
Beyond Apprenticeship: Graduate Students, Professional Development Programs and the Future(s) of English Studies

Mark C. Long

Jennifer H. Holberg

Marcy M. Taylor

Must I not serve a long apprenticeship
. . . . and, in the end,
Having my freedom, boast of nothing else
But that I was a journeyman to grief?

—Shakespeare, *Richard II*

Over the past twenty years or so, English departments have paid increasing attention to the preparation of graduate students which has, in turn, significantly affected the quality of composition teaching. This attention grows out of a relatively long tradition of attempts at reform documented by Janet Marting. For instance, she describes a 1930 conference by the Institute for Administrative Offices of Higher Institutions devoted to the topic of "The Training of College Teachers," where Gordon Laing noted "low rumblings of discontent, ominous mutterings of dissatisfaction, savage growlings of complaint, accompanied by flashes of forked criticism" which were being directed "immediately at the teaching capacity, or, to use the word of the critics, incapacity of the brilliantly hooded products of our graduate schools" (qtd. in Marting 35). More recently, through the efforts of such organizations as WPA and the Conference on College Composition and Communication, graduate programs in English have devoted considerable resources to the training of graduate teaching assistants. In fact, the situation of a new teaching assistant being thrust into a classroom for the first time, with little more than a class list and (perhaps) a copy of the approved text, has been reduced to a mythical remnant of our profession's history.¹

However, recent attempts to rectify the imbalance between training in research and training in teaching within graduate professional development programs can no longer be figured as a matter of emphasis (should we direct more training resources to pedagogy instead of content area scholarship?) but

rather as a failure of definition, a misreading of the profession and a misplacing of the graduate student within it. Not only do traditional models of training value a rather narrow definition of scholarship, but graduate faculty who train their students for positions like those for which they were trained and hired perpetuate a limited (and limiting) path of professionalization. Trudell Thomas notes that “discussions of the training of graduate students tend to focus solely upon their role as teachers and researchers, while paying virtually no attention to their future responsibilities as administrators” (41). For example, Thomas writes, “the essays in *Training the New Teacher of Composition* (edited by Charles Bridges, NCTE, 1986) all deal with helping graduate students in their role as teachers, and none addresses their responsibilities beyond the classroom” (41). Even within those training programs which devote extensive resources and time to developing materials and policies designed to aid graduate students in the classroom (and in those training manuals like Bridges’ which present students with all manner of techniques and good advice), graduate students themselves play only a passive part in their own professional development.²

While such efforts at increased training spring from laudable motives—primarily a genuine interest in the caliber of undergraduate and graduate education and the attendant need to introduce graduate teaching assistants to the body of scholarship surrounding composition studies—the model of graduate preparation which most often underlies these programs, what we term the “apprenticeship” model, does little to prepare students for the multiple roles and varied intellectual work of faculty members. Indeed, not only are students not trained with these wide range of faculty responsibilities in mind, but in many ways the profession for which they are being trained no longer exists. Our own experiences as graduate student administrators have highlighted the gaps in graduate preparation. It is our position that if the profession truly seeks to value and redefine the status of teaching, program service, and administrative work, then it must be willing to invest in the likely future in which these activities are more equally valued by its members. We propose that as graduate students gain teaching experience and develop a theoretical competency by engaging with the scholarship of the field, this experiential and theoretical knowledge should be used by the WPA for two interrelated aims: the first is to transform the intellectual work of the WPA by decentralizing and delegating day-to-day tasks of the program; the second is to create a collaborative administrative structure and thereby give students an opportunity to learn the practices of composition studies by actually finding themselves in a position to shape those practices. The paradigm we propose, the “collegial” model, envisions more fully involved graduate students as reflective, active participants in their own graduate preparation. By placing the metaphors of “apprentice” and “colleague” against one another, we argue the need, then, to reconceive the professional development program, and the graduate student’s position in it, as preparation for the future of English studies, and the full range of rights and obligations that comprise membership in the professorate.

The Graduate Student and the Contradiction of Apprenticeship

The absence of this fuller conception of graduate education is in part attributable to the way in which graduate student teaching assistants are defined within the "apprenticeship" model of TA training.³ In the Preface to *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*, Bridges refers to an MLA study entitled "The Current State of Teaching Apprentice Activities in Language and Literature" which surveyed 248 M.A. programs and 467 Ph.D. programs around the country. Of those programs reporting, 75% use TAs as "teaching apprentices" during their first year of graduate study, and the principle responsibility of the majority of TAs is "autonomous classroom teaching," most frequently in composition. Yet if the majority of TA work is so-called "autonomous teaching," in what ways does the notion of apprenticeship misrepresent the differing competencies of TAs? Likewise, if graduate school is an apprenticeship, how, then, is full membership in the "guild" of English studies conceived? In other words, is the kind of faculty members created by the apprenticeship model the kind of faculty members we desire or need?

It seems difficult to believe that they ever could be, given the logic of the metaphor of "apprenticeship." At its most fundamental level, "apprentice" is defined as 1) one who is bound by indentures or by legal agreement to serve another person for a certain time, with a view to learning an art or trade, usually of maintenance by the master; 2) hence, one who is learning, esp. by practical experience under skilled workers, and often without pay, an art, trade, or calling; and 3) one not well-versed in a subject; a novice. Although the term "apprentice" has been appropriated to supplant the connotations of "assistant," (that is, as someone additional to a faculty member in a course), and more recently to approximate the ideal of the reciprocal "mentoring" relationship between a student and a faculty advisor, the buried assumptions of apprenticeship regarding the position of the graduate student remain. In contrast to the relationship between relative equals implied by the ideal of mentoring, apprenticeship implies a rigid differential in status and power between master and apprentice: the apprentice is bound to serve the master, with the payoff for his/her labor being the learning of a trade. That learning is uni-directional, determined solely by the master; in fact, the apprentice's entire "maintenance" is dependent on the master. While the apprentice learns through practical experience, he or she is "under" those who are skilled, the apprentice him- or herself being a "novice." In terms of teaching, the apprentice-teacher is a "practice-teacher," (a student teacher who enters someone else's classroom for a short time and practices getting up in front of a class and delivering a predetermined set of lessons, but who is always under the direction of the cooperating teacher). In this view, graduate students are figured as "recipients of" training.

Reflecting on the concept of apprenticeship in turn reveals the organized contradictions which confine the ways we think about the relationship between the graduate student and the professional development program. Donovan, Sprouse and Williams summarize the situation:

Typically, something is handed down to TAs, whether a book or outline, or the latest theory, writing assignment, classroom exercise, or method of grading. To be sure, most TAs are grateful for whatever help they can get; beginners, after all, must have some security and direction. But the departmental program, whatever it may be, will not, and cannot, consistently serve all their needs—or those of their students—as many TAs learn very quickly. (140)

This apprentice model involves not only the handing down of materials, but also methods, rationales, even “stances.” Allen and Reuter, in *Teaching Assistant Strategies: An Introduction to College Teaching*, advise that “All new TAs must assume a myriad of roles and must try on teaching styles to use in accomplishing such roles” (28); the emphasis is on (presumed) choice among a series of options presented—by textbooks, teaching manuals, and training “programs”—as though one can “accomplish a role,” can, in effect, take a stand, by simply “trying on” a strategy or theory without understanding, questioning, and defining it for him- or herself through active, collaborative participation. This is the same teaching manual, by the way, that advises that “TAs should not engage in unnecessary ideological, methodological, or pedagogical disputes with the professor or director” (47). Thus, teaching is reduced to method, material, and “pose.”

Many counter that the apprenticeship model values collaboration and mentoring. Of course many programs organized around the logic of apprenticeship may offer graduate students the opportunity to participate in course design and to develop mutually beneficial relationships with more experienced instructors and/or faculty members. While such programs offer these benefits, it is also true that the conceptual boundaries of apprenticeship do not allow the members of a department to imagine other roles and responsibilities for the graduate student. Already burdened by a discrepancy in status (and power), graduate students are subject to the judicious decisions of a superior—whether articulating a pedagogical strategy for the classroom, making a decision about overall course design, or incorporating the goals and rationale of the curriculum into the personalized space of the classroom. However, our intention is not to challenge the obvious benefits of the mentoring relationship. Rather, we seek to frame an alternative to the hierarchical structure of the apprenticeship model. We see the need to rearticulate the centralized voice of the WPA by redistributing the one-way channels of power which confine graduate students to a narrow path of professionalization.

The Difficulty of Redefining Professional Development

Of course rethinking the apprenticeship model requires more than calling attention to the arbitrary conceptual distinctions which organize both departmental work and who will be charged with carrying out that work. It asks us to reflect on the controlling assumptions about academic work which guide what

appear to be even the most functional organizational models, and it demands that we address the cardinal question of how to organize the administration of a writing program.⁴ In recent years, teaching, program service, and administrative duties have begun to be considered as genuine intellectual work. This gradual realignment, while complex, is reflected in the current activities and research being conducted by groups like the PEW Preparing Future Faculty Project, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) and The Council of Writing Program Administrators itself.⁵ Professional and popular attention to what constitutes academic work has been a bellwether of sorts—an indicator, more specifically, of a re-examination of what English faculty do, how their work is represented, and how they are trained for the profession. However, underlying these calls for change are disciplinary assumptions which are transmitted through the professional development program. And, as we have argued, to ignore the assumptions of a development program organized around the concept of apprenticeship is to overlook how values about teaching and administrative work can be unknowingly perpetuated.

Many of these assumptions are what we call “organized contradictions,” all of which underscore the discontinuity between what graduate students are being trained to do and what they may end up doing as members of what is, by all accounts, a volatile profession. In “What Next? Thought and Action in Intellectual Work,” Nicholas Brommell reflects on the possible futures of the profession of English Studies. Calling attention to the nature of graduate training, Brommell asks, “Who, as a graduate student, was encouraged to think as seriously about teaching as about scholarship? . . . Who was taught anything at all and who was provided opportunities to participate in administration, management scheduling, curricular reform, and the host of other tasks that make up the dailiness of departmental life and work?” (109). Of course in both theory and practice, composition studies has unquestionably raised the status of pedagogy within graduate programs in English studies. But opportunities for graduate students to take the next step—to test this experience by participating in such departmental activities as formulating the goals and rationale for course design or implementing a curricular change—has not been adequately considered as a function of the organizational structure of the professional development program.

The *conceptual* limits of the apprenticeship model lead us to the somewhat obvious *structural* impediments to the alternative “collegial” model we envision. First, perhaps the most problematic effect of the apprentice model is that it continually reproduces “TAs” rather than colleagues. In the process, the model obscures the range of intellectual activity involved in being a faculty member—the useful, imaginative, important actions implied by the terms “colleague,” and “academic service”: making decisions with colleagues, negotiating departmental policies and politics, participating in cross-disciplinary conversations and understanding the constraints imposed from without, advising/mentoring students, creating curricula and rationalizing program requirements. To imagine

oneself as a member of the professorate requires true rhetorical action that cannot be created in a vacuum. Without a professional development program which offers these experiences to future faculty members of the profession, we will continue to train a generation of teachers and scholars for a university structure which, at the least, has become far more complicated and contested and, at the most, will no longer exist. Negotiating the potential configurations of departmental and faculty work—and situating the value of that work in the community and the liberal arts college, the state university and the research institution—will require graduate students to develop more than specialized disciplinary knowledge and compartmentalized decision making skills for the classroom. Indeed, English studies already demands a much broader and more responsive range of intellectual and administrative skills of its members.

Second, the apprenticeship model is problematic not only in the relationship of the “master” WPA to graduate students, but also because it tends to fix curriculum and training practices by placing all responsibility for graduate professional preparation on one faculty member. Hence the stark contradiction between collaborative pedagogies and the pedagogies used in many professional development programs. As Gunner remarks, “We cannot in good faith endorse collaboration as a pedagogy and turn away from it as an administrative model” (14). In composition courses, the experience to achieve such action is advocated by creating an atmosphere of shared inquiry, of testing and questioning methods and the assumptions underlying them, of choice combined with opportunities to extend the discussion of the responsibilities entailed by certain choices, of meaningful, sophisticated readings in (and of) various academic disciplines and cultural sites. The rationale for such student-centered, politically-engaged composition classrooms is to turn rhetoric from a passive body of knowledge—skills and techniques—to a social activity with public consequences—to turn from seeing students as passive outsiders who must be “initiated,” toward viewing them as already-involved participants in the shaping of the university. It is increasingly difficult to continue advocating an administrative model which has not adequately addressed the absence of this rationale in its practices.

Finally, because the apprentice model typically operates under the direction of one “master” administrator, teaching assistants learn to accept one set of assumptions and one image of teaching composition, rather than to reflect and develop teaching strategies and pedagogies in conjunction with a larger community. By de-emphasizing the need for the teacher to theorize his or her own teaching (through the reduction of training to “handing down” and “overseeing”), the apprenticeship model, in effect, ratifies research as an intellectual act and teaching as a mechanical one. This model further alienates TAs from their work as teachers, contributing to an already developed passive resistance to composition, the field associated with training, with enforced supervision, with static method, with mechanistic practicality. Wilson and Stearns argue: “Caught in the double bind of being expected to teach well, yet being told that teaching is not important, many TAs dissociate themselves from their teaching assignments” (qtd. in Nyquist, et al. 10). Many of us have seen first hand how this alienation of

graduate students from their classroom work limits the consequences of that work in the larger community of the department. Although within writing programs teaching is explicitly valued, we subtly tell TAs that it is not important (and, specifically, that composition is not important) because one doesn't have to be involved, to think about it, in order to do it. The ironic twist for graduate students is that, because they fail to actively associate their TA experience with their professional lives after graduate school, they tend not to attach legitimacy to their jobs as TAs, thus reinforcing their transitional, partial identity within departments of English. Real teaching, real faculty work will come later. But how do we include graduate student TAs in this process we so obviously value with undergraduates? And how can a collegial model enable graduate students to imagine their roles as future faculty?

The Graduate Student as Departmental Colleague

We understand the professional development program to be a crucial site for perpetuating or challenging disciplinary assumptions. We therefore suggest that foregrounding these assumptions will help contribute to transforming what we mean by the intellectual work of the WPA. Our experiences within a collaborative administrative model allow us to construct an alternative metaphor to frame graduate experiences—one that moves beyond the negative stasis of apprenticeship to a more dynamic notion of collegiality. Reflecting first on professional development programs from the perspective of the WPA, and second from the perspective of graduate students, we propose to set forth three principles to guide the "collegial model." We then elaborate the potential consequences of a professional development program which actually seeks to prepare future faculty members for the various roles and responsibilities of future work in the profession.

The first principle we propose is to help graduate students *become active institutional agents*. This principle may appear to be self-evident, as it builds on convincing theoretical and practical justification for the view that positioning one's self in a discourse requires being in a position to not only reflect upon, but participate in—indeed to modify—that discourse. In Recchio's terms, graduate students need to develop competencies in order to relate "the conceptual frames (the theory) and the facts (the practice) of the discipline" (61). Recchio advocates creating the opportunity for students of the profession to become "reflective practitioners." However, there is little evidence that we have been successful at linking professional definition with self-understanding. Using this connection, we can find our way toward the value of graduate students as institutional agents by simply abandoning the outmoded and, in most cases, inaccurate designation "teaching assistant." "Ultimately," write Bishop and Crossley, "we're powerless unless we have a role in saying how 'we' and not just our 'roles' or our 'job descriptions' are defined" (53).

We therefore urge members of the profession to replace the designation

“teaching assistant” with the title “instructor,” which will more accurately represent the preprofessional activities of the graduate student, thereby extending the concept, if not the title itself, of “instructor.” Although definition is only one form of the principle of making graduate students active institutional agents, the title of instructor would signify the broader roles and responsibilities in which graduate students have already positioned themselves, and would more accurately define the relative autonomy of the teaching presently undertaken by graduate students in most departments. Such autonomous teaching is represented at the University of Washington by the fact that graduate students teach 100- and 200-level composition courses as well as 200-level introductory literature courses. In the first year of teaching, graduate students teach English 131, a first year course centered on argumentative writing. They are required to attend a two week intensive orientation before the quarter begins and then to take a quarter-long course on pedagogy. Although English 131 has a suggested curriculum and the Expository Writing Office provides instructors with extensive course materials, instructors are encouraged to make changes as they see fit as long as these stay within the parameters of the course description and program goals. Even in the first quarter, instructors are expected to devise their own syllabi and course calendars and thereafter to be solely responsible for every aspect of the courses to which they are assigned. In the following years of their programs, graduate students are then given the opportunity to test and refine their teaching methods in a variety of pedagogical and administrative contexts.

The second principle is to create a *multi-tiered professional development program which utilizes the experience of upper level instructors in all levels of the administrative structure*. For example, at the University of Washington we have created multiple channels for graduate students to develop competencies which build on the first-year practicum or teaching seminar. Although this collaborative model will undoubtedly take a number of forms, depending on particular programs’ needs and resources, collaboration among graduate students and faculty at the University of Washington has produced an administrative structure that provides one possible image of the paradigm for which we are arguing. Graduate students have an extensive range of administrative roles in which to participate after two years of teaching experience in the department. These opportunities include membership on the Expository Writing Committee, whose primary functions include selecting textbooks for 100-level courses and inviting nationally known scholars in pedagogy to speak on campus; acting as the Assistant Director of the writing center (under supervision by a faculty member), including co-teaching the tutor training seminar, assisting in the ongoing training and supervision of the tutors, and serving as the liaison between the writing center and other members of the department; and serving as advisors in the English undergraduate advising center, not only guiding students through course choices but helping with a variety of other tasks from internship applications to graduate school statements of purpose.

Within the formal structure of the Expository Writing Office, assistant directors are extremely active in the administration of the programs contained

within it.⁶ ADs are competitively chosen each year to fill positions which come open on a rotating basis. Terms for ADs are two years, during which time their teaching load is reduced to accommodate their administrative duties. ADs serve in three units: the EOP (Educational Opportunity Program), the CIC (Computer Integrated Composition Program) and the EWP (Expository Writing Program). Advised by the EOP faculty advisor and the director of the writing program, the EOP AD is the department's primary administrator for English 104 and 105, a two quarter linked writing course for special admission students. The EOP AD designs curriculum, provides training to instructors, schedules classes, and acts as primary liaison with a number of programs under the Office of Minority Affairs. The duties of the CIC ADs center primarily on the orientation, training and support of instructors teaching in the program, both pedagogically and technologically. They assist the associate director of the expository writing program (who is also the director of CIC) in textbook and software testing and provide technical assistance to instructors in the classroom. Finally, the assistant directors with perhaps the largest range of influence are the three assistant directors of the expository writing program. In this position, the EWP ADs are the first to train every graduate student who teaches in the department—before they move on to more training in EOP, CIC, or other 100 or 200 level teaching assignments.⁷

Our title, "Beyond Apprenticeship," points to one of the most underdeveloped aspects of training programs: what happens to training *after* we introduce instructors to teaching composition? As Latterell indicates, the potential of this under-utilized resource has only begun to be explored (22). As graduate students are utilized in the sharing of administrative responsibility, one of the most obvious consequences is reducing the workload of the WPA. Specifically, the "collegial" model creates a responsive feedback system to keep busy WPAs informed about which training activities and protocols actually work; the delegation of administrative responsibilities also frees the WPA from many of the time-consuming, day-to-day responsibilities of conferencing, mentoring, doing class visits, and preparing teaching materials. But what is less work for the WPA is work of a certain kind, namely the kind of work that professional administrators will need to learn how to do. Producing teaching materials, organizing long-term training, preparing practica topics, visiting and conferring with new instructors—with these tasks distributed among the members of a collaborative administrative structure, the WPA can act as a more dynamic force in program development. Freed from the constraints of day-to-day program operation, the WPA can focus on overarching issues of program development, curricular innovation, and theoretical competencies among faculty members and graduate students alike. At the same time, the WPA is carrying out the important work of mentoring both instructors within the program and graduate student administrators.

The third principle is to *develop a responsive and collaborative community of teachers*. It is our experience that creating a collaborative administrative structure not only actively includes graduate students as administrators, but also opens up

new avenues of inclusion for every graduate student in the program. Such a model includes multiple mentors and, rather than depending upon the labor of a lone WPA, extends the role of mentor to other faculty and, importantly, graduate students. Training moves from handing down information to creating an interactive web of information exchange. At the University of Washington, helping new teachers construct ways of developing and managing their own courses takes place within a team-taught, small-group seminar format in which new instructors work through professional issues with faculty and graduate student administrators—in part, by producing a teaching portfolio around a new assignment which they design and by visiting one another's classrooms. Thus, creating an environment for active reflection about teaching not only produces better teachers, but generates an active cycle of innovation: instructors' work—in seminars, class visits and portfolios—directly influences the following year's training practices and pedagogical decisions. In our experience, curriculum and training protocols are contingent and in need of constant monitoring and, in many cases, modification. In contrast to a centralized administrative structure, the "collegial" model is able to monitor the problems and the successes in actual classroom work and is therefore far more responsive to the reciprocal relations between pedagogical theory and classroom practice.

For the WPA, one of the most compelling outcomes of this third principle is that the professional development program is better able to accommodate the wide range of experiences brought to the classroom by first-year teachers. Many teaching candidates have no prior teaching experience; and many of the "first-year" teachers bring many years of teaching to their assignments in the composition classroom. On the other hand, as Weiser observes, the burden on the WPA is compounded when one considers that "some of the people who teach composition have not only never studied the subject matter, they may have never taken a course in it" (64). But rather than suggest a more tightly controlled model of training by the WPA, we suggest this problem can be addressed by integrating the experiences of all instructors into the teaching community of the department. With experienced instructors serving as assistant directors of the program, inexperienced teaching associates are offered closer support. First-year instructors who bring pedagogical experience to their teaching assignments serve as valuable resources for the assistant directors as well, whose work includes monitoring the interface between the program goals and rationale and individual teaching styles, personalities, and teaching experience.

Finally, more than simply offering consistency with a pedagogical consensus which has shifted from a master to a collaborative model of learning, multiple forms of mentoring are opened up, which keeps the input of information flowing more efficiently to the WPA. The graduate student administrators can not only help the WPA access this information concerning the outcomes of established training protocols, but the graduate student can suggest and implement appropriate modifications to the existing program. These outcomes of the developmental model of administration we advocate have resulted, in part, from seeking ways to discuss our practical and theoretical interest in teaching, a

conversation which has not been fully offered in our coursework, and one which did not continue beyond our first year of training. More importantly, while the inclusion of 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th year graduate students in the administrative program has eased the day-to-day burdens of the WPA, participation in the multiple administrative responsibilities of the department has given graduate students real experience in refining not only the courses they are charged to teach, but the consequences of their teaching in the department and the university.

Conclusion

If, as we have suggested, the conceptual constraints of the “apprenticeship” model are embodied in the structural organization of professional development programs, then there is much work to be done. With the present culture of the English department in mind, we suggest each professional development program should examine its own vision of itself as well as its multiple and often conflicting hierarchies. Writing as present and recently graduated instructors, we suggest that although ‘we’ graduate students are being trained for jobs in the profession, there is increasing evidence that those jobs will be more varied and will require broader skills than the positions as they are defined today. Currently, as Bromell reminds us, “the path to professional recognition, status, and reward leads through the library, through the word processor, and through professional conventions” (107). As we suggest, changing the way we go about relating thought and action therefore requires at the very least reconceptualizing the value of these domains. More generally, we believe the preprofessional urgency to do research, attend conferences, and publish writing should therefore be redirected toward a wider conception of intellectual work.

In the administration of the writing program, how we define and prepare new members of the profession is directly correlated to deepening the value of what we do in the domains of teaching and administration. The “collegial model” seeks to articulate another site in which the transition from implicit justification of institutional practices to a more explicit critique of those practices can take place. We believe the best evidence that the profession is redefining the value of academic work not confined to its traditionally conceived boundaries—research, writing, and publication—will be programs which provide its students with opportunities to learn more than compartmentalized disciplinary knowledge. The ongoing theorizing of writing program administration should take place with its practitioners in mind—particularly those teaching “assistants” who are too often overlooked and under-utilized within the conceptual and structural confines of apprenticeship. The best professional development programs will demonstrate a more dynamic and equitable form of administrative collaboration between peers. Thus as future generations of scholars move into the profession, they will continue to redefine the boundaries of what we consider to be intellectual work, and will best prepare the next generation of faculty members for the various roles and responsibilities of the profession.

Notes

1. A version of this paper was presented at the 1995 CCCC Convention in Washington, D. C. and at the 1995 WPA Summer Conference in Bellingham, Washington. We would like to thank our audiences for comments. We are also indebted to the following faculty administrators of the Expository Writing Program at the University of Washington for their contributions to our thinking: John Webster (former WPA), Laurie George (Associate WPA and Director CIC Program, former Acting WPA,), Carolyn Allen (WPA), Gail Stygall (Advisor of EOP), and Gary Handwerk (Director of English 111 and former Interim WPA).
2. One need only survey a few articles on teacher training to glean that the first-year teacher is generally considered as a "passive" recipient of knowledge and in need of careful "guidance" (Hofstetter Towns 96).
3. The irony of our continuing use of the term "teaching assistant" is apparent. Although the term is still used in our department, we will argue the term more than often misrepresents the kind of classroom work graduate students actually do, and therefore use the term here for convenience and clarity. In the third section of this essay, we suggest broadening the term instructor to more accurately reflect the role of the graduate student in the professional development program.
4. For an alternative discussion of organizational models (as well as the need to address these alternatives), see Christine Hult, "Politics Redux: The Organization and Administration of Writing Programs," *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 18.3 (Spring 1995): 44–52. Hult responds to a question she argues has not been sufficiently debated in WPA circles: "how best to organize the administration of writing programs" (44).
5. See especially the draft statement on "The Intellectual Work of the WPA" elsewhere in this issue of *WPA: Writing Program Administration*. [Editor]
6. The duties of the Expository Writing Program's ADs are myriad—and in fact, over the past three years, the level of responsibility which this position entails has increased steadily. Working as colleagues with both the WPA and each other, ADs plan and conduct the two week intensive orientation session and assist in the quarter-long fall teaching practicum. In the Fall Quarter they visit each new instructor's class at least once and discuss individual classroom concerns with him/her. They also conference with instructors on a number of issues, including grading. Throughout the rest of the year, they continue to provide ongoing support to new teachers by holding office hours, conducting workshops on pedagogy, organizing roundtable discussions to facilitate departmental discussions about teaching, participating in an e-mail forum designed especially for instructors, and mentoring. At the same time, a great deal of their work is devoted to curricular development and revision. Not only do they teach the material given first year TAs, but the EWP ADs—in collaboration with the WPA and the Associate WPA—write and produce two in-house manuals: a course planner for teaching English 131 and a reference manual for subsequent teaching assignments in the department.
7. However, the use of graduate students in the roles we have outlined raises the inevitable question of abuse: the benefits sound appealing, one may agree, but aren't graduate students already overworked and underpaid? And isn't this model going to increase the burden? The question is interesting less for what it asks than the assumptions from which it issues—that doing this kind of work will cut into the more important coursework, exams, research, conferences and

publication. On the contrary, we are arguing for a more equitable model which balances scholarship, pedagogy, and administrative duties. For instance, at the University of Washington two year AD appointments include one quarter each year with no teaching assignment and one quarter with reduced administrative responsibilities.

Works Cited

- Allen, R. R., and Theodore Reuter. *Teaching Assistant Strategies: An Introduction to College Teaching*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1990.
- Bishop, Wendy and Gay Lynn Crossley. "Doing the Hokey Pokey? Why Writing Program Administrator's Job Conditions Don't Seem to be Improving." *Composition Studies: Freshman English News* 21.2 (Fall 1993): 46-59.
- Bridges, Charles W., ed. *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1986.
- Bromell, Nicholas. "What Next? Thought and Action in Intellectual Work." *American Quarterly* 47.1 (March 1995): 102-115.
- Donovan, Timothy, Patricia Sprouse and Patricia Williams. "How TAs Teach Themselves." *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*, ed. Charles W. Bridges. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1986. 139-47.
- Gunner, Jeanne. "Decentering the WPA." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 18.1/2 (Fall Winter 1994): 8-15.
- Hofstetter Towns, Cheryl. "Dumbo or Colleague? Our Professional Perception of Students." *Composition Studies: Freshman English News* 21.1 (Spring 1993): 94-103.
- Hult, Christine. "Politics Redux: The Organization and Administration of Writing Programs." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 18.3 (Spring 1995): 44-52.
- Latterell, Catherine G. *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 19.3 (Spring 1996): 7-23.
- Marting, Janet. "A Retrospective on Training Teaching Assistants." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 11 (Fall 1987): 35-44.
- Nyquist, Jody, Robert Abbott, and Donald Wulff, eds. *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990's*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 39. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1989.
- Recchio, Thomas E. "Parallel Academic Lives: Affinities of Teaching Assistant and Freshman Writers." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 15.3 (Spring 1992): 57-61.
- Thomas, Trudelle. "The Graduate Student as Apprentice WPA: Experiencing the Future." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 14.3 (Spring 1991): 41-51.
- Weiser, Irwin. "Surveying New Teaching Assistants: Who They Are, What They Know, and What They Want to Know." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 14.1-2 (1990): 63-71.