

Philosophy in Two-Year Colleges



SPRING 2017

VOLUME 16 | NUMBER 2

FROM THE EDITOR

Thomas Urban

ARTICLES

Richard Legum

The Value of Studying Philosophy for Community College Students

Darren Jones

Lower Division Pedagogy

Ian M. Duckles

A Tale of Two Professors: A Case Study in Justice at the Community College

CALL FOR PAPERS



APA NEWSLETTER ON

Philosophy in Two-Year Colleges

THOMAS URBAN, EDITOR

VOLUME 16 | NUMBER 2 | SPRING 2017

FROM THE EDITOR

Thomas Urban

RETIRED PROFESSOR, HOUSTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

This issue of the *Newsletter on Philosophy in Two-Year Colleges* focuses on three separate concerns. One is the value of studying philosophy at a two-year or community college, beyond the aim to earn transfer credits. Two are the pedagogical challenges that face two-year or community college faculty when student educational backgrounds and demographics demand unusual approaches to the selection and presentation of materials from philosophy and its related history. Three is the continuing disparity between adjunct or part-time faculty and their full-time, tenure-track colleagues and what that disparity actually implies relative to the question of justice in the workplace.

Professor Richard Legum of Kingsborough Community College (CUNY) lays out what he deems to be the goals and objectives that philosophy courses *ought* to target, his basis for assigning value to the study of philosophy in two-year and community colleges. Legum's article seeks to accomplish this by way of contrasting his understanding of philosophical scholarship at research and four-year institutions with that of teaching that focuses on the development and improvement of certain core competencies, i.e., "understanding, interpreting, and reconstructing arguments, (ii) understanding the criteria for dealing with these arguments in a rational manner, i.e., by evaluating arguments and reasoning; known in the field as informal logic."

Darren Jones, a community college professor in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, provides our readers a possible approach to matching Legum's goals and objectives to the presenting challenges one encounters in two-year and community college populations in a discussion that focuses on basic lower division pedagogy, namely, the selection of informative topics and teaching materials, including texts.

Our third article, by Ian M. Duckles of San Diego Mesa College, presents us with an interesting "apples to apples" discussion of the seeming contrasts between adjunct and full-time, tenure-track teaching at two-year and community colleges. By showing an "apples to apples" comparison, Duckles is able to formulate an argument for justice that challenges the more common comparisons one finds based on difference. In part, he is able to do this by developing a case study that draws on his own experience as a longtime adjunct instructor who was ultimately able to move into

a full-time, tenure-track position. Duckles sees this case study as something that would be useful in teaching ethics, and also as factual evidence for the absence of justice in an educational system that increasingly relies on part-time faculty to staff its courses.

The fall 2016 inaugural issue of this newsletter stated its aim is to foster a rich discussion concerning the nature and issues that characterize the evolution of two-year and community colleges. It also aims to highlight the great differences one finds from institution to institution, and the great diversity of faculty and students who populate their campuses. We invite all philosophers and students of philosophy to contribute to this discussion, without regard to employment status. A CFP for our next issue appears at the end of every issue.

ARTICLES

The Value of Studying Philosophy for Community College Students

Richard Legum

KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CUNY

Anyone attending a college graduation can't miss the elation on the graduates' faces. This is even more evident at community college graduations, where many graduates are the first generation in their family to attend college. The faculty takes pride in the fact that they have been able to guide their students through obstacles of school to reach this climax. However, we members of the faculty are not there on the day after graduation, when the graduates descend into an abyss as it sinks in that they are unable to find employment commensurate with their level of education. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that along with their coveted sheepskin many find themselves in significant debt with no obvious means to pay it off. Politicians on one side of the aisle propose to solve the problem by providing a free college education to all qualified students. But that only addressed one side of the equation, i.e., the debt that the student incurred. Politicians on the other side of the aisle propose formulae for economic growth that they believe will increase the number of entry level jobs in careers for college graduates. But the government cannot guarantee robust job growth.

Some of our colleagues in the humanities and social sciences enjoy speculating and/or pontificating on which

of these alternatives is the “right” approach. In fact, some members of the faculty, especially those who view the role of educator as a social reformer, try to enlighten their students as to how to ensure that society does not end up in this “unjust” outcome. This view of “education” is reinforced by some colleges instituting “civic engagement” as an additional graduation requirement.

Rather than preaching their solutions to the impressionable minds sitting in their classes, I will argue that the faculty ought to do some serious soul searching concerning the goals of the education they are tasked to provide. I would suggest that they should focus on the question of what they can do to help provide the students with the requisite skills and knowledge to qualify them for entry level jobs in promising careers. I propose to examine the goals and objectives which philosophy courses ought to target. I will argue that:

- 1) Philosophy courses, by their very nature, provide the students with an important, perhaps unique, opportunity to acquire a set of competencies that are directly correlated with those cited by employers as being difficult to find in today’s new employees.
- 2) Philosophy departments at major research institutions fail to focus on these competencies as a result of professors’ parochial views that their primary role is that of philosopher, rather than educator.
- 3) Philosophy professors at the most selective liberal arts colleges have inherited this same mindset from their mentors at research institutions, the education of their students taking a backseat to their philosophy scholarship.
- 4) The study of philosophy at community college ought to (and often does) break this mindset because of the nature and mission of the colleges—focusing on the development and improvement of certain core competencies.
- 5) The core competencies developed by the study of philosophy are those of (i) understanding, interpreting, and reconstructing arguments, (ii) understanding the criteria for dealing with these arguments in a rational manner, i.e., by evaluating arguments and reasoning, known in the field as informal logic.

Philosophy, from its ancient Greek inception, has had the reputation of being a discipline which lacks any practical application. Plato tells a well-known story about the founder of Greek philosophy, Thales, who “[w]hile . . . studying the stars and looking upwards, . . . fell into a pit, and a neat, witty Thracian servant girl jeered at him . . . because he was so eager to know things in the sky that he could not see what was there before him at his very feet.”¹ Plato, well aware of this occupational hazard, continues, “[t]he same jest applies to those who pass their lives in philosophy.” This impression of philosophy did not end two and a half millennia ago. Even

during times when a liberal arts education was viewed as the preferred course of study in college, a goal of a college education remained preparing the student for a career. My uncle, a dentist, used to ask facetiously whether I was planning to open a philosophy store when I graduate. The joke being that pursuing a liberal arts education in literature, history, art, etc., at least provides the student with factual knowledge requisite for certain commercial endeavors; by contrast, philosophy does not even provide the student with any *useful* base of knowledge.

As a philosophy professor at a two-year college in an era when the study of business is preferred to the study of the arts and sciences, I am frequently confronted with a similar mindset. I encounter it not only on campus, but even at home and in social contexts. I am asked whether community college students ought to be studying philosophy. The underlying premise, put somewhat diplomatically, being that two-year college students should be spending their time in remedial studies and vocational studies that prepare them for a career. Their study of philosophy is an intellectual exercise which at best will be of marginal value, at worst detrimental, to their acquiring the skills that they need to master. Even professional educators, who are well aware of the educational challenges of community college students, express these sentiments. For example, my wife, a twenty-year veteran of teaching history to *at-risk* high school students, insists that “your students don’t need philosophy; they need training in some skills that will get them a job.”

Are the critics right? Are we two-year college philosophy professors so vested in our thinking about the intrinsic value of philosophy (or so desperate to keeping our teaching positions) that we fail to see the obvious flaw in what we are trying to do? I think that the critics are wrong. I believe that studying philosophy has a vital role in the education of two-year college students. Studying philosophy facilitates the students’ cognitive development through the development of skills in argument analysis and logical thinking (what we, in philosophy, call informal logic). Philosophy, in contrast to other academic disciplines, uniquely concentrates on the development of logical thinking skills. As such, I believe that our philosophy courses ought to focus, primarily, on the development of these skills. Moreover, we must exercise care and restraint to avoid focusing too heavily on inculcating knowledge of philosophy—knowledge that we personally value so highly. I will argue that an introductory course in ethics, for example, ought to focus primarily on the logical analysis and assessment of moral arguments, theories, and concepts. Our obligation is to develop our students’ logical thinking skills, enabling them to come to rational conclusion and decision, not to tell them what to believe and decide.

1. THE VALUE OF STUDYING PHILOSOPHY

Bertrand Russell, a luminary of twentieth century philosophy, concluding his book *The Problems of Philosophy* with a chapter entitled “The Value of Philosophy,” sums up his view as follows:

Philosophy is to be studied, not for the sake of any definite answers to its questions, since no definite

answers can, as a rule, be known to be true, but rather for the sake of the questions themselves; because these questions enlarge our conception of what is possible, enrich our intellectual imagination and diminish the dogmatic assurance which closes the mind against speculation; but above all because, through the greatness of the universe which philosophy contemplates, the mind also is rendered great, and becomes capable of that union with the universe which constitutes its highest good.²

For Russell, the value of studying philosophy is not to be found in adding philosophical facts to one's body of knowledge. The study of philosophy is of practical value only to the extent that it opens and enhances the mind through contemplating philosophical questions and proposed solutions to the same. In an age where annual tuition at private colleges approaches the U.S. median family income, it is extravagant to spend large sums of money for this vague and somewhat nebulous benefit. If this is the value of studying philosophy, the student could accomplish this in less expensive ways: reading philosophy books, watching YouTube videos on philosophy, and taking free online courses about philosophy.

It is interesting that Russell never imagined his philosophical work to have practical and tangible benefits. It is ironic considering that his philosophical work in logic and the foundations of mathematics laid the foundation of the digital era. However, Russell's life work was that of a brilliant man of letters, not an inventor. Practical considerations did not motivate his work. While Russell's *Problems of Philosophy* is an engaging introduction to the classical problems of epistemology and metaphysics, there is a better explanation of the value of philosophy to which his comments allude. Studying philosophy is a mind-expanding experience but has practical value. One might wonder whether it is oxymoronic for the words "philosophy" and "practical" to be in the same sentence. However, there is a set of skills sought out by employers which are uniquely developed in the study of philosophy.

Susan Adams writes in *Forbes Magazine* (a leading business magazine), "Can you . . . make decisions and solve problems? Those are the skills employers most want when they are deciding which new college graduates to hire."³ The logical thinking skills developed in philosophy cultivate an ability to solve problems and make decisions. Many academic disciplines claim to teach *critical thinking* skills; however, philosophy is unique in teaching, exercising, and inculcating students to think logically. *Critical thinking* skills are employed in other disciplines and, moreover, may be essential to success in other disciplines. However, one of the disciplines in philosophy, logic, is uniquely devoted to the study and development of the rules and techniques of rational thinking, i.e., informal logic. The study of philosophy essentially involves the application of informal logic, the essence of *critical thinking* and decision making.

Why have we philosophers missed this critical educational outcome that we uniquely provide the students? Why have we missed the opportunity to make the case of requiring all

students to study philosophy for these important practical benefits? The short answer to these questions is that our interests in the subject matter and our graduate education has blinded us to this vital role for philosophy. I will now turn to clarifying the role that academic programs in philosophy and our having been brought up in these environments have played in our failing to focus on this critical role for philosophy.

2. FOCUS OF PHILOSOPHY IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Graduate programs in philosophy are (and ought to be) the training grounds for philosophy professors. Their primary focus is on the development of professional philosophers rather than philosophy professors. It is worth clarifying the distinction that I am employing. Professional philosopher, as I am using the term, is one who works on philosophical problems and questions with the goal of obtaining a solution to these problems or an answer to these questions. A professional philosopher (in contrast to a teacher or professor of philosophy) works to contribute to philosophical literature. The output of a professional philosopher is a written document, a published manuscript, or a presentation. While most professional philosophers have teaching responsibilities and many (perhaps most) take their teaching responsibilities seriously, they are, for the most part, compensated for and evaluated by their contributions to the philosophical literature and their reputation thereby gained for philosophical scholarship.

A philosopher who is a brilliant and talented educator of undergraduate philosophy students, who does not publish and make presentations, will not be a likely candidate for a faculty position in a graduate program (nor for tenure and promotion).⁴ A brilliant philosopher who devotes his entire effort to educating undergraduates would not be considered a *professional philosopher* in this special sense of the term.

The goal of graduate programs in philosophy is to produce professional philosophers. Most faculty members in these programs do teach undergraduate courses. Almost all philosophy departments rely on funding from tuition, especially undergraduate tuition, to keep the department financially afloat. Teaching undergraduate philosophy courses is thus required of faculty members. Teaching undergraduate courses is a necessary condition for the existence of graduate philosophy programs; however, it is not a sufficient condition for their continuing to operate. A graduate program which did an excellent job teaching undergraduates, especially in teaching core general education courses, but produced few professional philosophers would not be viewed favorably by university administrators.

Educating undergraduate students in this environment is on a par with fulfilling department administrative responsibilities such as serving on university and department administrative committees and advising students. I am not suggesting that one will be promoted without having served in these capacities, but they are necessary contributions that faculty members are required

to make to the operation of a department. They are not essential duties of a member of the philosophy faculty.

The essential role of the faculty of graduate programs is that of professional philosophers. One could be a poor undergraduate educator, a minimal contributor to department administration, but be a successful philosophy professor as a result of the person's publications and the publications of his/her graduate students, i.e., on one's success as a professional philosopher. It should be noted that because the primary focus of graduate departments of philosophy is not undergraduate teaching, it does not follow that these departments do not provide undergraduates with first-rate education in philosophy nor that they do not train their budding future professional philosophers with experience that will make them first-rate philosophy teachers.

The pedagogical focus of graduate-level philosophy courses is building the students' corpus of "philosophical" knowledge. What exactly is this corpus of knowledge? I will not try to do the impossible, i.e., define philosophy. Rather, I will answer this question with examples of the subject matter of philosophy courses, how this subject matter is addressed in graduate courses in philosophy, and what students in these courses are required to learn to demonstrate their mastery of this subject matter. In a graduate course in the history of philosophy, for example, the work of a particular philosopher (or group of philosophers) would constitute the subject matter of the course. In particular, the course might focus on the philosopher's (philosophers') answer and support for his/her answer to a particular (or group of) philosophical question.

Remediating or developing basic logical thinking skills is not a focus of graduate studies in philosophy. Graduate programs do not generally accept students lacking in these basic skills. Occasionally, they admit students who have not majored in philosophy as undergraduates, but in general it is assumed that those students will teach themselves any missing skills during the course of their graduate education. Graduate courses develop discipline knowledge, not remedial skills. A consequence of this is that graduate programs and the courses they offer are not models of courses in which basic skills are developed.

Few graduate programs offer courses in teaching philosophy, and virtually none mandates such a course as a degree requirement. The graduate student typically learns how to teach philosophy through an "apprenticeship" program, beginning as a teaching assistant grading papers, graduating to teaching discussion sections, and culminating in teaching an undergraduate course (with little or no oversight and guidance). Striving for excellence in undergraduate teaching and development of excellent undergraduate teachers of philosophy is not an essential focus of graduate programs in philosophy. Moreover, the teaching and remediation of logical thinking skills is not an essential focus of graduate departments of philosophy.

3. FOCUS OF PHILOSOPHY AT SELECTIVE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Selective liberal arts college philosophy faculties are, for the most part, made up of individuals who have earned Ph.D.s from graduate programs in philosophy. While some graduate programs in philosophy offer training in pedagogy, it is neither a requirement for receiving the degree, nor a requirement for securing the much coveted positions in philosophy at selective liberal arts colleges. Faculty members at selective liberal arts colleges are well aware that their employers expect them to contribute to the overall education of all of the students matriculating at those colleges. Moreover, ads for positions in philosophy at these schools emphasize the need for a commitment to providing a high quality of education to undergraduates. Even though being a talented teacher of philosophy is assumed to be a requirement for such positions, in the hiring process, far greater emphasis is given to the candidate's expertise in his/her areas of specialization and competence. The assumption appears to be that a candidate's depth of knowledge in his/her areas of specialization and competence are indicative of the candidate's capabilities to teach philosophy.

If the sole criterion of obtaining a position at such a school was on the candidate's ability to teach or develop into an excellent teacher of philosophy, candidates would be screened for their teaching ability. It is rare that a candidate for such a position on the faculty is asked to do a "teaching demonstration." Moreover, if any time is spent interviewing the candidate on his/her teaching qualifications, this sort of questioning takes a backseat to the questioning that occurs relative to the candidate's experience and potential as a professional philosopher. For the most part, the letters of recommendation supporting the candidates, usually written by their professors in graduate programs, rarely provide any details concerning the candidate's experience and ability to teach or to develop into a teacher of philosophy. Even if the recommendations contained such details, one might wonder what such a claim is based on given that faculty members rarely observe their graduate students' teaching. The assumption in many candidates' letters of recommendation seems to be that if the person has a deep knowledge of his/her areas of specialization and competence in philosophy, and is able to convey his/her knowledge to colleagues in enthusiastic and congenial fashion, the candidate is or will develop into a good teacher of philosophy.

This lack of focus on pedagogy for candidates for positions in philosophy at four-year colleges continues as one becomes a member of the faculty and as he/she comes up for tenure and promotion. At some colleges the department chair or another member of the faculty observes the junior faculty member's teaching once during the course of the semester or academic year. The purpose of this observation is to provide a documented assessment of the junior faculty member's teaching. It is not required to provide the junior faculty member an opportunity to get feedback to improve one's teaching. There is not much opportunity for a new faculty member to profit from the advice of colleagues with greater expertise and/

or experience in teaching philosophy. There is no forum for canvassing advice on pedagogy and, moreover, there is only downside risk in canvassing such advice. A junior faculty member's major career concerns are getting tenure and being promoted. Raising pedagogical concerns might only risk the specter that the professor is not discharging his/her teaching obligations in a satisfactory manner. In addition, many senior-level professors, even among the best teachers, don't feel qualified to dole out advice on how to improve their teaching.

The most available method of getting feedback to improve one's teaching is via a survey of one's students. However, students are not in the best position to give professors feedback concerning their pedagogical techniques. Often student feedback is based on personal likes and dislikes related to the course material, the method of presentation, and sometimes on the students' satisfaction with the grades that they receive on work in the class. In addition, these comments often reflect the learning styles of the individual students. Better prepared students seem to be able to learn regardless of the pedagogy. Their evaluations reflect their level of learning or interest in the subject matter rather than the teaching methods of the instructors. Less well prepared students are unable to discern the difference between difficult material and bad pedagogy.

The students at more selective four-year liberal arts colleges, for the most part, are the better prepared students. These are the students who are going to learn regardless of the professor's teaching expertise. The professor's level of knowledge of the subject, rather than his/her teaching expertise, creates the environment in which the students learn. Student engagement in the class is a given because of their motivation to get good grades. In addition, they are able to learn the subject matter of the course on their own.

While undergraduate teaching is a criterion on which faculty members are hired, and *de jure*, a factor in reappointment, tenure and promotion decision, *de facto*, it is a minor consideration at many selective four-year colleges. The reputation of the college is maintained not by the quality of their instruction (which admittedly is very difficult to assess), but by the reputation of the department. The reputation of the department is determined by the success of the students in admission to graduate school, professional schools, and employment. In the case of philosophy departments, employment is a minor factor in determining the department's reputation, if it is a factor at all. Admission to professional schools is largely determined by the quality of the graduating students, measured by their college grade point average and their performance on standardized admission tests like the LSAT, GMAT, and MCAT. This factor in the department's reputation is probably more closely linked to the admission standards of the entering students and to the rigor of the courses than any issue concerning pedagogy. The one area where a philosophy department can gain reputation is in the admissions of their graduates to graduate programs in philosophy. This part of the department's reputation is a function of two factors: the reputation of the faculty members and the track record of success for graduates

of the department who have pursued graduate degrees, primarily Ph.D.s in philosophy.

A junior member of the faculty quickly learns that presenting philosophy content outweighs skilled pedagogy. Faced with the reality that one only has a few years to establish one's credentials for earning tenure, a junior faculty member must focus on either researching philosophy or pedagogy. Researching and writing philosophy is something that he/she has spent the last eight to twelve years working on. Teaching philosophy is a means for maintaining one's existence while one continues to work on completing his/her dissertation. As a result, the new faculty members have developed greater expertise and comfort in writing philosophy than in teaching. Teaching is often viewed as a means to a living that will provide opportunity to continue the research and writing. Given the limited amount of time that one has to build up one's dossier for gaining tenure, the safe choice is to work on one's writing over one's pedagogy. In addition, the junior member of the faculty has found that presenting philosophy to a class in the manner that he/she writes usually results in the students learning the material. Many an excellent teacher has failed to get tenure as a result of not being able to demonstrate their reputation in philosophy. Few individuals with an excellent track record of publications and presentations in philosophy have been passed over for tenure because of their evaluations as teachers. Moreover, it is much easier to evaluate one's philosophy scholarship than one's teaching.

Finally, many of those who obtain positions in four-year colleges were also candidates for positions in departments with graduate programs in philosophy. It is not uncommon for an individual philosopher to begin a career at a four-year college and work his/her way up to securing a position in a graduate program. The path upward is usually paved with a list of publications rather than through the development of one's skill as a master teacher of philosophy. Teaching philosophy, even at selective four-year colleges, is a necessary evil to keep one afloat in a career in philosophy.⁵

Given the role of teaching philosophy at the best liberal arts colleges, the content and focus of courses is on what I would call philosophy content (to be contrasted with philosophical method or skills). Essential to a course in the history of philosophy in such colleges is the philosophical content, i.e., a focus on the work of the major figures in philosophy during the historical period covered. Essential to a course in ethics are the philosophical theories proposed and their solutions to ethical problems. The content of these courses is to build up a well-rounded basis of expertise in the problems of philosophy and the positions of major figures in philosophy. The ultimate goal of philosophy courses is to prepare the student for scholarship in philosophy, i.e., to complete a major or a minor concentration in philosophy. The goal of philosophers at four-year colleges is to ensure that students majoring in philosophy are prepared to continue on in philosophy scholarship—the kind of scholarship that one would undertake as a candidate for an advanced degree in the graduate program in philosophy. A side benefit of developing such skills is that philosophy majors often do well on professional school admissions tests and gain admittance to professional schools.

Thus, the goal or outcome of philosophy courses at four-year colleges, especially the selective colleges, is to ensure that students are well versed in the problems of philosophy and the solutions that have been proposed to these problems by philosophers over the history of the discipline. Another way of putting this is that the goal of philosophy courses is to provide the students with a good base of “philosophical” knowledge.

4. PHILOSOPHY AT TWO-YEAR COLLEGES OR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Two-year colleges or community colleges are different than four-year colleges. The role of a community college may be viewed as a “halfway house” to a four-year college education or to a technical vocation requiring post-high school education certification but less than a bachelor’s degree (e.g., law enforcement, paramedic, nursing, maritime technology and management). Community colleges generally provide the first two years of college education to high school graduates and holders of graduate equivalency diplomas, many of whom are not prepared to do college-level work. Community college programs seek to remediate the educational deficiencies in parallel with the student completing two-year college credit. As a result, it often takes the students more than two calendar years to complete the program. The goal, which many community colleges are successful in meeting, is for their graduates to be prepared to successfully complete their upper-division classes at four-year schools or to enter the workforce in their chosen vocation.

Students at two-year colleges are more educationally heterogeneous than at four-year colleges. Many, if not most, community colleges have open enrollment, i.e., the only requirement for admission is possession of a high school diploma or graduate equivalency diploma (GED). They often require the student to demonstrate competency in English and math skills and enroll students who are not proficient in remedial courses. The remedial courses prepare students who did not perform well in high school academics, who attended high schools that failed to academically prepare their graduates for college-level studies, and students for whom English is their second language. A significant percentage of students are the first generation in their families to attend college, who often have no educational role models, nor ready access to ongoing advice to help them develop the study skills required for succeeding in college. In addition, many of the students are impoverished and who do not have the luxury of viewing education as being intrinsically valuable, but view education as a ticket to a good job and career, i.e., upward socio-economic mobility.

It is easy to misjudge the academic heterogeneity of the typical two-year college academic class. At many urban community colleges, for example, those of the City University of New York, a professor will find a typical philosophy class filled with students from the entire spectrum of academic abilities and preparation, including one or two (graduates of some of the most selective and rigorous academic schools in the U.S., e.g., New York City’s specialized high schools such as Stuyvesant High School,

Bronx High School of Science, Brooklyn Tech) who would do well in an Ivy League College alongside students who barely made it through high school. The challenge facing the philosophy professor in that class is keeping students on all ends of the educational spectrum engaged and learning new skills.

Many of the students at community colleges, especially those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, require financial aid to be able to attend school. To maintain their financial aid, these students must take courses for which they will receive college credit, while simultaneously taking non-college credit remedial courses to remediate their educational deficiencies. As such, community college philosophy courses must concentrate on the development of student skills in addition to building knowledge of philosophical content.

In order to meet this objective, the professor’s philosophy scholarship must take a backseat to the development of excellence in teaching and philosophy pedagogy. Community colleges are well aware of their unique educational mission and strive to achieve this objective. This is evidenced in their faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure practices. Many, if not most, community colleges do not have a “publish or perish” requirement for tenure and promotion. Even at community colleges which require publication for tenure, publishing on pedagogy is considered on a par with publishing in one’s field.

Community colleges, for the most part, strive to hire faculty members to teach philosophy, rather than publish philosophy. Evidence of teaching competence and an interest in teaching is a requirement for securing a position as a community college philosophy professor. A teaching demonstration is a standard part of the hiring process. The brilliant philosopher who is unable to relate the subject to an average person will not be a good candidate for a position at a two-year college.

The goal of teaching community college students philosophy is not to prepare students to major in philosophy at the undergraduate level. This is especially true today when college is regarded as preparation for a career. The vast majority of community college students have matriculated in order to “get a good job.” Philosophy courses, for the vast majority of community college students, are taken to satisfy a general education graduation requirement rather than as a ticket to a dream job or career. For the vast majority, this course will be their one and only (or one of two) philosophy courses that they will take.

What, then, do philosophy courses have to offer the typical community college student? What compelling reason do they have for taking a philosophy course or two? Bertrand Russell’s explanation of increasing the greatness of the mind through studying the questions or problems of philosophy themselves hardly seems convincing or compelling. It would seem that this could be accomplished in a less expensive way than taking relatively expensive college credits to study the questions of philosophy. One could accomplish this by reading the writings of famous philosophers, reading books on philosophy, or studying

the wealth of information about philosophy available on the internet, including YouTube videos, Khan Academy, online encyclopedias of philosophy, etc.

Some philosophers suggest that the value of studying philosophy is its effect on the kind of person that you will become as a result of the study. That is, that studying philosophy, perhaps like practicing transcendental meditation, makes you a better person. I am somewhat skeptical of these claims and would like to see some evidence supporting them. However, even if they are correct, this would be at best an intrinsic value of studying philosophy. It is hard to see how this would provide any practical value to the student, i.e., how this helps to prepare the student for a well-paying career. Moreover, this sort of indoctrination does not appear to be an essential part of a well-rounded education.

Some professors suggest that the value of studying philosophy, like the other liberal arts, is the development of reading and writing skills, thereby hopping on the current "Writing Across the Curriculum" and "Reading Across the Curriculum" pedagogical bandwagons. Focusing on these skills certainly contributes to preparing community college students to undertake upper-level college courses in many disciplines as well as developing skills that are fundamental to securing a good career upon graduation. Professors have justifiably incorporated the development of reading and writing skills into the learning outcomes for their philosophy classes and have designed their courses to meet these objectives.

The downside to this approach is twofold. The first is that other studies in the humanities might be better choices for developing these skills. Using the study of philosophy as a means to this end complicates the process of developing reading and writing skills. The philosophy student must exercise these literary skills, which are difficult to develop, but must do so with an abstract subject matter, philosophical problems, which is difficult to comprehend and requires considerable work to gain the comprehension required to read and write. This added difficulty may be understood in light of Bloom's Taxonomy of learning, which highlights the hierarchy of the development of cognitive skills.⁶ The college student, according to this taxonomy, must master the lower-level cognitive skills on the way to developing higher-level skills. The questions addressed in philosophy courses tend to be at the high end of Bloom's Taxonomy. First- and second-year college students are in the early stages of developing the skills required to address questions of these sorts. "Writing intensive" or "reading intensive" philosophy courses not only require students to work to develop reading or writing skills, but also to work on the cognitive skills required to tackle philosophical issues. Other subjects in the humanities may focus on disciplinary issues that do not require higher-level cognitive skills. To meet the objectives of reading and writing intensive courses, significant time must be devoted in the course to the development of these literary skills. To accomplish this, course time devoted to learning the discipline in non-reading/writing intensive sections of the course must be reduced and devoted to developing the reading and writing skills. This means that there is less time in the

reading/writing intensive sections that can be devoted to philosophy content and skill development. Understanding philosophy requires devoting time to comprehending the problems addressed, i.e., to the development of the higher-level Bloom's Taxonomy skills. Therefore, disciplines whose study does not require the mastery of these higher-level skills may be as good or better candidates for developing community college reading and writing skills.⁷

The second and, to my mind, more important downside to this approach is that it neglects the fact that studying philosophy develops logical thinking skills. These skills are exactly those higher-level cognitive skills identified in Bloom's Taxonomy which an undergraduate student needs to develop to be successful in upper-division college courses as well as equipping the student for the challenges that are presented in the type of careers which they are attending college to secure. Moreover, studying philosophy uniquely provides the student the exercise and training needed to develop these very logical thinking skills.

I would suggest that philosophy courses are an essential part of a well-rounded community college education and are not merely a "worldview" broadening experience. Philosophy courses uniquely teach the students to look for, understand, and evaluate arguments given to make beliefs or a set of beliefs rational or reasonable. The student is challenged to comprehend and apply the relevant concepts, to clarify the concepts through a process of analysis. The student is then challenged to synthesize various concepts, combining data to lead to a conclusion, and finally to evaluate the reasoning. In the process, the student exercises all six levels of the cognitive domain, i.e., remembering, comprehending, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating (ordered from low to high levels). The learning exercises associated with the study of philosophy can be scaffolded to emphasize cognitive development, beginning with the lower levels and working up to the highest level. For this reason, philosophy ought to be required of all community college students much in the way that certain math and English language skills are required.

I conclude that greater emphasis in teaching philosophy needs to be devoted to the development of these logical thinking skills. I would suggest that this is the case not only for community college philosophy courses, but in all lower-division college philosophy courses. Moreover, it is important to note that this focus ought to be applied in all college philosophy courses, regardless of whether one is a philosophy professor in a community college, highly selective liberal arts college, or major research university. The vast majority of students taking philosophy courses in college are taking the one or two introductory-level classes in the subject. The number of philosophy majors pales by comparison, not to even mention that the number of graduate students in philosophy is a small subset of these. Academic work in philosophy is funded by students in introductory-level courses. Philosophy professors would benefit from concentrating on providing the general studies students enrolled in these classes the skills development that not only is the essence of work in philosophy, but of considerable practical value to the students.

NOTES

1. Plato, *Theatetus* 174A. See H. N. Fowler (translator), *Plato VII Theatetus Sophist*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1921), 121.
2. Bertrand Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy* (Indianapolis IN, Hackett Publishing Company, 1990), 161.
3. Susan Adams, "The 10 Skills Employers Most Want in 2015 Graduates," *Forbes Magazine*, November 12, 2014, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/susanadams/2014/11/12/the-10-skills-employers-most-want-in-2015-graduates/#4cbd75e719f6>. Adams bases this claim on the findings of a survey by the National Association of Colleges and Employers of organizations recruiting graduates from the class of 2015.
4. There are notable exceptions to this. Edmund Gettier, while not a prolific publisher of philosophical literature, was reputed to be an excellent teacher of philosophy graduate students. As a graduate teacher, he produced students who became prominent professionals who are prolific contributors to the philosophical literature. It should be noted that Gettier was coaxed into publishing his paper "Is Knowledge Justified True Belief?" in order to gain tenure teaching in the graduate program at Wayne State University. This paper, which, to my knowledge, was Gettier's only published paper, spawned a generation of literature from the most prominent epistemologists, and a half century later the Gettier problem continues to be discussed in the philosophical literature. While Gettier may not have personally been a prolific contributor to the philosophical literature, I am under the impression that he was instrumental in assisting colleagues in their work, which did contribute to the philosophical literature. Providing criticism and assistance to others (profession philosophers and graduate students) in their produce philosophical literature itself constitutes contributing to philosophical literature. For this reason, it would be fair to classify a philosopher such as Gettier as a professional philosopher in the sense that I am using the term.
5. There are four-year colleges where greater emphasis is placed on teaching. In addition, over the last forty years greater emphasis has been placed on the professor's role as teacher of philosophy. Even in many of these schools, the problem of finding an objective way of judging pedagogy is elusive.
6. Wikipedia contributors, "Bloom's taxonomy," *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*, https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Bloom%27s_taxonomy&oldid=762007418 (accessed February 1, 2017).
7. I have ignored an important caveat here, i.e., that logical thinking is a prerequisite for writing (and probably reading comprehension as well). Put another way, in order to write clearly, one must first have arranged his/her thoughts in a logical order.

Lower Division Pedagogy

Darren Jones

BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

Teaching philosophy at a two-year or community college offers particular challenges compared to teaching it at a university or even a high school. The savvy and caring instructor must be ready to confront those issues in order to truly fulfill a mission of enlightening and challenging minds (or sometimes even just staying employed). This paper will be an examination of some of those challenges as well as some possible solutions to those problems. The focus will narrow on three challenges in particular: lower-division teaching pedagogy and consideration, student demographics, and textbook selection. The reader should keep in mind that I write from the experience of teaching in only two of the fifty states in my nation, and from state

to state regulations in education differ, as do diversity demographics, K-12 outcomes, etc.

LIFE ISSUES AND CONSIDERATION

A distinctive feature for most, if not all, community colleges is their accessibility. Prospective university students will be tested extensively to see if they can "make the cut" getting into their first- or second-choice school. They wait on bated breath for a letter either starting with "congratulations . . ." or "we regret to inform you. . . ." There will be schools of which the student will think, "I'd better not waste my time (and money) even trying to apply to that school; I'm not smart and/or wealthy enough for that league." This is seldom the case for the community college student. They will be tested, but mostly for placement. If you meet the near barest minimum of literacy, the community college likely has a (modest but more affordable) path for you. This means the average community college classroom has a wider range of student academic ability, from the brilliant minds dealing with rough life circumstances, to the fresh-from-high-school student with a modest GPA looking to transfer, to the senior citizen who's been away from the classroom setting for decades but needs some certification for a work advancement. They haven't all taken the ACT or SAT or college prep courses, so their quantitative, qualitative, and analytical writing skills may need help. MLA or APA citations are either usually completely new or vaguely familiar, but rarely expertly handled. The important term "plagiarism" is often heard and learned for the first time, and so on.

East Baton Rouge, Louisiana, the parish where my current students overwhelmingly call home, statistically performed a full point less than the national average on the ACT in 2005, and 70 percent of students are classified as "at-risk." As the "at-risk" population increases, student performance outcomes decrease. The best of this group often finds themselves at LSU, if not out of state completely. Those left who pursue higher education often pursue it at lower cost community colleges like the one I work at.

Beyond academic issues, two-year college students will often deal with "life issues" at a higher rate than their university counterparts, and that could easily be due to the structure of the university versus the two-year college. At the community college where I teach, and every community college I've ever seen or been to, access to student resources is vastly limited compared to the university experience. There is no dorm system with resident advisors, no meal plans, no on-site doctors, no access to on-site babysitting (as was done in conjunction with my university's early childhood development degree program), no extensive gym, and no 24-hour library with free printing. So when a student or child of a student gets sick, or work gets in the way, they have a much harder time dealing with these issues at the two-year rather than at the university. Indeed, work, rent, food, children, commuting, and time management (probably the biggest pillars of concern in modern life) just don't bear down on the university student as much as the two-year student. Add to that the mere demographics differences: two-year students are more likely to be older, have more kids, be working while in school, and in general be dealing with more "life issues."¹

What does this mean to the educator at the two-year school? In sum it means the approach with the student both in terms of the pedagogical (how should I teach this person?) and interpersonal (how should I treat/advise this person?) has to be tailored to the environment. Let's start with the interpersonal, but with a caveat. I do not and cannot speak to how all or nearly all universities and faculties act, so some of what I say must be taken with a grain of salt. If you or your school already do these things or better, great! I will be speaking from my experiences as both student and teacher at both two-year and four-year colleges (from roughly 2002 to present), and the differences I noticed therein. The first is the amount of allowances given to the student. Frankly speaking, as an educator you will hear many more "hard luck tales" from the two-year student than the four-year student, due to the life issues bearing down on that two-year student. At the university level, automatic fails for a certain number of missed classes were common. You would receive only so many excused absences, then you have unexcused, and when a threshold of unexcused absences was hit, you failed the class. Game over. This is too punitive for the two-year student. Without a certain amount of "face time" in the classroom, it's true the student isn't likely to absorb all that's needed to be knowledgeable in their subject, but it's not impossible that they could absorb what they need. Think of comic book character Peter Parker, aka Spiderman. From the perspective of Parker's teachers, he was not a great student. Constantly absent, tired in class, and even though brilliant, he was missing deadlines, assignments, and even tests. The four-year system would very likely have failed Parker, even if he could prove proficiency in the subject. A hardnosed professor with an axe to grind could fail Parker and be backed by the college's administration and higher ups, and Parker had a pretty good excuse. Anger and insult at the very idea of a student succeeding without specifically their direct instruction isn't beyond some higher education instructors; I've seen it firsthand. Let me supplement my comic book example with examples from reality.

A student of mine, who I will call "Mary," once told me how she failed a certain math class. Hers was a sharp mind, and she had skill for math such that she could perform well on homework and tests despite missing lots of classes. It turns out she missed classes not because of laziness or anything like that; she was going through a rough breakup and as a result had an uptick in parental duties (picking up her child from school, etc.) that interfered with her schooling. Her math teacher, unlike myself, had a somewhat arbitrary attendance policy (more than X and you auto-fail), along with a suspicion that Mary was somehow cheating. She was forced to drop the class despite having a B, and was set back in time and money. Stories like Mary's are seen with startling regularity.

Parker, the absentee hero achiever, will not be a common occurrence. More common will be those struggling with kids or rent or worse, and who won't be achieving despite it all. This is the moment where instructor intervention, even if just in the form of informing a student about their low grade or directing a student with a clear disability to the proper office, could mean the difference between passing and failing. It may mean taking late assignments

or giving ethical extra credit opportunities for the student/class. The obligation to go above and beyond, or to be forgiving, isn't always built into the job contract or to be expected. A nice quote, questionably attributed to Plato,² says, "be kind, for everyone you meet is fighting a hard battle." It would serve us well to remember and consider the battles of our two-year students before more deserving students (and perhaps some heroes) are dropped due to life circumstances. If we want to better serve our students within the two-year system, it means more than a mere "acknowledgement" of life circumstances; it should mean structural support from the school itself, but it really starts with the professor and the syllabus.

PEDAGOGY

As we move to how a consideration for the two-year student should affect pedagogy, we can bring in Platonic quotes and ideas not in dispute (the ideas themselves are disputed, but not the fact that Plato had these ideas), specifically the Platonic idea of learning as recollection in the *Phaedo*. A brief summation of this idea is simply that every person, having an intelligent soul that has existed longer than their body, does not really learn anything new in life but really just remembers it. As the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy states,

Phaedo's discussion of recollection begins with a remark by Cebes in support of the claim that our souls preexist their incarceration in the body: "Such is also the case if that theory is true that you are accustomed to mention frequently, that for us learning is no other than recollection. According to this, we must at some previous time have learned what we now recollect. This is a possibility only if our soul existed somewhere before it took on this human shape" (72e-73).³

To prove this, Plato has Socrates speak to a slave boy about geometry, asking him questions like "isn't it true that things that are alike are similar? ($A = A$. True, right?)" and so on, and from those basic axioms, Socrates "proves" that the boy really knows the basic principles and, by extension, the more advanced principles of geometry. Leaving the metaphysical claims about souls and aspects of this aside, there is a more general lesson educators can take from Plato and Socrates: trust the student to be smart, despite his/her "station in life." There are absolutely subjects that I don't think general life experience can prepare you for. In medical science, for example, no one is born knowing cause and cure for polio. No one is born knowing the components of a car and how to identify and fix car problems. But here logic and philosophy differ from their academic subject cousins. I regularly tell my students that I rarely teach them anything, but rather impart official names to the concepts they are already (somewhat) familiar with. One needs to have a concept of " $A = A$ " in order to function in society without being run over by a car when trying to cross the street. This is the foundation of logic, and logic is the foundation of philosophy (when properly done, in my humble opinion). In philosophy too students will often say of Hume's or Kant's or Descartes' ideas that they had a similar thought and just didn't have a name for it and were unaware anyone else ever thought it. There's a positive energy and an element

of self-fulfilling prophecy when a student believes that the professor believes in them that can raise outcomes. Letting the student know that their work lives and family lives can help them in the philosophy classroom contributes to the chipping away of any inferiority complex lurking in the minds of our two-year students. Many studies and articles have been written about teacher expectations and the effect on student performance.⁴

A common theme that has developed in this paper is that the two-year student is often dealing with a lot both in terms of their personal and academic lives, and as such will need more consideration than the usual four-year student. While this is true, the two-year student is essentially the same as every other student in that within any given population there will be a multitude of learning styles. This comes to bear more strongly in the classroom where the teacher is expected to serve and adjust to the student, rather than more traditional settings where the student must adjust to the teacher. If you are concerned with dropout rates and the retention of students, the differentiation of teaching styles in the classroom is an important issue. In college, the lecture is the paramount method of instruction, and yet we know that not every student responds best to a long, dry lecture where they are expected to take notes. The two-year philosophy instructor must take differentiation of instruction into account in order to be the most effective. For example, some students appreciate the PowerPoint, while others want the teacher to lecture directly. Some students love to work in groups, while other students (most, in my experience) hate group work. Sticking with only one style is a recipe for disaster down the road.

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND TEXTBOOK SELECTION

The diversity of student populations is taken to be an expected and welcome trait among college communities in general. It's not uncommon to see a written declaration of a commitment to diversity in a school's mission statement. However, philosophy classrooms seem to be much less diverse (racially, demographically, and sometimes ideologically) than other general classes like math and English. The philosophy department is often much less diverse than the classroom, and the philosophy canon material less diverse than the philosophy department.⁵

In some ways this is not surprising. Philosophy as a class is seen by most students as a quirky elective to break the monotony of required core classes, not a career path or dedicated passion. Philosophy is often the poster child for "a college major that will not make you money," and so most students don't think they can "afford" to major in philosophy, and therefore that minority left to dedicate themselves to philosophy are either materially fortunate or very daring. To be clear, often two-year institutions do not offer a philosophy major; however, it's still important to talk about the value of philosophy to the student regardless. Philosophy, as a discipline, was formally practiced mostly by European and Western peoples. It would be a mistake to attribute the lack of diversity here and there to overt malice or internalized invisible malice, or gate keeping, or other nefarious motives. It would also be a mistake to assume

that a student could only or should prioritize, laud, or learn from works of philosophy done by people "sufficiently similar to them." There are many problems with the idea that the student and the philosopher must be alike, starting with even the bounds of "alike." The most pressing problem with this idea is that it runs counter to an ideal of philosophy to evaluate ideas and arguments on their own merits absent as much as possible the corrupting influence of personal circumstances and biases. The two-year philosophy student should be exposed to these arguments that conclude that the lack of diversity within a text is not enough in itself to dismiss it or cause grievance to be sure, but even so diversity should be pushed in the philosophy classroom. Let's explore why that is helpful.

Not every student is moved by logical arguments, and if students are dropping out because they are not inspired, that's a problem. If a student is mentally checking out because they feel insulted that no one who looks (or thinks, or acts, etc.) like them is on the syllabus, in the long run everyone is hurt by that. We should be seeking to inspire students, even in the face of the perfectly tenable idea that the student should logically be fulfilled with what's available. If introducing different and maybe "nontraditional" texts and authors can inspire students while at the same time entailing no real sacrifice in academic rigor or philosophical argument, why not do it? There is a plethora of material out there by a diverse set of authors and sources such that no classroom should be a boring monolith. Although Plato, Descartes, and Kant are near immovable pillars of the philosophy classroom, theirs need not be the only voices heard. A common mistake is to exclude any text not done under the official banner of "philosophy" as not philosophy proper. This would leave out Confucius, the Pre-Socratics, and maybe others. Although what they did they did not call "philosophy" (the term is attributed to Pythagoras, and from this a reasonable impulse to say anyone before him was not an "official" philosopher⁶), philosophy was still basically what they were doing.

There are other borderline cases. A work of fiction or myth may be a great jumping off point for philosophy, but a parable is not the same as a philosophical argument. There are many methods and modes of expression, but we should still be teaching the art of the persuasive essay. Pop culture can often be a student's easy gateway into a more complex or troubling idea (the *Matrix* to explain Descartes' Cogito anyone?), but there's a risk that the complexities get watered down. The struggle to be an effective teacher is doing this dance with various sources, trying to remain traditional with the likes of Plato, and trying to appeal to the student with pop culture references and newer material. But this dance is necessary if you truly want to reach as many of your two-year students as possible.

Textbook selection may very well be the most important part in the building of your philosophy class. It will largely determine what subjects you tackle and whose perspectives and ideas you will study; therefore, issues of diversity within the class material can be largely handled here. At my two-year college, I teach an introduction to philosophy class. We do not narrow the focus on Aristotle or Sartre or Nietzsche. Instead, we attempt to cover as much ground

as we can, so I look for a book that covers many different topics, philosophers, and eras. If the textbook does not have a chapter or significant space set aside for Eastern philosophical traditions, that textbook is not used, period. I make other considerations along similar lines, but this is my number one criteria. Any philosophical or historical discussion that cuts off half of the world seems incomplete.

There's a saying that all of philosophy is merely a footnote to Plato, and this mentality has made it seem as though all important philosophical work has already been done. I cannot over express how appreciative I've seen students get for being introduced to writers and thinkers that are real contemporaries with them. They enjoy reading people who are even still alive at the same time they are, imagine that in a philosophy classroom! They can even communicate (limitedly) through social media with living philosophers and their adherents and actively participate in doing philosophy. Showing the student that philosophy is something happening right now can really reinvigorate a class. The mistake is thinking that anything other than Plato and his ilk would be "low brow" and unsuitable. We need to make use of all the materials and techniques we have to reach the two-year student where they are.

CONCLUSION

There are a lot of other issues facing the philosophy teacher at the two-year college that I haven't even come close to speaking on, but are no less important. Even issues that do not or seldom involve the student directly, such as other job responsibilities getting in the way of teaching effectively, budget cuts, pay cuts, classes making or not making, class guidelines being changed, and office politics still have a bearing on what happens inside the classroom. Many issues will be familiar to other instructors whether they're tenured at a four-year or adjunct teaching. I choose to focus on what seemed to differentiate the two-year school the most, and that's the diversity of our students.

The real challenge is being prepared to handle that diversity in whatever form it may take. That may mean being considerate to the struggling student or being sensitive to the student who feels neglected somehow by the material. It means not writing them off as "unprepared, lazy, entitled" and not operating from a tempting position of "I'm the professor, deal with me and my class as is or go home."

The community college is different from other colleges, and the community college instructor needs to be different from other instructors. As the campus is more accessible, so too should the instructors and their classrooms be. Two-year institutions are sometimes called a community's "engine of mobility."⁷ Philosophy teachers are part of that engine, so let's do our best to contribute.

NOTES

1. Alexandra Pannoni, "4 Ways Community College Life Differs from the 4-Year College Experience," *U.S. News and World Report*, August 25, 2015, <http://www.usnews.com/education/community-colleges/articles/2015/08/26/4-ways-community-college-life-differs-from-the-4-year-college-experience>

2. "Be Kind; Everyone You Meet Is Fighting a Hard Battle," *Quote Investigator*, <http://quoteinvestigator.com/2010/06/29/be-kind/>
3. "Plato's Middle Period Metaphysics and Epistemology," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-metaphysics/#11>
4. Alix Spiefel, "Teachers' Expectations Can Influence How Students Perform," *NPR.org*, September 17, 2012, <http://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2012/09/18/161159263/teachers-expectations-can-influence-how-students-perform>; Larry A. Braskamp and John C. Ory, "Assessing Faculty Work: Enhancing Individual and Institutional Performance," *ERIC*, *Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series*, 1994, <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED368305>
5. Jay L. Garfield and Bryan W. Van Norden, "If Philosophy Won't Diversify, Let's Call It What It Really Is," *The New York Times*, *The Stone*, May 11, 2016, http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/11/opinion/if-philosophy-wont-diversify-lets-call-it-what-it-really-is.html?_r=1
6. Mortimer J. Adler, *How to Think About the Great Ideas: From the Great Books of Western Civilization* (Chicago, IL: Open Court, 2000).
7. David W. Chen, "Dreams Stall as CUNY, New York City's Engine of Mobility, Sputters," *The New York Times*, May 28, 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/29/nyregion/dreams-stall-as-cuny-city-engine-of-mobility-sputters.html>

A Tale of Two Professors: A Case Study in Justice at the Community College

Ian M. Duckles

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

INTRODUCTION

In January of 2016 I was hired full-time as a tenure-track philosophy professor at Mesa College in San Diego, CA. Prior to this, since 2007 I had been working as an adjunct. Having recently made this transition, I am in a unique position to compare my employment situations before and after becoming a full-timer and analyze the morality of a system that tolerates this two-tiered faculty structure. I will begin by highlighting the differences between my life as a "temporary part-time employee"¹ and as a tenure-track member of the Mesa College Community. Then I will examine the ethical implications of the situation through the lens of a Rawlsian conception of justice, with a particular emphasis on the unjust implications this situation has for adjuncts, students, and full-timers.

My purpose here is three-fold. First, I intend this to be a case study that any instructor could profitably employ in an introductory ethics course. Second, by using my own situation, I am able to make a clearer "apples to apples" comparison between full- and part-timers. While one might argue that full-timers deserve their status due to idiosyncrasies not shared with part-timers, one can't make a similar claim when comparing part-time me to full-time me. Finally, I intend this to contribute to the criticism of the continued reliance by the community college system on what are variously called adjuncts, contingent faculty, or part-timers.

A quick note on terminology: As I use the terms in this essay, “part-timer,” “adjunct,” and “contingent faculty” will be used interchangeably to refer to instructors who teach less than a full load and are not on the tenure track. “Full-time” will refer to faculty who do teach a full load or equivalent and are tenured or on the tenure track. I recognize that these terms may be confusing to some, especially since there are many schools that have full-time, non-tenure track faculty, or full-time visiting appointments that have a limited term of employment,² or some schools that have tenure-track part-timers. However, in this paper I will use these terms as described above since these are the only two job categories for faculty in the Californian Community College system.³

A TALE OF TWO PROFESSORS

In 2015 I taught a total of seventeen classes: seven during the spring semester, two in the summer, and eight in the fall. For this I grossed \$67,778.22. As a part-timer I am only paid for teaching, so if we divide this salary by the number of classes taught, we get a per class total of \$3,986.95, which can be rounded up to \$4,000.

As a full-timer I am contractually obligated to teach ten classes per year (five in the fall and five in the spring) for which I gross \$72,659.00. Dividing by ten gives a per class compensation of \$7,265.90. However, unlike adjunct pay, which just covers teaching, as a full-timer I have other responsibilities outside the classroom. Fortunately, I work in a unionized school, so there is a Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) that spells out my specific duties over the course of the workweek. According to the CBA, I am obligated to work forty hours a week (while most professors work significantly more, this is how much we are contractually compensated). Twenty-five of these hours are to be devoted to teaching (in my discipline each class meets for three hours a week; I teach five classes, so that works out to fifteen hours a week plus ten hours a week of prep-time), five hours a week for office hours, and ten hours a week for other academic responsibilities such as serving on committees, attending department and school meetings, etc.

Thus, twenty-five hours out of forty are devoted to teaching with the remaining fifteen for office hours and other work. I am excluding office hours because as an adjunct I wasn’t paid for holding them. So this means that 62.5 percent of my full-timer salary is compensation for teaching (twenty-five divided by forty). Multiplying my annual salary of \$72,659.00 by 62.5 percent gives me \$45,411.88 per year as my compensation for teaching with the remaining \$27,247.12 being my compensation for office hours and other work for the college. Dividing this classroom rate by ten gives me a per class compensation of \$4,541.18.

So as a part-timer I was making \$4,000 a class, and as a full-timer I am making just over \$4,500 a class. This means that as a part-timer I made about 88 percent of what I currently make as a full-timer. While there is a slight difference in pay rates, it doesn’t appear to be as significant a difference as others have claimed exists.⁴ However, if we pry into the details of my situation as a full-timer versus my situation as a part-timer, some other significant differences emerge.

Perhaps the most significant difference concerns job security. While our union has negotiated a robust job security program for part-timers, the protections pale in comparison to the security I have as a full-timer. As a full-timer I am guaranteed payment for teaching five classes a semester. As a part-timer I have no guarantee of employment from one semester to the next, and my job security amounts to seniority rights: part-timers with less seniority lose their courses first.

Closely connected to job security is healthcare. As an adjunct I did receive healthcare if I averaged a 50 percent load over the academic year (this means I had to teach a minimum 3/2 or 2/3 load in my district to qualify for benefits.⁵ In practice I tended to teach a 3/3 load). Consequently, if I lost a section or two, this impacted my eligibility for health benefits. By contrast, as a full-timer I am guaranteed benefits (under the CBA and the Affordable Care Act) as long as I remain employed.

A further area of difference involves step and column increases. The adjunct salary schedule offers seven salary columns with multiple steps within each column. One’s placement on the columns is determined by one’s level of education, and one moves through the steps based on the number of sections one has taught. As an adjunct I started at the very top of the pay scale because the highest column is for individuals with a Ph.D., and this column had only one step. So, aside from the occasional cost of living increase (COLA), as an adjunct I never saw my pay increase, and never would see any significant increases for the entire time of my professional career. By contrast, as a full-timer I started toward the bottom of the pay scale, and it will take me a minimum of fourteen years to earn the maximum amount of pay. This means that I can look forward to a significant pay increase of around 3 percent per year for the next fourteen years in addition to any additional COLA increases that I might receive.⁶ So, while my per class compensation as a full-timer is fairly close to what I received as an adjunct, in ten years I will be making \$6,250 per class while my adjunct colleagues will basically earn the same amount that I earned last year.

Another area of difference concerns the degree of institutional support that I received as an adjunct compared to what I receive as a full-timer. Unlike the other differences I discussed above, which are easy to calculate in an objective manner and based on publicly available information, this last area is much subtler and the differences are not as obvious. This issue was made clear to me when I saw how much time and effort the college put into orienting its new full-time hires as compared to its adjuncts. When I was hired as an adjunct, I was interviewed by the department chair and another full-timer in the department. The interview lasted about an hour and I was hired on the spot.⁷ Once I was entered into the system by Human Resources and given my keys, I was thrown into the classroom. As a full-timer, once I made it through the rigorous, multi-day interview process, I was given a two-day orientation, assigned a mentor, and enrolled in a more extended year-long orientation for new faculty hires. During this orientation, I learned more about the college and the support services offered for faculty

and students than I had during my previous seven years of employment as an adjunct.

A final area of difference is also difficult to quantify, but is no less important for that, and concerns quality of life. As an adjunct I averaged between six and eight courses a semester at four different schools. This involved commuting about 160 miles per week, sometimes traveling as many as fifty miles in a day (when I first began my career as an adjunct, I taught at a school which involved a 180 mile round trip commute!). As a full-timer I teach at one school and commute about fifty miles a week, doing no more than thirteen miles a day. This difference alone has dramatically improved my quality of life and given me a great deal more free time.

DIFFERENCES AND INEQUITIES

In the previous section I identified a number of differences between my life as a part-timer compared to my life as a full-timer. The question now is whether these differences are violations of justice. We justify and tolerate differences all the time, so the mere fact that there are differences does not immediately imply that there is an injustice. A case must be made that these differences translate to injustices or inequities.

The first and most obvious difference that would appear to be an injustice concerns compensation for teaching, and the nature of this injustice can be understood using the simple slogan "Equal Pay for Equal Work." While this slogan tends to be associated with feminism and the unequal pay that women often receive for the work they do, we can also repurpose this slogan to examine the situation of adjuncts. Under California law there are certain minimum qualifications that all faculty must meet in order to teach at a community college.⁸ Within the field of philosophy the minimum qualification is a master's degree in philosophy or religious studies, meaning that every faculty member who teaches philosophy at a community college in California has at least has an M.A., with many also possessing a Ph.D. or equivalent.⁹

In addition, though hard numbers are difficult to come by, many adjuncts have ten or more years of teaching experience, and in many cases existing adjuncts are much more experienced than new full-time hires, much more familiar with the student body, and often a great deal more experienced teaching many of the core courses in a particular department. This means that often the only significant difference between a part-timer and a full-timer is compensation. This is certainly the case with my situation. The only differences between me as a part-timer and me as a full-timer is that full-time me gets paid more, teaches less, commutes less, and has an office (full-time me is also arguably one semester more experienced than part-time me last semester).

Given all of this, the differences described in the preceding section would seem to be a clear example of an injustice. Justice is, obviously, a highly contentious issue within philosophy and there are likely as many different accounts of justice as there are philosophers. That being said, it does seem that most major theories of justice have a few shared

elements. Perhaps the most significant of these is the idea of justice as fairness, in which a fair distribution of goods (whether economic or social) is seen as just and an unfair distribution is seen as unjust. While there may be a great deal of discussion as to what counts as a "fair" distribution of goods, the idea that a fair distribution would be a just distribution is widely accepted.

The question at hand, then, is whether the distribution of goods described above is fair and just. While it might appear unjust or unfair at first glance, we should nevertheless explore the issue philosophically to determine whether our initial impressions are accurate. Since I have been invoking the notion of justice as fairness, it seems appropriate to use John Rawls, perhaps the most famous philosopher who makes this connection.¹⁰

One of the key aspects of Rawls' theory of justice is that it is not intended as a complete picture of morality. Instead, Rawls intends his account to be "a political conception of justice for a constitutional democracy."¹¹ Rawls rightly recognizes that different societies may have different systems of justice depending on how those societies are organized socially, culturally, and politically. Living in a constitutional democracy, we can focus on the systems of justice that are appropriate from this perspective, and ignore the questions of justice that would arise if this system of reliance on part-timers existed under other political arrangements.

So, working under these assumptions, Rawls' analysis begins by looking at how citizens are conceived within this framework. "Justice as fairness starts from the idea that society is to be conceived as a fair system of cooperation and so it adopts a conception of the person to go with this idea."¹² He quickly notes that one of the key assumption underlying constitutional democracies is a conception of citizens as free and equal.¹³ Rawls uses this conception as a framework to derive his two principles of justice, and even working with these basic assumptions underlying citizenship in a constitutional democracy, we can see some significant injustices in the case study described above.

The most obvious, of course, is the discrepancy in pay. As I noted above, full-time me is just as experienced and qualified as part-time me, yet makes significantly more money, and, perhaps more importantly, will earn significantly more income over the total time of my professional career. This is clearly not a "fair system of cooperation" since it violates Rawls' second principle of justice, which states, "Social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions: first, they must be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity; and second, they must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society."¹⁴ Examining the inequalities outlined above through the lens of Rawls demonstrates clear injustices. I will take it for granted that federal and state law as well as the Human Resources departments at the various colleges ensure that the first clause of this principle is satisfied.¹⁵ However, it does seem that the current arrangement fails to satisfy the second clause of the principle. To argue that this difference is not an inequity, one must argue that

part-timers or the “least advantaged” benefit from the existing system, an assertion I will debunk in the following paragraphs.

It is worth noting that, as initially conceived, there was a very clear role for adjuncts at two-year colleges. One of the initial conceptions of the community colleges (particularly in California, where the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education set up a template since adopted by many other states¹⁶) was as the primary vehicle for delivering vocational and adult education. Particularly in the realm of vocational education, it makes perfect sense to set up a system where experienced members of a particular field could come in on evenings or weekends to teach a class or two to students trying to get a degree or certificate. In many cases these individuals would not want to take the pay cut that comes with being a full-time instructor (as compared to what they would make working full time in their field). In addition, the reason they are appealing instructors is because they are currently active in their profession, something they would lose if they became full-timers. Given all this, there is clearly a role for part-timers that satisfies Rawls’ second principle of justice, and arguably this was the initial intent behind provisions in the law that allowed for the use of part-timers.

Unfortunately, the role of adjuncts has spread well beyond this important, but limited, role they were originally intended to play. According to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (the APA is one of the members of this coalition), when graduate students are included, adjunct faculty make up more than 75 percent of college and university instructors.¹⁷ Given the differences outlined in the previous section, this is a clear injustice since these inequalities are not to the greatest advantage of the part-timers.

One might respond by arguing that the use of adjuncts is justified because most adjuncts want to be part-time and wouldn’t apply for a full-time position if it became available. Fortunately, there is some data on this question which indicates that between 50 percent and 75 percent of part-timers would prefer a full-time job.¹⁸ Thus, while some may be satisfied as part-timers, many would prefer a full-time position and are likely working as adjuncts until a full-time position becomes available (this was certainly my situation). Given this it is not plausible to argue that a majority of part-timers benefit from the status quo, even if some may find it to their liking.

So adjuncts do not generally benefit from the current system, but perhaps it is beneficial to the students. A Rawlsian framework can justify certain inequities if they improve the least advantaged members of society. It might be possible to argue that even though adjuncts are disadvantaged compared to full-timers, this inequality produces better outcomes for students. That is, perhaps some adjuncts can be mildly disadvantaged in order to make the students and thereby all of society better off. However, I don’t need to make that argument because there is a great deal of research that indicates that students are not being given the best chance at success when colleges rely on adjuncts for the bulk of their instruction. This is a complex issue, so I can only highlight some of the significant impacts on

student success, but as I will show there are clear ways that students are negatively impacted.

From an administrative perspective, the most important components of student success are those components that can be easily quantified and tracked. These would include measures such as graduation rates (number of students who graduate with a degree or certificate), transfer rates (number of students who transfer to a four-year institution), and persistence or retention rates (students who take classes in their first year and then are “retained” or “persist” into the second year).¹⁹

For each of these measures, there is strong evidence that students who are exposed to part-time faculty do worse, and the more exposure to part-timers the worse students do. For example, a 2006 study by Jacoby found that “graduation rates for public community colleges in the United States are adversely affected when institutions rely heavily upon part-time faculty instruction.”²⁰ A 2009 study by Jaeger and Eagan went further in quantifying this impact. They found that “a 10% increase in the overall proportion of credits earned in courses taught by part-time faculty members reduced the students’ likelihood of earning an associate’s degree by 1%.”²¹ Given that community college students take about 50 percent of their courses from part-timers, this means that “the average student [is] at least 5% less likely to graduate with an associate’s degree compared to his or her peers who only have full-time instructors in the classroom, holding constant all other variables in the model.”²² Turning to transfer rates, in an earlier study Jaeger and Eagan concluded, “Findings suggest that students tend to be significantly less likely to transfer as their exposure to part-time faculty increases.”²³ Gross and Goldhaber are then able to more accurately quantify this effect in a 2009 study in which they conclude,

For every 10 percent increase in the percent of tenured faculty in the two-year college, holding all else equal, the chance that a student will transfer to a four-year college increases by 4 percent. The effect of tenured faculty is remarkable not only because it seems to have a positive effect on transferring, but also because it has an effect across all students, something not found for the transfer and articulation policies.²⁴

Finally, looking at retention or persistence rates, Jaeger and Eagan concluded, “high levels of exposure to part-time faculty in the first year of college are consistently found to negatively affect student retention to the second year.”²⁵

Taken together this data indicates that students are negatively impacted when colleges rely on adjuncts, and the greater the percentage of adjuncts, the worse students do. There is also a racial and class dimension to this inequity since the problem is most prevalent at the community college level, which is also the primary point of entry into higher education for low-income and minority students. Thus, those students who are most in need of the benefits that higher education can provide are thrust into a system that denies them the tools they need to succeed. This then creates a perpetual underclass that is denied the resources

needed for upward social and economic mobility, and this is a violation of the first clause of Rawls' second principle of justice regarding equality of opportunity. It is important to stress that most of this research does not argue that these differences are a result of poor pedagogical skills or lack of preparedness among adjuncts, but are rather a product of the systematic disadvantages that adjuncts face (e.g., not being able to stay around after a class because one needs to rush to another campus to teach another class there). Much of the research cited here concludes that the solution to these inequalities is to either hire more full-timers or significantly increase the resources available to part-timers.

While less a matter of justice, a final group that is disadvantaged by the reliance on part-timers is the full-timers, and this in at least two ways: first, the increase in institutional responsibilities of full-timers, and second, a loss of academic freedom.

Regarding the first issue, there is an enormous amount of behind-the-scenes administrative work that is necessary to keep a college functioning and accredited. While one might argue that much of this work is unnecessary or frivolous, the fact remains that this work must be done if faculty want to continue to offer courses and receive funding. Furthermore, given that very few institutions are willing to compensate adjuncts for this work, the burden for completing it falls primarily on the backs of full-timers. As the number of full-timers has shrunk and workload demands increase, full-time faculty have to spend more and more time on administrative work and less time on classroom prep and research. In addition to negatively impacting students, this also makes the job of a full-timer less appealing as one must devote considerable time to completing tasks that don't impact teaching and research, the very things that motivate one to become an academic.

This overreliance on adjuncts also negatively impacts the academic freedom of full- and part-timers. The negative impact on part-timers is quite easy to understand. Most part-timers are at-will employees with no guarantee of future employment from term to term.²⁶ While adjuncts are almost never fired, most are aware that their continued employment depends on maintaining the good graces of chairs and deans. Adjunct faculty who rock the boat or raise uncomfortable questions can easily be pushed out simply by not being given classes during the next term, effectively terminating their employment. This arrangement has a chilling effect on adjuncts who are afraid to speak up or make too much noise.²⁷

This also extends to full-timers. In addition to being overburdened with administrative work, full-timers are less able to organize effectively to criticize or question various college policies promoted by administrators. The full-timers are often too busy to reflect on and examine these issues, and even if they are aware, they have less support in their efforts as they can't ally themselves with adjunct faculty members who are fearful of losing their future classes. As a result, the power of all faculty is weakened and full-timers are less able to mobilize against the many political, economic, and administrative threats to the college.²⁸

CONCLUSION

Given the analysis above, I think it is clear that part-timers are the victims of inequity and injustice, especially when compared to their full-time counterparts. These injustices impact the adjuncts themselves, their students, and their full-time colleagues. To change this system there needs to be greater awareness of these inequities on the part of adjuncts, students, and full-timers. One way to raise awareness about these issues is to integrate these concepts into our courses. By using my own circumstances as a case study, students and others in the education community can gain clearer insight into the disadvantages adjuncts face. In my own—admittedly anecdotal—experience I have found that students become quite upset and incensed when the situation of adjuncts is explained to them, and often want to know what they can do to help change the situation. By giving students this information and incorporating these kinds of examples into our pedagogy, faculty can go a long way towards forming alliances with other groups to bring about change and correct the injustices that exist within the current system.

And what would this change look like? Ideally, it would involve converting existing part-timers into full-timers. A conservative estimate conducted by my union found that it would cost about \$265,000,000 to make this conversion in California.²⁹ This is clearly a significant amount of money, but in the context of the roughly \$170 billion California state budget, it is actually a small fraction. How to raise even this small amount of money is, of course, a difficult political question, and one's proposed solution will often depend quite a bit on one's political values. In my opinion, the easiest and most just solution would be to raise taxes on the wealthiest Californians, and to use this money to, among other things, hire significantly more full-time professors. While some might claim this is a pie in the sky dream, it is worth noting that there is a great deal of popular support in California for taxing the wealthy to help out everyone else.³⁰ While this solution may not be popular with everyone, I think it is the best and most just solution to this problem.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend special thanks to Jim Miller, Kelly Mayhew, Nina Rosenstand, and the anonymous reviewer who all provided enormous help and feedback on this paper. I would also like to thank Thomas Urban and the participants at the Teaching Philosophy at Community Colleges panel at the 2016 Pacific Division meeting of the APA who inspired me to write this paper.

NOTES

1. This is how these positions are defined in the California Education Code. See, for example, CA Ed. Code section 87482.5.
2. Although, increasingly, these "visiting professors" have their contracts renewed indefinitely, essentially making them full-time, non-tenure track faculty.
3. And this is a matter of state law and the education code, which is binding on all public community colleges in California.
4. Surprisingly, this data is extremely hard to find; what data is out there is fairly limited, and there isn't really any good aggregate information on this issue. This article (Laura McKenna, "The College President to Adjunct Pay Ration," *The Atlantic*, September 24, 2015, accessed May 17, 2016, <http://tinyurl.com/hts57x7>) gives a pretty good picture of the difficulty of tracking down this information: This is one of the major reasons why I have chosen

to use my own situation to explore this issue. Having just been hired full-time, I am in a unique position to make a clear apples-to-apples comparison.

5. California state laws prohibits "temporary, part-time faculty" from teaching more than 67 percent of a full-time load in any single community college district. See CA Ed. Code, section 87482.5. A typical load for a full-time philosopher is 5/5, so an adjunct philosopher can only teach three classes per semester in any one district (the 67 percent limit primarily impacts language instructors who, under these rules, can generally teach two sections of a language class), forcing adjuncts to work in multiple districts in order to make ends meet.
6. I will also receive additional increases when I get tenure and when I am promoted from assistant to full professor.
7. And this was one of the more robust hiring processes I experienced as an adjunct. Many schools hired me sight unseen based solely on my CV.
8. See Ca. Ed. Code, sections 87356-87358.
9. An anonymous reviewer raises the following objection: "The author should be more clear-eyed about 'equal pay for equal work.' If one interprets this literally, one could argue that there should not be steps in a pay scale. Why should a senior philosopher be paid more for teaching an Intro class than a junior faculty? Because of the very suspect idea that more senior faculty are better teachers?" This is a fascinating objection, and a decent response is, frankly, beyond the scope of this essay. That being said, it is a general feature of American labor that one should expect more pay the longer one works in a position. That is, as one advances in his or her career, one should receive more money for the work he or she does. In many academic settings it does make more sense to pay senior faculty more money. They generally have longer academic résumés with more publications and more grants. They clearly add "extra value" to the college to justify their larger salaries in comparison to junior faculty. At the two-year schools where the main emphasis is on teaching, some of these assumptions become more questionable. In this case, one could argue that more senior faculty provide greater service to the college via their work on committees and their institutional knowledge, and are thus deserving of greater compensation.
10. An anonymous reviewer raises the following objection: "The author should at least speak to the worry that the only kind of justice at issue is a field specific one, not necessarily society specific one, or even a more general notion of justice. A yearly pay of \$67K puts one about 20% above the median household income in the U.S. (to say nothing of the vast majority of other societies). At the least, one might expect an explanation of why Rawls can reasonably applied to things like, 'the philosophy profession in the U.S.'" A full answer is obviously beyond the scope of this footnote or this essay, but I would argue that the issues discussed in this essay are a matter of societal justice. Echoing Socrates' argument in the *Apology* about the role of the philosopher in society as well as his account of the proper "punishment" for someone guilty of his "crimes," I would argue that the teaching profession is enormously important to society and that a society that doesn't value education and intelligence will quickly destroy itself (stay tuned, USA). Given this, I do think it is just that educators make more than the median household income. This increase is justified by their increased education (MA minimum with many Ph.D.s) and the essential role they play in society.
11. John Rawls, "Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 14, no. 3 (Summer 1985): 223.
12. *Ibid.*, 232-33.
13. *Ibid.*, 233.
14. *Ibid.*, 227.
15. That being said, demographic information about the racial and ethnic make-up of full-time faculty might be used to make a case that these positions aren't really "open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity." For reasons of space I will not pursue this discussion here.
16. This website, <http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/welcome.html>, maintained by the University of California Office of the President, provides a nice summary of the details.

17. Coalition on the Academic Workforce, *A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members*, June 2012, accessed April 4, 2016, http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_portrait_2012.pdf.
18. It is hard to find consistent numbers on this topic. One survey [American Federation of Teachers, "A National Survey of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty," *American Academic* 2 (March 2010)] of 400 part-timers concluded that about 50 percent want a full-time position. Another, larger survey (discussed in Colleen Flaherty, "R-E-S-P-E-C-T," *Inside Higher Ed*, May 6, 2015, accessed April 25, 2016, <http://tinyurl.com/jxxl57f>) puts the number at 73 percent (as does the earlier referenced study from the Coalition on the Academic Workforce). In either case, it seems safe to say that at least half and as many as three quarters of current adjuncts want a full-time position.
19. I have a suspicion that many of these administrative benchmarks are guilty of some version of the Texas Sharpshooter Fallacy or the Drunkard's Search. Be that as it may, these are the benchmarks that administrators use to evaluate the college and the performance of various programs and departments.
20. Daniel Jacoby, "The Effects of Part-Time Faculty Employment on Community College Graduation Rates," *Journal of Higher Education* 77, no. 6 (2006): 1081-1103. The quotation is from the abstract.
21. A. J. Jaeger and M. K. Eagan, Jr., "Unintended Consequences: Examining the Effect of Part-time Faculty Members on Associate's Degree Completion," *Community College Review* 36, no. 3 (2009): 184.
22. *Ibid.*, 186.
23. M. K. Eagan, Jr., and A. J. Jaeger, "Effects of Exposure to Part-time Faculty on Community College Transfer," *Research in Higher Education* 50, no. 2 (2009).
24. B. Gross and D. Goldhaber, "Community College Transfer and Articulation Policies: Looking Beneath the Surface," *Center on Reinventing Public Education*, Working Paper No. 2009_1.
25. A. J. Jaeger and M. K. Eagan, "Examining Retention and Contingent Faculty Use in a State System of Public Higher Education," *Educational Policy* 25, no. 3 (2010): 507-37. The quotation is from the abstract.
26. In California, this fact was established in *Cervisi v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd.*, 208 Cal.App.3d 635. This decision allows adjuncts in California to apply for unemployment insurance during the winter and summer breaks. This can often result in significant additional income for part-timers to the tune of close to \$5,000 a year.
27. This "chilling effect" is difficult to quantify, but I encountered it often as a union activist. Faculty would often complain to me about unfair treatment, but would be unwilling to formally pursue the matter out of fear of reprisals and a loss of future employment.
28. Special thanks to Dr. Jim Miller, who has helped me understand the implications for academic freedom of the increased adjunctification in higher education.
29. This calculation was done by the president of my local, Jim Mahler. He found that

Using the average salary of \$35,784 per year for the full-time equivalent temporary, part-time faculty member and a modest \$70,000 average starting salary (including benefits) of a newly hired tenured/tenure-track faculty member, it would cost (\$70,000 - \$35,784 =) \$34,216 to convert a full-time equivalent temporary, part-time faculty position to a full-time tenure-track position.

Using the statewide goal of 75% of all sections being taught by full-time faculty, this would require the conversion of 7,762 part-time positions, or (7,762 positions X \$34,216 per conversion =) \$265,584,592 to reach the statewide goal of 75%.

This analysis comes from a public letter he sent to Governor Jerry Brown on October 14, 2014.
30. In 2012 California voters approved Proposition 30, which raised taxes on the wealthiest Californians (individuals making more than \$250,000 and households making more than \$500,000). In 2016 California voters approved Proposition 55, which extended this tax for another twelve years.

CALL FOR PAPERS

The APA Committee for Philosophy in Two-Year Colleges invites papers for inclusion in the fall 2017 issue of the *APA Newsletter on Philosophy in Two-Year Colleges*.

Papers should be devoted to topics of particular interest to two-year and community college faculty, and graduate students who are considering a two-year or community college career path. These include but should not be construed as limited to the following: lower division teaching pedagogy; text and textbook selections including the use of open-access resources; cross-disciplinary initiatives; student demographics and advising; student learning evaluation; program evaluation and program growth initiatives; faculty credentialing and hiring, including concerns for women and minorities, status of adjunct faculty, workload and related issues; faculty scholarship opportunities, research, and writing; and issues dealing with program administration. Co-authored papers are welcome.

All paper submissions should adhere to the following guidelines:

- Deadline: Friday, June 2, 2017
- Papers must be in 12 pt. Times New Roman font, double-spaced, and should be in the range of 3,000 to 5,000 words, including endnotes. Exceptional papers that fall outside this range may be considered, though this is not guaranteed. Authors are advised to read APA publishing guidelines available on the APA website.

- Pay close attention to all APA formatting restrictions. Submissions that do not conform will be returned to their author(s). Endnotes should follow the Word default using roman numerals to number the notes.
- Papers should be sent to the editor electronically and should contain nothing that identifies either the author(s) or her/his/their institution, including any such references in the endnotes. A separate page with the authors name, title, and full mailing address should also be submitted.

Submissions should be sent to the Philosophy in Two-Year Colleges Committee chair and newsletter editor, Thomas Urban, at TwoYearEditor@gmail.com, by June 2, 2017.

The editor, serving in the capacity of a disinterested coordinator, will distribute all papers to an editorial committee of current and past Two-Year College Committee members for anonymous review and evaluation. This committee will report its findings to members of the newsletter editorial board. The editorial board will make all publishing decisions based on those anonymously refereed results, and conduct any further anonymous review(s) deemed necessary. The editorial board includes Kristen L. Zbikowski, Hibbing Community College (kristenzbikowski@hibbing.edu); Anthony Kreider, Miami-Dade Community College (akreider@mdc.edu); Bill Hartmann, St. Louis Community College (bhartmann@stlcc.edu); and Rick Repetti, Kingsborough Community College-CUNY (Rick.Repetti@kbcc.cuny.edu).