

**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.