CONTENTS

Introduction

MAKING WORK VISIBLE WORK THROUGH DATA-INFORMED ADVOCACY

Leigh Graziano, Kay Halasek, Remi Hudgins,
Susan Miller-Cochran, Frank Napolitano,
and Natalie Szymanski

Like writing itself, which Chris M. Anson (2011, 33) reminds us "takes place within social systems where particular practices evolve locally based on the purposes and goals of participants," writing program administration is situated within complex institutional systems that demand our attention to "goals, motivations, histories, actions, norms, hierarchies, and other elements of human interaction." That fact is not lost on the editors of this collection, which has its origins in 2016, when five of us—Leigh, Kay, Susan, Frank, and Natalie—happened to sit at the same table at the same session at the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) and began to chat about our work as writing program administrators (WPAs) at very different institutions and professional locations. Our collaboration began with a clear realization that the different institutional systems in which we serve as WPAs shape our experiences. Nonetheless, we also shared a common desire to make WPA work more visible to ourselves, our institutions, and our discipline by calling explicit attention to and examining WPAs' lived labor experiences. We began by tracking our own labor and reporting on our analysis of the data in "A Return to Portland: Making Work Visible through the Ecologies of Writing Program Administration" (Graziano et al. 2020). We learned through that process that the field needs to hear from a much broader range of voices using a much broader range of methodologies to truly understand the scope of lived WPA labor. This collection is a response to that need.

We write this introduction in a very different context from that CWPA conversation in Raleigh, North Carolina. In 2022, we are in a cultural

and historical moment that has upended the way higher education oper-
ates, what spaces we work in, and how we plan for the future. The sud-
den outbreak of COVID-19 required every WPA and writing instructor to
change course—for many, in the middle of a semester or term—and to
reimagine what writing instruction might look like during a pandemic.
Unexpected additional labor is not unique to writing programs, but it
has impacted education at all levels on a global scale like nothing we've
ever seen. Because they typically serve incoming students, writing pro-
grams tend to feel the impact of fluctuations in higher education enroll-
ment trends first, and they always have to respond quickly. Because
writing programs are often some of the largest programs on college or
university campuses, the labor required to shift instructors and students
to and maintain them in online environments is significant.

But is that surprising? Aren't WPAs always having to adjust and react?
In writing studies scholarship, we often refer to writing programs as
"ecologies," and never has the ecological scope of our work and disci-
plinary space been so evident. When one element of our work or con-
text shifts, all others adjust and react in response. We are all adjusting
and responding as we always do, but suddenly the pull of external ecolo-
gies is much greater than it has ever been, increasing the urgency and
significance of what we must adjust to and how we do it. As is so often
the case, the labor of writing programs and WPAs provides a model of
response and often lightens the load for other units on campus. The
burden writing programs carry in this context is great, and the support
they provide to the campus as a whole extends far beyond support for
student writing.

HOW THE COLLECTION IS ORGANIZED AND
WHY IT'S FRAMED IN ADVOCACY

Much of our work as WPAs can be constituted as the work of advocacy.
What is unique, however, is the appearance of that advocacy work across
our different institutions and positionalities. Some WPAs are mired
in the work of advocating for their own positions, responsibilities,
compensation, or release time; others champion the colleagues (often
tenure-free) who comprise our writing programs. The work we can
do to fight for our programs, our peers, and ourselves is constrained
by our positions, ecologies, and ability to find the right moment to
embark on this important labor. Conceptualizing WPA work in this way
is not captured in policy documents, like the Portland Resolution (Hult
and the Portland Resolution Committee 1992), but it is examined in

disciplinary scholarship (McLeod 1995; Adler-Kassner 2008). As Mark Blaauw-Hara and Cheri Lemieux Spiegel (2018, 253) explain, "We began to realize WPA could be a role of vision and activism, not just one of basic management." What we don't have as a field is a picture of what this advocacy work looks like and the spectrum across which that work is performed. The data-driven projects in this collection explore the different ways WPAs take up the work of advocacy to be "agents of change" (McLeod 1995).

We have elected to organize the collection across three themes—Advocating through Representations of WPA Labor, Advocating by Accounting for Time and Labor, and Advocating in and through Complex Institutional Contexts—each of which focuses attention on what we and the contributors to this collection identify as among not only the most confounding challenges facing WPAs but also the most compelling sites of their advocacy for and contributions to writing program administration, labor in higher education, and our collective obligation to forward the goals of antiracism and social justice. The contributions of our colleagues here, we believe, move us all toward a "more complete picture of the current state of the profession" (Graziano et al. 2020, 148). By taking up and answering questions about the range of WPA work (and the various forms of that work across institutional types, positions, and people) and the invisibility of much of that work—which is often unaccounted for and unrewarded—contributors create avenues forward that account for and acknowledge WPAs across the complex activity systems in which they lead the work of the university (Charlton, Charlton, and Graban 2011).

If we are honest, on some level we've known that our long-standing myths of WPA labor—the lone WPA protagonist-as-leader trope; the organized, internally consistent writing program truism; and the traditional tenure-driven checkboxes for labor—have provided us with tidy accountability narratives around which to build our field and our scholarship. However, these narratives do us a disservice as a field because they marginalize many of our colleagues and therefore obscure (or simply exclude) their important and potentially transformative and antiracist work. Reframing this work in terms of advocacy is a first step in revealing and including the diversity of labor performed by WPAs.

The authors in this collection bring important and challenging questions to the forefront:

- How can we use a variety of qualitative and quantitative research methods to uncover and thus expand our definitions of our labor, productivity, and value to ourselves and thus to others?

- How can those findings help us to not only avoid becoming anach-
  ronistic but also to emerge as advocates for ourselves—and by exten-
  sion, and perhaps more important, for others and for our students
  (especially post-COVID and in light of calls for antiracism in our
  field)?
- How should/could "boss/canonical texts" (like our organization
  statements, journals, conferences, and more) work to align them-
  selves with these lived realities? How does that alter the ways we
  build and conduct business in our professional executive boards and
  governing bodies?

PART 1: ADVOCATING THROUGH REPRESENTATIONS OF WPA LABOR

The chapters in this section highlight the interdependent nature of
WPA work and narratives about it. Just as we often perform our duties
in response to or in relationship with the needs of others, so too do
we shape our narratives in response to the perceived expectations and
unexplored assumptions of the community about and for which they
are composed and in which they are situated—sometimes problem-
atically so. This interdependence between individual and community
even extends to our emotions, which are influenced, at least in part,
by ongoing discussions among writing program administrators. These
chapters account for WPA labor work through a range of critical
lenses—including antiracism and white privilege—and analyze qualita-
tive and quantitative data to help us understand the interconnected
matrices in which administrators and writing programs exist.

Situated within the exigencies and challenges of our contemporary
racial unrest and reckoning in the academy and across the nation,
Sheila Carter-Tod calls for, in "Nothing New: Systemic Invisibility,
Epistemological Exclusion, and Faculty and Administrators of Color,"
a disciplinary shift from epistemological exclusion to epistemological
inclusion to redress the institutional practices and structures that dis-
rupt and obstruct the personal and professional lives of faculty of color
(FOC)—an abandonment of those "overt and covert systematic racial-
ized structures that undervalue their labor and often discredit their
scholarship." In reviewing a selection of the important but relatively few
contributions to the scholarly conversation on race and writing program
administration, Carter-Tod explores, among other topics, the intersec-
tionality of racial hierarchies, discourse privileging, writing assessment,
and curricular development as well as scholarship that illuminates
the foundational whiteness of writing programs and the literal and

figurative costs of the invisible labor of FOC. The time and emotional energy expended in supporting others within racist structures and institutions constructed to marginalize them is work they undertake to their own detriment and at their own expense, as such work goes unacknowledged in terms of reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

Despite its importance, Carter-Tod argues that this scholarship has done little to effect "true systemic, epistemological change," as such change requires "dismantling a structure that allows all other scholars to conduct and publish scholarship that reinforces existing racial hierarchies and only speaks to and for limited audiences"—a change the discipline and its predominantly white scholars have not yet made. Systemic change requires that the "invisible labor performed by FOC is recognized and rewarded for what it is—quantifiable work that sustains the university's reputation by helping the university meet larger strategic goals of 'diversification.'" Only then does the work of FOC "become not only visible but also rewarded accordingly." Such a shift, however, demands dismantling the hierarchies that inform what "counts" as scholarship, shifting the epistemology of the discipline from one of exclusion to one of inclusion in which definitions of "such concepts as knowledge, knowledge creation, research, and scholarship" are broadened to account for all labor—both visible and invisible.

In "Teacher, Manager, Developer, Advocate: Representations of Work in *WPA*," Kristine Johnson challenges Douglas D. Hesse's (2015) thesis that writing program administration as a field has replaced its initial emphases on teaching and management with a focus on programmatic development and, later, on advocacy. Using topic modeling of key terms in nearly forty years of *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, Johnson demonstrates that while the field has focused less on management in recent years, its attention to teaching has increased over time. Meanwhile, the disciplinary commitments to development and advocacy have remained steady—and in the case of the latter activity, low—throughout the decades. This dearth of advocacy-related scholarship appears despite Johnson and Hesse defining the term as labor that "focuses on the position of the writing programs on campus, within higher education, and in the minds of publics and policymakers" (Hesse 2015, 135; qtd. in Johnson, chapter 2, this volume). We suspect that if she were to use our more spirited definition—"fighting for our programs, our peers, and ourselves"—the footprint of advocacy would be even smaller. Despite a rise in work focusing on "ethical and rhetorical action and agency" since around 2010, topic modeling doesn't support the idea that our flagship publication has heeded Linda Adler-Kassner's (2008,

184) call for more "story-changing" advocacy to counter nonacademic narratives of student literacy. Instead, the narrative conveyed by the journal and foundational disciplinary documents, such as the Portland Resolution (Hult and the Portland Resolution Committee 1992) and the Council of Writing Program Administrators' (1996) "Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Program Administration: A Draft," has sharpened its focus on development and "particularly its growth and improvement" (Johnson, chapter 2, this volume). While Johnson's study depicts a field dedicated to its pedagogical mission, it also reveals a discipline that is apparently slow to change narratives about composition outside writing programs.

Jill Gladstein's "Revising the Terminology and Frames around WPA Work to Uncover Networks of Sites of Writing Administration" acknowledges that the questions we ask about postsecondary writing administration and the terminology we use when asking those questions greatly affect the narrative of our field. Even more, our terminology frames what is and is not included, made visible, or deemed to have power/privilege within the landscape of writing program administration. Gladstein notes that we cannot understand writing at the university by simply asking who the WPA of a particular institution might be or even if the institution has a writing program. Instead, Gladstein advocates uncovering the "explicit and embedded sites" of writing in the academy. Using the expansive dataset of the National Census of Writing, Gladstein advocates expanding our terminology to be more inclusive and to better capture the complexity of administrative positions related to composition. By observing that writing at the university is often housed not in a writing program led by an individual WPA but instead in networked "sites of writing," Gladstein challenges our field to move past the conception of the WPA as a lone protagonist—noting that the term *WPA* has often led to exclusion and silos. By employing more inclusive terminology, our disciplinary conversations will allow many stakeholders to step forward and include themselves as participants in the ongoing discussion of writing program administration.

Kimberly Emmons and Martha Wilson Schaffer's "The Value of Mentoring in Writing Program Administration" highlights the importance of storytelling within and about writing programs. From data obtained—surveys, emails, calendars, and logs of daily interactions—Emmons and Schaffer assert that mentorship emerges through "dynamic, intellectual, and distributed moments" rather than through more discrete or formal interactions. All narrative relies on careful attention to the needs of its protagonists, and Emmons and

Schaffer reveal how mentoring, in its many forms, improves writing and teaching through communication, inclusion, and a dedication to instructors' professional development. Mentoring not only communicates program goals to its members and outside stakeholders but also develops individual instructors' professional identities, along with the identity of the program.

Kristi Murray Costello and Kate Navickas's "Naming What We Feel: Self-Dialogue as a Strategy for Negotiating Emotional Labor in WPA Work" shows that good storytelling requires both honesty and vulnerability. They demonstrate both qualities by introducing readers to their practice of a modified form of journaling that enables them to understand and process the emotional labors inherent in a WPA position. By illustrating how they journal about, organize, and engage with problematic emotions, Costello and Navickas demonstrate that their emotional labor arises from both their individual lived experiences and the ongoing narratives promulgated by our discipline and institutions. In contrast to traditional journaling or other purely expressive genres, their conception of "self-dialogue" includes formulating strategies to address the personal and programmatic effects of WPAs' emotional labor. In this way, self-dialogue also functions as a kind of self-advocacy, allowing WPAs to both make sense of their own representations of their labor and make more informed, self-aware choices. Self-dialogue also requires that practitioners reflect on what they have learned about themselves, their emotional labors, and the institutional or disciplinary narratives that contribute to them. The authors' commitment to candor shows their confidence in the process. For example, Costello shares how "staying with" her emotions surrounding the delegation of authority allowed her to see that she fears losing credit for her efforts in the writing program, and Navickas admits to sending "a defensive and presumptuous email" to a colleague over a misunderstanding. Their forthrightness about the process and its value to themselves and the field imbues with authenticity their call for more WPAs to share their individual stories of emotional labor. Doing so, they argue, will enable the field as a whole to recognize the power of emotions in WPA labor and the value of talking to each other about those emotions.

PART 2: ADVOCATING BY ACCOUNTING FOR TIME AND LABOR

Increasingly, institutions of higher education are contracting with corporations to implement time and labor platforms to track and manage workers' time and labor output—creating both implicit and explicit

expectations for accountability. Platforms such as Workday, PrismHR, PeopleSoft, Interfolio's Faculty180, PeopleAdmin's Faculty Information System, and AltMetric clearly make legible the labor that results in measurable outcomes: number of clients served, number of grants awarded, number of hours in the office, number of students taught. However, these measures do not speak to the nature, scope, and invisible emotional labor of faculty or WPAs (Konkiel 2016). The authors in this section step boldly into this complex scene, providing critiques of institutional practices for measuring time and labor and tools for accounting (e.g., EmailAnalytics, Mailstrom, time-use diaries), methods of data collection (surveys, semi-structured interviews, discourse analysis), and theoretical frames (e.g., thingification and exchange value) for situating and analyzing the impact and consequences of that accounting. They also—in their theorizing—extend and complicate what "counts" *as* labor and how that labor might be more fully valued by writing instructors, institutional assessment coordinators, department chairs, promotion and tenure committees, and deans. Overall, authors' metaphors of valuing (Robinson), trading (Dippre), working "under the radar" (Mina), in/visibility (Mitchell and Rieman), failing (Anderson), and weighing down (Poblete) establish new grounds for advocacy and activism.

Deploying Harold Garfinkel's (1967) concept of "thingification," Ryan J. Dippre describes in "Trading Time: Communicating Grand Strategy to Stakeholders through Hour Tracking" how making WPA work into an object, or "thingifying" it, makes it more visible, more "palpable," to stakeholders. Working intentionally as he moved first into a role as associate director of college composition and then as director of the program, Dippre articulates principle-driven strategies from Adler-Kassner (2008) to guide his administrative calculus. Like Heather Robinson in chapter 8, Dippre speaks emphatically about the invisible, even nonexistent nature of much of his WPA work, a factor that contributes to his decision to situate his year-long record-keeping and timekeeping project within a set of five explicit "grand strategies" that enable visibility for and sustainability of his work through its connections to departmental and college initiatives and values. Dippre also challenges the Council of Writing Program Administrators' "Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Program Administration" (1996). For Dippre, "Intellectual Work" complicates his accounting for how his reassigned time was "counted," "making things a little murky" and amplifying for him the necessity of continually *thingifying* all elements of his work. Dippre also speaks to the work of "keeping the lights on,"

of "program mechanics"—Robinson's "academic housework." Within his framework, "keeping the lights on" is situated on equal ground with such grand strategies as raising national awareness of the writing program or collaborating with K–20 schools, demonstrating that a decision to devote time to one strategy means devoting less time to another—and that pursuing the grand strategies is always accompanied by necessary attention to keeping the lights on.

Lilian W. Mina, in "Theorizing Programmatic Assessment as a Site of Visibility of WPA Intellectual Work," turns our attention to brokering alliances and enriching colleagues' professional learning—all while using program assessment as a vehicle for making WPA work more visible. Still attentive to the complexity and necessity of forging and sustaining relationships with institutional partners, Mina foregrounds a set of partners far different from the department chairs and deans we find in Dippre's and Robinson's studies. Here we are introduced to an assessment specialist from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the assistant director of and instructors in the writing program with whom Mina conducted semi-structured interviews about their engagements with and reflections on writing curricula, their own professional development, and program assessment as research. Although they are certainly critical stakeholders in the work of the writing program, these partners collaborate on the design, delivery, and evaluation of the program assessment—roles that then situate them for greater, deeper, firsthand understanding of the work of program assessment and its affordances for the writing program, its staff, and institutional assessment processes and practices. The powerful and substantive impact of the study leads Mina to argue that when undertaken as a site for professional development, program assessment can both broaden others' understanding of the value of qualitative approaches to assessment and increase the visibility of WPA work.

Heather M. Robinson continues this discussion of how institutions communicate what they value in "Making Administration's Exchange Value Visible," where she applies a Marxist theoretical analysis to make a sobering observation likely familiar to all WPAs: although our administrative work has "use value" (in that it serves meaningful institutional functions), it has little, if any, "exchange" value as a commodity that can be exchanged or rewarded with reappointment, tenure, or promotion. By analyzing the Council of Writing Program Administrators' "Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Program Administration" (1996), she illustrates how disciplinary documents further obfuscate the value of administrative labor by separating intellectual work from

emotional and "academic housework," those fundamental, named responsibilities of WPAs and other administrators. Consequently, the only administrative work granted exchange value is that which is singular, exceptional, and—above all—uncompensated. Through analysis of twenty-nine time-use diaries completed by English department faculty over a three-month period, institutional documents associated with promotion and tenure guidelines, and a thank you letter from her college president, Robinson advocates establishing formal, explicit metrics for evaluating administrative work. Such metrics would offer clarity to early-career administrators about which types of labor are valued in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process and which are not, empowering administrators with the ability to focus and promote their efforts accordingly to those who would recognize and reward their labor. Analysis of the letter, for example, demonstrates that it was not her assigned responsibilities as chair but activities that lie outside those responsibilities that were lauded as "achievements." Such a calling out of the exceptional undervalues, dismisses, and makes invisible her departmental administrative work. Moreover, Robinson argues that attempts to commodify administrative labor and thereby assign it exchange value are complicated and even thwarted by the practice of granting release time or reassignment as compensation for administrative appointments, essentially releasing departments from an obligation to acknowledge, recognize, or reward the labor. As Robinson points out, release time is not compensation or reward but simply "a necessary allocation of time for this work to get done"; however, because it *is* considered compensated work, administrative labor is rendered "invisible in our rewards and recognition systems."

Angela Mitchell and Jan Rieman's "Invisible Labor: Tracking Email Practices in WPA Work" analyzes the email practices of WPAs in a large, urban, R1 institution. Like many contributors to this collection, Mitchell and Rieman combine quantitative and qualitative research methods to understand the defining influences of email (a ubiquitous medium) on WPAs' lives. They examine their own reflective journals, collect survey data from fellow WPAs, and employ automated email analytics systems with the hope of understanding their email practices. The qualitative data—in the form of stories about email we tell to each other and to ourselves—form the heart of this chapter. We witness and can empathize with a WPA's dismay when a single email upends an already crowded daily agenda. We nod in recognition when participants describe spending their time in response mode to the "miscellaneous" matters that arise throughout the day. And we identify with the

emotional toll of keeping up with the informative but sometimes taxing interactions on the WPA Listserv. These affective factors, combined with the intellectual and time commitments that email imposes on us, Mitchell and Rieman argue, illustrate how this "visibly invisible mode of communication controls us" and defines our professional environments. For many, email forms not only a paper trail but also the repository for institutional and the WPA's professional memories. Although there is likely no way to entirely escape the demands of email, Mitchell and Rieman suggest steps to navigate its use more skillfully, including setting expectations among colleagues about when and how often they will respond to each other's emails and finding a way to include email work in annual reports.

Brooke Anderson's "Opportunity Lost: Failing to Make Administrative Work Visible" reports on her work spent advocating for the creation of the WPA and writing center director (WCD) positions, something that has further dramatized the importance of these positions and the need for other faculty to take up similar work on their campuses. Anderson makes use of autoethnographic methods (labor logs, internal documents, reflections) to capture her experience living through this change and applies Barbara Curry, Lillian M. Lowery, and Dennis Loftus's (2010) institutionalization framework to reflect on the data she collected to understand how and why she failed to get these positions created on her campus. Anderson reports on not succeeding in having these positions institutionalized on her campus; however, her efforts revealed important localized conditions that acted as barriers for her advocacy—namely, the perception of WPA work as managerial as well as other university conditions of salary and workload that demoralized faculty from engaging in the reorganization work necessary to create such positions. Although scholars like Curry, Lowery, and Loftus (2010) have already suggested a framework for engaging in the work of advocating for the creation of WPA-like positions, in her chapter Anderson rightly calls for data that can be used to both show that change is needed and document change as it is happening. Such data offer a possibility of combating localized pressures against institutionalizing these kinds of administration positions. However, Anderson picks up the call others make in this collection as well: the need for our governing organization to create more documents specifically focused on the needs of community colleges. Adding this disciplinary support to localized data would help community college faculty advocate for these positions.

Patti Poblete's "Weighing down the Body: Quantifying the Nature of Antiracist Work" notes that of the innumerable attempts to advocate for

antiracist academic policies and environments, some have been heart-felt and some "purely cosmetic." For example, many commissions and task forces see the inclusion of Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) faculty perspectives as a goal in and of itself rather than a starting point for informing or catalyzing meaningful change. Even worse, efforts to gain diverse perspectives often distill myriad backgrounds and experiences into reductive racial or ethnic categories that never encapsulate the trauma that institutional racism inflicts on individual people. Poblete contends that for antiracist efforts to be valued in the academy, they must be assessable and provide actionable data. However, she notes two problems attendant with such efforts. First, the pervasive nature of antiracist statements both dilutes the subject of its immediacy and lulls individual actors into complacency. Second, the emotional labor of antiracist advocacy is impossible to quantify. Poblete also contends that institutions of higher education are inherently racist and that the changes sought by antiracists would threaten the institutional structures of which they themselves are a part. She concludes by wondering if even the most intentional and goal-driven antiracist advocacy will achieve demonstrable reforms that would make visible the labors—and pains—of BIPOC scholars.

PART 3: ADVOCATING IN AND THROUGH COMPLEX INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXTS

The authors in this section highlight the myriad ways WPAs advocate within ever-changing institutional contexts and complex ecologies. In big and small ways, WPAs are always advocating and negotiating with changes to positions (Neal, Stark, Cicchino, Healy, and Albert; Murphy and Mikanovich), shifts in institutional culture that require programmatic changes (García de Müeller and Cortés Lagos), institutional constraints (Tinoco), needed professional development (Tremain), challenges to WPA identity itself (Cunningham, Stillman-Webb, Hilliard, and Stewart), and the methodologies that inform WPA research (González). Using both traditional and nontraditional data methods, these authors demonstrate that data can be used to advocate for change within our institutions at the same time that they acknowledge the limitations of data to reveal and sustain some labor, particularly as it relates to antiracist work. Together, these chapters provide a rich picture of the types of WPA advocacy work and ways we might explore additional avenues for activism in our programs.

As Michael Neal, Katelyn Stark, Amy Cicchino, Michael Healy, and Kamila Albert highlight in "Institutional Matters: The (In)Visibility of

Localized WPA Labor," no generalized curriculum can prepare graduate WPAs (gWPAs) to make the transition to the range of institutional contexts that await them and the complex transition from students to professionals. The difficulty of this transition is exacerbated by the homogeneity of the apprenticeship model research-focused institutions most often employ to prepare new WPAs. Using institutional profiles gathered from interviews of WPAs from across the institutional spectrum, the authors of this chapter—four of whom are graduate students—argue that preparing graduate students to transition into an administrative position requires an understanding of the way local writing contexts shape the nature of the position and the type of work encountered therein. Neal and colleagues' advocacy surfaces on two different fronts. First, gWPAs need to understand the types of labor that are not visible beyond the conditions of their graduate programs. By making this labor more visible, graduate programs will prepare gWPAs for the transition into new academic and administrative ecologies. Second, Neal and coauthors' work benefits the multiplicity of institutions that are often overlooked in both gWPA education and in scholarship. The chapter illustrates that advocacy for one party often results in benefits to all involved.

Greer Murphy and Troy Mikanovich also highlight the importance of institutional context and professional identity, especially for multilingual specialists-turned-administrators. In their chapter, "Labor and Loneliness of the Multilingual WPA," Murphy and Mikanovich explore the lived labor conditions of multilingual WPAs (mWPAs) embedded in writing programs. To further contextualize the material conditions that contribute to acknowledging or erasing their labor, the authors analyze position descriptions, mission statements, and other program materials. These data make visible the spaces mWPAs occupy at the intersection of the work they really do and the work others think they do. Much like Neal and coauthors' contribution to this collection, Murphy and Mikanovich's chapter advocates for marginalized institutions, as well as the WPAs working in them. The scholarship of our field, the authors note, neither adequately explores the pedagogical, material, and political realities of smaller, multilingual programs nor examines how institutional or emotional pressures make it difficult for mWPAs to move through the often precarious spaces they occupy.

Online writing instruction (OWI) offers instructors another kind of context, one that challenges their identities and teaching practices. In "Conceptualizing Time in Hybrid and Online Writing Instruction and Program Administration," Jennifer M. Cunningham, Natalie Stillman-Webb, Lyra Hilliard, and Mary K. Stewart share data from interviews

with seventeen writing instructors of online and blended courses at four different institutions. Because OWI is not readily visible to other instructors, we don't have a clear conception of how OWI instructors spend their time. Applying content analysis and a grounded theory approach, the authors identify three key patterns: how instructors save/manage their time, the need for more time for training, and the time instructors spend designing/delivering the course. In gathering their own data to understand the time and challenges of OWI, a space often occupied by contingent faculty, the authors advocate for ways WPAs can consider both scheduling and issues of professional development and support.

Too often underrepresented and unaccounted for in disciplinary scholarship, the advocacy work of WPAs at two-year colleges is the focus of Lizbett Tinoco's "Community College WPAs Creating Change through Advocacy." Using a mixed-methods approach to gather both qualitative and quantitative data, Tinoco captures important demographic information about individual institutions and WPAs and contextualizes that information with open-ended survey questions and one-on-one interviews. Of notable interest in the data that emerged are the ways WPAs at two-year colleges described the rhetorical nature of advocacy, which Tinoco defines as the work of "engag[ing] with departmental and institutional constraints through the process of negotiation, mediation, and collaboration to affect change." This definition fits what many of the participants in her study describe when they engage in the work of creating positions, outlining job descriptions, negotiating compensation, or supporting adjunct faculty. She notes that the language used to describe this work can take many forms, including "championing," "building trust," and "fighting." Tinoco also emphasizes the complementary nature of two particular forms of advocacy that surfaced in her data: self-advocacy and peer advocacy. To gather and use data for one's own ends is to provide models that WPAs at other two-year colleges can use to advocate for their own work, positions, and professional authority. Our field will likely find it beneficial to examine the various categories of advocacy work we perform as WPAs, and room certainly exists for other studies to broaden these efforts.

In "Heavy Lifting: How WPAs Broker Knowledge Transfer for Faculty," Lisa Tremain explores a different facet of the advocacy work WPAs perform: how they strategically advocate for the learning and professional development of contingent and lecturer faculty. Tremain's qualitative approach includes data from three semi-structured interviews with WPAs. Using an open coding method to define the codes used in selective coding analysis, she focuses on language use in context, particularly

around concepts such as leadership, teaching, and professional development. To understand these data, she uses the theoretical frames of *kairos* and David N. Perkins and Gavriel Salomon's (2012) transfer framework of detect-elect-connect to make sense of the ways WPAs find exigencies to advocate for their programs and their own knowledge development. One notable finding from her study is the different ways WPAs make use of micro- and macro-kairos. Micro-kairos might take the form of small conversations, sharing of interests, and finding ways to advocate for her collaboration. Macro-kairos, in contrast, involves examining and leveraging exigencies within our institutional contexts to make important curricular shifts. One WPA noted that a shift in her professional authority after earning tenure created an opportunity for her to take more risks and be bolder in her work and her calls for change. Similarly, for another WPA, employing this framework meant realizing her program's lack of readiness for change. This was not the moment to begin advocating for the work of uptaking knowledge from the field to make changes. "Detecting" these moments allows WPAs to be more strategic in their advocacy work. The contribution of these frameworks offers meaningful opportunities for the field to explore how WPAs make important changes in their programs. Similarly, as Tinoco notes in her conclusion, these frameworks can help us begin to paint a picture of how WPAs negotiate their work within complex ecological structures—material, labor, programmatic, institutional, cultural, and personal conditions—that shape the lived conditions of our positions and the work that we perform.

Advocacy work is always complex but perhaps more so when that work is grounded in antiracism. In their study, "Building an Antiracist WAC Program," authors Genevieve García de Müeller and Ana Cortés Lagos employ a method of reflective storytelling as a first attempt at understanding the effort and labor required to build and also sustain an antiracist WAC program at Syracuse University in light of institutional shifts (and a history of both racism and antiracism activism on their campus) and a national landscape under the Trump presidency. Building this program was not without substantial institutional challenges. They lacked a coordinated antiracist WAC initiative that spanned all parts of the department and had to convince the university that there was room for WAC in spite of a robust curriculum already in place while at the same time dismantling institutional assumptions that antiracist WAC is not an add-on or a quick fix to institutionalized racist practices. While the program they developed is grounded in practices of interrogating language conventions, analyzing values and conceptions of writing,

genre-based pedagogies, and the need for antiracist assessment practices, their workshops with faculty revealed struggles with white guilt and discomfort in talking about racism and seeing connections between instructors' own pedagogical materials and antiracist practices. All of these institutional challenges required ongoing labor, adjustments to their program design, and constant advocacy and education. The value of their study, though, transcends their own institutional context and advocates for a shift needed in our field—perhaps presciently, given the 2021 conversation on and decline of the WPA-L. The authors argue that "antiracist WAC is an important and necessary step toward addressing the whiteness of writing studies" and take up Carmen Kynard's (2018, 523) call to "constantly name the structural violence of our institutions (our local settings, colleges, nation, and our field)."

In "Making Research Methods Visible through the Alternative Table of Contents," Caleb González extends the themes of advocacy, (in)visibility, institutional change, and complexity of ecologies by examining the ways WPA research methodologies reflect, refract, and challenge entrenched disciplinary practices. Working from his findings in an earlier project in which he "scoped" a randomized sample of the research methodologies informing the *WPA Journal* and two other writing studies journals, González analyzes the research methodologies deployed by the authors in *Making Administrative Work Visible* and designs an alternative table of contents for the collection. In framing that alternative table of contents, González creates a structure that makes those methodologies legible and accessible—especially for graduate students studying research methodologies. Through the alternative table of contents, González demonstrates the wide range of methodologies informing WPA research and the consequential activist work those methodologies do for writing program administrators and writing programs.

RECOGNIZING OUR HISTORIES AND THEIR (INHERENT) PARADOXES

Many of the authors in this collection highlight the invisible labor of WPAs: the many forms of mentoring WPAs do (Emmons and Schaffer), the constant emotional labor WPAs engage in (Costello and Navickas, Poblete), and the relentless need to be available, often through technology (Mitchell and Rieman). Cunningham and colleagues, Anderson, Tinoco, and Mina highlight some of the spaces where WPA labor is expected and ongoing but often ignored, under-compensated, or both (OWI, community colleges, and programmatic assessment, respectively).

But the authors of the chapters in this collection also offer solutions to these persistent challenges, and, most important, several of the authors describe tangible strategies that have made their work more visible. Dippre describes the importance of tracking time spent on WPA labor, and Mina describes pursuing collaborative relationships to make programmatic assessment more visible. Robinson highlights a core challenge for WPAs: the lack of clarity for how administrative labor translates into an exchange value for tangible rewards such as tenure and promotion. Both Johnson and Gladstein describe efforts to understand and learn from efforts to study, document, and catalog WPA labor in the *WPA Journal* and the National Census of Writing, respectively.

While we've been inspired to see the new scholarly avenues opened by these contributors, we've also been humbled. As with any scholarly endeavor, this one provides us with preliminary answers to our questions but also leaves us aware that much labor remains uncovered. Most conspicuous, this collection doesn't include data-driven projects focused on important institutional types such as historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) or Hispanic-serving institutions. While attempting to confront this, we realized that the limitations of our collection presented an unavoidable paradox: we wanted to amplify certain kinds of labor that historically have been devalued, marginalized, or "unseen"; yet our traditional ways of amplifying still privileged the kinds of participation many don't have access to *because* of the labor they are doing. The antiracist chapters in this collection reveal the difficulties of using traditionally defined data-driven methodologies to try to capture the complexity of this work. García de Müeller and Cortés Lagos deploy reflective storytelling as their method for understanding the labor involved in launching an antiracist WAC program; Poblete uses narrative as an argument to highlight the difficulty of even trying to quantify antiracist work using traditional measures; and Carter-Tod engages in a literature review of scholarship on issues of invisible labor to help explain why specific disciplinary efforts (to consider race and program administration) in isolation fall short of creating actual change. In short, traditional forms of data-driven research are themselves mired in inequity and therefore limited in their ability to make visible some of this work.

The visibility of the antiracism activism of the COVID-19 era presents us with a kairotic exigence of sorts (both in our culture at large and for our field). Once these inequities are unveiled more plainly to us (yet again), we must decide if we will continue to respond with apathy and negligence or take action. The authors in this collection and this

moment inspire us to action, for it is our action now that will help create more equitable stability for our collective and disciplinary future. So the question(s) beg:

- How can we act?
- What can we do practically to ensure that the external representations of our writing programs and cultures of writing we articulate to others (and ourselves) catch up to our (already existing) realities?
- How can we pay more than lip service to the notion of creating an inclusive representation and thus understanding of writing program administration and those who do its labor?

FINDING A WAY FORWARD

Working on this collection has led us to believe that to move forward productively from this moment, we need to call into question, rethink, and (re)operationalize two major disciplinary assumptions: the *forms* of scholarship we value and the conceptions of *authorship* and *ownership* we prioritize.

Rethinking Forms of Scholarship in the Name of Equitable Representation

The traditional forms of scholarship that we (and our institutions) currently value most highly—single-author journal articles, chapters, book-length projects—require time-consuming research, both broad and deep knowledge of previous scholarship in the field, and lengthy processes of drafting, peer review, revision negotiations, editing, and document design. Completing these projects takes months of sustained attention, attention that many marginalized, non-, un-, or pre-tenured writing administrators simply cannot afford. The default preferred *form* of our scholarship and the processes inherent in its creation preclude those who most need to be represented and amplified in our future disciplinary narratives.

- What would it look like to rethink "acceptable" research methods and processes for WPA work? For example, one of our colleagues invited research participants to participate in a study and to be coauthors with him in all aspects of the work.
- What if our peer-review time lines moved more quickly and accelerated work so it reached an audience in a timely manner (e.g., Jordan Frith's 2020 Special Section COVID call for proposals [CFP] for the *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*)?
- What could we learn from models in other disciplines? For example, the Public Library of Science (PLOS) journal *PLOS ONE* publishes

research findings and data quickly, with an eye toward making data available to the scientific community.

Rethinking Authorship and Ownership in the Name of Equitable Representation

While much of our WPA scholarship is collaborative and we have persuasive arguments for the intellectual work of writing administration, we still largely exist—and are thus promoted and tenured—inside English departments with value systems that favor single-author, monolithic hierarchies of scholarship. Single-author researched pieces in national peer-reviewed journals or presses simply carry more weight. The default conceptions of *authorship* we are forced to operate within again preclude those who most need to be represented and amplified in our future disciplinary narratives.

What would it look like to reimagine publication, mentoring, and editorial relationships? How could we move toward feminist models of authorship and ownership in which empowered scholars empower other scholars? One of the authors of this conclusion had a graduate mentor who generously invited graduate students to coauthor nearly everything he published. These opportunities were valuable experiences for the students at the time and yielded tangible results the students could point to when interviewing for jobs.

At the same time, we feel it is important to note that already marginalized, non-, un-, or pre-tenured writing administrators and faculty members cannot advocate and enact these changes alone or for themselves. For both of these situations to realistically manifest, we need advocacy from (protected) senior scholars along the same lines of disciplinary collectives such as Tenure for the Common Good and New Faculty Majority, particularly in regard to external public relations–like messaging and internal negotiation/revision of tenure and promotion requirements in specific institutional contexts. The basic prerogatives of Tenure for the Common Good's (2021) mission align with ours here: "Let's transform our notion of tenure from being one associated principally with the professional achievements and privileges of the individual scholar into a concept associated, in addition, with the common good. . . . It may sound quixotic to try to get tenured professors together to fight for the common good, but we just don't have time to waste feeling powerless when we haven't exercised the power we have."

Those with protection and power need to advocate alongside their colleagues for these actions to take hold and for the field of writing program administration to build and support an equitable representation

of its lived realities across institutional types (e.g., two year, four year, HBCU, HSI, Indigenous serving) and institution-specific administrative labels (e.g., WPA, writing across the curriculum, writing in the disciplines, writing center director, writing coordinator).

OPPORTUNITY > CRISES?

COVID-19 has been described as both a crisis and an opportunity for higher education. As Megan Zahneis (2020) highlights, "The pandemic doesn't pose new problems to academe as much as it magnifies existing ones. 'Everything was held together with gum and paper clips, and coronavirus came and just sort of knocked it all down at once,' [Tom] DePaola said. 'I think none of the crises that this virus is causing are new. They're just accelerated greatly. And the contradictions of the system are heightened all at once for people to see.'"

Other exigencies—antiracism and its calls to end institutional racism and the deep social, economic, and political inequities it breeds, for example—also magnify existing problems within higher education and writing program administration. We hope this moment inspires us to face the (lived) realities of administering writing, acknowledge the exclusionary shortcomings of our current disciplinary approaches, and come together to collectively determine and enact a solution. As Seth Kahn asserts in his foreword to this volume, the data-driven primary research in this collection nuances the historical/critical arguments we've been engaged in and begins to address a tacit or overlooked call for exploration of the varied material conditions of writing program administration. However, unless we actually rethink and then (re)operationalize the *forms* of scholarship we value and alter our assumptions of *authorship* and *ownership*, we will never truly be inclusive of the voices we need to productively move forward as a field. If we continue with business as usual, we can call on these voices all we want, but we will only hear our own echoes in response: marginalized, un-tenured, or pre-tenured voices will continue to be too busy to contribute; the same limited number of (protected, tenured) names and thus perspectives will (re)circulate in our scholarship; and we will continue to be complicit in the same exclusionary practices we claim to fight.

REFERENCES

Adler-Kassner, Linda. 2008. *The Activist WPA: Changing Stories about Writing and Writers.* Logan: Utah State University Press.

Anson, Chris M. 2011. "Fraudulent Practices: Academic Misrepresentations of Plagiarism in the Name of Good Pedagogy." *Composition Studies* 39 (2): 29–43.

Blaauw-Hara, Mark, and Cheri Lemieux Spiegel. 2018. "Connection, Community, and Identity: Writing Programs and WPAs at the Community College." In *WPAs in Transition: Navigating Educational Leadership Positions*, edited by Courtney Adams Wooten, Jacob Babb, and Brian Ray, 245–259. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Charlton, Colin, Jonikka Charlton, and Tarez Samra Graban. 2011. *GenAdmin: Theorizing WPA Identities in the Twenty-first Century*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Council of Writing Program Administrators. 1996. "Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Program Administration: A Draft." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 20 (1–2): 92–103.

Curry, Barbara, Lillian M. Lowery, and Dennis Loftus. 2010. "What a Community Will Bear: Leadership and the Change Process." *International Journal of Educational Management* 24 (5): 404–417.

Frith, Jordan. 2020. "Special Section CFP: Business and Technical Communication and COVID-19." *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*. https://www.jordanfrith.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/JBTC_CovidCFP.pdf.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Graziano, Leigh, Kay Halasek, Susan Miller-Cochran, Frank Napolitano, and Natalie Szymanski. 2020. "A Return to Portland: Making Work Visible through the Ecologies of Writing Program Administration." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 43 (2): 131–151.

Hesse, Douglas D. 2015. "The WPA as Worker: What Would John Ruskin Say? What Would My Dad?" *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 38 (2): 129–140.

Hult, Christine, and the Portland Resolution Committee. 1992. "The Portland Resolution." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 16 (1–2): 88–94.

Konkiel, Stacy. 2016. "How to Use Altmetrics to Showcase Engagement Efforts for Promotion and Tenure." https://www.altmetric.com/blog/how-to-use-altmetrics-to-showcase-engagement-efforts-for-promotion-and-tenure/.

Kynard, Carmen. 2018. "Stayin Woke: Race-Radical Literacies in the Makings of a Higher Education." *College Composition and Communication* 69 (3): 519–529.

McLeod, Susan H. 1995. "The Foreigner: WAC Directors as Agents of Change." In *Resituating Writing: Constructing and Administering Writing Programs*, edited by Joseph Janangelo and Kristine Hansen, 108–116. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Perkins, David N., and Gavriel Salomon. 2012. "Knowledge to Go: A Motivational and Dispositional View of Transfer." *Educational Psychologist* 47 (3): 248–258.

Tenure for the Common Good. "About Us." 2021. https://tenureforthecommongood.org/about/.

Zahneis, Megan. 2020. "Faculty Members Fear Pandemic Will Weaken Their Ranks." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 9. https://www.chronicle.com/article/faculty-members-fear-pandemic-will-weaken-their-ranks/.