

# Time, Care and Faculty Working Conditions

Heather Robinson

York College/CUNY

## Abstract

This essay considers the invisible care work done by instructors of Composition and other General Education courses, and proposes that accounting for this care work in institutional narratives can improve working conditions for writing faculty. Drawing on the slow scholarship movement alongside feminist analyses of how reproductive labor is rendered invisible in our considerations of what counts as “work,” I argue that by centering academic care work in narratives of academic success, faculty working conditions will improve because they can be compensated for work that is expected, but which is rarely included in accountings of academic productivity. The essay concludes with a set of concrete suggestions as to how institutions can reframe what we think of as productive academic labor, and reward those faculty who invest in care.

## Time, Care and Faculty Working Conditions

To seize the agenda requires an alternative semantics of accountability and a knowledge of power. (Shore & Wright 572)

The expectation of significant affective labor in composition classrooms, as many scholars have pointed out (e.g. Schell, S. Miller, Ritter) is at the core of the issues with working conditions that are endemic in staffing and teaching composition classes; furthermore, these issues extend beyond composition into working conditions of those teaching in our institutions' General Education curricula. Therefore, I argue in this essay that in order to transform our working conditions we not only need to center care-work as what academics *do*, but also change the discourses which we build around care, and by extension, feminized work. Many discussions of how the working conditions of writing instructors might be improved focus on what I consider to be "masculinizing" strategies: make all writing courses electives (Crowley); create Department of Writing Studies with tenure-track faculty doing writing research and teaching graduate students (Lalicker), get rid of Writing Programs altogether (Bousquet), value Writing Program Administration (WPA) as scholarship (Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPAs), etcetera. These strategies are masculinizing because rather than contending with the cultural devaluation of the "feminine," they instead embrace existing academic hierarchies which are well-known to favor white, heterosexual men even when women play by "the rules" by rejecting care-work in most if not all aspects of their work lives. Furthermore, such proposals do nothing to address the structural inequalities that inhere of academic work, where most composition and general education classes are taught by contingent faculty. Instead, I suggest that we can change

the system on the ground by looking at what we have local control over: how workloads are distributed among courses, how we make care visible and count on campus, and how we describe care work in our reappointment, tenure and promotion documents and narratives. That is, I am proposing that in order to change working conditions in writing programs, we need to change our institutional discourses of what counts as success, and value as primary the work that is predominantly done by women and faculty of color: teaching general education courses, and providing care to students and colleagues in our teaching, mentoring and institutional service.

In developing my discussion, I draw from the slow scholarship movement to argue that in order to value care work appropriately in our institutions, we must move away from understanding of academic success based on individual “productivity,” and instead embrace the collectivity that care-work creates, in order to foster student success and enable faculty to lead healthy lives (see, for example, Mountz et al, Berg & Seeber, Hogan, and references cited therein). The question with which I will frame the next part of this discussion, then, is the following: “What conditions would best enable faculty to make determinations about where we invest our nurturance energies (rather than having them determined or imposed upon us) and how can we demand, foster, and sustain these conditions as a matter of course so that we are not forced to set our humanity aside in the workplace?” (Inayatulla & Robinson).

This question, which challenges us to think about ways in which we can center and foster our humanity in the workplace - is at the core of the slow scholarship movement. It sets up an expectation that there is a place for our nurturance time and energy to “count” in our institutions. It opposes “neoliberal temporal regimes” (Mountz et al), which are those that govern the high-productivity “ideal worker” model first named by Joan Williams. The attitudes to care work which currently prevail in our institutions and profession are at the center of these neoliberal

temporal regimes, because, culturally, time devoted to care is “wasted,” “unproductive” time, and should instead be dedicated to the production of “products”: articles, books, funded grants, and also possibly graduates. In other words, care doesn’t count according to the standard metrics that we use to measure success. But not counting the time we spend on care has the effect of dehumanizing us and our students in the academic workplace; if our only value as academic workers is our “productivity,” then there will always be people on campus who are less valuable than others because our research *and* our teaching is labelled as less- or un-productive. So what does count on campus? And where does care fit into this system?

I look to my university’s governance documents to establish how to count academic labor. The bylaws and collective bargaining agreements of the City University of New York (CUNY) establish how many hours faculty in each title and at each of the colleges that make up CUNY must teach: our number of teaching hours are clearly quantified. Department Chairs, according to the by-laws, break that workload down into class schedules; the number of classes that faculty must teach depends on the workload hours allotted to each class. These decisions about workload hours per class are made locally, as are the numbers of students who may enroll in each class section. These are student-facing numbers, and so must be published, though they are negotiable from semester to semester and, with governance’s approval, from course to course.

Our contract also states that faculty must undertake “research”; scholarly writing” and/or “creative works in individual’s discipline,” alongside “departmental, college and university assignments,” “student guidance,” and “course and curricula development.” These duties, however, are articulated in existential statements, and my college, like many others in the United States, has been reluctant to precisely quantify the amounts of each which faculty are expected to

engage. However, we do find ways on campus to articulate a general sense of “how much” scholarship and research is enough, whereas we determine sufficiency of service, student advising and mentoring, and other non-teaching, non-research labor on a case by case basis by looking at what individuals are doing. As Bird et al., Misra et al. and many other authors have shown, however, what counts as “enough” service, enough mentoring and enough student guidance for women and faculty of color tends to be much higher than for white men, which has the effect of taking members of these groups away from the work that unequivocally “counts”: research and scholarship.

Furthermore, my university has recently taken a problematic step in the realignment of expectations of faculty work, a much celebrated “teaching load reduction agreement.” The agreement is celebrated because the contractually-mandated teaching load of 21 hours or 27 hours annual for 4-year college and 2-year college professorial-line faculty respectively was seen as incompatible with the goal of having CUNY faculty’s research output increase at a time when the university is trying to build its reputation as a nationally-recognized research institution. The teaching load reduction agreement reduces faculty’s teaching load by three hours over a three year period, and is often described as a workload reduction agreement, but the language of the agreement makes it clear that it is explicitly not that. Beneath the calculation of how the teaching load reduction should be handled administratively, the agreement states:

The parties agree that the additional time resulting from the reduction in the undergraduate contact teaching hour workload specified above will be devoted to such activities as **student and academic advisement, office hours, academic research and such other activities that allow the University to improve our students’ success and outcomes.** [Emphasis mine] (PSC-CUNY Teaching Load Reduction)

[http://psc-cuny.org/sites/default/files/TeachingLoadReduction\\_Web.pdf](http://psc-cuny.org/sites/default/files/TeachingLoadReduction_Web.pdf)

In fact, this agreement provides a clear example of a the clash between counted and uncounted time that governs the lives of many full-time faculty. The parts of the agreement that I have emphasized in bold articulate an expectation that in lieu of counted teaching hours, faculty will be expected to engage in other activities that “allow the University to improve [its] students’ success and outcomes.” With the exception of the phrase “academic research, this language implies that the University will be increasing its expectations of care-work of the faculty; the teaching load reduction agreement shifts our care work from the classroom, in which space care-work is at least counted in a rudimentary way, to a fuzzy, uncounted space which will remain uncountable *unless* the university decides to find a way to quantify it, to make it part of our productivity as faculty, which the last clause suggests it could, by tying these things directly to “student success and outcomes.” If this shift of labor from the classroom to other service/advising/mentoring contexts could be distributed equally, then perhaps the language of the teaching load reduction would be fair. However, the language of the teaching load reduction agreement is highly problematic. To understand why, we must look in more detail at who does the care work on campus, and how such work is and is not rewarded and/or how much it “costs” the carers; it is to this discussion that this essay turns now.

## 1. Care Work on Campus

It is commonly accepted that teaching, service and student mentoring is care-work, and as such these aspects of faculty work are often undercompensated, institutionally devalued, and dissociated from metrics of “productivity” (e.g. Ritter; Schell; Holbrook and many others for teaching; Bird et al.; Misra et al.; Massé and Hogan and essays therein for service). These facts

are not accidental, but are connected to the fact that care-work traditionally being considered to be the work of women or people of color. These groups have often been culturally deprecated: Paula England explains the effects of such deprecation on not only women but also the work done by women:

Cultural ideas deprecate women and thus, by cognitive association, devalue work typically done by women. This association leads to cognitive errors in which decision makers underestimate the contribution of female jobs to organizational goals, including profits. It may also lead to normative beliefs that those doing male jobs deserve higher pay. (England 382).

Brittney Cooper, in a related vein, explores how the time of black people has been devalued, resulting in a cultural idea that the work that black people do cannot be worth as much as the work—and the time—of white people: ““White people own time. Those in power dictate the pace of the work day. They dictate how much money our time is worth ... We black people have always been out of time. Time does not belong to us.” (Cooper). Women and people of color have been historically and culturally assigned to care work in Western culture, doing the domestic labor that, throughout Western history, has enabled white men and, increasingly, white women, to go out into the workforce and engage in what we have traditionally seen as “productive” labor. The care work which supports paid work has been termed “reproductive labor” by feminist scholars, and is invisible in our cultural accountings of productivity. Mignon Duffy explains:

Although feminists have argued that reproductive labor produces value, and that the sustainability of productive labor and of society itself depends on it, domestic activities

remain largely defined in contrast to work. And when those domestic activities are performed by paid workers, they seem to retain their invisibility as labor. (Duffy 316)

Duffy's observation explains why the language of the CUNY teaching load reduction in particular, and the ways in which we treat care work on campus more generally is a problem: because it makes "reproductive labor" involved in supporting student success and outcomes invisible and therefore uncountable: it is the opposite of work. This means that the labor of a certain sector of our workforce becomes invisible, and therefore is seen as not contributing to the productivity of our organizations. And the fact that it is care work—women's work, people of color's work—*means* that it is devalued as important labor. The teaching load reduction language makes this devaluation clear: it makes "reproductive labor" involved in supporting student success and outcomes invisible. This, in turn, means the labor of a certain sector of our workforce becomes invisible, and therefore is seen as not contributing to the productivity of our organizations. In other words, care work on campus has a low exchange value, where we understand exchange value as , or "quantified worth of one good or service expressed in terms of the worth of another" (Business Dictionary).

Bird et al. argue that "service work carries little if any exchange value for those who do it" (201) and offer suggestions as to ways in which our institutions can change our exchange value equations when considering institutional service. They suggest that remedies muse come from institutions, rather than by encouraging women to set their own limits of what they will agree to: This kind of approach, which Sharon Bird calls "women-centered," (Bird 202) is necessarily limited because it requires women to resist culturally enforced behaviors in the workplace. While doing so is not necessarily a negative approach to take to expectations of nurturance, to navigate such an approach successfully is difficult because expectations of the

degree of resistance will change from context to context, and women and faculty of color may be punished as “uncollegial” if they reject the kinds of institutional care-work that is usually expected of members of these groups. Relying on women and people of color, on the individual level, to solve the gender problems that inhere in our institutions also shifts the burden of responsibility onto individuals rather than creating systems of collective accountability and forcing our institutions to change. Bird et al, Massé & Hogan, Misra et al., and Gutierrez et al. have shown convincingly that faculty who are women and/or people of color are expected to do more service on our campuses than their white, male counterparts: there is an institution that they will take care of the “institutional housekeeping” (Bird et al.) that keeps our universities and colleges running. However, this service work tends not to show up, beyond existential statements, in evaluations of professional work: reappointment, tenure and promotion discussions tend only to focus on the details of a faculty member’s service work when they have been deemed to be doing too much.

Alongside the hierarchy of people that this view of care perpetuates, it also perpetuates a hierarchy of teaching, where certain kinds of teaching are more valued in our institutions than other kinds. Low-care teaching is more prestigious and more sought after than high-care teaching; that is upper-division disciplinary courses, graduate courses, and research mentoring for graduate and undergraduate students (in that order) have a higher exchange value on our campuses. I suggest that this kind of teaching has a higher exchange value. The higher exchange value, moreover, is directly related to the material conditions under which instructors operate in these courses: low student numbers, high levels of intrinsic student motivation, connection with our own research programs, and potential for visible “productivity” in terms of collaborative publications with students. By contrast, general education courses, including but not limited to

first year writing courses, and other courses that students take primarily to fulfill graduation requirements, such as writing-intensive courses are associated with lower exchange value and thus worse working conditions.. The nature of these courses is such that levels of background knowledge and intrinsic motivation for taking these courses is potentially low. Because these courses make money for our institutions, enrollments are often higher than in upper-division elective courses. And, perhaps most significantly for care-work, these courses come both with increased administrative expectations, including more regular and standardized assessment to ensure alignment with institutional learning goals, requests for information about student progress, and so on, as well as, at least in composition and writing intensive courses, and an expectation of process pedagogy, which is inherently labor-intensive, even as the benefits of this labor for students remain unclear (Ritter; Sommers).

The contrast between these types of teaching is striking, not just when written out, but also in many instructors' lived experiences. In drawing this contrast, I do not mean to suggest that all faculty are not engaged in care work to some extent: at an institution like mine, for instance, where the President is committed to a "small college feel," enacted by maintaining relatively small class sizes (that is, we have no jumbo lectures, and no teaching assistants running recitations), the relatively low instructor to student ratio means that students are individually visible to instructors, and thus instructors are likely to understand what it is that each student in their class might need, in terms of instructor attention, to succeed. Furthermore, there is no less potential for care work in graduate courses and the supervision of graduate students; however, institutional expectations do not *require* care as part of those teaching arrangements, as attested to the long history of terrible, care-less graduate instruction that any conversation among academics could bring out. My point is, rather, that in these low exchange value courses, our

institutions *expect* and *require* instructor care work and *because* of this, teaching these classes brings less compensation for time, and less professional reward to their instructors. Therefore, by maintaining and participating in this hierarchy between types of teaching, our institutions, and, indeed, our very system of higher education, ask faculty to choose between professional advancement and doing care work in their classes. Those institutions whose goal is to have nationally recognized research “outputs” keep their full-time faculty out of the classroom, and certainly out of the introductory classroom, as much as possible. Institutions like mine, on the other hand, not only require full-time faculty to teach more, but the implicit requirement is that all faculty will teach general education courses, which require more care work.

But even at institutions like mine, the costs of care work on professional advancement and working conditions are well understood by the faculty: for instance, one faculty member in my department on the tenure track has asked not to teach general education classes for a year not because the subject matter is not important, but all the management of requirements for the course, linked to institutional goals, and all the attendant care for students, is just exhausting. Another, tenured, faculty member, planning to go up for promotion to full professor in the next few years, has asked to be assigned to our 300-level research writing course, rather than first year composition, because the latter “have too many requirements.” These faculty members, in their assessment of the toll that the required care work for our composition courses will take on their own working conditions and ability to fulfill other requirements of our job, are absolutely correct; teaching introductory writing courses requires care-work of us, so that our students can succeed in our introductory classes and beyond.

It is worth noting again and again that this hierarchy is detrimental to faculty who are women and people of color, as well, to an extent, for everyone in feminized disciplines. And it’s

certainly detrimental for our adjuncts, who teach most of our general education courses (National Census of Writing). The current climate around funding higher education, in the United States and internationally, makes it unlikely that proposals to improve the working conditions of teachers of writing, such as Marc Bousquet's, for having all instructors teaching composition be tenure-track faculty will come to fruition; other proposals to increase the exchange value of the discipline of composition, and thus value the time of composition faculty, rely on the perpetuation of a divide between those researching composition and those teaching it, since it is unlikely that all composition teaching jobs will be held by full-time, tenure-track faculty, as noted by critics of such proposals such as Jeanne Gunner. So, rather than repeating proposals that do nothing to change the feminized, racialized position in which composition teaching persists, I call for a bigger shift in the ways we articulate and value what is considered feminized and racialized on campus. I propose radically recentering what we value and compensate. The care work that we do at our institutions is known to be vital to student success (Noddings). Therefore, rather than considering teaching our introductory courses fringe elements of the real work that faculty do, I suggest that faculty care-work should be at the center of our narratives of success and our considerations about compensation, thus resisting the tendency, described by Duffy, of rendering care work invisible as work, even when it is done by paid employees. Mountz et al write:

Care work is work. It is not self-indulgent; it is radical and necessary (Federici, 2012; Ahmed, 2014). Care, moreover, is risky, imposing a burden on those who undertake care work (Tronto, 1989). Systematically marginalizing care "furthers the myth that our successes are achieved as autonomous individuals and, as such, we have no responsibility

to share the fruits of our success with others or to dedicate public resources to the work of care” (Lawson 2007, 5). (Mountz et al 1238-9)

I adapt Mountz et al’s description above, from their discussion of a “slow” approach to academic work, to claim that “care work *is* our work.” As such, therefore, it should be made visible *as* work in our workload calculations, and in our narratives of what successful academic workers do. Enacting this revaluing of care requires a systematic reconsideration of how care work fits in with our professional expertise. While the care work of teaching has often been outsourced from the so-called professor of record to teaching assistants and adjunct faculty, TJ Geiger’s work has shown that bringing together institutional endorsement of a faculty member—in terms of their permanent, full-time position—and care work is important to students’ experiences: “The relational labor many students value operates in tandem with the professional expertise of teachers, not as a negation of that expertise” (Geiger 109).

Several authors have described a dichotomy in which instructors are asked to choose between in their classes because it is not possible to do both adequately, despite the fact that we are asked to do it: content instruction and what Kelly Ritter calls “maternal-ethical care.” She writes,

It should not be, in my view, professionally acceptable to see first-year composition as the site of maternal-ethical student care. Writing teachers are increasingly pressured to be agents of literacy instruction and agents of personal care. We may need to decide which of these roles we want to prioritize if we expect to have reasonable working conditions for our already-undervalued writing faculty (Ritter 412).

As we see in this quotation, Ritter frames the choice between the two of these as a site of exploitation in our working conditions, and calls upon Writing Programs to decide what it really

is that they want their faculty to do. I suggest that our current educational conditions indicate that we do really want our general education instructors to do both of these things. Therefore, in order to improve faculty working conditions, our institutions need to find ways in which we can compensate instructors for doing both, rather than expecting a feminist ethic of care in the ways instructors teach their courses, without providing the necessary time to do so. In other words, we have an opportunity to refuse to use feminist principles to “aid the ‘surface amelioration of the unacceptable’” (Ozga & Deem 152, cited in Snyder 29), by first of all making this care work visible, and secondly being explicit about the resources that this care work requires to be sustained. We can show, through how we count time “spent,” that this is what we value including creating discourses and narratives that center our care work, rather than hiding because we work in a system where providing care in the classroom detracts from our professional status. As researchers into other kinds of care work have shown, having skilled carers increases the benefits which accrue not just to the people being cared for, but also to the public good (e.g. England and sources cited therein). Care work in the classroom benefits more than just the students: it benefits our institutions because it supports student retention and graduation through the connections with and integration into the institution that it facilitates, which has been shown to be a crucial element of students’ academic success (see Tinto: Umbach & Wawrzynski). Therefore, I reject the dichotomy that Ritter presents, but in doing so I reject the zero sum economic game in which our institutions exist. Ritter is right that the current system is unsustainable. But rather than choose, we need to find ways to explicitly value care as means to the achievement of our institutional and personal goals.

## 2. Care and Audit Culture

Many authors have contested the inevitability and the success of the neoliberal, corporate university: by definition, in fact, the neoliberal university can never be successful, because successful performance is framed as improvement, as Shore and Wright argue:

Central to this process [of auditing academic institutions] has been the re-invention of professionals themselves as units of resource whose performance and productivity must constantly be audited so that it can be enhanced. (559)

Katie Hogan, citing Tim Jackson, writes, “Education... it is a low-productivity sector ‘where chasing productivity growth doesn’t make sense’”(247). Working in education often means balancing productivity and reproductivity. Traditionally, we have considered our research and scholarship to be productive labor; teaching and service, on the other hand, are reproductive labor. Even though the neoliberal university is focused on measuring improvement, we have devised no direct metrics for measuring the care work that faculty do, because we do not really consider it as work that should be rewarded, and our conversations about doing it better are local and often perfunctory, and directed towards those with the least capital in our systems: teaching assistants and adjuncts, as evidenced by, for instance, the strong programs in graduate student training and adjunct professional development that we read about (e.g. Cripps, Hall & Robinson; Pytlik & Liggett and essays therein, WPA listserv discussion Nov 2-5, 2018).

Richard E. Miller suggests a way in which care and service can be valued as part of what he facetiously calls “university of excellence” model, making the work of composition programs central to the measures of excellence in the institution. I take his facetious description seriously: after all, the neoliberal university’s focus on quantifying productivity is part of a narrative of movement towards excellence and continuous improvement. All faculty and all departments—indeed, all operating units—are required to produce “outcomes” and account for these outcomes

for audit purposes. However, all research will not be counted equally: so-called “frontier research,” which tends to be understood as scientific research which expands the boundaries of human knowledge or human invention, is commonly understood to be more valuable to our institutions because of the revenue, either through grants or patents or licenses, that it can bring to our institutions. Therefore, as Miller suggests, a service ethic might be what distinguishes those departments and individuals who are not doing this kind of frontier scientific research.

Miller writes, of Writing Programs, that

It is a mistake to abandon the ethic of service that defines [Composition] in the hope that doing so will bring about a broader respect for the intellectual work done in the discipline . . . all research projects, from the use of the comma to the makeup of subatomic particles, are increasingly scrutinized, assessed, and frequently funded on the basis of their utility—on the basis, in other words, of the service they perform for society. Bereft of its service ethic, committed only to the project of researching the production of writing and the history of rhetoric, composition will be left to compete for resources in a game that it can never win. ( 103-104).

One of the meanings of audit is “rendering visible” (Shore & Wright, 559). Care is auditable, if we have the will to find ways to make it visible as labor. While I am not arguing for a total quality management approach to academic care work, where our care work is documented down to the minute, I *am* arguing for the creation of a discourse of care’s value on campus, and on its own terms. Creating this discourse means making care visible. This approach is in contrast to other attempts to articulate the value of administration and mentoring, such as the Council of Writing Program Administrators’ position statement on the Intellectual Work of Writing Program Administration does. This statement describes the value of WPA in terms of how we

value scholarship, in fact equating WPA *to* scholarship. As Laura Bartlett Snyder argues, such a strategy reinforces masculinist hierarchies by translating one articulation of productivity into another realm, while leaving in place the gendered divisions of labor between administration and instruction, scholarship and teaching.

Therefore, I offer some suggestions for how we can center care in our workloads and narratives, and so reject the idea that care work should not be counted, compensated and rewarded.<sup>1</sup>

- Composition and general education course teaching is “compensated” with fewer undergraduate students, and with more “counted” time per student.
- Institutions articulate the exchange value of various kinds of service and teaching, so that faculty can make strategic decisions about where to spend their energy.
- US institutions articulate and implement *workload tariff* counting methods (e.g. “University Workload Planning Framework”; see also Perks).<sup>2</sup>
- Faculty’s care work is articulated and valued in reappointment, tenure and promotion processes and guidelines.
- Local care work is articulated as service work for our institutions, professions and disciplines.

Through these measures, we can reward faculty for care-work well done, talk about care on campus, and count the care work that faculty are doing, and thus involve supervisors when faculty are taking on too much, or doing too little. Care work can become central to the stories that department chairs and deans tell about full-time faculty in reappointment, tenure and

---

<sup>1</sup> I note that various Writing Programs have put in place some of these strategies for valuing care work, but often in contexts where writing faculty are non-tenure track (e.g. Princeton, Duke, Harvard). It is at institutions where composition is taught by full-time faculty, we see the push to “compensate” writing faculty via making Composition a more traditional academic discipline (e.g. Lalicker), so maintaining gendered, classist academic hierarchies.

<sup>2</sup> Thanks to Andie Silva for bringing workload tariffs to my attention.

promotion processes, and WPAs and chairs can advocate for their programs in terms of the care that they provide to students. This articulated approach disproportionately benefits faculty who are women and people of color because these academic workers who are known to do the preponderance of care work on campus. Furthermore, it takes the important steps of centering and “normalizing” the lived experiences of faculty who women and/or people of color, and set their narratives as the baseline against all other faculty are compared. It is time that we started compensating faculty for all the things that help students succeed, rather than shifting them into an uncompensated, undervalued invisible labor space.

Re-placing care in our narratives of success is an example of “political reflexivity,” which Shore and Wright describe as a form of resistance to audit culture in UK higher education. They define political reflexivity as

neither navel-gazing nor 'rendering the implicit explicit' by revealing the inside to the outside (Strathern 1997: 314). Rather, as Okely (1992) argues, it is a political activity. It is about understanding critically the way individuals, as social persons, are positioned within systems of governance and how concepts, categories, boundaries, hierarchies and processes of subjectification are experienced and culturally reproduced. (572)

In our current climate of “doing more with less,” it seems more plausible to focus on what we can do locally, and to make the case for allocating more time to teaching, and for counting our workloads differently. Because, as Miller puts it “Our Future Donors,” our students, who benefit from this care-work, are our future donors, or, in the case of a college like mine, our future graduates. Department Chairs and WPAs may not have the institutional power to change course caps and workloads, but we can shape institutional and professional discourses and practices.

## Works Cited

- Bird, Sharon. "Unsettling Universities? Incongruous, Gendered Bureaucratic Structures: A Case-study Approach." *Gender, Work and Organization*, vol. 18, no. 2, 2011, pp. 202-230.  
doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00510.x
- Bird, Sharon, Jacquelyn Litt, and Yong Wang. "Creating Status of Women Reports: Institutional Housekeeping as 'Women's Work'." *NWSA Journal*, vol 16, no. 1, 2004, pp. 194-206.  
*Project Muse*. doi: 10.1353/nwsa.2004.0027
- Bousquet, Marc. "Composition as Management Science." *Works and Days* vol. 41/42. 2003. p. 189-218. <http://www.worksanddays.net/W&D%202003.html>
- Cooper, Brittney. "The Racial Politics of Time." *TED*. October 2016.  
[https://www.ted.com/talks/brittney\\_cooper\\_the\\_racial\\_politics\\_of\\_time](https://www.ted.com/talks/brittney_cooper_the_racial_politics_of_time).
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. *Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Program Administration*. 1998. <http://wpacouncil.org/positions/intellectualwork.html>
- Cripps, Michael J., Hall, Jonathan, & Robinson, Heather M. "'A Way to Talk about the Institution as Opposed to Just My Field': WAC fellowships and graduate student professional development. *TAs and the Teaching of Writing Across the Curriculum*, special issue of *Across the Disciplines*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2016.
- Crowley, Sharon. *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*. Pittsburgh, PA: U of Pittsburgh P, 1998.
- England, Paula. "Emerging theories of care work." *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 31, 2005, pp. 381-399.
- "Exchange Value." *Business Dictionary*. Accessed 12 October 2018.  
<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/exchange-value.html>

Duffy, Mignon. "Doing the Dirty Work: Gender, Race, and Reproductive Labor in Historical Perspective." *Gender & Society*, vol. 21, no. 3, 2007, pp. 313-336.

Geiger II, T. J. "An Intimate Discipline? Writing Studies, Undergraduate Majors, and Relational Labor." *Composition Studies*, vol. 43, no. 2, 2015, p. 92-112.

Gunner, Jeanne. "Among the Composition People: The WPA as English Department Agent." *JAC*, vol. 18, no. 1, 1998, pp. 153-165.

Gutiérrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y. F., González, C. G., & Harris, A. P.. Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia. Logan, UT: Utah State P. 2012. Not MLA

Hogan, Katie J. "The Academic Slow Lane." In Michelle Massé and Nan Bauer-Maglin (eds). *Staging Women's lives in Academia: Gendered Life Stages in Language and Literature Workplaces*. 2017. Albany: SUNY Press. P. 247-260. Not MLA

Holbrook, Sue Ellen. "Women's Work: The Feminizing of Composition." *Rhetoric Review*, vol 9, No. 2, 1991, pp. 201-229.

Inayatulla, Shereen & Heather M. Robinson (forthcoming). "'Backwards and in High Heels': The Invisibility and Underrepresentation of Femme(Inist) Administrative Labour in Academia." *Gender Identity and Expression and Sexual Orientation (LGBTQ+) in the Public and Nonprofit Contexts*. Special issue of *Administrative Theory and Praxis*.

Jackson, Tim. "Let's Be Less Productive." *New York Times*. New York Times, 26 May 2012. Accessed July 27, 2018.

Lalicker, William B. "The Five Equities: How To Achieve A Progressive Writing Program Within A Department Of English." In Justin Everett and Cristina Hanganau-Bresch,

- Minefield of Dreams: Triumphs and Travails of Independent Writing Programs*. WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado, 2016. pp. 293-392.
- Masse, Michelle A. & Katie J. Hogan. (Eds). *Over Ten Million Served: Gendered Service in Language and Literature Workplaces*. 2010. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Miller, Richard E. "From Intellectual Wasteland to Resource-Rich Colony: Capitalizing on the Role of Writing Instruction in Higher Education." *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2001, pp. 25-40.
- Miller, Richard E. "Our Future Donors." *College English*, vol. 66, no. 4, 2004, p. 365-379.
- Miller, Susan. *Textual carnivals: The politics of composition*. SIU Press. (1993).
- Misra, Joya, and Jennifer Lundquist. "Diversity and the Ivory Ceiling." *Inside Higher Ed* (26 June 2015). Accessed 9 July 2015.
- Misra, Joya, et al. "The Ivory Ceiling Of Service Work." *Academe*, vol 97, no. 1, 2011, p. 22. Accessed 9 July 2015.
- Mountz, Alison, et al. "For Slow Scholarship: A Feminist Politics Of Resistance Through Collective Action In The Neoliberal University." *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, vol. 14, no. 4, 2015, pp. 1235-1259.
- National Census of Writing. [writingcensus.swarthmore.edu](http://writingcensus.swarthmore.edu). Accessed 22 June 2018.
- Perks, Simon. "Academic Workload: A Model Approach." *The Guardian*. 15 April 2013. Accessed 9 November 2018.
- Pytlik, Betty Parsons, and Sarah Liggett, eds. *Preparing College Teachers Of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

- Ritter, Kelly. "Ladies Who Don't Know Us Correct Our Papers": Postwar Lay Reader Programs and Twenty-First Century Contingent Labor in First-Year Writing." *College Composition and Communication* vol. 63, no. 3, 2012, pp. 387-419.
- Schell, Eileen E. "The Feminization of composition: Questioning the metaphors that bind women teachers." *Composition Studies* vol. 20 no. 1, 1992, pp. 55-61.
- Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright. "Audit Culture and Anthropology: Neo-liberalism in British Higher Education." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 1999, pp. 557-575.
- Sommers, Nancy. "Responding to student writing." *College Composition and Communication* vol. 33 no. 2, 1982, pp. 148-156.
- Snyder, Laura Bartlett. "Feminisms and the Problem of Complicity in Writing Program Administrator Work." Strickland, Donna, and Jeanne Gunner, Eds. *The Writing Program Interrupted: Making Space for Critical Discourse*. Boynton/Cook Publishers, 2009, pp. 28-40.
- PSC-CUNY Teaching Load Reduction Agreement agreement. [http://psc-cuny.org/sites/default/files/TeachingLoadReduction\\_Web.pdf](http://psc-cuny.org/sites/default/files/TeachingLoadReduction_Web.pdf). Accessed September 15, 2018.
- Tinto, V. *Rethinking The Causes And Cures Of Student Attrition*. 1993. 2nd. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Umbach, Paul D. & Matthew R. Wawrzynski. "Faculty Do Matter: The Role of College Faculty in Student Learning and Engagement." *Research in Higher Education* 46.2 (2005): pp. 153-184. ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED491002.pdf>

University Workload Planning Framework: Tariffs For 2018-19. *Oxford Brookes University*.

[https://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/hr/handbook/workinghours/WLP\\_tariffs\\_for\\_2018-19\\_approved\\_by\\_VCG.doc.pdf](https://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/hr/handbook/workinghours/WLP_tariffs_for_2018-19_approved_by_VCG.doc.pdf). Accessed 9 November 2018.

Williams, Joan, *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do About it*.

Oxford University Press, 1999.