

## HALF-DAY WEDNESDAY WORKSHOPS

*Note:* Each workshop has an enrollment limit of 50 unless otherwise shown. These workshops are designed for maximal interaction between leaders and registrants. In fairness to those who have paid an additional fee (separate from the convention registration fee) for the special experience these workshops offer, no one can be admitted for a workshop once its registration limit has been reached.

**Morning: 9:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m.**

### **MW.1 Digital Media and Learning in a Social World**

Digital interventions into all pedagogical areas of English studies are not likely to abate in the near future (Berger, CCCC, Cope and Kalantzis, Gee, George, Graff, Kress, NCTE, Selfe, Sirc, Wysocki). Perhaps that is why collections like Technological Ecologies and Sustainability seem so timely (DeVoss, McKee, & Selfe, 2009). We need to take opportunities to think carefully about sustainable media-rich pedagogies. This workshop offers one such opportunity. It will also offer participants an opportunity to interact directly with a substantial number of teachers and students who have worked through and reflected on media assignments. As a result, presenters in this workshop/poster session will be able to talk critically and practically about how media-rich assignments provide communicative affordances of value to 21st century students.

The workshop will feature teacher/student teams from around the country who will show work, discuss the affordances of that work, and outline the pedagogical planning that went into creating interactive, civic oriented, purposeful, rhetorically sophisticated, project-based multimodal student compositions. During our interactive poster sessions, participants will have an opportunity to ask questions about pressing issues specific to their home institutions.

Participants and facilitators will be encouraged to add to the E-WAVE wiki resource page (<http://e-wave.wikispaces.com>). At the conference they will provide

- a description of the assignment/approach itself and a justification for its importance
- grading criteria or rubrics for assessment
- a teacher's reflection on the assignment/approach and what they will do to improve it in the future
- (with permissions) some student work that resulted
- student reflections (written, audio, video, or in-person) on the assignment

**Chair:** Dickie Selfe, The Ohio State University, Columbus

**Facilitators:** Andrea Beaudin, Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven, "Media Switch: From Text to Motion to Re-Vision"

Heidi McKee, Miami University, Oxford, OH, "Balancing Acts: Issues to Consider when Teaching and Learning Digital Multimodal Writing"

Joleen Hanson, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, "Online Partnerships in First Year Writing (FYW)"

Andre Buchenot, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, "Challenging Material Assumptions in Digital Writing Classrooms"

Mary Hocks, Georgia State University, Atlanta, "Sonic Composition within the Rhetorics of Sound"

Geneea Carter, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, “Discussion Boards Academic for Professional Discourse Communities”

Janice McIntire-Strasburg, St. Louis University, MO, “Don’t Sweat the Small Stuff: Giving Students More Autonomy in Designing a Freshman Writing Course Curriculum through Online Texts/Systems”

J.L. McClure, Kirkwood Community College, Cedar Rapids, IA, “A Multimodal First-Year Composition Course”

Jami L. Carlacio, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, “Blending Information Literacy with Digital Literacy: A Hybrid Approach to Teaching with Technology”

Caroline Dadas, Miami University, Oxford, OH, “Audio Composing as a Means of Accessing Techno-Rhetoric”

Bre Garrett, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, “Audio Composing as a Means of Accessing Techno-Rhetoric”

Ben McCorkle, Ohio State University, Marion, “It’s been ‘Sweded’: Incorporating internet Memes into Assignment Designs”

## **MW.2 Style Pedagogy Renewed, Revised, Remixed: New Directions for the Twenty-First Century Convention**

Workshop Rationale—Style: Why Now, Why Here?

If the study of style has seemed largely invisible in composition and rhetoric for the past few decades—a diminished aspect of classroom teaching, graduate assistant training, disciplinary conversations, and theoretical applications—then evidence of a recent resurgence in stylistic interest is just as palpable. Indeed, style as a critical resource in rhetoric and composition has reemerged convincingly with a host of new pedagogical and theoretical work in the past few years (e.g., Bacon, Brummett, Butler, Connors, Duncan, Elbow, Farmer, Flannery, Johnson, Johnson and Pace, Kreuter, Lanham). Given style’s recent resurgence as an active, generative, productive, and inventive site of discourse, now is the kairotic moment to workshop new pedagogical approaches to style in the composition classroom, energized by a concomitant surge in new theoretical insights in the discipline. In light of these new directions, we propose a workshop that will renew stylistic pedagogies as they are revised, remixed, and rethought for today’s composition teachers and classrooms.

Considering this style revival, how can we bring the rich possibilities of stylistic study back into our classrooms? Specifically, how is style important to composition teachers as a resource for disciplinary construction and engagement? How can we think more broadly about style in relation to course design and assessment; prose rhythm and figuration at the level of the sentence and paragraph; pedagogies of sentence combining, generative rhetoric, imitation, and revision? What can renewed attention to style offer us in working with diverse student populations or in teaching writing across the curriculum?

Workshop presenters will recount their specific experiences in teaching style as well as share syllabi, assignments, bibliographies, examples of student writing, and innovative classroom exercises. In addition, presenters and participants will engage in lively dialogue about the theoretical issues that inform renewed pedagogies of style. In so doing, we will examine how the competing and sometimes conflicting notions of style inform the composition classroom, curricular goals in graduate and undergraduate teaching, and issues of audience, response, and writing in the public sphere. Participants will have many opportunities to take an active role in the workshop: to ask questions, express concerns, and discuss (as well as introduce) new ideas about implementing stylistic practice in and beyond the classroom.

Some of the questions we will address include

- √ How can the study of style make students more critically aware of writing choices?
- √ What can style do to help us teach analysis and argument in writing courses?
- √ What choices exist for using style in writing in the disciplines?
- √ How does style work with invention to generate heuristics for the writing classroom?

- √ How do we assess style in evaluating and responding to student writing?
- √ How can we make style relevant through writing in the public sphere?
- √ How can we integrate style with professional and workplace writing?
- √ How should we address competing views of clarity and correctness in student writing?
- √ What approaches work well to teach—and talk about—the form/content division?

Workshop Format: The workshop will feature a series of three interactive colloquies on style facilitated by workshop leaders. The colloquies—which take up critical issues and interests that affect style’s pedagogical effectiveness—will serve as generative introductions and will involve workshop participants in dynamic exchanges. The first colloquy, which will include a writing activity, will introduce stylistic pedagogy by asking participants to analyze their own writing style. The second colloquy will be a conversation about the day-to-day issues instructors now face—or will face—in teaching style. The third colloquy, “iFigure, iTrope, iScheme,” will introduce the possibilities for using style to analyze and appreciate new media texts. In all instances, participants will have a chance to ask questions and contribute their ideas. Following the first and second colloquies, participants will divide into small groups in which presenters will share handouts and speak for approximately five minutes each. A majority of the small-group time will be reserved for open discussion about various style writing assignments, exercises, challenges, and solutions for particular courses, populations, and institutions. To give participants the opportunity to attend as many roundtables as possible, organizers will use a “speed dating” approach, with two “rounds” held during each hour-long session. Afterward, summaries of the small-group discussions will be shared with the whole group. As a group, we’ll also discuss suggestions for further study, communication, and collaboration.

*Speakers:* Mike Duncan, University of Memphis, TN, “Adding, Subtracting, Measuring: Demystifying Prose Rhythm”

Tom Pace, John Carroll University, University Heights, OH, “Parsing the Paragraph: Using Syntax and Stylistic Devices to Revise Prose”

Star Medzerian, The University of Arizona, Tucson, “Style as Assessment Tool: Innovative Responses to Student Writing”

Nora Bacon, University of Nebraska at Omaha, “Style and the Time Crunch: How to Fit Style into an Overcrowded Curriculum”

William FitzGerald, Rutgers University, Camden, “Anaphora? Asyndeton? Antanclasis? O My! Teaching the Figures to Reluctant Writers”

Paul Butler, University of Houston, TX, “Style as Invention: Updating Sentence Combining, Generative Rhetoric, and Imitation for Today’s Students”

T. R. Johnson, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, “The Sound and the Fury”

Tom Deans, University of Connecticut, Storrs, “Cultural Style: Incorporating Oral Traditions in Writing”

Frank Farmer, University of Kansas, Lawrence, “Style in the Public Sphere: Students Writing for Wider Audiences”

Nate Kreuter, University of Texas at Austin, “Style and Visual/Digital Media: Taking Technology to New Stylistic Levels”

Melissa Goldthwaite, St. Joseph’s University, Springfield, PA, “Style and an Analysis of Professions: Using Style to Discover Career Paths”

Nicole Amare, University of South Alabama, Mobile, “Style across Written Genres and Disciplines: Applications across the University”

### **MW.3 Recording, Preserving, and Using Literacy Narratives in Composition Classrooms and Community Spaces**

At the 2009 CCCC in San Francisco, our professional organization hosted the first annual Every CCCC Member Has a Literacy Story in connection with the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN), recording the literacy

narratives of approximately 153 CCCC members and preserving these narratives on a publicly accessible web site for the use of citizens, teachers, scholars, community literacy workers, and students.

At the 2010 CCCC in Louisville, We plan to host a similar event, this time offering a preliminary workshop to train an expanded corps of literacy narrative collectors to collect the literacy stories of Louisville citizens, as well as the stories of CCCC members.

Workshop attendees will not only have the opportunity to participate in collecting the literacy narratives of CCCC members and Louisville residents, but also to learn through these activities how to organize, set up, and conduct an Everybody has a Literacy Story event with students on their own campus, thus amplifying and expanding the effort of collecting and preserving literacy narratives across the country.

During the workshop, participants will

look at/ listen to/read a number of samples of literacy narratives in video, audio, and document formats;

discuss why efforts to collect and preserve literacy narratives are proving to be important to various citizens groups, teachers, librarians, literacy workers, scholars, and students;

get a detailed introduction to the recording equipment (Ederol digital audio recorders and Flip cameras) used to collect literacy narratives;

talk about IRB forms and procedures (e.g., informed consent, release, deed of gift, and Creative Commons licenses), issues of privacy, and issues of anonymity;

learn how to elicit and record literacy narratives in public situations, providing appropriate prompts and encouragement;

learn how to publicize, organize, and conduct an Everybody has a Literacy Story event on the participant's local campus with the support of the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN).

Workshop organizers (Cynthia L. Selfe and H. Lewis Ulman) will provide all the portable digital recording equipment needed for this workshop.

This workshop will involve plenty of hands-on activity, as well as a combination of theory and practice.

Participants will use recording equipment and collect literacy narratives throughout the CCCC conference from both conference attendees and citizens of Louisville. These literacy narratives will be stored online at the DALN where they are available to the public. They will also be made available to the CCCC organization for posting on its organizational web site as well.

**Facilitator:** Ulman H. Lewis, Ohio State University, Columbus

#### **MW.4 Renegotiating Academic Research: Innovative Approaches to the “Traditional Research Paper”**

In *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing*, Knoblauch and Brannon insightfully critique the typical “performance recipe” of process as a list of chronologically ordered behaviors that lead students from a “thesis statement” to a proofread second draft (82).

Composition has ostensibly allowed itself to stray from this proscriptive definition of process since 1984. As anyone who has ever picked up a writing handbook knows, however, the research process is still far too often described as if it's a series of clearly demarcated, numbered stages that rarely overlap. Like many handbooks, *Writers INC: A Student Handbook for Writing and Learning*, lays out the "steps" of "the research process" in a linear format that moves students through a process in which they "select a subject"; "develop a thesis statement"; "keep notes on cards of the same size and style"; "write (a) working outline"; "write [an] introduction"; "write the body"; "write the conclusion"; "revise (the) first draft at least two times"; and "add (a) title" (168-177). Such a limited view of "the research process" leaves little space for poetics, multimodal approaches, non-traditional critical methodologies, and research as narrative.

Perhaps even more problematically, such rhetoric serves to further divorce "the research paper" from "real life." The 2007 edition of *The Blair Handbook* clearly states that "(I)n college, the research you conduct is academic rather than practical, designed to result in a convincing paper rather than a practical purchase or an action" (282). The notion that the research and writing that take place in our classes is situated in some impractical sphere, divorced from concepts as diverse as "purchase" and "action," is exactly what we want our students to challenge. The work that we ask our students to do is the work of making meaning that matters. The goal of their research is to connect their experiences to a larger context, to situate themselves as active participants in a larger world. We expect our students to link their research methodologies to the questions they have and the sites in which they live and think and work.

Our workshop is a nuts-and-bolts look at various research practices and written forms that break down false distinctions between the "academic" and the "real."

Workshop participant one will discuss "endarkened epistemologies as research method, mode, and stories retold," looking at research that asks students to do ethnographic studies of the communities/discourses/literacies that they call and define as their own. With such projects, students need to consciously design the voices and genres in which they tell the stories of the people and communities in which they situate themselves, which often means that students themselves redefine the purposes, processes, and "products" of research in ways that discomfort and disquiet traditional notions of research/ers and subjects.

Workshop participant two will share how the semester-long, book-length project her students engage in encourages students to use their own experiential knowledge as a starting point for their research as they look to the questions that are most critical to their present day. At the end of the semester, students self-publish these books and then decide where in the community these books could do the most good. In the sending of these books, student writing acts as an agent of service and research becomes relevant to each student's individual experience.

Workshop participant three will show how her students ground their research in a particular subject position that they occupy and craft individualized projects that connect these positions to a larger context and audience, drawing on a variety of sources. She will showcase student work (student designed handbooks and research projects in varied forms) that highlight the role of writing student as writing expert.

Workshop participant four will explore what he calls "The Inheritance Project," a multigenre research project. In his essay "All That I Have is Yours: The Scars of a Christian Inheritance," Scott Korb documents the ways in which both his father and his stepfather contributed to his understanding of his spiritual faith. This essay asks readers to consider their own inheritances, something that is "inherently" theirs. After reading the essay, students are asked to identify an inheritance and to illuminate it in an essay. They must include source materials in their final project, mixing narrative of the inheritance with other forms of writing—poetry and prose, like-minded narratives from fiction and film, lyrics from songs, literally anything that can help students describe their inheritance. The project complicates conceptions of what research is and what it provides.

Workshop participant five will look to emerging research and pedagogy in writing studies that underscores the use of digital technology to encourage students to work against the artificial divisions between the academic work they do and the “real” research and writing done outside the classroom in the fields of journalism and magazine reporting. Employing digital technology to study and represent social issues and problems, which manifest themselves locally but have implications for national concerns, enables students to investigate through research, writing, and digital filmmaking the immediate conditions, cultural spaces, and communities they inhabit.

Workshop participant six will ask the questions, How do we help students use computer networks more critically as a way of learning about the world? How can we help them examine the way different information architectures, designs and policies (including those embedded in online encyclopedias, search engines, interfaces, news aggregation sites, and the like) shape possibilities of knowing and writing? In order to make these questions more concrete, he will examine specific policies and software architectures that Wikipedia uses to regulate user contributions as an especially transparent example of the politics of knowledge in the digital age.

Workshop participants seven and eight will explore a range of experimental, hybrid, and cross-disciplinary alternatives to conducting, composing, and presenting research in both introductory and advanced writing courses. They will draw upon ways that poets have argued for approaching research as a form of “investigative poetics,” as well as how essayists and memoirists have inverted traditional forms of narrative in their nonfiction. Participant seven will discuss a book-length research project that draws on Williams’s “Patterson”; participant eight will present on “Research as Preservation, Research as Testimony: Using Family Histories and Local Geographies to Unearth What Will Not Stay Forgotten.”

*Chair:* Roseanne Gatto, St. John’s University, Jamaica, NY

*Speakers:* Carmen Kynard, St. John’s University, Jamaica, NY, “Endarkened Epistemologies as Research Method, Mode, and Stories Retold”

Tara Roeder, St. John’s University, Jamaica, NY, “Reconfiguring Research: Subject Position as Starting Point”

Daniel Collins, Manhattan College, Riverdale, NY, “The Inheritance Project: A Multi-Genre Research Assignment”

Jody Swilky, Drake University, Des Moines, IA, “Digital Technology and Investigative Research”

Daniel Mahala, University of Missouri Kansas City, “E-Literacies and Academic Writing: Disassembling the Tools of Networked Research”

Claude Hurlbert, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, “The Poetics of Research”

Derek Owens, St. John’s University, Jamaica, NY, “Research as Preservation, Research as Testimony: Using Family Histories and Local Geographies to Unearth What Will Not Stay Forgotten”

Roseanne Gatto, St. John’s University, Jamaica, NY, “Student Bookmaking as Critical Inquiry”

### **MW.5 Technical Writing across The Disciplines: Developing Assignments for Technical Writing Courses That Cross Disciplinary Boundaries**

Synthesizing language used in characterizations of business and scientific workplace practices, Gee, Hull and Lankshear (1996) observed a reshaping of academic as well as workplace discourses as themes of the “new capitalism” such as cognitive science, distributed systems, and teamwork emerged. They state that, “(t)hose concerned with media, technology, communication...have rebuilt their discourses around these new themes”(50). Further, they assert four “focus points” for educational goals in this environment: thinking, tools discourse, and critique (160-161). Group-oriented, problem-based learning assignments and service learning projects that include reflective writing have emerged as favored approaches in technical writing courses to meet the situated-learning

needs of students. However, it is difficult to match assignment topics and discourses for particular disciplinary communities when a single technical writing course serves multiple academic programs as the debate regarding teaching disciplinary, discourse-specific approaches versus teaching toward a broader, cognitive science “megadisciplinary” approach continues. As technical writing courses serve disciplines beyond the traditional STEM programs, sections take on a technical-writing-across-the-disciplines atmosphere, challenging even experienced teachers to develop assignments and activities that help students learn disciplinary and cross-disciplinary discourses. A query to the ATTW listserv found demand for a workshop in which participants could share assignment and activity ideas to address such challenges. Consequently, participants in this workshop will discuss their assignment ideas and share student products with each other. These discussions will include acknowledging the pedagogical approach, theoretical grounding, and academic programs targeted with the assignment/course and assignment specifics. From this discussion, participants will also learn how they might incorporate other assignments into their technical writing course to meet the needs of their particular students and programs.

**Facilitators:** Dirk Remley, Kent State University, OH  
Derek Van Ittersum, Kent State University, OH, “STEM and Technical Writing”  
Ryan Hoover, Texas Tech University, Lubbock  
Donna Kain, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC

### **MW.6 Remixing WAC as English Communication across the Curriculum: The Shared Criteria, the Independent Writing Program, and the All-Purpose Faculty Learning Community**

Purpose: Targeting writing faculty, program administrators, and college English professionals, this half-day workshop will offer a robust, cross-disciplinary writing assessment experience. Essentially, workshop participants will review and apply recently developed formative and summative cross-disciplinary rubrics to writing samples collected at a newer public institution founded in an interdisciplinary and outcomes-based context. Critically, participants will consider specific challenges that come with the shared responsibility of teaching writing across disciplines, assess cross-disciplinary English Communication writing samples, and examine developed guidelines as rhetorical artifacts in operating an arguably effective and efficient Writing-Across-the-Curriculum (WAC) inspired faculty-learning community. This half-day workshop caps at 30 participants.

Context: At a newer member institution of a large state university system on the west coast, the independent University Writing Program (UWP) has its primary mission serving both faculty and students in a decidedly interdisciplinary context. Since the university has been outcomes-based from the outset, its general education components have been structured around 13 University Learning Requirements (ULRs) crossing the many disciplines, each with its specified outcomes and criteria. One of the key responsibilities of the UWP is to support the delivery of the English Communication (EngCom) ULR, a WAC-inspired curriculum, which translates to three levels of courses situated in different departments across the colleges. There are NO traditional composition courses on this campus. As WAC, the English Communication Faculty Learning Community faced many challenges throughout 2006-2007. Main challenges included (1) writing-intensive EngCom courses being staffed by non-rhetoric trained instructors, of whom many were adjunct/contingent faculty (who are also unionized), (2) the writing outcome, itself not adequately defined, being only one of multiple outcomes of a given EngCom course, (3) the non-student friendly outcome and criteria language, and (4) little assessment work done regarding any of the outcomes prior to 2006-2007. As a response, the UWP has taken faculty-based workshop approaches recommended by the nation’s WAC programs and consulted research regarding portfolio assessment (White, Yancey), regarding measuring outcomes (Huot, Condon, Broad), and most closely regarding critical-thinking based assignment designs (Bean, Elbow). The UWP then collaborates with the EngCom Community via different faculty development opportunities focusing on pedagogy and assessment. The most influential outcome has been the development of a Shared Criteria rubric, currently adopted and embraced in most departments across campus and is further supported by the learning center. Other results include additional rubrics for program-based assessment, numerous writing

samples from the disciplines, developed course certification and assessment policies, and on-going department consultation opportunities.

**Benefits for Workshop Participants:** Participants will examine representative assignments from the disciplines and assess selected samples using two cross-disciplinary rubrics. Beyond practice and norming, participants will compare rubrics especially in terms of their formative or summative purposes within cross-disciplinary and, in some cases, disciplinary contexts. Participants will also take home essential protocols and guideline statements as reference maps for energizing a WAC program or for building a WAC-inspired English communication program co-owned by faculty across campus. In sum, this workshop will underscore cross-disciplinary bridge-building strategies and—most practically for over two full hours—offer a hands-on experience for extensive discussion sake.

*Chair:* Joseph Eng, California State University Monterey Bay

### **MW.7 Scaffolding in Three Verses: Remixing Argumentation, Themes, and Information Literacy in First-Year Writing**

First year writing courses engage students in multiple literate activities: students must develop information literacy skills while also making their first attempts at college-level academic discourse. Helping students acquire these skills simultaneously is much like learning the parts of a song: they must be learned together, in verses, and over time. In other words, teaching research and argumentation requires a focused, scaffold approach that builds on students' prior knowledge of argument and research.

Compounding the pressure to enhance students' literacy skills in first-year writing is the recent rise in national and local assessment measures. Along with programmatic assessment, national programs such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS), and ETS iSkills test students' critical thinking, written communication, and information literacy skills. Composition engages all these components, so administrators often point at first-year writing courses when their institutional scores do not compare favorably with peer institutions.

This workshop will introduce a scaffold approach to addressing pressures of both classroom pedagogy and assessment measures in research-and-argument based composition courses by overviewing a recent composition curriculum revision at Auburn University. In addition, the workshop will present tools and activities by which participants can adapt this approach to their own writing programs. The workshop will be structured into three verses, each representing a component of Auburn's curriculum: Argumentation, Themes, and Information Literacy. In addition, each verse will have three parts: a general overview of the verse and its application to both internal and external assessment measures, a presentation of examples from Auburn's curriculum, and a generative activity that allows participants the opportunity to adapt each verse to their own institutional context. The following paragraphs overview each verse; a workshop schedule is included at the end of this proposal. The workshop will require tables for participants and preferably an LCD projector.

During the Argumentation verse, we will overview major rhetorical strategies, such as Aristotle's appeals and Toulmin's argumentation rubric. We will then present several activities that approach teaching basic argumentation through analysis of brief print and visual arguments and that examine more complex forms of argumentation through genre analysis. Through use of such materials as a Monty Python sketch, a web site, cartoons, bumper stickers, opinion letters, and a collection of cross-genre materials on a single theme, participants will get a look at ways to locate traditional strategies of argumentation within discourses of contemporary media.

During the Themes verse, we will first explain the advantages and disadvantages of themes, and then we will summarize how we developed our themes and how participants can develop ones that address their own institutional contexts. Finally, we will engage participants with two activities: the first will prompt them to brainstorm sub-topics

related to Auburn's themes, then we will ask them to generate a list of possible themes and subtopics appropriate to their own institutions.

During the information literacy verse, participants will actively develop a working definition of 'information literacy' and be introduced to the Association of College and Resource Libraries standards, outcomes, and performance indicators. Attendees will assess their own information literacy skills through a brief test and then compare their results with national findings. We will then summarize how we integrated information literacy skills into the curriculum through library instruction. Using their own sample assignments and experiences with library instruction, participants will be asked to revise and reconsider ways in which they might better assist students in learning essential information literacy skills.

*Chair:* Michelle Sidler, Auburn University, AL

*Speakers:* Victoria Lisle, Auburn University, AL

Chantel Acevedo, Auburn University, AL

Eva Shoop, Auburn University, AL

Pamela Horn, Auburn University, AL

Nancy Noe, Auburn University, AL

John Hagerty, Auburn University, AL

Amanda Morris, Auburn University, AL

Michelle Sidler, Auburn University, AL

### **MW.8 Reinventing the Writing Process: Infusing Simplex Applied Creative Problem Solving into a Composition Course**

In this half-day workshop, participants will begin to reinvent the writing process by infusing Simplex Applied Creative Problem Solving into a composition curriculum. President Obama is currently challenging educators to infuse in their teaching practice more innovative leadership and creative problem solving applications. The Simplex system of applied creative problem solving is one way to meet this objective. This eight step process interconnects problem solving with critical thinking and writing skills, giving students a specific means for acquiring knowledge as well as one way to approach and complete assignments. By applying this technique to writing, students incorporate problem solving into their own thinking process, promoting higher level cognitive reasoning skills. Simplex, although not the only answer to teaching challenges, is especially helpful for students who are seeking more ways to problem solve and think critically. This tool gives them at least one approach for navigating through this process. As we begin to re-envision the future of our field, infusing problem solving into the writing process gives students a more sophisticated rhetorical tool for thinking, composing, and creating ideas.

This workshop will center on three areas of concentration: Simplex Overview and Profile, The Eight Step Simplex Model, and Simplex in Composition. In the first part of this workshop, Speaker 1 will introduce Simplex applied creativity and discuss how this tool is currently being used in higher education. Then Speaker one will administer the Creative Problem Solving Profile (CPSP) to participants and share its implications for learning and cognition. The second part of the workshop will focus on the eight specific steps of Simplex. To this end, speakers 2 and 3 will explain each step of the process, as well as do mini exercises with the group to build competency in using this tool. The last part of the workshop will focus solely on Simplex in composition. Speakers 4 and 5 will give five examples of how Simplex is currently being used in composition. Breakout sessions will follow each example explanation for further hands-on use of integrating Simplex into the writing process.

*Chair:* Amy Abafo, University of Cincinnati, OH

*Speakers:* Hazem Said, University of Cincinnati, OH

Janet Dong, University of Cincinnati, OH

Annu Prabhakar, University of Cincinnati, OH

Amy Abafo, University of Cincinnati, OH  
Vicki Reynolds, University of Cincinnati, OH

### **MW.9 Literacy, Learning Communities and the Basic Writer: Getting Started at a Community College**

Opening questions: How do our students define literacy and how does literacy empower or disable our students' participation in the communities of which they are a part? How well can they negotiate environments and communities that are reliant on the written word and visuals layered with meaning?

Participants will begin by considering what constitutes literacy and how literacy empowers or disables students from participating in their various communities. Following a large group discussion, participants return to their small groups for the "Post-It" brainstorming session. Which educational values do they wish to pass on to their basic writing students and how do those values translate into a learning community (LC) focus? The presenters will then guide the participants through the process of identifying common educational values and goals upon which to base the LC. Small groups will go through the beginning steps of designing an LC. By the end of the workshop, participants will have completed the beginning steps of establishing a learning community that can be applied to their own basic writing classrooms. They will leave the workshop with a detailed outline that illustrates the steps necessary to launch their own Learning Community for both faculty and students.

*Chair:* Jennifer Stanton, Bellevue College, WA  
*Facilitators:* Tish Lopez, Bellevue College, WA  
Allison Lau, Bellevue College, WA  
Star Rush, Bellevue College, WA

### **MW.10 Utalotsa Woni, (Talking Leaves): Reinventing the Teaching of American Indian Rhetorical Texts**

Rationale: In the 1820s, Sequoyah invented a syllabary which represented all the sounds in the Cherokee language, and, soon afterward, half of the Cherokee Nation became literate in their own language. Many Cherokees hoped that their literacy would enable them to live side-by-side with Europeans, but the historical events that followed Sequoyah's invention proved that literacy in English was to assume a place of privilege. Today, in the academy, we like to think that we welcome difference and that we embrace diverse languages, but our efforts can fall short.

In the discipline of rhetoric and composition, a growing awareness of the exclusion of American Indian voices has led to an increasing classroom focus on American Indian rhetorics and literature. Although this trend is notable, some of the potential for progress is thwarted by the unintentional perpetuation of stereotypes and appropriation of American Indian cultures. Complicating this process is the discipline's tendency to prioritize objective approaches to knowledge, a tendency which discourages the inclusion of American Indian voices. As a result, even the best intentions can result in damaging consequences for American Indians (Lyons, Powell).

The study of American Indian texts (alphabetic, visual, digital, performative, oral, and material) requires an understanding of the importance of sovereignty to American Indian Nations as well as the diversity of cultures and subject positions which exist under the umbrella term "American Indian." Most importantly, the introduction of American Indian texts requires cross-cultural understanding.

Workshop Focus: This workshop, sponsored by the Caucus for American Indian Scholars and Scholarship, is designed to promote understanding of American Indian rhetorical and literary texts and the cultures and contexts within which those texts are produced. We focus on the importance of discussions of sovereignty and the diversity of American Indian communities. In addition, we supply resources for instructors, promote cultural awareness, and offer suggestions for further research. Finally, we provide examples of methods to incorporate American Indian

texts into the classroom curricula.

*Activities/Sequence:* This half-day workshop will begin with a presentation, led by facilitators, which will feature a discussion of methods for approaching American Indian texts in the classroom. The facilitators will focus their presentations on genres of texts, histories and contexts, and dispelling stereotypes through teaching often underrepresented American Indian experiences, including historical contexts, discussion of primary texts, various mixed-blood identities, urban experiences, and Two-Spirit/GLBT identities. These presentations will introduce participants to key rhetorical theories in the field of American Indian rhetorics (e.g., Vizenor, Lyons, and Powell) as well as American Indian texts which highlight the multiple forms of resistance, including protest rhetorics, storytelling, rhetorics of accommodation, and trickster rhetorics.

Next, presenters will discuss their own courses that feature American Indian texts and discuss syllabi, selecting texts, and providing students with resources for further research. Presenters will also distribute sample course materials to participants.

The final portion of the workshop will include a hands-on discussion that features a question and answer session. Participants will then be provided with classroom scenarios, and will be encouraged to brainstorm strategies for working with students.

The overall goals of the workshop are 1) to develop a deeper understanding of the role of American Indian rhetorics in composition classrooms, 2) to situate the workshop within current literature, understandings, and practices of teaching American Indian rhetorics, and 3) to provide teachers with models that they may adapt for their own classroom use.

Participants will leave the workshop with sample syllabi, assignments, and resources for further study. In addition, participants will be provided with bibliographies of sample texts for classroom discussion, historical sources, and theory.

*Facilitators:* Joyce Rain Anderson, Bridgewater State College, MA  
Malea Powell, Michigan State University, East Lansing  
Kim Lee, Michigan State University, East Lansing  
Lisa King, University of Kansas, Lawrence  
Qwo-Li Driskill, Texas A&M University, College Station  
Gabriela Ríos, Texas A&M University, College Station

### **MW.11 CCCC Unwritten and Rewritten: Spaces for International Dialogue and Higher Education Writing Research, Part I**

The College Conference on Composition and Communication has just celebrated sixty years of ground-breaking work: making, remaking, and indeed, composing composition studies in the United States. However, it remains by and large unwritten, and often unaware, in terms of how its developing body of knowledge might fit into the rich and broad history of related scholarly projects in the rest of world. The field's research traditions also remain only partly scripted, and could benefit from sustained contact with writing scholars from around the globe who have been engaged in their own novel and situated research projects on essential questions of writing theory, praxis, and pedagogy. The future of the field will depend on the "reciprocal relationships of give and take, learn and teach with our colleagues of other countries" defined in this year's CCCC call—relationships that encourage increasing reciprocal internationalization of the conversation of composition scholarship.

Dialogue with international colleagues requires, by its very nature, time for processing and extended discussion,

as well as defined protocols for opening up the various linguistic, theoretical, and institutional differences that may prevent scholars from fully engaging or appreciating the larger intellectual, cultural, linguistic-discursive frames and traditions in which the projects take place and produce meaning. Short presentations and brief dialogues tend to encourage intellectual tourism; we need to create more mindful spaces where we afford ourselves the opportunity to listen and to ensure effective, more fully-developed new connections and exchanges.

The proposed workshop will have no traditional presentations, but rather a series of extended small group discussions led by authors from 12 countries, many first-time CCCC presenters, based on texts about their research projects, read by all (presenters and workshop attendees alike) in advance of the workshop. This format, developed in our previous two years of workshops focused on sharing and debating higher education writing research from contexts other than the United States, successfully allows scholars from around the world and workshop participants to spend the workshop time actively discussing new and nuanced ideas more fully and substantively. The workshop thus serves to allow researchers and teachers from a variety of contexts to learn from each other and increase awareness of our work in much broader traditions, conflicts, and paths of inquiry. With this extended (and blended) dialogic process, we also hope to continue rewriting CCCC formats for creating communities of intellectual inquiry.

The collaborative exchange at the heart of the workshop, both in advance of meeting and in person, also invites meta-work on the framing of the exchange and meta-commentary on the complexities of attempting and attending to international work. The following questions, drawn directly from the projects that will be discussed (see titles), will focus the exchange:

- 1) What is research? What counts for research? What research methods are in use? Methods within a context, methods across contexts? What is learned in each kind of research? What is the relationship between research and writing in educational settings? What methods seek to understand writing in a particular context, or to build methods for intercultural research? What new methodologies and encounters will allow for productive and novel understandings through global, interactive work? What are the fields in which our research is grounded? How is it linked to fields in which writing is taught and learned around the world?
- 2) Which populations, sites, and demographics are studied, and why? What types of courses, programs, interventions, concerns, or practices are objects of research within or across contexts and cultures?
- 3) How do questions about a particular language complicate our work geopolitically, linguistically, rhetorically? Or the necessity of working across/through multiple languages? What about the disciplines in which students are writing? The genres? And what about seemingly innocent specific textual practices (such as citation) that are, in fact, fraught?
- 4) What do we take as the evolving meanings of “international” or “global” for our concerns? How do local politics and institutional frames shape the meanings? Conversely, how can local political, cultural, and institutional frames themselves be shaped or transformed by these kinds of research projects?

**Chair:** Cinthia Gannett, Fairfield University, Stratford, CT

**Speakers:** Linda Bradley, Chalmers University of Technology, Göteborg, Sweden, “Peer Feedback Practice across Cultures, Disciplines, and Technologies”

Dr. Peter O’Neill, London Metropolitan University, UK, “Negotiating Academic Identities: Students’ Experiences of Academic Writing in an Era of Internationalization of Higher Education”

Melanie Brinkshulte, Internationales Schreibzentrum der Universität Goe, Goettingen, Germany, “Negotiating Academic Identities: Students’ Experiences of Academic Writing in an Era of Internationalization of Higher Education”

Erica Cirillo-McCarthy, University of Arizona, Tucson, “Searching for Best Practices: Identity, Diversity, and Language Inclusion in the Post-Colonial European Classroom”

Iswari Pandey, Syracuse University, NY, “Globalization of Composition, Composition of Globalization”  
Lammert Holdjik, American University in Cairo, Egypt, “Why Can’t I Borrow Text? Problems with Arab College Students’ Perception of Plagiarism”  
Tim Warren, American University in Cairo, Egypt, “Why Can’t I Borrow Text? Problems with Arab College Students’ Perception of Plagiarism”  
Scott Baxter, American University of Beirut, Lebanon, “Narratives from Second Language Writing Teachers in Lebanon: Preliminary Investigations”  
Joan Turner, Goldsmiths, University of London, UK, “The International PhD Student in ‘Inner-Circle’ Institutions: How Far Is Lingua Franca / Transnational / International English or Global Englishes An Issue?”  
Rebecca Savage Bilbro, University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign, “Recomposing WID/WAC: Teaching and Researching College Composition in France”  
Betsy Bowen, Fairfield University, “Teaching Writing in Turkmenistan and Georgia”  
Janete Sander Costa, Universidade Federale do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil, “Collective Authorship and New Genre Production in the Perspective of English Teaching Education in Virtual Learning Environments”

### **MW.12 Play/Write 2.0: Connecting Games Research to Composition and Rhetoric Studies**

What can games research contribute to composition/rhetoric research? And what can we learn about games through the methodologies of composition/rhetoric? In this half-day workshop, current game studies researchers in composition/rhetoric will present an overview of research methods that have been deployed in the rich space of games and yet are compatible with the disciplinary concerns of composition and rhetoric. In short presentations and discussions, workshop leaders will share their own methods of research on games, their knowledge of the design space of games, and their understanding of the rich ecology of game worlds. By playing and considering both analog and digital games, participants will examine how their own research methods in new media and games draw upon these methodologies and others, and how they may connect their own research agendas in composition/rhetoric to a games studies approach to writing research. Ultimately, this workshop aims to consolidate some of the best practices in games research and through participants’ play, design and analysis, to equip all participants with the tools to perform groundbreaking research in this exciting new area of composition, interactivity, and expression.

The workshop is divided into two halves, focusing first on analysis and then on production. Each half will begin with a series of short presentations by workshop leaders followed by small group discussion and hands-on game play and game design activities.

In the first half of the workshop, leaders and participants will explore the application of composition/rhetoric research methods to a specific game environment through game play, discussion, and analysis of research methods as applied in fields such as educational technology, new media studies, and commercial game development. The short presentations that begin this half provide an overview of methods currently being used in games research, both within and outside of composition/rhetoric and ecology of games studies approaches that can serve as a common framework for both the analytic and production activities in this workshop. As participants play several short games rich in complex interactive demands on their players, groups will discuss their play styles and potential research questions that the play provokes. Leaders, all game-researchers as well as game-players, will guide the play and discussions.

In the second half of the workshop, participants and leaders will move from analysis of game play to an examination of the production of game design, thus moving the research focus from interacting with and reading games to the composing of games. Using the existing structure of an augmented reality game designed in last year’s workshop and played at last year’s CCCC (“Confarganon”), participants will work on one of several small teams to redesign the game to better accommodate players’ goals and conference exigencies. Leaders will help teams consider central aspects of game design in this activity: e.g., timing, movement, aesthetics, and gamer affect.

At the conclusion of the small-group sessions, leaders and participants will discuss ways to shape future directions in composition and rhetoric games research. By extending our discussions into the experience of playing “Confarganon 2.0,” we hope to discover together the potentially illuminating lens composition and rhetoric methods can bring to games, and what the dynamic space of games can tell us about our notions of audience, interactivity, and affect in our research on writing.

**Facilitators:** Annette Vee, University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Suzanne Blum Malley, Columbia College, Chicago, IL  
J. James Bono, University of Pittsburgh, PA  
Alice J. Robison, Arizona State University, Tempe  
Zachary Waggoner, Arizona State University, Tempe

## **ALL-DAY WEDNESDAY WORKSHOPS**

**9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.**

### **W.1 Writing Beyond the Edge**

We limit students...too often it seems. We prescribe word counts and page numbers, provide topics and modes, point to readers and rubrics. We limit students...too often it seems, if for no other reason than that our classroom practices reinforce the sort of flat, one-dimensional, and sterile writing that can only be done on the flat, one-dimensional, and sterile sheets of blank paper we ask them to write on or print to. How can students but help, then, to dread our classes and the writing we ask them to do? How can they help but present us with failed pieces of writing that very seldom have the finely crafted language the student struggles to write and professors long to read.

But is such failure merely the result of failed assignments and opportunities? Is it also, perhaps, the inevitable by-product of such new technologies as the Internet, cell phones, blogging, Facebook, MySpace, and Twitter increasingly becoming the way in which our students read and communicate? Is it, in short, the inevitable by-product of a writing landscape that has moved far—very far—from the two-dimensional pen and paper technology of old and into the landscape of multidimensional graphics and photos and sounds of today?

To that end, then, we argue that we should revisit the idea of writing, rethink our perhaps outmoded approaches to teaching it, and revise our classroom practices so that they encourage personal creativity, incorporate new technologies, and foster classroom, community, and global connections. We should, in other words, push our students to write beyond the edge. Our workshop will offer specific strategies to do just that...to move from the finitude of past technologies to the infinitude of current ones, from the flat and linear approach to writing of old to the dimensional and spatial approach to writing today, and from the limited creativity and audiences of previous classroom assignments to the limitless creativity and writer/reader relationships of new ones.

Workshop Approach:

- Consider past practices for teaching writing
- “Break” traditional practices by “breaking through” traditional boundaries
- Share results of ‘writing at the edge’ experimental classroom practices
- Replicate the experimental classroom with workshop participants
- Promote new ways and ideas for pushing writing boundaries even further

**Chair:** Symmetris Gohanna, Calhoun Community College, Huntsville, AL  
Jill Onega, Calhoun Community College, Huntsville, AL

## **W.2 BIFF! BAM! ZOOM! Remixing the Composition Classroom through Popular Culture**

In the past five years, the number of presentations at CCCC revolving around the use of popular culture in the classroom has increased, clearly demonstrating the viability of the use of popular culture in the composition classroom. In this full-day workshop, participants will consider how to incorporate popular culture into the composition courses, and hands-on exercises will provide participants with knowledge they can take back to and implement in their classrooms. Presentations by instructors versed in the fields of popular culture, rhetoric, and composition will aid participants in thinking about the use of popular culture in their own classrooms and working on the development of ideas that can transfer into their home classrooms as well as sharing interactive activities that guide participants into re-thinking about their classroom curriculum. All participants are expected to contribute significantly to the workshop. We plan to share course syllabi, discuss textbook use, share assessment strategies, and brainstorm about publishing possibilities.

The workshop will feature nine speakers, each working with all participants for forty-five minutes each. Speaker One will ground popular culture as rhetoric through history and theory. Speaker Two will consider various strategies composition instructors can use to engage students in critical thinking and transferring that critical thinking to the essay. Following this initial discussion, each speaker shall provide a brief overview of assignments used in the classroom and the development of each assignment, as well as assessment of the assignment. This will be followed by hands-on practicum whereby instructors will work with participants in activities designed to aid participants in the development of curriculum. The session will end with all participants coming together for a final discussion.

*Speakers:* Jill Dahlman, University of Hawaii at Manoa  
Erica Reynolds-Clayton, University of Hawaii at Manoa  
Dianna Baldwin, Michigan State University, East Lansing  
Holly Tipton, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro  
Janine Oshiro, Windward Community College, Kaneohe, Hawaii  
Miriam Gustafson, University of New Mexico-Valencia  
Renee Reynolds, University of West Florida, Pensacola  
Stacia Watkins, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro

## **W.3 Building on Their Strengths: Advocating for L2 Writers through Teaching, Administrating, Collaborating**

Description: In *Critical Academic Writing and Multilingual Students* (2002), A. Suresh Canagarajah introduced the framework of “difference-as-deficit” and “difference-as-resource” to describe two possible stances in relation to second language writers, the former positioning second language writers as limited, as less-than native English speaking students and the latter recognizing the additional resources these students bring to their writing in English. While this theoretical framework has been widely acknowledged, composition studies has yet to meet Canagarajah’s challenge of using this framework to reshape writing pedagogy and program administration. In this workshop, we take up that challenge, focusing on how we can design writing curricula so that students can draw on their multiple languages, cultures, literacy experiences, and areas of rhetorical knowledge as resources, how we can value “written accent” in our curricula, and how we can design placement practices and writing programs that are inclusive and equitable.

The workshop will open with a discussion of the theoretical framework of difference-as-deficit and difference-as-resource (Canagarajah 2002) and explore the resources L2 writers draw on as they write in English.

This discussion will be followed by five 20-minute sessions where presenters (speakers 2-8) will explore

- writing assignments that build on students’ resources
- digital writing—a space where L2 writers often write across languages and identities, but also a space that is often

outside of the view of writing teachers and therefore an untapped resource for building on L2 writers' strengths

- response practices that build student ownership of their writing
- bridges among the spaces where L2 writers write: high schools, community colleges, universities, and the community
- approaches for including knowledge of L2 writing in teacher education, TA preparation, and faculty development

Between each of these sessions, participants will be invited to inkshed, a social form of free writing useful for thinking by writing and using writing to engage in dialogue. After the opening discussion and each session, the speaker will end with a free writing prompt related to ideas and questions raised by the session. After free writing, participants will swap with others at their table and write responses to each other's free writes, creating a written dialogue which will then be used to prompt table conversations that are responsive to both the information presented and the table members' local contexts. Twenty minutes will be dedicated to each ink shedding session, providing participants with time to process knowledge from the workshop, make the knowledge relevant to their own work, and create an ongoing conversation with other participants.

Following these sessions, participants will choose to attend one of four concurrent roundtable discussions according to their needs and interests, which will be led by speakers 9-12. Each roundtable will focus on a particular instructional or administrative context, with round table 1 focused on writing pedagogy, roundtable 2 focused on first year composition program administration, roundtable 3 focused on writing centers, and roundtable 4 focused on writing across the curriculum.

The roundtables will be followed by a brief wrap-up discussion (led by speaker 13) on L2 writing research, which will include an overview of the opportunities for publishing on L2 writing pedagogy and administration and table discussions on possibilities for designing research projects related to the ideas explored during the workshop.

**Chair:** Michelle Cox, Bridgewater State College, MA

**Co-Chairs:** Angela Dadak, American University, Washington, D.C.

Kathryn Nielsen-Dube, Merrimack College, North Andover, MA

**Speakers:** A. Suresh Canagarajah, Pennsylvania State University, State College

Gail Shuck, Boise State University, ID

Michelle Cox, Bridgewater State College, MA

Kevin Romberger-Depew, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA

Susan Miller-Cochran, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, University of New Hampshire, Durham

Sarah Nakamaru, Borough of Manhattan Community College, CUNY, NY

Mark Roberge, San Francisco State University, CA

Angela Dadak, American University, Washington, D.C.

Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University, Tempe

Kathryn Nielsen-Dube, Merrimack College, North Andover, MA

#### **W.4 Writing Teachers Writing: Deepening Our Passion for Our Own Writing**

While the CCCC convention allows for useful, practical, and sometimes inspiring talk about writing and teaching writing, it rarely allows time for the activity of writing itself. The workshop leaders, experienced writers, and teachers of Creative Nonfiction will focus this day on writing. Participants will respond to a variety of writing prompts, writing as they see fit in response to these prompts, and they will have the opportunity to share some of their day's writing in small-group workshops.

In this pre-convention workshop, writing teachers will experience what we invite students in our classes to do: to write on demand and to share their writing. The writing teacher participants will also get to indulge in doing the kinds of writing that they may normally not make time to do: creative nonfiction, poetry, family or personal stories,

for example. They will also be responding to writing prompts that they themselves might want to use subsequently in their own classes. There will be three one-hour sessions devoted to writing during the day, with participants able to choose which prompts to respond to (or whether to modify or to ignore these prompts).

This workshop is a repeat (with new prompts) of the very successful workshop offered in 2008, where the 23 attendees gave glowing evaluations.

## THE SIX PROMPTS

### Feeding Hungers: Body, Soul, Spirit

“Our three basic needs, for food and security and love, are so mixed and mingled and entwined that we cannot straightly think of one without the others.” – M. F. K. Fisher

Write about how food has either shown you something about yourself; shaped your relationship with an individual, family, or group; or inspired adventures, culinary, philosophical, or otherwise. Your writing can range from how-to-do-it (gardening or recipes in context) to memories of events in which food (or its absence) played a major role, evoking succulence, hospitality, seduction, stress, an entire culture conveyed in a single dish or meal.

### Dreams and Fantasies

Writing comes from the same place fantasies and dreams come from. You are still, asleep, or empty, and something comes. Writing surely involves more conscious decision-making, but the source of writing is the source of dreams and fantasies, what modern people sometimes call the unconscious.

Write about your dreams and fantasies. You can talk about the important dreams of your life or about last night’s dream. You can talk about your youthful fantasies or your current ones. You are of course welcome to offer interpretations or commentary, but you need not do so.

### Writing About Place

All of us have memories of places that have been significant to us in our lives. Maybe it was a grandmother’s house, or the kitchen where we learned to cook, or the study where we wrote our first book, or a beloved garden, or a home we had to leave but were sorry to do so. For your next writing, recall a place that has been significant to you at some point in your life. It could be in your childhood or more recently, a place you’ve worked or lived, a place you find yourself returning to in memory or dreams. Recreate that place for us, making clear in what you write why and how this place is or has been important to you. Take us there.

### Our Endings Are Our Beginnings

We experience the end of the day, the end of a book, the end of a relationship, or a loved one’s death. Sometimes we don’t know how to go on or what will come next. Write about a time when you experienced something ending. List some possible topics. Choose one and write a piece that puts us there. Give us a filmable scene, maybe a half hour late one afternoon. What food was on the table? What was the light like? What did someone say? Was this also a beginning?

### Objects that Evoke

In *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With*, Sherry Turkle writes, “We find it familiar to consider objects as useful or aesthetic, as necessities or vain indulgences. We are on less familiar ground when we consider objects as companions to our emotional lives or as provocations to thought. . . . We think with the objects we love; we love the objects we think with.” Her book, then, consists of short essays, mostly narrative and memoir and reflection, in which people write about a personally evocative object. Perhaps even something mundane or easily overlooked, these objects mark a relationship (to people, ideas, places, or times) or they mix intellect and emotion. They evoke. Turkle’s authors write about cellos and rolling pins, bracelets and slime mold, a yellow raincoat, a stuffed bunny, the Melbourne train. Here’s an invitation to write about an evocative object of your own.

“How Many Questions Does a Cat Have?”– Pablo Neruda, *The Book of Questions*

Questions, without answers, can be a provocative means of exploring a subject. Questions can point up paradoxes, reveal tensions, explore mystery; serving as reflective surfaces, questions can open us to larger worlds. In this writing segment, participants will engage in question dialogues and use selections from Neruda’s *Book of Questions* to prompt questions and speculations about various subjects. Play!

*Speakers:* Lynn Bloom, University of Connecticut, “Feeding Hungers: Body, Soul, Spirit”

Boe John, University of California, Davis, “Dreams and Fantasies”

Rebecca Faery, MIT, Cambridge, MA, “Writing About Place”

Mike Heller, Roanoke College, VA, “Our Endings are Our Beginnings”

Doug Hesse, University of Denver, CO, “Objects that Evoke”

Libby Jones, Berea College, KY, “How Many Questions Does a Cat Have?” – Pablo Neruda, *The Book of Questions*”

## **W.5 Understanding Students’ Use of Sources through Collaborative Research**

Workshop participants will be introduced to methods of textual analysis developed in the Citation Project and will engage in hands-on practice of these methods. This form of analysis reveals how effectively students are understanding and using the sources they cite; it serves as a valuable means of faculty development; it can be used for course placement and program assessment; and, most of all, it can be used to develop pedagogy that teaches students how to engage with their research sources rather than plagiarize from them. Participants in this workshop will practice methods of textual analysis that they can use for their own purposes in writing program administration, teaching, and scholarship, and will also have the possibility of participating in ongoing research in the Citation Project.

The Citation Project is a multi-institution research project whose purpose is to compile an aggregate description of how college students use the research sources that they cite. Studying papers gathered from a variety of colleges, researchers read the papers and their sources as they pursue answers to a variety of questions, such as what types of sources students choose; how readily those sources can be retrieved by readers; the extent to which students’ papers reveal an engagement with the sources being cited; the frequency with which students use quotation, paraphrase, patch writing, and summary; whether students’ choice of quotation, paraphrase, patch writing, and summary correlates with the difficulty level or genre of the source they are citing; and whether any of these four strategies tend to be used in the early or later part of the students’ papers, suggesting that they are strategies to which students resort as they become fatigued or pressed for time.

The data gathered from this research furthers our understanding of underlying issues in students’ source-based writing, so that more effective pedagogy can be developed. Currently, writing faculty and librarians introducing students to research and source-based writing focus most of their attention on instructing students in citation systems and source analysis, installing honor codes, and/or adopting plagiarism-detecting software. Randall McClure and Kellian Clink’s study of student source selection decisions indicates the need for “alternative approaches to information literacy instruction” (131). The Citation Project is designed to further our understanding of student source selection and use and explore the hypothesis that students’ instructional needs are far more complex than we have imagined, calling for fresh, nuanced instruction in critical reading, building arguments from syntheses of sources, and the rhetorical uses of citation.

*Chairs:* Rebecca Moore Howard, Syracuse University, NY

Patricia Serviss, Syracuse University, NY

*Speakers:* Rebecca Moore Howard, Syracuse University, NY, “Why Citation Analysis Matters”

Sandra Jamieson, Drew University, Madison, NJ, “How to Do Citation Analysis”

Kelly Kinney, Binghamton University, NY, “Using Citation Analysis in New Writing Programs”  
Kristi Murray Costello, Binghamton University, NY, “Using Citation Analysis in Longitudinal Assessment”  
Crystal Benedicks, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, IN, “Analyzing Student Citation Practices to Drive Faculty Development”  
Samantha Roy, Binghamton University, NY, “Using Citation Analysis for MA Student Development”  
Tanya K. Rodrigue, Syracuse University, NY, “Tanya K. Rodrigue”  
Patricia Serviss, Syracuse University, NY, “Using Citation Analysis for PhD Student Development”

## **W.6 Intonation: A Neglected Key to How Language Works**

Intonation could be called the “musical” dimension of spoken language. When humans in all cultures speak, they almost invariably group their words into intonational “chunks” or separable tone units. Grammatically, these are often clause-based, but intonationally, each one shows a pattern with regard to pitch and stress. Intonation is not an emotional “frosting” spread on the real “cake” of meaning—grammar and semantics. Rather, intonation is an essential manifestation of meaning-carrying grammar. It’s always turned on when we speak naturally and it is reflected (well or badly) in writing.

Many of us in composition and rhetoric have studied English grammar, but too few have included intonation in that study. It’s clear from the burgeoning study of intonation that if we want to understand oral communication—and written language—we need to understand intonation and spoken language. In this workshop, participants will be introduced to some of the complexities of intonation in English. We will come at it from the Halliday-based theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL).

For example, the range of intonational choice is extensive. A simple sentence—“I like her”—can have three different meanings, depending on which of the three words is stressed; that is, intonation will change what is felt as new versus given information. The same sentence will also have five different implications depending on intonation: which of five declarative mood choices does the speaker use (strong, reserved, uncommitted, argumentative, or calmly certain).

**WRITING.** Students and teachers who have grown up with English don’t need to be taught how to do English intonation in their speaking: it is part of what we do subconsciously. And though writing is silent on the page, intonation can help us not only with punctuation but with many features of wording and grammar. If we learn to understand the intonational patterns we speak so effortlessly, we can use them to guide us in two crucial ways: sometimes we need to learn to harness unconscious intonational patterns for writing, sometimes we need to learn to make conscious revisions to capture spoken meanings that are lost in the silent written version.

**ORAL COMMUNICATION.** “Speak more clearly! Read your paper with better expression!” A conscious understanding of intonation can help us translate this vague advice into concrete help for speaking.

**EFL / ESL.** When the intonation system is not in the student’s unconscious, it can be acquired through extensive listening to spoken English movies, plays, newscasts, and so forth. But this kind of learning is more powerful when some of the key intonational principles are also taught. This explains the current strong interest in SFL intonation among ESL teachers in, for example, Argentina, Brazil, and Hong Kong.

**How the Workshop Will Work:** The workshop will be a hands-on experience of exploring and analyzing both spontaneous spoken English conversation and the reading aloud of written texts by writers as they compose and revise. To help in this work, participants will be given some newly developed free software (Praat) for studying intonation. (Participants will be encouraged to bring computers. If only as many as one-third do so, that will permit

us to work in groups of three around computers. If fewer than that brings computers—which is unlikely—we can still work in groups with a large screen and loudspeaker.)

The software will help participants see how intonation plays a central role in some crucial features of language.:

–It will clarify the three kinds of work we do when talking or writing: ideational work, interpersonal work, and textual work.

–It will provide a sequence of lenses to focus on the descending “layers” of language: from the interpersonal/social dimension, to the semantic dimension, to clauses, to particular contours of intonation, and finally down to the physics of sound.

–It will show how information units are “packaged” as clauses, phrases, or even individual words.

–It will show how intonation handles new vs. given information and how this interacts with the structure of theme/rheme (or topic/comment).

These hands-on analyses will help us understand these features of language more deeply than if we just studied “silent” grammar.

When participants are working in small groups with the computer or responding to presentations by the organizers, their face-to-face discussion will be an important part of processing the new information covered in the workshop.

**Chair:** Peter Elbow, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

**Speakers:** William Southworth Greaves, Glendon College, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, ““An Introduction to the Study of Intonation and the Use of Praat (software)”

Peter Elbow, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, “Intonation and Writing”

Craig Hancock, University at Albany, NY, “How I Use Intonation Theory in a Composition Class”

## **W.7 Social Justice, Multi-modalities and Basic Writers**

Institutions across the US are decreasing funds for Basic Writing (BW). Education stakeholders describe BW students as “marginal” or “remedial” (Greene and McAlexander), and identify BW students by “difference” in race, social class, ability, and language (Matsuda; Sanchez and Paulson). Institutional policies create barriers for BW students, indicating a need for equitable conditions for BW students. To address these issues, participants explore intersections of social justice, multimodal writing, and BW post-process pedagogy.

OPENING CONCEPTS: 9-10

A Post-Process Framework

I suggest a framework for considering intersections of multimodal writing and post-process writing instruction. Multimodal writing suggests a post-process writing pedagogy that includes collaboration, consideration of specific and authentic audiences outside the classroom, and real-world engagement with final products and publication (Arroyo; Kessler). According to Heard, compositionists have been largely “silent” in response to the post-process formulation of writing as uncodifiable, not bound by hard-and-fast rules; he asserts that one way to practicably engage diverse writers in the give-and-take of post-process writing instruction is through community-engaged writing.

**Chairs:** Shannon Carter, Texas A&M Commerce

Hannah Ashley, West Chester University, PA

**Facilitators:**

Greg Glau, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff

Kathleen Baca, Doña Ana Community College, Las Cruces, NM, “Social Justice, Multi-modalities and Basic Writers”

Marcia Ribble, University of Cincinnati, OH

Barbara Gleason, City College of New York, NY

**Speakers:** Valerie Kinloch, The Ohio State University, Columbus, “The Making of New Literacies: African American Youth and the Politics of Place”

Steve Lamos, University of Colorado-Boulder, “Race, Racism, and the Institutional Status of Basic Writing”

Deborah Mutnick, Long Island University, Brooklyn, NY, “Conference on Basic Writing Workgroup on the National Status of Basic Writing Programs”

William Lalicker, West Chester University, PA, “CBW Social Justice Workgroup”

Rebecca Mlynarczyk, Kingsborough Community College, CUNY, NY, “Conference on Basic Writing Workgroup on the National Status of Basic Writing Programs”

Peter Adams, Community College Baltimore County, MD, “Case Study of institutional Change: The Accelerated Learning Project (ALP)”

Susan Naomi Bernstein, LaGuardia Community College-CUNY, Long Island City, NY, “CBW Social Justice Workgroup”

Shannon Carter, Texas A&M University, Commerce, “Multi-modal Writing and Social Justice: The Right Mix or Mixed Up”

Hannah Ashley, West Chester University, PA, “Social justice and Multi-modal Writing for Basic Composition, really? A Post-Process Framework”

## **W.9 “Feminist Intersectionality: Confronting Identity(ies), Censorship, and Action”**

Taking up this year’s conference theme—to rethink, revisit, revise, and renew—this workshop reinvigorates feminist discourse through the lens of intersectionality. Feminists in rhetoric and composition studies must again interrogate how the forces of racism, classism, homophobia, sexism, and ableism continue to silence voices. What have been the effects? How can we resist not only the coerced silencing of feminist voices, but also prevent the censorship of ideas within feminist discourse? We offer the chance for workshop participants to bring together their multiple perspectives so we can work to translate analysis and pedagogy into action.

This workshop provides an open space for provocative multimedia, performative, multigenre, and roundtable discussion prompts, while also creating the opportunity for “ACTION!” groups to work out strategies and methods for working in a more productive and feminist way in the future. First, participants will discuss the past while looking to the future, in a discussion led by a feminist scholar looking back over her last 30 years in rhetoric, composition, and literacy to ask What do the ellipses look like? What are the major opportunities and challenges before us? This scholar and the discussion to follow will set the tone for the two roundtable-style small group discussions. The four discussion leaders in each of the two groups will spend five minutes to prompt participants to discuss themes and ideas that are often elided or marginalized, offering the chance to think critically about feminist theory and praxis (see below for themes). These roundtable sessions will be followed by a group brainstorm session oriented toward pedagogy: How do we encounter student resistance? We will discuss typical situations and anecdotes and then, in smaller groups, work through methods and strategies.

After lunch, participants will again come together as a big group for an interactive speaker panel (6-9 minutes apiece) that will set the stage for the action-oriented breakout groups to follow. The first panelist will perform a multi-genre performative reading that examines the tensions between taking and teaching feminist rhetoric courses and the realities of academic writing that privileges “masculine” ways of knowing and communicating. The next panelist offers an overview of ongoing experiences with a delegation of feminists seeking to build a productive connection between Guatemalans and United States feminists, using the service-learning model to raise awareness of the issues intersecting with femicide, both at the grassroots and political levels. And the final panelist investigates the immediacy of activism opportunities, using the bisexual lens to challenge monosexual (hetero or homo) readings

and discourses in the postmodern writing classroom. Participants will spend the rest of the afternoon working in action groups to discuss strategies for the future (please see descriptions below). We will wrap up with a final large group discussion and time for reflection.

**Facilitators:** Heather Branstetter, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, “Lessons from the Past and Overlaps Between Feminist Theory and Political Activism”

Angela Rounsaville, University of Washington, Seattle, “The Future of the Feminist Academy--A Feminist Workshop Mission Statement”

Kirsti Cole, Minnesota State University, Mankato, “Fusing Town with Gown for Service Learning and Community Engagement”

Emily Hoeflinger, Texas A&M University, College Station, “Coping with Institutionalized Sexism in Terms of Publishing, Promotion, and FTE Concerns”

**Speakers:** Jacqueline Jones Royster, The Ohio State University, Columbus, “We Are . . . Women . . .”

Nancy Mack, Wright State University, Urbana, OH, “Questions I Have Been Asked”

Melissa Nicolas, Drew University, Center Valley, PA, “Why I Left Feminism and Why I Came Back: Examining Rhetorical Space Within Feminism”

Lonie McMichael, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, “Why Feminists Should Support Fat Acceptance: A Rhetorical View”

Stephanie Morgan, South College--Asheville, NC, “What We Say When We Don’t Talk about Women’s Rhetoric and Online Dating”

Patti Hanlon-Baker, Stanford University, CA, “Where Are All the Boys? Exploring Gender Issues with First Year College Students”

Jason Barrett-Fox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, “Feminist Rhetoric of Old Hollywood and the Contemporary Writing Classroom”

Elana Hornblass Dushey, Fordham University, New York, NY, “When Words Are At Risk: The Death of Feminine Language and the Feminine in “The Handmaid’s Tale” and “Oryx and Crake””

Ruth Osorio, San Francisco State University, CA, “Student-Run Feminist Groups--Connecting Theory to the Streets”

Trish Roberts-Miller, University of Texas, Austin, “Student Resistance to Feminist Theory and Pedagogy”

Tammie Kennedy, University of Nebraska at Omaha, “Searching for Transformation After the Feminist Course Ends”

## **W.10 Technology and The Academic Zeitgeist: Te(ch)-ing in the Two Year College and Beyond**

Description: In an age when 8 million American adults have blogs , e-mail is now ubiquitous, cyber communities like YouTube, Twitter, Facebook, and MySpace are already passé among the teen and college-age set, and the 16-year-old implementation of computers and composition is a given, technology is part of the academic zeitgeist.

While in the 1980s and 1990s much was made of the digital divide, documenting the economic and educational injustice of access to computers, those arguments are largely erased or forgotten in a culture where computers are now omnipresent, from desktops to laptops to smart phones. With the advent of Web 2.0 and social media, however, a new “digital divide” is emerging. Concomitant with the idea of the digital native is the idea that all students will come to the classroom proficient in new technologies, cyber-literate, and comfortable with the discourse of digital rhetoric, but this expectation presumes of its “digital natives” a literacy which they have absorbed uncritically or which they cannot produce.

As three committed technology practitioners at large urban community colleges we are often faced with the fact that while our students are “digital natives” they do not know how or what to produce in digital mediums.

Moreover, some of this technology seems out of reach to instructors, the generation of “digital immigrants” burdened by large class sizes, heavy teaching loads, and unending paper grading. On-campus sessions led by IT staff are often disconnected to our writing pedagogy and to the realities of our classrooms. How do we learn this new language of a wired world? How do we find time to learn these new skills? How do we apply technology to the classroom effectively?

Kathleen Yancey’s “Writing in the 21st Century”<sup>2</sup> lays out an ambitious agenda for the future of writing pedagogy as it interfaces with digital culture. However, as thoughtful practitioners of writing, writing instructors need to feel empowered to use these tools in the classroom. In this hands-on, practical workshop, we hope to debunk technology myths, show the “how to” of the latest Web 2.0 technologies, demonstrate easy ways of incorporating technology into writing classes, and create meaningful course assignments that will give students a digital presence and cultivate the students’ digital voice. In this interactive workshop, participants will have a chance to design and receive feedback on assignments that they create.

**Facilitators:** Marisa Klages, LaGuardia Community College, Long Island City, NY

Carlos Hernandez, Borough of Manhattan Community College, NY

J. Elizabeth Clark, LaGuardia Community College, Long Island City, NY

Lisa Justine Hernandez, St. Edward’s University, Austin, TTX, “Engaging Writing and Women’s Studies Students in Coalition Work to End Violence Against the Women of Guatemala”

Jennifer Fallas, Bridgewater State College, MA, “I Kissed a Girl (and a Boy) and I Liked It: Intersectionalities of Bisexual Activism and Feminism in Pop-Culture Writing Classrooms”

## **HALF-DAY WEDNESDAY WORKSHOPS**

**Afternoon: 1:30 p.m.–5:00 p.m.**

### **AW.01 Mentoring, Publishing, and Celebrating Student Writing**

Focus and Audience: NCTE sees the importance of making the public aware of college students’ writing. NCTE’s National Day on Writing and the WPA’s National Conversation on Writing offer visible venues for such work. The question for writing teachers, then, is how might we support, publish, and celebrate our students’ work in other local, national, and international venues? In this workshop, we explore hands-on, innovative teaching strategies for using our field’s only peer-reviewed undergraduate journal to ensure that students’ work is read, discussed, and used by audiences beyond our own classrooms.

The editorial board of *Young Scholars in Writing: Undergraduate Research in Writing and Rhetoric (YSW)*, the international journal of peer-reviewed undergraduate research in writing and rhetoric, proposes a half-day workshop to offer writing teachers and WPAs strategies for enhancing writing instruction through the use of student publications. Since its inception in 2003, YSW has provided a venue for more than 80 undergraduate researchers to date, drawn from over 52 institutions in 20 states and 3 countries. As a result, the editorial board members (workshop facilitators) have learned a great deal about teaching and mentoring researched writing in and beyond classrooms and want to share this knowledge with colleagues.

The workshop will cover activities pertinent to first-year composition courses, advanced writing and rhetoric courses, WAC, and writing for undergraduate publication. We will also discuss new electronic modalities, which workshop participants can use to ensure that their students’ work extends far beyond the physical classroom. Participants will leave with ideas and strategies for bringing published student texts back into the classroom in order to enhance their own teaching, mentor their own students to produce and publish undergraduate research, and establish a culture of undergraduate writing research. While focusing on YSW articles, workshop leaders will also

identify and discuss other venues for student publication.

**Structure:** The workshop features three main topics, each addressing a different aspect of enhancing writing instruction through mentoring, publishing, and celebrating student writing: Teaching Research and Researched Argument, Mentoring Students' Research Writing and Publication Efforts, and Using Student Publications to Advocate for Writing Programs and Centers. Each 45-minute session includes concurrent "roundtables" which participants will move among. The roundtables will be facilitated by workshop leaders with relevant expertise, with assistance from successful YSW student authors. Each roundtable discussion will offer strategies for planning and implementing a specific session topic.

**Facilitators:** Susan Thomas, University of Sydney, Australia

Doug Downs, Montana State University, Bozeman

David Elder, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth

Joseph Janangelo, Loyola University of Chicago, IL

Patti Hanlon-Baker, Stanford University, CA

Jonathan Hunt, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Amy Robillard, Illinois State University, Normal

Jane Greer, University of Missouri, Kansas City,

Laurie Grobman, Penn State University-Berks, Reading

### **AW.02 Pinpointing Critical Thinking Opportunities: Revisiting Assignment Design**

How do we pinpoint opportunities for critical thinking in assignment design? In this session, participants will brainstorm ways of assessing the development of critical thinking. Participants will complete a brief survey about how they sequence assignments in their courses and leaders will then review the results with the participants and present results from their own department. Participants will then consider the implications for assignment design and revision. The group will discuss ways students can identify evidence of critical thinking in their written work, as well as ways students can make critical thinking connections across assignments, courses, and disciplines.

Participants will leave this session with strategies for rethinking critical thinking in the context of assignment design, especially concerning the issues of student perception and student engagement.

**Co-Chairs:** Janine Utell, Widener University, Chester, PA

Patricia Dyer, Widener University, Chester, PA

### **AW.03 The Pleasures of Teaching Composition: Reading and Responding to Student Writers**

Our collective interest in responding is deeply professional and personal. We feel a weighty responsibility when we respond to our students' words, knowing that we, too, have received comments that have given us hope—and sometimes made us despair—in our abilities as writers. The words teachers scribbled on our papers are often the same words we scribble in the margins or at the bottom of our own students' pages. These words, we hope, our students will take with them as they move from our class to the next, from one paper assignment to another, across the drafts. Responding to student writers reminds us of the pleasures of teaching writing, the call and response between our students' words and our own. As teachers, we respond to our students' great insights because we are grateful for the insights they have given us. And in encouraging our students to imagine other levels of questions, we, too, are inspired to think more widely and deeply. Everything shifts when teachers focus their comments to the person who wrote them, rather than to the words themselves. As we learn from students, our responses don't need to

be monumental, but their influence often extends beyond the margins of student papers and outside the walls of classrooms.

Research on responding has shown that teacher commentary, more than any other form of instruction, shapes the way students learn to write. To our students, it isn't just that without a reader "the whole process is diminished"; rather, it is with a thoughtful reader that the whole process is enriched and deepened. Yet most teachers acknowledge that they don't know how students use their comments or why students find some comments useful and others not.

In this half-day workshop, we propose to provide a forum for teachers to reflect on what it means to be a thoughtful reader of student work, as well as the principles and practices they use in responding to student writers.

**Chair:** Nancy Sommers, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

**Respondents:** Jean Ferguson Carr, University of Pittsburgh, PA

Jean P. Nadeau, Bristol Community College, Fall River, MA

Deborah Coxwell Teague, Florida State University, Tallahassee,

Howard Tinberg, Bristol Community College, Fall River, MA

Carmen Werder, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA

Jennifer Locke Whetham, Greenriver Community College, Auburn, WA

Terry Myers Zawacki, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA

#### **AW.04 Into the Streets: Transforming Institutional Barriers to Ebonics and Language Diversity in College Composition**

Despite sustained resistance by advocates of standardization and cultural homogenization (i.e., the "English Only" movement), incorporating African American Language (AAL) and language diversity in general within writing pedagogy has gained significant acceptance within college composition. After nearly a half-century of research in African American language and literacy (Labov 1972, Smitherman 1977, Baugh 1981, Lee 1993), combined with several decades of language policy resolutions and activism, (i.e., the 1974 NCTE and CCCC "Students Right to Their Own Language" Resolution; Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School Children, et al. v. Ann Arbor School District Board, 1979, and the 1996 Oakland School Board Resolution affirming Ebonics as a valuable component of language arts instruction), college composition scholarship has increasingly embraced AAL and other language varieties as a valuable tool for enhancing the "linguistic gifts" (Troutman 1996) diverse students bring with them into the language arts classroom. Such scholarships promotes a wide array of language arts strategies, from bi-dialectical or contrastive analysis approaches, which uses AAL to teach Standard American English (SAE), to more recent, innovative pedagogical strategies employing Rap, Hip Hop, and Black popular culture to develop both academic and critical literacy (Taylor 1991, Mahari 1998, Morrell, Richardson 2003, Alim 2008, and Kirkland 2008). In these and other approaches, rhetoric and composition teachers value AAL and other language varieties as essential components of language arts instruction.

Yet in many instances, teachers' ability to incorporate language diversity within composition instruction is undermined by educational policies and institutional practices that privilege monolingualism and cultural homogeneity. The 2000 "No Child Left Behind" policy, high-stakes standardized testing, so-called "performance-based" teacher retention and promotion, and other policies constitute concrete structural barriers that not only preclude language diversity, but also discipline and punish teachers for moving outside of official, institutionally-sanctioned language arts instruction. For college composition, such policies and institutional practices offer strong disincentives for providing instructors with theoretical and practical knowledge that would help them place decades of AAL and language diversity scholarship into meaningful pedagogical practice. Teachers of rhetoric and composition, much like their elementary and secondary school counterparts, often find themselves confronting the forces of language standardization and cultural homogenization within the academic units ostensibly committed to

diversity within language arts instruction.

These and other structural limitations became a major focus of conversation during the 2009 CCCC Language Policy Committee workshop on Ebonics. Workshop participants recognized the potential of using AAL and other language varieties within composition instruction, but at the same time expressed serious concerns about institutional resistance from home academic units that limit language pedagogy to linguistic conformity to SAE, especially within first-year composition programs. Teachers testified to risking negative evaluations, and even their jobs as composition instructors, for doing what nearly four decades of AAL and language policy research has determined to be pedagogically sound. This situation raises at least two critical questions that this proposed workshop will seek to address: What does it mean to teach African American language and culture in the context of institutional settings opposed to its use within official spaces? How can teachers seeking to incorporate language diversity within composition pedagogy negotiate or transform existing structural barriers that work to exclude such diversity within writing instruction in the first place?

According to Ernest Morrell (2002), incorporating marginalized voices into language pedagogy relies not only upon innovative teaching strategies, but also robust institutional arguments justifying the pedagogical intervention itself. In this context, the CCCC Language Policy Committee proposes a half-day workshop that will provide teachers with critical approaches to methods, pedagogical techniques, and rhetorical strategies that will enable them to negotiate institutional barriers to language diversity. In the process, we will model ways to create the necessary space for embracing AAL and other language varieties as a valuable components of composition pedagogy. The workshop we are proposing will begin with a 5-minute overview of its purpose, followed by two group-facilitated 75-minute interactive sessions. There will be a 10-minute break between sessions and a 30-minute wrap-up session to conclude the workshop. Both groups will provide participants with handouts and teaching resources. The first group will review recent scholarship on AAL and its implications for teaching and learning. This review will make use of multimedia such as PowerPoint, sound recordings, and film.

The second group will also provide participants with samples from successful composition and rhetoric programs that embrace AAL and language diversity within official institutional structures. The group will discuss and critique such programs to provide workshop participants with strategies and institutional arguments useful for creating institutional contexts for incorporating AAL and other language varieties within language arts instruction. Academic scholarship, news articles, and media interviews will help foster interactive dialogue to help participants negotiate difficult academic and political terrains in which composition and rhetoric teachers struggle to place AAL and language diversity theory into meaningful pedagogical application.

**Chair:** Geneva Smitherman, Michigan State University, East Lansing

**Facilitators:** Terry Carter, Southern Polytechnic State University, Marietta, GA

Victoria Cliett, Henry Ford Community College, Dearborn, MI

Austin Jackson, Michigan State University, East Lansing

David E. Kirkland, New York University, NY

Kim Brian Lovejoy, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, IN

Rashidah Jaami Muhammad, Governors State University, University Park, IL

Elaine Richardson, The Ohio State University, Columbus,

Geneva Smitherman, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Denise Troutman, Michigan State University, East Lansing

## **AW.05 Creating Safe Writing Center Spaces for Diverse Students**

This interactive workshop will help writing center administrators 1) identify and define the ways in which their campuses and their writing centers are diverse, 2) become aware of the needs of diverse students and tutors in the writing center, and 3) learn ways of addressing these needs in our writing centers. This workshop further develops the idea of writing centers as collaborative spaces where all students should feel safe and “heard.” Those often classified as “Other” because of their sexuality, gender presentation, race, linguistic skills, religion, or social skills, for example, may present writing center staff with additional resistance or shyness as well as different ways of thinking or writing. Consequently, staff and administrators must be prepared to recognize these needs and develop ways of meeting these needs in writing center policies: Does the physical arrangement make the center accessible? Are your center decorations inclusive, could they be offensive to someone’s culture? Does your tutor training address issues of diversity in the center? Do individual writing center sessions pay attention to “how written texts represent [students’] visions of their culture” and how they “need new processes and forms if [they] are to express ways of thinking that have been outside the dominant culture” (Bridwell-Bowles)? For example, GLBT students often find themselves writing outside of what Malinowitz calls their “most secure rhetorical footing” as they attempt to write about what they think will be safe or acceptable topics rather than those they are most interested in or knowledgeable of. Likewise, tutors may discover awkward language use when students hypercorrect or try to excise their more natural speech patterns or vernacular languages (Matsuda).

We will call attention to these needs and brainstorm ways of addressing them through various activities:

- Diversity Definitions Match Game—This game, modified from a version developed by GLSEN, asks participants to move around and talk to each other as they match a definition card to a word card. The cards ask participants to not only differentiate between words related to gender and sexuality but also to look at diversity from other viewpoints such as language (L1, L2, ESL, NNS, dialect), race and ethnicity, class, (dis)ability, etc.
- Naming Game—This game asks participants to work in small groups. Each group is given a category such as gender, geographic origins, religion, education, physicality. Working within their category, the group is asked to come up with as many labels for people as possible; they are then asked to categorize the labels as to positive or negative. Categorizing usually leads to intense debate and to a realization that context is very important in deciding whether something is positive or negative. Small groups are asked to share their responses with the large group.
- Small group and large group analysis of case study scenarios
- Role playing, open dialog, and resource sharing

We will end the session by leading participants through the development of individual action plans for fostering diversity and creating safe space in their writing centers.

**Chair:** Trixie G. Smith, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI

**Facilitators:** Pamela B. Childers, The McCallie School, Chattanooga, TN

Tammy Conard-Salvo, Purdue University, East Lafayette, IN

Steven T. Lessner, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Richard Sévère, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN

### **AW.06 Highlighting Shared Interests among Writing Programs: Centralizing WAC, Writing Centers, and Composition Programs**

Although we typically discuss writing programs as separate entities (i.e., University Writing Centers, Composition Programs, Writing across the Curriculum Programs), this workshop considers the possible points of connections among various writing programs, bringing together shared interests through the auspice of writing centralization. On many campuses, these programs are not housed in the same academic unit or are funded by multiple stakeholders. At our institution, for example, the University Writing Center and the Writing across the Curriculum Program are both housed in a new academic structure, the University College, while the Composition Program remains housed in

English. However, all three units work together to support a new General Education Curriculum, which implements a vertical writing model. This situation led us to ask a number of questions about the institutional location of writing on campus, and, further, allowed us to explore possibilities for increasing cross-talk among these programs in order to work collaboratively and independently as we advance the larger goals of rhetoric and composition.

We invite participants to engage in a focused workshop that asks them to investigate the location of writing on their campuses and to consider shared interests that exist among various writing programs. The workshop will begin with three speakers—a WAC director, writing center director, and director of composition—who will provide a brief overview of our efforts to gain independence for these programs at the same time we have fostered strong inter-programmatic collaborations. After this presentation, participants will engage in a writing activity and a group discussion in which they will assess their own programs and consider both the opportunities for and obstacles to centralizing writing on campus. To address both the macro- and micro-level considerations necessary for identifying shared interests, participants will engage in two breakout sessions that provide them with the opportunity to explore issues related to their own institutional contexts. During breakout session one, participants have the option to discuss administrative structures, faculty development, and labor issues, all of which relate to a wide range of writing programs. During breakout session two, participants have the option to discuss assessment, curriculum, and outreach. After these sessions, we will have a concluding discussion to develop strategic plans for potential collaborations that centralize writing programs.

*Chair:* Tonya Hassell, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

*Speakers:* Georgia Rhoades, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Beth Carroll, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Kim Gunter, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC,

Dennis Bohr, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Elizabeth West, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Kelly Edge-Terzaken, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Travis Rountree, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC”

Sherry Alusow Hart, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Erin Zimmerman, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Jonathan Bradshaw, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

### **AW.07 Is There Space in This Class? Designing Effective and Efficient Learning Environments with New Technologies**

Session Description: Because we live, work, and teach at a time when new technologies emerge on a nearly daily basis, writing teachers and administrators are faced with a frustrating paradox. How do we incorporate new technologies into writing instruction without becoming overwhelmed—and without overwhelming our students? At the same time, how do we adapt, or even retrofit, our classrooms and online learning environments to accommodate new technologies for teaching and learning without having to start from scratch? And how do we accomplish all of this with ever-shrinking resources during an economic crisis? During this workshop, the presenters will explore various models for designing technology-rich learning environments for teaching writing. Workshop participants will be encouraged to consider the challenges that arise when designing and adapting to different learning environments and they will discuss principles and guidelines for design and implementation.

When considering how to design innovative, technologically-rich writing environments, instructors and administrators must consider numerous questions, including

\* What innovative learning environment models are currently being used for writing instruction?

\* In a climate of decreasing resources and shrinking budgets, how can writing programs design more with less?

- \* What arguments can writing programs make for the resources that are needed for new learning spaces?
- \* What lessons can we learn from past innovations in technology-rich learning environments?
- \* What principles of Universal Design should be considered when designing new learning environments?
- \* How can we assess the effectiveness of new learning environments and technologies for writing instruction?
- \* What principles of faculty development are most important when designing and teaching in innovative learning environments?
- \* And, finally, how can we address issues of sustainability and scalability related to the often work-intensive piloting of new learning environments and technologies? How can sustainability be increased when applications continually change and learning environments need to be adapted?

In this half-day workshop, we will introduce participants to multiple learning environments for teaching writing that incorporate technology in a variety of ways, provide heuristics for assessing the effectiveness of those environments and technologies, discuss budget scenarios and funding issues for designing new learning environments, and raise issues of sustainability and faculty development. The first half of the workshop will include presentations addressing some of the central questions raised in this proposal and the second half will include two break-out sessions focusing on specific models and issues related to designing innovative learning environments for writing instruction. One round of break-out sessions will discuss issues related to implementing new learning environments in writing programs such as responding to budget scenarios, incorporating UD principles into class design, and preparing faculty to teach in innovative learning spaces. A second round of break-out sessions will describe and demonstrate four different design models for learning with new technologies.

The specific goals of this workshop are

- \* To discuss relevant issues about designing innovative learning spaces that incorporate emerging technologies into writing instruction
- \* To demonstrate and share images of learning spaces designed at institutions around the country
- \* To brainstorm possible scenarios and implementation strategies for new learning environments at the participants' institutions
- \* To provide participants with resources for designing new learning environments to include:
  1. Guidelines for incorporating Universal Design principles into classroom design
  2. Assessment strategies for determining the effectiveness of new designs and implementations of technology
  3. Suggestions for designing effective faculty development for instructors who are teaching in innovative learning environments with new technologies
  4. Budget scenarios and problem-solving strategies for designing innovative learning spaces on tight budgets

Learning environments to be discussed during the workshop will include

- \* Face-to-face classrooms
- \* Classes in which students bring their own technology
- \* Hybrid and blended learning environments
- \* Distance learning environments
- \* Environments which incorporate web-based applications, cloud computing, and mobile technologies
- \* Classes where students choose the learning environment best suited to their needs

Presenters will bring numerous laptop computers for use during the workshops and encourage participants to bring laptops as well if possible. Participants in the workshop would benefit greatly from having wireless internet access for this workshop.

**Chair:** Susan Miller-Cochran, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

**Speakers:** Dawn Shepherd, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

Shelley Rodrigo, Mesa Community College, AZ  
Anthony Atkins, University of North Carolina, Wilmington  
Colleen Reilly, University of North Carolina, Wilmington  
Matt Davis, Florida State University, Tallahassee  
Kevin Brock, North Carolina State University, Raleigh  
Katherine Hagopian, North Carolina State University, Raleigh  
Kevin Eric DePew, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA  
David Riedere, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

### **AW.08 Creating an Activist Service-Learning Community with Social Networking and Public Writing**

Building on a series of workshops from the 2009 CCCC attended by two of the panelists, and adding our own classroom interactions over the course of year and a half, our workshop will explain and demonstrate specific strategies for implementing, sustaining, and assessing service-learning projects using multiple classes (7 overall) of first-year composition. Participants will engage in discussions about semester-long service learning projects that rely on Weblogs, Ning, and multiple public writing assignments.

The workshop will begin with three speakers: one an adjunct, one on a renewable contract, and one tenure-track. Speaker One will explain the theory and practice behind his course argument in public literacy has two major goals: 1) to get students involved in an organization with which they have something in common and 2) to create a forum where students can develop a balance between academic and public discourse. The first goal also has two functions: First, it provides students with an opportunity to learn more about and develop an interest they have, and second, it develops retention among the student body. The first goal of the course is developed by the second through a translation of their academic research and rhetoric into a “common language.” When this is done in the public forum, students cultivate an understanding from their audience, spectators and participants, as to what their role is in the student’s argument. Speaker two will document specific types of student resistance and how that resistance was overcome by the construction of an impromptu assignment based on a campus bomb threat. Through writing to the campus newspaper in response to the “censoring” of reports about the threat, the student’s were able to make a private concern (their curiosity) public (through a form of public inquiry) to make a change in the environment (a crime log being published to inform the campus community of dangers). Speaker Three will focus on the heart of our project: concern about the uncertain future and remarkable transformation of our economy. We have moved over the past century from an economy of production to an economy of re-production driven more by affect as the scale for value than any material resource or product itself. The majority of jobs that universities are educating for now are what Robert Reich calls symbolic analytical services. These kinds of jobs require a new skill set and approach to learning through the development of relational knowledge and practices as a skillful style of action. While relational knowledge and practices (empathic and emotional competence, intersubjective and fluid communication, solidarity cultivation, and holistic response/ability, are examples) are often the by-product of educational acts, Speaker Three will show how to reach these goals by having students interact with the community to develop a skill set that helps them to transform their knowledge to solve everyday issues without relinquishing the right to critique these issues. We contend that service-learning courses, in conjunction with social technology and reflective writing practices, create the possibility for relational learning.

In addition, we will distribute a booklet funded by a teaching grant at our institution of “Best-Practices” developed over our year-and a-half of exploring this model of First Year Composition. The booklet includes multiple syllabi, assignments, rubrics, suggested readings and apparatus, strategies for troubleshooting technological, curricular, and classroom issues, and more. Far from being a finished document, we will examine the booklet as “in-process” and will borrow from the expertise of the room to improve it. Finally, participants will have the opportunity to create

their own weblog and Ning accounts for the purpose of trying out our rubric to examine student writing on these technological platforms.

*Speakers:* Don Moore, University of Southern Indiana, Evansville  
Brianne DiBacco, University of Southern Indiana, Evansville  
Dominic Miccer, University of Southern Indiana, Evansville

### **AW.09 The Composition MA Remixed: Preparing New Community College Faculty, Addressing Diverse Student Needs**

Rhetoric Review's 2005 survey of graduate programs reports that the number of MA programs in composition has nearly tripled in the past 20 years, from a handful of programs in the 1980's to over 55 in 2004. Most of these programs focus their energies on preparing students to meet the challenges of teaching in community colleges, and yet, since most journal articles consider graduate education from the doctoral perspective, community college teacher preparation remains largely invisible in the profession. To date, the profession has not debated the purpose of MA education, nor discussed its particular challenges or guidelines for preparing teachers that draw from a dialogue between community college faculty and faculty at MA-granting institutions.

In this workshop, we hope to make the work of preparing students for community college teaching visible by inviting faculty who teach in MA-granting institutions, faculty at community colleges, and recent MA graduates into dialogue with each other. We expect our proposed activities will address a series of rich questions: What is the relationship between theory and practice and how can we imagine the balance between them? What role does the graduate student's own writing and research play in MA education? What roles do reading, new media, and writing across the curriculum play in community college curriculums and how can MA education best attend to these issues?

To address these questions, our workshop brings different stakeholders together to discuss and generate possible models for successful MA education. Our objectives are: 1) to provide a much-needed forum to discuss the needs and goals of MA students in composition; 2) to make visible the work of preparing graduate students for teaching composition at the community college by talking with community college faculty; 3) to discuss key aspects of composition MA programs (core courses, culminating experience projects, teaching writing at the MA graduate level); and 4) to invite participants to share and reflect on productive changes in programs that participants have or may implement. In addition to sharing knowledge and generating possibilities for better preparing MA Composition students, we aim to begin a publishable statement concerning these goals that could more broadly serve our profession.

*Chair:* Sugie Goen-Salter, San Francisco State University,  
*Speakers:* Jennifer Trainor, San Francisco State University, CA  
Elise Wormuth, San Francisco State University, CA  
Kory Lawson Ching, San Francisco State University, CA  
Mary Soliday, San Francisco State University, CA  
Mark Roberge, San Francisco State University, CA  
Pamela VanHaitsma, University of Pittsburgh, PA  
Kelly Hagen, MiraCosta College, Oceanside, CA