

Structural Barriers and Knowledge Production at the Two-Year College

Steven Accardi and Jillian Grauman

While nearly half of all college undergraduates complete first-year writing at two-year colleges, very little research is conducted in two-year college writing programs. Encouraging two-year college writing teachers to redefine themselves as teacher-scholars or even teacher-scholar-activists has not been enough for them to produce knowledge in this area because the institutional structure of two-year colleges constrains scholarly production. Therefore, comprehensive structural reform that creates resilient academic leadership roles is required. The authors demonstrate how they were able to begin dismantling their restrictive institutional structures and produce knowledge in writing program administration by leveraging their tenure portfolios and leadership roles.

In “The Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar-Activist,” Patrick Sullivan argues that we as two-year college English faculty should “deliberately frame our professional identity, in part, as activists—accepting and embracing the revolutionary and inescapably political nature of our work” (327). This move builds upon the Two-Year College English Association’s (TYCA’s) decades-long agenda “to redefine the identity of two-year college faculty from that of teacher to that of teacher-scholar” (Andelora 354). However, incorporating “teacher-scholar” into our work as “teacher,” let alone “teacher-scholar-activist,” is challenging for two-year college English faculty; making this change is not as simple as merely redefining or deliberately framing our role. There are “institutional constraints” (Andelora 355), such as “the teaching load and lack of institutional incentive for research and scholarship” (354), that restrict faculty from being able to “take part in traditional scholarship” (355). These constraints frame our role primarily as practitioners, rather than scholars or activists. We may want to expand our role to encompass knowledge production and political activity, but the structural conditions of the two-year college do not afford this change. In order to overcome these challenges to knowledge production, we have leveraged the one main structure we can access—tenure. By tying our knowledge production goals to those valued by tenure, namely teaching and service, we have been able to contribute to the fields of writing studies and writing program administration. It is our hope that writing faculty at two-year colleges can examine our methods and adapt them to their local con-

ditions so that more two-year college writing faculty can contribute their valuable knowledge to our field.

STRUCTURAL BARRIERS

We work at the largest two-year college in Illinois, College of DuPage (COD), located 25 miles west of Chicago, which serves approximately 25,000 students a semester. We teach five courses a semester, a typical workload for two-year college faculty. In recent job postings for our full-time tenure-track faculty positions in English, the term “generalist” was used by administration, signaling to job applicants that anyone with a degree in English can and should teach any of our English course offerings. While faculty at many four-year institutions typically have a hand in composing job advertisements, those of us at two-year colleges may or may not be allowed this kind of input, with the work of writing these ads frequently falling to people working in human resources or administration (Ostman 129). Faculty at unionized institutions, like COD, may face additional complications to composing job advertisements because the bargained contract may assign that task to administration rather than allowing faculty a role in the process (Kahn). Second, while an area of English specialization in literature or writing studies or creative writing or film may be valuable to a department interested in developing scholarship in that area, the language of these job advertisements makes it clear that this kind of disciplinary expertise is not necessary nor valuable to teaching or developing courses at COD. Specialization, and therefore the knowledge production that might accompany it, is simply not necessary.

This de-emphasis of knowledge production is also borne out in the typical tenure requirements of two-year colleges.¹ At COD, teaching is listed first among the required areas of excellence in one’s tenure portfolio, followed by advising, curriculum development, and committee work. Scholarship, we suppose, is relegated to the fifth and final area, called “additional achievements.” While we have opportunities to share some of our *pedagogical* knowledge production internally, through events like departmental faculty development workshops and college-wide initiatives sponsored by the Teaching and Learning Center, there is little value placed on developing or sharing *disciplinary* expertise, especially in the somewhat invisible discipline of writing program administration. While we do have professional development funds that can be used to attend conferences and share knowledge externally, thereby creating and maintaining vibrant national scholarly conversations, faculty tend to leave funds on the table. Taken together, our institution, like many two-year colleges, positions all faculty as teach-

ers—as practitioners, not producers of knowledge. The role and workload of teacher limits us from producing knowledge in an area of expertise. The structure of tenure at two-year colleges uncouples pedagogical knowledge from disciplinary expertise, isolating tenure-track and tenured faculty as teachers rather than shaping academics who engage with and produce scholarship that informs their teaching.

In addition to two-year college tenure requirements, the structure of writing programs at many two-year colleges is another limiting factor on faculty's ability to produce knowledge. Like many two-year colleges, ours does not have a cohesive writing program. We do not have one person who functions as the writing program administrator (WPA); instead, our first-year writing courses are led by an elected committee of full-time faculty members. This decentered structure is very common to two-year colleges and is described many times throughout this special issue, but this more collaborative leadership style without a seat at the administrative decision-making table also makes it difficult to take actions that would help our writing program become more cohesive. Ours is the largest department on campus, with about 30 full-time tenured or tenure-track English faculty and over 120 adjunct faculty, nearly all of whom teach at least one first-year writing course every semester, and we lack or struggle with most of the features of a developed writing program, such as ongoing curriculum development, programmatic assessments, and professional development (Klausman, "Toward a Definition" 263). Though the program has become more cohesive in recent years, in 2015, when Steve was hired, the "English Program" was merely a listing of courses on the college's website: two in first-year writing, two in linguistics, three in technical communication, three in reading, three in basic writing, seven in creative writing, and twenty-four in literature. There was a dean and an associate dean of liberal arts, but no WPA or English department chair. The associate dean assigned courses and held meetings at the start of each semester but merely updated faculty on college-wide initiatives. There was no departmental structure, leadership roles, philosophy, or curriculum.

Finally, being part of a unionized faculty, as we and just over 40% of other two-year colleges are (Mayhall, Katsinas, and Bray), complicates two-year college writing program administration work. While the specific working conditions made possible by collective bargaining agreements are impossible to generalize, it is safe to acknowledge, as Seth Kahn does, that since the contract must cover everyone in the bargaining unit equally, it "may not be especially responsive to [writing program administrators'] needs" (259). In our case, there is no specific contract provision for faculty-administrator, only faculty-teacher. Thus, while the very nature of the work

of a WPA blends together teaching and administration, the contract may not allow for that sort of hybrid teacher-administrator role (Malenczyk 23), which makes it difficult to create or have a WPA position. At COD, all full-time faculty are part of one bargaining unit, which means we have a contract that must apply equally to all full-time faculty. (Our part-time faculty have their own separate union.) While this contract protects us in our working conditions and contributes to our overall well-being as employees, it also creates a strong separation between faculty and administrative roles, reinforcing our academic conditions as teachers, thereby making it difficult to create space for the administrator part of being a writing program administrator—let alone academic knowledge production in this area.

In short, the only role available to English faculty at many two-year colleges, including COD, is teacher, and as a teacher, one teaches five courses each semester, composed mainly of first-year writing, regardless of English degree specialization. This teaching load and role does not afford one to produce knowledge based on systematic inquiry (even the “alternative forms of knowledge” called for by Holly Larson (128) are challenging to achieve). There is no structure nor institutional incentive for scholarship, regardless of one’s individual desire to redefine or reframe one’s role. Those of us at two-year colleges are the ones who engage with first-year writing the most, interacting with over a hundred students each and every semester, but we are largely unable to generate scholarship in this area. Of course, there are two-year colleges where this kind of scholarship is both encouraged and successful, but these places are the exception—not the rule. At a time when 49% of college students attend a two-year colleges first (“Community College”) and is the site in which they complete first-year writing, the faculty teaching nearly half of all first-year writing classes are largely unable to effectively study their writing, evaluate pedagogies, create and administer writing programs, or professionally develop our writing faculty.

In this essay, instead of arguing to redefine our identity, we ask how can we change those identity-defining structures to enable scholarly knowledge production about our writing programs? While some two-year colleges have leadership roles for faculty to steer a writing program and the administrative support (in the form of course releases and stipends) for writing faculty to execute scholarly projects, community projects, assessment projects, we, and many other two-year colleges, do not. How can we argue for more of the material conditions that are necessary for sustainable knowledge production? In short, what can we do to become the teacher-scholar-activists we want to be?

Over the last four years, we have sought to answer these questions by dismantling some of the restrictive structures at our institution and rebuild-

ing more generative ones. We used the one structure we had access to, tied to the college's priority on teaching—the tenure structure. In this essay, we detail how we leveraged the tenure structure, which requires curriculum development and committee work, to remake English at College of DuPage. In doing so, we carved out the space for academic projects and scholarly work, allowing for the production of knowledge and contribution to the field of writing program administration and writing studies.

LEVERAGING THE AVAILABLE MEANS: THE TENURE STRUCTURE

According to *The Portland Resolution*, WPA positions should have a job description, a means of evaluation for their work, job security, access to decision-makers, and the resources and/or budget needed to do the work (Hult, Joliffe, Kelly, Mead, and Schuster). These positions afford WPAs the time, space, and resources to run their programs and to make knowledge. However, positions like these rarely exist at two-year colleges. According to the National Census of Writing, only 11% of participating two-year colleges have a WPA (“Who has”). Therefore, it comes as no surprise that writing program knowledge production at two-year colleges is rarely achieved, let alone widely recognized and valued by the field.

It was clear to us that in order to start producing knowledge in writing program administration, we needed to build a writing program. As Helen Howell Raines points out, what one means by “writing program” at the two-year college can vary wildly because of many different factors, including the purpose of writing classes, faculty workload, and where the courses are situated in the college, indicating that, “to many two-year faculty, the term ‘writing program’ does not evoke a precise image of what we do” (154). Despite these variations, Jeffrey Klausman (“Toward a Definition”) outlines features of a writing program as a means of conducting a self-evaluation; the features are the degree to which there is ongoing professional development, ongoing curriculum development, ongoing programmatic assessment, ongoing and attuned leadership, and a strong sense of community (270). Underlying several of these features is the assumption that someone, or a group of someones, is keeping up with current scholarship enough to design some of these initiatives for and with the larger English faculty body. In our self-assessment using Klausman’s features (“Toward a Definition”), the lack of a regularly supported person in a WPA position contributes to our relatively underdeveloped writing program.

To move us closer to having a writing program and a WPA to administer it, Steve leveraged our tenure criteria, which privileged teaching and required curriculum development and committee work, and took on the

massive undertaking of developing a curriculum for tenure that could be used to assemble a writing studies program. This work happened in two key ways.

First, as a newly elected member of the composition steering committee in fall 2015, Steve contributed to COD's "Statement of Core Principles," which followed the Council of Writing Program Administrators 2014 update to the *WPA Outcomes Statement* and were approved by the English faculty at the end of that academic year. The following year, the committee revised both first-year writing courses (Composition I and Composition II) to align with these new core principles. Steve saw this work as an opportunity not only to develop curriculum and work with a committee for his tenure portfolio but also to suggest creating Advanced Composition as a natural extension to the first-year sequence.

Second, during fall 2015, Steve joined the technical communication committee, which oversaw the technical communication certificate, a 24-credit hour credential, spread across English, speech, art, computer information systems, and journalism. After 10 years in operation, it only had nine graduates. At the first meeting of the semester, the committee sought to officially terminate the certificate, which had been deactivated the previous year, but Steve encouraged them to consider revising rather than terminating it. He proposed scaling back the certificate, housing it exclusively in English, and offering a new slate of courses that reflected today's academic and professional standards. While some members of the committee objected to the amount of curriculum development this would take, Steve took much of the heavy lifting on as part of his tenure portfolio. The other committee members did not have any professional incentives to participate, but even if they had participated, there were disciplinary knowledge barriers for them to overcome, the result of years of "generalist" hiring practices. Their objections then were an understandable byproduct of the institutional constraints of the two-year college.

Like the revision and development of first-year writing, the available structure of tenure provided the agency to assemble a burgeoning writing studies curriculum. The revisions of the technical communication certificate resulted in the creation of several new courses and several 2 + 2 transfer agreements with Elmhurst College, a nearby four-year institution (recently renamed Elmhurst University). The transfer agreements helped to give the newly renamed professional writing certificate legitimacy and increased visibility, as well as an opportunity to create an additional course that Elmhurst students needed: Advanced Composition. Moreover, it established the groundwork for a writing studies program, an organized writing curricu-

lum with a credential that has direct connections to an established four-year institution with a BA in English with a writing emphasis.

By spring 2017, Advanced Composition, all the new and revised professional writing courses, the new professional writing certificate, and the revised first-year writing courses were approved and ready to launch.

EXPANDING THE AVAILABLE MEANS: LEADERSHIP ROLES

Up to this point, we have argued that the tenure structure provides agency, allows us to work on committees and build curriculum. We built a curriculum that could be shaped into a writing studies program, reinforcing it with 2 + 2 agreements (i.e., a transfer agreement that guarantees program completion in two years at the first school and two years at the transfer institution) and a certificate credential. However, what happens when tenure is achieved and the kairotic window for agency is closed? How does one continue to assemble a writing studies program that could lead to knowledge production?

Shortly after the launch of the professional writing certificate, Steve earned tenure; however, since its curriculum contained “technical” and “professional” coursework, this certificate was placed into the COD’s career and technical education (CTE) programs. CTE programs “directly prepare the student for the world of work. . . . Students can master the fundamentals of a new trade or profession or build on established skills” (“Career”). One of the benefits to being placed into the CTE programs is the requisite role of “program coordinator,” which comes with a 3–credit hour course release each semester to schedule and promote courses, assess and review curriculum, compose and propose Perkins grants, and assemble and maintain an advisory board.

Steve was given the course release to coordinate the program, since he was chair of the professional writing committee. The academic leadership role, like the 2 + 2 transfer agreements, gave legitimacy to the work we had done so far and credibility to the program we were trying to build. It also afforded more time and agency to develop the program. For example, we secured Perkins funds to develop a professional writing lecture series. We invited local professional writers and professionals who write to speak to students on field-specific themes, such as writing for nonprofits, writing in healthcare, legal writing, and writing in STEM. It has functioned to demonstrate the importance of writing across the college and the community. It has attracted students to enroll in our professional writing certificate, and it has been used to vet and recruit new members to our advisory board. In addition, this academic leadership role afforded Steve the voice to develop

the program through hiring, pushing administration to have some say in the writing of our job advertisement for a full-time tenure-track English faculty member, and, for the first time, the term “generalist” was replaced with “a specialization in rhetoric and composition” and “who can teach courses in our new professional writing certificate program.” The search resulted in the hiring of Jill, with WPA experience.

The coordinator position offers two-year college faculty the rare occasion to take on a new role. It’s not a redefinition or reframing of “teacher,” but rather an institutionalized academic leadership role that affords the agency to take action and access to administrative decision makers. Furthermore, as is the case at COD, the scarcity of these positions grants a level of authority that is unattainable by the “teacher” role alone. These resilient academic leadership roles, common at universities and four-year colleges, are critically needed at the two-year college to assemble, develop, and produce writing program knowledge.

Around the same time we were exercising the agency and authority of this new role, COD went through a reorganization. One of the changes that occurred was the elimination of associate deans. The deans took on the administrative work of the associate deans in addition to their already burdensome workload. Consequently, looking to offload some of this work, the deans formed chair positions for faculty for the first time. English was given three chair positions—chair of literature, creative writing, and film; chair of developmental English; and chair of composition—with a 3–credit hour release for each. It was a massive axiological shift, exchanging teaching time for administrative time, a move away from the limited role of teacher. The English faculty member who became chair of composition was also the chair of comp steering. He decided to step down from the committee chair position, and Steve was elected chair of the committee. In the same way that the tenure structure yielded agency to expand and shape our writing offerings, this leadership position yielded agency to expand and shape the role of comp steering, from choosing textbooks and evaluating courses to engaging in the work of a WPA—and for the first time, producing knowledge.

For example, after the newly revised first-year writing sequence was rolled out, the composition steering committee designed and conducted a small-scale assessment project of 125 final essays from nine sections of Composition II. We were to assess whether students met course objective two: “Analyze a rhetorical situation within a discourse community.” These essays gave the committee a window into the course content, course materials, and course instruction of these sections. They were wildly inconsistent, and in some cases, emphasized the old rather than the new course objec-

tives. After some discussion of what comp steering could or should do, the committee decided to address the inconsistency like a WPA, by using the data to improve the program, which would improve writing instruction and student writing.

The following fall, Steve steered the committee to collect and respond to new data. Together they designed a “comfort survey,” listing all eleven new course objectives for Composition II, and asked writing faculty to select whether each objective made them feel “not comfortable,” “somewhat comfortable,” or “very comfortable.” The results identified three “uncomfortable” objectives, all having references to technology (e.g., “digital texts,” “digital media”) and terms used in writing studies parlance (e.g., “rhetorical situation,” “discourse community”). As a response, the committee designed and facilitated best practices workshops as professional development opportunities for writing faculty. We required attendees to fill out pre- and post-workshop reflective surveys about expectations, previous knowledge, comfort levels, and new learnings. The following semesters, we iterated on the format but continued to professionalize faculty.

Through this WPA-like assessment project it became clear to us how entangled pedagogical knowledge is with disciplinary knowledge. Without the up-to-date disciplinary knowledge in writing studies, writing faculty were “uncomfortable with”—unable to meet—the new course objectives, putting our students at a disadvantage. The resilient academic leadership role and the agency it afforded helped us to produce and pursue this knowledge. We are certain that with more institutionally sanctioned and supported academic leadership roles, two-year college faculty would have the ability to develop more writing program knowledge.

For the first time, comp steering expanded its role to include WPA work and began producing knowledge and contributing to national WPA scholarly conversations. For instance, Jill presented on our best practices workshop design, facilitation, and data at CWPA 2019 in Baltimore. We received funding, based on our data, from the COD Foundation’s resource for excellence grants program to study if/how best practices workshop attendees incorporate what they learned into their FYW courses the following year. (We are only halfway through the study, but already, the knowledge produced on adjunct writing faculty inequities and vulnerabilities fills a gap in our knowledge.) Finally, this special edition of *WPA: Writing Program Administration* gives us the chance to contribute to the national WPA conversations surrounding how two-year college writing programs make knowledge. These scholarly projects would have been impossible without the expansion of comp steering’s role.

Nevertheless, using the academic leadership role of committee chair to change the role of the committee to engage in WPA work is unsustainable. Yes, the role brought about task-oriented projects which lead to WPA knowledge production, but it is not “resilient” (Griffiths and Jensen) enough to afford the time and space to administer and study our developing writing program, undertake assessment initiatives, faculty development, teaching observations, dual credit and 2 + 2 transfer agreements, let alone schedule courses, and review syllabi and policies. In other words, to “redefine” (Andelora 354) or “deliberately frame our professional identity” (Sullivan 327) is not enough. A committee chair is not a WPA. A truly sustainable practice would be to dismantle the two-year college barriers—the 5/5 teaching load, the lack of incentives for scholarship, the devaluing of academic specialists, the myopic teaching requirements for tenure—and build a 21st century writing studies program with an institutionally-sanctioned WPA. This action would require “design resilience” reform, “institutional structures designed to foster individual and department resilience” (Griffiths and Jensen 305). With Steve’s leadership roles and Jill’s tenure-track structure, we attempted to make this last move.

SUSTAINABLE STRUCTURAL REFORM

First, we needed to shore up our writing curriculum to have a complete writing studies program. In our course catalogue, Jill found an old course that had not been offered in anyone’s recent memory. It was called “Introduction to Writing and Reading Center Theory and Practice.” She not only leveraged her tenure structure to revise it into “Writing Center Theory and Practice” but she also got permission to offer it as an honors section. The approval provided us with the opportunity to promote the course to a new audience, expanding our collegewide visibility. Steve reached out to DePaul University, home to the only independent writing program in the Chicagoland area, offering a BA and MA in writing, rhetoric, and discourse (WRD), and negotiated a new 2 + 2 transfer agreement. The design of the agreement mapped out a writing studies program at COD that would directly transfer coursework into DePaul’s WRD program. Like Elmhurst, this agreement afforded us the opportunity to create a new course for students—Argumentative Writing—to complete our rhetoric and writing offerings.

By the end of spring 2019, we had the following new or newly revised courses:

First-Year Writing

- Composition I
- Composition II

Professional Writing

- Workplace Writing
- Technical Writing
- Digital Writing
- Writing in the Professions
- Professional Editing
- Writing in the Community

Rhetoric and Writing

- Argumentative Writing
- Writing Center Theory and Practice
- Advanced Composition

We felt as though we finally had the curriculum, the transfer agreements, and credential offering to articulate a cohesive writing studies program.

Second, while we were working to assemble and articulate a modern writing program, our new college President required all faculty to map out “program pathways” for counselors and advisors to share with students, based on the guided pathways model advocated by Thomas R. Bailey, Shanna Smith Jaggars, and Davis Jenkins. As coordinator of the professional writing certificate, Steve was tasked with mapping a “Professional Writing Pathway.” At first this task seemed redundant. The certificate’s requirements already forged a “pathway” for our students. However, Steve saw an opportunity to officially construct—institutionally structure—our imagined writing studies program. Consolidating his leadership roles, Steve worked with both committees to bridge writing curriculums into one pathway for students to identify where to find more courses that study writing. And so, by combining the plots of both *Rogue One* and *Field of Dreams*, we mapped out a writing studies pathway and submitted it to our department chairs.

Third, we needed this new structure to be made visible, so that students could see it and follow it. Submitting the map to our chairs sparked a conversation about English as a whole, about being made up of multiple paths and programs. In the months that followed, in alignment with the college’s desire for clear pathways, we worked with the English chairs to redesign our official English webpage to illustrate this new vision. What used to be a listing of courses became a rebranding of English. We were now officially Eng-

lish programs, made up of four distinct programs: creative writing, film, literature, and writing studies. Using our tenure structure and leadership roles, we made a new structure, one which promised a sustainable space to produce knowledge. All we needed now was a WPA.

CONCLUSION

So far, we do not have a WPA. We do, however, have a new union contract, which maintains new language about “division chairs” (essentially the old associate deans), “interdisciplinary chairs” (such as an honors program director), and “program chairs” (replacing the term “coordinator” for CTE programs), which gives faculty new hybrid roles that cross into administrative territory. The WPA role that we envision spreads across these new roles, and so does not tidily fit into one of these categories. As Klausman argues “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” (“The Two-Year” 238). We are working with our dean to negotiate something that fits our program as we compose this manuscript.

At a time when nearly half the nation’s undergraduate population attend two-year colleges (“Community College”) and take FYW courses, it is essential to have a modern writing program, one that equips students with the rhetorical and literacy skills to succeed in the always already changing world. It is therefore essential to have a WPA to administer this program. However, when the entire structure of the two-year college positions English faculty as “teacher” and constrains their scholarly production, it is not enough to encourage them to “redefine” (Andelora 354) or “deliberately frame” (Sullivan 327) their role into something else.

There needs to be structural reform. We need four-year colleges and universities partnering with us, forming 2 + 2 transfer agreements, and building a comprehensive and cohesive structure that directly connects our programs together. “[L]eadership and coherence among two-year writing programs remain elusive” (Calhoon-Dillahunt 131), but they do not need to be nor remain that way. It’s time two-year writing programs are recognized for what they are, the starting point of a four-year writing program. They need to be structurally defined that way, and supported that way, with a resilient institutional role of WPA.

Our writing studies’ professional writing certificate won the 2020 Diana Hacker TYCA Outstanding Program in English Award. Such a program and our academic leadership roles have allowed us to produce some WPA knowledge, but such knowledge production under our restrictive two-year

college conditions is not sustainable. We will never be able to systematically study our share of nearly half of the nation's undergraduate population's literacy skills and how to address their rhetoric and writing needs. We will never be able to comprehensively develop and professionalize the two-year college English faculty who teach them and who are credentialed in specializations other than writing studies. For our work and knowledge production to be truly resilient, we need a sanctioned role with time and support, value and visibility, that can be filled by qualified faculty over time.

Some argue that since the conditions of two-year colleges are different from four-year colleges and universities, the criteria for scholarly work should be different. Since there is no time, support, or institutional incentives for two-year college English faculty to produce knowledge, and since we are expected to be teacher-scholars or even teacher-scholar-activists, the definition of scholarship should change. For example, Larson in her award-winning *TETYC* article argues for syllabi, narratives, and teacher lore to be included as publishable scholarship. "Why cannot my colleagues' and my kitchen-table conversations on critical writing or pedagogical issues be valuable scholarly work in itself?" (Larson 122). Such work certainly can be a valuable scholarly contribution, but why should more systemic inquiry be out of reach? Mark Reynolds argued years ago that "the most hopeful areas for two-year knowledge making lie in the recent calls for new definitions of scholarship and for valuing teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning" (10). But new definitions are not enough. While they do help to encourage two-year college faculty to engage with scholarship, they only reinforce our role as teachers and do not actively work to dismantle the structures that restrict our knowledge making at the two-year college.

And so that's the bind we are in. Two-year college faculty have the experience, teaching more FYW than any other academics in the field. We have the narratives and the lore. But we are institutionally constrained from studying and publishing them. Simultaneously, it is the two-year college FYW teachers who also need this knowledge the most because it is "researched-based best practices that are relevant to the daily work they do" (Hassel and Giordano 119). Additionally, the fact that two-year college FYW work is going largely unexamined means that, despite the *TYCA Guidelines for Preparing Teachers of English in the Two-Year College*, graduate programs will continue to produce graduate students who are not well prepared to work at two-year colleges (Jensen, Johnson, Tinberg, and Toth). That is why name changes and role expansions are not going to bring us the real progress we need. Until comprehensive resilient design structures are made at the two-year college, WPA and writing studies knowledge will remain limited.

NOTE

1. Unlike four-year colleges or universities in which tenure-track assistant professors are allotted a six-year probationary period (given successful two-year reviews) to assemble an exceptional record of scholarship, teaching, and service, at COD we are given three years (reviewed annually) to show evidence of excellence in teaching and service, with teaching being the most important. The dean observes and evaluates our teaching each semester, and along with student evaluations, gives feedback that we must respond to the following semester to show evidence of excellence in teaching.

WORKS CITED

- Andelora, Jeff. "The Teacher/Scholar: Reconstructing Our Professional Identity in Two-Year Colleges." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 32, no. 3, Mar. 2005, pp. 307–22.
- Bailey, Thomas R., Shanna Smith Jaggars, and Davis Jenkins. *Redesigning America's Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success*. Harvard UP, 2015.
- Calhoun-Dillahunt, Carolyn. "Writing Programs Without Administrators: Frameworks for Successful Writing Programs in the Two-Year College." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2011, pp. 118–45.
- "Career and Technical Education." *College of DuPage*. cod.edu/academics/career_technical_education/index.aspx.
- "Community College FAQs" *Community College Research Center*. Accessed 8 Jan. 2020. cccr.tc.columbia.edu/Community-College-FAQs.html.
- Griffiths, Brett, and Darin Jensen. "Conceptualizing English Department Resilience at Two-Year Colleges." *Pedagogy*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2019, pp. 301–21.
- Hassel, Holly, and Joanne Baird Giordano. "Occupy Writing Studies: Rethinking College Composition for the Needs of the Teaching Majority." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 65, no. 1, 2013, pp. 117–39.
- Hult, Christine, David Joliffe, Kathleen Kelly, Dana Mead, and Charles Schuster. *The Portland Resolution: Council of Writing Program Administrators Guidelines for Writing Program Administrator (WPA) Positions*. CWPA, *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1992, pp. 88–94.
- Jensen, Darin, Sarah Z. Johnson, Howard Tinberg, and Christie Toth. *TYCA Guidelines for Preparing Teachers of English in the Two-Year College*. TYCA, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 45, no. 1, 2017, pp. 8–19.
- Kahn, Seth. "What Is a Union?" In *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators*, 2nd ed., edited by Rita Malencyk, Parlor P, 2016, pp. 258–70.
- Klausman, Jeffrey. "The Two-Year College Writing Program and Academic Freedom: Labor, Scholarship, and Compassion." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 45, no. 4, 2018, pp. 385–405.
- . "Toward a Definition of a Writing Program at a Two-Year College: You Say You Want a Revolution?" *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2013, pp. 257–73.

- Larson, Holly. "Epistemic Authority in Composition Studies: Tenuous Relationship between Two-Year English Faculty and Knowledge Production." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 46, no. 2, 2018, pp. 109–36.
- Malenczyk, Rita. "Doin' the Managerial Exclusion: What WPAs Might Need to Know about Collective Bargaining" *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2004, pp. 23–33.
- Mayhall, Barry R., Stephen G. Katsinas, and Nathaniel J. Bray. "The Impact of Collective Bargaining and Local Appropriations on Faculty Salaries and Benefits at US Community Colleges." *Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2016, pp. 1–29.
- Ostman, Heather. *Writing Program Administration and the Community College*. Parlor P, 2013.
- "Perkins IV." *Perkins Collaborative Resource Network*. Accessed 9 Jan. 2020. cte.ed.gov/legislation/about-perkins-iv.
- Raines, Helen Howell. "Is There a Writing Program in This College? Two Hundred and Thirty-Six Two-Year Schools Respond." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 41, no. 2, 1990, pp. 151–65.
- Reynolds, Mark. "Two-Year College Teachers as Knowledge Makers." *The Profession of English in the Two-Year College*, edited by Mark Reynolds and Sylvia A. Holladay-Hicks, Boynton/Cook, 2005, pp. 1–15.
- "Statement of Core Principles." *Composition @ COD*. Accessed 8 Jan. 2020. sites.google.com/view/codcomp/home.
- Sullivan, Patrick. "The Two-Year College Teacher-Scholar-Activist." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 42, no. 4, 2015, pp. 327–50.
- "Who has primary responsibility for administering the first-year writing requirement?" *National Census of Writing*. Accessed 25 May 2020. writingcensus.swarthmore.edu/survey/2?question_name=s2q250&othercohorts=&op=Submit#results.
- WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition*. CWPA, *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 23, nos. 1–2, 1999, pp. 59–70.

Steven Accardi is associate professor of English at College of DuPage. His scholarship has been published in *Composition Studies*, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, and the *Journal of Second Language Writing*. His forthcoming project with Jillian Grauman addresses the disciplinary and pedagogical gaps among FYW faculty.

Jillian Grauman is assistant professor of English at College of DuPage. She earned her PhD from Iowa State University with an emphasis in writing program administration. Grauman researches responding to student writing. Recently, she has presented at CWPA and published in *WLN: A Journal of Writing Center Scholarship*.

