This collection centers writing program administration (WPA) discourse as intersectional race work. Editors Perryman-Clark and Craig have made a space for WPAs of color to cultivate antiracist responses within an Afrocentric framework, to enact socially responsible approaches to program building, and to develop concrete, specific models for taking action to confront and resist racist microaggressions. This framework also positions WPAs of color to build relationships with allies and create contexts for students and faculty to imagine rhetorics that speak truth to oppressive and divisive ideologies within and beyond the academy, but especially within writing programs. Contributors provide examples of how WPA scholars can push back against the ways in which larger, cultural rhetorical projects inform our institutional practices, are coded into administrative agendas, and are reflected in programmatic objectives and interpersonal relations. As a whole, this collection works to shift the focus from race more broadly toward perspectives on blackness in writing program administration.
From the Editor

Greetings, colleagues. I am delighted to present you this rich collection of scholarship comprising the June issue of *College Composition and Communication*. As editor over the last few years, I have periodically attempted to collect essays into different thematic clusters, but sometimes the capaciousness of our field—in terms of methods, objects of study, and even genres of presentation—exceeds any easy grouping. Such is the case in this issue. But precisely because of that capaciousness, I think you’ll find this issue intellectually and even affectively exciting given the range of topics and scholarly forms.

We start with Courtney Rivard’s “Turning Archives into Data: Archival Rhetorics and Digital Literacy in the Composition Classroom,” in which Rivard shows how collaboration and feminist historiography can combine to teach students how to convert archival research into rich data for interpretation, analysis, and action. Focusing in particular on marginalized communities, Rivard’s pedagogical approach prompts students to mobilize data and digital literacy skills to intervene actively in understanding, perhaps even transforming, their worlds. In a related attempt to theorize connecting across diverse modes of inquiry and meaning making, Xiqiao Wang, in “Tracing Connections and Disconnects: Reading, Writing, and...”
Digital Literacies across Contexts,” offers an in-depth study of a multi-lingual, transnational student’s literacy practices in a variety of contexts, both academic and personal. Wang’s particular contribution lies in a focus on “disconnection,” or the moments when literacies fail to meet particular needs, a failure requiring the need for further reflection, refinement, and even creativity and improvisation.

Resonating with Wang’s interest in disconnection, Bruce Ballenger and Kelly Myers attend to “dissonances” when examining them in “The Emotional Work of Revision.” Thinking critically—and movingly—about the fears that students face when revising, Ballenger and Myers trace how such fear can become generative with the right guidance from instructors. Writing, after all, is not just a cognitive labor; it is also emotional work, and becoming aware of the emotional labor of writing is as much a part of composing as any other more rational dimension of the work we—and our students—undertake. Working with the notion of the whole person, Aneil Rallin’s beautifully rendered piece, “’Can I Get a Witness?: Writing with June Jordan,” will place the work of this queer immigrant scholar/teacher/activist of color at the center of composition studies. For Rallin, Jordan represents a pivotal figure who can challenge us to think about our work and how it helps—or fails to help—students cultivate a sense of “home,” particularly in these “uneasy” times. Rallin models conscious, ethical engagement through his writing alongside Jordan’s work, demonstrating how we might collaborate with others in thinking and feeling toward home.

Rounding out the issue, Claire Lauer and Eva Brumberger offer us some compelling thoughts on “Redefining Writing for the Responsive Workplace.” Based on their substantial research into workplace writing, Lauer and Brumberger challenge our assumptions about the kinds of writers we are training students to be, noting instead how many written tasks in some workplaces revolve more around revision and redesign into different forms for different audiences and media. And finally, in a review essay, “Crip Disruptions: Agency, Anti-Compliance, and Autistext,” Tara Wood underscores the significant move by several scholars in our field to challenge and expand not only our understanding of “disability” but also the ways in which we continue to construct and normalize notions of ableism. For Wood, and the authors whose work she reviews, such expanded understanding will show us “how perspectives from a disability standpoint can challenge oppressive and ableist forces, how they can create new mean-
ing, allowing us new ways to think about and understand agency, activism, intention, and resistance.”

In a way, as I’ve composed this overview for you, I’ve recognized the significant ways in which all of these scholars and writers are challenging not only the assumptions we make about what’s important or primary in the work we do, but also how each of these authors emphasizes the value of attending to ever more capacious dimensions of writing—particularly the moments when writing connects us to different ways of thinking and being, becomes collaborative, bridges us to the work and lives of others. As such, the pedagogies, research, and critical projects represented by the articles in this issue—as diverse as they are, and because of their diversity—give me hope for how our teaching, research, and collaborations with our students might help us collectively create more just, equitable, and sustainable worlds. I wish you all a safe and restful summer.

Jonathan Alexander
University of California, Irvine