ALL ABOUT MENTORING

A Publication of the Empire State College Mentoring Institute

EMPIRE STATE COLLEGE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Issue 15 • Fall 1998

Issue 15, Fall 1998

Table of Contents

- Editorial (Mandell, Alan)
- Reflections on Mentoring (Broadaway, Carolyn)
- ELYSIUM (Folliet, Mary)
- The Philosophy Motion #285A (Davis, Forest K.)
- Direct Marketing and Its Growing Impact on US and Global Business (Giordano, Justin)
- Mentoring Interactions: The Breakthrough (Tatzel, Miriam)
- On Maternal Learning (Copley, Catherine)
- Tales of a Mentor: A Deeper Impact (Robinson, James)
- A Philosophy of Education (Rosenthal, Mel)
- On the Authority of Thirty Lett
- Book Review (Gadbow, Nancy)
- Mentoring Negativity (Hickey, Jim)
- Book Review (Brunschwig, Fernand)
- John and Maria: What Mentors Learn from Experiential Learning (Lee Herman and Xenia Coulter)
- CIRCLE News (Gerardi, Judith)
- NCAL News (Lehmann, Tim)
- MI News

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

From the Editor

Alan Mandell, Metropolitan Center

Some people have argued that one reason mentoring is an appealing model of teaching and learning is that its definition is not fixed. We wonder and debate about whether we can ever truly identify its qualities; about whether what we are doing is mentoring or should be called something else. Can mentoring occur in a group? How about via the Internet? Is it mentoring we do when we work with students in a residency-based program? Is mentoring what others might understand as good advising? Are we necessarily engaged in mentoring when we meet face to face with an individual student? How do we know? And, if what we most care about is "good teaching" practice, does it make any difference at all what mentoring means or whether anyone can determine that it is taking place? Perhaps (as others have suggested over the years) we are only involved in obsessive debates about our rather private institutional language that deflect us from honestly tackling more basic issues relevant to whether our students are learning and what they are learning.

However frustrating, it is my sense that these are important questions for a number of reasons. One reason concerns the mission of the College. Can an agreed upon understanding of mentoring provide us with a clear set of criteria for planning what we should do and for evaluating what we now do? A second reason has to do with the nature of our faculty community. As ESC continues to experiment with new forms of learning in new learning contexts, are we developing not so subtle hierarchies within the faculty? That is, will we become divided between those who consider themselves mentors and are considered by others as mentors; those who consider themselves mentors and are not considered by most others as mentors; and those faculty colleagues who define themselves and are defined by others as doing something else (usually in their minds as doing something more, and in other peoples' minds, something lesser)? And within this hierarchy, what's up and what's down? Is mentoring something to aim for or something to rise above? A third reason why our efforts to define teaching-as-mentoring are more than of peripheral interest concerns yet another question: Can access to higher education (along side mentoring, another basic but ambiguous ESC term) provide us with a rich enough foundation from which to distinguish ourselves from any other institution that is desperately searching for a niche in an extremely competitive adult higher education marketplace?

Part of the appeal of mentoring as a model of teaching and learning is certainly a result of the potential variety of pedagogies which it offers us as we continue to reflect on and struggle over its definition. Yet unless we can agree on general criteria by which to acknowledge teaching-that-is-mentoring, we will have no guidelines by which to evaluate our interactions with students (in whatever context we meet them), nor our programmatic forays, nor our institutional heart. That is, without such parameters, the call to mentoring will grant us permission for educational flexibility (just what can't we do?) but will not help us judge what we are doing.

This is perhaps problematic and potentially dangerous territory. Our very freedom to imagine and try out new ways to work with students (our wish for ourselves to have become what Herb Kohl describes as "craftperson[s] of learning") has been dependent upon the openness of what we have called the mentoring model as it has evolved at ESC over 28 years. And yet, at this time of institutional transition and self-study, we have a particular responsibility to more carefully articulate the contours of that openness — that is, to define mentoring. Without such a definition, it will become that much more difficult to hold our community together.

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

Reflections on Mentoring
Carolyn Broadaway, Northeast Center

Editor's Note: At the June, 1998, New Mentor Workshop, a number of faculty members were invited to offer their own more personal reflections on mentoring at ESC. Included below are the thoughts of Carolyn Broadaway, mentor at the Northeast Center.

I came to Empire State College as a mentor in the fall of 1972. I was drawn to ESC by the freedom it offered to teach what and how I saw fit, and by the opportunity to work one-to-one with students. I wanted to start with what the student thought it was important to know, not with what I was interested in or had been taught by others. I saw the traditional curriculum as deeply flawed and severely limited. I was 26 years old, somewhat radicalized by the experience of having been a female graduate student at the then very male and very elitist institution of Yale University. I wanted to teach students of a variety of ages and backgrounds — not just the young and the elite. I wanted to teach to and about women as well as men. I wanted to teach across and beyond disciplinary boundaries — that is why I had gone into the interdisciplinary field of American Studies. I wanted to teach diversity in literature and history. I thought I would teach at ESC for a few years and then perhaps move on to administration, with an eye to moving education in a new direction. I thought Empire State College was on the edge of a new frontier, and I liked the territory.

I loved Empire State College from the beginning. I loved my colleagues, who were all fired with enthusiasm about this new style of teaching and learning and who gave of themselves to students and colleagues with unstinting generosity. I loved working one-to-one with students. It was intimidating, at times, to try to figure out how to help someone whose interests were beyond the scope of my education and experience. But I grew with each student and got help from colleagues. And in the early days of the College, there was time to do reading and research right along with my students in the fields that interested them. Faculty loads were lower: many of our students were full time; and we had secretaries whose job description was to assist us mentors — period.

I spent much time on governance in the first 10 or 15 years of my work with the College. I enjoyed being on committees, hammering out positions and policies, seeing the dynamics of other parts of the College, and meeting colleagues across the state. I think the highlight, for me, of my involvement in collegewide activities was my work with the Center for Individualized Education, a grant-supported institute that was run out of Empire State College, but that involved work with teams of faculty and others from colleges throughout the eastern United States who were experimenting in various ways with individualized education. It was exhilarating to connect with faculty and administrators working to develop individualized education in different geographical and institutional settings. It gave me useful ideas and kept me in touch with developments in nontraditional education beyond the College's walls. After the Center for Individualized Education disbanded, much of collegewide governance came to seem like a blind alley to me. I found myself in endless meetings revisiting the same questions and issues, with the sense that the work was mostly window dressing and would not have much impact on the direction of the College. The vital connections with other institutions were now taking place on the administrative level, with little faculty involvement.

The College administrative environment was not one that I found positive at the time, nor was the College moving in a

direction which I found inspiring. And so I devoted my energies to teaching.

I worked full time with the graduate program, for two years chairing the M.A. program in culture and policy studies, which is now the M.A. program in social policy. In retrospect, I must say that this was really fun. I got to work with students and colleagues from across the state. I got to do a lot of curriculum development in league with other faculty. I got to do team teaching in residential seminars. I got to do admissions and troubleshooting for the program. On the down side, I suffered through monthly three-day administrative meetings of the graduate program in which the agenda was always virtually the same. We tabled most items after extensive discussion. I took up knitting. But I greatly enjoyed the meetings with faculty colleagues in culture and policy studies, where in the course of a few hours we identified goals and problems in our program, discussed the progress of our students, made and implemented changes in curriculum and procedures, evaluated our progress, and kept moving. After my two-year term as chair of culture and policy studies ended, coinciding with a brief maternity leave, I taught in the M.A. program in liberal studies along with work at my local center. But I found graduate teaching to be difficult to combine with undergraduate teaching. The rhythm and structure and demands are different; I had at one point, as the chair of a task force of PPBC, argued for greater integration of the undergraduate and graduate programs and against separate undergraduate and graduate faculties. I still believe in the principal, but in practice found that it was easier to focus on one or the other at a given time.

Work at the Albany center has always been absorbing. We have been through numerous reorganizations and several moves. This has been disruptive, but has probably kept us flexible and has given us a sense of humor about organizational matters. A reorganization five or six years ago, when we resisted having one of us named faculty chair, gave us the opportunity to engage in extensive dialogue about our goals and the way in which we had come to perform our roles, and allowed us to agree with new colleagues on what we call “ordinary good practices.” Coming together collectively to perform the responsibilities that were to be assigned to a faculty chair and rotating various responsibilities gave us a broader sense of center needs and priorities, as well as a sense of unity. Even now, when we have bowed to the inevitability and desirability of having a faculty chair in the current structure of the College, the tradition of working together cooperatively and collectively still characterizes life in our center and has shaped the way I perform the role of faculty chair.

After twenty-five and a half years, I have to say that the things that first attracted me to Empire State College and the things I first loved about it are still the source of my greatest rewards. I love teaching that begins with the student. I believe I have gotten better over the years at listening to students, at understanding more about what they want to get out of their education, at helping them to broaden their vision, as well as to focus their energies, and at helping them to develop the skills of independent learning. I enjoy educational planning. I like to help a student define educational goals and come up with a vision and a plan to achieve them. I find primary mentoring rewarding. I like to see the transformation in people from orientation to graduation. I like to see them discover how the parts all fit together, how learning becomes exponential.

I enjoy meeting with students one to one to discuss their reading and writing and research. I like to find out what they’re getting from their exploration. I like helping them to articulate what they’ve found most meaningful, how it relates to their life and goal, what questions they really want to pursue. I’m tired of reading bad papers, although the occasional good one makes up for a lot, but I never tire of talking with students about what they’re learning.

I enjoy study groups. Our students have so much to offer one another. It’s exciting to see the dynamics of a group of diverse people exploring new territory together, helping one another to new insights, sharing new discoveries. I get to teach things I love — American literature, children’s literature, women’s history, gender studies. And I’ve learned through trial and error what makes a study group work, primarily through soliciting student feedback. In addition to asking students to evaluate what worked and what didn’t work in the study group, I ask them to help me design the study group they would have liked to have had, for the benefit of future students. It’s much more fun than beating my brains out trying to figure out what students want, and it works much better.

I don’t think teaching at Empire State College is perfect. The role is fragmented and fragmenting. I find the work load to be heavier than in the past. Most faculty are consumed by details. Much of what we do could and, I believe, should be done by support staff, freeing mentors to be academics and scholars rather than handymen. The problems ESC faculty face in trying to find time to pursue scholarship in their areas of interest while keeping up with the demands of mentoring

are not much different from those I found in a study I did for the Center for Individualized Education in 1977, Faculty Development at Empire State College.

But I have no more interest in teaching at a traditional institution or joining a traditional department than I did 26 years ago at half my age. I think the ESC model works very well, and I'm sorry to see so much of nontraditional education moving in a different direction — more toward the mass market and sources of funding than to the educational needs of a diverse citizenry. I've been rewarded as an ESC mentor by having seen students grow and become freer, more knowledgeable, more understanding and more aware. I've seen students take fire and gain confidence and power. I've seen them make positive changes in their own lives and in the lives of others. I've been privileged to share moments of insight and inspiration. I've seen the light dawn in people's minds and light up their faces. I've been paid in gratitude. And I've had the privilege of sharing very special relationships with people — relationships rooted in those questions which life brings to a student, and which an institution such as Empire State College allows the student to bring to the academy. The interaction between education and the experiences of an individual life is endlessly fascinating to me. I'm still awed by the experience.

I would like to welcome those of you who are new colleagues. I hope you find your experience here to be rewarding.

> "...we can reimagine faculty work if we use legitimate new languages to talk about our roles. It is time to move beyond the language of counting and accountability and consider describing faculty work in new languages. Three desirable things to consider in a new definition of faculty roles are to be true to ourselves, to value students, and to work for intrinsic reasons. Simultaneously, we should avoid externally defined roles, the primacy of extrinsic rewards, and workaholism. These characteristics form a baseline from which new roles might emerge."
>
> John P. Bean
> "Alternative Models of Professorial Roles:
> New Languages to Reimagine Faculty Work"
> *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 69, No. 5
> (September/October, 1998) pp.496-512

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

While we may suffer still & grieve
beset by perennial longing & loss
yet never before so enriched by access
to the comfort & joy of great world
writing, cuisine, music, art
surfing WEBs, NETs & streets of desire;
while distressed by lethal disease,
global-pollution, -warming, -greed
& the violent return of the repressed,
yet never before so wired-exalted by
satiable envie for the new, the antique,
the beautiful, the true & exquisite:
though novel perversion & archaic pain last
before oblivion I claim paradise here/now.

Mary Folliet, Metropolitan Center
January 1998

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

The Philosophy Motion #285A
Forest Davis, Mentor Emeritus

Editor's Note: Forest Davis was kind enough to slightly revise Philosophy Motion #285 for this issue of All About Mentoring.

Toward the Long View: Eduard C. Lindeman (1885-1953) As a Factor in the History of Progressive Education.

To recognize Eduard C. Lindeman as a factor in the history of progressive education is to broaden the foundations of the movement during two decades in which the research and teaching of John Dewey and William H. Kilpatrick and their associates flourished in Chicago, New York and elsewhere. Lindeman's views on adult and continuing education were crystallizing in the 20-year period from 1915-35, and being spread in his writings, lecture tours and commission involvements for still another 15 years, roughly contemporaneous with the very active retirements of many of the principal leaders of the movement. In *The Transformation of the School*, Lawrence Cremin pushed back the origins of progressive education to 1876, picking out a single incident at the Philadelphia Exposition in that year, when the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, John D. Runkle, walking through Machinery Hall, saw the Russian display cases showing tools and their uses from Victor Della Vos' innovations in teaching manual/practical aspects of mathematics, physics and engineering at the Moscow Imperial Technical School, which had been founded in Moscow by imperial decree in 1868. Notice that this suggests that the eventual progressive education movement stemmed from the Imperial Court of Russia, not alone from the John Deweys of the western world. Runkle took these ideas about teaching back to MIT, building shops to do similar teaching in similar areas, applying Della Vos' discoveries to school institutions. Cremin points further to Calvin M. Woodward of Washington University, St. Louis as the first source of a progressive educational philosophy in the 1870s. By 1879 he had founded the Manual Training School of Washington University. John Dewey would begin to be heard from in Chicago about 1890, and in 1930 at Columbia University, NY, would enter upon an active retirement of more than 20 years. In this perspective E. C. Lindeman emerged in the middle period of progressive education, with interests in adult and continuing education fields.

Eduard C. Lindeman was a professor of social philosophy at the New York School of Social Work, later the Columbia University School of Social Work (1924-1950), and a well-known lecturer on continuing education in the 1930s and '40s. He appeared to be driven by new ideas of what education might become, and developed annual lecture tours around the country encouraging support for them. He knew John Dewey and William H. Kilpatrick at Columbia, Frederick Burckhardt at Bennington and Max Otto at Wisconsin; he served on innumerable committees and projects, including the Unitarian Commission on Appraisal (1935-36), seeming to talk to forward-moving people in social philosophy and education wherever they appeared. He was a social phenomenon in a time when it took social giants to get things done. What one is interested in mainly at this point is Lindeman's early books from 1915-35 when he was working out his corpus of new educational ideas, writing for *The New Republic* and other liberal magazines. His writings still seem prophetic today.

Might not one expect a figure of these dimensions in the arena of educational thought to appear in the awareness of educational institutions, specializing in progressive educational ideas and experiments? Clues might have surfaced in the

Goddard institutional archive: the seemingly remarkable result so far is that there do not appear to be any such clues in the archive, or for that matter, in the recollections of early to middle-years staff and faculty reachable now (1998). If anyone at Goddard was ever aware of Eduard C. Lindeman's role in the relatively early history and development of adult and continuing education that information does not appear to have been written down, noted among bibliographies, or described in numerous idea-pieces which make up part of the archival record of a college faculty talking professionally to itself and others.

At SUNY's Empire State College, however, the clues appear to be more positive. Bounces from various quarters suggest that some staffers do indeed know who Eduard C. Lindeman was; telltale quotations from his work appear occasionally in articles and publications. We are not sure why this is; possibly there has been enough study of educational history so that traces of it are left about, or perhaps recollections have been left from prior institutional involvements. Dean Tom Rocco, soon to beat feet to a western coast, who swings a very fair bat when he gets into discussional games, addresses the precise issue of institutional involvements as a criterion of relevance in progressive educational history. Was Lindeman, he inquired, involved in educational institutions? In the sense of being a faculty member at the New York School of Social Work- certainly. In the sense of being a teacher in a recognized experimental college or university, as persons today are, at either Goddard or Empire State College, perhaps not: there may not have been such institutions in early 20th century educational ambience. Lindeman would have been more solitary than faculties later. Yet he found crowds of people to talk with and to, and talked endlessly about educational ideas which interested him. One must allow for his setting. He was surely an original figure in a ripening body politic.

Once upon a time we found what may be a clue in Lawrence Cremin's *The Transformation of the School*. Cremin remarked in a general way that one of the problems in progressive education had always been the tendency of factions to develop among its proponents so that quarrels abounded, strivings for place, when everyone could readily have worked on the same side. We don't know if Cremin was free of this tendency himself, or whether those we knew better were free of it in their turn. It is the only explanation we can think of for a blindness of this stripe. Whatever the reason, it follows that the history of progressive education may not yet have been comprehensively written. People who think they know most about it have yet a few dimensions to master.

In case there is interest the following sources may offer clues:

1) Brookfield, Stephen. *Learning Democracy: Eduard Lindeman on Adult Education & Social Change*. New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall (1986).

2) Leonard, Elizabeth Lindeman. *Friendly Rebel: A Personal & Social History of Eduard C. Lindeman.* Adamant, VT: Adamant Press (1991).

3) Lindeman, Eduard C., "The Meaning of Adult Education." Norman, OK: Oklahoma Research Center for Continuing Professional & Higher Education University of Oklahoma (1926).

4) _________, *Wealth & Culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books (1936, 1988).

5) Stewart, David W., *Adult Learning in America: Eduard Lindeman and and his Agenda for Lifelong Education.* Malabar, FL: Krieger (1987).

Note:

University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, lists four Lindeman titles. For additional sources, see Select Bibliography (p. 265 & ff.) in Stewart (1987), *(see above).* Bear in mind that this refers only to E. C. Lindeman on adult and continuing education. For Lindeman on social work philosophy there is still another bibliography.

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

Direct Marketing and Its Growing Impact on US and Global Business

Justin Giordano, Metropolitan Center

On August 13-15, 1997, I was invited to attend the Direct Marketing Professors Institute Conference in New York City, sponsored and hosted by The Direct Marketing Day in New York, Inc. and The Direct Marketing Educational Foundation, Inc.

Twenty-two invitees were chosen on a competitive basis — most of us from academia. Indeed, like myself, 17 of the invitees were full-time faculty members, gathered primarily from the northeastern United States. (One of the faculty members was from Chile.) Among universities represented were: Yale, Fordham, City College, York, the University of Connecticut, and Kean College. The three-day conference featured many prominent speakers, each a highly respected specialist in his/her particular sub-area of marketing and direct marketing. The list included Mitch Orfuss of J. Walter Thompson; Lois Geller of Mason and Geller; Phil Blanco of Bloomingdale's by Mail; Jennifer Freidberg of Ogilvy & Mather Direct; Ruth Stevens of IBM Direct; and Patrice Servidea of Lucent Technologies.

Some of the numerous topics covered were: the current state of direct marketing; catalog marketing; database marketing techniques; legal issues regarding direct marketing and privacy (a very timely and controversial issue); the potential for acquiring markets abroad using direct marketing and catalog sales; and the use of the Internet in marketing strategies. From my perspective, another critical topic addressed at the conference was the teaching of marketing (and direct marketing), and the career opportunities that exist for students within this expanding business arena.

Prior to the conference, I had what I considered a reasonable grasp of the role of direct marketing. However, I was pleasantly surprised to find out how pivotal a niche direct marketing has carved for itself. Essentially, it has become an indispensable field within marketing, and by extension, within business at large. Direct marketing has been with us since time immemorial, and most people tend to have a picture of the not always pleasant door-to-door salesman, or his modern counterpart, the intrusive telephone salesperson. However, in this information age, there is a belief that eventually all marketing will be enveloped by direct marketing (thus, making the distinction between direct marketing and marketing irrelevant). This would arise as a consequence of the inevitable and fast-approaching merger of television and the Internet. For example, in the 1950s, about 1 in 50 sales arose out of direct marketing. It is projected that by the year 2000, about one in six sales will be the by-product of direct marketing.

Putting direct marketing into a larger context, it may be useful to play the number's game. Overall media spending for initiatives related to marketing reached $155.5 billion in 1996, an increase of 6.3 percent over 1995 expenditures. Direct marketing advertising represents 58.3 percent of total U.S. advertising expenditures. U.S. sales revenue attributable to direct marketing was approximately $1.2 trillion (outpacing growth in total sales). And, in the U.S., more than 20 million people are currently employed in the direct marketing field (8.8 million of whom are involved in the business-to-business area).

The industry is ably represented through its Direct Marketing Association (DMA) which not only serves the needs of the industry and enhances its visibility but, through its education foundation, also offers a variety of programs specifically

designed for educators and students. The major programs for educators feature a one-day meeting held in conjunction with DMA's annual conference, the Professors Institute to which I was invited, and a Direct Market Seminar for textbook authors and researchers (that has as its aim the encouragement of authors and researchers to include direct marketing in their work).

There are also a range of programs for students. The Collegiate Institute, offered three times a year, is an intensive professional four-day seminar for college seniors taught by leading professionals in the field. The Direct Marketing Seminar for Graduate Students is a program for full-time graduate students who have little or no exposure to direct marketing. The Hammond On-Campus Career Day is a one day sampling of leading-edge direct marketing and of career opportunities in the field; and the Collegiate Echo Program is a competition in which student teams develop a marketing strategy, campaign, media plan and identimized budget as a response to a marketing challenge offered by a corporate sponsor.

In addition, the Direct Marketing Educational Foundation offers teaching materials, access to the DMA library (which I found extremely impressive and which can also be accessed through the Internet), a number of publications, career information and informal career guidance for students, and resume referral for students as well.

I found the institute a most valuable experience which opens new horizons for myself and for my students. It expanded my knowledge base in a rapidly growing field, and established new network links which I can funnel to my students. As mentors we're relentlessly seeking to grow, remain intellectually stimulated, and stay on the cutting edge of developments in our fields of interest. Through participation in this conference, I feel I've added new and productive tools to my educational arsenal which I am confident can be utilized to enhance my students' learning experience.

Direct Marketing Association: 212 768-7277
Library: Ext. 1934
www.The-DMA.org

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

Mentoring Interactions: The Breakthrough

Miriam Tatzel, Nyack Unit

The moment had arrived. I felt it. This was the breakthrough. A little background first.

She is one of our younger students, of "traditional" college age I would guess. She is outgoing, enthusiastic, an altogether lovely person. She is not, however, a particularly strong student. She has been in a number of study groups, one with me included, and the evaluations have come back pretty much as fair to middling. Nonetheless, she said she enjoyed everything she "took" here.

She works with children, usually children with disabilities of one sort or another, and she describes herself proudly as a "professional babysitter." She spoke often of an autistic girl she works with and I suggested she do a study of autism. This would be her first independent study and I was a bit concerned about whether she could be self-directed. I suggested she find sources on observing child behavior so she could record her work with the child, but at first anyway, she brought books written for the general public on autism and how families can cope. She wrote a paper on one book in which she concentrated on retelling the story of the child in the book.

When we got to talking about the book, I discovered she had near total recall of the contents, could answer my questions, and discuss the subject quite well. I was impressed. What a disparity from her writing. I mentioned to her that her paper was more of a story than an attempt to grapple with the question of autism.

Then the summer intervened. When she next arrived at my office, I was pleased to see she brought some books on systematic observation, and she also gave me some observations she had written on her young charge. It seemed to me that she was now looking for different sorts of material, more professional and academic. Towards the end of the meeting, she said, "You know, I re-read some of my papers, and I see that you're right, I mostly tell the story of what I read. I'm writing papers on a high school level and I want to write on a college level."

This is the breakthrough. She came to it herself. She really wants this know-how. She is aware. I felt my heart go pitter-patter, all the more so because I didn't anticipate this breakthrough or make it happen.

As I reflect on this learning contract, as a lesson to myself, I think what mattered in my behavior was what I think of as "acceptance." First I accepted what she was really interested in, her work with this autistic child. Then I accepted the "level" at which she was working, and I think what helped here is that I knew her work from before and did not have unrealistic expectations. I think my interest in hearing what she had to say about her work and my admiration for what she does mattered too.

I am reminded of another student some years ago with whom I was struggling to have her keep to the topic. She'd come to our meetings not prepared with what I expected, but she had all this poetry she'd written, all sorts of "ditties" that seemed to flow from her as easily as breath. So I said, "How about doing a contract where you write poetry?" That did it. She grabbed onto the idea and began planning the contract. But no, she never did do a contract on poetry. Instead, after that

interaction, she began to stick to the topic.

I think what these examples have in common is that “learning works in mysterious ways” and that my success as a mentor came more from what I didn’t do than from what I did, unless you count telling the student to do what she’s doing anyway as a action on my part.

> 1) A rich body of experience is essential for learning to occur best;
> 2) Experience yields explicit knowledge only if reflected upon;
> 3) Individuals learn best when focusing primarily on the goals of their learning and how best to achieve them;
> 4) Using the solving of genuine problems as a means of learning enhances learning and furthers the development of cognitive skills;
> 5) Learning occurs best if learners understand early what is to be learned and how it is to be learned;
> 6) Deliberate practice is a more effective means of learning than less focused and less disciplined effort.
>
> Barry G. Sheckley and Morris T. Keeton
> “Perspectives on Key Principles of Adults Learning”
> *CAEL Forum and News* (Spring, 1998)

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

On Maternal Learning
Catherine Copley, Bell Atlantic Corporate/College Program

Most of my mentees are mothers employed as customer service representatives or managers at Bell Atlantic. During the last several years, I have been increasingly troubled when exploring prior experiential learning with them. How could we have overlooked what is perhaps the most significant work and learning in their lives, raising their children? In talking about the relationship between the work they do and the knowledge they create in the course of that work — in addition to identifying PONSI credits arising from their work, for billing and accounting, sales and management — my mentees and I must at least address maternal or parental work and learning, if only to understand why it should not qualify for college-level credit. In many cases a mother's engagement in mother-work contributes so substantially to her sense of self and to her orientation to the world, that to omit it not only fails to build upon a rich experiential base for learning but may also fail to bring her most important values and commitments into discussion of what she will study at ESC. My experience has been that to address parental or maternal work seriously is to encounter significant, college-level learning and to open important dialogue into the relationship between students' lives and the academy.

My approach to the assessment of prior learning in maternal or parental learning evolved both from my own work as a mother and as an ESC mentor, from knowledge I've gained both in women's studies and in narratology, and from my students' discoveries. Together, my students and I have moved from tacit and explicit knowledge about parenting and mothering to what I believe to be a more complete elaboration of our learning — a negotiation between academic and personal ways of understanding a body of knowledge. Ineluctably, it seems, I have been drawn into the process of retrieving my mentees' maternal learning and my own and accounting for it to the academy.

I began this process by researching ESC precedent for credit by evaluation in parenting, and found a number of CBE's in parenting and home and family management — descriptions of learning clustering around such topics as human growth and development; child and adolescent behavior; nutrition and health; household management; food preparation; and teaching, training and communicating with children. Parental learning was generally construed as partial knowledge in multiple fields. Though in some cases a set of competencies emerged that might be characterized as parenting practice (but were not), there was little explicit recognition of the thought that grew from and shaped this practice. Somehow the parent, the mother, was missing, ignored, or silent.

My early reading yielded a key theoretic text: Sara Ruddick's *Maternal Thinking*. Her practicalist view of truth, like prior learning assessment theory, recognizes materially situated knowledge claims and nonacademic sources of knowledge, arguing that distinctive ways of knowing and criteria of truth arise from practice. Maternal thinking is thus a body of reflections individual women (and sometimes men) generate from engaged maternal practice; it emerges from the work of raising children (primarily by women, in our culture). Though ordinarily unpaid, maternal practice is a complex profession, sustained over time, requiring disciplined reflection and the integration and application of diverse knowledge and a wide set of competencies.

A mother engaged in her discipline asks questions relevant to her aims, establishes criteria for distinguishing success, and

identifies and cultivates virtues and skills her discipline requires. Though specific practices and thinking occur within a social context varying in material and cultural resources and constraints, and they develop from the standpoint of each learner (Collins, 1994), maternal thinking and practice is a discipline, not categorically unlike other disciplines, with identifying aims, questions and methods.

Further reading, of Adrienne Rich's *Of Woman Born* among others, developed my concept of the mother as knowing and acting subject. The reflective mother understands motherhood as a relationship rooted in experience as well as a role: she constructs both her understanding of mothering and her maternal identity in response to the mother-child relation as she experiences it, often in opposition to canonical ideologies. She can give voice not only to various transformations in her thinking but also to a unique, accruing construction of self-as-mother emerging from her experience. This construction is central to her practice.

My growing understanding of maternal learning encouraged me to design a workshop to help students identify parental learning through narration and analysis. This approach was inspired by an article in *All About Mentoring*, Issue 9, by Morris Fiddler, "Using Storytelling to Identify Practice-Based Competencies of Advising," and drew as well from my own use of narrative in teaching and mentoring, and was bolstered by scholars like Elizabeth Minnich, who argues that there are "many ways of achieving, expressing and communicating fully 'rational' understanding" (Minnich, 1990, p. 110). Storytelling as a narrative way of knowing can integrate theory and practice within particular events; in this context it places the mother squarely within the narrative, not only as narrator but also as protagonist. She speaks and acts from a material and epistemic vantage within the narrative rather than as detached observer or universalizing reason outside the narrative [I am applying Michelson (1996, p. 641) but in a somewhat different context than hers]. Here, by telling her own story, a mother may begin constructing her own truth, incorporating other discourses and analyses from her own perspective within the story.

I asked students to prepare for the workshop by reading several short stories and one or two brief representations of mothering drawn from the popular press, as well as an excerpt from Ruddick, the readings intended as catalysts for participants' written, informal narrative accounts of their own practices, focusing on two significant events or turning points in their parental learning. At the workshop, each participant read her "story," then the group helped her to identify, describe and connect her learning based on the narrative. The central question each participant addressed during the workshop was: What have been my important practices, experiences and beliefs as a parent, as a mother? Interestingly, although I encouraged students to consider a "parental" designation of their learning as well as a "maternal" one (out of a wish to avoid gender bias), all the students in this workshop, once beginning to tell their own stories, felt compelled to describe their learning as "maternal." I conjecture that the "mother" identity, so central to personal identity, engages a more internal and more powerful narrator and discourse. The parent identity seems to place them at a distance from their own learning, speaking within the discourse of culturally dominant ideologies of motherhood rather than from their own real experiences.

In discussion with other mentors around the College and based on my own attempts, I realized that it was hard for students to describe this kind of learning in traditional academic terms. So I warned workshop participants of the difficulties that could arise from what they "expected what was expected." Nevertheless their responses were striking for the ease and confidence with which they wrote. They spoke as expert practitioners, as indeed, they mostly seem to be. Gradually I came to understand that the construction of maternal knowledge involves an ongoing internal negotiation between what they think they should know, what they know they know, and who they are. I took notes from their descriptions and expanded my own background reading. They in turn developed reflective narrative essays describing their learning: students new to or long absent from the academy wrote informal but compelling 10-15 page essays, which I used as the basis for an interview with each around those categories of learning that were emerging and continue to emerge in their work and in mine.

All mentees who have so far successfully engaged in this process — some in the workshop and some in one-to-one sessions with me — share at least the two perspectives of mother and office worker. All have been mothers for at least ten years and have more than one child. Several are grandmothers. They speak from positions culturally and historically produced across race and to some extent across class. Though each conceives, organizes and carries out mothering differently, the commonalities in their learning, the body of knowledge and set of skills that emerge from their ongoing reflection on and practice of mothering indicates to me both that they are working within a discipline elaborated by an

advancing scholarship and that their learning warrants granting college credits in this field.

Though my own analysis of maternal learning is just developing, I would like to share the emerging taxonomy. Several colleagues have been enormously helpful in discussing and clarifying these tentative categories, especially Peggy Tally, Elana Michelson and Lee Herman. I have also built on Pat Piscanti's work, encountered in an ESC Women's Studies Residency workshop several years ago, and I've benefited from the critique and encouragement of many colleagues, including Marilyn Grapin and Gary Goss. Scholarship on mothering has been central to this project, as has the narrative process itself. I doubt that my mentees and I could have identified, evaluated and systemized their/our knowledge outside of this process. Without the self-reflection, the sense of ownership, and the confidence in individual constructions of reality born of the narrative process — embedded as it is in personal experience, perspective and knowledge — I suspect my students and I might have construed their/my learning within traditional academic fields or popular ideologies, thus failing to accurately identify and describe it. Again and again during the assessment process, I heard "Well, I know this isn't what I'm supposed to think (or feel) about mothering, but...." And that preface frequently introduced something new, unsuspected and informative.

During this narrative and analytic process, two kinds of learning emerged. Because they support and complement one another and are both essential in constructing maternal thinking and practice as I understand them, it is impossible to separate them in assessment. One might be described as the development/construction of a set of principles and competencies analogous to managerial or teaching knowledge, and can be evaluated in a parallel way (though I would argue that this comparability is only useful not necessary). Another kind of learning is essential to frame the first: mothers' constructions of themselves as "subjects" of their own discourse — as mothers in their own right. In order to be maternal thinkers and practitioners, as opposed to having merely acquired a collection of skills or competencies in parenting, women must construct themselves as mothers in their own stories. This construction of self-as-mother through reflection is real and creditable and in turn gives rise to reconfigurations and elaborated understanding over time of the maternal practice that is its practical expression.

I have attempted to capture both kinds of learning in the following set of categories. They are neither complete nor elaborated here, obviously, to the degree required to grant credit, and I am continuing to structure them. Obviously, they are historically, regionally and culturally produced categories situated within material conditions that may vary enormously. But so far, the students who have gained credits for mothering have demonstrated significant learning in:

Meanings of Mothering

Each student awarded credit understood that she had a maternal practice and understood her maternal knowledge as disciplined reflection on that practice, her mothering as a set of learned values, attitudes, competencies and skills developed over time primarily in relation to the demands and needs of her children and her continuing commitment to their care. (Although they all also cited outside sources of learning including observations of other mothers' practices; discussions within a subculture — ordinarily comprising other women friends, co-workers or family — where issues and stories around mothering are valued; and information gleaned from a variety of manuals, training courses, and popular press articles.) All understood mothering not as a social role primarily but as a personal relationship (Jordan, 1993). Though some students believed there was a biologic or instinctual element in their mothering, none fell into the kind of essentialism that fails to see the mothering experience as largely socially produced. Perhaps most critically, out of her own experiences, each had appropriated, resisted and created a multiplicity of meanings about motherhood, developing, though to different degrees, a maternal subjectivity, or voice, in relation, sometimes direct opposition, to cultural and ideological expectations (Rich, 1986; Daly and Reddy, 1991).

Central Aims and Methods in Mothering

All were able to describe a central goal in mothering roughly translatable as an aim to nurture an unsocialized, undifferentiated human infant, unequal in terms of power, status and abilities, into an adult with relationships of full equality with others in society (though, of course, in the case of adoption and foster parenting, the aim shifts to correspond with the situation of the child). All were able to describe a model for achievement in the field, including criteria for

determining success and identification of the virtues and competencies required; and they could evaluate their relative achievement. Methods of thinking and practice centrally involved continuing to reflect, to emotionally respond, and to make judgments in response to the needs and demands of children and to maintain mutually helpful connections with the emerging person whose separateness the parent fosters and respects (Ruddick, 1989). Often students discussed their motivations (along with readiness, preparedness and partnering) in becoming mothers, often emphasizing the wide disparities between their expectations and goals and their experiences (Rich, 1986; McMahon, 1995).

Emotional Work

Most students understood mothering, including adoptive mothering, to include a passionate, physical attachment to the child. They were able to speak of the need to connect and negotiate feeling/thinking/action modalities and bring them into harmony when working within such a close relationship: feelings demand reflection, which is tested by action, which in turn is tested by the feelings and thinking it provokes (Ruddick, 1989). All understood mothering to invoke "attentive love" (Ruddick, 1989) — watching the child, being there with and for the child, growing a view of the child out of his or her individuality — within the limits of cultural norms and possibilities. Almost all spoke of the need for receptivity to children's needs — listening, empathizing, understanding what the child sees and feels important in order to affirm, validate, know and accept the child. Most described numerous difficulties and strategies in negotiating these close ties. All described a mix of many feelings towards their children on any given day and over time that depended far more on available time, space and support; her own desires and frustrations; and the behavior of her children than on "maternal love." As in any kind of caring labor, others' responses serve as an intrinsic and primary measure of success. At the end of the day, this mattered a great deal to all.

Protection, Nurturance and Training of the Child

All were able to describe their responsibilities and tasks in terms of protecting, training and nurturing their children (Ruddick, 1989). Each emphasized one or another of these three central responsibilities in relation to different stages of the child's growth or in relation to the circumstances of her mothering. Single mothers, for example, spoke more often of the need to provide material necessities for their childrens' protection and survival (Collins, 1994). All, whatever their circumstances, understood their mothering as going well beyond protection, and often framed mothering in terms of fostering their children's physical, emotional and intellectual growth through such strategies as active listening; open communication; and engendering self-esteem, confidence, and competence. Though they all grappled with issues around training, including the use of punishment and reward and other techniques to reinforce sociability, only one understood herself to be actually teaching physical, personal, social and especially intellectual skills. Most relegated "real" teaching to other spheres, primarily school. I don't yet know how best to account for this. But an ability to describe how children develop intellectually and to recount specific methods for teaching seems important in this domain.

Issues of Identity

Almost all, unprompted, explicitly raised questions and posed solutions and strategies around identity, involving issues of control, domination, personal boundaries, autonomy, dependence, and sense of self for both mother and child. Most described their children's growth and differentiation and their own development not only as separation but also as connection with and recognition of others (Jordan, 1993). Some, when interviewed, demonstrated an understanding of the individual's growth in and through relationship to others, sufficiently nuanced to suggest that the issue is how to become more active and sovereign within relationships rather than how to separate and achieve independence from relationships (Jordan, 1993).

Personal Growth and Development of Mother and Child

Many understood their work as a discipline partly describable in terms of sacrifice — of body, time, psyche, knowledge, skills, social life, economic capacities or relationships in service to their children. Certainly mothering centrally involved

accommodation of change and adaptation to children's needs and material circumstances over time. All discussed stages in their children's psychosocial development and in their own changing attitudes, feelings and strategies in dealing with and responding to them, displaying keen understanding of different needs in infancy, childhood, adolescence, and adulthood (though none, in my judgement, evinced knowledge sufficient to award credit equivalent to a course in human development). But all also were able to speak of these changes in terms of their own growth through mothering, of being pushed to reach far beyond whatever limits they thought they worked within. Mentioned were increased self-understanding, awareness of their values, and transformation of personal qualities, such as becoming less selfish, more mature and confident. Some even spoke explicitly of moral transformation (McMahon, 1995).

Family Culture and Family Work

All described family environments they sought to construct and maintain in nurturing and socializing their children, and they could enumerate material and cultural elements of that environment represented by such qualities as peacefulness, order, intellectual stimulation, moral and/or religious nurturance, and attention to family traditions and history. Some expressed a strong sense that the mother is somehow central to the family: she is the mediator of conflicting needs and demands, she assumes responsibility for the physical surroundings and attempts to keep peace among the family members. Many implied that they chose to maintain familial relations at the expense of egalitarian arrangements in day-to-day work and sometimes at a cost to their physical, emotional or intellectual well-being. All struggled with issues around mutual responsibilities of family members and their own complicit role in fostering unequal distribution of responsibility and work. Probably because all were working mothers, few dwelled on the relative devaluation of family work, often connected with low self-esteem in stay- at-home mothers (McMahon).

Mediation of Private and Public Spheres

All spoke to varying degrees about negotiations with educational, governmental, health care or other institutions in raising their children within the larger society, both under the ordinary circumstances of different stages in their childrens' lives and perhaps more especially in the case of parenting at times of change and trauma, such as divorce, remarriage, death, abuse. Some had taken part in political organizing to gain needed resources for their own or others' children, which they saw as a clear extension of their mothering. Many spoke as social critics in confronting issues surrounding the raising of children. A few were able to explicitly describe their politicization and the importance not only of the mother's practices in socializing and educating her children, but also of the extension of maternal thinking to societal problems and structures.

Home Management

Most included discussion of competencies in practical home and family management within their concepts of maternal practice; all confirmed the importance of such skills as organizing, planning, scheduling, financial management, problem solving and motivating.

Several explicitly compared these competencies to those of the workplace, with additions such as open communication, flexibility, discovering alternatives, looking closely at what's happening, asking hard questions, relishing complexities, tolerating ambiguities. Those most developed in this area sounded a great deal like competent managers, but ones who had developed skill beyond the ability to prioritize — what a colleague calls skill in "handling," the ability to somehow answer multiple, simultaneous demands on their time while keeping things working productively. Although there is some precedent at the College for granting credit for other activities attendant to running a household, such as meal preparation, repairs/maintenance, and handling of necessary goods and services, I did not see how these activities are college-level learning without considering them extensively in an evaluation in another field such as home economics.

Special Topics

Other forms of mothering emerged during the assessment process. This second or third perspective always enlarged the conversation. Such topics have so far included foster parenting; step-parenting; parenting and working, single parenting; grandparenting; child abuse; and drug abuse. In a few cases, learning was sufficient to warrant a separate designation of learning and evaluation by a specialist in that area. Interestingly, not a single student demonstrated college-level learning by thoughtful reflection on gestation and birth-giving, though I encouraged their explorations. They had not connected these aspects of mothering, except in obvious ways, to their constructions of mothering or to their identities as mothers. Other possibly relevant topics include parenting and disabilities; mothering daughters; and mothering sons.

The scholarship around motherhood as experience and institution is a still-burgeoning but shareable body of work emerging within the field of women's studies. For example, the Association for Research on Mothering (A.R.M.) has just been instituted following two widely successful international conferences, Mothers and Daughters (1997) and Mothers and Sons (1998), held at York University in Canada. In 1999 the conference's theme will be Mothering and Education, to be held at Brock University; in 2000, Mothering in Literature, the Arts, and Popular Culture, again at York. A wide, transdisciplinary body of publications on mothering has emerged in diverse journals and books in the fields of psychology, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, literature and fiction, among others. I plan to continue my explorations of the literature, especially around narrative, and would like to hear of others' experiences in identifying learning in this area.

A "father" note: I have just agreed to explore male parenting with one of my few male students, a particularly active and concerned parent of many years. I am interested to see what develops. Research on men who take full responsibility for parenting (rather than simply "helping out") suggests that such men also develop many of the nurturing capacities conventionally associated with women (McMahon, 1995, p. 195). "There are powerful reasons why men should mother.... Men should mother, should provide intimate, daily, ongoing nurturing care to children, in the interests...of men themselves, and of achieving economic justice and a better world" (Rothman, 1994, p. 225). I think in mothering we hone our empathic abilities.... I think that the experience of mothering teaches people how to be more emotionally and intellectually nurturant, how to take care of each other. It is not the only way we learn that lesson, but it is hard to mother and not learn it" (Rothman, 1994, p. 226).

References and Bibliography

Abbey, Sharon and Andrea O'Reilly. *Redefining Motherhood: Images and Ideologies in Transition*. Toronto: Second Story Press, 1998.

Allen, Paula Gunn. *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*. Boston: Beacon, 1986.

Belenky, Mary Field, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, Jill Mattuck Tarule. *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*. New York: Basic Books, 1986.

Chodorow, Nancy. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkeley,CA: University of California Press, 1978.

Collins, Patrica Hill. "Shifting the Center: Race, Class, and Feminist Theorizing About Motherhood," In glenn, chang & Forcey (Eds.), *Mothering: Ideology, Experience, and Agency*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Daly, Brenda O., and Maureen T. Reddy, *Narrating Mothers: Theorizing Maternal Subjectivities*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 1991.

Hirsch, Marianne "Maternity and Rememory: Toni Morrison's *Beloved*. In Bassin, Honey & Kaplan (Eds.), *Representations of Motherhood*. Yale University Press, 1994.

Jordan, Judith. "The Relational Self: A Model of Women's Development." In Mens-Verhulst, Schreurs & Woertman (Eds.), *Mothering: Female Subjectivity*, New York: Routledge, 1993.

McMahon, Martha. *Engendering Motherhood: Identity and Self Transformation in Women's Lives*. New York: The

Guilford Press, 1995.

Michelson, Elana. “ 'Auctoritee' and 'Experience': Feminist Epistemology and the Assessment of Experiential Learning.” *Feminist Studies,* vol. 22, no. 3 pp. 627- 665.

Minnich, Elizabeth Kamarck. *Transforming Knowledge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

Morrison, Toni. *Beloved*. New York: Knoft, 1983.

Rich, Adrienne. Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution. New York: Norton, 1986.

Rothman, Barbara Katz. “Beyond Mothers and Fathers.” E. Glenn, G. Chang, L. Forcey (Eds.), *Mothering: Ideology, Experience, and Agency*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Ruddick, Sara, *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1989.

 Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

Tales of a Mentor: A Deeper Impact
James Robinson, Long Island Center

It is 596:43 EMT (Elapsed Mission Time) on the Starship Docpak III, Captain Wally Lefrak commanding. Lieutenant Miriam Jonga has the bridge while Captain Lefrak conducts a tour of the ship for Commander Vishnu Proton, quality inspector from Beta Antares.

Lefrak: So you see, Commander Proton, that's about it. We haven't had a hydro- drive inspection in three years, there's no fuel left for the refrigeration units on the sleep ward, and I can't imagine what the outside of the rustbucket must look like when it docks. I need a new signal antenna...

Proton: (Wagging his head impatiently) Yes, yes, we know this blasted vessel is falling apart, but your click ration is below sub-par in every category. We can't have it, man. This is a starship, not a vacation cruise. Where are your mentors? (Going down a list on his clipboard.) What about this one, this Rusty Hammad?

Lefrak: That's Hammer, sir. Rusty Hammer, Julia Hammad is my chief engineer, a Harvard woman, and very competent. Hammer is our business coordinator and sociological anthropologist in the new Arid Zone Ph.D. program. He's also my navigator until Ensign Wu-Li returns from her maternity leave.

Proton: All right, I don't need these details. Where is he?

Lefrak: On Sleepies, sir. We have him on Tier Five, processing graduations for the Androgenoids. (Checking his watch.) He should be coming out in 15 minutes, sir. We could just catch him before he goes under again.

Proton: If you are fooling with me, captain, I'll have you in refrigeration before you can inflate your next headcount...

Lefrak: No sir, he's due to come out of Sleepies on his five-hour rotation. He's finished sleeping on his left side and should be rolling over to begin his right side. He'll have a five-minute Wake-up Period, then 15 minutes of Clear Time, then five of Dreamy Time, then back to Nappers. That's when he does most of his clicking.

Proton: You mean he clicks his files during Nappers?

Lefrak: No, sir! That's not regulation, sir, even out here. He's only allowed to click during Clear Time.

Proton: I should jolly well hope so. You're running a very loose ship, captain.

Lefrak: There he is, sir. I think he's coming around. You can watch through the ventillation hatch. You see, he's got his fingers working already, sir. I'm sure he'll be clicking any second now. They've got the keyboard right there beside him, so unless he rolls the wrong way, he can't very well avoid it. You see, sir? He's just reaching for the keyboard now. He's going for the Mousie, sir, right on schedule.

Proton: I don't see any clicking, captain.

Lefrak: He's got to click, sir. There's nothing else for him to do, except just lie there.

Proton: Damn bloody right. Just look at the paunch on that man; it's inexcusable.

Lefrak: If I know Hammer, he put away a couple of Venusian marsh-burgers before he went under, so he'll probably have to eructate a couple of times.

Proton: I can quite do without the physiological details, captain.

Lefrak: Quite right, sir, sorry. Be he is moving his fingers.

Proton: I've had enough of this. I'm putting this man on report. He's an obvious sleep addict. No wonder your graduation rate is down. Where did you get him, the Bombay Scrap Yards?

Lefrak: He was assigned to Commander Battaglia, sir. We got him on trade for 20 hull-crawlers and a five-gallon can of cooking oil. (Shrugs) I thought we could modify his brain patterns after a couple of voyages.

Proton: You got snookered, old man. (Sympathetically) It happens. What's his main assignment?

Lefrak: (Musing) Pretty routine. He's coordinating a short-term IFR for an asteroid colony that's headed for Saranac Lake. We hope to graduate them before they hit. We can always evacuate the M.B.A. applicants to the Mars Sub-Surface Unit. But forget about that...how about a toss of the old Zando? This is the last of the batch that Perkins sent me before he lost air pressure over Omega V.

Proton: (Uneasily) Zando on duty?

Lefrak: For god's sake, Vish, unstarch a little. It will be seven months before you get back to Beta Antares, and space gets lonely. Go on, have a short snort. (Tosses his Zando) To the Fleet!

Proton: (Reluctantly) To the Fleet!

Jonga: (Interrupting excitedly) Captain Lefrak, sir! We've got an Orange Emergency in Sector Five! I need authorization, sir! You have to wake the navigator! I can't graduate those Androgenoids without the input codes!

Proton: (Startled) Orange Emergency? What bloody nonsense is this?

Lefrak: (Chewing his lip) Sorry, sir. It's a productivity protocol. If we don't graduate the entire colony in ten minutes we plow the surface of that asteroid. It was part of the Pataki Pact at the very end of the last SUNY era. We have to wake up Hammer. He's the only one who can input the right codes.

Proton: (Aghast) That miserable creature? The one lying there with his kneees tucked up under his chin and his blankie clutched in one hand? You put him in charge of your bloody graduation plans?

Lefrak: Vish, he's the only navigator I've got and we have nine minutes to impact...(Rips open the ventilator and begins cutting Hammer's sleep harness with his pocket knife).

Proton: (Propping Hammer up) Lefrak, you said this was a bloody Annual Review. I didn't actually come up here expecting to die...

Lefrak: I know, I know! (Drags Hammer out of the sleep compartment) Rub his hands, Vish...harder! Shake him! Anything!

Proton: Maybe a shot of Zando... (Sloshes the bottle over Hammer's head).

Lefrak: Good work, Vish, pour it on...come on, Hammer...

Hammer: (Slowly coming around) Captain? Izzat you? Izza meeting over? Lord, I'd love some pancakes...

 Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

A Philosophy of Education
Mel Rosenthal, Metropolitan Center

Editor's Note: Earlier this fall, Metropolitan Center Mentor Mel Rosenthal was nominated for the Photography Educator of the Year Award — an honor sponsored by the Golden Light Award Program administered by the Main Photo Workshops. (No decision has yet been made about the recipient of this year's award.) As part of this process, nominees were asked to provide the award committee with a statement of their educational philosophies. What follows here is what Mel submitted.

My philosophy of education has grown slowly out of my own experiences of being educated, out of my work as an artist and from my work building the Empire State College Photography program. I have to tell you a little about my life so that you can understand how I got to believe what I believe. Twenty-five years ago I was a professor of literature. I liked literature, but was not liking teaching it. I decided to try to change my life.

It's a long story, but the essentials of it are: I quit my job and went to Africa. I had been a serious amateur photographer and when I got to Tanzania (the place I decided I wanted to live), after the usual trials and tribulations, I got a job with the Tanzanian government which needed someone to take pictures in what was their Public Relations Department. The only medical photographer in Tanzania left the country and suddenly I was the medical photographer. I learned to do the job and soon was photographing the results of diseases and helping to make posters and little flip books that had as their aim to teach people how to prevent the diseases and what to do if they had them. There were very few doctors there, and our materials became a kind of triage.

I was assigned to work with a Brazilian educator, Paulo Freire, who was teaching people how to read by finding out what were the most important words in Ki-Swahili, their language, and then getting them to read and write those words. My job was to "illustrate" the words so people could talk about them. At the time, there was a drought all over East Africa and people were beginning to starve. I worked for a very short while with the "flying doctors" from Kenya and saw the incredible extent of suffering and disease. I made photographs of water and sewage pipes, of hungry people and of many situations that could be used to generate literacy training. People learned quickly because they deeply cared about the subjects and saw the relevance of it to their lives. I had been close to this approach to teaching when I was an English professor, but I didn't understand completely what I was doing. Freire's methodology made sense and I immediately knew that the process of teaching from the place of deep personal involvement was extremely effective. I also loved photography more and more and realized the extent to which it had many social uses.

The wars in Africa got worse, and a number of people I loved were killed. I did not want to take autopsy pictures of my friends and I had already trained a Tanzanian to take my place. I came back to the United States and eventually was able to get a wonderful job directing the Empire State College program in the South Bronx. It was in the neighborhood in which I grew up and it was mostly to teach health and poverty program workers. Empire State College is an unusual experiment in education based on a belief in teaching "educationally by-passed students," as it says in our mission statement. It was one of the first colleges without walls relying on experientially-based education. That was over 20 years ago and I thought then, and I still think, that it was a perfect match for me to teach in an institution that valued flexibility,

experimentation and student-centered programs. When I got there we had no photography program. Slowly but surely I helped found one with the assistance of our students and alumni, many of whom were wonderful photographers and educators.

By most of the ways you judge the worth of an education, our students do well. Their work gets much better, they get into good MFA programs, they get jobs in photography, and they keep the love of photography that brought them to us. Many of our students are older and they come to us with a great deal of experience. Others come because they want a professional career or because they have a fondness for photography. Still others come just to learn a little about photography or to get a degree using the life experience credit they might be awarded by us. Because we are a nontraditional college in almost every way, we attract an unusual variety of students. One thing that they seem to have in common is that they all are in a hurry.

But we have no darkrooms, no equipment to loan, no studios, hardly any classrooms and not many teachers. We have very little money. The core of our program is a series of changing workshops in which professionals come and meet with the students. I invite photographers, photo editors, curators, critics and photo historians to spend time with our students and tell them what they do and how they do it. Over the last 17 years, many of the most creative and interesting people in the photography world have come by and many return time after time because they love our students and the format we offer. We use a wide variety of internships and each student works with a mentor and together they develop an individual program. I believe that who you are and what you know is reflected in your photographs no matter what kind of photography you do, so I encourage our students to read in literature, history, sociology, visual anthropology, film and philosophy. Though we have no curriculum requirements, I push them to become conversational in another language. I also stress the necessity of learning art history and the history of photography. I think it is very important for my students to have the privilege of a liberal arts education in the widest sense of that phrase.

Because I did not come to photography from art school, I was pretty ignorant about the work of other photographers. I didn't know the work of Lewis Hine, the FSA photographers, Edward Weston, Ansel Adams, Margaret Bourke White, Diane Arbus or Eugene Smith. I hadn't read the work of Beaumont Newhall and the other important critics and historians of photography. When I came back from Africa I took my first course in photography, a seminar with Lisette Model. I was bowled over. She critiqued my work and gave me a list of photographers and other visual artists to study. I began to read and study the work of the world's photographers. I am still studying. This made me a better photographer and I want all of my students to have the same privilege.

My own work is an inextricable part of my teaching. I use my own projects in many different ways. On the most obvious level, I love what I do and feel strongly about it and share it with my students. I often show my work and talk about it at our workshops. Sometimes the people in the workshops become involved with my projects. For example, the then mayor of New York, David Dinkins asked me to do a documentary project on health care in New York City. I thought it a mammoth job.

I got over 30 of my students and alumni and a number of doctors and writers together and formed a group, which we called The Triage Project. For over three years we photographed and wrote about health care in New York City.

This resulted in conferences, symposiums, many exhibitions in hospitals, public health conferences and a traveling show, which is still touring hospitals and clinics. My students did wonderful work and were very enriched by the experience. It was real and it engaged their spirits and their art. I often have students come with me when I do projects. My latest work is a very large one in which I have been photographing refugees who now live in New York City. Students have been coming with me on my shoots and have been learning about the various ethnic neighborhoods in NYC as well as about my process of photographing.

I'm drawn to issues and situations that affect people's lives, even their survival. I'm particularly interested in the relationship between changing social conditions and their influence on individuals. My pictures aren't always about that relationship, but that's where they most often begin. I have believed that the deeper I immerse myself in the shared issues of the people I photograph, the better my pictures will be. Sometimes that may lead to trying to make people aware of situations that need to be thought about or even changed. I tell my students that they need to believe in what they are doing, to feel something about whatever their subject is, and to get involved with the people they are photographing. They

frequently respond to this and do better and better work. And I do push hard to get them to have high technical and aesthetic standards in their own work.

My favorite projects are the ones in which my "subjects" are my first and primary audience and are my allies. In the South Bronx project, which was my first, I tried to make good pictures of everybody who lived in the neighborhood of our Empire State College office. Most of the people there didn't have any pictures of themselves so I made portraits, gave the people copies and displayed the pictures in little galleries we started in the neighborhood bar, in a grocery store and in the health center where I worked. I do variations of this process in all of my projects whenever I can. It is the essence of the Refuge project. A number of my old students now do interactive projects in their own work and with their students.

My work always grows out of my immediate experiences. All of my projects are interconnected. They are about people being pushed around, about what happens when people are seen as problems rather than as fellow human beings. Photographs are wonderful because they show particular people, and suddenly the results of political and economic policies are no longer abstract. Photographs document universal human moments, struggles and joys in particular concrete and often familiar situations. I find that many of my students profit from linking photography to issues touching their own lives. For some, this is a real stretch and for others it is irrelevant. Photography is a flexible and democratic art form that is accessible to very different people on different levels. I try to always respect those differences and help my students find what is important to them.

I should add that I consider my role as an educator to be outside national or any other boundaries. I am a participant member of the Coloquios Latinoamericano De Fotografia and have lectured and given presentations in Venezuela, Costa Rica, Mexico, Cuba and Puerto Rico. I feel very grateful to the world of photography and try hard to contribute to that world. I have given a number of lecture/presentations at the Society for Photographic Education and at the College Art Association. I have been an artist in residence or guest lecturer at many colleges and at many artist colonies. I was on the board of advisors of the New York Foundation for the Arts for five years.

I spend a significant amount of time teaching school teachers about photography and ways of teaching it. I am now involved with a project called Kids Make History. I am the professional photojournalist teaching high school teachers in New York City how to teach their students how to document their own neighborhoods. There are professors of history, literature and writing who are part of our team who will be working with the teachers and students to help them understand and write about these neighborhoods. We will then incorporate the collected material and the methods used into the curriculum of New York City high schools.

Being a photographer and an educator gives meaning to my life. Together they are my way of participating in history.

 Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

On the Authority of Thirty Lett

by Datatel, Saratoga Springs

Mr. Mihaly Czikszentmihalyi,
Your titles are great,
But the computer can't
Accept your co-authors
Unless you shorten your name.

And Mr. Brookfield,
Mr. Gibbons, and
Mr. Aristotle,
Your surnames are great,
But the computer won't,
As you can see,
Accept such long titles:

> Understanding and Facilitating
> The Decline and Fall of the Rom
> On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civil

In approaching the year 2000
Long is out, guys;
Short is in.
Please also replace all "ands"
With ampersands, &
Eliminate all subtitles;
Minimize, truncate, &
Welcome to the new age
Of technological tyranny.

By the way,
These would work nicely:

> Know and Help Adults Learn
> Roman Empire: Down and Out
> Talking Politely

Indeed, they seem to be
A real improvement.

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

Book Review
Nancy Gadbow, Genesee Valley Center

Pratt, D.D. Pratt and Associates. ***Five Perspectives on Teaching in Adult and Higher Education*****. Malabar, FL: Krieger, 1998.**

This recent book is a valuable addition to the field of adult and higher education, in which many books have described approaches and strategies to teaching and helping adults learn. Based on sound research, Daniel Pratt and his associates provide a careful analysis of five major perspectives that represent philosophical and practical orientations to teaching: The Transmission Perspective, The Apprenticeship Perspective, The Developmental Perspective, The Nurturing Perspective and The Social Reform Perspective.

A study of over 250 teachers was done to understand what teaching means across a range of very different settings in Canada, the United States and several other countries. Stephen Brookfield (p. x) notes in the foreword that the reader will be “struck by the diversity of ideas, perspectives and voices. This diversity is intentional and revealing.” The five perspectives represent not “methods,” but rather the intentions and beliefs of teachers that are the foundation for what they do and how they think about their teaching. Although most educators will identify with one or more of the perspectives, clearly the insights and experiences offered add new dimensions to our understanding of what it means to “teach,” and, more importantly, what it means to help adults learn and become competent, independent learners.

For those of us who mentor at ESC, I found many aspects of these five perspectives to be very relevant to the way we work with students and help them learn. The philosophies and orientations of some of the perspectives underlie much of the mentoring that we do. Unexpectedly, I found that many of the ideas offered by these teachers and trainers who work primarily in traditional classroom settings provided me with insights and a fresh way of considering how we facilitate learning as mentors. I recommend this book as an excellent resource for ESC faculty and for all who seek to stimulate and challenge their own and others’ understanding of teaching and learning.

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

Mentoring Negativity

Jim Hickey, Bell Atlantic Corporate/College Program

At a recent seminar on educational planning strategies, mentors were invited to entertain a hypothetical student profile. At the first mentoring session with a 25-year-old male who knows little about the Empire pedagogy and displays little educational motivation, what would be our first assignment at the end of that initial hour-long meeting? Among the suggestions proposed, one approach merits closer scrutiny and debate.

In an effort to work within the parameters of the mentee's own perspective, one mentor recommended assigning the student to write about his own past negative encounters with high school education; another recommended giving the mentee a book which chronicles the frustrations and humiliations of a high school student, thus articulating themes with which the new mentee may viscerally identify. The premise for such assignments is, most likely, to address the student's biases and resistance candidly and thus identify the mentor as a person whose insights and supportiveness may bond with him in an effort to overcome such intimate obstacles.

My resistance to such an approach stems from my own past attempts to use it myself. In an earlier life, I taught a poetry class for general studies adults at Fordham University's Rose Hill campus. I selected works which centered around evocative situations: Paul Goodman on the death of his grown son, Anthony Hecht on his wife's experience of an abortion, and, more abstractly later in the semester, Blake's "Crystal Cabinet" and "Mental Traveller." Before distributing the poems, I assigned students to write their own emotional responses to such situations; once they had established their own frame of reference, I then invited them to assess the articulation and honesty of a given poet's rendering. Very late in the term I warily introduced "Invictus" and the opening of Wordsworth "Prelude," suspecting that the first might seem too corny and the latter too arcane for this student audience. To my surprise, the class enthusiastically embraced an opportunity to finally work with materials that were upbeat and hopeful.

In other instructional settings, I have asked students to write about past negative experiences — often in their daily journals, but also in assignments similar to those advocated at the educational planning seminar. When I asked why my students were having trouble completing such assignments, their response mirrored that of my Fordham students. They found it difficult enough already to write for college, especially on topics seeking personal voice through introspection. And, therefore, it was all the more unpleasant to expose their own past failures, frustrations and agonies to first themselves and then the page. Reliving pain did not enhance their sense of personal transcendence, did not relieve but just reintroduced negativity they would just as soon forget. Feeling "trapped" in an assignment administered by the person who would then actually read and evaluate their former failures (though they were told that journal entries would only be read with their permission), they found such exercises unpleasant and inhibiting: a complete 180 degrees from the intent of the assignment.

Presenting such students with someone else's text on the personal pangs of high school also suggests several complicated agendas. Though perhaps meant as a medium of empathy and possible catharsis, not a few students are apt to infer that this negative student image reflects the mentor's tacit assumptions about themselves. The 12-step programs for everything from substance abuse to sibling rivalry have proven themselves effective over the past few decades in part because they

communicate that a person is not alone in her or his affliction and its ancillary baggage. And it is true of both the writing on negativity and reading on negativity assignments that their success depends much on how the mentor interacts with the student in the introduction and implementation of such endeavors. But models of bad self-image are far from indifferent or neutral teaching devices. The student profile we were to work with in the educational planning seminar might well interpret such a reading assignment as a negative trend for handling future mentoring topics, and would, at some inherent level, conjoin emotions roused by his negative memories with his associations surrounding this new college experience. If he were bringing to that initial mentoring session a vague distrust of and dissatisfaction with education, having to read a book detailing such alienation might reinforce his biases.

That said, I allow that I do incorporate the theme of students' negative self-image in my own teaching materials. While it does not cap my first hour-long session with new students, I do introduce the matter within the first few weeks of instruction. One piece I've used since it was published back in 1974 is a heavily abridged adaptation of *Ella Price's Journal* by Dorothy Bryant. Using the medium of an English Comp journal as its text, Bryant traces Ella's personal growth as a student a dozen years after graduation from high school, as well as her growing appreciation of journal writing as a means of self-empowerment. In addition to these not-too-subtle topics for my students who, themselves, share Ella's distaste and/or confusion about assigned journals, I apply its entries to analytical reading goals: encouraging students to recognize the difference between what Ella writes and why Bryant has her do so in that way at that phase of the journal. Another reading I've abridged for similar ends is from Joyce Carol Oates' *Because It is Bitter and Because It is My Heart*. In one passage a high school basketball star does poorly on a math test, to the chagrin of a white teacher who praises this one black student so he can be dismissive toward the other black students in the class; in another, an English teacher fails his essay because its content is to thoughtful for a student of Jinx's caliber and it contains too many run-on sentences, but grants it a B when the student dumbs it down and amends his syntax. When appropriate, I move next to an edited version of D. H. Lawrence's essay on Benjamin Franklin in order to examine similar themes in variant prose styles.

At issue for me, then, is the time and means of assignments that seek positive outcomes from negative material with which students are encouraged to identify. For an adult who comes to our first encounter without a positive outlook on education, I would not close our initial hour together with negative material. As a singular person (in contrast to a seminar group later in a term) whose reasons for attending the session should benefit from a mentor's guidance, he is more apt to identify with the negative student image and to conclude that this phenomenon called a "mentor" has pre-labeled him with such an image. Women, ethnic minorities, and other groups may also recognize the student's potential resentment at having his own personal experience (the good, the bad and the unique) co-opted by another author's paradigm of both "typical" conflicts and personal responses to them. The finer subtleties of the assignment might be clarified in the follow-up hour, if the student elects to come back. The mentor risks being perceived as arrogant, judgmental and as blind to the real mentee as Jinx's math and English teachers in the Oates novel — in short, risks creating the obverse of the desired effect and, one assumes, of the mentor's actual character. And the impact on the mentee can be no less counteractive.

1) All education is environmental education;
2) Environmental issues are complex and cannot be understood through a single discipline or department;
3) For inhabitants, education occurs in part as a dialogue with a place and has the characteristics of good conversation;
4) The way education occurs is as important as its content;
5) Experience in the natural world is both an essential part of understanding the environment, and conducive to good thinking;
6) Education relevant to the challenge of building a sustainable society will enhance the learner's competence with natural systems.

David W. Orr
"Six Foundations of Ecological Literacy"
Ecological Literacy: Education and the Transition to a Postmodern World
(Albany: SUNY Press, 1992)

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

Book Review
Fernand Brunschwig, Long Island Center

Elizabeth Steltenpohl, Jane Shipton and Sharon Villines. *Orientation to College: A Reader On Becoming An Educated Person* . Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1996.

Elizabeth Steltenpohl, Jane Shipton and Sharon Villines, retired ESC faculty members, developed a valuable focus on the developmental process as part of students' experience at ESC. Their work provides a valuable perspective for us to consider as we continue thinking and rethinking educational planning and its meaning and direction at ESC.

Steltenpohl, Shipton and Villines' book, *Orientation to College*, especially the final section on "Becoming Employable for the Twenty-First Century," provides a useful set of readings that helps students become familiar with experts' thinking about career and educational trends and which, I would expect, would stimulate students' thinking and help them to generalize from their own ideas. The readings also focus attention on how important students' personal goals and development are and communicate a variety of specific ideas for ways that students can seek to foster their own development.

The overall ideas animating this book are that each student's developmental path is somewhat different, that the work and credit of academic planning arises from investigating and pursuing this developmental path. This requires a variety of exercises, focused on both the "inside" world of the student and the "outside" world of higher education, jobs, professions and careers. Indeed, the success of academic planning lies precisely in bringing the "inside" and "outside" worlds into some kind of reasonable congruence, in matching a student's goals with his or her capacities and interests as well as with the external opportunities and resources.

In addition, Steltenpohl and Shipton have described their extensive work with adults at ESC in a 1986 article, "Facilitating a Successful Transition to College for Adults," (*Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 56, No. 6, pp. 637-658, November/December 1986). They argue convincingly that "not only our students, but adult students, generally, experience feelings of inadequacy and marginality upon entry or reentry to college, feelings that are counterproductive to academic success (p. 637)." Steltenpohl and Shipton argue further that to overcome these feelings adults need an introductory learning experience that provides an opportunity for a realistic self-appraisal of their potential as adult learners, the achievement of a sense of belongingness, and a deeper understanding of higher education in general and the meaning of liberal education in particular.

They developed and presented an eight-week entry-level course over six years that "integrated diagnosis and skill building with rigorous content related to the person (self), adult learning and the world of higher education. The course featured self-assessment, not external diagnosis, and skill building through practical use of skills, not isolated exercises or repetitious drill." Steltenpohl and Shipton documented that a high percentage of the students enrolled attended all eight sessions of the course and received full credit. They describe in rich and convincing detail the full range of what students achieved following the course: additional successful studies in various areas, planning and completion of associate and/or bachelor's degrees, improvement of academic skills,.... In general, student outcomes "related particularly to the quality,

ownership and, in some cases, the uniqueness of the educational programs these students planned as well as to the confidence they gained in themselves as adult learners. Rather than simply fulfilling degree requirements, many of these students attained a remarkably high level of scholarship after entering the College with great uncertainty about their ability to succeed."

Steltenpohl and Shipton's conclusions are timeless and worth restating: "Adults entering or reentering college ... have special needs that should be addressed so that they can successfully make the transition from citizen-in-the-world to college student." Steltenpohl and Shipton's data, as well as their other rich, anecdotal evidence, demonstrates that the learning engendered by their course is highly effective in helping adults make this transition to college.

To this reader, it seems that the key to the effectiveness of Steltenpohl and Shipton's course lay in the specific activities and approach of the course. These activities included, among other topics, an opportunity for students to compare themselves with peers in a learning situation, to self-diagnose skills and interests, to assess and reflect on self and on the reasons for the decision to return to college, and to learn about the purposes of higher education and the meaning of liberal education.

I think that these kinds of reflective, substantive activities form much of the real core of the "value added" by educational planning and by an ESC education itself. Helping students pursue such exercises, and finding new ways to help students succeed with educational planning both effectively and efficiently, should form the center of our inquiry, whatever the medium of communication and the format of interaction.

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

John and Maria: What Mentors Learn from Experiential Learning

Lee Herman, Central New York Center
Xenia Coulter, Central New York Center

One of the pleasant disturbances of mentoring is that so often by attending to our experiences with students we learn to refresh our questions about standard academic practices. In working with our students to design entire programs, we can and should wonder what a "good" education means. In creating individual studies, we ask what sufficient learning activities and sound outcomes are. In helping students prepare for formal "credit by evaluation," we need to consider how "learning" is really to be distinguished from "experience" and what makes such learning "college creditable." Conventional institutional routines presume implicit answers to these questions. Mentoring unfolds them. It constantly offers the opportunity to examine what our educational judgments mean. As we make explicit the assumptions within standard habits, there often emerge logical inconsistency, historical illusion and arbitrary convenience, rather than educational wisdom. Mentors who have ever asked themselves just what makes a "learning" into a "liberal study," must have had such an unsettling experience. So often, and with a not always pleasant thrill, we find that in collaborating with our students, we are forced to admit that our understanding of "knowledge" is less secure than we had supposed.

This happens most frequently in credit by evaluation, because there we are trying to make some credible (and creditable!) connections between normal academic judgments and non-academic experiences. Further, mentoring pushes us to wonder about the relationships — the possible distinctions and the possible interdependence — of learning and experience. It must be common for mentors to encounter students who are genuinely surprised that something they did could be considered learning at all! These moments of surprise, puzzlement and discovery occur even more often when mentors approach credit by evaluation without assuming that, from all the possible learnings a student might demonstrate, only those which "match" already existing course titles can be awarded credit. In this "discovery" approach to credit by evaluation (Coulter et. al., 1994; Coulter and Herman, 1997), interesting situations and questions abound.

We offer the following small example. Maria and John, although working in different venues, are both seeking credit for roughly the same subject, "preschool education" or "early childhood teaching skills." Here are portions of conversations, transcribed from videotapes, each had with the same mentor.

We begin with Maria:

Mentor: When you did see the preschool kids in your own class? And for how long?

Maria: Well, every day, all day. . . well, from around 8:30 until 3.

Mentor: How did you decide what they would do during that time?

Maria: I have followed, well — at the beginning of the year, we have a meeting and together we decide upon a schedule, and before I do any planning, the schedule is set. We know that a half hour is about as long as [preschoolers] can tolerate — well, with gym a little longer, but with [a foreign] language, 25 minutes or 30 minute max. It doesn't matter how good

you are, at that age, they will soon climb the walls — although they know they're in school, they still prefer to play.

Mentor: So you would plan what to do during that 30- minute period?

Maria: Yes.

Mentor: How? Did you read books, or . . .

Maria: We have a pretty good library at the school with lots of materials. I also looked at the materials that my son used when he went to preschool. I tried to get information wherever I could.

Mentor: Did you include reading to the children as part of the lesson?

Maria: I usually had a book associated with whatever I was talking about. For example, in the family unit [in the Spanish class] — I taught them some basic words, and then I read to them *The Three Bears* — in English — and then I also gave them two or three [related] words in Spanish — "padre, madre, bebe," and also, because it was repeated so often and you might as well take advantage of repetition with kids this age, I added one more word, "bear."

Mentor: How would you decide when or whether they were going to learn, say, colors or numbers or whatever? Was it just a random choice or did you have a plan?

Maria: I personally did it randomly — because I don't have a real structure — no one has taught me how to do this. Actually I decide on what's logical — the first week of school you need to get to know who you're talking to, so I taught them "Hello, how are you, my name is..."

Mentor: In Spanish?

Maria: Yes, and we did the same in the regular classroom. At this age, they need repetition — they love to know what they are doing. Then I did the family. This is the third week, and it's time to move on, for them to really learn something. I decided to do shapes, and then this morning, I changed my mind. I decided that I should go with something a little easier, like colors. They don't know shapes in English yet, so why go there? So, tonight I have to take some time and change the plan and decide what to do about teaching them colors. Even though I'm very busy, with school and all, I'd rather spend another hour and then do something that's more beneficial for the children.

And now for John:

John: Well, I plan to write about, first of all, all the skills and strategies I've learned for evaluating children from three to six. In terms of observation, there're different kinds — the anecdotal record, and a running record, which I've also done, where for each child you write their name and then leave a space for any information that stands out during the day. For example, you may note that a child has been reporting each day that he feels bad, or says something gross like he saw his mom hit his dad last night, or I might note that the child is making a lot of number and letter reversals. Now, for children we are honing in on, in particular kids having discipline problems, for example, we will create checklists, and then will count frequencies of how much we see of this or that type of behavior, for 15 or 30 minutes, depending. I've found that you really need this kind of report. It's important if you are going to be calling the parent in for a conference and saying to them that your child is having a problem and this is what we see. You can then present the record from the past three days and tell them that your child has done that so many times. It also helps that if the child gets referred to a counselor for help — then we have what they need recorded too.

Mentor: How long have you been doing this, John?

John: All the time I've been teaching [about 20 years]. Observation is a very important part of Montessori philosophy. Montessori herself developed her whole pedagogy by observing children. She would, for instance, take materials, put them in a room, and then observe the children's reactions.

Mentor: Is this something you do too?

John: Yes, when we have something new, we like to observe what the children do with it. In that case, the record is pretty anecdotal.

Mentor: Could it happen through bias or for some other reason that you might miss or overlook a student when making these observations?

John: Sure. To guard against that, what we have tried is to work in pairs, so that two people are observing, and sometimes we add an administrator, who hopefully is completely objective, at least more than we might be as the classroom teachers.

Although we see John and Maria talking about teaching different groups of students, different subjects and in different ways, some reasonable comparisons can be made about their teaching skills based on what they've said. Both John and Maria are dedicated and energetic teachers; both seem to have a "way" with schoolchildren. But, here are some blunt, albeit preliminary, evaluative statements: John knows more about teaching than Maria does. His knowledge of teaching skills is more sophisticated, at a higher level, than hers. He is likely to be recommended for more credit and/or more advanced level credit than she. It seems pretty easy to draw these conclusions because the observations on which they are based so readily "match" routine academic categories and standards of judgment.

What are some of these observations? John speaks about his experiences much more fluently and precisely than Maria does. His conceptual vocabulary is more sophisticated and abstract, and it suits the specific experiences to which he refers. Although neither student has a college degree or state teaching license, John has been teaching longer than Maria has. John's interpretations of his decisions and procedures are methodical and consistent; Maria's approach, in contrast, is tentative and, by her own account, is sometimes improvised in a rush. Moreover, John has had formal training in a long standing, globally recognized (even if not college accredited) form of teaching, Montessori method, one which, the mentor knows, includes supervised practice of new teachers and which is the subject of much published research and theorizing. John seems to be conversant with this literature. Maria, on the other hand, has received little or no formal training about how to be a teacher. Her lesson plans are invented "randomly," she says. Therefore, it would be easy to suppose that the mentor might reasonably and fairly advise Maria to seek fewer credits than John for "teaching skills" and, as well, that she should expect that this credit will be at an introductory level. According to quite transparent meanings of academic breadth, depth and proficiency of learning, John simply knows more than Maria and he knows it "better."

But something else might be striking to a mentor who reflects attentively on this experience of conversing with Maria. True, she describes her teaching activities and decisions in a halting and unself-assured manner. However, what she is describing is a persistent, thoughtful effort to become methodical. We can also see that she plans by organizing her observations of her students, by reasoning, and by reflecting on her own experiences as a parent. Even though her observations are limited and anecdotal, her reasoning hesitant, and her reflections often hurried by her busy life, once one begins to notice, it is easy to see that Maria has been making her own way. To do so, she is developing out of her experiences something like a "system" for teaching preschool kids. What intellectual operations must she perform in order to do this? From the videotape we see evidence of analysis when she specifies exactly which Spanish words to teach the children and exactly what steps she is going to take to do so. We see evidence of integration when she changes a lesson plan in order to match what the children are learning elsewhere. Maria also forms general hypotheses, for example, that children need repetition, which she evaluates through trial and error. She also uses logic in determining the order of her lessons. Although Maria appears to learn primarily on her own, she does seek out and make coherent use of information from diverse sources: She uses the library, she talks to her own children, she watches what is going on in other classes, and she consults with other teachers. And finally we can see that she engages in a rather sophisticated synthesis of all these operations such as when she teaches children how to greet each other.

Indeed, from the available evidence, John has done none of these things; indeed, the Montessori School's strong commitment to an already well-developed pedagogy may even discourage him from doing so. By and large, if we are to judge from just the account given here, he has been "trained" and he has perhaps read the same "authorities" his trainers have. John's learning consists very largely of his having internalized what Flaubert called "received" ideas and methods. Surely, this is learning — substantial learning displayed as "reproduction." It "matches" the established expectations of

Montessori method, and it can be quite readily matched to the kinds of skills college students would be expected to achieve in classes on teaching method theory or in supervised, credit-bearing student teaching courses. But it is not invention.

Maria is inventing. Of course it would be too much to say that Maria has invented a full blown repertoire of teaching methods, or "teaching methods for children learning a second language" — let alone a theory, a methodology, of such teaching. Maria is definitely not — or, not yet — that sophisticated. But she has invented, on her own, some moves that seem to work. And isn't "invention" or "creativity" a kind or aspect of learning, in fact quite sophisticated learning, in and of itself? Here is a question about standard academic assumptions that mentoring stirs up: Is inventiveness in learning an academically credible and creditable kind of learning? (Here is a rhetorical question as a reply: If inventiveness were not such learning, then why do we require and evaluate it in all Ph.D. and tenure candidates?[1])

This situation is very odd. Maria has engaged, almost entirely on her own, in higher level intellectual operations, and produced what seems to be lower level knowledge. So far as we or her mentor can tell at this point, the knowledge she's invented certainly is not at John's level of sophistication (let alone at the level of a Ph.D.). If we pay attention only to the product or content of Maria's learning, rather than to the learning activities by which she got there, she has some basic, limited, probably college-level knowledge of teaching skills. But if we value her inventiveness, how do we make sense of both the learning product and the learning process?

Perhaps a comparison might help. Let's say, with Einstein. Imagine that we were doing a credit by evaluation interview with Einstein some time before he was ready to publish his theories of special and general relativity. This would be the time when he, like Maria, was in the throes of invention. No doubt, we imagine, he would have been as hesistant and as inarticulate about the knowledge he was developing as Maria is about her knowledge. Nonetheless, in retrospect, we can see that the inventiveness he was displaying was remarkable and as worthy of recognition as the theories themselves.

Let's now magically transport that "early" Einstein to the final exam of a first or second year undergraduate physics class. How well might he do? Would he pass (even if he were excused from the section on quantum mechanics but not the section on relativity)? Perhaps. He might not do as well as the better students, since it's likely that they would have a more facile and articulate knowledge of his own theories of relativity than he did then. If we were to evaluate his learning only with respect to the results, the inventor of the theories of relativity might not be awarded as much credit as the barely adult students who now study his work and its consequences several generations later. Now we ask, should Einstein get "extra" or higher level credit for inventing the learning products those students are now getting credit for imitating? It would seem absurd to say no. Then why shouldn't Maria also get credit for independently inventing her learning products?

But wait: Maria, so far as we can tell, is no Einstein. The still very crude general ideas (it would be too much to call them "theories" at this point) she is hesitantly forming are probably not original. Unlike the theories of relativity Einstein invented, which were new to the physicists at the time he published them, Maria's notions of how children might learn a second language are almost certainly well known to experienced foreign language teachers, and they might have much wise correction to offer her. If we evaluate Maria's learning just on the basis of the results she's achieved, the content she's produced, and thus ignore the extraordinary intellectual enterprise which got her there, she doesn't seem to be offering anything "new." Moreover, we'd not be treating her any differently than we do in evaluating students who demonstrate, as John almost certainly has, that they have successfully learned, by whatever means, the acceptable and expectable academic material. Surely, the physics students will be graded for the number of problems they have correctly solved within a set time on the final examination, not for whatever intellectual motions they make to get those results. After grammar school, we generally don't give extra credit for "effort."

Or, do we?

Consider, for example, how severely we and other academics look upon plagiarism in essays and cheating on tests. We often punish students for their dishonesty. In making the dishonesty the critical factor, we tend to ignore whether or not in their concealed rote reproduction of knowledge they might in fact have learned what they've stolen! This is not to say of course that the dishonesty is unimportant, but only to observe that the academy does care, sometimes, about the process by which students arrive at the correct results. Guarding against plagiarism and cheating, we try to assure ourselves that students have made the correct answers really their own. That assurance, at bottom, is a necessary condition for awarding

credit. Similarly, the caricature of professors who simply expect students to parrot the contents of lectures rests in good part on our distaste for merely rote learning. Students will still get the credit for the knowledge they are able to reproduce or mimic. But we often righteously lament that we want students to make this knowledge deeply, intimately their own, and not just expendable material they reproduce on a test for a grade and thereafter forget. By this line of completely conventional academic thinking, shouldn't Maria's complex, far ranging and, to her, original learning activities, which have led her to (re)discover how children learn a second language, be commended and acknowledged? If so, why not with the currency which counts in academic institutions, with "extra" credit?

Similarly, should we not recognize and credit Maria's remarkable independence? (After all, this quality is an explicit goal of our institution.) Although her learning is for a school, certainly it is not taking place in a school nor in a conventionally pedagogical manner. Not only is she engaged in independent cognitive activities in the sense of being without pedagogical supervision, she also works independently in the sense of developing her own learning process. This second sense of "independence," that is, learning that comes from hands-on and ongoing experience, which the academy does not ordinarily offer, seems to get close to what we implicitly mean by "experiential learning." If we genuinely value experiential learning and actively promote independent learning, shouldn't we be able to separately recognize them as worthwhile intellectual achievements?

Note how the "discovery" approach to credit by evaluation, in contrast to "matching," makes us aware of how much more there is to knowledge than simply its content. Perhaps it is the leisurely quality of these conversations of discovery or perhaps their explicit focus on what the student knows rather than what the institution will accept that encourages this keener awareness. In any case, what we see is that the learning activities themselves can be analyzed and appreciated quite separately from the cognitive content or product they yield. Our Einstein and plagiarism examples suggest that this distinction is important, though rarely explicit, even in traditional academic judgments. From this perspective, if we assume that John is largely reproducing the content knowledge he has acquired from training, while Maria has invented her knowledge independently, we might then argue that John deserves credit for mastery of a higher level learning product while Maria deserves credit for the higher level learning activities she undertook to develop a learning product.

While this distinction is analytically useful, it does raise worrisome concerns. First, it could lead to cumbersomely elaborate sets of credit recommendations. John gets so many advanced level credits for Teaching Skills and so many introductory credits for Learning Teaching Skills. Maria gets so many introductory level credits for Teaching Skills and so many advanced credits for Learning Teaching Skills. Imagine generalizing this approach to entire curricula. Student transcripts would become enormous records of cognitive detail, informative but nearly incoherent.

Second, by emphasizing the component parts of learning, we may fail to apprehend and credit the wholeness of the learning experience. Take, for example, a student internship or practicum. The value of this experience is precisely in the interaction between practice and theory or experience and reflection. In fact, this interdependence is exactly what we mean by "experiential learning" (whether or not it is sponsored by the academy). Any effort to dissociate these varied aspects of learning distorts the purpose of the experience and to some degree misses the point. Doesn't "learning" become distorted in the same way when we separate process from product? Surely, the quality of "inventive" and "independent" learning activities depend to some extent on the quality of the outcome. (If Einstein had come up with a patently false theory, would we not evaluate his inventiveness in a different light? And, if Maria's emerging theory of teaching turned out to harm children, would we still be willing to celebrate her independence?) Moreover, so strongly distinguishing product from process results in an inauthentic rendering of experiential learning. It fragments learning experiences that are lived as a whole. This can be seen in the videotape selections, which show that neither John nor Maria understand their learning as separable processes and products. The latter are embedded as moments in the former. Thus, knowledge can be regarded as an emergent entity, the result of a variety of dynamically connected facets. That we can appreciate and separately evaluate some of these facets should not let us lose sight of the fact that it is still the entire learning experience that deserves recognition.

It is worth noting that a wholistic approach to learning is also ignored when, as is so often the case in traditional colleges, it is only the learning product that is acknowledged. The reliance of so many colleges upon "matching" student experiential learning to an existing curriculum illustrates this point precisely. In "matching," only the product matters. This approach may be fair enough from the perspective of equality of treatment and "quality assurance." But it also means that colleges, which exist both to assure the reproduction of knowledge and to nurture the creation of new knowledge,

limit legitimate learning to what, in effect, already exists within their institutional boundaries. Within those boundaries they recognize process — as lectures, textbooks, examinations and essays — but not from without (unless by chance, as in John's case, it strongly resembles traditional academic pedagogy). In failing to take more seriously the whole learning experience students can bring from the outside, these colleges lose the opportunity to learn from their students, to expand their own stores of knowledge, and to appreciate the remarkable synergy between product and process in the development of knowledge.

Thus, perhaps the truly basic problem that these reflections on John and Maria reveal is not so much that standard academic judgments are not refined enough to apprehend the learning these students have achieved. Rather, it may be that such judgments, even when refined in the way our analysis has suggested, err in making too much of the distinction (even in assuming there is a significant distinction) between "learning" and "experience." Perhaps we are accustomed to make too much of the separate facts that learning occurs through experiences within the academy and that learning also occurs through innumerable experiences outside of and independently of it. Reflecting on unconventional, inventive and independent learning, such as Maria's, we can envision "experiential learning" as a vast terrain of human activity that combines perceiving, acting and thoughtfulness, or experience and reflection. The academy has claimed, colonized and ordered some of that territory in such pedagogical formats as reading and writing assignments, labs, discussions and internships. All of those are "learning experiences." But they are not all the experiences of learning. In that much larger realm, the academy still has much to explore and learn, just as the child does from the parent, or as the species depends upon the genus. As mentors willing to discover the experiential learning of our students, we enter this larger world of learning.

Notes

[1] Although our focus is on Maria's inventiveness, the questions we ask about her learning also raise questions about the traditional assumptions we make about, say, the originality of knowledge generated by Ph.D.'s. Perhaps, as Kuhn might argue, dissertations are much less inventive than academic ritual supposes. Here again, mentoring and the evaluation of experiential learning leads us to question a normally accepted belief, but that's another issue for another paper.

References

Coulter, X., Herman, L., Hodgson, T., Nagler, S., Rivera de Royston, I. (1994). Assessing Adult's Experiential Learning. Unpublished Executive Summary for the National Center on Adult Learning, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.

Coulter, X., and Herman, L. (1997) Experiential Learning: What Teachers Learn from Seeing Conversations with Their Students. Paper presented at the National Conference on Creating a Nation of Lifelong Learners, Washington, D.C.; in press, Alliance Proceedings.

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

CIRCLE News
Judith Gerardi, Metropolitan Center

The CIRCLE affinity group continues to follow several avenues of research, theory building, and practice around adult development and learning. Some of those endeavors were reported at the October 1998 annual conference of the Adult Higher Education Alliance in San Diego. CIRCLE people presenting their work at that conference were Xenia Coulter, Chris Rounds, Irene Rivera de Royston, Ellen Hawkes and Judy Gerardi. In two of their sessions, student diversity was examined: one session addressed what is learned when one experiences one's own culture in the context of another; and a second session addressed assigning meaning to subject matter within one's cultural frame of reference. Other session topics by CIRCLE members were the principles and practices of faculty development in a nontraditional college setting, and the value of student stories in identifying learner goals.

Xenia Coulter was elected to the Board of Directors of Alliance, and we are both pleased for her and lucky to have her voice on the board. Congratulations, Xenia!

Next year's Alliance conference will take place in Saratoga Springs, sponsored by Skidmore's University Without Walls with Empire State College as a co-sponsor. CIRCLE members Meg Benke and Judy Gerardi are on the planning committee. We look forward to mentor participation at that October 1999 meeting. (Further details will follow.)

Editor's Note: Non-CIRCLE faculty from ESC who presented or co-authored papers for the conference were Carol Carnevale, Ken Cohen, Alan Mandell, Susan Oasks and Janet Ostrov.

New Publication

Consumer's Guide to Educational Planning in Technology, Science and Business by Long Island mentor, Fernand Brunschwig, is now available in printed book form from the ESC Bookstore. The stock number is 080009. The book ($24.95/copy) can be ordered from the ESC Bookstore using the ESC Educational Materials Order Form.

Evaluation copies are available. Please send requests to Fernand. A description of the guide and instructions about how to access it on the web were published in *All About Mentoring* #14. To view it on the web, point browser at s1n1.esc.edu/personal/faculty/fbrunsch; enter "ed planning" as UserID and "degree" as password. The password must be all lower case.

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

NCAL News
Tim Lehmann, National Center on Adult Learning (NCAL)

On October 15 and 16, the National Center on Adult Learning (NCAL) held its annual council meeting at ESC in Saratoga Springs. Tim Lehmann, NCAL director, chaired the gathering that included council members Blythe Clinchy, Patricia Cross, Morris Keeton, David Kolb, Marjorie Lavin, Donald MacIntyre, Victor Montana and Paula Peinovich. More than 20 colleges and institutions devoted to adult learning were represented.

A major focus of the meeting was the presentations of the five 1997-1998 NCAL Fellows. Each fellow had prepared an executive summary describing his/her project, offered the significant results of the research, and engaged the council in discussion about issues stemming from the work.

David Brigham from Regents College (NY) investigated the effectiveness of an electronic peer network that he had developed in facilitating peer contact and interaction about adult distance learners, and in promoting student progress. In her project, Diana Kelly from Cuyamaca College (CA), sought to learn whether or not participation in a weekend college program increased the success of adult learners. Nan Travers of the University of Connecticut, examined the effects of teaching methods on students' "self-regulation" of their own learning by comparing experiential learning techniques with traditional lecture teaching methods with respect to the way students regulated their learning of mathematics in a community college setting.

In a fourth project, John Reese from the College of Law, University of Denver, reported on a four-year effort to use the Kolb Inventory to examine the learning styles of both law school faculty and students, and to assess the effectiveness of typical legal educational strategies. And in a final presentation, Elana Michelson of ESC, discussed her work in developing a model of prior learning assessment (PLA) in South Africa, and her analysis of the ways in which highly individualized modes of self-awareness and self-representation upon which PLA rests can cause difficulty for those students from cultures in which knowledge is understood as both collective and active.

Later this fall, NCAL will announce a call for proposals re: a new round of fellowships for practitioner-based research. Please contact Tim Lehmann (518 587-2100 x288) if you are interested in receiving copies of any of the reports summarized above.

Copyright © 1998

ALL ABOUT
MENTORING
A Publication of Empire State College

Issue 15, Fall 1998

MI News

Journal Update

The goal of this column in *All About Mentoring* is to make us more aware of on-going scholarly work in the field of adult education and learning, and to offer options for the publication of our own research and reflections on mentoring. If you have any suggestions for journals we should include in this on-going list, please let us know.

The Journal of Higher Education

The Journal of Higher Education is published bi-monthly by Ohio State University Press. The journal includes articles on research, professional practice and policies regarding higher education. (Each issue also includes a section of book reviews. Literature reviews are also considered.)

Manuscripts should be sent to:

Leonard L. Baird, Editor
Journal of Higher Education
Ohio State University Press
1070 Carmack Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Recent issues have included a number of pieces relevant to the discussion of faculty development. The new issue (November/December 1998) includes an essay by Carol L. Colbeck, "Merging in a Seamless Blend: How Faculty Integrate Teaching and Research." A small quote from John P. Bean's provocative "Alternative Models of Professional Roles: New Languages to Reimagine Faculty Work" (September/October 1998) is included in these pages of *AAM*. And, an essay by Davis and Chandler, "Fundamental Change in the University and the Socioeconomic System" (January/February 1998) analyzes Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*.

Announcement

Kathleen Taylor, Catherine Marienau and Morris Fiddler of De Paul University in Chicago are writing a book about teaching and advising strategies that promote adult development. At the recent Alliance conference in San Diego, Marienau and Fiddler facilitated a workshop at which they presented their (current) view of development as "marked by movements along five dimensions:"

- Toward knowing as a dialogic process
- Toward a dialogic relationship to oneself
- Toward being a continuous learner
- Toward self-agency and self-authorship

- Toward connection with others

(You may contact Catherine or Morris if you wish a more fully developed list.)

They then invited the audience to share with them strategies they use in their teaching that promote such developmental outcomes. They would be very interested in hearing from Empire State College mentors as well (although it must be as soon as possible). Specifically, they ask that "if you would like to nominate a strategy that you use in your teaching and/or advising toward promoting a developmental outcome,"

- Please describe your strategy/method, including the specific activities/techniques used:
- Which developmental outcome(s) does it best promote?
- On what basis do you make that connection?

You may send your responses by e-mail to cmariena@wppost.depaul.edu or mfiddler@wppost.depaul.edu or by regular mail to either Catherine Marienau or Morris Fiddler, DePaul University, 25 E. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604. Be sure to let them know how to contact you in the event they might want to follow up about your becoming a contributor to their book.

Submissions to *All About Mentoring*

If you have read a book that interested you; if you have attended a stimulating conference; if you have 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 a talk that you presented (however informal); or if you have a short story, poem, drawings or photographs, please consider submitting them as well.

Please send *All About Mentoring* reports on your re-assignments and sabbaticals. You might also consider interviewing a colleague about his/her mentoring practices. (For example, the latter could be an important way for us to help all of us know and remember the insights of those who have been working at ESC for many years.)

Please send submissions to Alan Mandell (ESC, 225 Varick Street, NYC 10014-4382) or via e-mail (the simplest method). We very much look forward to your contributions. The next issue of *All About Mentoring* will be published in mid-spring, 1999. Please send your contributions by February 15. Thanks very much.

Special Inquiry

We often ask students to keep "journals" or some kind of reflective record of their on-going work. And, to that end, many mentors have developed for their students an outline, a description or an example of this kind of writing. The Mentoring Institute would like to collect examples of these materials so they might be used by others throughout the College. If you have a description of your journal model, please send it along to Mandell.

 Copyright © 1998