

Time, Care and Faculty Working Conditions

Heather M. 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 and Wright 1999, 572)

As many scholars have pointed out, the expectation of significant affective labor in composition classrooms is at the core of the issues with working conditions that are endemic in staffing and teaching composition classes (e.g. Schell 1992; S. Miller 1993; Ritter 2012). Furthermore, these issues extend beyond composition into working conditions of those teaching in our institutions' General Education curricula. I argue 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. Care work, in the way I am conceiving of it here, builds on the idea of “academic housework” in Heijstra et al. 2016 (p. 764), who use this term to describe “All the academic service work within the institution that is performed by all academic staff, both women and men, but that receives little recognition within the process of academic career making or within the definition of academic excellence” (Heijstra et al. 2016, 765). More specifically, care work is the activities that academic staff undertake to support students' learning, and to support students' and other colleagues' emotional health and academic advancement. Care work focuses on the affective parts of teaching, service and research, rather than the content of what we teach and do in our academic 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 1998); create a Department of Writing Studies with tenure-track faculty doing writing research and teaching graduate students (Lalicker 2016), get rid of Writing Programs altogether (Bousquet 2003), and value Writing Program Administration (WPA) as scholarship (Council of Writing Program Administrators). 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 (Bird 2011; Winslow 2010; O’Meara et al. 2017). Furthermore, such proposals do nothing to address the structural inequalities that inhere in academic work, where most composition and general education classes are taught by contingent faculty; indeed, many of these proposals pre-date US universities’ shift to a massive reliance on contingent and non-tenure track faculty.¹ Instead, I suggest that we can change the system on the ground by looking at what we have control over. These things might include changing how workloads are distributed among courses, how we make care visible and count in professional evaluation, 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 and professional 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

¹ Thanks to Kirsti Cole for this observation.

understanding of academic success based on individual “productivity.” The slow scholarship movement, which builds on other “slow” movements (e.g. slow food, Andrews (2008), resists “the accelerated timelines of the neoliberal university” (Mountz et al, 2015) by focusing on a commitment to thorough and thoughtful scholarship, and an embrace of an ethic of care in our academic work, as explored, for instance, in Martell (2014), McCabe (2012), O’Neill (2014) and Berg & Seeber (2016). In particular, I follow Mountz et al. (2015) in making central the collectivity to my version slow scholarship and its attention to structures of power and (in)equality, in order to (among other things) foster student success and enable faculty to lead healthy lives (see also Mountz et al. 2015; Berg and Seeber 2016; Hogan 2017). The questions with which I will frame the next part of this discussion 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)?
- “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 and Robinson, 2020).

These questions, which challenge us to think about ways in which we can center and foster our humanity in the workplace - are 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. 2015), which are those that govern the high-productivity “ideal worker” model first named by Joan Williams (1999). 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 (Mountz et al. 2015), and, in academic contexts 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 faculty and 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 unproductive. 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 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” (PSC-CUNY n.d.). 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 Misra et al. (2011), and Gutierrez y Muhs et al. (2012) have shown, however, the amount of service, mentoring and student guidance undertaken by women and faculty of color tends to be much higher than for white men. This has the effect of taking members of these groups away from the work that unequivocally counts: research and scholarship. For instance, Misra et al. (2011) show that, at the associate professor level, women faculty report spending 27% of their time on service and 25% on research; associate professors who identify as men report spending 20% of their time on service and 37% of their time on research.

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 3 hours over a 3 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 2018)

In fact, this agreement provides a clear example of 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. This space, this work, 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 in labor practices 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.

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 2012; Schell 1992; Holbrook 1991 for teaching; Bird, Litt & Wang 2004.; Misra et al., 2011; Massé and Hogan 2010; Hogan 2010 for service). This undervaluing is not accidental, but, rather, is connected with the long western tradition of treating care work as the work of women and people of color. These groups have often been culturally deprecated. Paula England (2005) 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 2005, 382).

Brittney Cooper (2017), 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” (5:56-6:03) and “We black people have always been out of time. Time does not belong to us.” (11:02-11:06). Women and people of color have been historically and culturally assigned to care work in U.S. academic culture, doing the domestic labor that 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

(e.g. Hansen & Philipson, 1990; Nakano Glenn, 1992; Laslett & Brenner, 1989), 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. (2007, 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 are problematic because they make "reproductive labor" involved in supporting student success and outcomes invisible and therefore uncountable. Reproductive labor, in this sense, 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 the "quantified worth of one good or service expressed in terms of the worth of another" ("Exchange Value").

Bird, Litt & Wang argue that "service work carries little if any exchange value for those who do it" (2004, 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

must come from institutions, rather than by encouraging women to set their own limits of what they will agree to. This latter kind of approach, which Sharon Bird calls “women-centered,” (Bird 2011, 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 (see Inayatulla and Robinson, 2020), 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 an 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, Litt & Wang (2004), Massé and Hogan (2010), Misra et al. (2011), and Gutierrez y Muhs et al. (2012) 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 assumption that they will take care of the “institutional housekeeping” (Bird, Litt & Wang 2004, 194) that keeps our universities and colleges running. However, this care work tends not to show up, beyond existential statements, in evaluations of professional work: reappointment, tenure and promotion discussions often 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--the kind of teaching which involves less nurturance of students

as people, and can focus more on the delivery of and engagement with content--is more prestigious and more sought after than high-care teaching; such low-care teaching includes upper-division disciplinary courses, graduate courses, and lecture-based courses. This low-care teaching also tends to carry a higher exchange value; that is, it is worth more in our reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions, because it tends to be a site in which instructors demonstrate disciplinary prowess. This higher exchange value is also directly related to the material conditions under which instructors tend to 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, 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, while enrollments tend to be high. These courses also tend to be taught by part-time, contingent and pre-tenure faculty, who often cost less to employ than full-time and tenured faculty. And, perhaps most significantly for care work, these courses come with increased administrative expectations, including more regular and standardized assessment to ensure alignment with institutional learning goals, requests for information about student progress, coordinating with student support services across campus and so on. Furthermore, at least in composition and writing intensive courses, there is an expectation of using process pedagogy, which is inherently labor-intensive, even as the benefits of this labor for students

remain unclear (Ritter 2012; Sommers 1982), as well as a full embrace of “active-” and “student-centered” learning, which are also labor-intensive to set up.²

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 large-enrollment 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. One institutional response has thus been to assign such courses to instructors with lower professional status; these instructors are, of course, those with lower social status, too, as is made clear by the well-known small of numbers of women and people of color in among the ranks of full professors, and the fact that the majority of adjunct faculty are white women and/or people of color (Finkelstein, Conley and Schuster 2016).

² Thanks to Rochelle Rodrigo for pointing this out.

Our institutions, and, indeed, our very system of higher education, participate in and maintain this hierarchy between types of teaching, in effect asking 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 two years not because the subject matter is not important, but because all the management of requirements for the course, linked to institutional goals and assessment, 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 will come to fruition (e.g. Bousquet 2003, Lalicker 2016, Crowley 1998). 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 2012). 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). (2007, 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, especially because of the positive role that it plays in students experiences, as suggested in Carlson (2014), describing the results of a Gallup-Purdue poll. The poll found that “college graduates, whether they went to a hoity-toity private college or a midtier public, had double the chances of being engaged in their work and were three times as likely to be thriving in their well-being if they connected with a professor on the campus who stimulated them, cared about them, and encouraged their hopes and dreams” Carlson 2014).

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 2012, 412).

Ritter frames the choice between instruction and care work 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. 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 and Deem 2000, 152, quoted in Snyder 2009, 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 2005). 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 1993: Umbach and Wawrzynski, 2005). 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.

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. (1999, 559)

Katie Hogan, citing Tim Jackson, writes, “Education... it is a low-productivity sector ‘where chasing productivity growth doesn't make sense’”(2017, 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. Furthermore, these efforts are often 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 and Robinson 2016; Pytlik and Liggett 2002, 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 (R. Miller 2001). 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. He 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. (R. Miller 2001, 103-104).

One of the meanings of audit is “rendering visible” (Shore and Wright 1999, 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 (Snyder 2009). 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.³

- Compensate composition and general education course teaching with fewer undergraduate students, and with more “counted” time per student.
- Articulate, on the institutional level, the exchange value of various kinds of service and teaching, so that faculty can make strategic decisions about where to spend their energy.
- Articulate and implement workload tariffs frameworks and methods such as *Workload Planning Frameworks*, as discussed below (e.g. “University Workload Planning Framework”; see also Perks 2013).⁴
- Articulate and value faculty's care work in reappointment, tenure and promotion processes and guidelines.
- Articulate local care work as service work for our institutions, professions and disciplines.

³ 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 2016), so maintaining gendered, classist academic hierarchies.

⁴ Thanks to Andie Silva for bringing workload tariffs to my attention.

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. For instance, workload tariffs are an example of vertical involvement in the care work assigned to and undertaken by faculty members. In a workload tariff framework, such as that set out by Oxford Brookes University in the United Kingdom, all activities are named and accounted for within a 1600 hour yearly workload allocation. While, as in US institutions, only formal teaching activities are counted in contractual terms, the workload tariffs, as established and negotiated by a committee chaired by a high-level administrator allow individual faculty members to account for their activities in the context of their academic job, and to include not only hours spent on research, but also those spent on, for instance, student advising (2 hours per student per year), research supervision (10-75 hours per year, depending on the level of the student), course preparation (1.5 hours per formally scheduled teaching hour) and grading and student assessment (hours vary depending on class size and “nature and complexity of assessment requirements”) (“Workload Planning Framework 2019-20,” 2). In models such as this, care work can become central to the stories that department chairs and deans tell about full-time faculty in reappointment, tenure and 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. (1999, 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. However, universities and colleges in the U.S. are similar enough to each other such that a national discourse about best practices for valuing care work on campus is a very possible, especially as led by our professional organizations. Indeed, if our accreditors valued care work, our institutions would too. Because, as Richard E. Miller (2004) puts it in “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. Faculty administrators may not, on the individual level, have the institutional power to change course caps and workloads, but we can shape institutional and professional discourses and practices.

References

Andrews, Geoff. 2008. *The Slow Food Story: Politics and Pleasure*. London: Pluto Press.

Bird, Sharon. 2011. "Unsettling Universities' Incongruous, Gendered Bureaucratic Structures: A Case-study Approach." *Gender, Work and Organization* 18, no. 2. pp. 202-230.
doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00510.x

Bird, Sharon, Jacquelyn Litt, and Yong Wang. 2001. "Creating Status of Women Reports: Institutional Housekeeping as 'Women's Work'." *NWSA Journal*, 16, no. 1. pp. 194-206.
Project Muse. doi: 10.1353/nwsa.2004.0027

Bousquet, Marc. 2003. "Composition as Management Science." *Works and Days* 41/42. p. 189-218. <http://www.worksanddays.net/W&D%202003.html>

Carlson, Scott. 2014. "A Caring Professor May Be Key in How a Graduate Thrives" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. May 6, 2014. Accessed August 19, 2019.
<https://www.chronicle.com/article/A-Caring-Professor-May-Be-Key/146409>

Cooper, Brittney. 2017. "The Racial Politics of Time." *TEDWomen*. from TED.com. 12:30.
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, and Robinson, Heather M. 2016. "'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*, 13, no. 3.

Crowley, Sharon. 1998. *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*.
Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

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

England, Paula. 2005. "Emerging theories of care work." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31. pp.
381-399.

"Exchange Value." *Business Dictionary*. Accessed 12 October 2018.

<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/exchange-value.html>

Finkelstein, Martin J, Valerie Martin Conley and Jack H. Schuster. 2016. "Taking the Measure
of Faculty Diversity." TIAA Institute.

<https://www.tiaainstitute.org/publication/taking-measure-faculty-diversity>

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

Gutiérrez y Muhs, Gabriella, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. González, and Angela P.
Harris. 2012. *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in
academia*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Hansen, Karen V., and Ilene J. Philipson. 1990. *Women, class, and the feminist imagination: A
socialist-feminist reader*. Philadelphia: Temple University.

Heijstra Tamar M, Finnborg S. Steinþórsdóttir, and Þorgerður Einarsdóttir. 2016. Academic
career making and the double-edged role of academic housework. *Gender and Education*.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016>.

- Hogan, Katie J. 2010. "Superserviceable feminism." In *Over ten million served: Gendered service in language and literature workplaces*. Edited by Michelle Massé & Katie J. Hogan. Albany, NY: SUNY Press. 55-72.
- Hogan, Katie J. 2017. "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*. Albany: SUNY Press. p. 247-260.
- Holbrook, Sue Ellen. 1991. "Women's Work: The Feminizing of Composition." *Rhetoric Review*, vol 9, No. 2. pp. 201-229.
- Inayatulla, Shereen and Heather M. Robinson (2020). "'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. 2012. "Let's Be Less Productive." *New York Times*. New York Times, 26 May 2012. Accessed July 27, 2018.
- Lalicker, William B. 2016. "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. pp. 293-392.
- Laslett, Barbara, and Johanna Brenner. 1989. Gender and social reproduction: Historical perspectives. *Annual Review of Sociology* 15:38 1-404.

- Martell, Luke. 2014. "The slow university: Inequality, power and alternatives." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 15(3). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/2223/3692>
- Massé, Michelle A. and Katie J. Hogan. 2010. (Eds). *Over Ten million Served: Gendered Service in Language and Literature Workplaces*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- McCabe, Daniel. 2012. "The slow science movement." Retrieved from <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/features/feature-article/the-slow-sciencemovement/>
- Miller, Richard E. 2001. "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. pp. 25-40.
- 2004. "Our Future Donors." *College English*, vol. 66, no. 4. p. 365-379.
- Miller, Susan. 1993. *Textual carnivals: The politics of composition*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Misra, Joya, and Jennifer Lundquist. 2015. "Diversity and the Ivory Ceiling." *Inside Higher Ed* (26 June 2015). Accessed 9 July 2015.
- Misra, Joya, Jennifer Lundquist, Elissa Dahlberg Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. 2011. "The Ivory Ceiling Of Service Work." *Academe*, vol 97, no. 1. p. 22. Accessed 9 July 2015.
- Mountz, Alison, Anne Bonds, Becky Mansfield, Jenna Loyd, Jennifer Hyndman, Margaret Walton-Roberts, Ranu Basu et al. 2015. "For slow scholarship: A feminist politics of resistance through collective action in the neoliberal university." *ACME: an international E-journal for critical geographies* 14, no. 4.

Nakano Glenn, Evelyn. 1992. "From servitude to service work: Historical continuities in the racial division of paid reproductive labor." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 18. 1-43.

National Census of Writing. n.d. writingcensus.swarthmore.edu. Accessed 22 June 2018.

Noddings, Nel. 2012. "The Caring Relation in Teaching." *Oxford Review of Education*. 38 no. 6. 771-781.

O'Meara, KerryAnn, Alexandra Kuvaeva, Gudrun Nyunt, Chelsea Waugaman and Rose Jackson. 2017. "Asked more often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the work interactions that shape them." *American Educational Research Journal* 54 no. 6. 1154-1186. DOI: 10.3102/0002831217716767.

O'Neill, Maggie. 2014. "The slow university – Work, time, and well-being." Retrieved from <http://www.discoversociety.org/2014/06/03/the-slowuniversity-work-time-and-well-being/>

Perks, Simon. 2013. "Academic Workload: A Model Approach." *The Guardian*. 15 April 2013. Accessed 9 November 2018.

PSC-CUNY. n.d. "Professional Evaluation." Accessed October 15, 2018.

<https://psc-cuny.org/contract/article-18-professional-evaluation>

PSC-CUNY. 2018. "Teaching Load Reduction Agreement." Accessed September 15, 2018. http://psc-cuny.org/sites/default/files/TeachingLoadReduction_Web.pdf.

Pytlik, Betty Parsons, and Sarah Liggett, eds. *Preparing College Teachers Of Writing: Histories, Theories, Programs, Practices*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

- Ritter, Kelly. 2012. "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* 63, no. 3. pp. 387-419.
- Schell, Eileen E. 1992. "The Feminization of composition: Questioning the metaphors that bind women teachers." *Composition Studies* 20 no. 1. pp. 55-61.
- Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright. 1999. "Audit Culture and Anthropology: Neo-liberalism in British Higher Education." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 5 no 4. pp. 557-575.
- Sommers, Nancy. 1982. "Responding to student writing." *College Composition and Communication* 33 no. 2. pp. 148-156.
- Snyder, Laura Bartlett. 2009. "Feminisms and the Problem of Complicity in Writing Program Administrator Work." In *The Writing Program Interrupted: Making Space for Critical Discourse*, edited by Donna Strickland and Jeanne Gunner. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, pp. 28-40.
- Tinto, V. 1993. *Rethinking The Causes And Cures Of Student Attrition*. 2nd. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Umbach, Paul D. and Matthew R. Wawrzynski. 2005. "Faculty Do Matter: The Role of College Faculty in Student Learning and Engagement." *Research in Higher Education* 46 no. 2. 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. Accessed 9 November 2018.

Williams, Joan. 1999. *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do About it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Winslow, Sarah. 2010. "Gender inequality and time allocations among academic faculty." *Gender & Society* 24, no. 6. 769-793.