

Scenario 1

In October of 1998, the dean pulls me out of a college staff meeting. I wonder what's up, but I'm unprepared for what he has to say: he asks me to take on the job of Associate Dean of Humanities. I'm stunned, mostly because the current associate dean has only been on the job for slightly longer than a year and is doing fine. I hate the idea; my wife hates it even more. But it is hard to say "no" to the dean, especially when your current job depends entirely on his good will. And it is alluring, no doubt about it, to move directly into the halls of power, to step behind the curtain hoping something more substantial resides behind the stage other than ropes, pulleys, wisps of white cotton, and bits of polished thread. After a week of uneasy deliberation, I say "yes" and spend the rest of fall semester descending into anxiety, self-doubt—even self pity—as I mourn the loss of my current life as Director of the Edison Initiative, a job that allowed me the freedom to do creative programming, keep my own schedule, run freshman seminars, create the peer mentoring program, spearhead faculty development, manage my own budget, and forge partnerships with university and community groups. It was the dream job I created for myself, with strong support from the dean, and I did so in lieu of applying a year earlier for the associate deanship, a job that I considered to be dreary and thankless and that I knew I did not want.

Scenario 2

It is three months later, January 15, 1999 to be exact. I've had a few orientation

Confessions of an Associate Dean

Charles Schuster

sessions with the outgoing associate dean/ I've learned a bit about his responsibilities, his filing system (no small matter), the issues that press upon the college. Now I walk down the second floor hallway toward my new office. I am on the college administration floor, where few faculty and almost no students enter except if summoned, or if in search of money, or if they are involved in an official investigation. As I pass the door of a long-time college staff member, someone I've known for years, she greets me in friendly fashion, welcomes me to the college. After talking for a few minutes, she says: "We're glad you are here, but we hope you won't be a nice guy. You can't want to be liked in this job. We hope you are tough enough to say 'no.'" I think about that as I turn the key to my office door. Within a month of taking on the job, I receive a variety of requests from faculty friends and colleagues:

- Can I have extra travel money to deliver a paper?
- Can you provide me with a research assistant for this crucial project that I am doing for the good of the college?
- Can you give me a bigger office?
- Can I teach an overload during the regular semester and receive extra pay?
- Can I have \$1,200 for a new computer for my departmental secretary?

The answers are all "no," and what I must develop is a way to keep the conversation going, to convince faculty that I have their best interests at heart, even as I reject most of their requests. For every allocation that I grant, we must find the money somewhere else within the college: every \$100 given to Professor U gets taken away from Professor Not-U. There is no secret pot of money, one of the first real disillusionments of my job. My dream of finding even a little pot of gold buried somewhere in the basement of the college proves illusory.

Scenario 3

I have approached the dean with what seems to me a surefire proposal: in order to bolster the teaching of foreign language on campus, we'll fund the second year of a three-year lab modernization proposal. Without this second year, the money spent last year is wasted; the foreign language lab lacks both the hardware and the software to be useful. The dean, however, says "no." In his view, the college spent too much in the first year and he thinks the foreign languages are being wasteful. For two months, I work with the language faculty to hone their proposal to a razor

thin edge. The dean finally approves it, and I write a letter in his name congratulating them. I am pleased with my success, but the language faculty keep their pleasure and approval to themselves, probably unhappy with my perverse concern for economy, certain that I have made them jump over so many hedges that I have hobbled their horse for life. Meanwhile I look forward to working with them to implement Phase 3.

Scenario 4

Oversight of the various research centers are distributed among the associate deans. The associate dean of social science helps me to hire an historian who will run the Center for Latin American Studies, which is my responsibility. Meanwhile, I help him hire a professor from English/film studies to run the Center for International Studies, which is under his supervision. He and I spend countless hours every week conferring, discussing, collaborating, mulling, problem sharing, trying to figure out how best to share our meager resources, build collaborative structures for students and faculty, and strengthen our mutual centers and departments. Meanwhile, we are asked to co-chair a building renovation committee, which will determine lecture and classroom space, along with a computer lab and building lounge. Neither of us has time for this, but we accept because control of space lies at the center of campus power and influence. In addition, he and I join with the associate dean of the business school in formulating the curriculum for a new joint degree program in global management. Given the amount of time that we spend together, we decide to inform our wives that we are giving up all pretence to a personal life—and moving into an efficiency together so that we can talk both day and night about college issues. Thankfully, our wives demur.

Scenario 5

On the face of it, it is a simple request. A faculty member in a foreign language department wants to move to the English department where he has many personal and professional friends and with which he has been intellectually affiliated for many years. Since the university lacks a policy on this matter, it is left to the college to make a decision. I talk to the other associate deans, but they have not faced this problem and have little advice to offer. Surely, however, there is not an issue here: faculty are not indentured servants, are they, who must remain in a department against their will? If the faculty member is forced to stay in his current department, he will be unhappy, frustrated, and possibly embittered. But the foreign language department does not wish to lose him, for it is concerned not just about maintaining its faculty strength but also about loss of student

credit hours and budget, reasonable concerns in this time of enrollment and revenue targets. Should the department be compensated for its loss? Does the English department owe them a replacement position? Does the college? Do we cut the foreign language department's operating budget and transfer that sum to English? Should we allow any faculty member to transfer to the English department, no matter his or her academic specialty? It is attractive to many of them since English is strong in numbers and reputation, even if it is typically contentious. Perhaps more importantly, because English offers the only PhD in the humanities, its faculty work with extraordinary graduate students and teach a lighter load because they direct so many doctoral exams and dissertations. With the transfer of this faculty member, not only does the foreign language department suffer a loss and become weaker, so does the college (at least budgetarily): we lose 2 courses a year—perhaps 200-300 student credit hours—which means everyone now has to work harder to reach the targets established by central administration. What seemed like a simple issue takes months to resolve and leaves bruised feelings among many faculty, including the individual who desired the transfer.

Scenario 6

The associate dean for the sciences heads up our affirmative action/human relations/ academic misconduct effort. She is a marvel of patience, tact, thoughtfulness, care, and firmness. Two cases blow up in the humanities during the spring, both of which carry the potential to be ugly for faculty and students. Some days, she and I spend two or three hours huddled in private conversation, sharing emails, talking to the campus diversity-compliance officer, and otherwise trying to negotiate that line between faculty rights and responsibilities, ethical behavior, student needs, and statutory obligation. The cases are murky; they are *Rashomon* in an academic context. Some days on the walk home, I can feel my skin prickling, and if I had hackles they'd be raised outward in a fan around my head.

Collectively, these condensed case studies illustrate certain truths that I have found to be self-evident about being an associate dean. Many of them bear distinct resemblance to truths that bear upon the life of a WPA:

1. My job is to work on unsolvable problems, the ones that defy solution. Much of my time is spent in mediation, trying to create compromise and uneasy agreement.

This means I spend weeks untangling complex histories, improving embittered relations, trying to purify the polluted waters of departmental and college life.

2. I am “the college”; I do not make a decision, the college makes it. I do not make a recommendation; the college makes it. All the associate deans similarly identify themselves as the college. So does the dean, although he is more personally identified with his decisions than we are. Like the Borg, I am the collective.
3. First and foremost, my job is to protect the college, protect the dean. This requires loyalty and discretion. It also requires, at least in my case, that I like the dean and agree with him about the direction of the college. Even if it invokes his ire, my job is to give him the best advice I can. If I don’t agree, if I can’t be loyal and discreet, I have only one option: resign.
4. One of my primary responsibilities is to keep the dean informed; I write weekly updates and brief him whenever he and I have a free 15 minutes. Few things trouble him more than being blind-sided by the chancellor or another dean; his job is to know the college and every initiative within it. Part of my job is to get out of my office and walk around campus so that I can meet chairs and faculty, TAs, lecturers, and classified staff. Social person that I am, this is one aspect of the job I enjoy, as long as people are still willing to talk to me. But as I take on more work and new initiatives, I become increasingly bound to my chair, my phone, and my e-mail. It does not take long before I begin to feel entombed.
5. The dean has made clear to me that I must help chart the path for the humanities, that is, I am to establish specific curricular and programmatic goals for my disciplines (art history, comparative literature, communication, English, the foreign languages, philosophy). The dean has told me that I need to do this not only for the good of the college but to build my own portfolio in the event that I stay on the administrative track and intend to apply

for a deanship. According to him (and his own meteoric rise supports the assertion), if I am going to move up the chain of command, I have to build programs and be able to claim them as my own.

6. My work, like those of the other associate deans, is deeply collaborative. Most of my decisions, certainly the significant ones, must be made in a college context since they impact other departments and divisions. Whether it is hiring priorities, merit decisions, promotion recommendations, program development, or departmental mergers, all of us associate deans must forge collaborative decisions that are equitable across divisions.
7. If I had to choose a metaphor for my job, I'd call myself a midwife, or maybe a wet nurse. I seldom have the opportunity to create my own child; mostly, I give birth to other people's children and do my best to nurture them. When a child thrives, it is the parent who gets the credit; midwives and wet nurses fade into the shadows. This observation undercuts number 5 (above), but I don't seem able to reconcile these tensions.
8. The job is not fun. Given the description of it I've offered so far, it is hard to imagine how it could be. It has its satisfactions: improving instruction, playing a key role in hiring, learning about various disciplines, having a say in how budget gets allocated. I also learn a lot of secrets. Unfortunately, I have no one to tell them to other than the other associate deans, who already know them.
9. Nor is the job intellectual. Being associate dean demands strong people skills, tact, a sense of history, patience, and maintaining the good will and trust of one's colleagues. But it is not intellectually demanding: I do not typically create curricula, do library research on scholarly subjects, win collegial esteem for my ideas, writing, or originality of mind. Being a WPA has many intellectual components, but I have not found the same to be true in my job as associate dean. A corollary to this condition is the loss

of one's disciplinary specialty: the longer I stay in the job, the more I lose touch with the scholarship in my discipline and with graduate students, which, of course, makes it harder over time to get off the dean track and resume a professorial life.

10. One benefit, however, is learning about other departments in the humanities. My job is to know their curriculum, their needs, and potential for attracting new majors, building new emphases, and establishing interdisciplinary majors. Much of my job involves staying in touch with departments and their faculty, including my own.
11. But staying in touch is different than staying in the department. I have a changed relationship with my faculty friends and colleagues. I have been removed from the faculty; what last year was gossip and good fellowship is now possible grounds for decisions about diversity compliance, harassment, salary increases, and hiring priorities. Because I'm responsible for budget and personnel, I find myself in danger of losing friendships as I build alliances. Being an Associate Dean means establishing a degree of caution and personal remoteness.

So far I've dwelt upon a highly subjective view of the associate deanship, based on my first six months of on-the-job experience. At this point, I wish to shift focus and turn to professional concerns. In particular, I want to consider the substance, tone, and tenor of some of the more significant and relevant discussions that we administrative types have been having recently. What I am most concerned about is that major changes are looming, and there is little evidence that college faculty are prepared for them. English departments in particular are often resistant to change, and they remain so at their peril. If change is to occur—and it must—it may be that the best site for exploring the new dimensions of higher education are within writing programs, which have recently been the site for much experimentation. At the very least, I believe writing program administrators (and English department chairs, for that matter) must become major shareholders in these decisions. In particular, I want to focus on three related areas: recruitment, retention, and technology, the constant themes in many deaconal conversations.

James J. Duderstadt, whose essay, "Can Colleges and Universities Survive in the Information Age?," appears in the aptly titled anthology, *Dancing with the Devil*, states what I think is an entirely justified anxiety:

Perhaps the most critical challenges facing most institutions will be to develop the capacity for change; to remove the constraints that prevent institutions from responding to the needs of rapidly changing societies; to remove unnecessary processes and administrative structures; to question existing premises and arrangements; and to challenge, excite, and embolden all members of the campus community to embark on what I believe will be a great adventure.

Those institutions that can step up to this process of change will thrive. Those that bury their heads in the sand, that rigidly defend the status quo—or even worse—some idyllic vision of a past that never existed, are at very great risk. (1)

Duderstadt here is focusing exclusively on the challenges of technology, but there are many more crises out there: national and international competition, decreasing state subsidies for higher education, dramatic shifts in cultural and popular value systems, internationalism, and so on. If there is one message I have drawn from the lessons I am now learning as an associate dean it is that we need to be flexible, nimble, entrepreneurial, and aggressive in our abilities to recruit, retain, and graduate our students.

Across the country, increasing resources are being poured into what is called the Freshman Year Experience (FYE). Spearheaded by John Gardner, Betsy Barefoot, and Charles Schroeder, the FYE folks are a coalition of faculty, residence life staff, advisers, and campus health care professionals committed to drawing students into a university setting and keeping them there. They are at the front line of developing freshman seminars that run the gamut from a great books curriculum to individualized topics to new-student orientations. They organize partnerships between academic programs and residence staff to build learning communities that foster productive linkages between freshman classes and dormitory life. They devote themselves to connecting students to faculty and to their peers and oversee peer mentoring programs and senior transition seminars. If most first-year composition directors do not know about this important national effort, they are missing out on a fundamental conversation, one that is

closely connected to the undergraduate reform movement, and thus to national sources of funding and overall institutional health. Too often, first-year composition and its attendant programs are viewed by administrators, including college deans, as a basic but lusterless necessity in the freshman year. As a result, we are in danger of being moved to the second or third tier of funding. We only have to look at those schools where one or even both semesters of first-year composition have been eliminated in favor of writing across the curriculum or freshman seminars to see this pattern in action. My first recommendation, therefore, is that we WPAs point our browsers in the direction of the FYE Web sites and listservs to see what can be imported from them into first-year composition.

To do this effectively, we must imagine ourselves participating in a college or university recruitment/retention meeting. Every institution must find ways to convince high school students to attend its programs rather than other public, private, and virtual universities. So here is the question: will your university's high school recruiters feature the composition curriculum as a way to celebrate your school? Will the first-year composition program be described as central to recruitment, retention, and academic excellence? Or will such a discussion gravitate immediately to freshman seminars, service learning, business internships, study abroad, professional careerism, high tech classrooms, interdisciplinary initiatives, and online learning? Does the dean pump more resources into first-year composition or into that new leadership major that the folks in history, communication, and political science are developing that is likely to draw 100 new students to campus? Yes, composition is a necessity; yes, it will get funded. In order to thrive, however, it needs more than a baseline budget. It needs an infusion of new ideas (and new students), which in turn will attract new money. One way to accomplish this goal is for composition to establish interdepartmental partnerships; another is for it to expand upward into the major (for more on this, see Shamoan et al.'s *Coming of Age*, a book I'd want to cite even if I hadn't been involved in publishing it). Whatever direction we take, composition needs to be one of the primary reasons high school students choose to come—and stay—at the university, not just a useful but largely invisible program.

In order to attract students into our curriculum beyond the first year, we not only have to know what we think is important; we also need to know what the students think is important. Aside from program development, the FYE folks develop and disseminate profiles of incoming first-year students to provide a clearer sense of their interests, values, strengths, and weaknesses. Here are just a few intriguing findings I have gathered from various sources that provide a partial snapshot of incoming

student expectations and concerns:

- In 1966, 15% of high school students earned As, and 31% earned C+ or below.
- In 1996, 32% of high school students earned As, and 14% earned C+ or below.

- In 1966, 82% of high school students said their life goal was to develop a meaningful philosophy of life.
- In 1996, 42% of high school students said their life goal was to develop a meaningful philosophy of life.

- Attrition of undergraduate students is highly correlated to boredom in class.
- By the time students enter college, they have spent 4 of their 18 years watching television—and 1 of those 4 years watching commercials.
- Over the past 15 years, a steady 7% of men felt overwhelmed by all they have to do, but the percentage of women who felt overwhelmed rose from 20% to 38%.
- The chief negative practices that cause students to fail or drop out of college are commuting, part-time attendance, full-time work, watching television, and not feeling they belong to the university community

What these kinds of data tell us is that our students require more than just academic content and writing skills; they need to participate in a community of learning that takes them seriously, that exhibits a commitment to their overall personal health and welfare, that involves them as genuine participants in the college conversation. My second recommendation, therefore, is that we begin to think of first-year composition as more than just learning how to write academic analyses and arguments: it must become a comprehensive program wedded to recruitment and retention, goals that resonate with college and university administrators.

Here are some of the key questions WPAs might want to start asking. What can first-year composition offer, in addition to the teaching of writing, that will attract high school students to our institution rather than a competing school? What can our recruitment specialists showcase when they go to recruitment fairs? What specific innovations have WPAs

provided which can reaffirm and reinforce the centrality of teaching writing, at the first year and beyond? Other than academic writing skills, how can the composition program enhance the retention of first-year students and connect them to their future majors, to research, scholarship, citizenship, and professional success? Does the composition program have web pages, brochures, and other presentational materials that highlight its accomplishments and speak in sound academic terms to incoming students and their parents?

If these concerns sounds more like those of someone from central administration than those of a writing program administrator . . . remember, they are being written by a former WPA who has now become the Borg.

Speaking of the Borg, let's move to my last major concern, technology. Higher education is focusing major attention on new technologies: computer-mediated learning, web-based curriculum, CD-ROM technology, compressed video, and the like. In this global economy, universities must internationalize and increasingly offer their curricula across campuses, cities, and time zones. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, for example, is partnering with institutions in Germany and the UK—to name just two—to develop joint curricular efforts in the humanities and social sciences and has also recently become a founding partner of the Global University Alliance. Like most institutions of higher education, we want to remain on the cutting edge and do not want to be left behind if advanced internet technologies become a staple of instructional delivery.

On a more basic level, however, technology represents a significant hope and a great challenge. It is altering the instructional philosophy of the university, given the success of Phoenix University, Virtual U., and other forms of on-line education. According to Kenneth Green, director of the Campus Computing Project, "Information technology has finally emerged as a permanent, respected (or at least accepted), and increasingly essential component of the college experience" (13). As of Fall 1998, says Green, "almost half of the nation's colleges had a formal plan to use the Internet for marketing the institution to prospective students" (13). Even as we engage in criticism and questioning about the efficacy of technologies in and out of the classroom, we see institutions being pulled toward online instruction, distance education, distributed learning, and Web-based teaching. These changes are driven by societal changes: demands for increased access, the needs of working people at all levels to engage in lifelong learning, technological advances that make interactive learning more possible at virtually any time of the day and in any location that is linked to a line, a modem, a node.

Green posits four Cs, different than from the ones we know:

Content (what is taught),
Context (the learning environment),
Certification (outcome assessment), and
Convenience (ease of use).

Green's conclusion is that all of us in higher education need "to view distance, distributed, and online learning as a new, fourth sector of higher education, residing alongside (and not behind) research universities, residential colleges, and commuter institutions" (15). And he asks a key question: "Now what do we do?" (15). I would echo this question with a slight modification: given the pressures on institutions to teach more efficiently and to distribute their learning outside the conventional classroom, how can composition participate? How can we be sure that writing instruction does not get left behind as conventional classrooms are transformed into online sites with chatrooms, virtual instructors, and electronic administration centers? Can we teach composition using compressed video? Can we modularize composition, or at least some aspects of our instruction, so that in-class time gets reconfigured? Can we partner with text publishers and find ways to make instruction available 24 hours a day? Can we fuse game technology, MUDing, and MOOing with discourse communities, civic literacy, and composition's brand of cultural studies?

In a provocative online article entitled "Restructuring Our Universities: Focusing on Student Learning" written for the American Library Association, Alan E. Guskin argues for a related but revolutionary conceptual change in higher education: a shift away from a focus on how faculty teach to one that emphasizes how students learn, a shift that is embedded within changing notions of faculty workload and new technologies. Composition studies, already a pioneer in many of these areas, has not yet become part of the wider campus conversation on restructuring higher education. Unless it gets involved, its influence is almost certain to diminish. For example, one of Guskin's important points is that universities operate on two increasingly false "overarching, global assumptions: that faculty members teaching groups of students in a classroom setting are essential for effective student learning, and, [that] because of this assumption, increasing the productivity of faculty members requires increasing the number of classes taught and/or the number of students taught in a

particular class.” Guskin offers a different paradigm. His view is that key elements of the learning process can only be accomplished effectively if they are based on three principles:

1. Productive interaction between students and faculty
2. Intelligent utilization of electronic technologies
3. Meaningful peer interaction without a faculty member present

Additionally, such activities should take place both inside and outside the institution. These transformations would necessitate changes in faculty responsibilities, graduate education, the academic calendar, and tenure and promotion criteria. Regardless, they are beginning to feel inevitable. With increasing pressure from businesses and the private sector to reduce cost and increase learning, universities are being asked to rethink how education gets delivered—and who delivers it. Most importantly, Guskin makes clear that the real test of higher education will not be in how we teach but in what students actually and demonstrably learn.

I’d like to conclude, as I began, by offering four brief, hypothetical scenarios for composition in the 21st century, scenarios that demand a different set of challenges, responsibilities, and opportunities for writing program administrators.

Scenario 1

The composition class is a real one with real students and a real instructor. Only in this classroom, the instructor is not paid by section, by student, or by rank. Rather, this instructor earns money based on a comparison between pre- and post-test writing scores based on a set of criteria developed by the state composition board. This class is the natural outcome of Guskin’s argument: in this case, instructors are paid not on the basis of time spent teaching but rather on certifiable progress toward specified outcomes, either determined by or imposed upon WPAs and their programs.

Scenario 2

Students who enroll in composition receive a CD-ROM which combines the graphical and narrative sophistication of a game like *Quake* or *Myst* and which requires them to master a ladder set of skill and achievement levels centered on the components of a sophistic argument. It is a game the students play, a story into which they insert themselves as avatars, but the outcome is serious. They wander through a digitized

landscape, forge partnerships with other players to form collaborative teams, score points as they play a kind of logical chess game, improve their skill levels, recount their exploits and problems in a chat room—always without losing sight of their major goal: analyzing the various components of written argument and producing their own. To win the game, students must produce a variety of creative expository texts that are evaluated by a virtual figure named Plato, who turns out to be a composition specialist, certified by the WPA but who works at home and is paid on the basis of productive response time, which is monitored by the WPA. And only by winning the game can these students pass on to the next level, which we might want to call “sophomore year” or “completion of the English Composition General Education Requirement.”

Scenario 3

As WPA, you are the master programmer of the expository writing curriculum. It exists on the web, with students working through options and exercises and making virtual appointments as they need them with writing specialists who work both on-line and in-person in a writing center that is the actual and virtual central ganglion of this system. Students pay an online fee rather than traditional tuition based on credits; it is composition by the hour rather than by the credit. Your writing center is open to both credit and non-credit students, including business people who may need a quick update on the business letter or how to use a library database for a research project. It is open 24-hours a day, and when staff members are not meeting with students face-to-face or electronically, they are creating curricular innovations, experimenting with Java applets, using HTML 19.0, and MOOing all the while.

Scenario 4

As WPA, you decide that there is only one way to teach writing: by hiring poorly paid adjunct faculty to work in classrooms with 20-27 students and with little departmental or institutional support. As learning gets distributed, as access becomes a major concern, as funding is increasingly channeled into other curricular areas, as our institutions lose students to electronic universities that may be lacking in academic substance but are appealing in terms of support services, community, technological sophistication, ease of use, and are state-certified to boot, we are likely to begin to wonder: is it time to change? My call then is for writing program administrators to begin to think proactively: not of

what first-year composition is but what it can be and what it must be if we are to play a central role in the education of the next generations of students.

Webliography

<http://www.uwex.edu/disted/home.html> (An excellent site, full of useful news and links. If you visit no other, visit this one, but be sure to figure on spending lots of time)

<http://www.sc.edu/fye/> (The First-Year Experience folks)

<http://web.missouri.edu/~stulife/> (Department. of Student Life, University of Missouri-Columbia)

http://www.acpa.nche.edu/srsch/charles_schroeder.html ("Developing Collaborative Partnerships That Enhance Student Learning and Educational Attainment" by Charles Schroeder, Vice Chancellor Student Affairs, University of Missouri-Columbia)

Selected Distance Education Sites

Excelsior College: <http://www.regents.edu>

INTELECOM Intelligent Telecommunications: <http://www.intelecom.org>

Sybase Education Services: <http://www.sybase.com/education/>

TheU (Virtual University): <http://www.ccon.org/theu/index.html>

The Technology Source: <http://horizon.unc.edu/TS/contents/1999-07.asp>

eCollege: <http://www.ecollege.com/student/index.html>

Campus Electronique: <http://www.campus-electronique.tm.fr>

Blackwell Publishers (Electronic Publishing):

<http://www.blackwellpublishers.co.uk/Static/electron.htm>

University Continuing Education Association: <http://www.nucea.edu/>

Peterson's.Com (Distance Learning): <http://www.petersons.com/dlearn/>

Virtual Learning Environments, Inc.: <http://www.vlei.com/>

EdIX (Distance Learning Channel): <http://www.ed-x.com>

University of Phoenix: <http://www.phoenix.edu/>

Also Recommended

Katz, Richard N. ed. *Dancing with the Devil: Information Technology and the New Competition in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.

Works Cited

- Duderstadt, James J. "Can Colleges and Universities Survive in the Information Age?" *Dancing with the Devil*. Ed. Richard N. Katz. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999. 1-25.
- Green, Kenneth. "When Wishes Come True: Colleges and the Convergence of Access, Lifelong Learning, and Technology." *Change* (March/April 1999): 11-15.
- Guskin, Alan. "Restructuring Our Universities: Focusing on Student Learning." October 1996. Association of College and Research Libraries. <<http://www.ala.org/acrl/invited/guskin.html>>. 18 April 2001. Presented at the 1997 Association of College and Research Libraries National Conference.
- Shamoon, Linda K., Rebecca Moore Howard, Sandra Jamieson and Robert A. Schwegler. *Coming of Age: The Advanced Writing Curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2000.

