

extraordinarily difficult to resist a practice that is both economically advantageous and supported by its victims. (I denied composition equivalency to a transfer student who had dual enrollment credit for composition but whose writing sample and test scores put him in the lower half of those who place into basic writing. Both the student and his parents were outraged at me—not at the school that gave him college credit—and showed little concern about his inability to write.)

High school/college dual enrollment arrangements seem to be spreading very rapidly with little discussion of the matter among WPAs. I hope this contribution will encourage such discussion. My own view is that we must resist dual enrollment arrangements individually and as members of the WPA. I suggest the following strategies:

1. WPAs who evaluate transferred composition courses should not accept dual enrollment courses as equivalent to college composition courses. They should notify colleges and high schools that have dual enrollment programs that their courses will not be accepted as meeting college writing requirements.
2. WPAs should avoid getting involved in dual enrollment programs and should work on withdrawing from them if already involved. This is sometimes more easily said than done, as the programs are vigorously promoted by administrators and sometimes offered through continuing education units to avoid English Department interference.
3. The WPA Consultant-Evaluators should pay special attention to dual enrollment arrangements in their evaluations of writing programs.
4. WPAs should encourage professional discussion of dual enrollment at NCTE, 4C's, and MLA national conferences.
5. WPAs should work with high schools in their areas to develop interesting, appropriate, and attractive high school English curricula that will better prepare students for college reading and writing.

High School/College Dual Enrollment and the Composition Program

Michael J. Vivion

At recent meetings of WPAs, high school/college dual enrollment in composition courses has become a subject of increasing controversy. This controversy, in brief whether English departments should participate in programs which allow students to enroll simultaneously in courses for which they receive both high school credit and college credit, reflects one which our department has resolved to its general satisfaction. We decided not only to continue our participation (begun in 1979) but also to increase it. We made this decision, however, not without a great deal of research and some important qualifications. We were aware of the potential for abuse and of our responsibility to provide quality college-level instruction to the students in the program. As a result of our concerns, we developed a program which benefits not only the students but also the department and the participating high schools.

The first step in reaching this decision was to discuss with representatives of local school districts the general concept of college credit offered to high school students. High schools in this area are under great pressure to offer their students the opportunity to earn college credit while still enrolled in high school. The overwhelming response was that these types of programs were perceived as essential opportunities for the districts' students, opportunities which parents both expected and demanded. We discovered that high school students were receiving college credit in a number of different ways: for high scores on ACT and SAT exams; from high scores on the CLEP English exam, both with and without a writing sample; from Advanced Placement classes and exams; from the International Baccalaureate program; and from dual enrollment on courses offered by two other area colleges. District administrators assured us that if we dropped our program they would turn to another source for their offerings.

We had already experienced frustration with several of these alternatives. The university's admission's office had recently sent the department chair a request that the department review its policy of accepting only six hours of credit for the AP English exam. He asked for the review in light of the change in the AP's English exam from one test to two: the Language

and Composition test and the Literature and Composition test. He recommended that the department consider awarding up to twelve hours to students who had taken both exams and had received a 3 or better. Our review of the AP program and the history of the department's acceptance of AP credit led us to a few surprises.

The major surprise was how little the members of the English Department knew about the AP test and the credit we granted for it. We also discovered that there was no university policy which called for a regular review of any of the tests which the university accepts for credit. Our examination of the two tests, the Language and Composition test and the Literature and Composition test, opened up questions both about the nature of knowledge within our fields, in particular undergraduate composition and literature, and about what constitutes acceptable evaluation. We discovered that 40% of each test is multiple choice. For those who believe that the measure of education should be the ability to deal with complex ideas in speech and writing, the questions on the AP exam are an inappropriate way to assign college credit. They are part of the "scantron" philosophy of measuring education by machine scoring computer cards. Each test, however, is 60% essay. In fact, on each exam students are given 105 minutes of essays. Fifteen minutes of this time is mandatory reading and thinking time. Ninety minutes are left to write. On both tests there are *at least* two essays questions. The longest the students had to write on any topic was 45 minutes. There was no time for revision or editing--15 minutes for thinking. We also examined the content of both courses and discovered an appalling lack of similarity to our own curriculum. As a result of this review, we severely limited the amount of credit we grant from AP, and we raised the score requirement from 3 to 4.¹

Even earlier we had researched the performance of students who had either received credit for or been exempted from freshman composition on the basis of ACT or SAT scores. We then raised the exemption level to the score which all students had who received an A in their next composition course. At the same time we changed our policy of accepting CLEP English scores without a writing sample; we also decided to score the writing sample ourselves.

We also reviewed the dual credit programs offered by the two other area colleges. We discovered that, although they provided the same syllabi used on-campus, they provided minimum supervision of the classroom teachers and negligible contact between on-campus faculty and high school faculty. In addition, one of the colleges offered both semesters of their

freshmen composition to the high school seniors. Furthermore, selection of the high school faculty teaching these courses seemed largely left up to the high school principals. In short, these programs are models of dual enrollment programs which make the concept the center of the recent WPA controversy.

After we decided to accept the reality of the pressures to offer college credit on the high school campus, we set out to recreate our program. The program which evolved includes the following elements: direct supervision of participating teachers, departmental approval of participating faculty, opportunities for professional development, collaboration between on-campus and high school faculty. This redesigned program has significantly changed the relationships between the English Department and local school teachers.

We now have two faculty members who supervise participating teachers. They visit each classroom at least once a year, observe and critique the teaching, examine a set of graded papers, and write an evaluation for the composition director--the same process used for new on-campus faculty. Because of our concern about accountability, however, this process is ongoing in the dual credit program, perhaps unfairly because the dual credit teachers consistently receive high evaluations. These teachers also participate in the same student evaluation program used on-campus; evaluations are sent sealed to the English Department and not released to the teachers until after the grading period. They also participate in our faculty grading exchange, which admittedly should take place more regularly. Teachers who show need for improvement receive direct attention from the two supervisors and the director of composition. Overall, the program teachers are almost always rated among the best in the department. It's been no surprise to us that dual credit students have regularly been among the winners in the university's expository writing contest.

Adding to our confidence in the program's quality is the selection of teachers. First, these teachers are always among the best of the high school faculty. Also, each of the teachers in the program must be approved by the departmental hiring committee. We ask for a master's degree in English, teaching experience, and evidence of formal instruction in the teaching of writing. If applicants lack these qualifications, they are rejected or accepted on probation--with extra supervision, a prescribed number of graduate hours, or a writing project course on teaching composition. In general, the teaching credentials of the dual enrollment faculty are superior to those of

many part-time faculty in departments throughout the country. They are clearly superior to those of beginning teaching assistants. Indeed, their credentials, and their performance, make them assets to our staff.

If the teachers are required to take courses or if they simply choose to take courses to further their education, their adjunct status makes them eligible for a 60% discount in tuition. Over 90% of the teachers in the program have used this option. Furthermore, they receive all privileges accorded regular faculty, for example, library, recreation, athletic, theater, conservatory.

In addition to this continuing education opportunity, we provide a variety of staff development activities. Each fall semester all the dual enrollment teachers are brought to campus for a program and to discuss their problems and successes teaching the course. The program usually consists of a presentation on a special topic made by one of the program teachers, although the format may vary to include something like responding to a challenging student paper or reviewing text selection. Each spring semester the department and the College of Arts and Sciences host an English studies conference which the dual enrollment teachers attend along with other K-13 teachers from the region. Almost every conference in the last five years has included at least one program teacher among the presenters. Program teachers are also invited to campus when the department has speakers. In recent years, at either the conference or at staff development meetings, they've been able to hear and respond to Judith and Geoffrey Summerfield, Ben McClelland, David Bleich, Ann Bertoff, Ken Macrorie, David Bartholomae, Lil Brannon, John Trimbur, Jim Berlin, Andrea Lunsford, Vivian Davis, Bob DiYanni, Maxine Hairston, and Joe Trimmer, among others. One of the most rewarding additions to the staff development program has been the dean's sponsorship of two to four program teachers to the CCCC each year.

Because the teachers feel connected with the department, they feel freer to collaborate with the department. In the past these teachers have served on textbook committees, worked for *New Letters Review of Books*, co-authored articles and made joint presentations with on-campus faculty, served as readers on our campus-wide writing assessment, come to department parties, and offered thorough critiques of our curriculum. In short, these teachers have become valuable colleagues whose voices are now part of the professional conversation of our English department. They also are more willing to listen to our voices. At least a third of the schools involved in the program have made changes in their own curricula as a

result of their participation in the dual credit program. The influence flows in both directions.

We feel that the department's involvement in the high school/college credit program has changed our relationship with local school districts and teachers. We have joined with our school colleagues to create a school/college collaboration which has significantly improved the quality of writing instruction at both the high school and the university. This collaboration has increased the professional status of writing instruction and has led to positive educational innovation, not only in the suburban districts that benefit most frequently from accelerated programs like AP and IB but also in Kansas City's inner city schools where few such benefits have been available in the past.

The students also benefit from this arrangement. Their dual credit classes are generally smaller than their other classes; the university controls class size as part of its agreement with the schools. Students who are active in other school activities can work dual credit offerings into their schedules. They follow the same syllabus, read the same texts, write the same assignments and face the same standards as their peers on-campus. The course is a college course, one for which they pay approximately 30% of regular tuition. Nevertheless, they receive the same campus privileges that other part-time students receive, library and writing-lab privileges included. Some teachers bring their students on campus tours and arrange for their students to visit on-campus courses. Students who are less sure of their abilities have the chance to experiment with college work within the familiar atmosphere of their high schools. Indeed, no student fails the course; instead those having difficulty are allowed to withdraw up until late in the semester. Those who do complete the course successfully receive credit on a regular transcript—the course is not identified as an off-campus or as a dual enrollment course. The follow-up studies we have done indicate that students completing the dual enrollment course generally perform as well or better in their following composition courses.

The dual credit concept is not ideal and should most certainly not be implemented without concern for local conditions and without a strong commitment to participation from the administering English department. In many ways we would prefer to have the students on campus, interacting with students from different high schools and of different ages. Indeed, this belief is one reason that we will not offer our second course on the high school campuses. Students can benefit from an experience with composition within the unique cultural circumstances of the university. We are

convinced, however, that in today's educational environment high schools and their students will aggressively pursue avenues to obtain college credit. It is our responsibility to respond to this reality by creating dual credit programs which offer students quality college-level instruction and which unite teachers at both levels in a mutually beneficial professional undertaking.²

Notes

1. Our examination of the May 1984 AP information on the English tests showed that 80% of the students who took the test received a 3 or above. This discovery and those noted within the text convince me that credit by examination is another issue which deserves intense scrutiny and discussion by WPAs.

2. I'd like to thank Joan Gilson for her excellent work with University of Missouri-Kansas City's High School/College Credit Program and for her helpful comments on this essay.

Somewhere Between Disparity and Despair: Writing Program Administrators, Image Problems, and *The MLA Job Information List*

Joseph Janangelo

There is a central irony in looking for work as a Writing Program Administrator. On the one hand, we have created several vehicles (including a Council, a journal, and a consultant-evaluator service) to help change the academy's traditional images of Writing Program Administrators. On the other hand, when we look for work many of us will still answer advertisements such as those listed in *The MLA Job Information List*. One problem for us is that the *JIL* is a conservative and somewhat outdated text. It consists largely of unedited job descriptions written and submitted by literary scholars who have serious misconceptions about the professional roles and responsibilities of Writing Program Administrators. Given this disparity between our self-images and the images reflected in the *JIL*'s job descriptions, two questions arise: What are the *JIL*'s dominant images of Writing

Program Administrators? And how do those images relate to our own self-conceptions as teachers and scholars?

My purpose here is to examine some emblematic job advertisements published in the *JIL* during the past two years. My argument is that the majority of these advertisements militate against Writing Program Administrators' professional advancement. In fact, they often serve to undermine our professionalization, to misrepresent our work, and to keep us further "marginalized" (Trimbur and Cambridge 15) in the academy. Before reviewing these advertisements, I want to specify that it is the naive attitudes embodied in them that I find most troublesome. For me, the problem lies in the fact that the people who write these ads seem to have an unclear concept of the field of rhetoric and composition, of the specialties within the field, and of the particular difficulties that face untenured WPAs. In reviewing these job advertisements, I see them as presenting three major problems: 1) they recruit WPAs as untenured assistant professors, 2) they require a high degree of literary training on the part of candidates, and 3) they disguise the political dangers of administering a writing program within the language of opportunity.

Varied Expectations and Untenured Vulnerability

Initially, the most compelling problem about many WPA job descriptions is that they are often targeted at beginning assistant professors, requiring them to assume too many different kinds of responsibilities while performing sustained and focused scholarship. Here are two examples from the *JIL* which illustrate my point. For Job #1, the prospective WPA is asked to

... coordinate a writing center and a computer facility...including supervision of graduate students and adjunct faculty and to teach undergraduate and graduate writing and composition theory courses (10/88, 34).

For Job #2, the prospective candidate's responsibilities include

teaching expository writing, directing Freshman Composition, coordinating course offerings in all basic skills courses, supervising adjuncts, and developing concern for good writing across the curriculum (12/89, 14).