WPA
Writing Program Administration

Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators
Volume 3, Number 1, Fall, 1979

The Editors of *WPA* invite contributions that are appropriate to the interests and concerns of those who administer writing programs in American and Canadian colleges and universities. Articles on teaching writing or research in composition are acceptable only if they deal with the relationship of these activities to program administration.

Article length (flexible), 2,000-4,000 words. Authors should submit two copies and retain a copy for their own files. Material should be suitably documented, using the *MLA Handbook*, although as much reference as possible should be included within the text. Annotated bibliographies accompanying articles are encouraged, as well as any other apparatus which might make material more conceptually and practically valuable to working writing program administrators. Article deadlines: fall and winter issues, March 1; spring issue, September 15. Relevant announcements are also acceptable. Announcement deadlines: fall and winter issues, April 15; spring issue, November 1. Address contributions and editorial correspondence to Kenneth A. Bruffee, Editor, *WPA*, English Department, Brooklyn College, CUNY, Brooklyn, New York 11210.

Subscription with membership in the Council of Writing Program Administrators: $10/year (add $1.50 postage outside U.S.). Institutional subscription: $20/year (add $1.50 postage outside U.S.). Single copies, $5 (add $.50 postage outside U.S.). Address subscription and membership correspondence to Joseph Comprone, Treasurer, WPA, English Department, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40208.

Address advertising inquiries to Richard Sterling, Managing Editor, *WPA*, English Department, Lehman College, CUNY, Bronx, New York 10468.

The Council of Writing Program Administrators is a national association of college and university faculty who serve or have served as directors of freshman composition, coordinators of writing labs and workshops, chairs and members of writing-program-related committees, or in a similar administrative capacity.

President
Harvey Wiener, La Guardia Community College, CUNY

Vice-President
Winifred Horner, University of Missouri, Columbia

Treasurer
Joseph Comprone, University of Louisville

Secretary
Lawrence N. Kasden, J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Richmond, Va.

Board of Directors
David Bartholomae, University of Pittsburgh (1980)
Harry Crosby, Boston University (1979)
Elaine Maimon, Beaver College (1980)
Donald McQuade, Queens College, CUNY (1979)
Richard Raspa, University of Utah (1979)
James Raymond, University of Alabama (1980)

WPA
Writing Program Administration

Volume 3, Number 1, Fall, 1979

Contents

Editorial

With this issue, the *WPA Newsletter* becomes a full-fledged journal. We confess we really didn't expect to leave the comfortable nest of newsletter publication so soon. Practical considerations drove us to it. We're still a little shaky on our pinions. Our first few flights are likely to be short ones. But we are glad we've taken wing, and we hope our fellow WPAs share our exhilaration.

We have decided to call our new self simply **WPA: Writing Program Administration.** We will continue, as a journal, the editorial direction established during the past year in the *Newsletter.* We will continue to be a refereed publication whose purpose is to focus thought, information, and expertise relevant to the teaching-administrative function of writing program administration and to explain to educators and the general public the special needs, values, and aims of writing program administrators.

Articles published in *WPA* will be read and approved by the journal's Board of Editors, a panel of knowledgeable and respected people in the field of writing program administration who generously contribute their time and expertise. Each advisory Editor is or has been a writing program administrator. Each is therefore in a position to help evaluate the quality and significance of material submitted for publication. As a result, members of the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA), and other readers, are assured that communication shared through this medium is well informed and reliable, as well as readable and helpful; as a result also, publication in *WPA* can be cited with confidence on our authors' curriculum vitae.

WPA is necessary to writing program administrators and to the larger educational community, we believe, because it helps define an important field within our profession. Although many of us do most of the other things that college and university administrators do—hire and fire, tinker with budgets, schedule classes, and keep our programs running from day to day—WPAs also serve an institutional function quite distinct from that served by presidents, deans, chairs, provosts, and the like. Most writing program administrators continue to be writing teachers, differing from other writing teachers only in the nature of the people we teach. We teach not only college and university students, but often other college and university teachers as well. We are called upon sometimes to teach other administrators, trustees, and legislators, and even the general public. As a result, WPAs are not just teachers who also administrate, or administrators who also teach. We administrate in part *by* teaching. We teach in part *through* administration.

As the "voice" of writing program administrators, *WPA* will try to speak with as wide and diverse an authority as possible, in order to synthesize thought,

information, and expertise appropriate to this distinct institutional function. In the recent past, the *WPA Newsletter* has published articles on training programs for WPAs, on organizing small regional conferences, and on interviewing and hiring. This first issue in journal format focuses generally on program definition and evaluation. Future issues of *WPA* will contain articles on large-scale testing and its implications for WPAs, on faculty development, on evaluating writing faculty, and on resources available to WPAs in graduate courses and programs devoted to higher education administration. Beyond these lie many topics which *WPA* authors might conceivably address: relations with government bureaus and legislatures; grant sources and strategies; uses of public relations techniques; techniques of organization and leadership; budgeting; institutional politics; working conditions; training and retraining teachers; program planning; defining, promulgating, and attaining curricular goals; tenure and promotion; integrating basic writing into composition programs; the care and feeding of faculty, students, and fellow administrators; relations with faculty unions; and so on.

We believe that exploring the ramifications of these and other such topics can help us to do our job better, because it will contribute to a better understanding of that job by ourselves, by senior administrators who oversee our work, and by colleagues who are directly affected by our actions, decisions, and influence as writing program administrators.

A word of thanks

WPA exists as a journal because of the educational foresight and concern of Brooklyn College's Dean of the School of Humanities, Maurice Kramer. Through his offices, Brooklyn College has undertaken to support the journal's publication during its precarious first few years of life. He joins us in our belief that writing program administration is a humanistic pursuit of great importance to higher education.

Several members of the Brooklyn College community have generously contributed to planning the journal and getting it on its way: Teresa Edge, Director of College Publications; Rochelle Lorber, Assistant Editor, College Publications; Laurence Mucciolo, Director of Budget and Facilities Planning; Maurice Callahan and William Graizel, Assistants to the Dean of the School of Humanities; Sydney Ornstein of the Brooklyn College Division of General Services; and Lawrence Schweitzer of the Brooklyn College Computer Center. Each of these people has made important concrete and practical contributions to *WPA*. Teresa Edge has also donated valuable time to the patient guidance and instruction of *WPA*'s neophyte Editor. I owe them all deepest thanks.

Last, too late, and with profound sadness, we thank Mina Shaughnessy, whose invaluable help and companionship we have lost. Mina had "*lots* to say about writing program administration," but never got to say it. We carry on in her spirit.

Ken Bruffee

What freshman directors need to know about evaluating writing programs
Maxine Hairston

For the past 15 years I have been a teacher of writing and a teacher of teachers of writing. For four of those years I was Director of Freshman English at the University of Texas at Austin, and for two of them I have been Associate Dean of Humanities at Texas. In all of these roles I have been involved in evaluating writing programs and in evaluating writing teachers. In retrospect, I think I have probably done a fairly good job. But during these years as I have read more, thought more, and talked more to people about the evaluation of teaching, particularly teaching writing, I have realized how haphazardly I and, I think, most administrators have been judging our writing teachers and our writing programs. We operate too much by hunch and impression, and we base many of our judgments on anecdotal evidence or on evaluation instruments that have never been validated for writing courses.

Not that we've always been wrong. Good instincts, dedication, and energy count for a lot, and many of us have been able to run successful programs simply because we believe in what we are doing and because we have zealous teachers working for us. I think, however, that it is time for administrators at all levels to take a more professional and objective look at teaching writing than we have ever done in the past. The discipline itself is becoming more sophisticated and mature, and we're beginning to realize what a complicated and difficult teaching process we're involved in. All administrators, from program directors to deans, need to realize that evaluating the teaching of writing is as complex as the teaching of writing itself, that it demands sophisticated procedures and instruments and a kind of professional expertise that we have not brought to it in the past. We need to take a more systematic and rigorous look at what we are doing. And all of us need to expand our vision beyond our own departments and institutions in order to see where our programs fit in the larger context. Only if we move in these directions are we going to be on solid ground when we try to improve our programs or try to defend them against critics, internal and external.

Because they are in such a critical decision-making and policy-setting position, freshman writing program directors especially need to learn more about evaluating writing programs and the problems and issues evaluation raises. Pooling and comparing insights we have gained during the eight years we have run the freshman program at Texas, Jim Kinneavy and I have identified the following issues connected with evaluation, that we think writing program directors should be informed about.

1. Placement tests. When a department chooses the placement test that it will use for credit, exemption, and placement in writing courses, it implicitly says it values

the skills that instrument tests. Accordingly, the writing program director needs to know if the skills the test is designed to measure are the same skills taught in freshman courses. That is, when students have successfully completed freshman composition, can they reasonably be expected to show significant gains if they take the placement test again? If not, how is the director going to justify the content of the freshman courses?

This is a sticky issue, one fraught with dangers no matter what one does. For economic and administrative reasons, as well as educational ones, most institutions use machine-scored placement tests. But people who have had long experience with machine-scored tests tell us that unless such a test is coupled with a writing sample, it won't tell us much about an individual's writing ability. Machine-scored tests will probably predict how well that individual will do in a writing class, however, and that predictive accuracy makes it difficult to say that such tests are worthless. But a director who is serious about enforcing sound placement procedures and making sure that poor writers do not place out of composition must insist that departmental and college administrators authorize writing samples for at least those students who score in the middle range on placement tests. The writing program director also needs to educate the faculty about what placement tests actually measure so that instructors won't assume that students with high scores already know how to write. Those who do make that assumption are likely to be badly disappointed.

2. Research design and reliable evaluation of a writing program. Because almost all writing program directors come from English departments, they are usually uninformed about statistical methods and often hostile to any proposal that smacks of quantification. They don't know how many variables may be involved in trying to compare different methods of teaching writing, they don't know how to set up controlled experiments, they know little about the precautions one must observe in giving and scoring pretests and posttests, they don't know what kind of data can be obtained from a computer and what kind cannot, and so on. They also do not realize how much it costs to make almost any kind of evaluation, whether it involves comparing the writing development of students taught by different methods or simply the cost of paying someone to read writing samples for placement purposes.

Probably most freshman directors cannot take the time to become experts in statistics, psychometrics, or computer programming. But if they hope to evaluate their own programs or want to gather reliable data on which to base requests or proposals, they need to learn the basics of research design, and they should recruit for their faculty at least one person competent to set up and supervise evaluations. They also have to figure computer time into their budget and confer with the computer people on their campus to find out how they can use those facilities.

3. Hazards of experimental programs. In the interests of flexibility and growth, most freshman directors and committees invite their faculties to submit proposals for using new approaches and materials for teaching composition. Almost no one would urge that we keep our composition program a closed system, however committed to a particular philosophy we may be. But directors who solicit new ideas should look at them carefully with several considerations in mind.

First, if experiments are going to benefit the department, the department must

be able to duplicate them. If a so-called experimental approach to teaching writing depends on the knowledge and skills of one particular teacher, then it should not be considered a real experiment. It is a variant. A few students may benefit from it, but the whole program will not. And too many variants having no long-range value can splinter a program.

Second, if the department wants to learn from an experiment, it must be able to evaluate the experiment. Evaluation not only raises the problem of research design that I just mentioned and the cost of making the evaluation. It also raises the question of evaluation criteria. No one can judge how well an experimental component in a program is doing unless its goals are the same as those of the traditional components. To establish evaluation criteria, therefore, the writing director or committee must spell out the goals of the program as a whole. Experiments should be judged by the same criteria, against each other and against the norm.

Perhaps the chief problem lies in getting the people who propose experiments to agree to participate in an evaluation that is designed and controlled by the writing program director or committee. Creative people who have the initiative and energy to propose a new system of teaching are apt to be zealots who believe so strongly in what they want to do that they can scarcely tolerate anyone who questions their methods or philosophy. Often they do not cooperate willingly with evaluators, and they resent and contest any negative judgments made on their projects. Yet no department can afford to allow individuals or groups to initiate major changes in its program unless those changes are going to be monitored and judged. For that reason, a writing director needs to outline the evaluation procedures that will be used to assess experiments before those experiments are authorized. We learned the hard way at Texas.

4. What it costs to improve a program. Writing program directors and department chairs need to know what improving a writing program costs; unless they do, they cannot set realistic goals for that program nor bargain intelligently with the people who allot money and set priorities for the institution. Watching deans and vice-presidents at work has convinced me that they have neither time nor sympathy for high-minded department chairs and program directors who have not done their homework. Good ideas nearly always cost money, and people in charge want to know how much. Should the size of all writing classes be reduced from 25 to 20? Almost everyone agrees that they should, but in a program the size of the one at Texas, that reduction would instantly create 50 new sections of freshman English. Who would teach them? Can the department hire 25 more half-time instructors? Are there qualified people available? Should 50 faculty members each be asked to teach an extra section? The director who recommends such a change must have answers to those questions.

Should departmental standards be raised? That's always a popular proposal with those who find that some students who placed out of first semester composition don't meet their standards for good writers. But the director who would propose increasing the cutoff score for exemption from first-semester composition should first look at the distribution of those scores. In the department at Texas, for example, raising the ECT cutting score for exemption from the first course from 550 to 600 would instantly create 80 new sections of freshman

English. Once more the issue of who would teach those sections would come up, as well as the problem of finding hours and rooms for those new classes.

Should a department require a writing sample from all entering freshmen? Almost everyone agrees that students should not be placed solely on the basis of machine-scored tests. But last year we admitted 4,900 freshmen to the University of Texas at Austin; this year we expect several hundred more. If we suggest that all those students submit writing samples, we need to know where, when, and under whose supervision they are going to write them, who is going to grade them, how those graders are going to be trained, supervised, and paid, and how the results are going to be processed. One could ask similar questions about the ramifications of setting up a writing lab, requiring more hours of composition, or adopting an English proficiency test for all graduates.

By raising these kinds of questions I am not suggesting that writing program directors or chairs should just give up and decide that there is no point in trying to reduce class size or raise standards. Not only do I think they should try, I think they should nag, preach, wheedle, and generally make a nuisance of themselves with the higher administration. But when they do approach administrative officers, they should be sure they know the cost of what they are asking for and be able to defend that cost. They must also figure out their priorities. If they can get only part of what they ask for, they should decide ahead of time which change will benefit their program most. And they should remember that telling the dean, "If the university can afford to spend fourteen million dollars adding on to the football stadium, it can afford to reduce the size of writing classes," is both pointless and not very bright. In the first place, the dean probably agrees, but can't afford to say so in public. Second, for a faculty member to imply that the dean has access to nonacademic funds is naive.

5. The pitfalls of evaluation methods. A writing program director should know some of the problems of evaluating teaching, especially teaching writing. Reading Richard Larson's *The Evaluation of Teaching College English* (New York: Modern Language Association/ERIC, 1971), is the first requisite. In this monograph, Larson outlines several approaches to evaluating a teacher's performance and points out the limitations of each. A director who realizes those limitations and understands that a conscientious effort to judge writing teachers must include a variety of methods can, with the help of some people who are knowledgeable in the field, try to devise a system of evaluation that will be fair to his or her teachers and yet will yield information from which both the teachers and the program can benefit.

One step a director can take is to establish a committee to draft a student evaluation form designed specifically for writing courses. Another step is to put together a set of guidelines about what observers should look for when they visit writing classrooms. Still another is to establish criteria for judging a teacher's writing assignments or grading of papers. Drafting these tools for evaluation is a formidable responsibility, but directors who allow their programs and teachers to be evaluated by instruments and procedures set up by outsiders who know virtually nothing about the process and problems of teaching writing are not taking care of their own best interests.

6. What's going on at other institutions. Finally, directors of writing programs should know how their programs compare to those at similar institutions. It is easy to get so immersed in our own problems that we no longer see them in proportion. When we begin to fantasize about some ideal institution where money is plentiful, administrators are enlightened, students are highly motivated and well prepared, and teaching writing is respected and rewarded, it's time to come down to earth and find out some facts. What is the average class size in other composition programs? What do their T.A.s get paid? What kind of training program do they have for their teachers? Who runs it? What is the average teaching load? What is their composition requirement? What is the average SAT or ACT score of their freshmen, and how many are exempted from freshman English? How many are enrolled in remedial courses? How are those courses funded?

Directors can get the answers to some of these questions from the new MLA publication, *Options for the Teaching of English: Freshman Composition* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1978). They can also learn about writing programs through such journals as *WPA* and from reading regular and special issues of the Association of Departments of English *Bulletin* published by MLA. In Texas, we formed a state Association of Directors of Freshman English, which also helps. This group meets and presents a program each fall, in conjunction with the annual meeting of the South Central MLA, and in the spring, when the Texas Council of Teachers of English meets. The programs deal with ways to improve freshman English courses. And association with peers helps directors to get to know each other and strengthens their informal network of communication.

Finding out what is going on at other institutions benefits program directors in a number of ways. First, they can get some idea of how well their own programs measure up and what kinds of changes might be possible. Often they will find that they're doing better than they thought. Second, they will realize that their problems are not unique or even unusual, and therefore that other directors can provide good counsel and lots of reinforcement. But perhaps the greatest advantage of learning as much as one can about other writing programs is that the information is invaluable in negotiating with the upper administration. To be able to tell one's chair or the dean or the vice-president of academic affairs that the University of Iowa has an eight-hour composition requirement is useful when one wants to persuade the administration to reinstate the second required semester of composition. To argue that the cutoff score for exemption from first-semester composition should be raised, it helps to know that the ECT cutting score at Ball State University is 600 and that in the University of California system students who score below 600 must take remedial English. And in pleading for smaller classes, it's useful to know that at the University of Virginia, composition classes are limited to 18. Administrators are competitive about other institutions, and the writing program director who can substantiate the claim, "Everybody else does it," makes a powerful impression.

I have focused my comments on administrators at the freshman level because I believe that they are the ones who are closest to the problems of evaluation of writing programs and that they are the ones who can have the most influence on chairs and deans. A well-informed and astute freshman writing program director can establish good relations with top-level administrators by keeping them informed about the departmental writing program, what its successes are, and

what its needs are. That program director can cultivate the good will of both the administration and the general public by publicizing the goals of the program and by showing how the program is trying to meet problems that are everyone's shared concern. And the freshman writing program director who can evaluate his or her own writing program objectively, intelligently, and professionally is most likely to be able to strengthen that program.

Evaluating writing programs:
What an outside evaluator looks for
Erika Lindemann

As a rule, we evaluate writing programs because an institution requires periodic assessments of its instructional programs, because an administrator requests it, or because we want to satisfy ourselves that students receive the best writing instruction we can give them. In many colleges, evaluation remains an in-house affair. The arguments against soliciting advice from outside evaluators run something like this. Evaluators are an unnecessary expense. We'd have to squeeze one or two honoraria and some travel money out of an already tight budget to pay them. We'd need to reserve one or two days in a hectic semester for their visit and arrange a few phony socials so that everyone can smile a lot and say nice things about the program. And how will we keep the evaluators away from Professor X, who never says anything constructive about anything? Isn't it wiser to solve our problems by ourselves? Besides, how can an outsider learn enough about the program in a few days to resolve issues we've been discussing for years? These arguments convince many faculty members that outside evaluators can't make a significant contribution to improving a writing program. Unless the dean insists, forget it.

As one who has directed one writing program and evaluated two others, I don't believe outside evaluation should be optional, not if we are to assess our writing programs thoroughly and honestly. The arguments faculty raise in opposition to outside evaluation are not really about the cost of bringing in outsiders, or their competence to advise us, or the rights of faculty "to solve our problems by ourselves." Rather, these practical objections mask the human reluctance *to be evaluated*. We don't want to hear adverse criticism of our work, to open doors which let in—my God—an expert who might discover our shortcomings.

Our defensive postures notwithstanding, however, outside evaluators serve a useful function. Their written reports obviously represent one kind of information which, together with other data, can help us assess our program's effectiveness. Until we know more about evaluating the teaching of writing, we would do well to base programmatic decisions on as much information as we have time to collect and patience to interpret.

But outside evaluators can do still more. They can support our work in a program that has become visible, public, and often controversial. Everybody notices the writing program these days. English faculty, who teach more composition courses now than they did five years ago, expect to shape the program. Department heads and deans give the writing program a substantial portion of the budget and want it spent wisely. Faculty outside the department often wish the program would decrease its emphasis on literature and prepare prospective engineers, lawyers, and business executives for the kinds of writing required in

those professions. Finally, legislators and the public expect the writing program to solve the literacy crisis. They don't think we're doing very well, and they hope we'll do better without its costing too much. Some will condemn the program no matter what we do, but others would support us if they knew how. If they seem to offer simplistic solutions to our problems, it's because they don't understand the more complex alternatives. And when we describe how complicated the writing process is, how difficult teaching someone to write well is, they sometimes interpret our explanations as excuses.

Perhaps because outside evaluators have no special reason to defend the writing program we run, our colleagues and administrative officers find them easier to listen to than the folks at home. Personalities and past confrontations can't tangle the issues, and most people seem to make an effort to be cooperative and courteous in talking with the evaluator, who is after all an invited guest on their campus. For whatever reason, outside evaluators usually command the attention of college administrators, faculty, and even the public. Outside evaluators may say what you've been saying all along, but in repeating the message they reinforce your position, especially among colleagues who may have stopped listening to you. In supporting those who understand what the goals of a writing program should be, outside evaluators also help educate faculty and administrators in other departments, encouraging them to pursue their legitimate interests in the program constructively.

Besides developing support for the writing program in other departments, outside evaluators help clarify and resolve conflicting notions that members of the English department may hold about the program's *raison d'etre*. Properly qualified outside evaluators are thoroughly familiar with their own writing programs, of course, but they also know how programs at other institutions function. They read rhetorical theory and research; they teach writing; they discuss their work at professional meetings. As evaluators, their primary intention is not to transform your writing program into one like theirs. Rather, they assess a particular program more or less objectively, determining its unique *strengths and weaknesses*, using what they know to suggest ways to improve it. They recognize that every program must retain its individual character, serve a particular group of students, and solve special problems. They hope to exercise their best professional judgment in helping you move the program forward.

If your department resembles mine, most of your colleagues, innocent of recent developments in the field, fail to understand why some changes in the program seem desirable. Many do not read research in the theory and teaching of writing *or attend professional meetings which specifically address the concerns of writing* teachers. An outside evaluator helps educate these members of the English faculty, helps them discover alternative ways of viewing the writing program and resolve questions that research has already answered. As a resource, the evaluator can discuss with your English colleagues what's happening at other institutions, what the profession now knows about teaching writing, even what we have yet to learn.

If you do decide to invite a consultant or two to your campus to evaluate your writing program, what can you expect them to do? What will they be looking for? Well, that depends—on the size and nature of the program, on whom you invite,

on what you want their advice about. I can't speak for all outside evaluators, but I can tell you what I look for, having evaluated two quite different programs and requested a review of the one I directed. I emphasize four areas: the curriculum, teacher training, program administration, and what I call "support services" or those resources, like libraries, which support writing instruction but are administered outside the English department.

Curriculum. In evaluating the curriculum, I try to determine in advance of my visit what holds the program together, what philosophy of composition the department supports. By *philosophy* I don't mean something like "we want our students to write effectively." I want to know *how* the department hopes to realize this commendable goal, and *why*. Why does the department think students need to write well? How does it define "writing well"? What is its definition of a "well-written" product? What theories of discourse, or discoursing, or pedagogy inform the writing program? Without a consistent rationale, everything else about the program is likely to appear chaotic and patched together.

Beyond assessing the program's underlying rationale, I ask other questions of the curriculum: How much writing do the students and their teachers do? Is there a logical fit between courses in the program? Do texts and instructional materials match course objectives and students' abilities? Is the program serving students throughout the institution instead of assuming that all freshmen will become English majors? How are students placed in or exempted from writing courses? How large are individual sections of the course? Can students readily discuss their work individually with instructors? With other students? What audiences do students write for? Do they know what standards apply when their work is evaluated? How serious a problem is grade inflation and what might account for it? I try to determine provisional answers to these questions before I come to campus, reviewing whatever written documents those who requested the evaluation have sent me. Then, I draft questions and comments to discuss with students, faculty, and administrators during my visit.

Teacher Training. More and more English departments want to improve the quality of teaching in writing courses, and I want to encourage their efforts as much as I can. As a rule, I review the opportunities for professional development available to three groups of teachers: graduate teaching assistants, part-time faculty, and full-time faculty.

According to Claude Gibson's "CEA 1978 National Survey," [*The CEA Forum*, 9 (October 1978), 3-9], about one-third of the 486 institutions surveyed staff writing courses with graduate students. Since many graduate students begin their teaching careers in writing programs, and since they will teach writing for several years (at least) once they find full-time jobs, we ought to provide rigorous training for them. As a consultant, I want to know how the department guides, supports, and evaluates the development of graduate students as teachers, especially during their first year of teaching. Does the department offer an orientation program, an apprenticeship or mentor system, workshops? What graduate courses in rhetoric, linguistics, and pedagogy are available to beginning teachers? According to the CEA survey, among institutions that staff writing courses with teaching assistants and offer a graduate course in teaching writing, only 59 percent require the course. I favor that requirement and would like to see

it broadened to include a graduate course in *teaching* literature. I also support informal arrangements which bring graduate students and faculty together to discuss teaching problems, as well as efforts to encourage graduate students to develop conference presentations which apply what they are learning in their graduate courses to the classroom, and vice versa. But however substantial a department's efforts to train beginning teachers may be, graduate students are not likely to participate enthusiastically in their own professional development if they are overworked and underpaid. Consequently, as an outside evaluator, I want to know how much graduate students earn, how many writing students they teach, and how many graduate courses they are expected to take while they are teaching.

In 70 percent of the schools CEA surveyed, part-time faculty also teach many writing courses. Members of this underground portion of our profession generally walk softly, uncertain whether or not their contracts will be renewed, unable to shape decisions which affect them. When I evaluate a program that relies heavily on the "rent-a-teacher" system, I try to explore ways the department can improve its commitment to part-time faculty by giving them opportunities to continue their professional growth and a voice in matters which concern their teaching. I would also want to discuss with departmental administrators strategies for reducing over a period of time the amount of part-time instruction they depend on.

Finally, efforts to decrease part-time staff, tightened budgets, and reduced upper-division enrollments require departments to assign a greater number of writing courses to full-time faculty who may neither be prepared to teach writing nor have much enthusiasm for the assignment. This development calls for another kind of teacher training, requiring greater tact and predicated on the assumption that full-time faculty view themselves as "already educated." Some faculty, of course, respond well to compelling arguments that departments redirect their resources toward lower-division courses. Others, frustrated and fearful, attempt with sometimes nasty evasion maneuvers, to avoid teaching freshmen. Outside evaluators pose questions which may help departments mitigate these agonies and lesson the angst our colleagues in literature feel when "demoted" to teaching writing: How many faculty already teach writing? Do the department head and other respected leaders among the faculty teach writing? Could they be persuaded to? Are teaching assignments equitably distributed among all faculty ranks? Does the department offer incentives to encourage and reward faculty participation in the program? Or does it assign freshman courses to punish the disfavored, the unpublished, the powerless, or the young? Can faculty retrain themselves without feeling threatened or incompetent? Would they attend informal seminars led by their colleagues or presentations offered by outside "experts"?

Outside evaluators can help faculty members sort out many of these emotionally-charged arguments about teacher training and retraining. They can encourage administrators to state their expectations clearly, firmly, and humanely, to reward those who willingly agree to teach writing, and to fund programs which encourage a writing teacher's continued growth.

Program Administration. In evaluating the third area, program administration, I try to determine who makes decisions affecting the program. That's difficult,

because paper documents don't always reveal the important political contexts which shape almost all educational enterprises. Public postures notwithstanding, I want to know who finally exercises the greatest clout. In about 14 percent of the schools CEA surveyed, the department head, with or without the aid of a committee, oversees the writing program. Sixty-two percent of the schools surveyed designate a special supervisor to administer the program. Sixty-eight percent of these program directors hold the Ph.D.; 81 percent of them are on the tenure track.

If these statistics hold true nationwide (they may not; CEA surveyed only 486 institutions), I'm a little concerned. More than 30 percent of all writing program administrators may not hold the doctorate, and almost 20 percent may not be in tenure-track positions. Furthermore, *being* in a tenure-track position does not mean that the program director *has* tenure. Writing program administrators without tenure need protection, not only because they must devote considerable time to the job and must speak with authority to faculty, administrators, and the public, but also because they often find themselves at the center of complex, controversial issues. If the department head or dean abandons them, if no job description specifies how their administration of the program figures in promotion and tenure decisions, their future in the department looks bleak. As an outside evaluator, I want to examine the kinds of "protection" the program director enjoys, so that we won't lose competent young professionals who accept an important position but then are denied tenure or advancement because they couldn't find time in a sixty-hour week to publish twenty articles.

How curricular decisions are made is important, too. I want to know if those responsible for the writing program frequently confer with faculty and administrators outside as well as within the department. If a committee supervises the program, are its members appointed or elected? Do they represent all who teach in the program, including graduate teaching assistants and part-time faculty? Does the committee or the program director elicit suggestions about courses, texts, and program policies? Do students have opportunities to evaluate their courses and instructors? Are grievance procedures for students and teachers fair and consistently applied?

Support Services. Most successful writing programs cultivate mutually sustaining relationships with ESL, honors, and minority student programs; with reading, writing, or study skills centers; with bridging or remedial courses. Testing centers help us assess our students' reading and writing abilities; computer centers compile enrollment statistics and tally course evaluations; libraries offer orientation lectures, research paper workshops, and special assistance to teachers. When I evaluate a program, I ask about these support services. Is the program using all of the institution's resources to enhance writing instruction? Are teachers, administrators, and staff working cooperatively to fulfill the institution's primary mission: serving students? Are faculty in other departments encouraged to support and improve writing instruction?

Since many a college draws its entering freshman class largely from local high schools, the writing program itself can also function as a support service for the teachers in those schools. We should visit them often, not to criticize overworked, underpaid teachers, but to commend what they are doing right and well, to offer our help in improving writing instruction at all educational levels. As a rule, I do

not award demerits if a writing program neglects its feeder schools; those who oversee a writing program must help their own students first. But if the program also serves the larger educational community, so much the better. Those co-operative ventures gain special praise in my evaluation report.

When I evaluate a writing program, then, I look *first* for what works well in each of these four areas: curriculum, teacher training, program administration, and support services. I look for elements of the curriculum that realize respected theory and practice, programs that encourage excellence in teaching, procedures that effect responsible and responsive decisions, and efforts that urge cooperation among all sorts of professionals who want to help students write effectively. *Second,* I suggest improvements in the program, addressing problems I've been asked to investigate or that persistently recur in talking with teachers, students, and administrators. Some changes I broach informally, in conversation. Others, especially those which teachers themselves feel powerless to implement, need whatever force my written report might give them. *Third,* I comment on controversies, recognizing that dedicated professionals sometimes disagree about the best way to move a program forward. In my written report I discuss such differences of opinion as objectively as I can, sometimes outlining a few compromises, always recommending continued, constructive debate until the faculty accepts its own comfortable stance on the issue. Avoiding controversy would be irresponsible, especially if it threatens the program, but, as an outsider, I cannot resolve controversy merely by siding with one faction or another. So, I hope to keep the dialogue going constructively after I leave the campus.

In some ways, I find, evaluating a writing program is much like rewriting an essay. Some faculty members, like student writers reluctant to condemn what had previously satisfied them in a draft, refuse to discover new lines of thought which would improve the writing program. Other faculty members, like students who presume that everything in a draft is flawed, assume that any alteration in a program improves it. "They are," as Quintilian characterizes compulsive revisers, "like doctors who use the knife even when the flesh is perfectly healthy. The result of their critical activities is that the finished work is full of scars, bloodless, and all the worse for their anxious care."

An outside evaluator, much like a skillful teacher of rewriting, must encourage a re-vision of a writing program, not necessarily to correct it but to make it an honest expression of the best collective thinking its teachers and students wish to live by. As with revision, we may discover through outside evaluation that parts of the program are out of order, that new material could be beneficially incorporated, that some practices ought to be questioned and perhaps discarded. We may even realize that we have misjudged our audience of writing students. Outside evaluators assume the dispassionate view that pencils have both an eraser and a writing point. They help us decide both what parts of the program need revising and what elements remain sheer poetry, justifying our satisfaction.

Guide for planning an evaluation visit

1. Discuss the entire procedure with your department head or dean. Determine in advance what you expect of the evaluator, how much the visit will cost, and when it will take place. The program director should be consulted, but his or her superior should bear ultimate responsibility for the visit.

2. Submit a list of potential consultants. Note their areas of expertise. Estimate air fares for bringing them to campus. WPA can suggest possible consultants: contact Professor Winifred B. Horner, Vice-President, WPA, Department of English, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65201.

3. The dean or department head may ask your help in drafting the letter of invitation. Be sure it specifies what you want the evaluators to do, what the honorarium will be, and when you want the written report.

4. Prepare the agenda. Evaluators usually want to discuss the program with full-time faculty, part-time staff, teaching assistants, students, program administrators, the freshman committee, the department head, and the dean (and perhaps other department or university administrators). If the evaluators request it, reserve time for talks with students or non-English faculty with special interest in the program. Give each group an opportunity to voice opinions without fear of later reprisals; for example, faculty should not be present when the evaluators meet with teaching assistants. Schedule discussions with the highest-ranking administrators toward the end of the visit, and give the evaluators some free time, so that they can collect their thoughts, digest comments, compare notes, or reread evaluation materials.

5. Mail evaluators background materials ahead of time. But do not overwhelm them with documents they cannot conveniently synthesize. The following materials would be helpful:
    a. A self-study report recommending changes the department wants to implement;
    b. Tallies of evaluation questionnaires completed before the visit by teachers and students;
    c. A copy of the college catalog together with descriptions, syllabi, or guidelines for the courses in the writing program;
    d. A list of texts and other instructional materials;
    e. A description of placement and exemption procedures;
    f. A description of grading criteria;
    g. Materials pertaining to orientation meetings, workshops, graduate courses, and other teacher training programs;
    h. Statistical information for the previous and current academic year: enrollment, class size, composition of the teaching staff, final grade distributions;
    i. Curriculum vitae of the program's director(s);
    j. An agenda for the evaluation visit.

6. Arrange hotel accommodations; *reserve comfortable meeting rooms;* locate a *large* coffee pot; find someone to meet the evaluators at the airport, escort them to each meeting, and take them to lunch and dinner. Delegate these responsibilities to other teachers, not to an already overworked secretary, so that you are relatively free to handle unforeseen problems.

The essential unity of language arts programs:
Its pedagogical implications
Greg Larkin

As administrators of language arts programs, we are all painfully aware of the multiplicity of our calling. We must train new faculty and, what is worse, retrain old ones. We must keep up with the explosion of knowledge in the area of composition and rhetoric, and we must apply that knowledge to our programs in practical ways. Also, for most of us, with the job comes a host of small decisions, each of which can be time-consuming, agonizing, and petty all at once, e.g., "Who will teach the 7:30 a.m. class?" "Does Ricardo Baconawa's 'English Grammar' class taken at the University of the Philippines in 1974 satisfy our freshman English requirement?" "Can Sherry Stevens retake the qualifying test she failed by one point because her aunt died and she had to go to Boston and flew all night to get back for the test and really could do better?" The list of problems and decisions goes on and on.

In fact, I am afraid that all too often these small questions get the better of us and we lose sight of the larger overall purpose of any language program as we attempt to create a fail-safe system for dealing with every individual situation. We are so busy preparing for the exceptions that we forget about the rule. When as writing program administrators we get lost among the thousand little problems, the programs we administer are exposed to what I think is one of the most serious and least-discussed ills besetting language arts programs: conceptual fragmentation. Unfortunately, even if each individual element in a program is fine-tuned and its problems systematically held at bay, or even eliminated, the overall program will still suffer from a lack of continuity if each course bears no functional or conceptual relationship to other courses or to the overall goal of the program. Exclusive focus on individual courses results in a fragmented program much weaker than the potential value of the individual courses taken together. Rather than adding to each other, individual courses in a fragmented program actually subtract from each other, because of their contradictory premises, methods, and materials.

To combat this fragmentation, I would like to identify what seem to me to be four very common types of courses into which our programs typically fall, and then suggest some specific ways, both theoretical and practical, to unite these units into a larger whole.

Basic Reading. We all administer courses or parts of courses that are concerned with the process of interpreting a series of written symbols on a page into a total message, including denotative content or theme, authorial tone, and the projected image of the intended audience. Reading, we teach our students, is an

active process in which the reader forms expectations and then verifies or modifies these expectations through further reading. Readers seek a consistent whole in what they read, something unified in mechanics, tone, and content. Where readers note apparent inconsistencies, they form a hypothesis of a larger consistency, and verify or modify it through further reading.

Basic Writing. We all administer courses or parts of courses in writing, composition, or rhetoric, each of which is concerned with the basic process by which a writer generates a topic, either from some internal pressure or through a response to some external pressure, selects and orders details relevant to the response the author feels impelled to make to the pressure, and carefully polishes the text until its words and sentences together most perfectly represent and communicate his or her response.

Literature. Most of us administer courses or parts of courses concerned with the study of literature. Usually these courses combine basic reading (understanding literary texts) and basic writing (preparing critical articles). In other words, in a literary class students are simply reading and writing respectively two rather specialized language products: creation in language of an imaginative and self-contained world bearing no necessary or absolute relationship to the "real" or everyday world, and commentary on that created world.

Practical Writing. Most of us administer courses or parts of courses, such as business English and technical writing, which are concerned with writing on the job for very mundane but necessary ends, such as writing memos, sales reports, lab reports, etc. This kind of writing, like basic writing and critical writing about literature, involves generating an overt message and patiently looking for the clearest and most economical means of stating the message to the intended audience.

If we have a general education program in which these four types of courses remain conceptually unrelated, I fear that from the student's point of view the whole thing starts to look like a nonlinear series of randomly placed hurdles that must be cleared or otherwise gotten around or out of the way before they attain the overall goal of getting out of school. My question is, can we provide any conceptual unity to this collection of courses, and, if so, can this theoretical unity be manifested in specific teaching methodologies which will reinforce each other from class to class throughout the student's career in the language arts and beyond? To answer this question, I would like to identify what I consider the common theoretical ground of all the courses I have discussed above and then describe three specific teaching methodologies we can use in all these courses.

The theoretical ground of all the courses which we as language program administrators supervise is that all lasting language products are the result of conscious, consistent, and purposeful choices by their creators, whether essayists, novelists, business executives, scientists, or whatever. The ability to control these choices, i.e., to create a language product, is the result of one's being literate—a person's overall awareness of the resources of language, and ability to use them to achieve a predetermined end. As the particular goal differs, so the exact language resources required to achieve that goal will differ. But the ability to see

the goal and sense the language most appropriate to the goal is the essence of being literate, and therefore it is the essence of what should be taught in every course we administer.

If we accept this basic theory underpinning all the language arts, we can refer to it as we define the specific language skills sought in our various courses. Because our courses would then be based on a common theoretical framework, certain teaching methodologies based on that framework should fit very naturally into them. It ssems to me that there are three such methodologies, which I think apply to every type of course we are concerned with.

1. Thesis and Support. Language products are the result of many conscious decisions on matters of individual words and sentences which build toward a total, predetermined effect. It follows that whether reading or writing, we should be able to find in an essay, a poem, or a business proposal, patterns of relatively abstract theses related to relatively concrete supporting material. Each language product will of course have its own end, and thus its own means of support. Nonetheless, the relationship between thesis and support is quite consistent from essay to poem to business proposal. In each, the creator has certain intentions, the establishment of which implies certain supporting methods and materials. Thus, a businessperson makes a careful market analysis (supporting material) and writes a proposal to open a French restaurant on North University Avenue (thesis). In exactly the same relationship, Charles Dickens invents the story of Stephen Blackpool (supporting material) to point out the evils of uncontrolled industrialism (thesis).

2. Expectation and Fulfillment. The term "thesis and support" refers only to the end product as a whole, and can not therefore account for the process we go through as we read or write a language product. Neither reader nor writer is fully aware of all the theses and supporting materials at the beginning of reading or writing. Hence, both readers and writers work through a system of expectation and fulfillment. A title, a metre, a thesis statement, and a salutation at the head of a letter, each sets up certain expectations. These expectations will not be the same for everyone, but generally those with similar background will feel similar expectations. AS we read, we refine our expectations until they satisfactorily account for every observed detail in the language product. Whatever the goal, the writer sets up a system of expectations to lead the reader to that goal. This applies as precisely to a collection agency's attempt to get a check back by return mail as it does to Maria's letter to Malvolio. If the desire is to shock or to be comic, the expectations set up may be purposefully violated, but this tactic does not change the fact that the writer, in creating a desired effect, is playing on the reader's expectations—in this case the shock or humor of seeing the expectation violated. Introductions, transitions, characters' names, and report abstracts can all be approached meaningfully through examinations of expectation and fulfillment.

3. The Idea of Order. Language products use words, sentences, and paragraphs in an order that is inherent in the goals and methods of the product itself, and in the expectations that are aroused in the reader. This order manifests itself as the conscious process of discovery by writer and reader alike of logical patterns which

will unite thesis and support in a way that will lead to the desired effect. All logic, which is simply a set of rules for orderly thinking, is based on the possible relationships between abstract thesis and concrete support inherent in any given proposition. To place equipment and materials first in a pineapple upside-down cake recipe is logically identical to Marvell's flattering his coy mistress before propositioning her. Thus, the five-paragraph essay is as logical and appropriate to the impromptu university essay exam as the heroic couplet is to the reasoning of "The Essay on Man," and as inside address, salutation, body, and complimentary close are to a business letter. Each *could* be written in a different order, or in a different manner, but they simply would not work the same way any more, or have the same meaning.

To the extent that program administrators can focus all four types of courses in language arts programs (basic reading, basic writing, literature, and practical writing) with these three theoretical concepts (thesis and support, expectation and fulfillment, and the idea of order), the individual components of our programs will reinforce each other. This conceptual unity will provide a soil, furthermore, in which each individual course can flower.

Announcements

WPA at MLA

WPA will sponsor a Special Session at the Modern Language Association convention in San Francisco this December entitled "Involving Senior Faculty in Teaching Writing." Harvey Wiener, President of WPA, will moderate the session. The speakers will be Robert Lyons, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, City University of New York; Richard Marius, Director of Composition, Harvard University; and Ellen Nold, Coordinator of Composition, School of Engineering, Stanford University. The session (No. 640) is scheduled for December 30, 1979, 11:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. in Elizabethan C, St. Francis Hotel. A general meeting of WPA members will follow the session in the same room from 12:15 to 1:00 p.m.

Massachusetts Bay Area WPA

The Massachusetts Bay Area Council of Writing Program Administrators held its second conference this past spring, on difficulties in establishing departmental objectives. Speakers included Marilyn Chew, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy; Fred Kolb, Quinsigamond Community College; William Roberts, University of Lowell; Richard Marius, Harvard University; Rick Branscomb, Northern Essex Community College; Louis Edmond, Dean Junior College; John Roche, Rhode Island College; and Linda Goldberg, Lasell Junior College. The keynote speaker was WPA President Harvey Wiener. The Mass Bay Area WPA's October conference will be devoted to a discussion of evaluation and testing. The President of the Mass Bay Area WPA is Timothy Donovan, Northeastern University.

Institute on Writing

The following writing program administrators have been appointed to participate in the second session of the University of Iowa Institute on Writing, January 13 through July 13, 1980:

Melvin Bertolozzi
Director of Freshman English
Loyola Marymount University
Los Angeles, California 90045

Owen Brady
Coordinator of the Freshman Humanities Forum
Clarkson College
Potsdam, New York 13676

Alma Bryant
Director of the Freshman Composition Program
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Harry Caldwell
Director of the Academic Writing Program
Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas 78284

Patricia Ann Carlson
Director of Freshman Composition
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Terre Haute, Indiana 47803

Marjorie Dew
Director of Freshman Writing
Ashland College
Ashland, Ohio 44805

Timothy Donovan
Director of Freshman English
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

Rebecca Faery
Hollins College
Hollins College, Virginia 24020

Lynda Jerit
Coordinator of the Communications Discipline
Oakton Community College
Morton Grove, Illinois 60053

Margaret Kantz
Monroe Community College
Rochester, New York 14623

Philip Keith
Director of Composition
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301

Ruth Lucas
Coordinator of the Freshman Composition Program
Kapiolani Community College
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

Donald A. Maxwell, Jr.
Leader for Writing Curriculum
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
Richmond, Virginia 23241

Major William McCarron
Director of Freshman English
U.S. Air Force Academy
USAF Academy, Colorado 80840

Thomas Miles
Coordinator of Writing Programs
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Hugh Owings
Director of Freshman English
West Georgia College
Carrollton, Georgia 30118

Jon Patton
Director of Freshman Composition
University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Sister Ann Redmond
Director of the Writing Center
College of Saint Catherine
St. Paul, Minnesota 55105

Leone Scanlon
Director of Writing
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610

Dianna Vitanza
Director of Composition
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Notes on contributors

Maxine Hairston is Associate Professor of English, University of Texas at Austin. She was Director of Freshman English from 1971 to 1975 and has been Associate Dean of Humanities since 1977. She is the author of *A Contemporary Rhetoric* (Houghton Mifflin), and is currently working on an advanced composition text for Norton. She is a member of the Executive Committee of CCCC and of the College Section Committee of NCTE.

Erika Lindemann received her Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill in 1972. From 1974 to 1978 she directed the Freshman English Program at the University of South Carolina, where she established a Writing Laboratory and coordinated a summer Conference for Teachers of Composition. She frequently conducts in-service workshops for secondary English teachers and teaches freshman composition, historical linguistics, and courses for prospective writing teachers. A member of *WPA*'s Board of Advisory Editors, she also serves as South Carolina's NCTE Affiliate representative to SLATE, and was recently named to NCTE's Commission on Composition. She is currently writing a book on teaching writing to be published by Oxford University Press. She teaches at the University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Greg Larkin holds a B.A. and Ph.D. in English from Brigham Young University, Provo, and an M.A. from the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He has written an advanced composition text for biology students, as well as many journal articles and convention presentations. He is currently working on effective ways to integrate advanced composition courses with major division courses and assignments. He is the editor of the *HCTE Leaflet,* the official publication of the Hawaii Council of Teachers of English. He teaches at Brigham Young University, Laie, Hawaii campus.

In the winter issue

Industrial management and teaching evaluation programs
William F. Woods

Observing teaching: Discovering and developing the individual's teaching style
Michael C. Flanigan

A device for interpreting the results of student evaluation forms
George L. Findlen

Membership in the Council of Writing Program Administrators is $10 a year, including an annual subscription to *WPA*. Residents outside the United States add $1.50 postage.

Please fill out the membership form, enclose check or money order, and return to: Joseph Comprone, Treasurer, WPA.

English Department
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40208

Council of Writing Program Administrators   Membership Form

Date_____

Name _____

Title _____

Institution _____

Address _____

_____

_____

Amount enclosed: ☐ $10   ☐ $11.50 (Includes $1.50 postage.)

Brooklyn College Studies on Society in Change
Brooklyn College Press

The Great Impeacher: A Political Biography of James M. Ashley
Robert E. Horowitz

James M. Ashley, an influential Radical Republican in Congress during the Civil War and Reconstruction years, is best known as a leader in the movement to impeach Andrew Johnson. However, as chairman of the House Committee on Territories, he was a driving force behind many important Reconstruction measures; he collaborated closely with Abraham Lincoln to make possible the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment; and he proposed the enfranchisement of blacks as early as 1858. In portraying these often over-looked accomplishments and giving a full accounting of Ashley's political career, Horowitz has filled an important gap in Reconstruction history.

Robert E. Horowitz is assistant professor of history at Rutgers University.

The Mutual Effects of the Islamic and Judeo-Christian Worlds: The East European Pattern
Abraham Ascher, Tibor Halasi-Kun, and Béla K. Király, Editors

Thirteen historians examine the interaction of Jewish, Christian, and Islamic cultures during the early modern period in eastern Europe. The essays stress the role of the Ottoman Empire in molding East-West relations and establishing legal and cultural patterns which continue to affect Eastern Europe. Such specific topics are examined as servile labor in the Ottoman Empire; the Protestant Reformation and Islam; Russian-Muslim relations in the Crimea; the Ottoman Empire in Danubian Europe; and the European influence on Ottoman architecture.

Abraham Ascher and Béla K. Király are professors of history at Brooklyn College.
Tibor Halasi-Kun is professor of history at Columbia University.

Before Watergate: The Problems of Corruption in American Society
Abraham S. Eisenstadt, Ari Hoogenboom, and Hans L. Trefousse, Editors
With an introduction by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.

These essays provide a historical context for the Watergate scandal and other contemporary instances of corruption and form an absorbing picture of a perennial American problem in many of its seemingly innumerable forms. Contributions include comprehensive analyses and studies of specific historical incidents—among them the case of Nelson W. Aldrich and the sugar trust; the U.S. fuel administration of World War I; the activities of Aaron Burr; corruption in Britain as a historical precedent for the early American state; and an examination of the political scandals of the Gilded Age in an attempt to discover whether the exposing of corruption helped bring significant reforms.

Abraham S. Eisenstadt, Ari Hoogenboom, and Hans L. Trefousse are professors of history at Brooklyn College.

Brooklyn, U.S.A.: Fourth Largest City in America
Rita S. Miller, Editor

This collection of essays is devoted to the historical and sociological study of Brooklyn—once an independent city, but now a borough of almost 2.5 million inhabitants within New York City. One essay gives a historical overview of 500 yaers of continual changes in the area now known as Brooklyn. Among other topics are the Canarsie Indians (the area's first inhabitants), Brooklyn in revolutionary times, and the making of the Bedford-Stuyvesant ghetto. The book examines traditional symbols of Brooklyn life—including Brooklyn speech, the now-departed Dodgers, the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and Coney Island—and Brooklyn today, when its ethnic diversity and constantly shifting population make it one of the most complex communities in America. The final section of the book provides two very different views of Brooklyn's future.

Rita S. Miller is assistant professor of sociology at Brooklyn College.