

Collaborating at the ECB: A Reflection

Sharon Quiroz

The English Composition Board of the University of Michigan has been called "The Mother of All Writing Across the Curriculum Programs." It was established in 1978 by professors in the English Department, with its own budget, housed outside the English Department, and directed by a policy board drawn from faculty across the disciplines. In the next twenty years, as the discipline of composition emerged, the lecturers who staffed the unit became increasingly important on the national scene, and the hope grew of establishing an independent rhetoric department at the University of Michigan, once the home of Fred Newton Scott. But in 1997 the College of Arts and Sciences refused (again) to allow the ECB to become an academic unit with majors and tenure lines, and this time it put the ECB under the administration of the Director of Writing in the English Department, effectively ending it.

Over those twenty years, the ECB served as the model for many other campus-wide writing programs. But the model changed over those years, as some impulses in the original came into the foreground and others receded, in ways that often speak to the rise of composition as a discipline, diffracted, as always, through local needs. (Keep in mind that the ECB never was an introductory composition program in an English department. That default model does not apply here—except that it was in the air we all breathed.) The ECB began as a writing across the curriculum program, with a strong element of social reform patched onto a fundamental commitment to existing intellectual disciplines. At the end it was a political program, with a decidedly vexed sense of its own disciplinarity and its relationship to power. There was, of course, wide disagreement among us. But the argument that theoretical work of any kind indicated insufficient commitment to political action was very frequently advanced and very often carried the day. This commitment to action, to real social change, paradoxically as I think, required the ECB to maintain an expensive utopia. We had to deny too much of what was happening around us, as I will argue later.

And yet it was a great experiment. The ECB was essentially a child of affirmative action in the seventies, early on a mostly pedagogical commitment. Later, as sustained reflection on social issues moved us all toward the eighties focus on diversity, and unforeseen events seemed to open up possibilities, that critique of power migrated to the management style. The ECB served as a crucible in which we forged a practice of collaboration, a living laboratory for contending with power.

In what follows I will describe the differences between the two conceptions of the ECB, the early cooperative and the later collaborative. Because we invested so much in imagining the practice of collaboration I will elaborate its

expression in our use of portfolios. If God exists in the details, as Einstein is rumored to have said, it was in the details of assessment that our "god" existed. A word of caution: just when you get to the end, I will unleash a host of furies that assailed the ECB, befuddling causality, calling into question the story I have been asked to tell about the effect of collaborative management on the demise of the ECB.

Cooperative Practice

The ECB began in the English Department with Dan Fader, Richard Bailey, and Jay Robertson. For Fader, a tenured Shakespearean in the English Department who got the original money from the Carnegie Mellon Foundation in the late seventies, it was all about affirmative action. He described it for me this way: The University had made a commitment to bring in more minority students, but it had no support in place for them. You could see their anger, he said. They hung out by what was then the courtyard, in the passageway that connects Angell Hall with Haven, glaring at professors who passed by. And so, he said, he wanted to deal with that mute pain. The ECB was put in place to make it possible for them to succeed. And he feels that the ECB did its job, and that the larger scene is no longer what it was: affirmative action has effectively changed the situation of entering minority students.

According to Fader, he had sold the ECB to the professoriate at Michigan as support for students writing in their classes, and for teaching assistants who received a salary enhancement for helping the instructor work with students' writing; but for him, the affirmative action piece was always the crucial point. Other founders always thought of the Junior/Senior Writing Program as central to the ECB mission, always saw it as a WAC program. In any case, the original conception was hierarchical, presuming that access to existing power was a good thing. As I said earlier, the "Board" part of the English Composition Board was originally made up of representatives from each department in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one of whom—usually the one from the English Department—served as the director of the ECB. The staff was hired on one-year contracts. Some had Ph.D.s in English, others didn't.

From the Board's point of view, the focus was the upper level writing officially called the Junior/Senior Writing Program, but usually just the "UL." The UL program was taught by faculty in the disciplines, who had agreed to make regular courses into writing intensive courses. ECB's role was administrative and developmental. We paid and trained teaching assistants hired by the departments to help faculty with the workload. They received a salary enhancement for the extra effort. We further supported this program in the Writing Workshop—our writing center. Other supporting duties included assessment and tutorials for incoming students, a writing workshop to support the writing intensive courses, and outreach to high schools. The players in those days were faculty in the disciplines, with ECB staff in a supporting role.

Barbra Morris, who was there from the beginning, resists my interpretation, insists that collaboration was always the agenda. She writes:

When the ECB was established (I was one of the original faculty who thought through and presented the ECB model to University of Michigan departments and to schools outside the University of Michigan), we all understood that the teaching of writing was our common mission. In the case of the Tutorial (later renamed the Practicum), we would be teaching students who were identified as not yet ready for Introductory (or first-year) Composition. Our well-defined mission led us to professional conversations about composition nationally and to research in writing that we could talk about together, because we all wanted to learn from each other, certainly to improve our courses and to ensure that our students would become better academic writers. Common teaching ground became the basis for our ECB culture of dialogue and shared expertise. Unlike other disciplines or fields, in which people probably do not identify so congruently with each other's work, we became more than just colleagues; we were deeply engaged with each other's teaching and research, methods and practice. Moreover, we mentored young teachers who came into the ECB and we believed that time spent in committee work and professional development, talking together with each other about assessment and language development as people entered and left the ECB, was valuable to the ECB and to the College of LAS [Liberal Arts and Sciences] in general, because we had been mandated to prepare students for tackling academic writing in all departments. The professional momentum of the ECB was invigorated by collective attention to differing facets of improving writing ability, from second language students to those who had writers' blocks or were deeply confused about structuring their ideas or were unable to sustain a consistent voice, and so on. A rich variety of composition research interests and of concerns about writing in the disciplines converged in our discussions, as we learned from and respected each others' areas of expertise. Our collaborative management style evolved naturally out of a unified and coherent purpose, and from our sincere interests in various teaching/learning strategies we employed so that this educational objective could be achieved. (Morris)

In Barbra's description I do not find the critique of expertise that later constituted one important current in the ECB discussions. And I note that the description applies to a group of one-year lecturers whose work was carried on outside a regular academic department, under the supervision of tenured faculty in regular academic departments. Perhaps the early gatherings of faculty, graduate students, and ECB lecturers did not feel hierarchical at the time. In the history of composition, this is an important and exciting early statement about collaboration. In the history of the University of Michigan, it describes rather the cooperation of different departments in putting together a committee to oversee writing instruction. In this early cooperative effort, expert knowledge is not affected by the cooperative process. It is not a collaborative construction of knowledge; it is the cooperative application of pre-existing expertise. And the institutional hierarchy does not appear to be challenged.

Collaborative Practice

Collaborative management became a real option when Bill Condon, Associate Director for Instruction and still a lecturer, was appointed interim director of the ECB because the director (tenured in the English department) fell ill. We had the practice Barbra described, and also the experience of collaboratively organizing a national conference. When the ECB hosted the Computers and Writing Conference, five people developed that conference collaboratively, without so much as a committee head. In my recounting here I won't include personal histories because I have no right and not enough knowledge. But individual commitments matter, and the ECB believed that the personal is political and acted on that belief, so I will profile briefly some of personal commitments that seemed powerful to me. At one point four of the 11 full-time faculty were devout Quakers; almost all the faculty, male or female, would say they were some kind of feminists. Women usually outnumbered men in a ratio of about three to one, and the majority of the faculty were single mothers. There were no older experienced white men, and only a couple of less experienced older women—and so it was a very young unit.

To continue: With Bill Condon's appointment a new set of players took over the ECB—the collaborative composition folks. At that point the ECB had nine ongoing three-year lectureships, and two of the original faculty had retired after twenty years of service, one year at a time. Bill and Emily Decker (assessment) and I (Jr./Sr. Writing Program) were the associate directors.¹ The collaborative team included everyone, we said. Staff voted at faculty meetings. (You'll find all the names I can remember from the relevant time period in the footnote. I know I will have left out someone, and I apologize.² Although we never completely did away with a top layer, an accurate description of our collaborative management has to include "the middle" as well as "the top," dimensions we tried hard to do away with.

I believe Bill was genuinely morally committed to collaborative management, and Emily was a truly brilliant strategist of internal collaborative management. It is difficult to separate the collaborative piece from the professionalization of composition, especially as those were related to each other at the ECB. We tried to imagine new ways of being professional without being hierarchical. Some of the ECB faculty strongly resisted the idea of disciplinarity, while searching for a way to value composition, without turning it completely into politics. Others—I'm one—while finding much to critique in disciplinary practice, nevertheless believed that disciplines are useful social formations and unlikely to disappear.

The ECB sought to define composition as a set of collaborative practices in every way. Although it was a relatively late expression of that principle, I will focus here on the way we used portfolios to work out principles of collaboration. Of course, it was part of the nationwide move to use assessment to drive curriculum reform. For some, educational reform is what the ECB was about, and portfolios were the central instrument. They provided a way to define ourselves as a composition program, and a way to make an argument for

tenuring teaching faculty. So we used portfolios to define ourselves and our work collaboratively.

Even before we began to use portfolios to place entering students into the writing program in 1994, we did a great deal of work with high school English teachers around the state, soliciting their suggestions about developing entrance portfolios as well as representing the University to them. We prided ourselves on developing a school/university collaborative mode that respected the experience of the high-school teachers. We did not go to the schools as experts and tell them what to do. The placement process was also an enculturation process—modeled on consciousness raising. ECB faculty and graduate students read 500 portfolios each summer. The graduate students were almost always from the English Department and had experience teaching the introductory composition course in that department. We drew on their experience as teachers, and treated the portfolio placement process as an ongoing conversation about all facets of writing instruction. ECB faculty were expected to go through the training every year, on the grounds that this was to be an ongoing process always involving both newcomers and old hands because of what we could learn from each other. The development of criteria for reading the portfolios went through several phases, always collaborative, using committees of the whole as well as focus groups, with varied configurations of experienced readers.

In the tutorials or practica we carried forward the portfolio as center of collaboration. Besides designing the portfolios to include students' evaluations of their own work, we also had working groups of instructors, including newcomers and old-timers, which met two or three times throughout the term to talk and look at syllabi or sample portfolios, and we visited each others' classes. We evaluated our students' portfolios at the end of the term as a team. For a while we tried to assign the task of evaluating instructors through this team approach, but it simply didn't get done. Young teachers objected that they didn't have the kinds of evaluations they wanted in their professional recommendations, so that task was reassigned to senior lecturers, but again, in a mentoring structure.

We also developed teacher portfolios to use in end-of-the-year evaluations. Some ECB faculty wanted to simply divide the money available for salary increase by the number of faculty and distribute that equally. Our director found the College unreceptive to that idea, and borrowed from somewhere a system by which each faculty was given shares on the basis of performance, and the shares redeemed for a percentage of the total amount available. The evaluation of teaching portfolios was done by the director and associate directors, not by the teams or any such collaborative device.

Thus, portfolios provided a focus for discussions of students' work and discussions of our own pedagogy, as well as examinations of our standards. They provided us a medium for mentoring of newcomers by those who had been there for many years, providing a framework for continuity. All this activity based on sharing portfolios provided us a common language and a common experience.

At the "top" of this collaborative management was the administration of

the ECB, the director and the three associates (Wayne Butler became an associate director when Bill became the director). From my point of view, having attended Associate Directors meetings under three different directors, the last was extraordinarily collaborative. Even meeting with the door open felt new and exciting. But I soon was given to understand that collaboration among the associate directors was not nearly enough. Faculty at the ECB wanted more say in the management, and were not satisfied with what seemed to me like huge efforts to do away with hierarchy. Decisions that before would have been made by the director without a second thought were brought to the table for faculty to discuss—mostly through Emily Decker's watchful effort. She made sure that support staff and even work studies attended faculty meetings, for example. That simply would not have occurred to me. It does now.

Faculty pointed out that all the A.D.s had been appointed by earlier directors. Not one had been chosen by the rest of the faculty. In response, the unit had agreed, just before the end, that the various A.D. positions would become elective. If the mission of the ECB required sharing knowledge and experience, it followed that faculty should be rotated through the management positions. That would never have been proposed under a tenured director, though Robinson had tried hard to get tenure lines for the ECB (as had Deborah Keller-Cohen, the director who succeeded Robinson's first term).

ECB Faculty also complained that their role was really advisory, that their decisions were not binding on the leaders. The strain of trying to maintain a collaborative structure in a hierarchical institution caused people to rethink positions, and as individuals changed in different ways, collaboration became problematic.

The Costs of Collaboration

As Barbra's paragraph makes clear, long before we had portfolio assessment and continuous conversations, the ECB faculty was committed in principle to the notion that all learners are equal, including the teacher; that new teachers bring a great deal of new experience into the faculty and should, therefore, be respected in the same way that old experience is respected; that teaching is learning and learning is teaching; and that students cannot be taught to write, they can only be allowed to learn. We did outreach with the idea that we could learn from high school teachers, that outreach was a two-way street. We defined "our work" as teaching the practica and in the Writing Workshop, and working with each other.

There is not much room for expertise in such a system, and one faction of the ECB was profoundly suspicious of disciplines and expertise, invoking the Freirean notion that knowledge owned by the oppressor could only keep the oppressed in bondage. In fact, talk about doing one's "own" work was discouraged. It was a little like the Club Med of the sixties, where the common spaces were featured at the expense of the private spaces. Some ECB faculty do not see this as a conflict, but others felt it keenly. For some, being part of the ECB gave them great freedom; others found it a bit cramped. One effect of our collabora-

tive approach was the way it constrained individual research, and therefore our options for a professional future. The development of expertise, as the academy defines it, was discouraged by a system in which the ideal, for some, was that everyone could do everything. Our portfolio system was carefully engineered to insure collaboration and collegiality and to insure that our time was spent doing those things, not other things. One could get around that by doing research on portfolios. For those who wanted to focus our research elsewhere, it was a problem. We had to finish our portfolios first. When I raised this issue I was told, "That is the job." And certainly from the administration's point of view, our job was to teach, not do research. But there were faculty who felt used by those in leadership positions who wanted to develop portfolios. I am not so sure how we might have arrived at any focus without what some people felt was coercive. There were those who would have preferred to spend their time on computers, for instance, instead of undergoing the two-day reader training for the fifth time. And there were those who felt that being required to follow even a very loose portfolio design, or to use portfolios in their classrooms at all, was intrusive. But my main point is that the collaboration as the ECB defined it constrained our ability to compete for tenure-track jobs elsewhere, and to enter institutions as full members. Collaboration was disempowering in this sense, but for those deeply committed to changing the power structure, that was just fine.

There were members of the ECB who would have preferred to keep the unit in place, without tenure lines, with its focus on teaching and collegiality, even if the administration never chose to reward us for that. They argued that tenure lines and research would interfere with our focus on teaching, and that the community we existed to serve could be served within the marginal structure we had in place. They preferred to fight for higher wages and long-term contracts. I found that ideal seductive but ultimately naive. I can't imagine such self-sacrifice gaining so much support in a faculty dominated by men. Some of us congratulated ourselves on that challenge to masculinist ways. As I said earlier, the ECB was dominated by single mothers, at a stage in their lives where child-rearing was necessarily central. Both men and women brought their children to work and felt good about that. Our collaborative model was very much colored by the ideals of family, by the notion that family commitments and needs must be recognized in the workplace. The climate definitely discouraged any critique of that ideal, and it was hard even to deal with blatant incompetence on the part of a staff person. On the other hand, the productivity was prodigious. The unit offered enormous emotional and moral support, and even though we insisted on valuing family, we put out a tremendous amount of work. We did everything anybody asked, and then took on extra work for dessert.

In our enthusiasm, we refused to hear other views. We wouldn't hire anyone who didn't "look like us." But reality came calling in the form of the 5-year review. The external evaluators were all tenured composition people with the highest credentials, and I believe they came in with a great deal of sympathy for the ECB. After all, the English Department at Michigan has steadfastly refused to take composition seriously. On the other hand, English departments can hand out tenure. As many comp/rhetoric folks have argued, the only way to

legitimate the discipline is from inside an English Department, however uncomfortable that may be. Composition's confused relationship to power leads to an argument that to be legitimated, collaboration must fit in the hierarchy. And the ECB struggled with that. In our deliberations as the ECB prepared the self-study, and considered what future we wished to fight for, some people felt that our collaborative model was betrayed. As a committee of the whole, we specifically refused to make tenure lines the priority. However, some of the leadership didn't hear that. It became clear that tenure for the director at least was being represented as the will of the ECB. Those most committed to a collaborative model were outraged at this misrepresentation.

With regret and a sense of loss, I must say that attention to the realities of the institution was absolutely necessary. Tenure for any ECB faculty was never a possibility, and, in the context, that is lethal. My perception is reinforced by the recommendations of the review committee. The final document they prepared warmly approved the work of the ECB. It was less approving of the English Department's role in teaching writing. Still, it recommended that, since the administration was adamantly opposed to making the ECB a tenure-granting unit, a college committee be formed to oversee the relationship between the ECB and the English Department. In other words, they ducked the issue, in part because they had no real choices. I believe it would have been very difficult for tenured reviewers committed to composition as a discipline to vigorously recommend that a nationally prominent program like the ECB should function as an independent rhetoric department but without tenure lines, if, indeed, such an idea was ever presented to them. The struggle to get composition recognized as a discipline has been too hard. But some of the ECB faculty would have preferred that arrangement. Some ECB members took the view that if we had not fought for tenure lines, the ECB could have gone on as before.

In the last days, after the "merger" was announced, many in the ECB believed that by showing our solidarity and the strength of our collaborative model, we could maintain our dignity and independence within the English Department. We tried to talk with them as equals. That incensed our new bosses.

The Institution

We were too focused on our internal issues. Most ECB faculty spent very little time examining the larger institution surrounding us—in fact could rarely see over the English Department. We felt cut off from the rest of the University, and turned inward. Someone once said, "There's a big concrete wall between me and the rest of the University, and there's nothing I can do about it." And we often blamed others, as if they were under some obligation to allow themselves to be reformed by us. Most faculty within the ECB were not aware that the bulk of the resources were allocated to the upper level writing program, which was a WAC conception. Conversations with faculty in other departments were consistently marked by the failure to grasp each others' assumptions. ECB thought it was a rhetoric department; the rest of the University thought it was an administrative support for the WAC program. Because I directed the UL program and had to work with people in other disciplines, I knew that, but I

didn't know how to close the gap.

The ECB experience with collaboration has remarkably little to do with what else was going on. Indeed the salient characteristic is the lack of connection between what we thought we were doing and what the rest of the University had in mind. It not only makes it hard to organize this essay, but hard to make any evaluation of the experience. There were huge forces raging around us, and our collaborative experiment was mostly irrelevant. I find that especially troubling. We lost the battle in part because no one knew where the war was. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences officially hoped that the infusion of ECB faculty would have an impact on the English Department's pedagogy. "Trickle up." More candidly, some administrators approved the ideas of the ECB, but, they said, "It isn't working. You are too isolated. Your ideas aren't getting out to the faculty." But they didn't give us the resources we would have needed to do that. They wanted to reform the professoriate, not the lecturers. And they had other things to think about: financial models, eroding support for affirmative action, inability to find leadership for the ECB under the existing rules, and—back to money—a donor who wanted to give the University five million dollars for a writing center, with some guarantees of future stability, I suspect. As Bill used to say, "It's hard to make a five-year plan with three-year lectureships."

I'm not deconstructing my story here out of nostalgia for fashion past. I would impose unity if I could. But I think it would be too easy to make the ECB a martyr to the cause of equality. We have to confront those other forces somewhere. I'll begin and end with money.

Like many universities, Michigan has begun to look to business for financial models. Their version is called "Total Quality Management." It is so complicated that they hold endless seminars and never succeed in explaining it to the faculty. The basic idea is that units will be rewarded for bringing in students. Education will improve, they argue, if success is measured by student feet. But any scheme can be undermined, and there are ways to increase enrollment figures without improving the quality of the education. Many people at Michigan believe it was this policy that prompted the School of Engineering to discontinue the practice of sending first year students in engineering over to the College of Liberal Arts for the introductory composition course. However, and composition people should think hard about this, there is also evidence that the School of Engineering didn't like what the Introductory Composition program was teaching engineering students. To other faculty, composition, for all its quarrels with literature, still only prepares students to write about literature. Either way, by fall of 1998 the English Department will have lost about a thousand students. The ECB had about 800. Many on the ECB faculty think that accounts for everything. I think it is more symptomatic than causal.

The End of Affirmative Action

I asked the founder how he would go about it if he wanted to start the ECB today. He said the moment was past, and he didn't think such a thing would be possible today, that Carnegie Mellon wouldn't fund such a thing

today. Some activists (though not those in the ECB) believed that affirmative action had effectively already done its job and really wasn't needed any longer. As we all know, now is the time of California's reactionary legislative action. And we began to hear more calls from faculty in the College for increased effort to attract better prepared students. There aren't equivalent people in the English Department these days. One doesn't have Shakespearians and grammarians and medievalists who want to support a social action seen as separate from their "disciplines." Nowadays the department hires literary critics for their social critique, and tenures them for doing research in that area. It is a different world. And another reason no one wanted to take on the directorship of the ECB is that they didn't see support for it in the College.

So we're back to money. The ECB began and ended with outside grants. I don't have much information about the new arrangement, but it does rely much more on graduate students in the English Department than faculty trained in composition.

At the summer meeting of the WPA in Houghton, Michigan, I heard many people comparing what happened to Chris Anson at the University of Minnesota with what happened to Bill Condon at Michigan. It was irritating to hear all those composition folks assuming the same hierarchical structure they so often fulminate against, as if Bill had been the only member of the ECB who counted, the rest of us simply dismissed.

On the other hand, there are some reasons to make the comparison between two manifestations of the conflicting perceptions of who should teach writing, the WAC model versus the expert model. Nationally I see three impulses that constantly come into conflict, and they were part of the ECB experience, too. One impulse is toward what Jim Slevin called the "amateurism" of Writing Across the Curriculum defined so that writing can be taught by some variety of nonspecialist; another impulse is the emergence of composition as a discipline; and another is the "WID" (Writing in the Disciplines) impulse, which often claims disciplinary status but is focused on content, based on various rhetorical and linguistic approaches to discourse analysis, rather than on pedagogy. The ECB appears to have begun as a WAC program, become a composition program, and then gone back to being a WAC program.

Those in the administration who looked to the ECB for educational reform, who wanted to involve tenured professors more in undergraduate education, and who saw the writing across the curriculum program as part of that movement, supported the ECB in a certain way. But they also represent the version of WAC that makes it a social movement, not a discipline. So I think the opposition between WAC and composition was very much implicated in this conflict. Although ECB faculty taught the First Year Seminars, begun about this time, along with faculty from other disciplines, those seminars were early indications that the administration was committed to a nonprofessional model. Even before the changes, administration at Michigan was looking at Cornell's John S. Knight program. The fact that First Year Seminars taught by other faculty rarely provided enough writing assignments to count, in the eyes of the adminis-

tration, as writing courses is only one more confounding factor (though crucial to my own thinking on the issue).

Our effort to institutionalize composition at Michigan was fundamentally at cross-purposes with the University. From the administration's point of view, the ECB was a teaching unit. The administration did not want a rhetoric department that would offer a degree and develop a research faculty. The Carnegie-Mellon Foundation had offered to fund such a unit a few years back, but Michigan turned down fifteen million dollars rather than go ahead and develop a modern rhetoric department. Tenure lines based on teaching became the goal of the ECB leadership. And all this time, composition was becoming institutionalized as a discipline, and, in the ECB version, ever more focused on *learning* as opposed to *teaching* (a very difficult concept for lots of faculty across the curriculum). We defined composition in terms of assessment, portfolios and computers. The ECB's website never has laid its legitimate claim to being "the mother of all writing-across-the-curriculum programs." In the nineties we wanted to be a rhetoric department (though some faculty could not abide the word), not a WAC program. As the Associate Director for the Jr./Sr. Writing Program, the upper level writing-across-the-curriculum piece, I often felt myself in conflict with the rest of the ECB, focused as they were on defining composition as a discipline chiefly through pedagogy. That was a productive conflict for me. In my new job I find myself confronting the same issues, with local variations. I'm very grateful for what I learned from my collaborating colleagues at the ECB about 1) pedagogy, and 2) intellectual politics in practice. And about collaboration.

Notes

1. The typical teaching load was 21 contact hours per week: two 4-credit practica per term, plus ten hours in the Writing Workshop. Practica were structured with two hours per week of class and a half hour of individual conferences every other week. If we taught advanced courses, it was under another rubric or in another department. That was the exception rather than the rule, and it matters that we were so heavily focused on first-year courses, as it matters that so much of composition theory has been developed in first-year courses.

2. Wayne Butler, Francelia Clark, Bill Condon, George Cooper, Emily Decker, Amy Doherty, Dacia Dressen, Zilia Estrada, Teri Ford, Helen Fox, Todd Gemes, Peggy Goetz, Liz Hamp-Lyon, Susanmarie Harrington, Janice Honeyman, Helen Isaacson, Kay Keeler-Johnston, Colleen LaPere, Phyllis Lassner, Mark McPhael, Barbara Monroe, Barbra Morris, Sue Richardson, Becky Rickley, Rebecca Reed, Marty Rosenberg, Ann Russell, Julie Stieff, LeeAnn Sutherland, Renee Moreno, Ray McDaniels, Margaret Willard.

Works Cited

Fader, Dan. Personal interview. 18 Nov. 1997.

Morris, Barbra. Personal interview. 26 Jan. 1998.