

ALL ABOUT

MENTORING

A Publication of the Empire State College Mentoring Institute



EMPIRE STATE
COLLEGE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Issue 13 • Spring 1998



Issue 13, Spring 1998

Table of Contents

- Editorial (Mandell, Alan)
- Further Visits (Seidel, Robert N,)
- The Adult Student and the Decision to Apply to Law School (Giordano, Justin)
- Just Changing My Job Conditions – A Conversation with Lois Muzio (Mandell, Alan)
- What Scholarship Does for My Teaching, or, How to Turn Students into Intellectual Adventurers (Turbin, Carol)
- In Memoriam – Joseph Goldberg
- Sabbatical Report, 1997 (Coughlan, Reed)
- Mentoring in FORUM/East: Some Unique Aspects (Di Nitto, Andrew)
- On Radicalism and Mentoring: A Conversation
- The Fort Drum Unit (Corsica, Joanne)
- Two Companion Poems (Elaine Handley and Suzanne Borowicz,)
- Two Book Reviews - Do We Offer Piano Lessons at Empire State College (McClary, William)
- Two Book Reviews - The Workshop Mathematics Program: Abandoning Lectures (Grapin, Marilyn)
- Circle News (Gerardi, Judith)
- MI News

ALL ABOUT

MENTORING

A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

From the Editor

Alan Mandell, Metropolitan Center

As a professional identity, mentoring has always been precarious. It has been stimulating because the kind of work that it cherishes pushes at the boundaries of what we know and asks us to regularly engage in conversations that alter conventional relationships of authority. It has been frustrating because there are no models upon which we have been able to rely that help us hold what we do in high esteem. In many ways, we have struggled to invent a way of thinking about ourselves that communicates the distinctiveness of mentoring as a teaching practice but also gives us a meaningful foothold in the academic world. We want to be different and often feel that we are. But we also worry that our life as mentors is not taken seriously by colleagues outside of Empire State College, and that the special insights, skills and values that we have nourished as a community have only the most limited currency.

This search for an identity that can ground our practice makes our work especially reflective. Our relative isolation makes us wonder who we really are. Moreover, it is in the very nature of our everyday work with students that we ask critical and unsettling questions about knowledge, authority, teaching and learning. For example, where should the student and I begin? What should be read? How can this student's questions remain alive and attended to? When should I speak? Are there enough openings for the student to really explore? Have we found a useful way to structure the work of the contract? Have I given the student enough? Has the student taken sufficient responsibility for the design of the study (or of the degree)? These and many other questions that we ask every day can never go away. In fact, it may be that our promise to keep them alive – to speak about them among ourselves and especially with our students – is at the very heart of our understanding of mentoring.

Yet, amidst the recurring questions (and the genuine stimulation that comes from this process of wondering about them and always trying things out) is the problem of our expertise. The most obvious mentoring question is: What do I know? The question suggests that we are not sure, which is certainly provocative enough. But it also reminds us that we believe the real knowledge of the mentor is not identical to that of the traditional professor who knows what there is to know. And, if we don't base our expertise upon the stock of knowledge as defined by the professorial disciplines (or even the interdisciplines), what do we have? Upon what do we as mentors ground our claims as teaching professionals? What is our currency? Upon what expertise can we depend?

The question of our authenticity as academic experts becomes particularly acute in an institutional environment like ours. In addition to troubling, however necessary, questions of learning, we also worry about workload, lack of resources, diminishing revenues, weakening academic standards, and whether we are helping our students learn what they need to know in the world beyond Empire State College. So, we hunker down and long for a more stable mooring such as the conventional professoriate seems to hold. This model becomes an idealized place from which we can judge with more surety and seek to control the domain that means most to us: what we believe we can teach and what we think students can learn.

However, so many other institutional environments, including the academy, are experiencing crises of legitimacy and authority quite like our own. Our advantage is that asking critical questions about ourselves is already embedded

essentially in our work as mentors. This is our expertise. To the extent that we look outside ourselves for certainty, we might shut off many of the openings to new understanding that we could enjoy everyday with our students.

As the pieces in this issue of *All About Mentoring* so vividly demonstrate, there are many distinctive dimensions of working at Empire State College, many activities and skills that we regularly rely upon and develop, and much evidence of the kind of deep reflectiveness about our role that is the very terrain of mentoring. While these materials – and the ongoing conversations that we must continue to have – will not solve all of the dilemmas of a precarious identity, I hope they will help us continue to define ourselves in a manner that does not seek to reproduce the conventional academic definitions that are themselves so precarious.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

Further Visits

Robert N. Seidel, Genesee Valley Center

Editor's Note: Issue #12 of All About Mentoring included a piece by Gary Goss on the philosophical foundations of our work at Empire State College. It was followed by five responses from colleagues across the College. Bob Seidel's comments that are included here offer yet another response, and, thus, another opportunity to reflect on what we do and how we judge it. We welcome further discussion.

The excellent November 1997 issue of *All About Mentoring* moves me to comment. Mentoring and the mission of Empire State College have ever been noble and problematic, worthwhile and incomplete. They therefore, always deserve analysis and reflection, in part because they are, like community and compassion in a regime of capitalist materialism and indulgent individualism, constantly in danger. It is proper that the threats, apparent and real, propel us to greater than normal consideration of what is dear and what is at risk. Thus it is that the report of the Distance Learning Task Force has stimulated several rounds of soul searching and, I feel, bouts of suspicion and acrimony.

Can It Be Done?

The things that are on my mind are not exactly despair about the question, as George Drury used to ask it, "Is Empire State College possible?" After all, we've lived through and continue to tolerate difficult problems, stuff like fiscal scissors, enrollment pressure cookers, resource shortages, reorganization anxieties and distended community blues.

Yet I approach our situation with some skepticism. What I will try to say here is in relation to the important things that Gary Goss and others have written about how we have fallen short in formulating (Gary's words) "criteria to help us evaluate our various programs and proposed programs." In this context, Lee Herman focuses on mentoring, about which more below. Here is my attempt to contribute to the discussion.

Practice

Empire State College has been a *practice*, with often quite pragmatic and instrumental ways of getting along. There's even been a share of "the ends more or less justify the means" utilitarianism on the ground level. Thus, and granting the best of intentions, it was the case that the Center for Distance Learning, Graduate Studies and FORUM, among other institutional enterprises, were initiated to demonstrate that the College was continuing to innovate, and secure (ugh!) standing and market share. We made assumptions, or at least I think we did, about "criteria" (in Gary's sense) in the planning and early implementation of these programs. Yet I'm confident that in their first stages they would be as openly vulnerable to Gary's criticism as, apparently, reconception and expansion of distance learning is now.

Ours is a practice that speaks of principles yet often has difficulty specifying them. The College's initial and still dominant mission – to provide educational opportunity for adults who can't attend more conventional programs or who wish alternatives – doesn't supply the principles. Arthur Chickering's contribution to the College's formation helped provide intellectual and normative basis for now well-established practices of individualization, mentoring, curriculum

development and learning contract studies. Yet his work was only part of the mix that made a functioning institution. Other elements include accountability measures; bureaucratic systems; means to secure and maintain formal legitimation; and ways of grappling with problems of institutional coherence, territorial dispersion, and the searing forces of enrollment and revenue requirements.

So I want to say that practice comes first. It always has. I think this is what Fern Brunschwig means when he points out that if we had to name and agree upon such criteria in advance of the institution's original founding, "the College probably would never have been created."

What I'm calling practice, the ESC practice, arises, however, not out of nothing. It emerges from the good and sincere and intelligent efforts of students, mentors, and the rest of us. This complex practice is a consequence of what we do. It's what we do together, in so many ways and places.

The presuppositions are important. They include several dimensions of trust: in the education and skills of mentors and administrators; in ways of observing how students fare under these regimes and what outcomes are produced; in our self-assurance that what is happening is compatible with our sense of what is right and good; that what we do and students achieve is reasonably comparable, where this applies, to what is going on elsewhere in various disciplines, fields, professions, and communities of discourse; and that we can correct inappropriate behavior or systems before much damage is done.

These are strong presuppositions, to be sure. Gary is right: We do have an obligation to be explicit about this. Practice provides material for such reflection as Gary's advice requires. My reading of history here suggests, however, that we won't be able to do as well as Gary would like us to do in "agree[ing] in public on educational criteria we can employ in reaching decisions about such things like distance learning." We generally presuppose and decide first; then we (sometimes) find the criteria from our practice.

Community

The College's mission statement, to which we've tried to adhere and that we've elaborated on over the years, is, again, not a statement of fundamental principles. It is a device that made it possible for those who have joined the organization to apply their talents, in many different ways and often creatively. It is also only one of the bases for constructing a formal institution of many parts, an institution that has forms, procedures and obligations relating, to put it crassly, to institutional survival.

Survival of the institution has protected us, just as it has surely harbored activities and behaviors about which we disagree and about some of which we hang our heads. There are times when institutional survival has relegated concern to avoid questionable activity and behaviors to, at best, a closet. Yet there has always been, in my view, a desire for and some success in nurturing not just acceptable but admirable practices at the same time. As well, there are moments (this seems surely to be one) when we have a stronger obligation to deliberate about what Gary, Lee and Fernand, and Deborah Kleese, Cathy Copley-Woods, Wayne Ouderkirk, and Alan Mandell, have written in last November's *All About Mentoring*.

The College formed from such original ideas and motives, and from variously appended, reworked, and abrogated programs and activities, is indeed an institution. Is it a community? Is it a community in the sense in which Gary, Deborah and Cathy use the term? Well, I can't be sure, for two reasons. The concept is ambiguous, for one. Second, consistent with Wayne's proper call for "radical questioning," can we truly conceive of an organization such as ours as a community? Long ago, Peter Drucker raised this question regarding corporations (*The Concept of the Corporation* [New American Library, 1946, 1964, pp. 19, 25, 207]). The question remains whether this is an apology for rampant capitalist power or a plea for humanizing the corporation, in part to ward off state regulation and socialism.

The issue is still important. While this is not the place to work it out, we might say that the concept of community resonates. We would all like to take it seriously. Many of us say we'd like the College to be a community, and more power to us. Lee has a truly poignant story in this regard, of a student, her million dollar machine, and the difficulties of being "fully human" in a regime of power and profit-driven authority. He seems to be saying, and I agree absolutely, that

we should try to make our conceptions of community fit us and our lives together. It is not either “Do as I say” or “Do what I do,” but both.

One implication of this is critical. It is that the people, activities and programs of FORUM, Graduate Studies and CDL are as much a part of our putative community as those of our longest established learning centers. We’re all colleagues, members, citizens. Historical primacy has some weight, but it cannot trump the rights to community membership of newcomers, no matter how the newcomers came to be our colleagues and neighbors. (Isn’t this one of our country’s most rightfully cherished civic ideals?) From practice, the historical primacy of some of our colleagues instructs us. Mentoring and centering our focus on students have great weight from these findings. They should continue to color our quest to find criteria from practice even as we innovate. But they absolutely must accommodate a principle of inclusiveness within the institution and community.

Mentoring

We’ve surely made assumptions, from time to time. Some ways of going about mentoring students are more admirable and successful than others. Yet we’ve not developed fundamentally and universally disciplined behaviors to suit, and then canonized them in fact. Here again practice continues to come first. We’ve also had seasons of different habits that relate to mentoring, and as an institution we have felt various, not always consistent ways about them. Thus, we have considered, and treated in various ways, many issues: What are the strengths and shortcomings of the use of learning contracts? (Lee’s definition of the contract as the “heart” of our practice is excellent. Yet we practice a broad range of contracting behaviors that surely merits attention.)

What is the place of group studies? What are appropriate mixes of the counseling mode in mentoring as compared with the inquiry mode? Are there disadvantages in practices of individualization that we should avoid? Can and do mentors spend enough time with students? How much time is enough? What sorts of student demonstrations and outcomes should we expect? How might these differ by topic, inquiry, field and profession? What accountability must we expect about such demonstrations on the part of mentors and tutors?

Can the College serve the instrumental interests of students in human services, business and technology as well as in cultural and historical studies? When may adherence to a disciplinary method become dogmatism and, therefore, unacceptable, and when might creative openness to inquiry become destructive of disciplinary approaches?

To what degree are personality, communication mode and other such characteristics of mentors dependent variables in the activity of mentoring? In the preparation for and sustaining of the lives of mentor, how much stretching in subject matter is acceptable? In what cases? How much mentor study and reflection time is appropriate? Who will decide? What should we understand about students’ different ways of learning and knowing? About the advantages and shortcomings of each? About how they may impact mentoring practices?

These are all interesting questions, and there are more. In the best of all possible worlds, all probably merit inspection. As a practical matter, we talk about these things a great deal; we also leave a lot unsaid or pass over it lightly.

So, again, with Gary I agree: We should work on criteria. I think that the process, which has been ongoing over the years, will not be definitive within the community, whether it is the mentoring and direct mentor relationship with students or whether it is collateral realms of decisions on new programs, institutional structures and resource allocations. We’ll do it well sometimes, and sometimes we’ll lapse. We’ll be unclear and we’ll disagree strongly about particular things. So long as we keep at it, however, we’ll do better. We may find more admirable ways to talk with each other and improve ourselves. (Here is where the general concept of the College as community works better for me than the general concept of the College as an institution.)

I disagree with Lee, however. Lee declares that “in 25-plus years . . . we have not consistently discovered, agreed upon and energetically nurtured even one specific practice which represents ‘good’ mentoring or excised even one specific practice which represents ‘bad’ mentoring.” (To this he immediately adds a tempering proviso, “Well, that’s not entirely fair.”) I find this awfully harsh, in fact incomprehensible. Lee’s statement is sensible in implying that mentoring practice gives rise to recognition of principles in that practice and, subsequently, to the possibility of communal and institutional

refinement of the practice. But I feel the statement is insensitive to the amount of time and energy we actually, and I think sincerely, give to mentoring practices, good and bad. While I cannot in any way document this, it is my impression that we probably spend proportionately more effort and paper on this issue than academic practitioners of the traditional lecture, recitation, laboratory and seminar mode of professorship.

Thus, I do believe we have indeed “consistently discovered, agreed upon and energetically nurtured” good mentoring practices and striven to excise “bad” practices. I believe this discovery and so forth has been in our general practice, with lots of inherent ambiguity and a significant range of behaviors. (At Genesee Valley, we’ve been seriously working on learning styles and on serving disabled students.) And it has been an imperfect, incomplete discovery. (The discovery of what is right and proper for conventional professorship seems similarly to be imperfect and incomplete, the prestige of major institutions of higher learning and the academic achievements of their distinguished faculty notwithstanding.)

Moreover, we’ve not done as well as either Lee or I want. My test is the degree to which the questions I’ve posed above are part of our every day discussions, periodic faculty discourses, peer reviews and self-study enterprises, and the degree to which insights and understandings from such give-and-take (without canonization) inform our practice and, from time to time, improve it.

Getting On

Maybe there’s no proper conclusion to this, only observations.

We’re in this together. Commitment to mission and core values obligates us to continuous self-examination in ways that are integral to our actual day-to-day realities. Formation of the institution as community is the work of many parts, drives and motives. It’s a task that is necessary for *All About Mentoring* to engage in, and (sorry) it’s a task that is bigger than the fundamental and honorable profession of mentoring alone.

We – mentors, administrators and staff people of all stripes, perspectives and experience; and of the various programs and locations – simply must work together on this. We are not, I believe, in danger from distance learning or administrative decision making so long as we proceed on the course of discourse. (The real perils, and surely they exist, are in excessive work load; insufficiently serviceable systems; inadequate collaboration, reflection, and analysis; and, sad to say, the state.) If we are one college, we’ll have to work out how authority and power are distributed among us (this seems doable) and the degree to which centralization and localism can co-exist (there will always be tensions on this level).

If we’re strong enough, and I think we are, we can get along on this just splendidly.

Malcolm Shepard Knowles
1913-1997

“I visualize that the learner would be gradually weaned away from the perception that he (sic) is engaged in schooling, and that when he has acquired the skills of learning appropriate to his aspirations he will come to see himself as a self-directed learner, making use of the learning resources center as a resource that is available to him on his terms for the rest of his life. There will be no such thing as adult education. There will only be lifelong education.”

Toward a Model of Lifelong Education (1970)

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

The Adult Student and the Decision to Apply to Law School

Justin Giordano, Metropolitan Center

The decision to apply to law school in pursuit of a law degree and ultimately a career in the legal profession certainly ranks among the most important decisions an individual will ever make. In most instances the decision is never an easy one, and the choice made will undoubtedly result in a life altering career path. The decision-making process becomes even more heart-wrenching and, in most respects, the consequences must be weighted more severely in the case of many of our students.

I would distinguish among three categories of law school applicants: Group A is made up of younger or “traditional” law student applicants. Group B is made up of older students, ranging in age from the mid-40s onward. And Group C is made up of what I would call the adult learner. Members of Group A face the kinds of personal and academic questions and dilemmas any applicant to a professional program have to deal with. Those in Group B are typically empty-nesters who are often retired from a previous career and are eagerly seeking to commence another, or to fulfill a lifelong ambition long postponed. (Members of this group are generally in a better financial position than those of the other two groups.) It is the adult learner, Group C, who is truly caught in the middle in practically every way. This is usually a person who bears a substantial number of responsibilities with the most heavily laden one generally revolving around family concerns. Another dilemma the adult applicant faces involves his/her current career path and its envisioned trajectory. That is, this adult student has to decide whether his/her current career is worth pursuing further, or whether it is better to cut one’s losses while the possibility for a change of course still remains viable.

The question thus becomes: Can the adult student approach this decision in a methodical manner without emotional overindulgence or conversely, without sole reliance on financial and/or cost benefit analysis? The answer (as you probably guessed) is yes! However, a sound decision cannot be arrived at without using a step by step analytical approach. This could take the form of a series of questions with which the adult student may grapple in order to comb through the multitude of issues he/she must confront. Many of these questions are obvious; others are not immediately apparent but certainly no less deserving of serious scrutiny and thought.

Firstly, the career issue. The potential adult law student must ask him/herself: Do I really want to be a lawyer? This question opens the door to a slew of possible answers and sometimes subconscious motives that are buried beneath the surface. Our society views the legal profession with mixed feelings. At best, we see it as a financially rewarding career with a degree of prestige and respectability. At worst, however, it is seen as a profession which is often unscrupulous, opportunistic, and even unethical. Thus, while this is an emotionally driven question, for many, how one is perceived by peers and society is very crucial to their lives.

Another aspect of the career question is a more pragmatic one. What is the cost I can expect to incur, and how much can I realistically expect to earn once I’ve undergone the full transformation from student to licensed attorney? This question is much more easily answered by members of Group A, for whom the analysis is relatively straightforward: The cost of a legal education ranges from \$50,000 to \$100,000; it requires a commitment of three to four years, and is invariably accompanied by its opportunity costs – that is, a loss of potential earnings directly related to employment for this time

frame ranging from \$100,00 to \$120,000. These two items are measured against the promise of a higher starting salary coupled with the prospect of higher earnings throughout the lifespan of one's new career. Salaries and earnings vary so dramatically that in order to ascertain a figure, the question of which field of law is contemplated, the law school one expects to attend, and the rank one will attain by the end of one's career, all play a pivotal role. Suffice it to say, however, that freshly minted new lawyers' annual salaries cover a wide spectrum from the middle to high 30s through the \$90,000 range.

The adult students in Group C face essentially the same financial realities as those of Group A, but the numbers may vary somewhat on both ends. Specifically, the opportunity cost is more likely than not, higher – and sometimes substantially higher, given that the adult student has already been involved in the workplace for a number of years. The potential starting compensation package at the other end might also be more lucrative especially if the chosen field of practice is related to that individual's expertise prior to law school.

The next career-related question is what I call the “dead end career syndrome.” A good number of adult students are presently in careers that simply pay the mortgage and car payments, and put food on the table; otherwise, they are uninspiring, offer little opportunity for promotion, and can generally be regarded as unrewarding. Typical questions the student might ask are: Is my discouragement with or overall alienation from my current position the major motivation for moving to what I hope will be a more fulfilling professional life? To what extent is this a realistic assessment? Have my feelings about my current job distorted my understanding of law school or future legal work?

More than either the Group A or Group B applicant, the member of Group C must contend with complex issues regarding family life. Two sub-issues arise here: time and finances. The adult student is more often than not the parent of growing children who require a substantial chunk of his/her time. A serious commitment to law school places substantial demands on time, a situation that is exacerbated if the adult student is pursuing legal studies on a part-time basis while holding a job (a not unlikely scenario). Family finances can also be placed in serious jeopardy if proper planning hasn't been done. The questions that often arise are: What are the sacrifices of each member of my family if I choose to pursue legal studies? Is everyone in the family (adults as well as children) aware of the significant changes in everyday responsibilities that will result from this new direction? Have I adequately planned for this major reorganization of my priorities and my time?

Should the adult learner consider law school in this day and age of rising tuition and ceaseless talk of the legal profession being overcrowded? My answer to this question is also yes. Severe competition can be a formidable obstacle to overcome, particularly if one is not lucky enough to attend a first tier law school and consequently may be facing a hostile job market upon graduation. The rewards can nonetheless be quite impressive as well, including an education in a field which does have a noble history and which continues to grow at a steady pace. A legal education can also lead to venues other than the practice of law. (Note that 25-35 percent of current CEO's in the U.S. hold law degrees.) And, the legal trade – arguably more than any other profession – still does hold the promise of making a difference and having an impact on our lives.

Ultimately, a legal education and a license to practice law are only tools – but valuable ones, that can be instrumental in bringing about positive change and growth. It is worthwhile remembering that such tools can only come to life through practitioners who must enter the law from every segment of our society, including the adult students whose on-going contributions to the profession – and to the country – are so critical. But our students who are contemplating this shift in their lives must not forget that they have to grapple with their responses to the kinds of questions introduced above. It is only in so doing that they can seriously and honestly arrive at a conclusion about this most significant planning decision.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

“Just Changing My Job Conditions” – A Conversation with Lois Muzio

Alan Mandell, Metropolitan Center

Editor’s Note: On 25 February 98, I met with Lois Muzio to discuss Empire State College, her life as a mentor over the last 24 years, and her perceptions of the College and its direction. A jointly edited version of our conversation is included here.

LM: The first thing is a basic fact. From the beginning, I really loved working at Empire State College. I loved working with students: constructing studies, creating patterns of learning, and focusing on what students needed as individuals and shaping studies to suit them. When I first came and found that was what it was, it just blew my mind away, and I have stuck with that feeling.

AM: Prior to coming to ESC what were you doing?

L: I was teaching at a community college – part of the CUNY system. I was looking for another job when I heard about ESC. It seemed so unusual, but I thought I would try it out by working one day a week, which I did. I think it was after about four weeks when I knew this was for me.

A: What were you doing at CUNY?

L: I was teaching in a program where there were 1500 students in exactly the same program of studies. Every teacher had to do exactly the same thing. We were handed an outline of what we had to cover in the classroom. You had no idea what the students needed. You just got in the classroom and taught the class. That was it. Students took the notes, faculty got involved in making the examinations, and students took the exams from somebody else. The only students I got to see and interact with on an individual basis were the ten students I had in the clinical laboratory twice a week.

A: This was a nursing program?

L: Yes. I was happy to teach these students at the college level (I had previously taught in a hospital- based program), but I wasn’t happy with the structure. I just didn’t agree with the information-feeding approach. I didn’t agree that this is how nursing should be taught, but I also had no choice at all. There were 10 or 15 sections of the same course. Every student had to meet the same objectives in the same manner.

A: And then Empire State College.

L: There was one student at a time, I got to know the student, I got to know what that student was thinking, what that student knew, what that student didn’t know. It was another world. I loved it.

A: At what was then called the Lower Hudson Unit, there was a real interest in connecting a student’s life history, and particularly a student’s work and career experience, with new academic work. That seemed a key part of the orientation of

the faculty.

L: We were working under a grant and we achieved the purposes of that grant. But I think we could have done even better than we did. I'm not sure how career-oriented the program ever really got to be. How many new experiences did we really set up for students? There were too many careers to address with too few people in too short a time. I think we relied a great deal on what the student brought to the program – on prior learning.

A: But there was a specific attitude about that experiential learning that did make a difference.

L: I think we wanted to look at the student and find the college-level learning the student presented, regardless of what that was and what shape it was in. There was a commitment to looking at the student, not just at the topics. There wasn't a great interest in determining whether the student fit into a preconstructed knowledge or skill component or not. We were working from the other direction. What did the student know? What did the student not know? What could it be called? How could it be incorporated into a program effectively without creating redundancy? It was an important perspective to have.

A: And this perspective continues to guide our work?

L: In some ways; but I think the College has changed and continues to change. It is one of the reasons I felt comfortable about retiring. The College has gone in the direction of so many other systems. Decisions are made based on costs. This is what determines whether studies are done or whether students are served in one way or another. Students may come with certain knowledge. It may never get evaluated for prior learning because it doesn't fit into cost effective patterns.

A: Is this pragmatism and a response to a changed fiscal context for a public institution, or do you see this as reflective of a philosophical shift?

L: I'm not sure if it is a shift that people will attest to. But if you look at where the college is putting its money; if you look at the direction of activities, then it seems to me that we are supporting things that are planned around a topic and not around the needs of any particular student. So the individualization is falling aside to the construction of studies whether these are study groups, distance learning courses, or programs designed for a specific agency or company. We still have individualization in regard to degree program planning, but even that is slowly diminishing. The pressure of costs seems to be overwhelming.

A: Aren't there limits to individualization as an approach? Don't we miss opportunities to help students learn what they might need to learn if we see the individual as our basic guide? Don't students who come out of institutions with more explicit expectations, for example of foundation studies in the liberal arts and sciences, develop broader college programs?

L: How do we know this to be true? What research do you have to show this to be the case? We *don't* know. There are those of us who think that paying attention first to the individual – not ignoring the system – but helping the individual first focus on what that individual needs to learn. This is very different than beginning with the needs of the system. No one has proved that one direction has a great advantage over the other. We don't have any evidence to support that. We do know that there are particular students who would flourish under one approach and particular students who would flourish under another approach. For example, we do sometimes get a student who comes to ESC and it becomes apparent that this particular student belongs at a traditional college. There are plenty of traditional colleges to provide the kind of preset, preplanned approach based upon the disciplines. If ESC wants to move in that direction – which I see over the years that we have been drawn to by the gravity of that larger body – why distinguish ourselves at all? If we move in that direction there is no need for Empire State College as far as I am concerned. There are plenty of colleges that are doing that same job much better.

A: We have to find ways to accent our distinctiveness. It certainly cannot be in the institutional resources and academic infrastructure that we can provide our students.

L: What is our advantage? I think our advantage is to be able to meet with one student, to get to know that person, to get to

know the strengths and weaknesses of that person's background of knowledge, that student's ability to reason and problem-solve, that student's ability to write clearly and communicate. Those are all pieces that belong in the construction of contracts. You don't do that in traditional colleges. And that is essentially what I have cared most about since I came here.

A: How about your life as a professional at ESC – your identity as a teacher and mentor?

L: When I finished my program at Teacher's College, I had a group of colleagues, all of whom were making almost double of what I made here at ESC. I probably would have been in that group. Most of them also have ulcers, their marriages have failed, and they are under enormous pressure because they run various programs in the economically plagued health care system. I chose something that was more personal. And intellectually, this has been much better for me. I have always had new things to read, new ideas to incorporate, and a much wider variety of topics to explore with my students.

A: But you have also always had an identity as a professional in your field outside of ESC.

L: I have made an effort to connect myself to groups outside of the College. I chaired the nursing group for the UUP, I taught at the University of Hawaii while on leave for a year from ESC where I helped them develop a distance learning program, I did some clinical work in a hospital in New Jersey, and now I am involved in a program in Zambia to establish continuing education programs for midwives and nurses. So yes, I always wanted to keep my connection to the nursing community which has been very important to me. I have been able to make a variety of contributions.

A: And how about your sense of your own expertise? Isn't part of our effort to do more groups or to develop more pre-planned programs or to write wonderful courses, part of our desire to redefine our own sense of being experts in something?

L: No. I think that what faculty are doing is recreating their own experiences in a learning situation rather than trying to create the experiences for students that are appropriate to group work in a setting like this. We aren't doing that enough. We are constructing typical courses. For example, in contract over the last year I have been meeting with a small group of students. The general topic was health in the workplace. We began with a problem that we had to address; and it had to be done in a research form. So we did the research together. What was also important was that the research we were doing also benefited an outside organization; so people from that organization were involved too. So it was a "real world" situation that our students could get involved in. And they did a lot of work and they learned a great deal.

I think there are endless possibilities for creating these kinds of educational experiences in our kind of setting. I'm now planning one about cancer. The key to my plan is that the students will be educating each other. The production – or reproduction – of courses is not what I believe we should be doing.

A: Perhaps this is another one of our advantages as an institution.

L: Yes. We can put together something that is coherent and that addresses issues of the moment. While individual faculty at other institutions can do this in a particular course, it's not done on the level of curriculum. Those changes are incredibly cumbersome and can take years. There is no other school that has the flexibility we do, and we don't use this advantage. It's one of the reasons that I'm looking forward to this new group on cancer. I have had it in my mind for years but I haven't had the time to do the necessary preparation.

A: Do you find that the preparation for this kind of group is different than if you were to teach a more conventional course on cancer?

L: For a course you prepare everything, and almost everything is done before you offer the course. It's a package; a neat package. That's the ideal. When you offer an experience, you're not preparing a neat package but something that is much broader for yourself. And then, it doesn't end when the group starts. The preparation continues because the group then takes part in the very construction of that study.

A: The kind of open-ended activity that you are describing is also demanding for the students who participate; or at least it brings with it a very particular set of expectations. Do you think our current ESC students are interested in this kind of work? Have our students changed over the years?

L: To a certain extent I think it is true. Our students have changed. And the change is connected to the kind of system-oriented thinking we spoke about earlier. Students are interested in the end product – to the document, to the certificate, to the degree. This is part of our society and the values that define our lives. But I see this in the College as well. The College is doing exactly the same thing. We are following the same pattern that the health care system has followed. It comes down to the question of cost. That is our measure. If it doesn't bring in any money or if it costs too much, it's not good.

A: What do you think an experimenting college should look like now in 1998? For example, if someone gave you the money and the opportunity to begin again, what would you do? Would you recreate ESC?

L: I don't know exactly what I would do. But there are a couple of things I like the idea of – I haven't seen much of it, but the idea is important. For example, I like the idea of students getting involved in teaching – in teaching other students, informing one another, challenging one another. And I also think we have so many opportunities to use technology now that we never had before. Access to information and to others is fantastic on the computer. We just don't use it, or when we use it we don't use it well.

A: And you think this could further the kind of individualization and focus on the particular learner about which you spoke earlier?

L: Absolutely. I think that the computer has the potential for absolute individualization. We assume that the technology and individualization don't match each other. It's completely wrong; a false dichotomy. I have a whole group of students on the computer. They can be involved with each other, they can be involved with me. I know when they are online. I can tell them to go to bed when they are online at 2:00 in the morning! I can do a search and send a student some information that can help her. I can set up a chat room with a group of students at the drop of a pin. If an idea comes up, I can say – let's chat about this or that. And we'll do it. It's a wonderful tool for individualization. It's great.

A: In all of these areas we just seem to be stuck in the dichotomy between the pre-set – the fully worked-out – and the individualized.

L: Here again is the false dichotomy. If we can take the outcomes that are not individual and bring those together with the process that has to be individual, we have the best of both worlds. I believe in defining outcomes, and I always do have outcomes for students. Even if they are going to come back in a week, we discuss what their outcomes should be. I don't see outcomes defined in most tutorials, study groups or in distance learning courses. What is supposed to be achieved? What should the student be learning? The process of getting to that outcome can be quite different depending on the student. That's where the individualization comes in.

A: You are really asking about a return to "evaluative criteria" which are the part of the learning contract that we have probably most neglected, if not completely lost.

L: We do just what they do in traditional colleges. We hold time constant and let outcomes vary. I don't believe in that. I believe in holding outcomes constant and letting time vary. We do this with students. As mentors we try to provide this flexibility. But as an institution we don't. I know we can do a lot more with outcomes that – and here we are back to technology – can absolutely be supported with good software. For example, we need software that would allow a mentor to "select" outcomes in terms of knowledge, outcomes in terms of application, outcomes in terms of analysis or synthesis. This is the kind of technology that can really support individualization and would support a mentor in constructing a study with a particular student.

A: What are your thoughts about ESC and your mentoring life now that you have retired?

L: There are many things I've never had the time or energy to put together for my students. I just couldn't have done it as

a full time mentor because as a typical mentor the demands on our time are just too great. So retirement is giving me this opportunity to work at ESC as I would like to work, to do the projects I want to do. I'm not retiring; I'm just changing my job conditions! But I do want to make another point. A great attraction of this College to me has been the terribly important set of relationships I have developed at the College. I have cherished the people I have known here. The community has always been more significant to me than the money. And this is why it disturbs me so much that our world, whether in health care or higher education or at ESC, is so dominated by money and cost-based decisions. We have to find another way.

The "key characteristics" of adult learners:

- 1) Adults are motivated to learn as they experience needs and interests learning will satisfy; therefore, these are the appropriate starting points for organizing such activities.
- 2) Adults' orientation to learning is life-centered; therefore, the appropriate units for organizing adult learning are life situations, not subjects.
- 3) Experience is the richest resource for adults' learning; therefore, the core methodology of adult education is the analysis of experience.
- 4) Adults have a deep need to be self-directing; therefore, the role of the instructor is to engage in a process of mutual inquiry with them rather than to transmit personal expert knowledge and then evaluate their acquisition of it.
- 5) Individual differences among people increase with age; therefore, adult education must make optimal provision for differences in style, time, place and pace of learning.

Knowles, *Andragogy in Action* (1984)

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

What Scholarship Does for My Teaching, or, How to Turn Students into Intellectual Adventurers **Carol Turbin, Long Island Center**

Much of what I can say about the relationship between scholarship and teaching seems like a cliché. It goes without saying that I am fortunate to be able to write about this topic, as I have had leaves of absences (including outside funding) that have enabled me to develop as a scholar, to complete a book and numerous articles, and to teach at other institutions. It goes without saying that active engagement in scholarship and occasionally teaching at other institutions keeps me up-to-date on the latest developments in teaching fields, keeps ideas about my field close to the surface of my consciousness, and generates intellectual challenges that give me renewed energy and enthusiasm for teaching at ESC. I could relate my excitement about new perspectives on old teaching fields and I could detail ways that my research and experiences in other settings have helped me to rework contracts and create new ones that incorporate exciting new social science issues. I could chronicle the delight of discovering new books that convey abstract ideas in language comprehensible to undergraduates, and describe the times that I find myself thinking about ideas that I exchange with students when I am engaged in very different pursuits. I could describe the excitement expressed by students when they discover their teacher's published work in a library book, and the moments when students' insights suggest ideas to pursue in my research.

However, I think I'll leave the above for my personnel reports. Instead, I want to describe an aspect of the connection between teaching and scholarship that is often neglected yet is more fundamental to the way we work at ESC than most other undergraduate institutions. Like most of the more interesting of life's challenges, this one is related to a dilemma.

Recently an ESC student who is particularly independent confided to me that she finds herself trying to do well in her studies by pleasing her teacher but that she learns much more and produces better work when she pleases herself. I realized that her insight is a piece of an important challenge for ESC students; that is, to find a way to learn from their mentors and at the same time to discover their own goals and how to reach them. College mentors face an equivalent dilemma: how to find ways to give students the background knowledge and skills they need to prepare them for future studies or other goals, and at the same time to foster independent thinking and learning. The difficulty is that the two parts of these challenges are potentially contradictory. Students depend on mentors' guidance (and evaluation of their work). Yet if students are too dependent and limit themselves to learning what mentors can teach them, they risk not learning how to acquire knowledge on their own and develop their own conclusions. The special challenge of ESC mentors is to know how to foster independent learning and thinking.

My scholarly work helps me to teach students independent learning because at the heart of independent learning and thinking are the fundamental requirements of an adventure. This is particularly apparent to me at the moment because I have embarked on a new research project, the relationship between dress and social distinctions (in the U.S. from the late 19th to mid- 20th century) particularly as manifested by changes in the social significance of bodily movements, gesture, bearing and posture. Some aspects of this research build on previous training, especially my knowledge of social class, gender studies, and my early work in fine arts and art history. But much is new, and sometimes I feel as my students often do, uncomfortably inexperienced. But unlike my students, I'm familiar with the feeling and I know that this discomfort is a motivation to strive to improve abilities, to gain confidence. More important, I know that uneasiness is a component of

facing the unknown and is accompanied by the excitement of exploring new territory.

My scholarship has taught me not only to appreciate the excitement and fulfillment of intellectual quests but also to fully understand the components of the adventure. This understanding has helped me to convey the process of research to students. I think of the adventure of research as analogous to finding one's way in territory that is largely mapped but includes unexplored areas. The adventurer assumes that the new terrain has some characteristics of the old but is motivated by curiosity of the unknown, the anticipation of finding enticing new perspectives; for example, previously unseen macro viewpoints from mountain peaks, micro views in dense forests or open plains or deserts, or perhaps previously hidden or veiled origins of familiar terrain. Mastering what is already known is as important as motivation to explore. In order to satisfy his or her curiosity, the adventurer must thoroughly learn the already explored and mapped territory and must master the tools and become skilled in methods and approaches of previous explorers. For many students, this is enough. They are not ready to explore on their own. But others are motivated to consider which aspect of unexplored terrain they wish to explore and to select the paved road that leads to less well-known roads and then to the unpaved paths to unknown territory. Some may also reach the point of learning to make their own maps, and if necessary to devise new tools and methods. Many experienced explorers plunge directly into little-known areas, but students or novices must test their skills as they explore, building on the explorations of others until they feel ready to go it alone.

As an ESC mentor I have learned that my most obvious role is to engender curiosity and motivation to explore, to provide good maps, to encourage students to have confidence in their decisions about which territory to explore, and to supply the necessary tools, skills and knowledge of methods. I have learned from my research that it is equally important that students must be willing to take risks and to persevere despite obstacles and setbacks. They must be patient as well as enthusiastic, disciplined as well as spontaneous, and be prepared for disappointments, frustration and discouragement, as well as delight, pride and satisfaction. I counsel students to be prepared for many possible outcomes. They may be lucky and find the sources they need right away that help them craft an argument for an effective research paper. But most are not so lucky. Both novice and expert explorers often spend patient hours hunting for sources that are useless, or take roads that seem to lead nowhere. They might find blind alleys or other obstacles and thus must retrace their steps and start again. Just as revising and correcting mistakes is essential to good writing, taking the wrong path and scaling arduous peaks that do not reveal the expected goal on the other side is fundamental to independent learning and good scholarship. What is important is to appreciate the journey for itself and not to have rigid, predetermined goals about the end result. The independent learner knows that more often than not the blind alleys are intriguing in themselves, and overcoming unforeseen obstacles that turn out to be unrelated to the final project helps to hone skills that will prove to be useful in the future.

As a researcher, I am often immersed in esoteric details which are of interest to only a few others who share my special fascinations. However, that researchers in vastly different fields share this view of scholarship as an adventure serves as a reminder of what I have in common with my students and ESC colleagues with divergent interests and perspectives. This is an important thread that connects us all together.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

In Memoriam – Joseph Goldberg

On November 23, relatives, colleagues, students and friends gathered at the Henry Street Settlement Playhouse on New York City's Lower East Side to celebrate the life of Joe Goldberg who died on May 10. More than 30 people who had been touched by Joe's generosity, caring, intelligence and wonderful insight offered their words and voices. Clearly, Joe had deeply inspired so many people from so many parts of his life.

Among the personal reflections, poems, songs, film-clips (of Chaplin's "Modern Times") and music that were presented was a Yiddish poem, "Glatt Azoi" by M.L. Halpern read by Mentors Lucy Winner and Leslie Satin. They read the first few lines in Yiddish and then the full poem in translation:

Glatt Azoi

Hut Moyshe Labye zich anidergeshtelt
In mitten der nacht tzu dertrachtn di velt
Hert air tzum aigenum trachtn zikh ein
Shepshet eem emetz in oyer arhine.

Just Because

Moyshe Leyb stood up
in the middle of the night to think out the world.
He listens to his own thinking –
someone whispers in his ear
that everything is straight and everything is crooked
and that the world spins around everything.
Moyshe Leyb picks at a straw with his nails
Why?
Just because.

He picks at a straw in the night,
and then he has another thought.
He thinks – he listens again –
someone whispers in his ear
that nothing is straight and nothing is crooked
and that the world spins around nothing.
Moyshe Leyb picks at a straw with his nails
and smiles.
Why?
Just because.

As the biography in the celebration program concluded: “Joe was a man of great honor who is profoundly missed by his family, friends, colleagues and his many students.” And guided by Joe’s faith in community and his abiding belief in the power of song, we ended the afternoon by singing, “The Little Light of Mine.” We think of him often and miss him dearly.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

Sabbatical Report, 1997

Reed Coughlan, Central New York Center

Sabbatical leaves are never long enough. Fortunately I knew that in advance and didn't come away disappointed with what I was able to accomplish. I read widely and initiated a number of projects which emerged from my interests in ethnic identity and conflict. I developed three separate versions of a study group titled Ethnic Conflict and World Politics. This project immersed me in reading case studies of a variety of ethnic conflicts like those in the Middle East, Bosnia, Northern Ireland and Sri Lanka. It also led me to read widely in the field of international relations. I had originally developed this reading interest while I was working on putting together a study guide for an examination for Regents College, "International Conflicts in the Twentieth Century." I created one version of this study for undergraduates, one for graduate students at a distance, and one version for international students, again to be delivered at a distance.

A second project entailed reading and research in the area of constitutional federalism. I had been asked by a colleague, a Tamil member of Parliament in Sri Lanka, to contribute a chapter to a volume on comparative federalism. Actually, I was asked to write this essay because of my prior work and writing on Cyprus, not because I knew much about federalism. I knew that the United Nations had been trying to bring about a federal settlement on Cyprus since 1974 when the two populations were separated as a result of the intervention of Turkish troops and the partition of the island between the Turkish sector in the North (37 percent of the territory) and the Greek Republic in the South.¹ A good deal of my research and writing over the last seven years (when I first became interested in this case) has been focused on discovering why a settlement has been so elusive. Although I am familiar with the history and current situation in Cyprus, I was not conversant with the literature on federalism. I was astonished to discover in the course of my research for this paper that there is a broad consensus among federalism scholars that two unit federations are simply not viable.

The argument I developed in the paper I have now written on federalism in Cyprus has some serious policy implications. Following a discussion of the historical contexts of the conflict between the Greeks and Turks on the island, I analyze the conditions under which consociational forms of governance are known to work effectively. This type of governance involves power sharing through coalition rule. Drawing on the work of Lijphart and others, I argue that the consociational experiment which collapsed in civil war in 1963 could not have been expected to survive because of the structure of Cypriot society, comprised as it was of two highly segmented and unequal elements. Even though the two ethnic populations were geographically interspersed, Cypriot nationalism was virtually nonexistent and there were, therefore, no overarching loyalties which could counteract the divisive consequences of Greek and Turkish antagonisms.

In 1974, when the pro Enosis (Enosis is the term given to the movement to unite Cyprus with Greece) military dictatorship in Athens overthrew Makarios, the Greek Cypriot president of the Republic, Turkey intervened militarily, taking over a third of the island in the north. This forced a subsequent exchange of populations; the Greeks fled to the South, the Turks flocked to the North. This also created, for the first time, an opportunity to consider the development of a territorially based federation. Since 1975 the United Nations has sponsored intercommunal negotiations aimed at the formation of a bizonal, bicommunal federation.

Having sketched out these developments, my analysis then moves to a consideration of the preconditions for successful federal arrangements. John Stuart Mill identified three: he said that there needs to be mutual sympathy between the populations, a degree of mutual need, and the assurance that one unit will not dominate the others. I develop the argument that actually none of these conditions exist in Cyprus. Mutual sympathy is conspicuous by its absence, there is little mutual need for a federation, and it is precisely the conviction that the Greeks would dominate them which has persuaded the Turkish Cypriots that they don't want a federal settlement.

Other more contemporary theorists agree with Mill. Maurice Vile who goes so far as to suggest that a federation with two unequal segments could not possibly survive because "federal systems operate on the basis of the bargaining between shifting coalitions of groups, bringing about compromises because no single group or coalition of groups is in a continually dominant position. The danger of an irreconcilable confrontation between the units in a two unit federation is so great that sooner or later it would lead to civil war, secession, or both."² This is all the more likely, says Vile, if one of the units in a two unit federation is in a dominant position. The dominant member state, says Vile, will effectively run the show much like a unitary state. That was precisely what the Greek Cypriots tried to achieve when Makarios proposed amendments to the constitution in 1963. The Turkish Cypriots responded just as Vile would have predicted. I then delineate the economic and political inequalities between the Turks and the Greeks and conclude that the recent and growing economic gap between the two communities suggests that there has never been a less propitious time to consider a federation. The economic squeeze on the Turkish Cypriots began to tighten in the early 1980s. After the declaration of independence by the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) in 1983, the Greek Cypriot Republic developed new customs regulations which stipulated that only Cypriot goods bearing the certificates of origin and health issued by the Greek Republic should be accepted in the European Economic Community. Most member nations initially ignored this effort to block Turkish Cypriot goods from European markets. In fact, European markets accounted for 74 percent of the agricultural exports (citrus and potatoes mostly) from TRNC in 1993. But, in 1994, the European Court of Justice ruled that agricultural products from Cyprus were indeed required to bear the government certificates, and that manufactured goods from the TRNC would now be subject to additional tariffs customarily levied on goods from countries outside of the protective umbrella of the European Union. This ruling, which is still in effect, has been enormously damaging to the economy in the North.

The lack of markets is strangling the textile sector as well as agriculture in the TRNC. These difficulties are compounded by extremely high rates of inflation (as high as 200 percent in recent years) which is a function of the TRNC tie to the Turkish lira. Hyper-inflation causes severe problems for farmers who are unable to repay loans they take out to purchase seeds and fertilizers, nor can they afford the price of tractors and other equipment. The result is that much of the arable land in the North lies fallow. Unemployment in the TRNC is reported at 17 to 25 percent. These problems are highlighted by comparisons with the South where the economy is booming, unemployment is virtually nonexistent and incomes are rising. Recent figures are striking. For example, in the second quarter of 1996 per capita income for Turkish Cypriots was reported at \$3,000 compared to \$14,000 in the South. The gap between North and South is growing. One consequence is the increasing emigration of Turkish Cypriots from the TRNC. It is, thus, clear that the inequalities between the two communities on the island would make it very difficult to implement a federal settlement. Importantly, this also leads to the conclusion that the continuation of the UN mediated talks is a waste of time. Further efforts to secure a federal government for the island fly in the face of what we know about federations elsewhere in the world and what we know about Cyprus in particular. If my analysis is correct then we would have to consider other goals and outcomes for Cyprus.

Late last month I presented my paper at a conference in the Hague. The conference was sponsored by the Ford Foundation, the International Center for Ethnic Studies in Sri Lanka and the Institute for Social Studies in the Hague with a view to the publication of an edited volume on comparative federalism. The project sought to "examine the distinguishing characteristics of ethnically based federations, to study the utility and viability of the federal device in managing ethnic tensions, and to articulate the new challenges and demands faced by federal forms of devolution in plural societies."

I have sent a copy of my paper to the American ambassador in Cyprus, Ken Brill, whom I met last year and who has told me he would read and comment on anything I write. I will urge the ambassador to forward a copy of my paper, if he finds it persuasive, to Richard Holbrooke who has been appointed by Clinton to serve as presidential envoy to Cyprus. I have also sent a copy to Gus Fiessel, the resident representative of the United Nations on Cyprus. I have met with him a couple

of times over the last several years. I plan to travel to Cyprus this spring and will arrange interviews with both of them.

Initial feedback, besides a very positive reception at the conference in the Hague, came from the Cyprus desk officer at the United Nations in New York who had a strongly negative reaction. Her response was to try to persuade me to bury the paper because it may contribute to the Turkish Cypriot determination to resist a federal settlement. She asked me if I thought it was moral (I think she meant ethical) to publish a paper which could contribute so palpably to derailing a federal settlement. I told her that I had come across the literature on federalism solely because a colleague had invited me to write a paper on the topic not because I was looking for an argument which would help one side or the other. It was never part of the sabbatical plan to legitimize the political position of either group on the island. It is nonetheless true that the Greek Cypriots aspire to a strong federal government and the Turkish Cypriots have resisted that. The Turkish Cypriots would prefer a very loose arrangement, a confederation, under which the two constituent units retain responsibility for their own affairs. In fact, my paper concludes with the notion that a confederation might be possible as a result of a deal in which the Turkish Cypriots cede part of the territory under their control to the Greeks in exchange for getting the embargo lifted and for international recognition and sovereignty. This is a recommendation which many will regard as favorable to the Turkish Cypriots but it flows logically out of the argument and is not driven by an ethnic bias. Yet this is where scholarship collides with politics. Ironically, when I set out to research this topic I actually thought it would prove fairly innocuous and boring. Federalism? In Cyprus?

This study of a vexing political situation which affects many peoples lives highlights the dilemmas of ethics, politics and scholarship. My paper apparently has some significance beyond that of a purely scholarly work. As a result, some of the knotty and difficult ethical dilemmas associated with responsibilities of the scholar have become personally relevant and immediately compelling. My position, that reunification of the island is highly unlikely, will probably prove unpopular with the entire international community both because the UN has been working toward a federal solution for 23 years and because of the pervasive bias against the break up of nation states. As Samuel Huntington points out, the contemporary international taboo against secession, or political divorce,” is just about as strong as the 19th century bias against marital divorce.”³ The Desk Officer at the United Nations certainly made her position clear. The United Nations is, after all, a community of nation states (of which the Greek Cypriot Republic is a member, and the break away TRNC is not) and as such, is especially apt to disapprove of partition.

Future work growing out of the federalism paper will necessarily involve an exploration of other options for a settlement on Cyprus. That paper was actually the only project which reached completion, but there are several more in the works. I have been invited to contribute a volume to the series “Sources for a History of Cyprus,” edited by Paul Wallace at SUNY Albany, and I have a good deal of data which I gathered as a result of field trips to archives on both sides of the island during my sabbatical. Other projects include an essay on British justice in Cyprus, a paper on the treatment of Christians in the Ottoman Empire and the impact this had on British foreign policy in the late 19th century, and a book which provides a revisionist interpretation of the history of Cyprus. But all of that will have to wait for the next opportunity that comes my way for a little uninterrupted reading and writing.

Notes:

1) The island of Cyprus and its capital city, Nicosia, are divided by the so-called “greenline” which is patrolled by UN peace keeping troops. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus occupies the northern third; Greek Cypriots control the internationally recognized Republic of Cyprus in the south. The two populations were separated in 1974 as a result of the intervention of the Turkish army after the military dictatorship in Athens sponsored a coup which overthrew Greek Cypriot President Makarios. These events brought closure to intercommunal violence which had erupted in 1963 when the two communities could not agree on a slew of issues associated with the constitution which had been handed to Cyprus on the occasion of her independence from Britain three years earlier.

2) Vile, Maurice, J.C., “Federation and Confederation: The Experience of the United States and The British Commonwealth,” *Political Co-Operation in Divided Societies*, ed. Desmond Rea (Dublin: Gill and Macmillian, 1982), p.222.

3) Huntington, Samuel, “Foreword” to Eric A. Nordlinger, *Conflict Regulation in Divided Societies* (Cambridge, Mass:

Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, 1972), p. vii.

ALL ABOUT

MENTORING

A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

Mentoring in FORUM/East: Some Unique Aspects

Andrew Di Nitto, FORUM/East

Although mentoring throughout the myriad of ESC programs has obvious common elements, it is sufficiently different in the FORUM/East (F/E) program to engender interest and discussion. Given the limited space available, the purpose here is simply to identify some of the more salient differences in order to inform our colleagues and to generate college-wide discussions.

The two most important pieces of information that the reader needs to know are: all of our students are middle-level managers mostly sponsored by their employers, and the program is based on three residencies per term. The first provides the mentors a pedagogical challenge; the second a delivery opportunity. Both shape the mentoring role.

The approximately 190 students are successful middle managers drawn from over 30 private corporations and business. Some come from non-profit organizations. Each has been identified by her employer as having growth potential in the organization. The number of people these managers supervise ranges from a few to several hundred. Some administer budgets in the millions. As one can imagine, students bring into the program a great deal of company-based training and professional experience. In fact, the average F/E student earns 30-34 Credits by Evaluation (CBEs).

Helping students to identify potential management and technical CBE components is especially challenging for liberal arts and science faculty members with little or no background in the area of BM&E and SM&T. However, experience, coupled with the substantially similar background of students in the program, enables mentors to identify certain recurring patterns. Also, as a program faculty, we often consult with each other to make sure we are getting expert advice for our students. A great help to F/E mentors has been the establishment of the Assessment Center within Collegewide Programs and the on-site presence of expert evaluators during the weekend residencies.

Hence, once students and mentors have identified potential components to be evaluated, students meet with said evaluators and have face-to-face discussions with them. Of course, the key component of the mentor's role is to assist the student in developing a degree plan that is both academically sound and professionally useful to the individual. In doing so, F/E mentors have been strongly influenced by the pedagogy of its first director, Mike Fortunato. F/E has operated under the assumption that the educational needs of an experienced middle-level manager are substantially different from those of a 20 year old student at a traditional institution seeking a business degree and hoping to land an entry-level job in an organization. The younger, traditional student is expected to keep his/her options open by studying the skills required for entry level jobs in each of the functions of the business enterprise: human resources, finance, marketing, accounting, operations, systems, etc. However, such an approach "does not make sense for a 40 year old middle manager in the human resources area! In fact, the 40 year old HR manager is not interested in an entry level job in any of the functional areas of the business!" (Fortunato, "Andragogy and Middle Managers")

Consequently, mentors need to keep in mind that whether the student has knowledge in all or most functional areas of an organization becomes a moot point. The middle manager is obviously not interested in starting over but rather wants to advance in her/his field. In guiding students through the educational planning process, the mission of the F/E mentor is

thus to help students “to develop the professionally narrower skill set which they need to advance in their chosen specialty” (Fortunato) while providing them just enough information about the functions and operations of other departments in order for them to communicate effectively with other professionals.

Unfortunately, for some, this pedagogy has created the perception that it creates degree programs that are too narrow, especially when compared to degrees offered by traditional colleges. Though there is continuous discussion among F/E mentors about this perception, a general consensus has been shaped around two arguments. The first is that the liberal arts demands of the degree encourage and often force students into disciplines to which they would never have exposed. When advising and serving on assessment committees, mentors meticulously adhere to the liberal credits guidelines.

Moreover, the program has placed great emphasis on writing and communication skills. Particular attention is paid by mentors to identify and encourage students in studies with writing components. In addition, under the direction of Elaine Handley, F/E has developed an array of resources not only to help students with deficient skills but to encourage the development of whatever writing potentials students may have. These include the Writer’s Complex (on the VAX), two writing consultants constantly available during residencies, writing workshops, and the bi-annual publication of the *Forum Chronicle*, a student run publication which publishes students’ and faculty’s writings.

Second, in some very fundamental ways, the general BM&E degree as structured by F/E students is broader than the degree of his/her younger counterpart at a traditional institution. As Fortunato wrote, “The entry level student is learning basic functional skills; the 40 year old is learning about organizations, markets, countries, financial and regulatory bodies; people, motivation, leadership and vision; cultural diversity and its real impacts; communication; technology and change. These are the mind-expanding roles of management that are broader at higher levels of the organizations.”

To serve some of the particular needs of our students, F/E has been building and developing competency-based management education since 1993. This model has already been described in *Exchange* by the coordinator of the program, Alan Belasen (*Exchange*, January 9, 1997, p.2). Here let it suffice to say that the theoretical framework on which F/E’s competency-based education is based is the Competing Values Framework. This framework integrates four (competing) management models: Rational Goal, Open System, Internal Processes and Human Relations. Each of the emphases of these models are seen as relevant to the effectiveness of an organization, yet the different emphases inherent in these models create a tension and the need for a balancing of the competing values of each. For example, organizations need to be concerned with both flexibility/adaptability and control/stability. Another tension exists between external focus and internal focus.

Another Forum-specific development has been the publication of the *Management Development Forum*, an academic journal with the objective to “stimulate innovative thinking, share new developments and ideas, and report on new techniques and intervention programs relevant to managers.” Alan Belasen is the editor-in-chief and several F/E mentors serve on the editorial board.

As stated, mentoring and teaching are based on three residencies per term. Between residencies, the dialogues and discussions occur via telephone, mail and increasingly, e-mail and the web. The structure of the residencies further helps to define the role of the F/E mentor. During each residency the mentor’s responsibilities are to teach a study within her/his discipline, facilitate a debate team, and meet with his/her mentees. Each study meets for three and a half hours; meetings with the assigned debate team take up one and a half hours each Friday and Saturday evening, plus about four hours on Sunday morning. Commonly during these weekends, students hear presentations by invited academician, top level managers and artists; participate in workshops, and enjoy some traditional extra-curricula activities. To say the least, this makes for a very busy weekend. Meetings with mentees are scheduled when time is mutually available to both students and mentors. Given the tightness of the schedules, it is not unusual for mentoring meetings to be scheduled from before breakfast to past 10 p.m.

Sunday morning debates have become part of the institutional culture of the program. Every first year student collaborates with team members on the group analysis, strategy development, and debate of an academically substantial issue that is critical to future managers. Each participant takes personal responsibility for developing expertise in a well-defined portion of the group’s total research agenda and participates in and contributes to the public debate of an assigned position. Mentors are assigned to facilitate the entire process of a particular team and to assess the team building, writing

and research abilities of each member the team, as well as the team's ability to create and execute a debate strategy.

Given the constraints of time during the residencies, it is impossible for mentors to carry the traditional number of mentees carried by full-time mentors throughout the College. Therefore, other than the few with "administrative responsibilities," all other mentors are part timers or faculty with full-time positions, split between programs. This, coupled with the fact that F/E is pretty much a self-contained program, raises unique governance issues. All mentors are expected to attend the monthly F/E faculty meetings, held during weekdays, and to participate in the program's committee work, including assessment and personnel committees. These arrangements have created a double-edged sword: there is a perception that part-time mentors may be more involved and less alienated from the decision-making process than those in other parts of ESC. However, there may also be a perception that demands are being made on part timers to carry out full time governance duties without the benefits of the full time status.

Nevertheless, the strong general consensus of F/E mentors is that we are part of a vibrant and cutting edge program replete with challenges and rewards for both students and mentors.

Perhaps, Elaine Handley expressed the feelings of the F/E faculty best when she wrote:

"As a hybrid of sorts, the FORUM/East program incorporates some of the best aspects of traditional college's education with the personalized, student-centered advising that is the hallmark of ESC. We're a distance learning program with the benefits of meeting face-to-face with our students, three times a term. So far it has been an effective way to teach adults who have demanding full-time jobs and family responsibilities and yet who are eager and motivated to earn a degree and apply what they are learning to their everyday work lives."

"...people who take the initiative in learning (proactive learners) learn more things, and learn better than do people who sit at the feet of teachers waiting patiently to be taught (reactive learners). They enter into learning more purposefully and with greater motivation. They also tend to retain and make use of what they learn better and longer than do reactive learners."

Knowles, *Self-Directed Learning* (1975)

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

On Radicalism and Mentoring: A Conversation

Editor's Note: In the fall, Tom Grunfeld forwarded to Historical Studies mentors an "invitation" from the Radical History Review which was seeking essays on mentoring and its relationship to the teaching of "radical" history. This notice sparked a lively exchange at the Albany Area of Studies meeting and over the e-mail which dealt with such questions as: What does "radical" mean? Does mentoring invite radical inquiry? Does mentoring encourage our students to challenge authority? Are mentors radical? What follows is a sampling and significantly edited version of that exchange. We hope it will provide some insight into the conversation and to our thinking about teaching history and to mentoring practices across the disciplines. (Many thanks to Jim Wunsch, Historical Studies convener, and to all participants.)

Bob Seidel:

Wayne Willis and I had a conversation yesterday. I think the key questions are: whether our practice of doing history mentoring at ESC offers something genuinely radical; and, whether we can fruitfully engage in discussion of the central tenets undergirding the *Radical History Review's* approach – that radical history requires that students come to consciousness of and become willing to challenge existing configurations of power and distributions of resources and goods. I would simply pose the question this way: Does ESC mentoring in history tend toward liberation of individuals from prejudice, narrow-mindedness and relative ignorance in the direction of skepticism, new insights about evaluating information and so forth? Does this challenge power?

Charles DeMotte:

My dictionary defines "radical" as "going to the root or foundations of something fundamental." It would seem to me that the ways that we teach history at the College is often radical in this sense insofar as we shift the focus of learning from the expert model to the student-based model.

Jim Wunsch:

There is nothing inherently radical, in a cultural or political sense, to mentoring. If anything, the mentor, whether the governess, the Oxford don or Aristotle in the court of Philip of Macedon, has traditionally been the servant of reaction. Now as it happens, because ESC was founded in a period of anti-war fervor and because it could distinguish itself from other institutions by its utilization of independent study, it proved enormously attractive to instructors who considered themselves to be radical or progressive. Has our student body ever been as politically progressive as the faculty? Probably not. Shall we expect that radical mentors will teach radical history and conservative mentors the contrary? This is a pernicious idea. Do not impose thy values on the student. Mentoring, whether in historical studies or other disciplines should never be considered radical or otherwise. It is simply a neutral tool to examine ideas, beliefs, or in the case of history, the problem of change.

Chris Rounds:

I'm in total sympathy with most of Jim's observations, but I think it might be helpful to consider an alternative definition of radical as well. The attraction of the individual tutorial lies in the freedom it provides to build on interests the student already has. Thus, a Latin American history tutorial which begins with a text I assign can move on to address issues related to international trade for a student whose job takes him to Rio, and on women and community activism for a human services worker. Many of our students come to us firmly believing that history is boring and useless. With luck and patience, I can help them discover that history deals not just with generals and politicians, but also with communities and families. In this context, I see history as a tool in the "radicalization" of students who, often for the first time, begin to acknowledge their own rootedness in the history of immigration, industrialization and community.

Wayne Willis:

Several of us have now said that we are pedagogically radical, rather than radical in "content." I would argue, however, that this pedagogical radicalism is not only consistent with a broader political radicalism but is also far more oppositional to "existing patterns of power" in our society than is much ostensibly radical instruction offered by professors within traditional institutions. When we work with our students in a highly collaboratively, egalitarian manner, we are transforming the ordinary hierarchical relationship of professor and student, implicitly challenging other conventional authority relationships. In this way, whatever we call ourselves politically, we often come closer to the lived experience of "liberty, equality and fraternity" than do many faculty in traditional settings whose pedagogical conservatism is at odds with the politics of mass liberation that they affirm in their writings and lectures.

Marnie Evans:

I would add that I find Wayne's analysis nicely parallel to the discussion of "feminist pedagogy." In fact, I would argue that without radical pedagogy there is no true radicalism. Surely, students learn as much from what we "do" (and how we do it) as from what we "say."

Susan Hollis:

While we apparently may not seem radical in our content, by moving things out of the hierarchical, authoritative modality, and recognizing the validity of studying history from other than the privileged viewpoint of the elite, we are indeed "radical." I have engaged in some of this "coming to new consciousness" in reading Elizabeth Minnich's *Transforming Knowledge*. I wrote and presented a paper taking her model of Greek philosophy and asked questions about Egyptologists' approach to ancient Egyptian history and "whose" history it is. Is this "radical" history? It certainly does "challenge existing configurations of power."

Bob Carey:

My major question remains "radical" with respect to what? "Radicalism" is a large, spongy term that spreads in several directions. If it means opposition to current political patterns of power especially those shaped by capitalistic economies, then I would ask if the teaching of history grounded in such an apriori is the teaching of history at all. If radicalism registers a kind of feeling tone, having a list of current beliefs, of being for certain things and disliking other things, who isn't? Is pedagogy radical? Only to the extent that it fosters clarity, insight and the mastery of written and spoken English (in our case). Other attempts to argue that particular approaches are or are not radical confuse cause and effect rather badly.

Tom Grunfeld:

I do recall that when I came to the College in January, 1978, ESC was under censure from the AAUP for firing people active in organizing UUP. I presume these people were perceived as being "radical." And, for many years, the Metro Center was considered to be "radical." As Bob and others have suggested, it is a question of how we define the terms. Our pedagogy does make a significant contribution to social democracy and is more "radical" than most professors at traditional institutions. But I also don't think we break down the hierarchical relationships that much; certainly not enough to "challenge other conventional authority relationships."

Carol Turbin:

I associate radical history with the new social history which emerged in the 1970s. These social historians wanted to say something about society in their interpretations. By chronicling the lives of ordinary people they developed fresh approaches to the analyses of power and authority and also challenged the methodologies of generations of historians before them. I now find many students (undergraduate and graduate) who take this kind of social history for granted and think of it as a part of the canon which they must criticize. So I think the term “radical history” has become more problematic partly because social history is no longer new; it has gone through its own twists and turns and is questioned by new generations of historians. I’ve even noticed a recent interest in discussing the history of social history.

Charles DeMotte:

It seems to me that radical history is now neo-orthodoxy in many universities. When one listens, for example, to the debate over history standards that is currently being waged, it seems that the approach of looking at history from the “bottom” up is now fairly mainstream. My question then becomes: Do we really have a radical history today?

Rae Rohfeld:

While it’s true that social history, which incorporates the lives of previously excluded groups, is pretty well accepted, that, in itself, is not radical history. When we include groups with little power in our histories, we are more likely to deal with questions of power and distribution, but it is not necessarily the case. Many approach social history content in very different ways. Radical pedagogy involves realigning traditional study/faculty power relationships. It can support radical history, but it applies to other disciplines as well. I’m not convinced that mentoring is necessarily radical pedagogy. As others observed earlier in this discussion, mentoring has often served dominant groups, although many of us attempt to do otherwise. Certainly when we involve students in historical studies related to their experience, they are able to at least help pose the questions, and they may have some control over sources for study. But one-to-one mentoring relationships limit the power of students at the same time that they limit collaborative learning. Study groups can provide more support for students in altering power structures. These, of course, are not either/or things. Mentors can use groups to provide opportunities for students to alter power relationships. The real issue here is not how many people are involved, but what roles we foster for ourselves and for our students.

Jim Wunsch:

Thanks to all. Your convener should have been mindful (with authority under siege) that one who ventures to adjourn an ESC meeting prematurely – does so at his peril! Therefore, on this the glorious 29th of January – let us toast Tom Paine on his birthday, and celebrate too, all radicals, the dead and the quick.

“In all cases, a negotiation relationship between learners and instructors is established. This may be the deepest wedge of all in the traditional academic bastion, for it begins to redefine the role of the instructor away from totally controlling didactic teacher toward facilitator of learning who is willing to share control to some degree. But it also places a heavy responsibility on the instructor to be open and clear about what the boundaries of freedom are and why) and what his or her criteria for making evaluative judgments will be.

Knowles, *Using Learning Contracts* (1986)

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

The Fort Drum Unit

Joanne Corsica, Central New York Center

The Fort Drum Unit, opened in 1990, provides educational services to the military personnel of the U.S. Army's 10th Mountain Division stationed at Fort Drum, N.Y., their family members, and civilian employees working on the base. Empire State College educational services are also provided to retired and disabled service members resident in the Fort Drum/Watertown area, as well as local area civilian populations selecting the Fort Drum Unit as their ESC Unit of choice, and various categories of non-matriculated students from other institutions. The unit is housed, along with the SUNY Consortia offices and Army education counselors, in an old temporary Army barracks built circa 1940. The unit is a fast paced, dynamic and complex program which functions and interacts with three distinct cultures simultaneously: the U.S. Army, the SUNY Consortia of North Country Colleges, and the Central New York Center (CNY) of ESC.

In terms of uniform personnel alone, there are approximately 10,000 military personnel stationed at the base, and hence, a large potential market for ESC. During the course of the year, over 3,300 soldiers will transfer to other bases in the U.S. and abroad, and another 3,300 soldiers will transfer into Fort Drum from elsewhere. Over a three year period, a complete change of military personnel is possible, including the command structure; and obviously, the family members who move with the service member. In addition to geographical mobility, service members are subject to unpredictable periodic deployments (Gulf War, Somalia, Haiti, Hurricane Andrew Relief, etc.) of unknown duration. Family members often "go back home" when the service member is deployed. Thus, the military service member and family member populations are neither long term members of the community nor a stable market for a traditional college program. The civilian population is, however, a stable one and provides continuity to the base as well as the community.

College services to the Fort Drum and local area populations are through our membership in the SUNY Consortia of North Country Colleges. Educational services are provided by ESC faculty and staff who interact regularly with both consortia faculty and staff and the civilian employees of the military responsible for educational services for the service member. The ESC unit provides educational services, as needed, to students attending consortia member schools. Additionally, the unit provides services to nonmatriculated military/military family member students completing degrees through out-of-state post secondary institutions via the Service Members Opportunity College (SOC) agreement. Thus, it is not uncommon for the unit faculty to provide educational services to students who have been transferred to the base from elsewhere and are matriculated with institutions such as University of Maryland, Central Texas University and Austin Peay University.

The Fort Drum Unit serves very diverse populations. The military and family member populations are culturally, ethnically and geographically diverse. Many have lived in European and/or Asian countries for extended periods of time. Age ranges tend to be somewhat younger and narrower than one typically finds with other units in CNYC. That is, there are more younger, traditional age students (in their early 20s) and fewer older ones (in their mid to late 40s and older). But the majority of the military students, including family members, tend to be in their mid-to late 30s which is not terribly dissimilar to the typical ESC student served in other CNYC units. The civilian population (area residents, as well as civilian employees of the military) that the unit serves tends to be somewhat older than the military population, and unlike the military population, they tend to be native to the local geographical area, ethnically/culturally homogenous and

relatively untraveled. Academic preparation of unit students is highly variable. Several of the unit's military students and their family members are non-native speakers of English.

Because service members and their families are likely to move early in their educational careers, it is necessary to start them in degree program planning in their first contract. When they are transferred, the unit can easily transfer the students (service member and/or family member) into the CDL program so that credits are not lost in cross college transfers. That is, the students stay with the College to finish their educational programs even if they can't stay with the Fort Drum Unit. Army tuition assistance (75 percent tuition assistance for those who study through CDL while based at Fort Drum) provides additional incentives to complete educational planning early, as it is only available to military students who are matriculated with approved degree programs.

The unit recently added a .50 faculty line because the program has grown by leaps and bounds since I started at the unit in October, 1993. Last year, I enrolled well over 1250 credits and this year the count is likely to go even higher. I expect growth to continue at a fairly rapid pace as the College is building a solid reputation for service and excellence. A very telling statistic is the shift in matriculation rates. In 1995, only 52 percent of the unit's students were matriculated; in 1996, it was 80 percent, and in 1997, it was 87 percent. The unit has been approached by different civilian offices on the base to discuss educational possibilities with the College for their employees. It is my sense that we are just beginning to tap the civilian employee market. I also believe that with consistent marketing through the Army education counselors, the unit will attract more and more military service members and their families.

What would be helpful to the unit in accomplishing its goals of quality educational services, increased enrollment, and consortia participation is better understanding by the College of the factors that make Fort Drum so very different from other units, not only in Central New York, but in the College. The unit pace is very fast because the military student needs to have things in place before he or she deploys or is transferred. Neither the service member, nor the family member really knows how long they will be resident at Fort Drum. The unit faculty and staff have learned to be sensitive to army etiquette, rules, procedures and culture; sometimes these conflict with college culture. But these are the rules we live with as guests of the U.S. Army. If we want to provide educational services to the base, then we do need to understand and appreciate our special "guest" status. Our goal has to be to see how we can continue to serve student needs in the context of this specific work and life situation. We must develop flexibilities within our structures to effectively deal with the relative inflexibilities that the military student constantly confronts.

I believe the enrollment target for the unit should be revisited. In setting it, the College made certain assumptions about the unit and its students that experience has not borne out: First, that the student population would be homogenous, hence easier to serve. Clearly, the student population is more diverse than in most centers/units. And second, that there would be extensive use of CDL. Because CDL is on a semester calendar and soldiers and families are moving in and out of the base all year, CDL registration deadlines do not work well. Hence, more students than anticipated are engaged in mentor guided one-to-one independent study with the Fort Drum mentor or with other CNYC mentors, and – when possible – in study groups.

The major cultural differences between the Fort Drum Unit and other ESC units may be most obvious in the admissions and assessment processes. Military students and military family members can't wait the six to eight weeks it takes for the application process to be completed. To assist students in getting started, Fort Drum and the CNYC director have worked with admissions to expedite student admissions, waiving transcript and immunization requirements on a temporary basis. This allows students to start their education almost immediately after attending an information session. Orientations are provided on an individual basis to students, and typically the student enrolls in his/her first contract at the orientation. It does take some time to get the Army tuition assistance piece put together, but a military student usually is enrolled within two weeks of the request for an expedited admission. Because there is a constant stream of new arrivals to the base, I do a weekly information session. I meet with the Army's education counselors on a regular basis (at least quarterly) and keep them supplied with ESC marketing materials and updated on our study groups, CDL enrollment periods, and any other items of public relations or marketing interest.

Because of time pressures (actually, uncertainties about length of stay at Fort Drum), and the pressure to qualify for the richest Army tuition reimbursement program, it is important for some soldiers to do educational planning/degree program planning in their first learning contract with ESC. As part of a "re-up" option, soldiers may receive six months of work

release to study full time, but they must present a degree plan to be considered for this benefit. These are just two examples of factors driving the student's need to design a degree program in the first contract.

In many ways, mentoring at Fort Drum has meant changing my way of working with students especially in degree program planning. It has been necessary to think very pragmatically because students are limited to a 16 week contract and are encouraged to focus on the planning process from the start. Therefore, without sacrificing my commitment to the real "process" nature of planning, I have attempted to develop a planning contract that students can use which involves them in a study of andragogy. While this cannot replace "process," it does provide an important opportunity for students to contextualize their experiences at ESC with their own developmental processes as learners.

Perhaps in spite of – or maybe because of – the special features of this unit, I feel very much at home here. The ESC and consortia staff have become special to military personnel and to their family members. We are a home away from home, a link to the civilian community, and a context in which they are seen and treated as unique individuals. We really try to be an inclusive community of which I love being a member.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

Two Companion Poems

Migraine Night

Elaine Handley, Center for Distance Learning

In this version William Tell misses the apple and the arrow pierces just above my left brow.

On other days, it's a naughty boy
who aimed for a crow
but slugs a beebe into my temple
where it lodges a low, searing ache.

Sometimes there's a truck crash –
two semis jackknifed in my forehead,
ambulances screaming round,
people shouting, and one
trucker is weeping.

White pills don't work, neither do
incantations. I think of making phone calls:
“Hello friend? Could you come and hold
my head? It's cracking wide open you see,
and everything may tumble our –”

It's 3 am and the POWs of my sorrows
are marching, marching
until the floorboards of my brain
creak with the thudding rhythm
of their number and weight.

At dawn I'm praying to Nietche
my patron saint of migraines,
who learned to write through them
before he went insane
(the blue devils turned muses.)

Instead Mighty Mouse careens through my skull
accompanied by terrible, stirring music,
slaying one coil of pain after another
while more keep coming.

Small blue pills don't work,
neither does cursing. Friends
nodding sympathy can't cure, and
there's no will strong enough for
what the body prescribes.

The sun in its dreadful brightness
creeps into the world. Race horses snort
into the fog and stamp and rear up
ready to thunder round, round, round
the track in my head.

The birds begin their high-pitched
diurnal complaints,
and the flowers show their faces.
The pain is a dear friend
who's sat up the night with me.

Migraines turn up unbidden –
like a relative who knocks on the door
with a heavy satchel at his side
his eyes talking woe
that assures admittance.

Some might say migraines arrive
suddenly like poems.
A food of sorts, a gift, a message from the brain:
too much, too much, too much
it sings in my head.
We've grown intimate and wise together
for pain is a funny thing –
without it there seems to be only
silence.

Migraine Envy

Suzanne Borowicz, Erie County Department of Social Services Project

I'm one of those women who
gets a headache once every
two years.
I had one the other day
so I should be good till
the year 2000.

My friend wrote a poem about migraines.
Her words surrounded her pain so
intimately, I was jealous.
I wanted it, the smashed brains
the swollen eyes, the lips
muted with agony.

Hey, at least she has something.

She can hold it, mold it
even point a finger and blame it.
All I have is a long wait.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

Two Book Reviews

Do We Offer *Piano Lessons* at Empire State College William McClary, Center for Distance Learning

One of my favorite books in the past several years has been *Piano Lessons*, by Noah Adams. These are the autobiographical reflections of a man, who, in his early 50s, decided that he would like to fulfill a life-long dream, to learn to play the piano.

If the name of the author seems familiar, perhaps it's because you are a listener of "All Things Considered," on National Public Radio. Noah Adams has been long-time host of that program, although as of November '97, he has been on an extended leave for almost a year while pursuing another project.

Adams chooses an interesting format for his work. He presents his reflections as an almanac, one "chapter" for each month of the year. "January," his month of decision, is subtitled, "Why does a 51 year old man decide he has to have a piano?" In it, he describes his life-long dream as he wrestles with the decision as to whether to proceed and which piano to buy. "February" is the month of delivery; finally, the piano is there, in his living room! Reality sets in. In "March," he experiments with, but gives up on, a computer program for his lessons.

And so it goes, month by month. During the spring and summer, we follow Adams as he travels "on assignment" for his professional reports for "All Things Considered." Wherever he travels he thinks of his life and his work in terms of his new challenge, the piano. Always, in the back of his mind, he wants to be able to play "Traumerei" by Robert Schuman, a piece which has special meaning for him.

The chapter titled "October" is my favorite. Adams enrolls in the prestigious Autumn Sonata, a workshop of piano lessons conducted in Bennington, Vermont. This workshop is conducted by the van der Linde family, all accomplished professional musicians in their own right, who return home each year to give lessons. Adams shares with us his apprehension about crowding such a long commitment into his busy schedule; a 10 day session seems like a very long time for him. He has even greater fears upon learning that at the close of the workshop, each attendee will be expected to participate in a public recital, showing off his "accomplishment." His stage fright is ironic in light of his highly visible professional success in front of a national radio audience! Adams describes the way in which his tutors, each in turn, accept his impossible goal. After all, they tell him, "Traumerei" is a fourth-year piece, and he's only a beginner! Each tutor quietly begins to mold the talents of the student, emphasizing his strengths while subtly suggesting ways to make improvements.

Piano Lessons is a short book, only 250 pages, and it reads easily. So easily that when I realized it was "October," I began to read more slowly because I did not want the book to end!

Why do I recommend it? First of all, I want to share with you something that is a treasure for me. Secondly, and more importantly for the Empire State College community, I think that *Piano Lessons* offers a role model of the adult learner.

For faculty, there may be some suggestions as to style of tutoring and mentoring. For students, it's the role model of a very public figure who has never lost his love of learning, and the realization that learning can be enjoyable, even beyond the gaining of a "degree" primarily for professional reasons.

Is Adams successful in learning to play "Traumerei?" You will need to read the book to find out. Enjoy!

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

Two Book Reviews

The Workshop Mathematics Program: Abandoning Lectures **Marilyn Grapin, Bell Atlantic Corporate/College Program**

Nancy Baxter Hastings, "The Workshop Mathematics Program: Abandoning Lectures," in Ann P. McNeal and Charlene D'Avanzo (eds.) *Student-Active Science: Models of Innovation in College Science Teaching*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1997.

This article came out of the National Science Foundation-sponsored Conference on Inquiry Approaches to Science Teaching held at Hampshire College in June, 1996. One of the objectives of this conference was to investigate innovative models of science and mathematics teaching in response to various reports indicating the need for making mathematics and science teaching more effective.

Broadly, Hastings focuses on the "workshop" as an alternative approach to traditional remedial and introductory mathematics courses. Three mathematics workshop courses being taught at Dickinson College were discussed: Quantitative Reasoning, Statistics: Discovery with Data, and Calculus: Guided Explorations with Review.

The first, a workshop on Quantitative Reasoning, was intended as an alternative to remedial courses in college algebra. The statistics workshop was designed for students in the social sciences and health professions. And the third workshop in calculus was planned for students with three to four years of high school mathematics who did not feel confident enough to take a traditional calculus course. The workshop prepared students for Calculus II.

The workshops are all student-centered and emphasize "active learning, conceptual understanding, real-world applications, use of technology, and motivation of underserved populations." (359) They also recognize the importance of connectivity between mathematics and other disciplines, and between classroom math and the "real" world. Methods rely heavily on learning by doing and discovery learning techniques. "Workshop courses are 'leaner and livelier' than traditionally taught courses, but they may also go through the material more slowly." (361) To that end, as Hastings explains, "(l)ectures are abandoned. They are replaced by interactive teaching." (359) The teacher becomes a "facilitator" or manager of learning.

As described, the premise is very exciting. It appears to have all the answers, and seems especially well suited to ESC's model of student-centered education. However, two broad issues in the report made me uneasy. One concerned "content," the other "assessment."

Content: "Leaner and livelier" material suggests the sacrifice of depth. One point to make here is that skimming the surface of any topic results in shallow coverage. Additionally, material that is "covered more slowly" suggests tacitly that, given the constraints of time, a slower pace limits the number of units that can be completed in any given term of study.

Assessment. Hastings relies heavily on responses to an attitude questionnaire. After taking the workshop, 80 percent of

the students were more confident in their knowledge and became more positive about their skills. Did the change in attitude affect their ability? Was the student's confidence borne out by increased skill in mathematics? Did increased ability lead to improvement in attitude and, as their ability increased, student attitudes became more positive?

Another measure of assessment that Hastings used was the comparison of calculus test results on specific questions between Dickinson and U.S. Naval Academy students. Dickinson students did almost as well as the students from the USNA on five specific questions. Was the comparison limited to just five questions because the other material on the USNA test wasn't covered in the workshop? It would be interesting to see a comparison of results from the full examination.

Although the workshop idea seems attractive as an alternative for weaker mathematics students, it also seems premature to abandon traditional practices. Comments by conference participants Frank Cerreto, Yitzhak Sharon and Tom Tucker included at the end of the Hastings chapter made several good points, one of which I found quite salient:

...students who have been successful in high school mathematics are very resistant to nonstandard approaches, as well as they should be, since they are being asked to change their winning game. I would be very curious to see how the workshop program would work with the regular Calculus I students or with everyone in Calculus II. (381)

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

Circle News Judith Gerardi, Metropolitan Center

Mentors as scholars work alone, with others in the Empire State College community, and with colleagues outside of that community. A primary impetus for the formation of the CIRCLE Adult Development and Learning group was to create a place within which to locate one's examination of theory, thought and practice. Having such a place supports members' efforts and brings encouragement through a sense of belonging to a scholarly group that has purpose and focus – focus in the sense of goals and interests, not in terms of particular areas of investigation.

As I engaged in presentations, plenaries and casual discussions at the November 1997 Creating a Nation of Lifelong Learners Conference in Washington, D.C., I saw many Circle participants and valued our bond with each other. We had not planned to come to the conference as an identified group, but there we were, demonstrating our commitment to furthering thought and research addressed to adult higher education. We presented research and analysis in several areas: models of mentoring, distance learning, enduring aspects of adult learner programs, the interplay of culture and cognition, and an examination of student development online.

Close to a year ago, some of us reflected upon Circle's particular meaning to us. Some statements were included in the July 1997 issue of *All About Mentoring*. We had not presented Mary Klinger's reflections, and we do so now. It captures the developing sense of the group's actual and potential importance to us.

Mary wrote: "The Circle is about connections. As academics, we study and learn alone, much in the same way as our students study and learn – in isolation. Many of our learners welcome an opportunity to share and discuss their learning. Whether in a study group or an online discussion, many find these opportunities rewarding and these encounters seem to give our students a new impetus to strive and achieve – a connection to their learning, to other learners and to the College. I am confident that the Circle will do the same for those of us involved."

Connection is a critical, fully descriptive term. On the phone, face-to-face, on e-mail or in our thoughts, we feel connected, and that connection promotes our approaches to careful examination of adult development and learning.

We continue to find our way in this new endeavor, a rather large group, separated by hundreds of miles and confronting the demands of faculty members at our busy evolving College.

ALL ABOUT

MENTORING

A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 13, Spring 1998

MI News

Journal Updates

In this and subsequent issues of *All About Mentoring* we will provide information on academic/professional journals devoted to adult education and learning. Our goal is to make us more aware of on-going scholarly work in the field and to offer us options for the publication of our own research and reflections on mentoring.

Adult Education Quarterly

Adult Education Quarterly (AEQ) is the second of two journals sponsored by the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education. (A description of the first, *Adult Learning*, was included in *All About Mentoring* 12.) *Adult Education Quarterly* is a refereed journal of research and theory in adult and continuing education. "The editor seeks manuscripts that report research, build theory, interpret and review literature, or critique articles previously published in *AEQ*. Manuscripts primarily concerned with the techniques of practice are generally not within the scope of this journal." John M. Dirkx is the current editor.

Address: *Adult Education Quarterly*
 Educational Administration
 Michigan State University
 412 Erickson Hall
 East Lansing, MI 48824-1034
 E-mail: aeq@pilot.msu.edu
 Phone: 517 355 4508

The journal also has a significant book review section that is edited by M. Carolyn Clark. (Dept. of Education, 615 Harrington, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77845-3256). Recent issues of *AEQ* have included essays on "empowerment and emancipation," self-directed learning, Schon's theory of "reflective practice," and one titled, "The Centrality of Meaning-Making in Transformational Learning: How HIV Positive Adults Make Sense of Their Lives."

NCAL News

The National Center on Adult Learning (NCAL) was formed in 1988 by representatives of a number of innovative institutions and nationally recognized researchers with the goal of improving the effective practices of innovative, alternative and nontraditional adult learning through a practitioner-based research program. Tim Lehmann is the NCAL Director.

Starting in 1990, 36 Fellows have been awarded NCAL grants to pursue a range of projects. Anne Bertholf and the Niagara Frontier Center's project on writing proficiency, Susan Oaks' work on "Testing the Effectiveness of Writing Self-Assessment," and the joint project of Xenia Coulter, Lee Herman, Tom Hodgson, Sylvain Nagler and Irene Rivera de

Royston on the videotaping of mentor-student discussion of life experience, were all sponsored by NCAL.

Over the last year, much of NCAL's focus has been on the national conference, "Creating a National of Lifelong Learners" that was held in Washington, D.C. this fall, and in which many members of the ESC community participated. In addition, there are five current fellows whose work will be presented this fall: David Bringham of Regents College focused on the topic, "An Electronic Peer Network for Adult Distance Learners;" Diana Kelly of Cuyamaca College (in El Cajon, California) conducted research on the effectiveness of accelerated Weekend College programs; John Reese of the University of Denver's College of Law explored the "enhancement" of law school student performance using "learning style interventions;" Nancy Travers of the University of Connecticut worked on the topic: "Self-Regulation, Experiential Learning and Academic Achievement," and Elana Michelson of ESC has been doing research on the assessment of prior learning in South Africa in comparison with practice in the U.S.

For those who may be interested, there is a special NCAL report that provides more detail about current and past practitioner research projects. This is available by calling Judy Richards at x287. Currently, NCAL is focusing on follow-up efforts to the National Commission's recommendations on life-long learning, and is deferring the fellowship award program for the current year. More information about NCAL and its future activities will be provided in upcoming issues of *All About Mentoring*.

Submissions to *All About Mentoring*

If you have read a book that interested you; if you have attended a stimulating conference; if you had a valuable, surprising or difficult mentoring experience you would be willing to describe, or if you have a comment on any part of this issue or on topics/concerns relevant to our mentoring community, please consider writing about them for *All About Mentoring*. If you have developed written materials for your students that may be of good use to others, if you have a scholarly paper-in-progress or something you presented, or if you have a short story, poem, drawing or photograph, please consider submitting them as well. Please also let us know if there are specific topics about which we should try to develop a dialogue in these pages.

Please send submissions to Alan Mandell (ESC, 225 Varick Street, NYC 10014-4382), and note that it is most convenient if your submissions were sent via e-mail or on a disk. We very much look forward to your contributions. The next issue of *All About Mentoring* will be published early July 1998. Please send your contributions to Mandell by June 1. Thanks very much.