

# TRANSFORMATIONS

*Change Work across Writing Programs,  
Pedagogies, and Practices*

EDITED BY  
HOLLY HASSEL AND KIRSTI COLE

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
*Logan*

copyrighted material, not for distribution

© 2021 by University Press of Colorado

Published by Utah State University Press  
An imprint of University Press of Colorado  
245 Century Circle, Suite 202  
Louisville, Colorado 80027

All rights reserved  
Manufactured in the United States of America



The University Press of Colorado is a proud member of  
the Association of University Presses.

The University Press of Colorado is a cooperative publishing enterprise supported, in part, by Adams State University, Colorado State University, Fort Lewis College, Metropolitan State University of Denver, Regis University, University of Colorado, University of Northern Colorado, University of Wyoming, Utah State University, and Western Colorado University.

∞ This paper meets the requirements of the ANSI/NISO Z39.48–1992 (Permanence of Paper)

ISBN: 978-1-64642-141-1 (paperback)  
ISBN: 978-1-64642-142-8 (ebook)  
<https://doi.org/10.7330/9781646421428>

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Hassel, Holly, editor. | Cole, Kirsti, editor.

Title: Transformations : change work across writing programs, pedagogies, and practices / edited by Holly Hassel and Kirsti Cole.

Description: Logan : Utah State University Press, [2021] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021021089 (print) | LCCN 2021021090 (ebook) | ISBN 9781646421411 (paperback) | ISBN 9781646421428 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: English language—Rhetoric—Study and teaching (Higher)—United States. | English language—Rhetoric—Study and teaching (Higher)—Administration. | English teachers—Training of—United States. | College teachers—Training of—United States. | Writing centers—United States—Administration. | Academic writing—Study and teaching (Higher)—United States.

Classification: LCC PE1405.U6 T735 2021 (print) | LCC PE1405.U6 (ebook) | DDC 428.0071—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021021089>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021021090>

Cover photograph © Marijus Auruskevicius/Shutterstock.

copyrighted material, not for distribution

# CONTENTS

*Acknowledgments* ix

Introduction: Transformations in a Changing Landscape

*Kirsti Cole and Holly Hassel* 3

## **PART 1: TRANSFORMING LABOR 17**

1. Braiding Stories, Taking Action: A Narrative of Graduate Worker–Led Change Work  
*Ruth Osorio, Jaclyn Fiscus-Cannaday, and Allison Hutchison* 19
2. Circulating NTFF Stories to Effect Change: The Case of ASU against 5/5  
*Paulette Stevenson* 37
3. From “Expendable” to Credentialed: Transforming Working Conditions through the HLC’s New Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications  
*Megan Schoen and Lori Ostergaard* 53
4. Advocating Together: Pros and Cons of Cross-Rank Collaboration as a Strategy for Advocacy  
*Rachel Hall Buck and Susan Miller-Cochran* 72

## **PART 2: TRANSFORMING INSTITUTIONS 85**

5. Time, Care, and Faculty Working Conditions  
*Heather M. Robinson* 87
6. Everyone Writes: Expanding Writing across the Curriculum to Change a Culture of Writing  
*Tiffany Rousculp* 105
7. Mapping Trajectories of ALP within Developmental Writing Education  
*Leah Anderst, Jennifer Maloy, and Neil Meyer* 123

8. Actors and Allies: Faculty, IT Work, and Writing Program Support  
*Rochelle Rodrigo and Julia Romberger* 146

**PART 3: TRANSFORMING CURRICULUM 165**

9. Personal Choice: Connecting Lived Experience to Academic Experience as Essential Empowerment in Basic Writing  
*Ruth Benander, Brenda Refaei, Mwangi Alex Chege* 167
10. Leveraging the Translanguaging Labor of a Multilingual University: SJSU's Transformation to a Postremedial Writing Community  
*Cynthia M. Baer* 183
11. World Englishes in the First-Year Composition Classroom: Perceptions of Multilingual Writers  
*Sarah Henderson Lee and Shyam B. Pandey* 210
12. Teaching with Archives: Transformative Pedagogy  
*Lynée Lewis Gaillet* 225
13. Designing an Open-Access Online Writing Program: Negotiating Tensions between Disciplinary Ideals and Institutional Realities  
*Joanne Baird Giordano and Cassandra Phillips* 240
- Epilogue: Teaching and Writing during the Pandemic, 2020  
*Holly Hassel and Kirsti Cole* 259
- Index* 261  
*About the Authors* 269

## INTRODUCTION

### *Transformations in a Changing Landscape*

Kirsti Cole and Holly Hassel

If writing programs in the United States have anything in common it is this: they change. As our teaching practices adapt to changing technologies, budgetary constraints, new student populations, and changing employment practices, writing programs remain full of people dedicated to helping students improve their writing. However, as we know from the long and diverse histories of composition in the university, writing programs are typically sustained by the most vulnerable individuals in the institution. Although we have made great strides in recognizing the institutional value of writing programs, in making recognizable our professionalization efforts for writing program administrators (WPAs) and faculty hired on the tenure-track to teach writing, a large portion of our courses are offered by non-tenure-track faculty and graduate students in other programs. According to Emily Isaacs, 82 percent of writing programs are in institutions in which writing is embedded in English departments (Isaacs 2018). We know that part of the precarity of composition and rhetoric is simply the fact that we have been, for so long, embedded in such departments (Goggin 1995). Even though this is changing, particularly at research-intensive institutions, the majority of programs are still struggling for disciplinary recognition as a part of a larger interdisciplinary space, training, and expertise are directly impacted. As such, coordinating writing programs outside of a research-intensive context involves a kind of labor that people are not regularly trained to do.

This book speaks to common issues that might arise in the majority of those situations and proposes solutions to problems that faculty may not know that they will face. In using the prism of transformation as the organizing principle for the collection, the chapter contributions present a series of strategies, situated within the ecology of the campuses, writing programs, and classrooms. In doing so, we hope to highlight the multiplicity of ways that teacher-scholar-activists across institutional sites

bring about change to their work environment. To echo Kathleen Blake Yancey, we have a moment (Yancey 2004). At this moment—at the intersection of austerity, neoliberalism, anti-intellectualism, unprecedented labor issues, and apathy—composition instructors are doing good work. And no one is making these instructors do this work. This collection was already well through the publication process in spring of 2020 when the COVID-19 global pandemic upended higher education, including many of the key assumptions that had underpinned teaching in and managing college writing programs. These included assumptions about how we assess what students have learned, how we teach, what we teach, or where we teach. The changes we made to respond to the pandemic amplified the calls that the authors in this collection make—change work can be initiated locally, or it can be thrust upon us, but it cannot be avoided.

In the three decades since the first PhDs were granted in composition and rhetoric, we've transformed our field. But we still have work to do. In the same way that our pedagogies shift to accommodate new and evolving literacy practices, our labor and institutional presence must also shift. We must articulate what that work is and how we can do that work just as well as we articulate our changing pedagogies. This book offers models for faculty who hope to build new programs or revise existing ones while maintaining a critical eye on our labor practices and external concerns, even in contexts that do not include writing program administrators to do that work.

The call for papers (CFP) for this collection had already gone out when one of the coauthors attended the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) convention in Baltimore in 2019. She couldn't help but observe the number of sessions she attended in which presenters described struggles they faced, in large part because they held WPA positions at institutions typical of writing programs in the United States—four-year comprehensives, baccalaureate-granting liberal arts colleges, two-year colleges, and in which they sought to influence writing instruction. However, they often were one of a handful, if not the only, writing-studies-trained faculty member in the department, perhaps expected to manage an established program or to oversee adjunct instructors but with little influence to change the current practices or implement best practices recommended in our disciplinary principles statements. Some presenters discussed their work in community colleges, where they are responsible for offering writing classes but without a position or structure resembling writing program administration as it is typically framed in the field.

It is within this context that we offer *Transformations* then—research, stories, studies, and scholarship from the discipline that reflects program work that looks very different from the traditional research I / research-intensive / doctoral program model in which a dedicated coordinator leads less experienced and part-time (or apprentice) writing instructors for first-year students. Many of the programs and instructors included in this volume are bringing about effective change in their programs through democratic rather than hierarchical methods. In “Writing Programs without Administrators,” Carolyn Calhoon-Dillahunt (2011, 121) identifies some of the challenges to writing program support and development in two-year colleges, ranging from complex or insufficient placement methods to administrative accountability measures to precarious employment status for instructors, and inconsistent disciplinary preparation among instructors (also addressed by Klausman 2008, 2010, 2018). As she writes,

Working conditions, then, are another significant challenge to effective writing program administration. In two-year college English departments, writing courses tend to make up the majority of the course offerings—composition is, after all, required, but very few of those teaching writing courses have any theoretical background in composition and rhetoric or writing pedagogy. In my own department, most full time and part-time faculty have degrees in literature or creative writing. That said, those teaching composition in community colleges are often experienced practitioners, unlike the graduate students who so often do the work of teaching composition at major universities with well-developed writing programs led by a WPA.

In research-intensive and graduate-degree-granting programs, who teaches composition tends to be more diverse. It may include a WPA, a teaching assistant (TA) trainer, tenured or tenure-track faculty in writing studies or composition and rhetoric, as well as instructors, graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), and contingent, non-tenure-track faculty. In other environments, such as smaller colleges and two-year colleges, people with PhD credentials, graduate students building expertise, and people with job security may not be available to teach composition at all, institutionally or locally. The shape and nature of programs at nonselective universities, without designated WPA positions, require a different type of navigating and negotiating (Dew 2009).

In such an environment, navigating change work in writing programs benefits from Eileen Schell’s (2016) admonition in *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators* handbook, “What Is a Writing Instructor?” that “writing instructors, no matter what rank, *are your colleagues*” (223). Our

goal here is to present work that reflects the conditions in which most writing instructors and writing program administrators find themselves: working, perhaps, off the tenure track and within the context of English departments, sometimes as the sole member of the department with expertise in writing studies, and working with a highly diverse range of writing instructor colleagues. Perhaps writing courses are staffed by tenure-line faculty who have not been trained in writing studies beyond the requisite “Comp Theory” seminar in graduate school, or with non-tenure-track faculty. Writing program change work in this context is quite distinct from that in International Writing Programs (IWP) or WPA positions in which administrators are responsible for supervising almost exclusively a cadre of graduate student teaching assistants and non-tenure-stream faculty.

Such positions require distinct skills that include navigating complex political landscapes, working with a wide range of diversely trained—and largely autonomous—instructors, and designing and assessing writing programs that serve students who may not be like those at the institutions in which they were trained. Eileen Schell rightly describes the responsibilities of those doing writing program work in such contexts as to “find ways to establish a *shared and mutual pedagogical culture and community* that successfully bridges and addresses differences in knowledge, training, and approaches or that at least attempts to do so through conversation and dialogue” (223). Program work within English departments in comprehensive regional universities, in two-year colleges, or in other teaching-intensive and access-focused institutions also required extensive collaborative decision-making with administrators—department chairs, deans and associate deans, general education committees, coordinators for related programs (perhaps developmental education, reading support programs, or ESL program coordinators). Certainly, when writing programs are embedded in English departments, unilateral budget cuts to the department can detrimentally impact how many sections of composition are offered. Many administrators do not consider such issues at all in the face of ever-declining state funding and potentially low enrollment numbers. However, such considerations are necessary and require dedicated work on the part of the writing faculty in order to move a program’s work forward or to make changes that will have a positive impact on retention, student success, or instructor support, conversations.

This is the context for this collection. The aim of these chapters is to equip readers with a set of schema to advance change for equity within their own contexts. In the contemporary higher education milieu,

issues of increasing urgency and complexity face writing programs and department chairs, English departments and writing teachers, issues we center in this volume—in particular, these rapid changes are disproportionately affecting the kinds of institutions we focus on here, those that value access over selectivity. These challenges will only intensify in the postpandemic landscape. These include

- Remediation, developmental coursework, and the status of basic writing program interventions and reforms, such as the Accelerated Learning Program, studio models, the “Stretch” approach, and other corequisite support models serving marginalized and underprepared student populations
- Developments in technology, including online courses, blended writing courses, and other efforts that require supporting students in using technology for learning, as well as increasing the access to quality educational experiences for diverse students
- Gendered and racialized gaps in emotional labor, care work, and service in higher education, whether in types or level of instruction, or in the “outside the classroom” work required to manage writing programs including mentoring, advising and supporting students and instructors, serving on committees, and advocating administrators
- Labor, equitable, and just working conditions, the intensifying demands of graduate workers and contingent faculty resulting from the casualization of labor, the unstable and shrinking market for tenure-line work in higher education, and levels of “doing without / taking on” faced by instructors: additional debt, unmet material and teaching needs, lack of healthcare as just a few examples
- Calls (or the desire by faculty) to do curricular reform, whether through innovative curriculum approaches, as efforts to integrate high-impact learning, or as the result of assessment data or external mandates, as a need to respond to changes in student populations within the institution (including linguistically diverse, first-generation, low-income, nontraditional, and other growing student populations)

This is not to say that no recent scholarship tackles these issues. James Porter et al. introduced the notion of “institutional critique” in their 2000 *CCC* article, “Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodology for Change,” which they describe as

a method that insists that institutions, as unchangeable as they may seem (and, indeed, often are), do contain spaces for reflection, resistance, revision, and productive action. This method insists that sometimes individuals (writing teachers, researchers, writers, students, citizens) can rewrite institutions through rhetorical action. We see institutional critique as a way to supplement the field’s current efforts and to extend the field into broader interrogations of discourse in society. (612–13)

Likewise, Michelle LaFrance and Melissa Nicolas's (2012) account of institutional ethnography (IE) provides a map for, as they describe it,

how things happen—what practices constitute the institution as we think of it, how discourse may be understood to compel and shape those practices, and how norms of practice speak to, for, and over individuals. Institutional ethnography's focus on the day-to-day work life of individuals, as well as its emphasis on describing how individuals choose to interact with/in their institutions, provides a methodology for explicating, and thereby gaining insight into, the actualities of our academic work lives. (131)

What we want to highlight here, then, is the next step to this work of institutional examination. Porter et al. (2000) argue that "institutional critique is, fundamentally, a pragmatic effort to use rhetorical means to improve institutional systems," (625), and though we agree that a substantive understanding of the material and rhetorical components of the space that requires change, we want to show what *comes after the deployment of institutional critique*. Recognizing the value of Porter et al.'s claim that "a simple spatial reordering, a micropolitical and rhetorical use of space, can constitute an effective political action" (625), we want to show how, in a rapidly changing ideological and material landscape, change work is possible—even big and seemingly impossible change work. We nod here to Debra Dew and Susan McLeod, as well, who have documented change work in writing programs.

The central galvanizing theme of this collection moves from institutional knowledge (whether through a critique or ethnography) to acting on that knowledge. Steve Lamos (2012), for example, in "Institutional Critique in Composition Studies: Methodological and Ethical Considerations for Researchers," describes the methodological considerations of institutional critique—a step that often precedes action-oriented efforts—that are relevant here in that teacher-scholar-activists must employ evidence and data-based approach to their change work. A key in this discussion is the work and how we envision ourselves as faculty; we must see ourselves as workers in an institution and embrace our role at that institution to do this work instead of continually buying into the myth of mobility (Cole et al. 2017). Our collection takes this work one step further in creating maps for how to move from analysis, critique, and ethnography to interventions that can happen in and from a multiplicity of positions and places within our programs.

Writing program change work as documented in this collection shows how faculty from diverse institutional positionalities (contingent faculty and graduate workers, as well as faculty working on the tenure track), and within, or in response to, institutional constraints can navigate these

challenges to bring about change for the benefit of students the mission of educational access.

**LABOR, INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE,  
CURRICULUM: A GUIDE TO THE BOOK**

Part 1: Transforming Labor focuses on work done by graduate students, non-tenure-track faculty, and tenured allies to improve working conditions in writing programs. In the first chapter, “Braiding Stories, Taking Action: A Narrative of Graduate Worker–Led Change Work,” Ruth Osorio, Jaclyn Fiscus-Cannaday, and Allison Hutchison launch our collection with a powerful narrative based on their work with the Labor Census Task Force within the Writing Program Administration Graduate Organization. Their chapter highlights the labor issues rife within composition, rhetoric, and writing studies: the shockingly familiar stories of graduate labor exploitation. Their chapter, however, is one that claims power, agency, and hope in untenable and unsustainable circumstances. Their study illustrates the power that graduate students can hold as leaders of institutional change, especially regarding issues of equity, labor, and diversity. This chapter begins our collections for an important reason. Osorio, Fiscus-Cannaday, and Hutchinson set the tone for the spaces in which our labor practices must and can change, and they emphasize the nature of what grassroots change can look like at our institutions, in our programs, and as a part of our organizing professional bodies. Paulette Stevenson’s chapter, “Circulating NTTF Stories to Effect Change: The Case of ASU against 5/5,” follows to illustrate the role that non-tenure-track (NTT) instructors can inhabit to improve labor conditions. She sums up the labor of NTT faculty perfectly: “Budgets are balanced, bottoms lines are cut, and tenured faculty lines are paid for by exploiting NTTF” (chapter 1). In her chapter, Stevenson illustrates the ways in which a large, research-intensive state school attempted to force NTT faculty to teach more courses for less pay. She outlines the work that the non-tenured faculty did to fight even more exploitative working conditions by harnessing the knowledge of the discipline, conveying the pitfalls of the higher course load to a wider public, and getting coverage from popular and academic news outlets. Building off of chapter 1, this chapter highlights the kairotic and rhetorically cunning work that can happen in the face of institutional misuse of vulnerable workers.

In chapter 3, “‘From ‘Expendable’ to Credentialed: Transforming Working Conditions through the HLC’s New Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications,” Megan Schoen and Lori Ostergaard contextualize how

our field remains torn between two contradictory instincts: to improve labor conditions for part-time and contingent faculty, many of whom possess few credentials in the field of composition, or to assert our (exclusive) disciplinary expertise. Locating their chapter in the history of the Wyoming Conference Resolution, they argue that though our scholarship has spent a great deal of time talking about labor, there has been no move to enact the recommendations from the 1987 conference. Schoen and Ostergaard argue that instead of developing a single, national credential for writing instructors, writing programs may be able to leverage the “faculty qualification guidelines handed down from higher education accreditation agencies to develop local, departmental standards for disciplinary expertise in the field” (chapter 3) to improve job security and professional status. Rachel Hall Buck and Susan Miller-Cochran in chapter 4, “Advocating Together: Pros and Cons of Cross-Rank Collaboration as a Strategy for Advocacy,” round out the first part of the collection by focusing on cross-rank collaboration: the often messy but rewarding work that happens when faculty across ranks and graduate students work together to navigate the administration of a writing program. This chapter illustrates, in part, what was missing in the change work of the first two chapters—the support of tenured faculty for those who are in precarious labor situations in their programs. Hall Buck and Miller-Cochran use their work collecting data to keep a lower course cap in composition courses to illustrate ways in which cross-rank collaboration can impact and improve labor conditions at colleges and universities.

Authors in Part 2, “Transforming Institutions,” direct our attention to the sometimes ignored and often confusing institutional practices that writing studies professionals must navigate to do the work of writing programs. In chapter 5, “Time, Care, and Faculty Working Conditions,” Heather M. Robinson provides a useful transition from labor practices to institutions by centering care work as what academics do. Her chapter gives readers a context for the larger foci of this section. By emphasizing care work, she opens space for the various programs that proliferate in or on the edges of writing programs: Writing Across the Curriculum, Accelerated Learning Programs and developmental writing courses, and digital mediated courses. She advocates that we change the discourses that we build around care and, by extension, feminized work. Robinson defines care work as the activities that academic staff undertake to support students’ learning and to support students’ and other colleagues’ emotional health and academic advancement. In this chapter, Robinson focuses on care work as the affective parts of teaching, service, and

research, rather than as the content of what we teach and do in our academic work. By countering often all-consuming discourses of productivity, this chapter uses the slow scholarship movement to resist and demonstrate the ways in which what counts as academic labor might be revised through the governance process at colleges and universities.

Tiffany Rousculp, in chapter 6 “Everyone Writes: Expanding Writing across the Curriculum to Change a Culture of Writing,” focuses on another cross-institutional writing program, Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC). Rousculp argues that “WAC programs and their ‘agents’ increase, foster, create, promote, transform, and make change; they do not stand still nor do they accept the status quo of writing at a given institution.” However, she highlights the ways in which, though powerful spaces for institutional change work, very few WAC programs are sustained or sustainable. They tend to come and go with funding models, accreditation initiatives, and faculty willingness to do the work. This chapter points to how much more complicated the work of WAC becomes at community colleges. Rousculp illustrates the history of three different versions of WAC at her institution in order to discuss strategies for establishing a culture of writing in a transitional educational space. Her chapter illustrates the labor, and in connection to the first chapter in this section, the care that it takes to establish a sustainable program that supports faculty and students. Transitioning to another common model of writing program instruction, Leah Anderst, Jennifer Maloy, and Neil Meyer discuss Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) models in chapter 7: “Mapping Trajectories of ALP within Developmental Writing Education.” The authors contextualize ALP within the histories of basic writing and argue that ALP can serve those who are invested in providing additional support to underprepared students because it is one of the few acceptable alternatives to traditional remediation. They argue that discourses of austerity and a new literacy crisis can circumvent key stakeholders in developmental educational curriculum, and they highlight the importance of our disciplinary position statements and white papers in doing institutional change work that keeps attention on the voices of educators and their students.

In the final chapter of this section, chapter 8, Rochelle (Shelley) Rodrigo and Julia Romberger focus on another writing program initiative that is sweeping our institutions: digital mediated courses. In “Actors and Allies: Faculty, IT Work, and Writing Program Support,” they contextualize the impact of information technology (IT) in the academy and in writing programs, and they share their study results that introduce and define writing program technologists to discuss how and why they might

be helpful to both WPAs and their institutions at large. Writing studies experienced the impact of rapidly changing computer technologies very early in higher education, and it is an ongoing issue as our programs move to online instruction; multimodal pedagogies; and research in digital rhetoric, media, and composing. Rodrigo and Romberger provide a map in for how writing program administrators, faculty, and instructors can effectively work with “techies” in various roles and at different ranks within writing programs and across individual institutions.

In the final section of the collection, part 3, “Transforming Curriculum,” authors highlight curricular initiatives and innovations that have been increasingly important in composition and rhetoric in the last few decades. Debates about basic writing and developmental education, multilingual writing and writers, and online writing programs discussed in part 2 are explored here in detail. The authors in this section focus on transformative course design by highlighting our methods in practice: archival work, multimodal, multilingual, and developmental writing. In the first chapter, chapter 9, “Personal Choice: Connecting Lived Experience to Academic Experience as Essential Empowerment in Basic Writing,” Ruth Benander, Brenda Refaei, and Mwangi Alex Chege discuss curriculum reform at an open-access institution for developmental writing. Like Anderst, Maloy, and Meyer in chapter 7, these authors were guided by the “Two-Year College English Association (TYCA) White Paper on Developmental Education Reforms” to redesign a course that serves the majority of English language learners and generation 1.5 students. What sets their chapter apart in terms of curriculum design is their focus on student choice and flexibility to accommodate a diverse student population through a culturally responsive pedagogy.

In “Leveraging the Translanguaging Labor of a Multilingual University: SJSU’s Transformation to a Postremedial Writing Community,” chapter 10, Cynthia Baer asks “if [her institution] can leverage our internal consensus to transform diversity into learning, what work might we do to develop public consensus for a working, thriving democracy?” Moving beyond developmental writing curriculum, Baer’s chapter focuses on a response to rapidly changing student demographics that include multilingual writers. She narrates her program’s move to a Stretch model that emphasizes the labor of translanguaging to support an inclusive, equitable, and sustainable multilingual learning community. This chapter works to contextualize curriculum transformation not only within the institution but within the transformative scholarship that supports multilingual writers and their teachers. She argues that remediation in higher education has been an academic intervention to contain the difference

(at its perceived source) and thereby increase communication efficiency (readability) for listeners and readers already expert in the target language of the community. It is a labor policy—and one that has been anything but efficient. In connection to Baer’s work, Sarah Henderson Lee and Shyam B. Pandey also focus on multilingual populations in their chapter, chapter 11, “World Englishes in the First-Year Composition Classroom: Perceptions of Multilingual Writers.” Henderson Lee and Pandey locate their chapter in the shift in the international student population that they argue stems from a number of factors, including increased globalization and the strong reputation and prestige associated with US higher education and related degrees. They gather and analyze multilingual writers’ perceptions of the incorporation of World Englishes texts in an academic writing course at a large state institution. They report on their participants’ movement toward language variation that supports a revised first-year writing curriculum that prioritizes the development of global literacy among all undergraduate writers. They found that their students moved from resistance to curiosity to acceptance as they powerfully navigated the relationship between language, culture, and academics. As our populations in writing programs become increasingly diverse, this focus on World Englishes demonstrates the ways in which writing studies programs can support all of their learners.

Lynée Lewis Gaillet in chapter 12, “Teaching with Archives: Transformative Pedagogy” also highlights how the major in composition has changed. Instead of focusing on demographics, however, Gaillet offers an example of transformative pedagogy in response to the needs of twenty-first-century humanities students in an era of decline. Locating her work in the “archival turn” in writing instruction, this chapter outlines a split-level graduate/undergraduate course in archival research methods, providing a rationale for the course along with reading suggestions and dovetailed assignments that introduce students to digital and material primary investigations. She highlights student voices as primary researchers as a way for instructors to enact larger concepts integral to writing studies: multidimensional collaboration, opening access, rhetorical activism, and dissemination of student writing. The level of detail that Gaillet provides in her chapter gives instructors interested in exploring such a course a blueprint and a series of tools to enact primary research in their classrooms. By pairing her course design with her students’ voices, Gaillet powerfully demonstrates the role of primary research in twenty-first-century writing education.

The final chapter of the collection also moves us powerfully forward in terms of twenty-first-century writing instruction. In chapter

13, “Designing an Open-Access Online Writing Program: Negotiating Tensions between Disciplinary Ideals and Institutional Realities,” Joanne Baird Giordano and Cassandra Phillips discuss the ways in which online writing instruction (OWI) principles as outlined by the OWI Committee lay a foundation for developing an online writing program based on writing studies theory and practice while also arguing for disciplinary values and ethical standards, including manageable class sizes, instructor control over course content and teaching, fair compensation, and faculty training. For Giordano and Phillips, however, many of the OWI principles can be difficult to implement fully at two-year open-access institutions and some public four-year institutions because of institutional mandates, limited financial and professional resources, contingent staffing, and limited instructor agency. This chapter describes the complicated process of designing and implementing change within an online writing program at a two-year, open-admissions college. The authors outline the process of negotiating disciplinary tensions, conditions of austerity that impacted their work, and the ways in which they met the needs of diverse learners. Like the previous chapters on multilingual writing, primary research, and the needs of diverse learners in the composition classroom, these authors highlight the affordances and constraints of best practices in new pedagogical trends at different institutional types.

We organized this collection out of a sense of ambition for what it could be and what the implications are: change can happen in positive ways for our teachers and our students. While the material experiences of being underpaid, overworked, and overwhelmed in higher education is a reality of the job, writing teachers navigate change and work to better the educational experiences of their students all the time. Some of this pedagogical work can happen individually and does because composition instructors put their heads down, teach their classes, grade mountains of papers, and make it better the next time they do it. But, the work that is outlined in this collection cannot happen independently or individually in our classrooms only. The chapters in this collection that focus on curriculum contextualize curricular work in collaboration for a reason. And that is what these authors speak to collectively: collaboration. In reaching out to others, building coalitions beyond our immediate spaces and environments, we resist the isolation that unfolds at many institutions. This collection asks us to move beyond our cloisters, dynamically, by forging alliances even if they seem unlikely or challenging.

If there is one thing that all of these chapters demonstrate, it is that even seemingly impossible tasks are doable. But they require us to think

strategically about the role of composition in the university. The field is past the point where we can bemoan the reality of our curriculum, and our students, and our precarity. Compositionists know the business of the university, perhaps better than people in any other discipline. By leveraging that longitudinal knowledge, understanding the systems in which we labor, and forging alliances with people who are as invested as we are, we can create educational spaces that are true to our values. And as we all begin to process the political, social, economic, and institutional changes that have been foisted upon us by the COVID-19 pandemic, it will be more important than ever that we articulate these values to ourselves, our colleagues, and our discipline as we face unprecedented and swift calls for change.

What are these values? Those haven't really changed. We strive to support literacy development for our students, in ways that meet their needs, that are sustainable and responsive, and that help students name and achieve their educational goals. For those of us who are in positions with some stability and agency, we make it (and must work harder to make it) a priority to support and respect the people who are working with our students, all of the people across rank and institution type. Advocating for all the best practice models and conditions brings us part of the way to that goal, but the work discussed in these chapters makes it a reality. Knowledge about how students become better writers has been established and fine-tuned for decades, and so, in this collection, we ask readers to commit to making strategic and intentional decisions that move us closer rather than farther away from the ideals they espouse. We have to care about all students. We have to care about all instructors. The individuals in our ecosystems have the capacity to do the work and must be afforded every opportunity to fulfill their potential. The individuals writing in the collection focus, in a way, on one big question: Am I making the learning environment for writers, students, and teachers better? And they demand of our readers: are you?

## REFERENCES

- Calhoun-Dillahunt, Carolyn. 2011. "Writing Programs without Administrators: Frameworks for Successful Writing Programs in the Two-Year College," *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 35.1: 118–34.
- Cole, Kirsti, Holly Hassel, and Eileen Schell. 2017. "Remodeling Shared Governance: Feminist Decision Making and Resistance in Academic Neoliberalism," In *Surviving Sexism in Academia: Strategies for Feminist Leadership*, edited by Kirsti Cole and Holly Hassel, 13–28. London: Routledge.
- Dew, Debra Frank. 2009. "WPA as Rhetor: Scholarly Production and the Difference a Discipline Makes." *College Composition and Communication* 60.2: W40–W62.

- Goggin, Maureen Daly. 1995. "The Disciplinary Instability of Composition." In *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction*, edited by Joseph Petraglia, 27–48. Mahway, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.
- Isaacs, Emily. 2018. *Writing at the State U: Instruction and Administration at 106 Comprehensive Universities*. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- Klausman, Jeffrey. 2008. "Mapping the Terrain: The Two-Year College Writing Program Administrator." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 35.3: 238–51.
- Klausman, Jeffrey. 2010. "Not Just a Matter of Fairness: Adjunct Faculty and Writing Programs in Two-Year Colleges." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 37.4: 363–71.
- Klausman, Jeffrey. 2018. "The Two-Year College Writing Program and Academic Freedom: Labor, Scholarship, and Compassion." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 45.4: 385–405.
- LaFrance, Michelle, and Melissa Nicolas. 2012. "Institutional Ethnography as Materialist Framework for Writing Program Research and the Faculty-Staff Work Standpoints Project." *College Composition and Communication* 64.1: 130–50.
- Lamos, Steve. 2012. "Institutional Critique in Composition Studies: Methodological and Ethical Considerations for Researchers." In *Writing Studies Research in Practice Methods and Methodologies*, edited by Lee Nickoson and Mary P. Sheridan, 158–70. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Porter, James, Patricia Sullivan, Stuart Blythe, Jeffrey T. Grabill, and Libby Miles. 2000. "Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodology for Change." *College Composition and Communication* 51.1: 610–42.
- Schell, Eileen. 2016. "What Is a Writing Instructor?" In *A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators*, 2nd ed., edited by Rita Malenczyk, 219–32. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.
- Yancey, Kathleen Blake. 2004. "Made Not Only in Words: Composition Is the New Key." *College Composition and Communication* 56.2: 297–328.