have not been as lucky as I was. In reading *The Slow Professor*, I came to realize that there may be no population in the academy who suffers more from the cult of productivity. Berg and Seeber offer no tangible solutions to adjunct labor concerns, but I do believe we can use their text to help us reframe our perceptions of contingent productivity. We can and must do more to acknowledge the ways in which our culture’s time sickness exploits these professionals.

Though with limitations, Berg and Seeber provide a starting place for imaging how slow principles might be used as a productive lens through which to see our work in the academy. We are left to imagine how we might realize their principles within our contexts. As the authors indicate, “academic work by its very nature is never done,” (3) so we must “advocate deliberation over acceleration” (x). What does the deliberate teacher-scholar-activist look like? How about the deliberate adjunct professor? We all can benefit from questioning the notions of productivity we have come to accept as normal, desirable to “get ahead,” or even necessary to consider ourselves “good enough.” Within this text are useful reminders to be savored, especially the point that we can and should find enjoyment in our teaching, even in these times wherein efficiency and accountability are becoming the resounding songs of administration. What’s most important, perhaps, is the reminder that education and the processes involved in teaching and learning, researching and writing, are not always efficient. We do well to remember that it is okay, perhaps even productive, to slow down and allow ourselves space to question our beliefs about efficiency and time management.

**Works Cited**
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**Teaching Composition at the Two-Year College: Background Readings**

For those who have taught at the two-year college, the differences between what we learn in our graduate programs regarding teaching writing and the reality of the classroom practice can seem stark, sometimes even shocking. In this collection, we have a view of what teaching in the two-year college is like for those preparing to enter, as well as practical guides for managing teach-
ing writing in this context for those already engaged here. Additionally, the historical perspective of the history and mission of the two-year college provides context for the discussions about access and inclusion that are essential to quality teaching of writing anywhere, but particularly here.

The collection is thoughtfully crafted to begin each section with an introduction, covering the scope of the unit and directing readers to content areas of interest. Unlike typical edited collections that use a whole-book introduction, the model of using section introductions provides a concise section-by-section overview, perfectly aware of its varied readership and the myriad demands on their time and attention. When these introductions are used in conjunction with the table of contents, a reader can easily and quickly determine which chapters and articles meet their needs at the moment, and can select and make use of them quickly and efficiently.

In some ways, the collection does not provide new information. Many of the articles here are reprinted landmark essays on teaching writing in the two-year college, and others are landmark essays simply about teaching writing. When placed together in this collection, however, they remind us of what is significant, and why. We find new applications for ideas that we might have missed in earlier readings—and the book provides access to readings that some might have missed altogether. Additionally, the new articles presented in the collection fill gaps in the discussion of two-year college writing instruction. Old and new, landmark and remarkable, together the voices of the field provide us with a rich experience of what it means to teach writing, generally, and then focus us on what it means to teach writing at the two-year college.

One such interesting intersection of ideas is in part 2, chapter 1, where the editors have included “Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century” by Richard Fulkerson and “Two-Year College Teachers at Knowledge Makers” by Mark Reynolds. Fulkerson’s article is the third, and final, in a series of historical perspectives that he wrote to chronicle the development and changes in our field of study. It prods readers to explore our epistemologies and pedagogies, to consider our biases and philosophies. But for many readers from the two-year college, Fulkerson’s article can be difficult to commit to for its length and attention to theoretical nuances, which may not seem immediately relevant to the two-year college writing classroom. Further, he calls for reflection of practice through his historical perspective and argument about the field, another time-consuming (and sometimes painful) pursuit that may seem a luxury to those teaching a heavy load of courses with substantial service commitments.

Reynolds’s article, on the other hand, is more accessible. It makes the argument that two-year college English faculty are, in fact, knowledge makers, not merely teachers. The focus on the teacher-scholar is not new to Reynolds’s text, of course, but by bringing the discussion back into the book, following the theoretical discussion of Fulkerson’s historical perspective, we are asked to think about how we make knowledge, and what importance these knowledge formations have in the teaching of writ-
ing and in the field more broadly. There is, then, also a subtle push toward sharing that knowledge outside of the walls of our own institutions, which requires, at times, teachers in the two-year college to think of themselves differently: as experts.

What happens, then, when we read this chapter on “Theory, Scholarship, and Practice” in the unit on “Preparing to Teach” in the two-year college? These are the two articles presented to us in the chapter: Fulkerson and Reynolds. Do we see an argument that two-year college teachers are “behind the times” and teaching “out of date” theories and models? Or do we see an argument that these faculty are engaged in solving problems, in meeting students where they are, in innovating with the affordances of the technology and material constraints of their classrooms? I certainly see the latter, and it seems that Sullivan and Toth set us up to see just that and implore us to engage in the practices and to see ourselves through this lens.

The book is filled with these carefully crafted juxtapositions of ideas. Each article is worthy on its own for offering the reader something to grapple with, something to work with to solve a local or global problem in the two-year college. But when read together, the articles in a given chapter and the chapters in a given unit or section provide a complex image of what teaching in the two-year college is really all about, what it really is on a day-to-day and heart-to-heart level.

Even from the very beginning of the book, the editors provide the readers with a sense of purpose, of calling for teaching in the two-year college. The opening chapter of the book presents the “History and Mission of the Two-Year College” by asking readers to engage first with a selection from the 1947 Truman Commission Report, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, in which a call for a new form of education, tailored to democracy, was heralded. This is followed by 2016 Community College Fast Facts, so readers can see just how this educational policy works today. Finally, the chapter ends with Nell Ann Pickett’s “The Two-Year College as Democracy in Action,” inviting us to review the statistics and the historical perspective of why two-year colleges were created through her 1997 Chair’s Address to the Conference on College Composition and Communication. She reminds us of the promise two-year colleges provide to the citizens of our nation, opening doors because of the education afforded here.

What can sometimes feel like very difficult and thankless work, we are reminded, is the work of providing opportunities and of inspiring lives to go beyond the boundaries previously set for them. Chapters 2 and 3 further extend this inspirational journey for readers, guiding us to see our work as important and highly contextualized.

Part 2, which focuses on “Preparing to Teach” in four separate chapters, including the chapter mentioned above with Fulkerson and Reynolds as the opening chapter to the unit. But its practical turn in chapters focused on designing courses, designing assignments, and teaching for transfer of learning make this unit a section not to be missed. Whether we pick this collection up as graduate students in a course preparing us for teaching in the two-
year college or as seasoned two-year college faculty and administrators who are looking for answers for themselves or to share with others, this is a section of the book that is certain to be visited again and again by most readers. Sullivan and Toth have carefully constructed each chapter so that we have multiple considerations and perspectives as we frame our ideas, pushing us always to see the teacher-scholar within us and the opportunities for further development and exploration that await us and our students within our classrooms.

Understanding that the challenges of the two-year college writing classroom are complicated and complex, the editors designed part 3 of the collection to help us find theoretical frameworks to support our inquiries into our most common or perplexing problems, such as fostering critical thinking and how to assess it, integrating reading and writing in a variety of ways and courses, managing the responses to student writing in critical ways, and teaching academic literacies in diverse classrooms. Chapters 8–11 in part 3 serve to explore the questions that, while not unique to two-year college writing classrooms, must be addressed uniquely by two-year college writing faculty and administrators for our courses at the programmatic level. These questions about critical thinking, for instance, continue to flow around our institutions and throughout higher education in general, and each department and program must address, on its own, what critical thinking looks like and works in its curriculum before it can determine how to teach and assess it successfully with its students. These chapters, then, help to provide a theoretical platform for the conversations that departments are likely having all the time, and should be having in an ongoing way to ensure continuous improvement of curriculum and programming to meet student needs.

Part 4, then, really is more about the nuts-and-bolts issues than was part 3. Teaching writing in the two-year college presents some challenges and questions that may appear to have been dismissed by the larger composition theory community. And part 2 does a good job of exploring the ongoing conversation within the field of addressing some of these concerns. From talking about the five-paragraph essay to exploring instruction in grammar, readers will find this unit helpful for professional development, as well as for supporting their choices in their classrooms if challenged. Chapter 3, “Rethinking Developmental Education,” may prove particularly useful to many readers who are engaged in discussions regarding restructuring programs or methods of supporting developmental learners within their schools. With three selections included, the discussion is wide and far-reaching, offering a strong springboard into further research and discussion.

Sullivan and Toth segue from the discussion of “Business as Usual” into part 5 to discuss “Teaching Diverse Student Populations.” This move is natural in terms of the progression of topics, but of course a reader may simply jump to any section or reading at any time, as previously noted, and find useful material there. The unit begins with the underprepared learner, a hallmark of the two-year college. The two selections included in this chapter provide readers with a glimpse of what students are
like in the two-year college and makes clear the argument that all students have value and worth. Indeed, the call to democratic education in the opening chapter of the book is again realized in this chapter as we read the stories of students who struggle to find their way to success in the only institutions that can afford them such an opportunity. Two more chapters are presented, focusing on “Racially, Ethnically, and Linguistically Diverse Students” and on “Non-Traditional Students” and providing us with more information and views about who the students working in two-year colleges may be when we say “diverse student populations.” The chapter on nontraditional students is appropriately complex, offering a view of returning adult students, high school students, and veterans in composition classrooms.

Finally, part 6 reminds us that teaching writing in the two-year college is a profession, a specific one. With a chapter on “Professional Identities,” the collection brings readers back to the idea of the teacher-scholar, reminding us that we have a responsibility to ourselves, our students, and our departments to remain engaged in our field and the scholarship it produces—not only to read what is produced, but to be participants in the production as well. We are reminded to join in the professional organizations to have a shared voice in the governance of the organizations and the shape of the field itself. This is not a small task for faculty at two-year colleges, of course, but it is one that is clearly significant for Sullivan and Toth, who have dedicated a significant portion of the book to reminding the readers of the need to see themselves as teacher-scholars, not to separate themselves out from the greater field of those working in the discipline. In the second chapter in this unit, the editors focus on “Contingent Faculty” and demonstrate the important role that adjuncts and those without tenure status have in the two-year college and higher education more generally. Both selections focus on the need to improve the contingent faculty numbers and working situations, from issues of fairness to the general sense of vulnerability that adjuncts face. Helena Worthen’s “The Problem of the Majority Contingent Faculty in the Community Colleges” examines the stories of adjuncts that may otherwise go unseen or untold in the college community, focusing on lives so close to the edge that they might teeter at any moment. Her work with their stories validates them, gives them voice, and brings them into the light. This is important. Together with the text by Jeffrey Klausman, who seeks to demonstrate how to work as a WPA or faculty member to build a more coherent writing program while addressing inequalities for adjuncts in their programs, readers can see where the injustices may lie in their departments and colleges, and begin to make right the wrongs of the past, to facilitate conversations among both full-time and part-time faculty to address issues of equity.

Throughout, then, Sullivan and Toth’s collection provides readers with a broad view of what life in the two-year college writing classroom is and can be, making this book an excellent resource for graduate students preparing for a future of teaching, as well as current practitioners seeking continu-
ous professional development. For the two-year college department chair or writing program administrator looking for a point of reference for themselves or their colleagues regarding the daily work of teaching, conceptualizing, and building a writing program in the ever-changing waters of the two-year college, perhaps for faculty development, or just for reassurances that the choices they make are solid and sure, there is likely to be no stronger collection or book available.

Sonja L. Andrus
University of Cincinnati Blue Ash College


Stanley Fish has written a follow-up to his 2011 How to Write a Sentence and How to Read One (reviewed by me in TETYC 41.2). Although Fish mentions in passing Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein’s They Say / I Say and Andrea A. Lunsford et al.’s Everything’s an Argument, the new book—Winning Arguments: What Works and Doesn’t Work in Politics, the Bedroom, the Courtroom, and the Classroom—isn’t a textbook. And though Fish references J. L. Austin, Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, and Jürgen Habermas, Winning Arguments isn’t academic either. It’s for the public, finding a much larger audience than anything published in CCC ever will, which is why Winning Arguments has great importance for teachers of writing. Winning Arguments presents a portrait of argument—its aims, its practitioners, its methods—as it is practiced currently in various venues. This is argument as our students see it carried out, argument that seems effective, argument that one might think burgeoning rhetors ought to imitate. I can imagine a reading of Winning Arguments that sees its pedagogical value as offering readers a taxonomy, a heuristic for invention even, and the book is quite useful for its articulation of how language shapes the world, but I see its value elsewhere. Winning Arguments outlines the very sort of public discourse—a discourse built upon bulldozer arguments that strive to win at all costs—that is so problematic and that writing courses can and should upend in this, our present moment.

And what is that present moment? I picked up my copy of Winning Arguments here in Seattle the day it hit the shelves, July 5, 2016. Alton Sterling was shot that morning in Baton Rouge; the next day, July 6, Philando Castile was shot in St. Paul; the day after that, July 7, Lorne Ahrens, Michael Krol, Michael Smith, Brent Thompson, and Patrick Zamarripa were shot in Dallas. I began reading Fish’s book in the midst of this, and as I read it, I couldn’t help but question the worth of argument, of rhetoric, of the teaching of writing. Why bother teaching organization, thesis statements, the semicolon, when people are dying in the streets? I tried to console myself with the party line—that education fights ignorance and intolerance, works against violence, restores communities—but in the face of overwhelming despair in and for the world, these answers don’t seem to cut it. I don’t think I am alone, as a writing teacher, in questioning what we do when we teach summary, synthesis, business writing, argument papers, literary and rhetori-