

**2015 CCCC Workshops**

### Wednesday Morning: 9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

**MW.01 Opportunity, Reflection, and Tactical Foresight: Mapping the Full Span of Your Career from Graduate School to Post-Retirement**

Recent research suggests that career planning and faculty development is largely absent in all fields once a faculty member reaches tenure (Austin & Sorcinelli, 2013). In addition, there are few, if any cross-generational conversations between various generations of faculty where faculty at all career stages help each other (deJanasz & Sullivan, 2004).

Our field has mimicked these historical trends. The field of composition studies has concentrated attention on two periods—graduate school and the first six years of academic life—and two decision points, finding the first job and getting tenure, accounting for perhaps a quarter of a lifetime career of intellectual work in our field. Cross-generational mentoring within our field has essentially been top down, with senior WPAs mentoring junior WPAs through the Council of Writing Program Administrators mentoring program and Rhetoric Society of America’s senior mentorship program for associate professors. Like most fields, ours has not adequately supported preparation for growth and decision making for the full span of the traditional career (tenure-line faculty). These processes have become more important for keeping late career faculty engaged, particularly as some faculty choose to keep working past the traditional age of retirement in tough financial times and others keep working because they don’t have newer faculty to replace them in their departments (Kemper, 2010).

Cross generational mentorship is also important as career paths in writing studies are changing. Many, if not most, careers will no longer fit a traditional tenure-track full time model over such a long work span. Goodburn, LeCourt, and Leverenz (2013) have recognized professional careers in our field already include many nontraditional options, i.e. faculty or staff positions outside the tenure system, professions outside the academy, hybrid careers in and out of the academy, and multiple career shifts. Existing mentoring options don’t necessarily address these alternative careers in rhetoric and composition nor promote conversations among generations who have chosen these alternative routes.

To address these linked gaps in professional development, our workshop will address long-term career planning in this expanded context, complementing other offerings in the conference program that address and support professional (traditional faculty) development at specific career points. This workshop is sponsored by the CCCC Task Force on Cross-Generational Activities, which was formed in 2013 after a successful session at CCCC 2012 bringing together the generations to discuss cross-generational connections and communication. One of the most popular requests emerging from this session was for a cross-generational workshop to discuss personal career planning over the long span of professional lives in rhetoric and composition/writing studies. Such careers can be expected to span typically 40 years, in some cases as much as 60, and may encompass a variety of positions and even careers.

This half-day morning workshop (9:00 am -12:30 pm) is an opportunity for CCCC participants from different generations to engage with one another in personal career planning appropriate to any stage of their careers from graduate school to post-retirement, using the concepts of opportunity (kairos), reflection (metanoia), and tactical foresight (pronoia) (NOTE: These terms are drawn from an article which will be distributed to workshop participants in advance: Kelly A. Myers, "Metanoia and the Transformation of Opportunity," Rhetoric Society Quarterly 41.1 (2011): 1-18). These concepts allow participants to reflect on their careers to date and to anticipate and plan for future opportunities and challenges, sharing knowledge and ideas in both generational and cross-generational conversations. The workshop will particularly highlight planning for career shifts and (re)balancing personal and professional commitments at different points in a long career.

Four facilitators, coming from a range of generational perspectives and positions in the field (WPA, chair, retirement, mid-career, etc.) will introduce the workshop, present composite case studies, guide the career planning workshop activities, and serve as table facilitators in the activities described below.

The workshop will offer five specific activities:

Introduction to the workshop [20 minutes]: Leaders will introduce goals and concepts that frame the workshop; provide an agenda; and ask participants to introduce themselves and their motives/goals in taking the workshop.

Case studies [40 minutes]: Leaders will share four fictionalized case studies (both textually and visually) that illustrate the complexity of circumstances and choices that challenge participants in various career stages. These will be used to generate discussion of some of the issues that might arise in both academic and non-academic careers and frame the following table discussions. “Generations” are defined for purposes of our workshop as “early career,” “mid-career,” “late career,” and “post-retirement.”

The following table discussions will provide time for participants to generate personal career maps and discuss them with both their own generational cohort and those at other stages of their careers. Each table will have a workshop facilitator and note-taker.

Table discussion 1 [1 hour]: Participants will be broken into tables by generation (participants will self-identify and select a table.) Table leaders will facilitate a “decade mapping” activity that will create a participant’s individual career map. Participants at the table will share career maps (with the option to keep any aspects of these maps private) and discuss them within the framework of opportunity, reflection on past choices, and forecasting.

Table discussion 2 [45 minutes] After a 15 minute break, tables will be mixed up with participants from different generations sitting together with their career maps to stimulate discussion. We envision table members advising each other or discussing with each other the kinds of complexities, decision points, and underlying goals that affect a career as well how to maintain a personal/professional balance while pursuing goals and the ways the workplace (academic and nonacademic) does or doesn’t support these goals. Participants will be asked to develop an action item list during the last fifteen minutes of this segment so they have a clear list of projects to work from in the future.

Windup: [30 minutes] The concluding activity will be a full-group discussion of insights gained from both the career mapping activity as well as the cross-generational discussion about the issues and projects revealed from the maps. A bibliography to follow up on career plans will be provided.

**MW.02 Handcrafted Rhetorics: DIY and the Public Power of Made Things**

In this half-day interactive workshop, we will work with participants to consider the potential that do-it-yourself (DIY) histories, practices, ethics, and publics have for rhetoric and composition pedagogies. We begin with the premise that DIY frameworks can expand our definition of writing to what Ratto and Boler call critical making, a process of creating things -- zines, buttons, yarnbombs, Twitterbots -- that critique and provide an alternative to received assumptions about what counts as legitimate knowledge production in the 21st century. Given this framework, we will work with participants to consider how such making is inherently public and the extent to which it shifts the politics of our classes from content to form; that is, from an emphasis on the social-epistemic to wider scenes of multiliterate, communicative practices. In this sense, we also want to consider the extent to which the range of modalities and styles we ask our students to compose with is rhetorically relevant in the digital age, when “attention is the commodity in short supply” (Lanham xi). That is, we want to ask, how do we make things that make a difference? That disrupt? That defamiliarize? Finally, we want to consider the ways DIY embraces the risks of rhetorical agency through an appetite for self-learning and experimentation--to bumble through new processes or forms or scenes only to see what’s possible in the process and in so doing, imagine a form of participatory democracy where making things constitutes political, civic action.

After an hour of discussion and theorizing, we will hold a “Makers Faire,” where participants will rotate through three different crafting stations in 90 minutes (or 30 minutes each). Options include working with textiles (yarnbombing and subversive cross-stitch), paper (zines and trading cards), and digital media (DIY websites and Twitter bots). During this time, participants will learn techniques for making DIY crafts and discuss how such work functions in relationship to -- and as -- public rhetoric.

The final hour of the workshop considers how to bring critical crafting and DIY practices into (and beyond) the classroom. Participants will leave the workshop with: at least three craft projects, information about all of the processes presented, encouragement to circulate their public rhetoric (within conference spaces, on Twitter feed, at an optional post-workshop meetup, etc.), and with new ideas about they might use DIY craft to enhance their teaching of composition and public rhetorics.

Goals:

-To promote an awareness of DIY and its relevance to our changing understandings of what a text is, and to reveal why any new understanding of composition must acknowledge how making and writing are inseparably linked practices;

-To show how DIY is both a critique of and an alternative to, received assumptions about what counts as legitimate publication;

-To reveal why DIY production serves a democratic function--in our classrooms and in our communities.

**MW.03 Teach, Transform, and Talk for “High Road”[1] Transfer: Uptake Genres Helping Students Articulate How They Mediate Writing Development**

A student competent in writing five-paragraph essays is given the task of writing a press release. She has never written a press release before. How will she negotiate this new writing situation? How can we as instructors help her navigate this new context as well as the myriad of other unfamiliar writing situations that she may encounter? How can we help, especially since writing research reveals that generalizable skills are incomplete and do not make for “high road” transfer from composition courses to new writing contexts (Wardle & Downs, Perkins & Salomon)?

To answer, rhetorical genre studies (RGS) have zoomed in on the processes of writing, the transitory space where complex negotiations between what is known and what is not takes place, and in doing so, have demonstrated that what does transfer is a set of strategies for figuring out how to write in different environments (Artemeva, Bawarshi & Reiff). Such “strategies for figuring out how” are uptake—specifically how a writer moves between writing situations and ‘takes up’ the new genre. Rounsaville states uptake is “a dynamic, problem-solving endeavor where writers can be encouraged to proactively sort through and make selections in and amongst prior genre knowledge.” Helping students develop awareness of their uptakes promotes not only transference of strategies to any writing situation, but also metacognition into their own learning and development.

To that end, our workshop—Teach, Transform, and Talk for “High Road” Transfer, 4 T’s for 4 C’s—aims to train writing instructors to design and utilize uptake genres in their courses. The 4 T’s for 4 C’s Workshop is informed Anne Freadman’s work on uptake and Anis Bawarshi’s presentation on genre [2], which inspired a two semester-long teaching experiment at Illinois State University. For students, uptake genres are genres that enable them to document not so much what they learned but how they went about learning it in any given writing situation. For instructors, uptakes genres allow for making the complexities of transfer and uptake more explicit as well as assessing student learning alongside our own methodologies. Instructors from first-year composition (face-to-face and online sections), Business English, Technical Writing, and Literature courses recorded the use of uptake genres and convened biweekly to compare and discuss results.

Interestingly, our study revealed that uptake genres—informally used by many instructors—can be adapted from any genre or modality. While this is true, not all uptake genres are the same, and instructors and students benefit from implementing a combination of short-, intermediate-, and long-term uptake genres. Overall, we found uptake genres made teaching and learning more transparent and fostered a problem-solution approach that improved: 1) student acquisition of transferable strategies, 2) student articulation of writing development, and 3) instructor ability to assess acquisition, development, and articulation.

Wanting to share our study, we propose 4 T’s for 4 C’s as a Wednesday morning or afternoon workshop with four speakers, organized into three interactive hour-long sessions, concluding in a 30-minute wrap-up. A computer, projector screen, and Internet are required to engage in group brainstorming and provide examples of interactive, multimodal uptake genres.

Hour 1: Teach Uptake for Transfer

Speaker 1 outlines focus and itinerary and invites attendees to join a “4-Corners” activity to get acquainted. Speaker 1 inquires about the genres that attendees utilize in assessing learning and overviews theories of uptake, suggesting differences between assessing what is learned and how it is learned. To test theories, attendees are placed into three groups.

One group are the “Students,” and the other two are “Ethnographers.” Speaker 1 facilitates, and Students are given the task of composing a rap song on ways in which assessments are used in writing courses. As Students complete the task, Ethnographers guided by Speaker 2 document What Students are Doing while Ethnographers guided by Speaker 3 document How Students are Going About Doing It. Speaker 4 also plays Ethnographer, recording how the Ethnographers are documenting.

Led by Speaker 1, activities conclude with Ethnographers reporting findings, demonstrating how the processes of writing are located not only in what, but more so in how, which helps to make transferable strategies more explicit. The rap song is performed by Speakers.

Hour 2: Transform Uptake for Transfer

Speaker 2 introduces how to transform assignments into uptake genres, building on conversations. As a model, Speaker 2 guides participants in transforming the ‘4-Corners’ activity into an uptake genre. Speaker 2 explains the temporality of uptake genres and how ‘4-Corners’ could be used for short-term uptake assessments.

After, attendees, now in the role of instructors, are divided into mini groups and transform assessment assignment scenarios into uptake genres. The assessment assignment scenarios provided include short, intermediate, and long-term genres, such as a question and answer lecture, quiz, report, journal, and blog. Speakers 1, 2, and 3 assist in the transformations. Speaker 4 again plays Ethnographer, recording how groups are negotiating transformations.

Hour 3: Talk Uptake for Transfer

For the first 30 minutes, groups informally present their work, highlighting problematic areas and successes. Then Speaker 3 invites questions and facilitates a dialogue about specific strategies of transforming non-uptake genres into uptake genres, thereby helping students to articulate how they negotiated new writing situations. Groups discuss ways to improve student articulations. Speaker 4 concludes, presenting her ethnographies, highlighting key observations from throughout the workshop.

Wrap-Up: Assessing Uptake is Sharing Uptake

Speaker 4 asks how participants how they might implement uptake genres in their own courses. Participants receive a packet of sample uptake genres and student work in those genres. Each speaker briefly discusses contributions to the packet. During the last 15 minutes, participants are encouraged to ask questions, give comments, and provide feedback about the workshop. In the spirit of Rounsaville’s call to RGS scholars, speakers also encourage continued “explicit and sustained use of uptake for transfer research” (Rounsaville).

[1]Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (1992). The Science and Art of Transfer. If Minds Matter: A Foreword to the Future.” Perkins and Salomon write that high road transfer “depends on deliberate, mindful abstraction of skill or knowledge from one context for application to another” (26).

[2]Bawarshi, A. (2013, October). Uptake genres. Fall Speaker Series. Lecture conducted from Illinois State University, Normal, IL

**MW.04 Give Writing a Body That Moves: Embodied Performance in the Writing Classroom**

This multidisciplinary, interactive half-day workshop (Wednesday morning, 30 participants) will explore and exercise the incorporation (or “in-corporealization”) of performance pedagogies into writing classrooms. Drawing on multimodal composition studies, performance studies, and education, the five workshop leaders will guide participants through a series of exercises inspired by educational and activist theater. We will break down the workshop into a series of “stages,” with each stage inviting participants to enact a specific practice. Through these practices, participants will consider how bodies can activate literacies, (de)compose normative structures, and promote collaboration. This workshop will draw heavily upon the work of Augusto Boal, the Brazilian theater practitioner and pedagogue best known for Theater of the Oppressed, a form of activist theater designed to turn audience members into “spect-actors.” Boal’s methods offer ways for students in English classrooms to “think” through reading material and writing assignments, engaging students who are kinesthetic or spatial learners and enlivening classrooms with sound and movement.

Though it is tempting to argue that writing has become disembodied in academia, especially with the evolution of media, the link between literacy and performance is not new. In fact, performance is one of the oldest forms of multimodal composition. Since the Dartmouth Conference of 1966, teachers and scholars such as Douglas Barnes, Gavin Bolton, and Andrea Lunsford have written extensively about the educative potential of performance. Lunsford herself suggests that “the act of embodying writing through voice, gesture, and movement can help early college students learn vital lessons about literacy” while also reconnecting composition to its rhetorical heritage (“Performing Writing” 226). However, performative writing pedagogies can also be risky for teachers and students, since they expose the body’s vulnerabilities to material, social, and rhetorical forces. Therefore, workshop participants will reconsider the role of performance in multimodal writing pedagogy and enact methods for transforming such vulnerabilities into discourse.

"Stage 1: Story Circles"

Time: 30 minutes

Leader: Speaker 1

The first stage of the workshop will be devoted to the Story Circle, a practice developed by the Free Southern Theater and practiced today by New Orleans organizations such as Junebug Productions and Students at the Center. The Story Circle draws from oral arts and community activist traditions that structure storytelling as a means to narrate individual experience within a coalitional context. Story Circles enact local knowledge, highlight critical agency, and put master narratives at risk through performative, embodied encounters. We will facilitate Story Circles during the first stage of the workshop in order to generate themes and content for the remaining stages, thus fueling the workshops’ subsequent stages with the narrative resources of participants.

"Stage 2: De-Mechanizing the Body"

Time: 30 Minutes

Leader: Speaker 2

The second stage will be devoted to warm-up exercises developed by Augusto Boal. These exercises are designed to not only prepare participants for future exercises but also to call attention to the ways in which bodies are disciplined. Exercises at this stage, such as “silly walks,” help participants reclaim both embodied learning and classroom space. By reconsidering how the body is already used in classrooms and breaking embodied classroom habits, we redefine ability and dis/ability. This stage will help participants dis/able static modes of knowledge-making through movement and will provide a space for interrogating how bodies can be dis/abled or re-enabled through de-familiarizing writing as bodily process.

"Stage 3: Image Theater"

Time: 30 Minutes

Leader: Speaker 3

The third stage will be devoted to Image Theater, a visual mode of composition developed by Augusto Boal during a literacy campaign in Peru. Participants will create “living statues” to represent snapshots from the stories heard during Stage 1. This process emphasizes collaborative composition, as participants work together to direct statues into poses which integrate individual visions and interpretations into a collective representation. Participants will gain the ability to practice Image Theater in their own classrooms with various texts.

[Intermission: Fifteen Minutes]

"Stage 4: Forum Theater"

Time: 30 Minutes

Leader: Speaker 4

The fourth stage will be devoted to Forum Theater, a mode of situational theater where participants can stop and alter a performance to uncover real and ideal versions of a text. Forum Theater encourages collaboration and revision of a multimodal text in order to develop critical-rhetorical awareness and overturn cultural norms, ideologies, and mythologies. This part of the workshop will directly utilize and also build upon narrative material from previous stages; it will also allow big-picture coherence of Boal applications, enabling participants to transfer and expand on previous exercises, excerpts, and story images.

"Stage 5: Games for Writers & Non-Writers"

Time: 30 Minutes

Leader: Speaker 5

The fifth stage will be devoted to synthesizing and applying the above methods for standard writing pedagogies. For example, participants may compose multiple “context images” for a single “text image,” thereby illustrating the impact of kairos on any reading or writing situation; they may compose “paragraph images” and then use movements between images to teach transitions; or they may enact literacy narratives using Story Circles and Forum Theater. The exercises for this stage will depend upon participants’ interests.

"Stage 6: Discussion"

Time: 45 Minutes

Leader: Speakers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

The final stage will be devoted to discussion among participants. Inquiries may include: What is there to gain by engaging bodies in space (i.e., our bodies, students’ bodies) as sites of critical learning in classrooms? Conversely, what is put at risk by doing so? How do we understand the relationship between our bodies, vulnerability, and the dynamics of teaching and learning? How does incorporating bodies into learning de-compose the act of writing? How can we incorporate bodies in a way that highlights power dynamics and sites of agency? How can we utilize bodies in the classroom ethically and in a way that does not reproduce gender, racial, sexual, class, or disability inequality?

**MW.05 Linking Archives and Digital Humanities: Identifying Questions, Defining Terms, Exploring Resources, and Creating Digital Archives**

Building on the success of the National Archives of Composition and Rhetoric (NACR) workshops held at 4Cs from 2007 to 2013, this year’s workshop continues conversations on conducting archival research and building archives, drawing on a theme raised in the 2014 workshop: intersections between archival projects in rhetoric and composition and the digital humanities. In this workshop, composition scholars who contributed to a special issue of College English on digital humanities will lead a discussion framing roundtable conversations later in the workshop. We will also hear from a scholar who will discuss issues related to creating a collaborative digital archival project and from NACR representatives, who will share new developments on a digital finding aid that will help researchers search NACR records, track and map research nationwide using a “trending” component, and locate other physical and digital archives.

In rhetoric and composition, interest in archival projects continues to grow and, as evidenced by the books and articles published recently—Skinner’s Women Physicians and Professional Ethos in Nineteenth-Century America, Gold and Hobbs’ Educating the New Southern Woman: Speech, Writing, and Race at the Public Women's Colleges, 1884-1945, Harrison’s The Rhetoric of Rebel Women: Civil War Diaries and Confederate Persuasion and Dyehouse’s “Theory in the Archives: Fred Newton Scott and John Dewey on Writing the Social Organism”—all illustrate how historical/archival projects continue to expand in scope. Recent conversations about archival research have also turned to the possibilities and challenges of negotiating digital archives, conducting digital-only historical research, working with meta-data, and building and linking digital archives.

Growth in digital humanities projects has generated new conversations about the field’s connection to such work, in part due to support of the digital humanities at national, regional, and institutional levels and also due to the ways digital humanities projects help us to rethink how we approach historical research. Jessica Enoch and David Gold explain in “Introduction: Seizing the Methodological Moment: The Digital Humanities and Historiography in Rhetoric and Composition” (2013) that “New scholarship emerging out of the digital humanities works…to use technology to develop digital tools and platforms that position scholars to do more robust as well as new kinds of interpretive and historiographic work. Much of this work, to the excitement of historians across the disciplines, begins with digital archivization” (106).

The last few years have seen growth in national digitization projects such as the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives, the Writing Studies Tree, Florida State’s card project, and Michigan State’s Samaritan Archive 2.0 project. While this work is exciting, it is also challenging and presents scholars with new difficulties. Enoch and Gold observe “the concern of scholars has begun to shift from obtaining and archiving materials to searching and negotiating these sources. This move has also prompted a widespread recognition among digital scholars that digitization brings with it a new kind of methodological problem: archival overabundance. Reflecting on their digital archivization work with the Women and Social Movements Project, historians Katherine Kish Sklar and Thomas Dublin note that although we now have access to a “sea of information,” we have relatively little guidance regarding how to “construct meaning within that sea.” The archive, as historian William Turkel asserts, is now “infinite” (qtd. in D. Cohen et al. 455), and we need a set of tools and a set of methodologies for negotiating it” (106). Scholars also need to be able to quickly attain and work with a vocabulary that will help them seek out needed resources. Moreover, the need to be able to articulate rhetoric composition archival work in terms that will appeal to digital humanities internal/external sources of funding is crucial. Thus, this workshop will respond to the need for a digitally focused workshop as expressed by scholars who are either shifting their methodological questions into digital spaces, or whose first forays into archives focus on digital-only projects.

Also, as many libraries and special collections are considering digital preservation of extant materials and the digital re/construction of new collections or holdings, rhetoric and composition historians should consider the implications of such efforts not only on the ways that we conduct research but also on the ways that we build both physical and digital archival projects of our own. Sources that are digitized “extend, remediate, and transform our research environments; these transformations, in turn, open up possibilities for new kinds of interaction with, and new movements through, the archive. Digital environments thus have the potential to reorient us…to our research subjects and the artifacts through which we come to know them” (Solberg “Googling the Archive” 54). In terms of building digital archives, the workshop will ask participants to consider questions about what to save, how to save it, how to keep up with technological advances, and how to sustain support for a digital archive over time. We will also discuss ethical issues related to digitizing archival material, including access, permissions, and what Jim Ridolfo calls, the “rhetorical task of tailoring [. . .] digital resources to the needs of multiple stakeholder audiences” (136). This workshop takes up Solberg’s call to “take a more active role in shaping the emerging landscape of digital research” (53) by asking participants to explore, question and plan strategies for next steps in their own research and in building connections across composition and the digital humanities.

**MW.06 Plagiarism as Educational Opportunity: Risks and Innovations**

Despite decades of research and immense amounts of news coverage and public debate, plagiarism remains an issue all writers and writing instructors must address. The risks involved in plagiarism seem obvious to us teachers, even if they do not appear so obvious to our students. Yet, research and our own teaching experiences suggest that what seems obvious about plagiaristic behavior often hides perils we simply are not aware of, as well as powerful opportunities for learning.

Consider the student who explained her intentional plagiarism this way: She knew, if she wrote her papers herself, she couldn’t get a grade for the course that would satisfy her parents enough that they would allow her to stay in college, so even though she understood the serious consequences that could befall her if caught plagiarizing, she believed the risk of getting caught was less than the risk of not getting the grade she needed. In this student’s risk analysis, the end result of her plagiarism being detected would not be any different from the end result of her writing her papers on her own.

This story suggests not only something about the plagiarism risks students confront and how they view these risks but also about the risks that we teachers face in the ways in which we respond to student plagiarism. The above student’s instructor would have never known the stress that the student was experiencing had he responded in the knee-jerk fashion that is often recommended to teachers, had he not asked the simple question, “Why?” Given the way in which some plagiarism policies are written, that simple question and the consideration of that student’s stress as a mitigating factor constitute significant acts of disobedience that could well place that instructor’s position at his institution in jeopardy. Indeed, many teachers have admitted to us that they regularly take that same risk of disobeying the procedures laid out by their institutions on how to respond to cases of plagiarism. And plagiarism research continues to reveal how students regularly risk their college careers by sometimes intentionally but often unintentionally plagiarizing, and how teachers risk losing important educational opportunities by treating all plagiaristic behaviors, unintentional as well as intentional, the same.

Complicating things even more are the ongoing innovations in technology and changing attitudes toward what constitutes authorship. In our increasingly open-source world, social media and the ever-increasing online culture challenge our understandings of authorship, text, and plagiarism—and how to respond to plagiarism.

This highly interactive workshop benefits writing instructors and administrators at any level and from across the curriculum, WPAs, and Writing Center and WAC personnel. Participants are introduced to what the scholarship on student plagiarism over the last 30 years tells us about why students plagiarize; how patchwriting is a form of developmental plagiarism that occurs when outsiders seek to sound like insiders as they move into particular discourse communities; how plagiarism regularly occurs in institutionalized contexts where it is not only acceptable but even expected; how students’ views on authorship often diverge widely from their teachers’ views; how social media and new technologies are changing the topography of student plagiarism; and how understanding these and other factors can change the way teachers respond to cases of student plagiarism by opening them up to the idea of plagiarism as an educational opportunity.

This workshop will be organized around an easy-to-use Plagiarism Response Heuristic Guide that includes 5 questions, the answers to which guide instructors and administrators toward fair and just resolutions to plagiarism cases. As we consider each question, we will address case scenarios that highlight issues involved in student plagiarism. Participants are expected to bring their own experiences and questions to the workshop for consideration by facilitators and other workshop participants. And throughout, discussion of these factors will also include both proactive as well as reactive pedagogical strategies for addressing student plagiarism.

The scholars facilitating this workshop (together and individually) have successfully facilitated similar workshops for over a decade now. Evaluations of this workshop continue to indicate unanimous agreement about its value to them. Participants usually mention that they found helpful the scenarios and subsequent stimulating discussions, collaboration with other teachers and administrators, learning about relevant and practical research-based pedagogical information, the positive approach to a difficult problem, and the informative, balanced integration of active learning activities and information provided via PowerPoint.
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**MW.07 Seeking Sources: How International/ELL/SLW Students Search, Read, and Write from Sources**

Research over the past decade has informed our understanding of how students search for and make use of sources: they use popular search engines like Google (or Baidu, or Naver), and avoid their university’s library portals; they rarely scroll beyond the first page of results; they accept their source material at face value (see McClure, e.g.). We also know much about the difficulties students face in making use of those sources: they struggle to make sense of what they are reading, and to articulate what they understand the source to say; they rely too much on just a few sentences from their source material, writing from “sentences, not […] sources” (Howard, et al., “Writing”); and they do not know enough about the mechanics of how to incorporate and cite those sources.

These problems are compounded for students working in a non-native language. SLW students may understand the “role of textual borrowing” very differently than their teachers (Shi), and what may look like plagiarism to some may be a necessary step in a student writer’s development (Howard, “Plagiarism;” Pecorari, e.g.).

We propose a Wednesday morning workshop, focused on how International/ELL/SLW students use sources: how they search, how they read what they find, how they make use of what they read, in their writing. Our aim is to learn more about how we might move our students – and ourselves -- from the kinds of safe research and writing practices already familiar to us, and toward riskier ground: seeing research as a more open-ended and recursive process, venturing into new territory in searching for sources (the “deep web” of library holdings, e.g.), making use of these sources more substantively, and for greater purpose (what McCullough calls “the rhetorical function of citation”).

The first part of the workshop asks teachers to reflect on their own, early experiences with research. The second part examines how our students search, and offers ways of teaching students more effective strategies for searching. The third part investigates how our students understand and incorporate sources into their texts.

Our plan:

Introductions and a short series of video clips of “research stories.” (10 min.)

Speaker 1 will prompt us to reflect on our own experiences with research, asking participants to write their own stories of discovery: "write about the time in your life when research came alive for you, when the search to find something out became meaningful for you" (10 min.) – and to then choose a single word that conceptualizes “research” for you. We will share these stories and discuss the various senses of research we hold. (20 min.)

We will then open the discussion further, to how our students think about research, and how their ideas about research may or may not be useful for them, as they learn to work in the academy. (20 min.)

Speaker 2 will then describe a brief classroom exercise, aimed at helping her students navigate their home university’s library website. She will briefly describe the work her students did, and offer a sample student text, along with the student’s revised text, as the student comes to see research as recursive and more open-ended. (10 min.)

Then we will ask participants to describe and discuss their own experiences, designing classroom exercises or assignment prompts, to help students find more useful source materials. (20 min.)

Speaker 3 will focus on students’ use of the familiar territory of Wikipedia. While we want to lead students to new ground, we also recognize the necessity of helping them understand more about the strategies they already use, and of thinking more with our students about the uses and limits of the Wikipedia platform. Nicholson Baker's essay, “The Charms of Wikipedia,” provides one way to figure out with students what exactly this pervasive online encyclopedia is, how it began, and how Wikipedia—this seemingly inescapable source of sources—is built, edited and curated. Baker’s curiosity about the textual roots of Wikipedia (its editors draw liberally from printed texts in the public domain) suggests that we need not see Wikipedia as a threat to more traditional referencing and incorporation of written texts. Speaker 3 will briefly discuss his own work with students, and engage us in discussion: How has the Wikipedia platform shaped our students’ understanding of what it means to “search”? How might we use Wikipedia in the classroom as a way to investigate different styles of research and referencing? (15 min.)

Break (15 min.)

Speaker 4 will report on an analysis of texts written by first-year International students, focusing on the use of sources. How does the student introduce the source? How does the student contextualize the source? What is the rhetorical use of the source, in the student’s text? In response to this analysis, Speaker 4 designed class lessons around the concept of “apposition” -- in both its grammatical and broader senses. These “apposite” additions worked to clarify the text’s meaning, for both the (student) writer and the reader. (20 min.)

Speaker 4 will then prompt us to read and respond to a student text, focusing us on the student’s use of source material. (20 min. to read and respond/30 min. to discuss.)

With the remainder of the time, we will open the floor for more discussion. What have we learned about students’ use of sources? What do teachers of International/ELL/SLW students, in particular, need to consider, given the diversity in their classrooms? How might we stretch ourselves, as teachers and learners, to understand more about our students and their conceptualization(s) of research and the use of sources in their writing? (20 min.)
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**MW.08 Campus Writing Marathons: Cultivating Community, Ownership, and Confidence**

Students in first year composition courses are often hesitant and lacking in confidence when entering college-level writing courses. They have preconceived notions about what the course will entail, and these misperceptions, combined with feeling unprepared for college writing, often lead to a lack of engagement in the classroom (Daiker, 2011). Additionally, “The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing” discusses the importance of composing a variety of assignments “in multiple environments, including traditional pen and paper” (WPA, NCTE, NWP, 2011). Writing marathons, when conducted early in the semester, challenge incorrect perceptions about FYC courses, and encourage engagement and retention by building community within the classroom, cultivating a sense of ownership, and increasing confidence levels.

Whether the writing marathon takes place on a campus-wide level or within individual classrooms, they encourage community by mutual exploration and discovery of the college campus or nearby areas. Walking between stops gives students and their instructors opportunities to create relationships without the instructor/ student hierarchy created by a traditional classroom environment. Similarly, when instructors participate in writing and sharing, thereby revealing themselves as vulnerable, students are more likely to allow themselves to be vulnerable during the writing process in the classroom and future writing assignments. This comfort in vulnerability allows students to take risks and ownership of their writing.

Writing marathons are well known for their role in the National Writing Project, and are loved because they are “writing for the sake of writing,” enjoying it, and being in the moment (Louth, 2010). Because marathons take place in a low-stakes environment and mutual vulnerability, students are able to write how and why they want to, and in their own voice, which is crucial to confident and engaged writing in the FYC classroom (NCTE 2003). The low-stakes environment also increases confidence; “Teachers at all levels have learned that developing students' competence and confidence in writing requires encouraging them in informal, expressive, exploratory writing...” (NCTE 2004).

Additionally, writing marathons also encourage some of the habits of mind listed in “The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing” such as openness, creativity, persistence, and flexibility (WPA, NCTE, NWP, 2011), and can enforce rhetorical concepts and the writing process.

After a brief introductory session, the workshop will begin with a brief interactive presentation discussing methods and benefits of holding writing marathons on college campuses. 9-10:30.

From 10:30 to 12, registrants will participate in a writing marathon.

From 12 to 12:30, registrants will share and conclude.

**MW.09 Three Ways of Starting and Sustaining Conversations about (Teaching) Writing: The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing, the WPA Outcomes Statement, and Threshold Concepts**

In what appears to be a back-rationalization for existing teaching and testing apparatus, the Common Core State Standards assert that students “must have the flexibility, concentration, and fluency to produce high-quality first draft text under a tight deadline

and the capacity to revisit and make improvements to a piece of writing over multiple drafts when circumstances encourage or require it.” That “must” and that “when” are yet another reminder that the loudest voices in the US conversation about language arts speak with only a very dim understanding of what “writing” is and can be. Yet, as Thomas Miller, Sharon Crowley, Susan Miller, Mike Rose, and many others have demonstrated, these voices are the ones in the ears of our students, their parents, our state legislators, our colleagues in other disciplines, and the novice teachers who arrive at our programs every fall.

Writing scholars and writing teachers have responded to these voices in several ways: increased calls for engagement with the public, increased calls for engagement with assessment initiatives, and increased research on the nature of writing as a discipline and the possibilities of teaching and learning for transfer. Highly regarded professional organizations—the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the National Writing Project (NWP), the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA)—have developed projects designed to encourage large-scale conversations about what writing is and how it is best taught and learned. The newly revised WPA Outcomes Statement and the NCTE/NWP’s Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing Instruction are two such public statements. Most recently, the notion of threshold concepts—concepts which researchers in composition view as critical for epistemological participation in the field—has emerged as a powerful way of framing and naming what we know and do.

Using the Framework, the Outcomes Statement, and the threshold concepts, this half-day workshop will equip participants with strategies for shaping conversations about writing and writing assessment with each other and to those outside of our programs and outside of higher education. Each of these has something important to offer:

\*\*The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing describes “the rhetorical and twenty-first-century skills as well as habit of mind and experiences that are critical for college success.” Created by two- and four-year college faculty and high school teachers, it has been endorsed by the CWPA, NCTE, and NWP. It addresses qualities that can be learned in and out of school. While it focuses on postsecondary writing, the document also notes that many of these habits of mind are useful in relationship to other disciplines. The Framework focus on helping students make a transition into the demands of college work.

\*\*The WPA Outcomes Statement, originally begun as a grassroots effort 1998, is now an official position statement from the CWPA (originally adopted in 2000; amended in 2008, and currently in revision again; new version should be available by the time of the workshop). The Outcomes Statement “describes the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes sought by first-year composition programs in American postsecondary education.” It focuses on first-year composition as a course or sequence, and invites attention to course outcomes. It also invites attention to assessment, as it sets outcomes but not standards--leaving standard-setting to local programs.

\*\*Threshold concepts exist in every discipline; they are core concepts, that once understood by learners, change the way a field is understood. To consider threshold concepts is to consider what is necessary to move into “insider” ways of seeing a subject. While it would do us well to remember that these concepts are troublesome (they may seem counterintuitive); irreversible (once learned, they change the way we see things); and liminal (they may not be learned all at once; learners may approach them, move back, and then forward). There is no official list of threshold concepts in composition, of course (although a collaboratively written book project on the subject is currently in process), but the very notion of threshold concepts opens up many possibilities for teachers, students, and researchers.

This workshop will allow participants to come to a deeper understanding about each of the documents/concepts and to craft plans for using these materials to foster productive conversations about teaching and writing. It will be organized as follows:

Part 1: Understanding the Framework, the Outcomes Statement, and the Threshold Concepts

Participants will be encouraged to read the documents prior to the workshop. During Part 1, short presentations (10 minutes each) will introduce each of the core materials for the workshop, briefly historicizing each of them and emphasizing the core knowledge associated with each document (or exemplary core knowledge in the case of threshold concepts), and identifying various audiences who might be interested in the moves made in each document. Workshop leaders will then lead small group discussions to allow all participants to explore the workshop materials and discuss the ways in which they might align with one another. (1 hour)

Part 2: Discussing Case Studies

The second part of the workshop will reconvene all participants to discuss real and potential applications of the statements and threshold concepts in local contexts with the purpose of illustrating possibilities for course design, program design, institutional frameworks, and public conversations about writing and assessment. Workshop attendees will then participate in 2 30-minute breakout sessions on case studies of their choice (4-5 will be provided, addressing the possibilities listed above). Table-level conversations about the case studies will allow participants to examine whether and how the use of the Framework, Outcomes Statement, and threshold concepts to effect changes in their local programs relative to course design, program design, institutional frameworks, and public conversations about writing and assessment. (1 hour)

Part 3: Crafting Action Plans

In the last hour of the workshop, carefully guided small group time (with leaders dispersed among tables) will enable participants to work through their individual local scenarios (which they will be directed to bring with them). Participants will talk through what approaches and documents might best address their needs and context. Leaders will facilitate conversation so that participants leave with useful strategies they can share with faculty at their institution. (1.5 hours)

**MW.10 Actually Teaching Style: Upping the Ante on Academic Writing**

This workshop is designed to help new and experienced teachers integrate a dynamic view of style in the composition classroom, energized by the surge in new theoretical insights in the discipline. In particular, this workshop taps emerging theories and pedagogies of style in order to encourage experimentation and risk-taking in writing. This work contests narrow definitions of style as only form and convention, opening new possibilities in terms of voice, expression, and invention. Conventional approaches to style often value adherence to norms and reward safe writing (e.g., Strunk and White and other writing handbooks). Meanwhile, research in numerous areas including language difference and digital writing has become increasingly aware of style’s potential to reward risk and destabilize the idea of norms (Brooke, Canagarajah, Folk, Horner et al., Tougaw, Young).

Important questions arise from this orientation: How can we teach style as awareness of, but not submission to, norms of academic discourse? When do we reward students for taking risks in their writing, and should we do so even when it leads to uncomfortable subversions or even “errors?” What is the relationship between style, voice, and grammar? What can research in other areas such as professional writing and WAC teach us about style, and vice versa? What risks do we take as teachers when introducing such stylistic pedagogies to diverse student populations?

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. They will begin to develop or build on lesson plans and share their ideas with peers and colleagues.

Workshop Format:

The workshop will feature two 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. In all instances, participants will have a chance to ask questions and contribute their ideas. Following the first and second colloquies, participants will subdivide into small groups for breakout sessions. Each breakout session will begin with a five-minute introduction by a workshop presenter, after which the session will move to brainstorming, planning, and discussion activities about various style writing assignments, exercises, challenges, and solutions for particular courses, populations, and institutions. To give participants the opportunity to attend as many breakout sessions as possible, organizers will use a “speed dating” approach, with two “rounds” held during each hour-long session. In other words, each breakout session will run twice at 25 minutes each. This leaves 10 minutes for regrouping the workshop and hearing summaries of each small-group discussion. During this time, the entire workshop will also discuss suggestions for further study, communication, and collaboration.

**MW.11 Literacy Narratives: Reflecting on Theory, Practice, and Research**

In composition, literacy narratives have become important in our classrooms, our research, our service and outreach, and our professional identity/ies. Literacy narratives frequently appear in writing classrooms as course texts or assignments, and composition scholars research them in academic, personal, and civic contexts. We also use literacy narratives as evidence in arguments that investigate historic and culturally-specific practices of literacy, that theorize how literacy operates, and that consider classroom practice and instructor behavior. Yet, literacy narratives are still under-theorized in our field. At the 2014 CCCC, three panels on literacy narratives ran concurrently, and they challenged much of the research that has come before. While one looked at how to create opportunities for critical reflection on the social development of language through literacy narratives, another wanted to disrupt literacy narratives, and the third called the literacy narrative a “dead genre” alleging that literacy narratives are arhetorical or, at best, an ex post facto scholarly label.

Given that Janet Carey Eldred first advocated for a rhetorical literacy approach to literacy narratives in 1991. Despite its status as a respected genre, practitioners who make use of literacy narratives or who are considering them for teaching or research need spaces for reflection on the genre and their assignments. This workshop can serve as such a space. In this workshop, we want to take the risk of digging into literacy narratives—including their definitions, media, classroom purposes, research applications, and instructor values—for the reward of deeper engagement and understanding. Thus, in this workshop, participants will explore the theories, practices, and values of the literacy narrative as a genre.

The workshop includes presentations and discussions on a range of subjects within literacy narrative research, teaching, and scholarship. We will examine the history of the literacy narrative; the potentials and limitations of literacy narratives, including what they can teach us about writing, culture, identity, and schooling; strategies for designing and teaching the literacy narrative; instructor goals and evaluation of the assignment; methods of researching the literacy narrative; teacher training and graduate education; the affordances of “new” literacy narratives; and how literacy narratives can both open up and close down individuals’ and instructors’ reflection on their identity/ies, values, and beliefs. These roundtable discussions increase participants’ knowledge about and understanding of the literacy narrative and will be useful and applicable for teachers and scholars in a range of contexts.

Each roundtable will be led by 2-3 scholars who will present and discuss their topic. Roundtables will be interactive and speakers will provide handouts so the participants can have something to take with them. The roundtables will be organized around the following themes:

1. History and Definitions of Literacy Narratives

a. Speaker 1: “Ethnography as Literacy Narrative”

b. Speaker 2:“Medium and Meaning: Defining and Analyzing Literacy Narratives”

2. Literacy Narrative Assignments in the Classroom and Curriculum

a. Speaker 3: “From Story to Analysis: Reflection and Uptake in the Literacy Narrative Assignment”

b. Speaker 4: “Complicating Teachers’ Reflections: Literacy Narratives and Teacher Training”

c. Speaker 5: “Literacy Narratives and Undergraduate Research: Students Working with Source Material”

3. Literacy, Identity, and the Literacy Myth

a. Speaker 6: “Resisting the Grand Narratives of Literacy”

b. Speaker 7: “Narrating Literacy and Identity”

4. Literacy Narratives from the Margins

a. Speaker 8: “Recovering the Literacy Narratives of African American Female Blues Singers”

b. Speaker 9: “Literacy Narratives and Place: The Stories of Students Navigating Institutional Structures and Lives beyond the Classroom.”

c. Speaker 10: “Literacy Narratives from the Margins”

5. New Literacy Narratives: Digital, Multimodal, and Beyond-Print Literacy Narratives

a. Speaker 11: “New Literacy Narratives and Narrative Analysis”

b. Speaker 12: “From Shakespeare to Office Space: Connecting Narratives to Literacy as a Social Practice”

c. Speaker 13: “Queering Composition with the Digital Archives of Literacy Narratives”

We’ve designed the workshop to be welcoming and enriching for instructors who are new to the literacy narrative genre; who continue to use the literacy narrative but are unsatisfied; who once assigned or researched it but stopped; and for writing instructors interested in it but who want to imagine it differently somehow. Participants will engage in discussions about research, teaching, genre, and assignment design. Participants are invited to bring copies of their literacy narrative assignment(s), research questions, exemplary literacy narratives they like to read, or anything else that might be useful to share during the workshop. The workshop content is applicable to a wide variety of teaching contexts, including first-year composition, advanced composition, professional/technical writing, and high school English.

**MW.12 Basics of Coding: Analyzing Data and Reporting Findings**

Building on the success of panels at CCCC 2013 and 2014, as well as on a well-received workshop at CCCC 2014, this proposed workshop addresses a key method for a wide range of scholars in writing studies. The goal of coding, according to Saldaña (2009) is systematically to capture and represent the content and essence of the phenomena under investigation. In our previous presentations, we discussed the challenges of coding language data in our own research, and we shared examples of coding and its representation in articles. All of the panels and the workshop were well attended. We were encouraged to offer a second workshop to meet the strong interest in learning new techniques and sharing "war stories," er, that is to say, "coding stories" from researchers.

We have designed a half-day workshop (Wednesday, 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.) to help writing studies researchers overcome challenges that they are likely to encounter when they code their own language data. Our workshop aims to help novice coders become comfortable with coding as a tool for analyzing communication and to become conversant with appropriate practices for reporting their findings. That said, the workshop also aims to provide more experienced coders who have collected data with a forum for exploring different coding options and for becoming more confident about conducting the steps involved. While data coding does follow rigorous procedures, the process can often be described as "messy." To deal with this messiness, researchers must practice and discuss a craft that is best engaged in the interactive format that a workshop allows.

In the workshop, we will take on the rigorous messiness that is coding by providing examples from our own research--research that employs coding as a method and spans the breadth of writing studies.

**MW.13 Engaging the Global in the Teaching of Writing**

Led by eleven scholars and teachers of writing, language, literacy, and communication from six different countries (with some facilitators joining by video conferencing), the proposed workshop will engage participants in activities and discussions about pedagogies, syllabi, assignments, materials, and ideas for teaching global issues and fostering the sense of global citizenship among students. The key objective of the workshop is to bring together teachers from different national, cultural, and academic backgrounds in order to share practical strategies, experiences, and inspiration for teaching writing and communication skills in and for a globalized and interconnected world.

Since the teaching of writing, rhetoric, language, and communication skills should no longer be limited to how students will use these skills within particular contexts/cultures, we posit that teachers should foster competence in cross-cultural communication and understanding of global issues. Theoretically, the above competencies are recognized as central to the teaching of language, communication, writing, and rhetoric. However, while many teachers, especially in the USA, embrace these objectives, they do not often have expertise in cross-cultural rhetorical resources and pedagogical conventions to draw on.

The diversification of demographics (often referred to as the globalization of the classroom), the ubiquity of social media that connects students to the world beyond the local society and culture, and the increasing depth and breadth of non-mainstream bodies of knowledge both demand and enable us to draw on multiple traditions/resources, to foster cross-cultural/contextual communicative competencies among our students, and to update our pedagogies in tune with the needs of students to be citizens of the world. Drawing on issues and perspectives from beyond local contexts can help us better motivate and engage students even when we teach local issues.

Facilitators of the proposed workshop will draw on rhetorical traditions, personal/professional experiences, and scholarly interests from beyond the dominant Western rhetorical traditions and geopolitical settings of higher education. The majority of us will be on site, and the workshop will focus on how teachers can learn from how the teaching/learning of writing and communication is done in different countries, contexts, and education systems. By drawing on our diverse experiences, we will demonstrate a diversity of ways for designing/reshaping syllabi, developing/integrating assignments, using/adapting class activities, and connecting research/scholarship to pedagogy with a focus on global issues, cross-cultural understanding/communication, and global citizenship. We will engage participants in activities for practically developing pedagogical strategies for teaching cross-cultural communication, promoting multiple perspectives when students write about complex social/political issues on global and local scopes, and drawing on non-mainstream rhetorical traditions/practices in order to rethink their scholarship as well as pedagogy.

We will start the workshop by inviting participants to discuss how they’ve been approaching the above objectives in their courses. The rest of the time will be dedicated to small-group and whole-group activities and discussions focusing on the issues below:

i) using global issues as study materials, topics of inquiry/research, and writing assignments

ii) drawing on rhetorical/communicative practices from global societies/cultures

iii) engaging students in reading, citing, and translating research in non-local languages

iv) creating and assessing personal narrative/reflective essay assignments that allow students to examine academic or other experiences in contexts beyond local society/culture

v) fostering global or cross-cultural/contextual perspectives in argumentative writing

vi) developing, teaching, and assessing multivalent arguments

vii) teaching cross-cultural rhetorics (in upper division and graduate courses)

viii) developing strategies for pedagogical collaboration across national/cultural borders

ix) using social media and other emerging technologies for fostering multilingual and cross-cultural competencies

x) adapting syllabi, developing assignments, and assessment strategies

The workshop will be run using the jigsaw puzzle strategy: usually, participants will be split into small groups for activities or discussions and then they will regroup to share the main ideas/outcomes. Groups will be formed around areas of interest and expertise that facilitators bring into the workshop; thus, for instance, participants interested in learning about how a facilitator from country X teaches cross-cultural issues can join him/her, and participants interested in learning how to help students incorporate/translate foreign language texts will join another activity run by a facilitator with the latter expertise. This strategy helps to save time, make conversations more focused, and allows the small groups to share ideas with the whole group in a participant-centered manner.

The subject, structure, and approach of the workshop are in the spirit of the conference theme of risk and reward. In particular, we believe that by sharing ideas without assuming the local/US academic context as the default, the workshop could create significant rewards (of learning how teachers in different countries/contexts address the same/similar issues in their own terms) in return for a small risk (of having many rather than a set context). Cross-cultural communicative competence has been an appealing subject of theoretical discussions for some time, but it also tends to be limited to abstract ideas, and many teachers find them difficult to translate into practice. The half-day workshop format would be a perfect opportunity to address this need by assembling a diverse group of teachers in and from different parts of the world and share experiences from wherever we teach or have taught.

We will invite potential participants to join conversations that we intend to start a few months ahead of the conference (as has been practiced by other workshop groups, especially those that involved international participants). Facilitators who use platforms like Twitter, Facebook, and Google Plus, and blogs will discuss how they enable student writers to draw on and cultivate linguistic and discursive repertoires and to engage meaningfully with multiple audiences in/across multiple rhetorical contexts and situations. While the preliminary conversations are optional both for future workshop participants and for workshop facilitators, they will serve as useful resource and networking opportunities for us and for any interested participants. We will also live tweet during and blog after the workshop so that participants and others who want to follow the event can do so.

**MW.14 Faculty Matters: The Rewards and Risks of Online Writing Instruction**

This workshop will use the Online Writing Instruction (OWI) Principles and Effective Practices 2013 position statement as the foundation for a hands-on experience in the rewards and risks of teaching writing online. This half-day morning workshop is a pedagogy workshop dedicated to effective practices in online writing instruction and centers on faculty matters, those aspects of the OWI Principles and Effective Practices that faculty can incorporate into their instruction using their own teaching style and methodologies. The workshop will offer participants instruction and hands-on practice in two areas of online instruction: in-course orientation and content modification for the online environment. The workshop will end with a discussion on the broader implications of, and requirements for, sound online instruction.

The goals for this workshop are for participants to receive guidance and to share experiences with effectively incorporating some of the OWI Principles and Effective Practices into their daily instruction. Presenters will demonstrate effective online course design and pedagogy in terms of accessibility, use of appropriate technology, and working from and to learning objectives in relation to a course orientation and developing unit or module content. Time will be devoted throughout the workshop for participants to work with presenters and workshop facilitators, individually and in small groups, to develop a plan of action for designing and revising teaching materials that reflect application of OWI Principles and Effective Practices. Participants will also be given time to practice selective applications/programs with content in their own Learning Management System (LMS) or a guest LMS provided by workshop presenters. As such, workshop participants will take away not just knowledge and practice for the future, but also tangible evidence--in their own LMS and Online Writing Courses--of how OWI principles and effective practices can look and operate. Additionally, the presenters will create an electronic, collaborative space in which participants and presenters can continue sharing resources and ideas beyond the physical workshop.

The workshop will be set up with tables of five to six participants and one workshop facilitator who will be available to work with participants individually or in small groups. Each session is designed for a combination of instruction and demonstration along with time for participants work in their own LMS to revise their own teaching materials (or use the guest LMS and content) or to work with the facilitator and other participants on developing a pedagogically sound plan for revision of course content. Below is a schedule and detailed description of each session of the workshop.

Pre-Workshop Set Up. 8:30-9:00. Participants can come early to meet the presenters and facilitators and to set up their workspace with laptops and other materials.

Part I: In-course Orientation. 9:00-10:00. Many online teachers, both current and prospective, can be overwhelmed by the amount of time needed to set up and maintain an online class. In this first part of the workshop, presenters will demonstrate effective practices for orienting students to classes as a way to minimize logistical and technical issues that can otherwise overwhelm instructors during the first few weeks of class. Participants will learn how to prepare their online classrooms before classes start and create short video or screen capture presentations that orient students to that particular class.

Break. 10:00 - 10:15

Part II: Content Unit/Module. 10:15 - 12:00. In this part of the workshop, participants will learn how to maximize their use of the online environment to offer accessible, effective, and efficient, instruction that uses distinct online pedagogies to provide students with a meaningful learning experience. In particular, there will be focus on how to use effective online pedagogy to teach from and to learning objectives. Presenters will demonstrate use of the OWI Principles and Effective Practices in an example content unit. Participants will then revise either a unit in their own LMS or work within a guest LMS with a content unit provided by the presenters.

Workshop Wrap Up. Risk Assessment. 12:00-12:30. This last part of the workshop is an open discussion period where participants and presenters address what it might take from a broader, institutional framework to support and reward good online pedagogy. This will be a time to reflect on and even challenge the concepts brought up in the workshop.

Participants will need a laptop with wireless Internet capability

**MW.15 Countering Stereotype Threat in Writing Classes, Programs, and Centers**

As explained by psychologist Claude Steele, stereotype threat is a kind of “identity contingency” that refers to “the things you have to deal with in a situation because you have a given social identity, because you are old, young, gay, a white male, a woman, black, Latino, politically conservative or liberal, … a cancer patient, and so on” (3). Stereotype threat induces people to perform below their ability on tasks for which their identity group is negatively stereotyped. Generally speaking, stereotype threat demonstrates that in many situations where students underperform, the problem lies not with the students but with the larger society, particularly its tendency to stigmatize people who are not part of the dominant group.

To the extent that stereotype threat hurts students’ academic performance, this issue has significant implications for college retention. However, stereotype threat is particularly relevant for FYC, many students of which bear painful reminders of past formal writing instruction and who in turn view their placement in FYC as an institutional message that they are poor writers. Moreover, as addressed in Rebecca Cox’s book The College Fear Factor, students (especially in community colleges) tend to perceive composition as a gatekeeper separating them from the courses they must take to obtain a degree and financial stability. These students find themselves in the difficult position of feeling disengaged from writing while simultaneously believing they must do well in order to prove their college bona fides. Studies suggest that students in these high-anxiety circumstances may face greater vulnerability to stereotype threat.

Considering the high stakes, designing interventions to counteract stereotype threat could offer universities cost-effective ways to improve students’ self-efficacy and to raise retention rates. This workshop thus emerges from the premise that writing programs and writing centers should take the institutional lead in crafting proactive responses to stereotype threat. Such interventions could, for instance, positively influence one or more of the eight habits of mind that, according to the CWPA’s Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing, represent “ways of approaching learning that are both intellectual and practical and that will support students’ success in a variety of fields and disciplines.” Particularly relevant habits of mind include openness, engagement, persistence, and metacognition. In fact, several interventions make a natural fit with canonical composition practices. For example, in regard to the mentor’s dilemma--the idea that minority students might perceive critical feedback from evaluators as biased and counter-productive to their success, one promising intervention has to do with wise feedback--which involves setting high expectations, assuring students that they can meet these expectations, and providing the necessary support through substantive, rigorous critique. This workshop will focus on these kinds of interventions that might instigate positive changes in how students, peer tutors, mentors, and instructors engage the feedback process in writing classes and writing centers.

Schedule

9:00 Introduction: Providing an overview of stereotype threat, including its implications for academic performance in general and writing in particular.

9:45 Discussion #1: Attendees can choose between two discussions focusing on pedagogical interventions against stereotype threat.

Table 1: Table 1 will work with participants to introduce and develop strategies for working against implicit biases. First, participants will identify implicit, gender-based biases by taking a brief Implicit Association Test. Table leaders and participants will then discuss the results in the context of current research on proposed interventions, including wise feedback, introducing counter-stereotypes, etc. Table leaders will propose interventions specific to the context of the composition classroom and invite participants to develop their own possible interventions to try in their own classrooms, based on their particular teaching contexts.

Table 2: Writing teachers often hear students proclaim fixed mindsets about writing—i.e., that they are poor writers who cannot improve much. Stereotype threat is particularly relevant here, given that stereotypes are labels resulting from fixed mindsets. Table 2 will discuss the implications of teaching a growth mindset—the idea that intelligence is malleable and subject to change rather than fixed and static—which can make students less vulnerable to stereotype threat. Facilitators and attendees will then discuss options for integrating growth mindset into curricula, such as reframing threats into challenges.

10:45 Break

11:00 Discussion #2: Attendees can choose between two discussions focusing on programmatic interventions against stereotype threat.

Table 3: Table 3 will discuss strategies that a writing center and writing fellows program can use to lessen the effects of stereotype threat. This conversation will focus on a Writing Fellows program in which undergraduate tutors write response letters to other students taking a writing intensive course. To address stereotype threat, writing fellows use “wise feedback,” or a positive, affirming statement at the end of their response letters to stress the students’ abilities as writers. This kind of feedback then extends to their face-to-face tutoring sessions. The results of this technique and its ability to decrease the effects of stereotypes will be shared.

Table 4: Table 4 will address and discuss questions related to how WPAs can most effectively train faculty and create curricular changes that mitigate stereotype threat. How can we work, program-wide, to minimize the negative impacts of stereotype threats? What is most effective in training and preparing faculty to discuss and ameliorate stereotype threat mindsets? What large-scale curricular changes can be made in first-year writing courses to serve such goals? We will provide examples of professional development opportunities and curricular modifications, inviting participants to assist us in brainstorming potential best practices to maximize student success in writing courses.

12:00 Debrief: Facilitators and attendees will collectively debrief key themes from the table discussions and consider next steps for how people at different campuses might develop stereotype-focused interventions within writing classes, programs, and centers.

**MW.16 Visible Futures: Building Success Beyond the Curriculum in Rhetoric & Writing Graduate Programs**

Rationale

Faculty and graduate students understand that graduate education involves building the knowledge and expertise necessary for success. Less understood is the importance of building the professional relationships necessary to launch and sustain a career. Although graduate programs in Rhetoric & Writing typically provide formal and informal mentoring opportunities, we can do a better job at crafting these opportunities into a coherent strategy. The diversity and quality of scholarship and teaching in our discipline depend upon faculty and graduate students understanding this extra-curriculum -- the work of recruitment, curriculum-building, formal mentoring, cohort-building and informal collaborative mentoring – as a critical component of graduate education.

Workshop Focus & Goals

Our goal is to provide a supportive and knowledgeable environment in which participants can draft a plan for enhancing student success in their own programs. The plans may include re-orienting recruitment strategies, increasing program diversity, and supporting cohort-building among graduate students.

Who Should Attend?

Faculty and graduate students with leadership interests in graduate education will find this workshop valuable as a means to reflect and improve on their own programs. We especially encourage students who play roles as peer mentors. Early career faculty and graduate students will also find the workshop useful for making visible the diverse pathways available to them in the discipline to build a robust network of support.

Workshop Activities

This is a workshop composed of three interactive sessions. Each includes activities done in breakout groups, guided by a heuristic and followed by sharing of ideas. Activities focus on how teaching and mentoring can happen across the mission of a graduate program. Facilitators will introduce each session and heuristic, offer models or examples as needed, and moderate discussion and sharing sessions.

Part I: How Can Programs Build Mentoring Relationships to Support Diverse Needs?

Exercise: Creating a Mentoring Network Map

The National Center for Faculty Development & Diversity encourages a move conceptually away from a master/apprentice model of mentoring toward a student-centered “mentor network” model. We will encourage participants to build network maps to think about formal and informal learning activities – workshops, conferences, social gatherings with faculty and peers – as ways to build professional relationships.

Part II: Building Mentoring Into Programs In Formal & Informal Ways

Activity: Mentoring Stories

We will encourage participants to share brief stories of significant, positive, formative moments from their own mentoring experiences. We will seek to describe the cultural, social, and economic conditions that might make positive encounters like those shared more common.

Activity: Identifying Value Clashes

We will engage participants in mapping areas where personal and institutional values may clash with those values that underlay mentoring practices of various kinds. We will explore what hurdles institutions may need to overcome in order to support graduate students who bring diverse experiences to their work.

Part III: Enhancing Graduate Education and Building the Discipline: Participant Plans

In the third session of the workshop, participants will use a planning guide to craft initiatives for their local institutional contexts, working to articulate activities with goals and values to form a strong, coherent program.

Our facilitators represent a diverse group of faculty and students at different stages in their careers, all of whom have a passionate stake and proven success in enhancing graduate education in Rhetoric and Writing.

### All-Day Wednesday: 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

**W.01 Multimodal, Embodied Pedagogy for the 21st Century**

After a resoundingly successful 2014 debut at CCCC in Indianapolis, this workshop builds on last year’s enthusiasm for incorporating performance theories and practices into composition pedagogy, with new and innovative strategies for multimodal, embodied pedagogies characteristic of 21st century literacies. Offering both pedagogical and professional development resources, this all-day workshop introduces and explores a variety of performative exercises and alternative rhetorics derived from participants’ own interpersonal, bodily-kinesthetic, and musical intelligences. These include listening rhetorically to popular music as a means of critically developing pedagogical personae; integrating improvisational acting exercises into writing instruction as invention strategies; and adopting analytical approaches to karaoke so as to rethink voice, rhetoric, and collaboration.

This year’s workshop adds an entirely new feature: dance as a means of visual rhetorical analysis and a channel for kinesthetic intelligences. Throughout the day, the functions and importance of movement, music, kairos, identity, and multimodality in composition are addressed in small groups in breakout sessions, in which professional development activities are enacted and practical models for writing instruction are provided for use in classrooms on “Monday morning.”

At the workshop’s conclusion, the focus truly becomes a stage. The day culminates in group performances guided by workshop leaders, followed by reflective discussion. Participants are also offered the option to put the day’s lessons into public effect later in the evening, along with the workshop leaders, at a local karaoke club.

\*Participants are asked to bring with them a copy of a favorite inspirational song (that has lyrics) downloaded to their phone, laptop, or other digital media device.

Session 1, “Teaching to the Killer Riff: Writing as Beats,” begins with the sharing of music as participants reflect on their own chosen songs that invoke aspects of their pedagogy. We then examine surprisingly rich rhetorical connections between the bedrock five-paragraph essay and the foundational “Bo Diddley beat,” which has been both limiting and freeing for Western musicians for the past fifty years.

Session 2, “Embodied Rhetoric: Improvisation and Invention,” introduces participants to various techniques that derive from improvisational acting, liberatory theater, and process drama. These techniques, which include theater exercises, tableaus, and role-play, offer ways of engaging students and teachers in deep explorations of invention, rhetoric, and visual and kinesthetic learning.

Session 3, “The Influence of Anxiety,” puts together kairos and karaoke, offering heuristics for teaching rhetorical analysis and awareness of self, audience, and purpose in contexts that shift in real-time and are influenced by ownership, originality, and their attendant anxieties.

Session 4, “Get Outta Yo Mind: Dance as Rhetoric,” addresses everyday body language to draw on participant’s intuitive kinesthetic intelligences. We will practice simple dance exercises as a means to understand body movement and the rhetoric of dance. Participants will then analyze the “arguments” made by dancers’ bodies in the popular reality competition show \_So You Think You Can Dance\_. Finally, inspired by the popular website \_Dance Your PhD\_, participants will be coached through the process of “dancing” a writing lesson or scholarly argument.

**W.02 Feminist Workshop: Teaching, Service, and the Material Conditions of Labor**

Sponsored by the CCCC Committee on the Status of Women, this workshop will address a range of perspectives on ways we engage as feminist professionals: through mentoring of students and colleagues, through our feminist pedagogical techniques, and through examinations of disciplinary questions.

Participants will work to identify and define feminist leadership in the areas that make up our day-to-day work in the profession of writing studies, reflecting on the array of workplaces, positions, and employment statuses that rhetoric and writing teacher-scholars occupy. The workshop presentations and activities will be a springboard for conversations around professional pathways and narratives of success in rhetoric and composition (and in the academy more broadly).

We want to open up a space where feminist academics (tenure-line, contingent, full-time, part-time, and graduate students) are able to facilitate ongoing discussions about their experiences in academia. The workshop will create dialogues among those who are not only or exclusively concerned with their feminist labor and scholarship, but also may be seeking a supportive environment in which they explore or reflect on their teaching.

The day will begin with panel presentations on the topics of feminist teaching teaching, service, and scholarship (panel 1); and on the material conditions of women’s work in Rhetoric and Composition (panel 2). Discussions instigated by the presentations will extend into larger talk and activities between participants on how to open up academic spaces and provide opportunities for more feminist intervention.

Description of panel presentations:

Panel 1: Feminist Teaching, Service, and Scholarship

Speaker 1 will address how a graduate program in the southwest has created a unique space to support graduate students across the university. Working broadly to assist students in finding external funding, the speakers will discuss mentoring strategies: talks across campus, helping students with their writing, and connecting students to work in the community. This presentation will discuss both the program’s practical work and its underlying values .

Speaker 2 (joint presentation by two people) will discuss their research on feminized labor in academia, particularly how service that is invisible and unassessed contributes to gender inequity. In particular, they will speak to “Feminist Service” strategies that address the inequity that results from outdated institutional value systems.

Speaker 3 will explore her responsibility as a writing program administrator at a small liberal-arts college, a position configured as a staff position with coterminous faculty status (but without tenure or the possibility of tenure). This presentation will reflect on questions of feminist strategy and practice along that trajectory, and particularly about inhabiting the role of a faculty WPA without (technically) having full faculty status.

Speaker 4 As a graduate student, speaker 4 has held administrative positions working with an FYC program, writing center, and WAC/WID program. Speaker 4 brings a feminist perspective to the job; yet, she has questions about being in graduate administrative position that are not directly covered in the research on feminist administration (Ratcliffe and Rickley 2010; Dew and Horning 2007; Strickland and Gunner 2009). Speaker 4 will address the following questions: What does graduate student feminist administration look like? How do such leaders redistribute power in the program when they lack institutional power? How can such leaders work with administrators to “decenter the WPA” (Gunner 1994) and give teachers and tutors more agency? What can graduate students do to enact feminist administration?

Panel 2: The Material Conditions of Women’s Work in Rhetoric and Composition: Different Paths, Positions, and Places

Speaker 5 (joint presentation by two people) will reflect on their collaborative scholarship and professional paths as instructors of writing. They believe that the focus on language, whether it is in an English studies program or in another field (such as business or engineering), will strengthen the ability of women in all stages of their professional careers to learn from each other as they meet the challenges of starting, growing, and eventually, transitioning out of their careers. Their collaborative projects and research interests focus on the power of language and how it strengthens and encourages the collaborative process, and their presentation discusses how their collaborative experiences may help other women further their growth as writers and scholars.

Speaker 6’s career as a feminist teacher, writing center administrator, editor, and writer has found her on many different paths, positions, and places. She is particularly interested in Grutsch-McKinney's observations of writing centers as spaces prone to "home-making," where the director is cast as homemaker. As a recent MFA graduate stepping into her first faculty appointment at age 30, Speaker 6 has struggled to weigh advice for women to "lean in" against advice about the perceived faux pas of negotiating salary upon receipt of a job offer.

Speaker 7 wears many hats: full-time PhD student and composition teacher, President Elect of the graduate student association, TA representative to her university’s writing program committee, researcher/writer, conference organizer, and mother of an 8-year-old son. Her ongoing path to a career as a teacher/scholar is synergistically a feminist one. Speaker 7’s lived experience as an attorney and now as teacher/scholar of gender studies and writing/rhetoric shapes her feminist pedagogical beliefs in the classroom and in feminist leadership. As a panelist, Speaker 7 can offer specific strategies that have proven successful as she navigates the graduate student experience as a second career student.

Speaker 8 will talk about the risks and rewards of making a career in our field without a PhD. After earning an MA in rhet/comp, Speaker 8 worked for 10 years as a full-time non-tenure-track lecturer at a state university, then moved to a community college where she was able to earn tenure, take on an administrative role as a writing center coordinator, get involved in TYCA at the regional and national levels, serve as a manuscript reviewer for TETYC, and participate in a number of community-based projects along the way. Speaker 8 is interested in sharing the story of her particular professional pathway -- the challenges, compromises, and benefits.

**W.03 Council on Basic Writing Preconvention Workshop: Risky Relationships in Placement, Teaching and the Professional Organization**

What happens when we reach outside of BW scholarship to help inform the design of writing programs that strive to be more democratic and respectful of language diversity? How can faculty better utilize campus and community resources, as well as resources from unexpected places to help balance their lives outside of school with the often demanding challenges of being mentor and teacher to students with equally complex lives? How might we rethink writing placement in order to increase access to multilingual and other culturally and racially diverse students? These questions will guide us as we examine the risks and rewards of BW relationships in writing placement, in student and instructor lives, and in our professional organizations.

Session 1: The CBW 2014 Award for Innovation: Our Lady of the Lake University will discuss their QUEST program, which offers a democratic, hospitable and progressive writing curriculum that responds to the needs of OLLU’s student population. OLLU is a Hispanic Serving Institution that serves a considerable amount of first-generation, Latin@ and low-income students with more than 86% historically placing into developmental courses. Nearly four decades after Shaughnessy challenged instructors to look beyond students’ errors by studying their linguistic and cultural identity, Gregory Shafer questions what we have learned and if instructors (and writing programs) “respect the linguistic competence that students possess.” Shafer proposes that if the goal of current BW scholarship is to “foster a writing that is democratic, that expands literacies to authentic contexts and cultivates a truly creative spirit, a paradigm shift is in order and must begin with the way we see dialects and language diversity and the way we handle them in the placement process.” Shafer’s paradigm shift is a rather ambitious vision, but offers a vibrant description of QUEST.

Session 2: The Risks and Rewards of Complex Lives: Balancing BW with Instructor and Student Lives: Teaching basic writing is hard work that often comes home with us, not only in the form of grading and class preparation but also in the way the often complex lives of our students finds its way into our own teaching narratives. How to balance our roles as teachers and mentors (available to students for guidance and assistance), our scholarly selves (with responsibilities for publishing and institutional service), our lives as caretakers (parents, elders, our own illnesses) is a complex question, requiring careful navigation. These problems seem particularly relevant to BW, where grading essays often takes a significantly long time and where one-to-one student conferences often elicit discussions about students’ personal and academic lives. This roundtable focuses on helping faculty think through this question of balance, with focus on: Utilizing Resources on Campus and in the Community, Finding Mentors and Support in Unexpected Places, and Learning from Our Students.

Session 3: Best Practices in Placement and Pedagogy: Progressive Policy Statements by the BW Community: Basic writing still, in too many sites, enacts a system of gatekeeping, where risk is in difference and reward resides in the normative. Placement policies broadcast institutional values: how we sort students may express old prejudices, or may transform our institutions into progressive communities of learners. In this session, the facilitator first invites all participants to contribute to the creation of a policy statement that establishes principles for placement that can respect difference, recognize the generative intersections of culture and voice and identity, and honor the strengths of developing student writers by inviting them into the academic conversation. This segment will invite participants to apply these progressive placement principles, using these values to create a statement of best pedagogical practices. The result will be two policy statements drafted by the workshop that will integrate BW placement and pedagogy to scaffold more humanistic, pluralistic, and welcoming BW programs for all developing student writers.

Session 4: Writing Placement that Risks the Academy: Rethinking Ways of Access and the Reward of 1st Year Writing: This keynote discusses ways to rethink writing placement methods, procedures, validation, and outcomes. Most placement systems are designed with the assumption that placement decisions must come from a measurement of student writing ability, perhaps from a test score, a timed writing exam decision, or even directed self-placement that asks students to perform writing tasks or self-assessments of some sort. This address will question two assumptions that work in all these placement models: (1) the nature of the writing construct against which readers or raters measure student performances (e.g. as a white construct, as a transactive rhetorical construct); and (2) the nature of the kinds of judgments needed to make a placement (e.g. judgments of cognitive dimensions of writing that seem to be associated with writing “quality” or success in first-year writing courses). This keynote ask the question: How do we increase access to multilingual and other culturally and racially diverse students in our writing programs? The larger purpose of this discussion, beyond rethinking writing placement, is to suggest rethinking the nature of academic discourse(s) we expect in the academy.

Session 5: Situated Placement: The Rewards of Developing Placement Processes: Roundtable discussants represent a range of institutions where all speakers have developed new placement processes. The first group of speakers will describe how a new course matching process at their doctoral institution mediates students' understandings of college writing courses prior to enrollment and encourages student self-efficacy while also increasing retention. The second speaker will share how her regional campus used a state mandate to eliminate “remedial” education as leverage to develop a new basic writing curriculum and a guided self-placement process that led to better outcomes and increased satisfaction for instructors and students. The final speaker will discuss the challenges of placement at a two-year college and how her program has used its placement process to respond to student needs.

Session 6: The Rewards of Collaboration Between TYCA and CBW: Discussants will facilitate collaboration between CBW and TYCA to determine key areas of crossover in our organizations and to develop professional communities to support, produce and participate in work in these particular areas. Attendees will be actively engaged through conversation, brainstorming, and planning future collaborative work around key topics, such as placement, retention, acceleration, critical thinking, rigor, and shifting expectation in college-level writing.

Wed: 50 Participants

**W.04 TYCA Presents: The Rewards of Playing with Placement and Pedagogy**

Speaker 1 will describe a developmental composition course she’s created that incorporates multimodal composition strategies with "This I Believe" curriculum. The curriculum is designed to explore questions of meaning-making: how we construct meaning from personal experience and narrative and how contemporary media shape values. Speaker 1 will offer assignment ideas and share strategies for integrating multimodal literacy in the developmental classroom as well as the risks and rewards of this curricular experiment.

Speakers 2, 3, and 4 share their most recent first-year curricular collaboration centered on Art, Writing, and Meaning Making. The curriculum uses art as the vehicle through which students explore and develop their reading and writing abilities by studying a variety of visual and written texts, such as paintings on display at a local art gallery, advertisements, poems, plays, and film. A featured part of this curriculum is a collaborative multimodal project and presentation that allows students to develop digital literacy and make meaning of their own. The three instructors will share an overview of their class, focusing particularly on their final multimodal project and the scaffolding and support they provided in class. The speakers will show several examples of final student projects.

Speaker 5 will describe a final project in her argument writing course, in which students transform one of their argument essays (text-based) into an audio, visual, or multimedia argument. Such transformation requires students to think critically about the rhetorical elements of their arguments and consider how to best leverage alternative media to achieve their purposes. Examples of argument transformations include debates, public service announcements, poster sessions, collages, movies, advertisements or commercials, and brochures, among others. Assignment guidelines and student samples will be provided. 10:30-10:45: Break 10:45-11:30: Multi-modal/group projects in an online environment

Speaker 2 will discuss the challenges and delights of her digi-autoethnography-themed online English 101 course, a class in which students wrote about their relationship to the digital world, starting with three shorter papers, which incorporated visual elements in support of text, and culminating in a capstone paper in which students made a claim about their digital identity and supported it based on experiential research from their previous papers and at least one additional source. Workshop participants will then collaborate on a “digi-dialogue,” one of the activities in which the online students participated as they developed their conception of themselves in a technologically saturated world. Laptops/Google accounts recommended.

11:30-12:30: Assessing multi-modal work/group work AND multi-modal feedback strategies

Speaker 5 will share a range of audio and video feedback strategies available (often for free) for peer and teacher review and the benefits of using these alternative methods of commentary. The presentation will include brief demonstrations of Jing screencast videos and Sound Cloud audio recordings. Additionally, speaker 5 will share the results of a yearlong classroom-based experiment she’s conducted with incorporating alternative media in students’ metawriting activities.

To wrap up this session speakers 1,2,3,4, and 5 will briefly share examples of assessment strategies and tools they have used to evaluate their students’ multimodal projects, individual and group, and then will guide participants through an activity designed to develop feedback strategies and evaluation criteria that center on the multimodal project’s goals and students’ learning/ability development. This morning session will wrap up with a roundtable discussion about multimodal assessment to develop feedback that fosters multimodal literacy development and promotes the “habits of mind” (Frameworks for Success in Postsecondary Writing).

12:30-1:30: Lunch Break

PM Program: Joint Session with CBW and TYCA: requires larger meeting space

1:30-2:30: Writing Placement that Risks the Academy: Rethinking Ways of Access and the Reward of First-Year Writing

This session reconsiders writing placement methods, procedures, validation, and outcomes in order to address the increasingly diverse students entering first-year writing programs. Most placement systems are designed with the assumption that placement decisions must come from a measurement of student writing ability, perhaps from a test score, a timed writing exam decision, or even a directed self-placement that asks students to perform writing tasks or self-assessments of some sort. Speaker 6 will question two assumptions that work in all these placement models: (1) the nature of the writing construct against which readers or raters measure student performances and (2) the nature of the kinds of judgments needed to make a placement. How do we increase access to multilingual and other culturally and racially diverse students in our writing programs? The speaker suggests a rethinking of the nature of the academic discourse(s) we expect in the academy.

2:30-3:30: Situated Placement: The Rewards of Developing Placement Processes

This roundtable discussion will focus on placement, featuring discussants from a range of institutions. The first group of speakers will describe how a new course matching process at their doctoral institution mediates students' understandings of college writing courses prior to enrollment, increasing retention across all first-year writing courses. The second speaker will share how her regional campus used a state mandate to eliminate “remedial” education as leverage to develop a new basic writing curriculum and a guided self-placement process that led to better outcomes and increased satisfaction for instructors and students. The final speaker will discuss the challenges of placement at a two-year college, the politics of placement where it concerns basic writers, and how her program has used its placement process to respond to student needs.

3:30-3:45 Break

3:45-5pm: The Rewards of Collaboration between CBW and TYCA

Roundtable discussants will facilitate collaboration between CBW and TYCA attendees around research in our field. The goal of this segment of the workshop will be to determine the key areas of crossover in our organizations where research needs exist, and to develop connections among instructors to support, produce, and participate in work in these particular areas. Attendees will be actively engaged in this segment through conversation, brainstorming, and planning future collaborative work around key topics, such as placement, retention, acceleration, critical thinking, rigor, and shifting expectations in college-level writing.

**W.05 Having Fun Teaching and Learning: Risking Gaming and Game Design in the Classroom**

Recent years have seen a surge of interest in incorporating games and game-based learning into the classroom. As James Paul Gee (2003), Kurt Squire (2011), and others have argued, digital games require players to not only master a diverse number of social and cognitive skills, but to employ these skills to solve complex problems. Digital games, in this sense, are already powerful teaching tools. But what do they teach? And how can the pedagogical strategies implicit in these games be used to reimagine traditional composition pedagogies, especially in light of the digital literacies through which today’s students increasingly construct themselves and express their ideas? How can we apply the lessons learned from gaming rhetorics and pedagogies toward other writing and multimedia tasks?

Conceived as two half-day sessions, this workshop will address these and related questions. It will not only provide participants with hands-on experience with a variety of different games and modes of gameplay, but will also demonstrate how simple game design exercises can help students better understand the writing process. This workshop will facilitate a larger conversation about how games and game design can be incorporated into the composition classroom to improve student engagement and interaction.

Specifically, this workshop will examine how digital games scaffold learning through what Judd Ruggill and Ken McAllister (2011) describe as “insistent design” (pp. 40-45). As they point out, much of what constitutes play in digital games is comprised of a series of discrete actions that, when viewed separately, can appear repetitive and boring. Digital games, however, embed these discrete interactions in complex cycles of risk and reward. Not content to leave players alone, they require players to constantly leverage what they have learned to accomplish ever more complex tasks. As Ian Bogost (2007) argues, the structure of these tasks--their inherent procedurality--is one of the primary rhetorical means through which games express meaning. Digital games thus employ insistent design not only to maintain player engagement, but to convince players to take playing the game and learning its content seriously.

This workshop will teach participants not only how to leverage principles such as insistent design to supplement traditional composition pedagogies, but, ultimately, how to incorporate game design into the composition classroom. Accordingly, the first half-day workshop will focus on playing and analyzing a variety of games. Subdivided into a number of collaborative, scaffolded breakout activities, it will familiarize participants with the principles of game design and demonstrate how these principles can be translated into a variety of high and low-stakes writing assignments. In the second half-day workshop, participants will enter riskier territory: they will construct digital games based on the assignments they created in the first half-day workshop. Although conceived of as a game jam (a gathering of game creators to plan and create games in a short period of time), participants will not need previous experience with programming or game design. Instead, they will learn how to use applications such as Twine, Sploder, Construct 2, Quest, and Adventure Game Studio to quickly prototype and create playable games. In doing so, this session will demonstrate how the work of game design, as a complex mode of composition, can help students better understand how, as James Berlin (1982) points out, writers create reality through the writing process.

This workshop will model the pedagogy it seeks to teach. By asking participants to collaborate to accomplish a series of increasingly complex and risky tasks, it will demonstrate how insistent design can transform discrete moments of learning into the sophisticated pedagogical practices that characterize learner-centered teaching.

OUTCOMES: After attending this workshop, participants will be able to:

discuss how/why games help facilitate learning;

outline core elements in game design;

describe major game design strategies/processes;

outline a game design to achieve a specific learning objective; and

experiment with various digital game design applications.

TAKE AWAYS:

annotated list of scholarly resources;

assignment prompts, graphic organizers, and lesson plans/activities to help develop games; and

annotated list of digital game development applications.

**W.06 Working with Post-9/11 Student-Veterans: A Workshop for Composition Teachers, Scholars, and WPAs**

According to the Department of Defense, between 300,000-400,000 veterans discharge from the military each year, and approximately 30% of those veterans will enroll in higher education. By 2015, it is projected that over a million veterans will be in our classrooms.

Student-veterans comprise a complex and diverse cohort, and many bring to our campuses highly-developed work ethics, sophisticated rhetorical and genre knowledge, and maturity and leadership skills well beyond those of traditional students. Teacher/scholars are gathering a more accurate and useful understanding of student-veterans’ strengths and challenges, best practices for veterans in writing-intensive courses, campus-wide initiatives to enhance student-veterans’ success, and the power of community writing groups for veterans.

However, as Hart and Thompson note in their landmark white paper, “An Ethical Obligation: Promising Practices for Veterans in College Writing Classes,” though most writing faculty are aware of veterans’ presence on their campuses and in their classrooms, “few have received formal training on veteran issues, military culture, or military writing conventions.” This workshop provides composition instructors with an opportunity for that formal training. We structure the workshop into three areas for discussion:

1. An introduction to “the” student-veteran, including an overview of demographics, scholarship on veterans’ experiences as they transition from active duty to student status, and information about military c

ulture and common writing genres and practices.

2. Models of community writing programs for veterans. In particular, founders of “Words after War,” a national literary organization, will share information about their program.

3. Information about campus-wide programs and best-practice in composition courses, designed to enhance student-veterans’ success.

Workshop facilitators represent a diverse array of community organizers and faculty from two-year colleges, online colleges, research universities, and preparatory military institutions. Some workshop facilitators are veterans; some are military family members; some are peace activists; some are directors of veteran’s programs. We hope that this array of perspectives represents the immense diversity of veterans and their advocates and engages workshop participants in lively conversation and concrete action.

The workshop will feature highly participatory discussions and activities, such as reviews of sample assignments, classroom and WPA-related scenarios for group discussion, videos of student-veterans enrolled in writing-intensive courses, and readings of veteran’s creative and expository writing. Each of the aforementioned areas of discussion will entail brief, roundtable presentations followed by break-out sessions, facilitated by workshop participants, on various topics.

The workshop schedule is delineated below:

Part I, Roundtable Discussion: Introducing “the” Student Veteran

Speaker 1: "The Legacy of War in the College Writing Classroom.”

Speaker 2: “Who is “the” Student Veteran? A Demographic Overview”

Speaker 3: “Representations and Realities: Addressing Media Representations of Post-911 Veterans”

Speaker 4: “Complicating Transitions: Perspectives of a Veteran and Composition Instructor”

10:00-11:00: Breakout Sessions, Table Leader Topics

Table Leader 1: “Teaching and Learning from Veterans”

Table Leader 2: “Veteran-Designated, Hybrid, and Online Composition Courses: The Importance of Choices, Timing, and Fit”

Table Leader 3: “An Ethical Obligation: Key Findings from the C’s White Paper on Veterans in Composition”

Table Leader 4: “Models for Veterans’ Services on College Campuses”

11:00-12:00: Part II, Community Writing Programs for Veterans

Speakers 1 & 2: Co-founders, Words After War: “Writing After the War: An Inclusive Community-based Approach to Understanding War and Conflict through Literary Programming”

12:00-1:30: Lunch

1:30-2:45: Part III, Best Practice in the Classroom and across Campus

Speaker 1: “Acceleration, Student Support, and Learning Communities: Fast-Tracking Veterans in Community College Basic Writing”

Speaker 2: “Academic Support for Student-Veterans”

Speaker 3: “Epistemological Interference in Veteran Writing”

Speaker 4: “Discussing ‘Conceal Carry’ and Other Hot-Button Topics with Student-Veterans”

2:45-3:45: Breakout Sessions, Table Leader Topics:

Table Leader 1: On-line Pedagogy: The Write Space for Veterans and Family Members”

Table Leader 2: Developing Effective Writing Assignments for Student Veterans

Table Leader 3: “Gender, Race and Sexuality: Issues Facing Student-Veterans”

Table Leader 4: “Community-based Writing Programs for Veterans”

3:45-4:45: Whole Group Discussion and Synthesis

4:45-5:00: Workshop Evaluations

**W.07 Big Data Methods, Digital Tools, & Writing Studies**

Designed for writing program directors and researchers in Writing Studies, this day-long (Wednesday) workshop explores the affordances of My Reviewers <http://myreviewers.com>, a cloud-based software tool for writing instructors, reviewers, writers, and writing programs. In Benkler’s \_Wealth of Networks\_, he theorizes “Different technologies make different kinds of human action and interaction easier or harder to perform. All other things being equal, things that are easier to do are more likely to be done (p. 17).”

Based on our use of My Reviewers on seven campuses (Malmö University, Sweden; University of Tartu (Estonia); University of Pennsylvania; University of South Florida, Northwest Florida State College, Eastern Michigan University, and Eckerd College), we reflect on the ways document workflows, peer-review workflows, real-time learning analytics, data visualization methods, and big data impinge on the mentoring of faculty, student writing, peer review, curriculum development, writing program assessment, and the development of students’ reasoning and writing.

Our workshop will have three parts: (1) a focus on ongoing and published research; (2) demonstrations of big-data tools; and, (3) an opportunity to collectively brainstorm about ways big-data methods are likely to transform research methods in Writing Studies and challenge pedagogical practices.

Part 1: Report on Current Research

Speakers 1, 2 and 3: Currently, the USF part of the My Reviewers corpus consists of 247,208 essays and 87,000 peer reviews. We will summarize our published and ongoing research based on the MyR corpus regarding writing transfer, assessment of critical thinking, peer-review research, and teacher commentary.

Speakers 4, 5, and 6: Currently, the Malmö University (Sweden) corpus consists of approximately 4,000 essays and 2500 peer reviews. Malmö will report on its big-data methods and results, noting disparities between its instructors’ and students’ reviews and USF’s.

Speaker 7: At Northwest Florida State College, an open-door, four-year institution, students entering first year freshman composition have limited experience with effective peer review. NWFSC will report on how its use of My Reviewers provides students with a framework to communicate meaningful, critical feedback that their peers can respond to and implement in their own writing.

Speaker 8: Peer review has become a dominant method of instruction in U.S. writing courses (Fulkerson, 2005; Kennedy, Krista and Rebecca Moore Howard 2013 ) yet research has failed to empirically affirm the millions of hours American students spend conducting peer reviews of one another’s drafts/texts. UPENN reports on the effectiveness of assigning anonymous multiple reciprocal peer reviews in contrast to an expert review.

Speaker 9: In Europe, the majority of doctoral students lack academic writing experience. As a result, doctoral students quite often start their doctoral programme as novice academic writers, who, in addition to the lack of writing experience, need to struggle with the English language requirements. The University of Tartu will report on its usage of My Reviewers to provide doctoral students an authentic writing experience including the revision and reviewing process.

Speaker 10: Eastern Michigan University (EMU) will reflect on its Fall pilot of My Reviewers, analyzing the effects of Community Comments, Revision Plans, Document Workflows, and Learning Analytics on the development of students’ reasoning and writing.

Part 2: Demonstrations of Big Data Methods

Speaker 1, 2, and 3 will demonstrate how participants can use QDA Miner and Wordstat, addressing libraries, coding schemes, and the possibilities of machine learning.

Speaker 9 will demonstrate methods for deploying machine learning for analyzing My Reviewers data.

Speaker 11 will show ways to use Open Source R to visualize our big data to ascertain distinctions between expert and non-expert commentary and ranking.

Part III: Imagining the Future of Writing Studies

In their May 2014 report to President Obama, “Big Data: Seizing Opportunities, Preserving Values,” John Podesta et al write

\* “big data will transform the way we live and work and alter the relationships between government, citizens, businesses, and consumers.”

\* “the availability of new types of data profoundly improves researchers’ ability to learn about learning.

For those of us in Writing Studies, the affordances of digital tools such as My Reviewers are revolutionary. A third of our workshop will constitute group brainstorming regarding potential research studies based on big data methods.

**W.08 The Risks and Rewards of Assessment: A Workshop for WPA's and Writing Instructors**

Assessment is becoming even more a central issue at all levels of education. Assessment not only measures instruction, it can inform it. As Jack Jennings the founder and long time CEO of the Center for Educational Policy stated, “what gets tested gets taught.” Administrators and other stakeholders often want a corporate model of summative assessment to measure both student and faculty performance, while faculty usually favor formative assessments focused on improving teaching. The purpose of this workshop is to present the basic concepts and models of formative and summative assessments both of individual students and of writing programs and then to help colleagues use these tools to draft an outline of a plan for a specific assessment project. The specific elements of the morning program and the configuration of the afternoon working groups will be revised and informed based on the specific needs of participants determined through a pre-conference survey.

This full day workshop, presented by Committee on Assessment of the Conference on College Composition, will focus on assessment as a rhetorical and necessary practice that has significant rewards as well as risks. The morning session will consist of several presentations and a panel discussion beginning with an overview by [Speaker 2] that frames writing assessment in terms of purpose and audience by reviewing four case studies The morning session will also consist of a short overview by [Speaker 1], of key concepts in assessing student writing assessment including the various types of validity and reliability, correlation and shared variance, holistic and analytic scales, developing rubrics and training samples, and possible pitfalls of reading sessions. Chris Anson [Speaker 3] will describe a new and highly innovative assessment model of student writing ability aimed at evaluating high-level critical thinking and revision. A panel of WPA’s, [Speaker 4], I [Speaker 5], and [Speaker 7], will discuss online writing assessments for different purposes including as a placement mechanism, as a final exercise for all sections of a large first-year program, and as a research tool. The morning session will conclude with a short presentation on the concept of consequential validity by[Speaker 6].

After a lunch break, the afternoon will consist of roundtable workshop sessions hosted by assessment experts, including [Discussion Leader 1] and members of the Committee on Assessment. These roundtables will be focused on specific types of assessments for specific purposes. Some tables will focus on program assessment, while other tables will focus primarily on various types of assessment of student writing. The goal of these afternoon workshops is to help each participant develop an assessment plan specifically designed for his or her program’s needs within the context of its specific institution. These plans will contain not only specific assessment designs but also specific arguments and strategies aimed at securing the assent of various stakeholders to rigorous and pedagogically defensible assessments. There will also be prepared handouts based on NCTE and CCCC position papers giving strong arguments and talking points against the kind of cheap mass-market assessments favored by some administrators.

**W.09 Using Artifact-based Interviews as an Approach to Inquiry in Scenes of Teaching and Learning**

This workshop will give participants experience with a model of inquiry that can be used to address a variety of teaching and learning needs: artifact-based interviewing. It will be of interest to teachers looking to incorporate new approaches to narrative inquiry into their writing pedagogies as well as to those who work with teachers to develop their capacity to help students move from experience to inquiry.

Our artifact-based interview methodology emerges from our ongoing research on first-year students’ experiences of literacy sponsorship, but we have found the methodology to be a useful approach to eliciting heuristic narratives in various scenes of teaching and learning. Participants will learn about affordances and uses of artifact-based interviewing, will get opportunities to practice this approach, and will be invited to imagine ways to integrate it, as a highly transferrable practice, into pedagogical scenes at their home institutions. To demonstrate our approach to artifact-based interviewing, we describe a methodology for literacy research that uses artifacts as inventional assets to elicit narratives in scenes of interviewing. This methodology assumes, as Pahl and Rowsell explain in Artifactual Literacies (2010), that everyday objects can be approached as “potential sites of story, community building, and identity performance” (vii).

Workshop facilitators will lead participants in a series of discussions and activities to help them

• learn how artifact-based interviewing can be useful as a mode of inquiry for teaching and learning

• practice artifact-based interviewing with other teachers

• work with others to imagine how interviewing as an inquiry model might be enacted as a practice (e.g., as an approach to teacher development, as a part of a writing curriculum, as a model for peer mentoring, etc.)

Both morning and afternoon sessions will be scaffolded to move from general inquiry to situated practice, and will follow a sequence of moves inviting participants to inquire, model, practice, and discuss their learning.

In the morning session, we will begin by inviting participants to imagine the uses and locations of a kind of inquiry that enables theorizing from and through experience. To demonstrate this approach, we will show two video products: one, a documentary piece created as a product of LiteracyCorps Michigan (LCM), a long-term, multi-phase project that inquires into experiences of literacy sponsorship among first-year college students; and two, a video demonstrating the inquiry moves of our approach to artifact-based interviewing. We will then give participants time for hands-on practice with interviewing techniques. The morning’s activities will be as follows:

1. Inquire: How do you currently create opportunities in your life as a teacher or learner to move from experience to inquiry? What are the rhetorical forms, moves, genres, and practices you call upon to do so? What has been useful, and what has been disappointing, about your approaches to experiential inquiry?

2. Model: Video demonstrations showing examples of approaches to moving from experience to inquiry through artifact-based interviewing.

3. Discuss: Identify and theorize the interview moves demonstrated in the videos.

4. Practice: Interviews in pairs. Participants will have been instructed to bring with them two artifacts, one representing who they are as teachers, the other representing who they are as learners. In pairs, they will practice interviewing and being interviewed around artifacts as foci for storytelling.

In the afternoon session, we will follow up from the morning’s practice session by inviting participants to discuss what they learned from their experiences as interviewers and interviewees (by reporting out, sharing observations, and triangulating experiences). We will end the session with an activity in which participants work in groups to imagine uses of artifact-based interviews in writing classes, programs, and mentoring situations at their home institutions. The afternoon’s activities will be as follows:

1. Inquire: What has been learned from the morning’s practice session? What was surprising, useful, dangerous, or generative about the experience of interviewing--and being interviewed? What was the nature of the stories that emerged during the interview sessions? What can this approach to narrative inquiry do or generate?

2. Model: Where do you notice moves like this that appear in pedagogical encounters/practices/curricula “in the wild?” What could they look like?

3. Practice: What are your current practices? How could the approaches to narrative inquiry we have been pursuing help address the goals and disappointments you identified in the morning session? Participants will develop exploratory drafts of revised curricular content, professional development activities, and/or programmatic changes.

4. Discuss: Participants share their exploratory drafts with the larger group and discuss opportunities and implications for further development.

**W.10 Deep Rewards and Serious Risks: Working Through International Higher Education Writing Research Exchanges**

Sponsored by the CCCC Globalization Committee

“Taking a chance on change, on trying something different, is risky.”

21st century writing scholars around the world are moving out of their comfort zones into rewarding, yet risky, projects, engaging with diverse traditions, theoretical models and methodologies, and complex, often unfamiliar cultural, political, and linguistic contexts in which research, writing practices, and pedagogies take shape. The rewards are many: new opportunities to test tacit models and assumptions about literacy in national or global contexts; to render visible new or hidden forms of writing research; to reconsider the means and effects of pressing international collaborations. The risks are also great. Questions of language, culture, and context must be addressed, and negotiating these matters and their accompanying power relations is arduous. Even in the age of the Internet, projects are endangered by restricted resources or limited access to subjects, data, or publishing venues. The logistics of international work can be costly: institutions may not know how to value these projects, and political events can hinder research.

We believe the discomfort and difficulty are valuable, even necessary, to our collective future. We seek, for an 8th year, to create a structured space for participants’ risk-taking, one that allows everyone, across a full day of discussion, to learn with – and from – international partners from Europe: Germany, UK, Sweden, Denmark, Portugal, Italy; the Middle East: Lebanon, Turkey, Israel, Egypt, Qatar, Iraq; the Pacific Rim/Southeast Asia: India, Vietnam, the Philippines; North America: Mexico, United States, Canada and First Nations; South America: Colombia, Chile, and Argentina; South Africa. We will share our specific writing research projects-in-progress from physical/disciplinary sites often missing in US discussions, to create a dialogue that reaps new rewards for those willing to take these risks in a format and level of international participation unique at CCCC.

35 research projects by 41 scholars representing 23 countries and diverse national, cross-national, and multilingual contexts will enable participants to reframe understandings of models of writing and writing instruction across cultures, disciplines, and populations. The projects consider (see individual project titles below): historical legacies of educational and rhetorical models; metaphors for academic enculturation in writing-intensive courses; disciplinary writing development and pedagogy in social sciences, natural sciences, and general academic contexts; genre development studies; teaching exposition, argumentation, and research writing; gaps in student/teacher perceptions in L1 or L2 writing; analyzing approaches to ESL and ELL (multiple intelligences, story telling, visual rubrics, language in new media sites, rhetorical and stylistic differences); transnational, cross-institutional online student collaborations and communities; successes and conflicts in programmatic exchanges and transnational partnerships; roles of secondary literacy preparation for successful academic writing; writing technologies, from uses of handwriting across national contexts to globally distributed online media.

Workshop goals:

When writing researchers from different geopolitical, theoretical, national, and institutional contexts come together to work, they need preparation and time to understand each other and to encounter and negotiate multiple discursive orientations, from simple terminology to deep theoretical grounding. Translating practices and projects across national, cultural, and linguistic borders requires exchanging materials in advance of the workshop, and extended time together to reduce misunderstandings. The workshop design addresses these challenges.

Format:

The workshop includes 3 interactive activities, 2 to be completed before the CCCC:

1) By January, workshop discussion leaders post on a wiki (see http://compfaqs.org/CompFAQsInternational/InternationalWritingStudies):

- A draft research text.

- A brief institutional description, for context.

- A glossary of potentially context/culture-specific terms, to be further discussed during the workshop.

- A digest of key theorists and frames used in the methods and research design.

2) The texts are grouped into 6 clusters on the wiki. Workshop participants (discussion leaders and registrants) choose a text from each cluster, and read 6 texts from January to March, freeing up the workshop time for discussion and exchange.

3) At the workshop, all participants join small group discussions with each selected author/text across the day. In this unique workshop format, discussion leaders become learner-participants, alongside registrants, when not leading a discussion of their own draft. Everyone encounters the writing research, research questions, and emergent or well-established methods from other countries. Each project receives attentive, sustained discussion: we question assumptions, negotiate tensions and differences, model practices that resist simple dichotomies, and construct a collective sense of possible responses and shared concerns.

The workshop chairs keep track of threads across the day:

• What is the “work” of research in different contexts? What new or revised research methods do we need to foster serious international collaboration?

• What questions of student, teacher, or researcher languages, of institutional or national languages, inform the research being done?

• How can international communities of writing scholars benefit from sharing the texts and theoretical, methodological, and cultural contexts of higher education writing research-in-progress from around the world while working to minimize risks and barriers for all involved?

We conclude the workshop having reflected on the deep rewards and the inevitable risks of international scholarship, and on how to engage these new projects in sensitive, productive ways. The dialogic exchange rewards us through the evolution of our disciplinary communities and re-orients our research horizons, as both novices and experts. Finally, the workshop introduces linguistic/discursive challenges that disrupt monolingual spaces and move us toward the translingual modes of work required to gain those rewards.

**W.11 Composing Pedagogies of Labor**

At a moment when writing teachers and professional organizations seem to be finding renewed labor consciousness, we invite participants to collaborate on labor-conscious writing pedagogy and curricula. Especially for those of us teaching students many (if not most) of whom work while going to college, pedagogies that invite them to explore, inquire, critique, and rewrite their understandings of labor and of themselves as workers are more important than ever. We recognize and deeply respect extant work on social class and pedagogy, and much outstanding work on pedagogies of civic/community engagement, service learning, and public advocacy; a workshop sharply focused on labor enhances that work without duplicating it.

Universities serve as training grounds for the local and global economies that intersect in our (student, faculty, campus workers’) lives. As such, we will consider how American universities function simultaneously in local and global economies, dependent on the local economy of students, businesses and workers on the one hand, and focused on intellectual property creation and worker training on the other. Do universities value scholarship differently from teaching and administration? What kinds of management models might explain the contemporary cultures of higher education where tenured radicals are creating brands for their work, and where underprivileged groups of instructors struggle to meet mandated standards for their students, while publishing to maintain a professional profile? And where low-wage workers feed and clean up after everyone else?

Developing our labor consciousness calls us to articulate the overlapping interests of students, campus workers, and faculty along with labor/workers outside the academy, but proposers share the sense that we haven't fully integrated labor issues into pedagogy or curricula: FYC, advanced undergraduate, or graduate. We believe our disciplinary strengths in pedagogy position us well to imagine possibilities for labor education and mobilization within and outside traditional curricular settings.

This participant-driven all-day workshop offers critical frameworks and practical opportunities for participants to compose pedagogies of labor for first-year writing, undergraduate and graduate courses. Our goals are to: help participants define/imagine pedagogies of labor; discuss how instructors can justify such pedagogies; examine how these pedagogies intersect with other kinds of writing courses; and share and develop models/techniques for their own courses. Together the workshop participants will work with/on projects that describe and analyze distinct trends in labor based on critical readings, case studies, and student-conducted research.

Along with these workshop activities, we will provide registrants with resources to develop labor pedagogies: sample syllabi/activities; bibliographies; a few key articles about labor and pedagogies of labor; and sample student texts.

FYC. Themed courses; Integrating Labor into Other Writing courses.

Example Courses:

Experiences of Work, Experiences of Labor (First-Year Research Writing course)

Public Writing Courses from Harvard and Stanford about developing campaigns for custodial and migrant workers

Advanced undergrad rhet/comp/writing courses: The labor of writing/literacy; writing for social change; workplace writing; how labor issues relate to such courses (e.g., when teaching business writing, does "labor" come up?); how critical approaches to the university’s work and function can be the basis of advanced undergraduate/graduate courses in writing.

Example Courses:

Interdisciplinary course on Universities as Economic Entities

The Subject is Writing the University: Think Globally, Act Locally

Writing for Social Change

Activism and Advocacy Writing

Propaganda, Power, and Politics (highlighting anti-union propaganda)

Grad courses: Labor of teaching writing (K-12/college level); material practices of writing that bring in labor as issue or perspective; courses in labor rhetoric/propaganda; integrating labor into courses in social movement or activist rhetorics.

Example Courses:

Teaching Composition (MA course focused on surveying major pedagogies, recently redesigned to include unit on contingency)

Critical Pedagogy (MA course integrating labor concerns into efforts to problematize learning and teaching conditions)

Lunch 11:55-1:15

5. Breakout 2 (1:15-2:15): Continue break-out groups; stay in same group or move to another.

Teaching about labor in FYC (cont).

Teaching about labor in undergrad rhet/comp/writing courses (cont).

Teaching about labor in grad courses (cont).

6. Reporting results from each group so far (2:15-2:40)

7. Resources for Composing Pedagogies of Labor (2:40-3:30): Sharing materials. A sample of the kinds of materials we would expect to share:

Books, Articles, Readings

Hedges, Chris, and Joe Sacco, Days of Destruction, Days of Revolt. (Graphic text on immigrant labor)

Jordan, Pete. Dishwasher: One Man’s Quest to Wash Dishes in All Fifty States. (Memoir of working-class teenager’s complex relationship to work, labor, and class)

Mazurek, Raymond A. “Running Shoes, Auto Workers, and Labor: Business Writing Pedagogy in the Working-Class College.” Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 29:3 (2002): 259-72.

Syllabi, Assignments, Course Materials

Syllabi and assignments from example courses listed in breakout sessions

Websites

Student Labor Activism Resources

United Students Against Sweatshops <http://usas.org>

Student Labor Action Project <http://www.studentlabor.org>

Contingent Labor Resources

Delphi Project <http://www.thechangingfaculty.org>

New Faculty Majority <http://www.newfacultymajority.org>

American Association of University Professors <http://aaup.org>

Adjunct Action <http://adjuntaction.org>

Organizing/Organized Labor Resources

AFL-CIO <http://www.aflcio.org>

SEIU <http://www.seiu.org>

United Electrical Workers, “The Five Basic Steps to Organizing a Union” <http://www.ueunion.org/org\_steps.html>

IWW Industrial Organizing Department <http://www.iww.org/organize>

Sample Student Projects

We will supply sample student projects (with appropriate student permissions)

8. Checking In (3:30-3:45)

Break (3:45-4)

9. Doing a Teach-In for Labor Advocacy (faculty labor and/or other campus labor and/or community labor) (4:00-4:30)

\*Campus example: Teach-In sponsored by Associate Faculty Coalition at IUPUI

10. Wrap-Up (4:30-5:00)

**W.12 Writing and Teaching Creative Nonfiction: Risks and Rewards**

Creative nonfiction is a genre central to writing in the academy, playing an important role in first-year composition and beginning/advanced creative writing, as well as in writing in myriad fields. This workshop is designed to invite participants to experience a day of creative nonfiction writing--writing on demand and sharing writing--as well as to explore techniques for teaching effectively this multi-faceted genre. Workshop leaders, experienced creative nonfiction writers and teachers, will offer invitations to write, framed by assignment rationales and suggestions for teaching. The workshop includes two short presentations on risks and rewards of writing and teaching creative nonfiction. Leaders will guide small group sharing of writing and discussions of ways to adapt the day’s prompts and processes for effective classroom teaching. Participants will take away pieces of their own writing and ideas for developing them, tested writing prompts plus teaching suggestions, and a deepened understanding of creative nonfiction.

Three segments will be devoted to writing in response to six different prompts, followed by brief sharing at tables. The afternoon includes small group feedback on writings plus a discussion of strategies for teaching these prompts. The workshop concludes with the whole group's sharing of writings and reflections on the value of creative nonfiction writing for ourselves and for our students.

SPEAKER 1 (prompt): “Access Denied”

As someone who was adopted in the 1970s, when closed adoption was the norm in the United States, I am familiar with being denied access to information about my birth history. Even now, several years after successfully petitioning the courts of Illinois to open my records and reuniting with my birth parents, I still find myself unable to obtain parts of my past that may be relevant to the story of myself I am trying to tell. Is there something in your life that you wanted that was denied to you? What was it that you wanted—information? answers? entrance? opportunity? options?—and why was/is it important to you? As you write, consider the risks you were/are willing to take as well as the ones you were/are not.

SPEAKER 2 (prompt): "Choose Your Own Adventure"

Seeking out experiences outside our comfort zones can remind us what it is like to be a novice—the initial struggle to learn a new concept or practice, the excitement of “getting” even the smallest piece of it, the opportunity for self-discovery. Since “adventure” is defined by the in’s and out’s of your individual comfort zone, your adventures might look quite different. When was the last time, by choice or by chance, you stepped outside your comfort zone to learn something new? What inspired (or forced) you to do so? What did you learn about yourself--and about learning--from the experience?

SPEAKER 3 (prompt): “Risking Language: Wordplay”

Words—tangible, magical, powerful—can spark association and insight in creative nonfiction writing. First, make a list of words embodying the senses, motion, abstractions, and personal connections (detailed instructions will be given). Your words must be specific and sound good to your ear. Then randomly select a dozen words to spark your writing. Use all twelve, in ways you don't expect. If you like, trade some words with a neighbor. Take risks! Play!

SPEAKER 4, “Inward Life/Outward Action in Writing Creative Nonfiction”

How can we help students (and ourselves) nurture trust in that rich writing resource, the inward life? Nonfiction genres such as the lyric essay, grow out of the mysterious and magical meeting of the inward self and the world. But there are challenges, too. When does reference to one's inward life become merely a tangent or inappropriate? How do we make it work to enhance our larger purposes?

SPEAKER 5 (prompt): “Excavating Emotions in Creative Nonfiction”

Think of a time you experienced a powerful emotion. Spend some time quietly contemplating the emotion and your experience of it. Part One: Write about your inner experience of the emotion itself, apart from the story of what happened with it. What are your thoughts about the emotion? Where in your body do/did you experience it most? What colors or images do you associate with it? Part Two: Explore the story of a particular time when you experienced that emotion.

SPEAKER 6 (prompt): "Re-Opening Your Future"

One writer’s trick is to posit a counterfactual. Lee Harvey Oswald doesn’t kill Kennedy, as in Stephen King’s novel 11/22/63, for example. Imagine that one thing in your past happened differently--maybe something significant, maybe something minor. But that one change affects your life significantly, for better or worse. Narrate that event and the change it enacted. You might find it particularly interesting to create a specific day or part of a day in your new life, creating a scene or two with the counterfactual you.

SPEAKER 7 (prompt): “Writing Auto-ethnography”

Your writing life consists of every time you have written anything on paper or electronic gadget and everything you read, listen to, and watch. Recall specific memories that may have formed your attitudes and beliefs about writing. What was the occasion? Who was involved? feel? What do you cherish? What would you change? Do these memories foster positive or negative relationships with writing? How do your attitudes toward writing change in response to purpose, occasion, or subject? What do you enjoy about writing? Dislike? Is there “good” or “bad” writing?

SPEAKER 8: “Ethical Issues in (Teaching) Risky Writing”

Writers take risks in subject, substance, style, and sharing. Each can be a venue for growth as a human being and as a writer, but each can be a source of terror for novice writers or people who want to play it safe. An ethical teacher or writing coach should create a safe space for all writers, where they can feel free to write about what’s meaningful to them-including topics subversive or taboo—in ways they never before imagined (models help); and then NOT show it to anyone. Feedback from teacher or peers should respect these constraints. and be constructive rather than arbitrarily judgmental.

**Wednesday Afternoon: 1:30–5:00 p.m.**

**AW.01 Exploring Latinidad in the South and Florida: A Workshop Sponsored by the NCTE/CCCC Latina/o Caucus**

The purpose of this workshop is to provide opportunities for local and national teachers, students, and community members at all levels to exchange knowledge and experience on teaching, research, mentorship, media, professional development, and community engagement related to Latin@ student populations in the South and, especially, Florida. According to the Pew Research Hispanic Trends Project, Florida Latin@ K-12 students make up 27% of all Latin@ students in the nation. Six community colleges and universities in Florida are in the top 50 in enrolling the highest number of Latin@ students with Miami Dade as number one in the country. Florida also ranks high in the number of degrees granted to Latin@s. Our workshop will tap into and enhance Latin@ student success in Florida and beyond by tapping into the knowledge and expertise of the facilitators who span institutional and geographical affiliations. This workshop will benefit a range of attendees as we will 1) mentor Latin@ teacher scholars learning to navigate the institution; 2) offer pedagogical advice to literacy instructors who educate Latin@ students; and 3) provide guidance for allies in our discipline who are interested in scholarship on and engagement with Latino/a communities.

Community participants in this year's Latina/o Caucus Workshop are representatives from the Tampa Bay chapter of United We Dream. The mission of United We Dream-Tampa Bay (UWDTB) is to expand awareness and support for passage of a new immigration system that includes a pathway to citizenship for all 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States; to empower DREAMers; to educate the community about immigrant rights; and to incorporate the values of diversity and equality for all. The UWDTB community stands for justice and equal opportunity for all. During their presentation, UWDTB members will discuss local responses to the broken immigration system. The speakers will also open a dialogue with the Caucus on how we can become allies in the DREAM movement and the struggle for immigration reform.

**AW.02 Going Outside: Internships, Fieldtrips, and Experiential Learning**

As universities renegotiate what it means to go to school, more and more are offering experiential learning experiences for students. While service learning has been theorized in compelling ways, there is less formal discussion and theorizing of internships and other activities uncommon in English Studies (field trips, overnight nature encounters, historical fieldwork, etc…). Service learning is meant to “equally benefit the provider and the recipient of the service” (Furco 5). Considering this, how do we justify those experiences that are more career focused, are about personal edification or connecting with nature as part of humanities and/or writing curricula?

This half-day, Wednesday afternoon workshop examines experiential learning in rural universities and large metropolitan cities, in internship programs (old and new) as well as in innovative curricula from endowed travel courses, rural internships, and regional field trips. We will discuss the logistics of developing and running these programs as well as the pedagogical theory that supports them as a way to gather this material for dissemination and study. By looking to books like the Sourcebook of Experiential Education: Key Thinkers and Their Contributions we work to find confluence with Rhetoric and Composition theory within and against institutional and disciplinary parameters.

Organization

There are two sections 1) Internships and Community Partnerships and 2) Travelling with Students. Each will include presentations and then small group discussion. After the small groups, we will come together for a larger discussion to gather what we have learned. There will be a conclusive full group discussion focusing on ways to promote experiential learning in English Studies and promote English Studies in the community. The end result of the workshop will be the development of an online resource for this kind of experiential learning.

Internships and Community Partnerships

Overview, Comparison and Logistics

Speaker 1 Expanding Conceptions of Service Learning within English Studies

This presentation will discuss key differences between experiential learning and the three primary models of service learning used in college composition – writing for the community, writing about the community, and writing with the community (Deans).

Speaker 2 Experiential Learning as an Exotic Flower

Experiential learning pedagogy is often an exotic flower on college and university campuses, a singular fragile beauty surviving in an otherwise hostile environment. This presentation discusses the following structural problems: Too much one-size-fits-all, incapacity of assessment, lack of reciprocity, and compartmentalization.

Speaker 3 Convincing (with) Data: Assessing Your Community Engagement Project

This presentation discusses a community engagement where project first-year composition students co-authoring the oral histories of/with an adult ESL learners at the local community center. It reviews the good, bad, and ugly of making a community partnership and the need for comprehensive assessment.

Speaker 4 Experiential Learning and Institutional “Space”: Developing Service Learning Opportunities for English Majors

This presentation discusses faculty resistance to internships and service learning opportunities for students from two sources (via Butin (2010) 1) loss of control when a course leaves the “space” of the classroom and 2) learning features insights and epistemologies from academic disciplines other than our own and suggests ways to meet these challenges to create meaningful and rigorous academic experiences.

Developing and Sustaining Internship Programs

Speaker 5 Finding Niches: Internships for English Majors in Rural Areas

This presentation discusses meaningful internship opportunities in rural areas, where the number of potential community partners is limited, and where students’ own identities and experiences as English majors emphasize literature rather than professional writing.

Speaker 6 Experiential Learning as a Requirement: Working with Clients in English Studies

This presentation examines a minor in Professional Writing where students are required to take experiential learning courses, work with actual clients, learn project management skills, manage actual deadlines, and create usable documentation in real life learning situations.

Speaker 7 Developing a New Departmental Internship Program

This speaker will raise key issues in developing a departmentally-supported internship program in a small public college and in a state that is just beginning to grapple with questions about internship standards and best practices. Discussion will center on how to begin to build local networks among departmental internship coordinators, career advising, and local community partners.

Speaker 8 Writing With and For Nonprofits

This session will share ideas for locating and engaging with community-based nonprofit partners, finding funding for course-based projects, and avoiding pitfalls along the way. We will discuss projects including interpreting documents such as IRS Form 990, researching and evaluating funding sources for specific projects, and writing grant proposals for a variety of audiences.

Traveling with Students

Speaker 9 Geographies of the American Imagination: Endowments for Experiential Learning

This presentation will discuss a built in endowment at Yale that funds Wilderness in the American Imagination, 1492 – present, a seminar and experiential learning course. The program emphasizes the central importance of the experience of place and space in undergraduate education.

Speaker 10 Engaging with Yourself: First Year Students and Chicago’s Yoga Community

This presentation addresses a new first year experiential learning course titled “Chicago’s Yoga Community,” where students practiced yoga at different Chicago studios as one of many options in DePaul’s university-wide student engagement courses.

Speaker 11 Writing on the Trail: Putting Sustainability into Practice in a Professional University Honors Program

At the University of the Sciences, and urban campus in Philadelphia, honors students are professionalized early and have few opportunities to write about, let alone practice, issues related to civic responsibility. The program plans expand into a "Wild Earth Intensive" experience that will explore concepts of environmentalism, sustainability, and Native American culture.

Speaker 12 Collaborating with the Eastern Band of the Cherokee

This presentation describes the ongoing collaboration with the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Indians (EBCI) to create a summer internship experience with departments across the campus of the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga.

**AW.03 A Technical & Professional Writing Pedagogy Workshop: The Risk & Reward of Teaching Results-Oriented Invention and Heuristic Design Process**

A pedagogy workshop for FYW teachers shifting to technical and professional communication instruction (TPC), graduate students, or faculty being asked to create, administer, or assess TPC courses.

The workshop first offers a comparative overview of composition and TPC instructional contexts, with a key connection in writing about writing approaches in FYW and heuristic problem-solving approaches in TPC. Where both approaches articulate and value the process, in the latter formative testing and goal-analysis with users shifts the heuristic process from being learning-focused towards data-driven interaction design, and opens up space for students to consider complex rhetorical situations and goals. TPC instruction should not solely be genre-focused, but prepare students to research, adapt, and argue for innovative responses to new and different situations.

Short presentations in three areas—interdisciplinary communication, visual rhetoric/information design, and usability—are offered as formative, audience-engaged research and design processes.

Attendees are engaged project critique and design, workshopping for their own institution and locale. Participant assignments (or supplied ones), typical of a given area, will be analyzed and workshopped from a heuristic perspective, recognizing possible complexities and socially situating them, and helping participants invent research tactics for recursive development.

Innovative format: presentations will be prepared in highly visual format, audio recorded and matched to slide decks, and posted online. Attendees will be encouraged to reflect on and share their materials online.

Problem Statement: Which ‘Heuristic’ – ‘Rule of Thumb’ or ‘Complex Iterative Problem Solving?’

Daniel Kahneman’s Thinking Fast and Slow examines what he calls System 1 and System 2 in our brains. S1 is intuitive and automatic, while S2 is the cognitive, hard, and slow thinking. He explains how our brains often substitute previous thought patterns for difficult questions. He describes these as heuristics—rough rules of thumb our minds use to avoid hard work and maintain “cognitive ease.”

The field of TPC has been changing as rapidly as our technological times. Graduates today, and not just those of new majors and concentrations in the field, are expected to develop a wide array of materials from traditional proposals and documentation to infographics, videos, and the websites that share them. With more and more genres and technology to learn, there is continual pressure in tech comm service courses, even where they are innovative in technologies and projects, to offer instruction that uses “rule of thumb” definitions of heuristic—cookbooks, guidelines, or superstructures—for common TPC genres. This is not a new problem in the field—15 years ago Carliner described the issue in parallel terms, though his field view was not fundamentally rhetorical, as is much more common now: “Somehow, the practice of design as improving the appearance of pages and screens has replaced the concept of design as problem-solving, even though published definitions of document design suggest otherwise. Perhaps that’s because the source material is primarily a series of guidelines of dos and don’ts for technical communication products—a cookbook of sorts.”

But heuristic has another, almost opposed sense. Selber and Johnson-Eilola, in Solving Problems in Technical Communication (SPiTC), intended for majors in the field, explain that “[h]euristics, rough frameworks for approaching specific types of situations, help technical communicators solve problems not by providing straightforward answers but by providing tentatively structured procedures for understanding and acting in complex situations.” Indeed this definition of heuristic is not a simple substitution for an easy S1 answer, but a recursive method of problem exploration and response that mirrors our understandings of composition process today. “[T]echnical communication problems are—at their core—ill-structured, complex, and messy, defying easy or pat solutions. Technical communication work, in other words, is rhetorical work.”

Thus is it understandable that the complexity and variety of contexts and technologies inherent in TPC today push pedagogy, and particularly service and introductory pedagogy, towards structured rules and guidelines, but as SPiTC again makes clear, “[t]echnical communicators who provide value to organizations do not simply fill in templates or follow rigid procedures. Instead, they constantly move back and forth between analysis and action, checking their assumptions against reality and adjusting.” Given the challenges of coverage in service courses and the time and expense of rhetorical training, it is understandable that cookbook strategies largely prevail, but we, the Teaching Committee of the ATTW, believe that some projects, even in service environments, should offer rhetorical, heuristic, problem-solving perspective, as an integral course outcome. Whether developing more traditional genres of writing or working in visual and digital realms, the goal is still writing that “works,” and even non-majors will need to understand TPC as an iterative, problem-solving process. But when faced with new and emerging genres of writing, audience expectations, and situations of use and constantly evolving technology, it can be quite difficult for new TPC teachers to feel grounded in these tactical aspects, and even more so in questions of the goals and ends of such work.

This workshop will offer examples of recursive, heuristic projects in three veins of tech comm: interdisciplinary communication, visual rhetoric and information design, and usability. The presenters, experienced scholars in these areas, and will share the capabilities and drawbacks of the technologies and genres involved, and offer recursive development heuristics with research activities or testing for their projects.

Following the presentations, the workshop will break up into small groups for participant exploration and development of assignments local to their schools, disciplines, and other stakeholders. Participants, for example, will have the opportunity to engage presenters and other participants, sharing, collaborating, and developing heuristic strategies appropriate for their situated contexts. Finally the workshop will collect feedback on whether and how the workshop provided useful context and understanding for the participants, helped them develop an assignment idea and means of capturing and assessing the process of problem solving and development.

**AW.04 Writing Democracy: Invisibility and Visibility**

For the past three years, the Writing Democracy CCCC workshops have sponsored sessions designed to engage participants not only in discussions about the current state of democracy but also in activities aimed at fostering democratic activism in their classrooms and communities. The workshops have also featured activists, such as John Carlos and Angela Davis, who draw upon their activist experience to help us develop an agenda for the current moment. The goal of these workshops, then, has been to combine theory and action, past and present, to create a praxis that can extend beyond the confines of a conference to cultivate literacy, writing, history, and other public sphere projects in support of educational, local, and national, and transnational networks devoted to democratic activism.

Writing Democracy (WD) originally emerged as a response to the economic crisis of 2008, exploring how neo-liberal economic policies were ravaging economic equality and educational access here in the U.S. and abroad. In the succeeding years, Writing Democracy focused on the “who” (what it meant to work collectively toward democratic rights) and the “how” (what actions best suit our collective abilities). In 2015, the "what" has become the problems with the “medium” (the channels of communication for organizing) that have become abundantly clear. Recent events have demonstrated the ways in which an emergent surveillance culture has permeated and distorted democratic debate. We work as writing teachers, that is, in a moment of the NSA “eavesdropping” on government leaders and local citizens, of universities repressing activist voices in the classroom and on campus, and of disciplinary identities that fail to respond to these attacks on basic freedoms—speech, press, academic—inherent in government surveillance, mass data collection, and warrantless searches. Our work, then, must combat the mutually reinforcing drives that make our lives visible and vulnerable to the government and chill our democratic discourses on our campuses and in our communities.

There appear, however, to be few models that draw these different political forces into a productive set of reflections and actions in our classrooms and communities. Moreover, while there has been a “social” turn and a “public” turn, it is not clear that these turns sufficiently address the underlying causes for a lack of democratic debate. Community projects might enable an evening session with political leaders, but the neo-liberal political apparatus is rarely confronted. Such moments seem to make power visible, but more often then not they act as an alibi for democracy, masking deeper and more systemic causes. The “social turn,” that is, represents little risk, but great rewards for the field’s “public” stature. As detailed below, this workshop explores the risks of confronting the suppression of democracy on and off campus, risks in the current climate that perhaps offer more punishment than rewards.

Writing Democracy: Invisibility and Visibility is thus designed to create a space where this important conversation and difficult work can begin.

Schedule:

1:30 Opening Remarks:

1:35 Assignment 1: Exploring Democratic Discourses and Struggles in the Classroom

The workshop will begin with the prompt: Write an assignment that asks students to explore the limitations and possibilities of democratic debate at the current moment. Use that assignment to discuss your role as teacher, citizen, activist in democratic struggles on and off-campus. Participants will be asked to form groups, write the assignment, and then discuss the results.

2:00 Making Progressive Action Visible Globally

The panel organizers have reached out to progressive journalists Glen Greenwald, Jeremy Scahill, and Amy Goodman, as well as whistleblower Edward Snowden, all of whom share the long-term goal of regenerating investigative and adversarial journalism. Journalists will discuss the relationship between writing and democracy in an NSA dominated state. Subject to his availability, Snowden (via online video) will also discuss the stakes of being democratic activists in the current moment.

NOTE: In previous years, we have been successful in securing national figures like John Carlos and Angela Davis to participate. We expect confirmation, then, prior to the convention. Given our already confirmed participants (see list of discussion leaders), we are confident a panel on this issue could be created with their insights/participation if the above are unable to participate.

3:00 Break

3:15 Making Progressive Action Visible in Composition and Rhetoric Composition and Rhetoric has failed to develop a model of scholarship, service, and teaching that can successfully confront the neo-liberal political-economic structures and NSA surveillance policies that are fundamentally attacking democratic rights. This panel draws upon the radical collective practices of earlier decades as a possible framework to recast our disciplinary and political activism for the current moment, and also uses personal experiences to detail the costs of such work. Structured as an octalog, each discussant will speak for 3 minutes each, followed by twenty minutes of conversation among the speakers, culminating in an open conversation with all the workshop participants.

NOTE: This octalog will be published in the WD book project, The Political Turn, under development by WD organizers.

4:00 Assignment 2: Interrupting Circulation/Risking Visibility

While the field has turned its attention to digital production, this session will ask participants to consider how “zines,” handmade print publications, offer an alternative form of circulation to sponsor democratic dialogue. Participants will learn how to use one sheet of paper to create an 8-page zine. They will then use this knowledge to create a zine that highlights an issue that needs to be addressed by the conference and our discipline (such as the fact the conference is occurring in the same state where Trayvon Martin was murdered). Copies will be made of these zines, so participants can have them to distribute throughout the conference. A twitter hashtag will also be created to track conference participants’ responses to the zines.

5:00 Closing Remarks

**AW.05 Teaching Indigenous Rhetorics in the First-Year Writing Classroom**

The study of Indigenous rhetorics (alphabetic, visual, digital, performative, oral, and material) are positioned at the meeting grounds between rhetoric and composition and Native American and Indigenous studies. While scholars of Indigenous rhetorics are concerned with complicated questions about the relationships between power, history, knowledge-making, literacy, and language, we also believe that all teachers in rhetoric and composition are uniquely positioned to develop strategies for bringing these concepts into our collective classrooms. However, we recognize the need to serve as translators, of a sort, for those pedagogical practices-- to help teachers and scholars in the discipline develop strategies to appropriately address Indigenous knowledge-making practices that don’t repeat old stereotypes, treat Indigenous peoples as interesting relics, or ignore the political dimensions of their rhetorical practices, past and present. An Indigenous rhetorics approach to teaching rhetoric and composition, then, creates an opportunity to examine how all rhetorical practices are constellated under the triad of body, space, and culture -- an important consideration when addressing the increasingly diverse student populations in our classrooms.

Workshop Focus:

This workshop, sponsored by the Caucus for American Indian Scholars and Scholarship, is designed to show how to incorporate Indigenous texts and rhetorical practices into first-year composition classrooms in a range of institutional settings.

The goals of the workshop are: 1) for participants to develop a deeper understanding of the possible roles that Indigenous rhetorics can play in their first-year writing classrooms; 2) to provide current intellectual contexts and practices in which to anchor those pedagogical practices; 3) to learn from the pedagogical knowledge being made by first-year writing faculty at tribal colleges; and 4) to provide teachers with models that they may adapt for their own classroom use.

We’ll accomplish these goals in three ways: 1) by providing intellectual contexts to anchor activities for the workshop; 2) by providing hands-on opportunities to develop strategies for incorporating Indigenous texts, makings, and practices into many different first-year writing contexts, and 3) by modelling the pedagogical strategies and practices that are the focus of this workshop. This learning-based workshop, then, focuses on the needs of our participants by fostering collaboration with experienced teachers of Indigenous rhetorics to plan assignments and course activities tailored to participants’ local context. In addition, we’ll supply a wide array of starter resources for instructors, such as syllabi, assignments, and curricular designs.

Activities/Sequence:

This half-day workshop begins the way that scholarship in Indigenous rhetorics often begins: with the history of the peoples on whose lands we’re located, the Indigenous peoples of Florida. This context is necessary in order to understand the work of Indigenous rhetorics as engaged with the histories, cultures, and political realities shaping Indigenous spaces. Following this context-setting, facilitators will give 15 minute presentations in which they will 1) explain the types of first-year writing classrooms in which they teach; 2) situate sample assignments or activities within the first-year classroom; and 3) discuss strategies to incorporate Indigenous rhetorics within local curricular, institutional, and community contexts. The purpose is to demonstrate the variety of first-year writing classrooms where Indigenous rhetorics can be incorporated and to provide a basis for conversation in breakout sessions.

For the remainder of the workshop, participants will rotate around four breakout sessions where they will be able to talk with facilitators in greater depth about the types of assignments and activities appropriate for first-year writing, and what to consider while incorporating Indigenous rhetorics into their classrooms. These breakout sessions will cover the following topics:

-Traditional knowledge/community engagement

-Research and research methods

-First-year writing in tribal colleges

-Digital, visual, and material literacies

At each table, a group of facilitators will offer strategies to participants for how to successfully incorporate Indigenous rhetorical practices, epistemologies, texts, and makings within their classrooms. Questions and discussion at the tables will be driven by the participants’ needs and particular institutional situations. While facilitators will offer sample materials (syllabi, assignments, curricula, etc.) and practices from their teaching, every effort will be made to help participants imagine how to adapt those samples for their own use. Participants will spend 25 minutes at each table in a group small enough to attend to their own needs, then rotate through the other tables.

Participants will leave the workshop with sample syllabi, assignments, resources for further study, and a network of experienced teachers as human resources.

**AW.06 The Job Market and Higher Education: Negotiations and Navigations of the New Doctoral Student**

This workshop addresses the current climate of higher education, the growing crisis of the corporatization of the university, and the risks and rewards new doctoral students face in the market in terms of employment and job security. In his article, “We Need to Acknowledge the Realities of Employment in Higher Education,” Stephen Corn argues that humanities faculty members and administrators have failed to adequately respond to the cluster of threats posed to full-time faculty employment. With adjunct positions increasing in universities and an ever-growing, competitive market of newly-minted PhD students, problems of full-time employment are terrifying. These unspoken or, perhaps, articulated realities lurk in the minds of those taking on the profession - at times adding to the ever present doubt that casts quite the daunting shadow. However, all is not lost. And though clearly cognizant of the risks involved in this field, this workshop chooses to focus on optimism and positive productivity; after all, we risk job security and stability for intimate, individual reasons, seeing the perils of the career with eyes wide open; however, remembering that far more is at stake than simply security.

With this in mind, this workshop consists of doctoral students, in various stages of completion - some just entering doctoral work, while others taking on their first tenure track appointment - who have chosen to pursue a degree in English and Compositions studies because of a love of teaching, of working with and for students, and because we realize the importance (and relevance) of writing and reading. We come from an English doctoral program that is up-front about the very real issue of future employment - a program where our advisors encourage us to “wear multiple hats” to position ourselves as teachers, innovators, and implementers, rather than as strictly researchers. While addressing job market concerns, we will also discuss ways graduate students can better position themselves for employment, examining four specific points:

Implementing “better” uses of technology in areas of teaching, publishing, networking, and researching.

Creating pedagogies that embrace the ever-increasing diversity of students, and that recognize the multiple literacies and discourses present in the classroom.

Networking and discussing the importance of conference attendance and participation for future employment opportunities.

Discussing how doctoral students can successfully juggle the roles of both student and beginning professional. Some key discussion points might be: what are the best ways to balance student teaching, academic/dissertation writing, and conference presenting and networking? How can we best avoid burnout?

We hope to introduce new ideas and tactics so that workshop participants may successfully position themselves on the market and to encourage a larger, more productive conversation regarding what we can do, as a community, to address the numerous issues facing the doctoral student when preparing for the job market.

**AW.08 Are Texts That Display Differently Different Texts? The Role of the Device—Cell, Kindle, Tablet, Laptop, Paper—in the Making of Meaning**

It’s commonplace for students in writing programs of all kinds (first-year composition, undergraduate majors, and graduate programs) to conduct research. Often—given writing programs’ increasing reliance on students’ bringing their own devices to class, a situation characterized as BYOD—students conduct their research—that is, read—on a dizzying array of digital devices. Some students research on desktops or laptops of multiple kinds, others on Kindles, others on iPads, and others on smart phones. Some students conduct the bulk of their research on one of these devices; others use multiple devices simultaneously and/or sequentially to complete their writing tasks. Interestingly, and because of responsive web design, mobile apps, and ebook reading platforms, the way that a single text is displayed on these various surfaces varies, which speaks directly to the relationship of form and content relative to device and display. If form and content are unrelated, such difference in “display” may not be a problem. If they are related, it is a problem, but even then, is it a problem that teachers of writing need to consider or address?

In part, our sense of how much and what kind of a problem differential textual display is depends on scale. When the differences between textual displays are small, for instance, it may not be a problem. But what defines small: a differently-sized margin, a scaled image, a moved column? And what about display differences—like a significant restructuring of the text—that are not small? What difference does \*this\* difference make, and what if any accommodation—in assignments, in reading pedagogy, in instructions for annotating texts—should teachers make for these differences?

Our assumption is that texts that display differently are different texts; form, content, display, and device work together to create one version of a text. Thus, when these devices come in different configurations, they create a different version of the "same" text. One theory that underpins our assumption is Gerard Genette’s concept of paratext, a concept speaking to the various materials that help to bring a text into existence: layouts, prefatory materials, page numbers, and indexes. In this view of text, the transaction of meaning between writer and reader begins with paratext. Similarly, digital paratexts are those materials that bring a digital text into existence: snippets of code creating multiple, device-specific layouts; file formats like stable PDFs and fluid HTML; and platforms like Amazon’s Kindle app that define and narrow ways of interacting with texts. How do these different kinds of digital paratexts frame textual reception? How do these paratexts frame a reader’s understanding? If a book-length text is formatted to display on a smart phone screen, does it invite the same kind of reading as the “same” text displayed on a dedicated e-reader? A laptop? Does the ability to manipulate the text through touch make a difference in the meaning we make of a given text, and if so, how much, and how much does it matter?

To explore such issues, our workshop will begin by briefly displaying the “same” text—the New York Times “Snowfall”—on various devices, in the process raising the kinds of issues participants will explore. Participants will then engage in a “round-robin reading” of the same three texts: one text in print, a second text displayed on a smart phone, and a third text displayed on another device (e.g., a laptop, an iPad) for each of a set of three readings. More specifically, participants will (a) read text 1 provided in print, annotate and synthesize it, making notes on the design features and affordances they found helpful and disruptive; (b) repeat the process with text 2 on a first device, with half of the participants reading on a smart phone and half on a different device; and (c) repeat the process with text 3, with, again, half reading on a smart phone and half on another device. Between each reading, the group will convene to discuss their reading practices relative to the medium and/or device hosting the reading. We will conclude the workshop by thinking about these issues from four perspectives: a university press editor and publisher; a teacher-scholar interested in rhetorical multimodal reading; a teacher-scholar interested in multimodal composition; and a graduate faculty member involved in curricular design.

Our intent in asking a group to work with multiple displays of a common text is to prompt a more nuanced understanding of the relationship of form, content, device, and display as it is developing in our current multi-device landscape. For scholars, the value of such an understanding may include a more fluid appreciation of digital access and a layered sensibility of textual circulation. For teachers, this workshop will provide the experience that students have when they read on multiple devices and thus allow us to think together about what such divergent reading practices mean and what, if anything, we should do about it—in assigning texts, in asking for summaries of readings, in helping students read across platforms. And for our students-as-writers, considering issues like format, content, device, and display as an interdependent set of issues related to audience may provide a way to teach them a kind of design thinking that increasingly is incorporated into composition curricula--in FYC, within the major in Rhetoric and Composition, and in graduate programs.

**AW.09 Writing Studio Tools and Strategies Across Contexts: Exploring Possibilities at Your Institutions**

Writing Studio is an alternative method for teaching, supporting, and studying writers in higher education. Traditionally, Writing Studio was associated with developmental writers, such as the program developed in 1992 by Nancy Thompson and Rhonda Grego at the University of South Carolina. Since then, however, it has been expanded to multiple contexts: an online model supporting a hybrid course, as a stand-alone course, as support for struggling community college writers, and as a fellows program staffed by undergraduates, among many others that were shared at the 2014 CCCC.

In this workshop, composition program directors, writing center coordinators, classroom instructors, and others who are interested in exploring Studio approaches to student-sponsored learning are invited to work on designing a Studio program specifically suited to needs at their own institution. More importantly, participants will meet these goals through engaging in Studio practices.

We will ask all participants to prepare a one-page overview in which they talk about why they are interested in Studio possibilities at their home institutions or about problems they might be having with their initial attempts. Participants will summarize these “one-pagers” at the start of the workshop, mirroring a common practice in many Studio staff meetings. Next, workshop facilitators (who are experienced with a variety of Studio program designs) will provide insight into specific tools and strategies they have used to forge Studio programs—as well as issues that commonly arise—in order to help workshop participants further develop ideas and questions about possibilities and resources. These presentations are groups into two general categories: “Studio Locations” and “Studio Implementation.” Presenters will provide materials which will be available on a website that will remain active after the workshop, as well as through print copies. Then, facilitators (both presenters and others) and participants will make use of interactional inquiry approaches in focused small-group roundtables to further shape ideas and hone in one of the categories listed above. The workshop will end with ideas and questions brought back to the whole group.

Timeline

20 minutes—Introductions guided by one-pagers participants prepared. Facilitators will gather one-pagers after they’re presented.

60 minutes—Snapshots by presenters who will briefly (approximately 5 minutes per topic) discuss one aspect of Studio work (see below for current topics). At the same time, facilitators will group participants by interest as indicated in their writing.

• Studio Locations

o Studio and General Education

o Politics of the Studio model

o ALP and Studio

o Studio and online spaces

• Studio Implementation

o Placement

o Working with diverse student populations

o Framing and Naming Studio curriculum

o Studio staff meetings

10 minutes—Break

45 minutes—Participants gather in facilitated groups and use Studio pedagogy to talk through specific issues.

45 minutes—Participants will be given the opportunity to change groups and discuss a second issue.

30 minutes—Groups report back via a bulleted list to be presented by the facilitators at each table. This list will be added to the website for later review and development.

**AW.10 The LILAC Project: Studying Student Research for Improved Information Literacy Pedagogies**

Project Information Literacy’s 2013 research study reports that 87% of the 983 college sophomores continue to cite Google as their preferred research reference while 83% report also using academic databases. The Learning Information Literacy Across the Curriculum (LILAC) Project, partially funded by a CCCC Research Initiative Grant, delves deeper into the why of such student choices. The LILAC Project uses a questionnaire that identifies what students think they know and do when researching and a Research Aloud Protocol (RAP) that captures the screen and voice narration of a 15-minute research session to determine what students actually do when researching. Initial findings emphasize a strong need to develop better information literacy pedagogies for both undergraduate and graduate students; however, more student participants are necessary to begin understanding the larger changes to information literacy pedagogy. We are inviting other institutions to join the LILAC Project and contribute to this important body of knowledge. Hence, we propose a half-day workshop to introduce potential research partners to our methodology and findings thus far, and to provide more detailed information on how working with the LILAC Project benefits not only the larger project, but also the individual university.

This half-day Wednesday afternoon workshop addresses the following questions:

How can studying student research patterns using a RAP process contribute to information literacy pedagogy?

What risks do students take when beginning course-related research? What risks are they unwilling to take?

What risks and rewards accompany studying student research habits?

What risks and rewards accompany partnering with the LILAC Project?

This half day pre-conference workshop is divided into multiple sessions that provide an introduction to the methodology and research of the LILAC Project, demonstration of the RAP process, hands on experience with coding the research, and information about joining the LILAC Project.

Presenters need the following equipment for a successful workshop:

One podium, microphone, and LCD projector

Tables for participants, preferably tables that seat approximately 4 participants each.

Workshop agenda follows:

9:00 - 9:20 Opening Remarks

Introduction, background, goals, and research questions for the LILAC Project

9:20 - 9:35 RAP Session Demonstration

Presenters will demonstrate the RAP sessions used in the the LILAC Project

9:35 - 10:35 Video coding session

Participants are introduced to The LILAC Project’s coding methods and have the opportunity to code and discuss sample RAP sessions.

10:35 - 11:00 LILAC at your university

Presenters discuss applying for IRB approval, recruiting participants, and collecting data for the project. Benefits to LILAC Project researchers and participating universities will be discussed. Presenters will receive information on accessing necessary materials for the study.

11:00 - 12:00 Discussion and closing remarks

Presenters will discuss next steps for The LILAC Project, discuss next steps for interested institutions and researchers, and answer questions participants have about the project itself or their university’s participation.

**AW.11 The Job, not Just the Job Market: Preparing for Professional Life in Composition & Rhetoric**

Many if not most people pursuing degrees in composition and rhetoric enter graduate school interested in teaching college-level writing. We spend the next several years honing our teaching skills, gaining administrative experience, and building a research profile. Along the way, we begin to imagine a professional life outside of graduate school--one modeled, perhaps, on the careers of our advisors, on our undergraduate experience, or on our sense of where our skills might be used best. Still, the reality of that first academic job can feel nebulous. How do we prepare to be both marketable candidates and able professionals for the kind(s) of jobs we think we want?

This half-day afternoon workshop intended for intermediate and advanced graduate students aims to tackle that perennial question with practical advice, networking opportunities, and shared reflection on the profession. Led by recent Ph.Ds working in a wide variety of tenure-line positions, the workshop will address ways to frame research for professional development, pursue teaching experiences relevant to different kinds of positions, and navigate the balance of administration, teaching, and research both in and beyond graduate school.

Leaders and workshop participants will discuss a range of professional development activities (e.g. administrative work, mentoring programs, opportunities to teach/consult across the curriculum, pursuit of external grant funding, and university-level service and leadership). Such activities, which go beyond the old standbys of research excellence and exemplary classroom writing instruction, are not always built into graduate programming but can be integral to preparing for professional life after graduate school. Participants will have structured opportunities to share their experiences and goals, strategize for the future, and engage in conversation and networking. Based on participants' interests, leaders will share their experiences leading up to the job market and in their jobs, illustrating a broad approach to graduate professional development and talking about how the varied research, teaching, administration, service, and community work they did as students led to their faculty jobs. They will also share insights from having served on search committees at their current home institutions, often soon after having been on the market themselves.

Overall, this workshop aims to engage graduate students in shaping a professional narrative and preparing for the variety of academic jobs available. As a group, we will discuss the reciprocal relationship between graduate school activities and professional goals and will model the experiences and orientations that constitute our identities on the job market and beyond.

Specific Topics

- Strategies for positioning the dissertation before, during, & after the job market,

- Planning for research, teaching, & administrative responsibilities as a new assistant professor,

- Balancing the benefits/hazards of tailoring graduate education to a certain type of job, and

- Approaching the job market itself as a professional development opportunity.

Format:

After a brief introduction, the workshop will run as four concurrent "tables" (described below). Participants will rotate among the tables every 45 minutes as they choose, attending a maximum of three out of the four possible sessions. After devoting the first 5-10 minutes of each table session to learning participants' experiences and interests, leaders will then guide discussions around those interests and relevant subtopics. The last half hour of the workshop will be devoted to networking and planning for ongoing professional connections.

Introduction (1:30-2:pm)

Leaders introduce themselves, share brief descriptions of their current positions, and present the workshop format.

Tables (2:-4:30)

Table 1: Your Dissertation and Your Job: Graduate School Writing & Professional Life

This table focuses on strategies for crafting the dissertation and other graduate school writing to serve longer-term professional goals. Moving beyond the assumption that the dissertation is always and only the first draft of a monograph, the leaders for this table will encourage discussion about how dissertation research actually relates to teaching and the different lives the major project can assume after graduation. Depending on participant interests, this table might split into smaller conversations addressing topics such as pedagogical application, becoming a teacher-scholar, and pursuing publication options.

Table 2: Kinds of Work: Preparing for Administration, Research, & Teaching

This table will feature a discussion about balancing research, teaching, and service commitments in first jobs that include a WPA component. Leaders will describe their individual experiences directing writing centers and writing programs and offer strategies to both prepare for and thrive in first jobs like these. Participants will be encouraged to make connections to their own experiences with administrative and related work, though previous experience is not essential for participation in this table. Depending on the interests of the group, breakout conversations may focus on running programs, jumping into new preps, and maintaining an active research agenda.

Table 3: Having a Job in Mind: Strategies for Ending up in a Right Place

This table will tackle the benefits and perils of having (or not having) a specific kind of job in mind while in grad school. Table discussion will address ways to craft a professional profile that might appeal to a particular kind of institution without becoming overly narrow. Leaders will also discuss how the process of preparing job materials like the cover letter and C.V. can serve as recursive opportunities to craft professional narratives and plan trajectories. Depending on table participation, breakout groups may allow participants to discuss preparing for specific sorts of institutions.

Table 4: The Job Market from the Other Side

This table features leaders who served on search committees soon after beginning their own tenure-line positions. Leaders will share general impressions of the process from the ‘other side’ and facilitate a conversation meant to demystify the process and offer concrete skills for applications, interviews, and negotiations. Table conversation will draw attention to how the job market itself can serve as a professional development experience by exposing applicants to different aspects of the profession and raising awareness of the field’s internal variety.

Wrap-up (4:30-5:pm)

Time to make sure that the connections made during the workshop remain active beyond it, building concrete opportunities for mentorship, advice, and companionship in preparing for the market and for jobs.

**AW.12 Narrative Truth: The Risks and Rewards of Prison Research, Writing, and Teaching**

Who do we see when we think of prison writers? To what extent are their lives and histories erased —or distorted—by popular representations in the media, in tough on crime rhetorics? For the 2015 workshop session, we will focus on the work of narrative as a force and a method for understanding the depth and complexities of prison writing, research, and teaching. This workshop begins by asking whose story is being left out of discussions of prison writing and higher education. Then, what are the risks and rewards of bringing such stories forward? For example, women represent one of the fastest-growing segments of the prison population, and their stories are often left out of both public and academic discussions.

For those of us who research and teach in prison and who create community publications with incarcerated writers, the question quickly becomes whose story needs to be heard? And more importantly, how will these stories be heard?

We use the theme “narrative truth” as a central focus of this workshop because it addresses the vulnerably that comes as stories circulate across multiple locations. Given our success in 2014, we again aim to broadcast this work, this time with a focus on the narratives of incarcerated women. Our workshop will begin with a keynote presentation from Tobi Jacobi, Associate Professor at Colorado State University and co-editor with Ann Folwell Stanford of the 2014 edited collection Women, Writing & Prison: Activists, Scholars, and Writers Speak Out. Jacobi will suggest how writing and publishing life stories from prison might enable incarcerated women to actively contribute to social justice movements through literacy activism. Her talk will be followed with a podcast activity with participants reading and responding to the work of currently incarcerated writers to be featured on the Prison Writing Networks web site.

The workshop will address questions of the risks and rewards of “narrative truth” by examining three main areas 1) the risks and rewards of narrative truth in prison research, teaching, and writing; 2) the reading and misreading of women’s lives 3) the work of narrative in the making and sustaining of prison literacy programs.

The day will provide ample opportunity for participants to network with others and address issues related to their own programs or agendas. It will consist of six main components:

1. The workshop includes an opening keynote by Tobi Jacobi, co-author of Women, Writing, and Prison: Activists, Scholars and Writers Speak Out.

2. An interactive session in which participants will respond to the work of incarcerated women which will be recorded in both print and oral formats as a way of creating a dialogue between this group of teacher/researcher/scholars and this often invisible group of writers. This activity will create space for both discussing and addressing questions about whose voices get heard and how we respond to those voices.

3. In order to build on our theme of “narrative” and creating dialogue, the workshop will also feature an interview and question and answer session with Wendy Wolters Hinshaw, Florida Atlantic University and Kathie Klarreich, creative writing teacher, journalist, and director of an emerging organization that aims to connect voices from inside and outside traditional educational settings. Hinshaw and Klarreich will be joined by guests who have participated in their respective programs.

4. Roundtable sessions in which facilitators will explore critical issues in prison research, writing, and teaching. To allow ample time for discussion, roundtable/discussion leaders will provide materials that elaborate on key issues. Roundtable leaders will also report highlights from the discussion to the entire group.

5. A closing address from Ashley Lucas of the Prison Creative Arts Program and Phil Christman, editor of the Michigan Review of Prisoner Creative Writing.

6. A final concluding session in which participants can synthesize the ideas of the day and make plans for ongoing research and collaboration.

Schedule

1:30 – 1:45 p.m. Welcome and Introductions

1:45-2:15 p.m. Opening Keynote Address

Speaker 1

“I am Not My History: The Twists and Turns of Narrative Truth in Jail”

2:15- 3:15 p.m. Responses to Writing/Podcast

3:15-3:25 Break

3:25-4 p.m. Speakers 2 & 3

Interview and Q&A on Community Outreach Efforts

4-4:30 Roundtable sessions

Roundtable One: Reflecting on Faculty and Facilitators' Narrative Truth

Speakers 3 and 4: "Risks and Rewards of Teaching Inside: Reflecting on Faculty and Facilitators’ Narrative Truth"

Roundtable Two: Prison Writing and the Digital Humanities

Speakers 4 and 5: “Prison Writing Networks: What Can the Digital Humanities Offer?”

Roundtable Three: Prison Literacy Research: Ethics, Agendas, and Questions

Speaker 6: “Into the Archives: Narratives From the New York Training School for Girls”

Speaker 7: “The Faces of Miss-demeanor: Institutional Representations of Female Deviance”

Speaker 8: “Twice Censored: Navigating the Overlapping Bureaus of Prison and University”

Roundtable Four: "Establishing Programs/Community Partnerships

Speaker 9: Women's Ways of Writing: Developing Family Writing Courses in a Women's Prison"

Speaker 10: “Giving Voice to Ohio's Incarcerated Writers and Artists"

Speaker 11: “Narrative Failure in a Prison Writing Exchange: ‘Getting Real’ and Learning to Evolve”

4:30-4:50 p.m.

Closing Session

Speakers 12 and 13: "Who is This For: Negotiating Ethics, Politics, and Aesthetics in a Journal of Prisoner Writing"

4:50-5 p.m. Concluding Session

**AW.13 Ethical Issues for Beginning Researchers**

Participants will engage in viewing clips of visual arguments related to the ethics of food production, analyze arguments made by research both written and visual, then engage in directed short readings, discussion, and ultimately develop opinions for potential research. Specifically, presenters will guide the audience through an interactive process of presenting rhetorical arguments and college research topics to students. The final aspect of research project turns the student’s thesis into his or her own visual argument in the form of a public service announcement. The session is contingent on participation of the audience to develop ideas that lead to areas of research and discussion.

Ethical Ambiguity: Presenter One will discuss the place the study of ethics has in our society where shades of grey and ambiguity prevent the development of concrete ideas. Participants will view a clip of “Food Inc.” which provides strong examples of ethos, pathos and logos. Participants will identify these aspects of argumentation and discuss in small groups the merits of the film/clip.

Research and Reading: Presenter Two will guide participants through a close reading then debate about two scholarly or non-scholarly articles presented on similar topics. Discussion then turns to the merits of different types of research.

Technology and Arguments: Participant Three will go over the technological requirement of this research project: The public service announcement. For this section the internet is needed to show examples of a visual argument.

Ultimately, participants will be guided through a unit about a contemporary ethical issue, how to approach difficult subject matter, and finally expanding a thesis or argument into a visual in the form of a public service announcement. Participants will be divided into groups.

**AW.14 Making the Most Powerful Point: How to Get the Most out of Slideware in the Classroom**

Presentation software (also known as Slideware, with PowerPoint, Keynote, and Prezi being the most dominant examples) is by far the most common example of technology in the classroom, as well as the technology where the main communication medium—the slide itself—is most often created by the teacher. Despite this fact, however, many teachers often feel anxious when using slideware. This anxiety can come in several forms: uncertainty about the slides themselves, and what choices might invite the desired impact, but also uncertainty about how to make the software do what you want it to do, and what its capable even of doing at all.

This workshop will attempt ease some of those anxieties. It will begin with a quick literature survey of slideware in the classroom, and current thoughts about its impact, followed by exercises, discussions, and activities designed to guide teachers through the process of slide design: how to imagine, build, and incorporate effective slides. Time will be split between discussing the strategy behind making an effective slide (design, animation, language, images, and so forth) and working with the actual software to achieve the desired effect. Attendees should come to the workshop with a lesson plan (ideally lecture based) that does not currently incorporate slideware. Attendees should also plan to bring laptops equipped with a slideware program.

By the end of the workshop, teachers will have thoughtfully considered and designed ways to incorporate slideware technology into their classrooms, both on the level of individual slides and how to incorporate a series of slides into a larger lesson plan.