work narratives from adjuncts that sound almost identical to the laments we hear over coffee with our adjunct colleagues today. And while substandard economic conditions seem to be the first complaint of many of our fellow adjunct professors, many feel it is the alienation and isolation of the position that is most troubling. For composition adjuncts, this alienation results in a sense of disciplinary hypocrisy—in our classrooms, we battle the systematic alienation of students who lack certain social privileges only to be alienated ourselves for our own lack of socio-professional privileges. This sense of hypocrisy also results in a not-so-subtle anger that tints the theorizing of our adjunct work. An example of this anger can be seen in Jody Norton’s “Reason, Responsibility, and the Post-Tenure University: Theorizing the Role of the Adjunct Professor” as she explains how collegiality often breaks down when outwardly egalitarian tenure-line faculty are forced to consider their own institutional privilege when addressing the issue of contingent faculty:

> This sort of bureaucratic doublespeak reproduces the cast of mind exhibited by members of the dominant culture towards racial, ethnic, sexual, and gender minorities, immigrants, and others: you are us, but whenever we are made anxious about the implications of your proximity for our identity we shall remind you, in unambiguous terms, that you are not us. (19–20)

What Norton describes here stems from the uneasiness of what adjuncts represent to the future of higher education: *We, tenure-line compositionists, want to fight for your rights as adjuncts, but your increasing existence in academia will erode tenured positions and ultimately jeopardize academic freedom.* This paradoxical sentiment has been echoed by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Until just a few years ago, the CCCC Executive Committee had long claimed in their “Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of
Writing” that “[t]he quality, integrity, and continuity of instruction and the principle of academic freedom are best ensured by a full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty” (334). For the AAUP, the constant turnover of contingent faculty weakens faculty governance, and “[t]he integrity of faculty work is threatened as parts of the whole are divided and assigned piecemeal to instructors, lecturers, graduate students, specialists, researchers, and even administrators” (“Contingent” 173). Moreover, the AAUP adds that “academic freedom is weakened when a majority of the faculty cannot rely on the protections of tenure” (“Contingent”173). And as James Sledd highlights: “In the long run the use of contingent labor weakens the professoriate. It is hard to argue that tenure is essential to academic freedom when half the faculty will never be tenured” (274). As a result of this uncomfortable relationship between tenured and contingent faculty, adjuncts are often excluded from the programmatical conversations that inform the very classes they are teaching. This strict allegiance to institutional rank is detrimental to the status and identity of adjuncts because it alienates us—Others us—from the core of our profession. It also constructs tenure-line faculty as knowledge-makers and adjuncts as mere practitioners, a distinction that degrades the spirit of collaboration that undergirds most of the best practices for first-year composition (FYC) instruction.

Our Story

Tenure-line composition faculty often make up a relatively homogenous group of professionals. After all, part of the appeal of the national search is to find composition faculty who will “fit in” nicely with the existing tenure-track faculty. However, adjunct composition faculty often work within a wildly diverse rank, sometimes working alongside FYC professors who know nothing about composition at all. We are often last-minute hires with little to no vetting, and we often know little to nothing about our adjunct colleagues’ professional backgrounds and areas of expertise. The two of us—Chloe and Gina—could not be more different. Chloe is a thirty-something who was born in the Philippines and moved to the US in middle school. Her professional interests revolve around writing centers, multilingual writing, the intersections of applied linguistics and composition studies and the intersections of language, identity, and culture. Gina is a middle-aged lesbian from Southern California whose first language is American Sign Language. Gina’s professional interests center on WAD/WID and the intersections of composition and creative writing. Besides both of us being women, our only real shared experience is the stigma associated with being adjunct composition professors.¹
Although we both have taught FYC at neighboring private universities, our shared site is a public four-year institution in the California State University system. We both teach in our English department’s first-year composition stretch program, and we both teach or have taught writing in other campus departments as well (Chloe in our International Extension Program and Gina in our Department of Natural Sciences). We both generally teach four writing-intensive courses a quarter. Like tenure-line composition faculty, our professional interests vary considerably. But unlike tenure-line composition faculty, our working conditions and limited opportunities to contribute to the campus outside of the classroom do not vary much from term to term.

We point this out because despite all our differences, we are intrigued by our shared responses to our shared professional identity. We cannot claim to be compositionists or rhetoricians or linguists or creative writers because our professional identity has been defined for us: part-time lecturers. We are defined by a work schedule (part-time) and by a single trait of teaching (lecturer) because we are not expected to be or do more than that. Our tenure-line faculty, on the other hand, are defined by their specializations and their vital roles in protecting shared governance and academic freedom. In other words, we are the workers and they are the thinkers.

To illustrate how deeply rooted these constructions of adjunct (worker) and compositionist (thinker) manifest themselves in day-to-day interactions, we’d like to share an event that occurred in the early stages of writing this article. The two of us were invited to serve on a panel in a graduate class for future FYC professors. We were both incredibly excited. We loved that our work was being taken seriously, and that our experiences as FYC professors were seen as important enough to share with others. The panel consisted of the two of us, plus another adjunct professor and a tenure-line composition professor. When the classroom instructor introduced the members of the panel, she introduced us as “some of our [campus’s] adjunct professors” and the tenure-line professor as “one of the department’s compositionists.” Interestingly, many of the questions that the grad students subsequently addressed...
to the three of us “adjuncts” had to do with how to get employment, how to follow
departmental guidelines, and how to manage classrooms. The compositionist, on the
other hand, fielded questions about theory and pedagogy and about how theory informs
practice. The three of us seemed to be offered a wonderful opportunity to contribute knowl-
edge within a group of composition-minded people, but once institutional labels were in-
troduced, our audience located our expertise in our worker identity. We had been robbed of
our disciplinarity and defined instead by our institutional rank.

When we started to ask ourselves why they—and we—made these distinctions
between compositionist-thinker and teacher-worker, we returned to many of the
foundational texts we read in our graduate composition programs. While these texts
had once outlined for us the embattled history of composition’s fight for disciplinar-
ity, we now saw the distinctions between theorizer and practitioner being reified
in these texts. Farris and Anson, for example, write, “Compositionists’ knowledge-
making activity is increasingly bound up in context and self-reflexivity rather than
a question for models that will tell us the best way to produce ‘good writing’ or the
most effective teachers of writing” (3). In this two-tier construction, one rank theo-
rizes practices and training for the other rank, who is somehow supposed to enact
those practices without the capacity to theorize themselves. In other words, this
two-tier distinction constructs us more as composition workers (in need of training
and skill development) rather than composition thinkers (capable of contributing to
the field and our individual composition programs).

Bringing It All Together

“Compositionists might be said to research and construct a meta-discourse, a total-
izing narrative that explains ‘writing’; in other words, we create a ‘theory’ of com-
position,” writes Christopher Ferry (12). But are we, as adjuncts, compositionists?
To most in our field, it seems we are not. To many in our field, compositionists must
contribute knowledge to our field through research and scholarship, and because
our adjunct position does not require that we research and publish, then we aren’t
“true” compositionists. Real compositionists do more than merely teach. They must
manage institutional writing programs or teach in graduate programs to be con-
sidered full-fledged members of the composition club. And while many have been
critical of compositionists who aren’t in the FYC classroom, inherent in many of the
defensive claims for being outside of the classroom is that what happens outside the classroom is more important. Consider the 2005 JAC article “We Compositionists: Toward Engaged Professionalism,” in which Chris Gallagher asks:

Was I more of a composition ‘specialist’ when I taught 5-5 at three different institutions, or when I had a 2-2 teaching load and led two statewide writing and assessment initiatives? Surely, time spent in the classroom is an impoverished metric for either teaching commitment or teaching impact. (79)

Gallagher’s frustration is understandable to us. We, too, are frustrated by these troublesome definitions of composition specialist. But we’re frustrated for different reasons. It is improbable that we, as adjuncts, will ever be allowed to lead “statewide writing and assessment initiatives” because those projects are often reserved for tenure-line compositionists. In fact, tenure and the label “compositionist” seem inseparable as evidenced by Gallagher later in his essay:

What compositionist, striving for tenure, has not wondered if her talents might do more good in the world outside the academy? […] In short, what compositionist has not worried that she is a little too comfortable? And at the same time, it must be admitted that we compositionists fret over losing what we have—our jobs, our tenure, the respect of our colleagues, the relative autonomy of our programs, the colleagues we actually like, and so on. (79–80)

Clearly, this description of a compositionist leaves little room for non-tenure-track faculty. Unfortunately, our specialization (teaching in the FYC classroom) seems to be not only “an impoverished metric for either teaching commitment or teaching impact” but also an impoverished metric for determining our impact on the discipline itself. Wouldn’t it be in our discipline’s best interest to define compositionists by shared practices, values, and knowledge rather than by an institutionally defined measurement of expertise?

Composition’s troubled history with defining its work has contributed to a concerning split between “practitioner” or teacher and “knowledge-maker” or researcher. Sadly, adjuncts are often viewed merely as those “who do the work that the compositionists theorize about” (Sledd 275). Viewing adjuncts as solely practitioners denies us the specialization needed to understand what it is we are “practitioning.” When adjuncts are constructed as the workers and not the thinkers, they become something our field wants to distance itself from—composition has worked too hard to establish itself as an autonomous discipline, as a bona fide body of knowledge that tenure-line faculty can appropriately contribute to. In her WPA listerv post recruiting participants for a 2018 CCCC workshop entitled “Workshop on Developing and Publishing Classroom-Based Research”, Melissa Ianetta writes:
“Given that classroom practice is central to our definition as a professional community, the under-representation of classroom research in the books and journals of our field is somewhat surprising.” This is not surprising to the two of us or to many other adjuncts. If our professional community does little to move beyond the two-tier system of composition thinkers and composition workers, our community’s defining practice will continue to go under-researched and underdeveloped as the divide between practice and theory grows wider.

Until our discipline is able to truly allow the practitioners in our field to fully participate in the knowledge-making of our field, we will place the responsibility for the future of our discipline firmly on the shoulders of tenured faculty—a dying breed in today’s colleges and universities—and sacrifice the potential that non-tenure-track professionals offer in creating a thriving, long-lasting discipline; not to mention, we will overlook the ways in which the quality of teaching within our FYC programs will never improve if the growing number of adjuncts who teach in these programs cannot participate fully in the body of knowledge that informs the pedagogies they are being asked to enact. As Harris points out:

I have come to believe that we have succumbed to a professional logic in which establishing composition as a research field is seen as the key to improving the teaching of writing to undergraduates. But there will never be close to enough tenure-stream compositionists to teach all the sections of first-year writing offered at U.S. colleges and universities each year; indeed, there will never be enough English professors to do so. The tenure system has done little to prevent the exploitation of part-time teachers of writing—and simply granting tenure to a few more Ph.D.s in rhetoric and composition each year won’t fix that problem. (“Meet” 56)

Ultimately, we contend that adjunct teaching in composition need not be an “undesirable” job. But in order for this to become a truth, more than merely improved economic conditions for adjuncts needs to be considered. In other words, even with improved working conditions, adjuncts in the field of composition studies would still suffer with sub-standard professional conditions. Because our field seems to reserve the title of compositionist solely for those in the privileged academic class, as adjunct composition instructors, we often become good enough to work for you, but not good enough to think with you. This distinction matters because it changes how we see ourselves and how we are seen by our students and our institutional colleagues.

The crux of our argument is this: even if colleges and universities across the nation improved the economic conditions for adjunct professors, unless the field of composition studies improves the professional conditions of adjunct professors (especially those with M.A. degrees), the lived realities of adjunct composition
professors would still be dreary. At our site, we often hear of the great strides our union has made in securing long-term contracts for adjuncts. Both of us have three-year contracts, which means we receive health benefits, but it doesn’t necessarily mean we are any better off in terms of job stability. We are still contingent faculty, and we often feel the sting of that status during spring and summer quarters when there isn’t enough work for us. It’s during these times of underemployment that we research and develop papers to present at professional conferences or to publish. Even without the promise of tenure, we want to be seen (and be “allowed” to self-identify) as compositionists. For us, it’s the only thing that keeps us in the field as we watch our fellow adjuncts leave academia for greener pastures in the private sector. But the fight to be taken seriously in our field is a tough one, an exhausting one. One, neither of us is sure we are willing to fight for years and years to come. We could be content (happy even) as non-tenured compositionist-professors if only we could be treated like compositionists and knowledgeable professors by our disciplinary “peers.”

Conclusion

In this article, we have voiced many of our frustrations with how the identity and status of adjunct composition professors are complicated by the large gulf that divides the field of composition according to institutionally defined labels. We are emphatic, however, that our frustrations stem from a strong desire to be serious, contributing members to this field we love so much. We are so grateful to the faculty who work hard at doing what they can to change the material working conditions for adjunct faculty, but we argue that solely improving economic conditions for adjuncts would not necessarily translate to improved professional conditions. In the spirit of starting a conversation about how our field constructs adjuncts, we want to conclude by drawing attention to what we think are the two most troubling aspects of our involuntary disciplinary identity construction.

Adjuncts are constructed as teachers who do not DO research. It is true that adjuncts often do not need to do research in order to earn tenure, but that doesn’t mean we don’t research. When the two of us set out to write this article, we could not write it without doing any research first. We were not excused from the traditional discursive practice of researching what’s already been said and foreground-
ing our work in some theoretical framework simply because we are “teachers” and not “researchers.” Research is a discursive practice for composition. It's what compositionists do. In fact, our classroom experiences are often the most useful kind of research in our field. In “Do College Teachers Have to Be Scholars?,” Frank Donoghue asks: “What if pedagogy—class preparation and reading groups—were recognized as scholarship by administrators?” (184). Certainly, in a field that is a “teaching subject,” this can’t be too wild of a suggestion.

Additionally, when adjuncts do research, it’s often not done for any foreseeable gain in professional status. Instead, we research solely to participate in the knowledge-building of our discipline. And we do this in spite of increased stakes. We do not enjoy the same level of academic freedom that our tenure-line colleagues do. Don Eron points out that “Legally, these two conditions—having academic freedom and being at will—cannot coexist. Academic freedom includes the freedom to express an opinion. ‘At will’ means you can be fired for expressing an opinion. The two, by definition, are mutually exclusive” (37). If our scholarship offends the tenure-line faculty who perform our evaluations, we are at a much greater risk for termination. For this to be the reality of so many members of our field only slows our knowledge-making potential and puts a false sense of research superiority into the minds of many in the self-defined researcher class.

When Joseph Harris describes the troubled tension between research and teaching in his book, A Teaching Subject: Composition Since 1966, he considers what Habermas refers to as the “legitimation crisis” (5). This crisis results from a profession needing to legitimize itself within the academy and to the public. But as Harris ultimately points out, the teaching-versus-research conflict “cannot be resolved simply through admonitions to do both well or to have one inform the other, since scholars and teachers address competing needs and audiences” (Teaching 5). We agree that research and teaching address different needs and different audiences, and we aren’t advocating for an erasure of the lines that distinguish one from the other. But what we are advocating is a way to challenge the assumption that one practice is inherently better than the other. This distinction is problematic because it confounds our own personal identities; it is also problematic because it pits researcher against teacher in a competition for some elite status. As Christopher Ferry puts it, “We are talking, finally, about a gap between a knowledge-making ‘professional’ class and a teaching working class” (14).

In the battle for quality education, a growing adjunct population is often constructed as a result of a declining educational system. Because of this, adjuncts must be constructed as inferior in order to support the argument for more tenure-line faculty. As we all know, language constructs and reflects our society. Whenever
we argue that the quality of education in our colleges is going down because of the lack of “expertise” on the part of adjuncts, we are constructing adjuncts unfairly. In doing this, we identify tenure-line faculty by what they have and adjunct faculty by what they lack. Deficit language often abounds in discussions about adjunct composition instructors. How can economic and professional conditions ever improve for us if our own professionalism is the sacrificial lamb in the fight for better working conditions for all educators? Using the stereotype that we lack expertise as the rallying cry in the fight for better working conditions for all educators is to ensure only better working conditions for some educators. This particular construction of the adjunct composition instructor (as unspecialized) is a double-edged sword: when adjuncts do well at teaching FYC courses, it suggests that no specialized knowledge was needed to teach FYC, that anyone can do it because some unqualified yahoo just did. When an adjunct professor does poorly at teaching FYC courses, it can easily be dismissed as a byproduct of a broken system. But as Harris contends, “In return for better working conditions, we need to insist that teachers in our programs keep up with new work in composition and that they revise their practices in light of their reading” (“Meet” 57). Unfortunately, our working conditions can’t ever improve if we are continually constructed as unqualified generalists. Unskilled labor is cheap. And skilled labor paid at unskilled labor wages is a bargain. Fighting for better working conditions for contingent composition faculty while simultaneously constructing us as mere practitioners at best or inept droids at worst is an altogether wasted effort in improving all of our professional lives.

We want to conclude by suggesting that in celebrating the vantage point of an adjunct faculty member, we can not only help new composition professors find value in the various identities they may bring to a site, but we can also help all adjunct compositionists to consider how to articulate their various (and often conflicting) identities in order to make the most out of their adjunct experience. The discomfort of moving across our different writing Discourses and selves remains palpable, and it has left us conflicted and at times frustrated, yet it still is central to our professional growth. Indeed, we may have never noticed our similarities and gained a deeper understanding of our discipline if we hadn’t been so frustrated with adjuncting and attempted to articulate what we were feeling. In the end, we choose to see ourselves as compositionists even if others do not. Because we see value in that label and all the habits of mind associated with it. Because we are committed to the discipline that spawned that label, even if that discipline isn’t always committed to us. And because ultimately, we believe that by not allowing institutional definitions to define us within our own disciplinary culture, the identity of compositionist can come to mean a person who shares in the give-and-take of a
distinct body of knowledge and not merely one who engages in the push-and-pull of academic politics.

Note
1. Our experience echoes the 1991 *College English* article “Writing as Outsiders: Academic Discourse and Marginalized Faculty” by Mary Kupiec Cayton in which she writes: “Despite our diversity of circumstance, we all share a marginalized or outsider status in relation to ‘regular’ faculty and to the institution itself. The litany of problems we face by now ought to be familiar” (648). Twenty-seven years later, that litany of problems remains sadly familiar.
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