**Workshops for 2012 CCCC**

**Half-Day Wednesday Morning:**

**MW.1 Building Arguments for Best Practices in Staffing and Working Conditions**

Writing teachers have traditionally been interested in rhetoric, in particular the study of argumentation, and that interest has carried over into studies of diverse genres and rhetorical situations across society. Recent economic shifts and trends in public policy related to higher education have foregrounded the importance of literacy educators arguing persuasively for the value of their work. As it has been reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and many other news outlets, many state budgets for higher education are in peril, and disciplines heavily reliant on tax dollars and tuition fees, including composition studies, are particularly vulnerable to program cuts, consolidation, and elimination. Even the first-year composition course, a stalwart in the undergraduate curriculum for decades and one often viewed as safe from most cuts, has been under attack of late.

In the environment of data-driven decision making common to higher education and public policy, the key feature in forming strong arguments is the use of evidence, specifically empirical evidence. Typically, this type of data is derived from local sources such as campuses or programs. In recent years, however, organizations such as CCCC have tried to augment these local sources with national cross-institutional data. For example, the 2009 Report on the Survey of CCCC Members produced by Anne Ruggles Gere and the Squire Office of Policy Research provides survey data on staffing models as well as teaching conditions for first-year composition. Despite the usefulness of this data, there is a need for stronger arguments in order to secure the funding necessary for running a composition program as disciplinarily established best practices would dictate. This workshop will offer data for and practice in making empirical arguments that administrators find persuasive.

During this workshop, the workshop leaders and winners of a past CCCC Research Initiative Grant will help writing advocates conceive of arguments that appeal to decision makers on their home campuses and in their state systems. The workshop is geared toward leaders of composition programs, writing center directors, department chairs, graduate coordinators, and WPAs. Essentially anyone in a position to make arguments regarding the conditions under which teachers of writing labor, should benefit from this workshop. Participants will leave the workshop with data-supported arguments with which they may return to their campuses and use.

First, workshop attendees will be asked to free-write about their concerns regarding the conditions for teaching writing on their respective campuses. Second, workshop leaders will offer sample documents in several genres such as proposals, evaluations summaries, and annual reports that illustrate some of the moves made in data-supported arguments. Each table will then analyze the samples to derive relevant argument heuristics. Based on this group work, each workshop participant will be asked to generate a list of arguments about the condition for teaching writing at his or her home institution.

After a short break, the workshop will reconvene and participants will share their concerns about administrating writing programs in order to identify common issues by shared exigence, audience, or constraints. As questions in common arise around labor issues, participants will be grouped by related questions. In these groups, participants will work together with the assistance of the workshop leaders to generate arguments using the data provided by the workshop leaders and the corresponding heuristics developed earlier in the workshop. Participants will be asked to share their arguments with the whole workshop.

After the statistic-supported argument generation and sharing, the workshop leaders will introduce discussion regarding some of the special rhetorical concerns of using empirical arguments in the higher education policy setting. Before closing the workshop, the participants will be asked to give their feedback on the role data-driven decision making plays for those working in the field and for their future in the academy.

***Chair:*** Randall McClure, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro

**MW.2 Assessing Transfer: Using Reflection to Evaluate Transfer at Critical Transitions**

Transfer of learning, or the ability to apply knowledge learned in one course or context in diverse contexts, has become an area of growing interest in Writing Studies. As writing programs revise their goals to include transfer, the problem of how to assess transfer becomes critical. This is particularly important given the difficulty of measuring transfer, as described by Smit (2004), among others. Some scholars have suggested that assessments of transfer should focus on learners’ interpretive knowledge, or schemas for making sense of a task, and should include opportunities for learning (Schwartz, Bransford, and Sears, 2005). These scholars imply a transactional theory of transfer that, like transactional theories of rhetoric, emphasizes how writers construct knowledge, here knowledge about writing. Because students use general education writing courses to transition into their subsequent writing courses, it is crucial to develop assessments that work from a transactional theory, which raises questions about how students interpret writing tasks in subsequent courses. This half-day workshop introduces student reflection as an approach to assessing transfer from a transactional perspective that involves students in opportunities for learning.

It leads participants in developing plans for assessing transfer at critical transitions in their writing programs. In the first hour, speakers will introduce methods for investigating transfer. Afterward, speakers will help participants use these methods to develop plans for assessing transfer at such critical transitions in their own writing programs. First, speakers # 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 14 will overview research on transfer and scholarship on assessment in composition, emphasizing reflection and attention to local context. Next, all speakers will introduce methods for assessing how and how extensively transfer occurs at critical transitions and will discuss the challenge of measuring transfer. They will do so through short case studies of research-based approaches to assessing transfer at three institutions. The case studies will illustrate methods used to evaluate transfer and the use of findings to revise curricula, teacher training, and long-term assessment approaches.

Case study #1 briefly explores the transfer from the FYC classroom to other academic writing situations, focusing on two issues: first, the role of content in transfer, and second, reflection as a primary vehicle fostering appropriate transfer. Scholars studying transfer have drawn from writing development and writing-across-the-curriculum research, as well as research findings of their own, to make persuasive claims that course design that attempts to teach academic writing that will transfer to disciplinary contexts is implausible. Others are more optimistic. While “teaching students how to write” may not be what FYC accomplishes, research indicates the potential of FYC for “teaching students how to learn to write” (Bergmann and Zepernick, their emphasis). This case study presents a teaching-for-transfer model: writing content informed by writing theory based on a reflective framework that guides students to develop a theory of writing. The success students enjoy within this pedagogical construct allows for an assessment of self-efficacy, which develops through a two-pronged approach: (1) teaching with a direct focus on theoretical writing content and (2) teaching that engages students in reflective activities. Two research studies using this model have demonstrated that when students learn theoretical writing concepts and participate in reflective activity they develop knowledge and practice that leads to the successful transfer between contexts.

Case study #2 presents a large-scale assessment that seeks to measure transfer in a large FYC program with little unified content and implied, rather than explicit, university general education goals concerning transfer. In meeting these challenges, the FYC assessment focused on student written reflections (including metacognitive and transfer-based questions) and student research writing. A random sample of student work and course materials from the entire FYC program for a period of one year was collected and assessed (n=142; one set of documents per section). This assessment work was complemented with beginning and end of the semester surveys of twenty-five classrooms (n=500), structured interviews of students in FYC (n=18), and interviews with faculty in the program (n=7). The case study will include descriptions of the assessment process, findings, and changes made to the program based on the assessment. It will conclude with suggestions for assessing transfer using student reflection and other lessons learned from this process. Samples of all assessment materials and reflective prompts will be provided.

Case study #3 will describe an assessment of transfer at the transition between an Intermediate Writing course and Writing Intensive courses students take subsequently in their majors. This assessment focuses on investigating the extent to which students transfer writing-related skills and knowledge from Intermediate Writing to subsequent courses. It uses student surveys, focus groups with students and instructors, and Dynamic Criteria Mapping (DCM) sessions, which guide instructors in making explicit their tacit criteria for evaluating students’ writing. The case study will describe the methods used, provide participants with copies of all materials, and summarize findings. It will explain how findings were used to 1) develop pilot sections of the Intermediate Writing course designed to promote transfer, and 2) develop a course outcomes statement used to implement White’s Phase 2 portfolio evaluation in the pilot sections. This approach emphasizes the use of reflective introductory letters to evaluate how effectively students’ portfolios enact course learning outcomes.

After presenting the case studies, all speakers will lead participants in small working groups that will examine the three sets of case study materials to identify critical transitions at participants’ institutions, develop specific goals for assessing transfer, and begin designing assessment plans to address their goals.

***Speakers:*** Dana Driscoll, Oakland University, Rochester, MI

David Slomp, University of Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada

Kara Taczak, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Liane Robertson, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Bob Broad, Illinois State University, Normal

Joe Paszek, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Thomas Trimble, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Jared Grogan, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Wendy Duprey, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Adrienne Jankens, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Julie Mix-Thibault, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Dave MacKinder, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Heidi Kenaga, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Gwen Gorzelsky, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

**MW.3 Gateways to the Past: Conducting Archival Research**

Building on the success of the National Archives of Composition and Rhetoric workshops held in Atlanta, New Orleans, San Francisco, and New York, this year’s workshop will continue the conversations on historical research projects and conducting archival research. While there is a growing canon of archival works focusing on local histories of composition and rhetoric and on conducting archival research (Glenn/Enoch, 2009; Gold, 2010; Bordelon, 2010; Ramsey, Sharer, L’Eplattenier, Mastrangelo, 2010; Fleming, 2011; Miller, 2011), scholars looking to begin their own work in the archives often find that they are unprepared for the many challenges inherent in discovering, uncovering, and recovering historical data. As David Gold says, “It’s like putting together a jigsaw puzzle, except that you don’t have a picture on the box for reference, there’s more than one puzzle in the box, the picture keeps changing depending on how you fit the pieces together, and the pieces themselves change shape when your back is turned” (in Kirsch and Rohan, *Beyond the Archives*, 2008). For the past five years, this workshop has helped participants and facilitators make sense of the puzzles in their work and has provided an opportunity for veteran scholars to demystify approaches toward archival research.

This year’s workshop will focus on archival research as a methodological gateway that allows us to understand what Glenn and Enoch describe as “a variety of versions of what the history of composition and rhetoric is and should be, [. . .] that there is no one history but instead many histories” (2010). Facilitators will work with participants on how to move from research questions to locating and working with archival materials. We will consider, too, where our blind spots might be in conducting archival research, and how we might rethink or expand our notions about what we mean by “archival materials,” considering unofficial as well as official archives to be equally important in our work.

Guided by workshop participants’ interests, we plan to discuss best practices in archival research, including issues such as locating and accessing materials within and beyond official archives; accessing, organizing, and cataloging findings; developing finding aids; troubleshooting obstacles; publishing findings; developing archival projects in undergraduate and graduate courses; locating, collecting, and interpreting oral histories; and building and linking archives together. We will also recommend established starting places for archival research in Rhetoric and Composition, such as those available through the National Archives of Rhetoric and Composition, the Sound Archives of Composition and Rhetoric, the Writing Centers Research Project and institutional archives dedicated to writing program administration such as those at Purdue University or the University of New Hampshire.

Workshop Format: The workshop will begin with facilitators and participants introducing themselves and describing their background in archival work, current archival projects they are working on, and particular issues that they are facing in their research. Facilitators will then highlight some of the best practices in archival research and will provide an overview of the resources available to scholars doing archival work. Participants will then be paired up in small roundtables with a facilitator who will help them create an action plan to get started with their archival project or to move forward with their current project. Afterwards, participants will share their action plans with the whole group for further input and ideas. The workshop will conclude with facilitators and participants considering ways to expand the use of archival resource materials, including adding to current archives, creating local archives, and/or linking archival resources online, to make it easier for scholars to locate archival materials and to extend our work beyond the workshop setting.

***Co-Chairs:*** Michelle Niestepski, Lasell College, Newton, MA

Katherine Tirabassi, Keene State College, NH

***Speakers:*** Michael DePalma, Baylor University, Waco, TX

Jessica Enoch, The University of Pittsburgh, PA

David Gold, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Wendy Hayden, Hunter College, CUNY, New York

Jordynn Jack, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

O. Brian Kaufman, Quinebaug Valley Community College, Danielson, CT

Kelly Ritter, University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Robert Schwegler, University of Rhode Island, Kingston

Margaret Strain, University of Dayton, OH

Chris Warnick, College of Charleston, SC

**MW.4 50 Ways to Leave the Five-Paragraph Essay: Challenging Traditional Rhetoric through the Creation of Digital Writing Assignments for First-Year Writing Students**

Many state secondary public English/Language Arts standards depend on and teach the five-paragraph essay, meaning that the student population coming to us college teachers is highly dependent on this five-paragraph paper as a primary means of expression in their English courses. However, in the 21st century, college students need to develop skills that transcend the teachings of current-traditional classroom spaces. To paraphrase Paul Simon, college students may benefit by learning “fifty ways to leave” this five-paragraph paper behind for good. After all, most of the writing that students will do after college will not be in this format: it will be Internet-based, and consist of blogs, wikis, and social networking. As Kathleen Welch wrote, “Rhetoric is now electric.” Andrea Lunsford’s statement that “every act of writing is an act of collaboration” will seem even truer, as the dimensions of literacy become increasingly social. During this half-day workshop, we will examine how college instructors may use digital writing assignments for purposes well-suited for 21st century learning. These purposes include promoting collaboration, expanding student notion of audience, critically responding to the work of one’s peers, and developing analytical and creative abilities.

Participants are encouraged to bring their own ideas for digital writing assignments as well as their own laptop computers. All participants will create at least one digital writing assignment for their first-year composition students. It is hoped that by the end of the session that we will have built a collection (on a wiki site) of drafts of at least fifty digital writing assignments for first-year composition students. We can even continue revising these assignments beyond the scope of this workshop on the wiki.

As creators of digital writing assignments, the workshop facilitators and participants challenge the spaces and knowledge of current-traditional composition instruction by questioning how we approach writing and what is truly best for first-year composition students. These new assignments serve as gateways for 21st century literacy instruction.

***Chair:*** Brian Lewis, Century College, White Bear Lake, MN

***Speakers:*** Gordon Pueschner, Century College, White Bear Lake, MN

Brian Lewis, Century College, White Bear Lake, MN

Laurie Lykken, Century College, White Bear Lake, MN

Diana Ostrander, Anoka Technical College, MN

Jacqueline Arnold, Minnesota State University-Mankato

**MW.5 Making Translingual Pedagogies a Reality: Redesigning Syllabi, Assignments, Feedback, and Program Mission Statements**

Recognizing the integral relationship between language practices and writing practices, scholars, researchers, and practitioners in composition studies are increasingly examining assumptions of English as a monolithic language, of English monolingualism as an achievable or even desirable norm, and of non-native English speakers as a monolithic group whose learning needs can be addressed by peripheral writing support or remediation. They have documented and detailed not only the extent to which these assumptions are misinformed, but also the inequity and damage perpetuated in what Paul Kei Matsuda has called the myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. Scholars like Suresh Canagarajah (2006a; 2006b) have increasingly made calls to shift the perception of language difference-as-deficit to language difference-as-resource and to transform teaching practices, most notably in a special issue of *College English* titled Cross-Language Relations in College English (2006) and the more recent collection Cross-Language Relations in Composition (2010). In “Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach” (2011), Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster, and John Trimbur propose a translingual approach to writing instruction which “sees difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening” (303).

To move forward with such an approach, the legacy of English’s hegemony in writing instruction practices needs to be addressed and students need to actively participate. Anne-Marie Pedersen (2011) provides a vision of classroom environments in which students “negotiate changing expectations for English in the future.” It is “[b]y providing students with opportunities to explore and question English as practiced in multiple global contexts,” she writes, that “we help them to become more critical users of it and, perhaps, to discover how to effect change in the language practices of their own discourse communities” (304). This workshop provides practical, hands-on activities to establish the classroom practices that will allow our students to be collaborator-participants in a difference-as-resource, translingual approach to writing instruction.

This workshop takes the perspective of the transformed, translingual classroom: one that assumes a culturally/linguistically diverse student population rather than a monolingual population with peripheral ESL students. Together, we will work towards identifying what a translingual approach might mean to our individual classrooms and writing programs “by changing the kind of attention we pay to our language practices, questioning the assumptions underlying our learned dispositions toward difference in language, and engaging in critical inquiry on alternative dispositions to take toward such differences in our writing and reading” (Horner, et al., 313). To do this, we focus on redesigning classroom artifacts such as syllabi, writing assignments, feedback on student writing samples, and WPA mission statements because they contain and enact these dispositions in our daily classroom work.

To begin the process of redesigning classroom artifacts—by paying attention to our practices, questioning our assumptions, and engaging in critical inquiry—participants will share and respond to syllabi, writing assignments, student writing samples, and WPA mission statements before and during the workshop (digitally or in hard copy form). All of us—co-leaders and participants alike—will begin communicating prior to the physical meeting of the workshop using digital platforms such as PBWorks and GoogleGroups. This will help ground our work in the kinds of questions and practices that are meaningful both locally and across a variety of contexts.

The workshop begins with a presentation by Speaker 1 to lay the theoretical foundation and articulate the challenges of transforming a language difference-as-deficit paradigm to a language difference-as-resource paradigm. This introduction will lead into the first roundtable discussion which asks workshop participants to interrogate how student populations are defined. We consider this in three overlapping ways: according to institutional data (e.g. the statistics and categories listed in Institutional Factbooks), according to the range of labels and terms used for students and the programs that serve them (e.g., ESL, Gen 1.5, international, basic writers, etc.), and according to students’ learning needs. These discussions will be facilitated by two co-leaders at each table (Speakers 1 to 8). Display charts and markers will be provided for each table to create visuals to document their discussion. These charts will then be displayed “gallery style” around the room, and participants will be invited to view and add to the work of other tables.

In the next section of the workshop, participants can choose from one of four concurrent roundtables: Sustainable Syllabus, Assignment Design, Reconsidering Feedback, and WPA Mission Statements. Two co-leaders (Speakers 1 to 8) at each table will facilitate hands-on activities generated from the artifacts brought by the participants and co-leaders. Each roundtable will conceive of and produce their own contribution to the final section of the workshop, Taking It All Back Home, in which each table will briefly present to the full group. Materials created during the workshop will be documented by Speaker 10 and shared in a virtual space that participants can continue to use for post-workshop networking and discussion. This virtual space will also connect to discussions from the afternoon workshop on Writing Across the Curriculum.

The workshop will conclude with remarks by Speaker 9 synthesizing and responding to the themes generated during the roundtables.

The afternoon workshop, “Embracing the Richness of Multilingualism through WAC/WID: Re-envisioning Institutional Leadership, Advocacy, and Faculty Support” continue this focus on the multilingual majority and extend the discussion beyond the writing classroom to consider how writing professionals can support WAC/WID colleagues in transitioning to translingual perspectives and practices.

***Co-Chairs:*** Angela Dadak, American University, Washington, DC

Maria Jerskey, LaGuardia CC/CUNY, New York, NY

Sarah Nakamaru, Borough of Manhattan Community College (City University), New York, NY

***Speakers:*** Ann-Marie Pedersen, Chapman University, Orange, CA

Maria Jerskey, LaGuardia CC/CUNY, New York, NY

Sarah Nakamaru, Borough of Manhattan Community College (City University), New York, NY

Steve Simpson, New Mexico Tech, Socorro

Todd Ruecker, University of Texas at El Paso

Thomas Lavalle, Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden

Jonathan Hall, York College–City University of New York, NY

Tanita Saenkhum, Arizona State University, Tempe

Xiaoye You, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Kacie Kaiser, Arizona State University, Tempe

**MW.6 Yours, Mine, and Ours: Co-Constructing a Scholarship Ethic with Students and Faculty**

Surveys of students and faculty reveal that many believe plagiarism is a serious problem, but they also express a lack of confidence in their own scholarly writing and citation skills (students) and in teaching these skills (faculty). In fact, in-depth research by Rebecca Moore Howard (2010) shows students’ sentence-level manipulation of sources falls seriously short of the analysis and synthesis required for scholarly writing. Previous scrutiny of faculty writing samples by Miguel Roig (2001) revealed that even some professors stayed dangerously close to the original text when summarizing and citing difficult material. Integrity culture change is not easy, warned Tricia Bertram Gallant (2007) because, in addition to skills deficits with writers, the underlying assumptions of an institution’s subcultures are often at odds on issues like plagiarism. Don’t avoid these contradictions, she advised; get them out into the open.

Unfortunately, attempts to explicitly “teach” the ethics of scholarship are often reduced to preach-and-police policies, which render the discussion hostile and bring learning to a halt. A necessary first step is to move beyond the punitive view of academic integrity into a broad and deliberate discussion of writing among scholars, to an “open, but shared space,” as Kathleen Blake Yancey encouraged (2008). The questions then become when, where, with whom, and with what curriculum do we begin the conversation? How do we engage students and faculty in the co-construction of a scholarship ethic that we will mentor and share? How do we harness the tension and use it to fuel positive change?

In this interactive workshop, four experienced WPAs and mentors (who have been variously Directors of First-Year Writing, Directors of Composition, Director of ESL, Directors of Basic Writing, Directors of Writing Centers, Director of Educational Services for Graduate School, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, mentors to new instructors, participants and leaders of WAC/WID implementation committees) from diverse institutions (land grant Research, urban Research) and who have worked with varied student levels and disciplines (developmental writers to Ph.D. candidates and across disciplines) will engage participants in a series of strategic activities to help them understand how to teach, not preach and police. Additionally, participants will begin to see how to situate the “integrity” part of “academic integrity” within their classes and their institutions.

Featuring a workshop format in current use with undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty, we will introduce, practice and evaluate strategies and techniques for defining the problem and suggesting multiple solutions. Guiding the workshop curriculum is an ethical framework based on work by the late psychologist James Rest and Darcia Narváez (1994), who documented four key areas of moral decision making and action: sensitivity, judgment, motivation, and action/character. After two decades, this model remains one of the most widely used in education. Moreover, Rest and Narváez documented that college students, including graduate and professional school students, are particularly “receptive to moral education programs designed to foster moral judgment development.” To that end, presenters will demonstrate what students can learn through authorship role plays, ethical dilemmas (case studies) about plagiarism, and small group debates over scholarly rationales based on the author’s goals and disciplines. In addition, we will offer an activity designed to teach writing from source work (Ethical Summary Protocol—E.S.P.—which involves reading like a writer, conceptual note-taking, drafting from memory, fact checking, and citing sources).

***Speakers:*** Tracey Baker, University of Alabama at Birmingham

Irwin Weiser, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN

Julia Austin, University of Alabama at Birmingham

Jennifer Greer, University of Alabama at Birmingham

**MW.7 Casting Gateways: Practical and Theoretical Applications of Screen Recording for Composition**

Screen casts are gateway projects. They fuse composing and computers as they capture the activities of the writer through software. Often used for tutorials, screen recorders turn the computer into a video camera so that activities can be captured and played back. But the software can be pushed in many more directions. From Internet memes to instructional videos to published scholarship we find screen casts pointing us toward new directions for composition.

A number of rhetorical strategies are linked with screen casts. The use of words on a page, the way they are typed, their fonts and shapes—all of this can be manipulated and made part of the screen cast composition. Writers can learn the screen cast move of composing text for the screen, typing in an e-mail message, search field, or word processor. Once conscious of the need to capture the look and movement of words, the senses of typing changes as words are translated into video shapes and sequences. Add music or sound and a new gateway emerges. A number of modes come together in screen recordings—as many as can happen on a computer. You might record a YouTube clip, some typing, photo sets, audio narration. By translating the medium of the computer screen into a composing space, recordings call forth multimedia reading and writing.

Screen casts often emerge from extensive drafting, editing, and revision. Most software affords video editing, effects, callouts, and audio channels—to name a few features. When first drafts are shared with a class, peers often respond to the dynamics of voice (volume, tone, pacing, and inflection). Again a number of moves can be developed. Video reading can use the software to analyze texts, annotating scanned passages and zooming in on details. Web searches and other online activities can be captured, archived, or analyzed. Authors compose with a timeline. And they layer ideas together through callouts, titles, captions, or narration. The process is reasonably straightforward and students generally find fewer technical headaches than with video or audio editing. For teaching, screen casts represent a prosumer gateway, an easy to implement project that opens avenues for thinking about and practicing mixed media composing.

This workshop will provide practical guidance for integrating screen casting activities into composition courses. Facilitators will coordinate with attendees and develop group exercises that will include hands-on activities. Wireless access for the workshop room will be required. Facilitators will also draw upon classroom and scholarly experience to cover conceptual and theoretical implications of screen casts. The workshop will also feature practical assignment-development sessions drawing on student models.

Speaker 1 and Speaker 2 will discuss conceptual and theoretical concerns associated with screen casts. In particular, this presenter will describe how screen casts foreground the mechanics of multi-application composition. This approach to composition utilizes the PC as a composition tool in ways that far exceed the more conventional, single-application composition strategies manifest in word processing, composing slide ware, image manipulation, and web composition. This segment of the workshop will also address the performative nature of screen casts, as screen casts involve elements such as choreography, orchestration, timing, and movement. Because screen casts result in a kind of “recorded stream” of computer activity, they serve as a lens for thinking about processes and products. Screen casts also bring to light the need for continually evolving literacies. As composers learn to perform, bringing applications and activities together on the desktop, they move toward notions of computer literacy that transcend skill sets associated with individual programs or tasks. Instead, composers become fluent with a fluid sense of constantly mixing ideas, applications, voices, persona, and activities.

Speaker 3 will lead participants through a group exercise in which they practice and develop strategies for reading and evaluating screen casts. Using faculty and student model projects, participants will take up concerns of assessment. They will develop vocabularies for reading and describing screen casts and consider models of evaluation. They will contextualize screen casts by taking up rhetorical concerns, and then develop recommendations related to screen casts.

Speaker 4, Speaker 5, and Speaker 6 (with other speakers assisting) will lead a hands-on session in which participants compose their own screen casts. Working in small groups, participants will develop a screen cast. The session will look at methods of planning and invention, resulting in a storyboard. Participants will learn to capture screen material using either a mac or pc computer. They will also edit captured material, add textual and audio elements, and produce the screen cast for publication.

Speaker 7 will lead a session in which participants develop potential screen casting assignments for classes or for their own projects. The session will begin with a brief survey of existing assignments. The survey will be followed by a group exercise through which a potential screen casting assignment will be developed for each participant’s teaching situation. The session will then look at and develop avenues for implementing screen casting into participants’ own projects and scholarship.

***Speakers:*** Spencer Schaffner, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Chidsey Dickson, Lynchburg College, VA

Erich Werner, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Jason Loan, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Sydney Stegall, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Daniel Anderson, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Phil Sandick, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

**MW.8 Becoming “Engaged”: Service-Learning and Civic Engagement in Program and Course Design**

Service-Learning rhetoric is filled with images of gateways and thresholds, of spaces between seeming binaries: town/gown, university/community, classroom/ “real world,” student/teacher, book-learning/experience, and us/them. Indeed, service-learning is a gateway. Instructors, students, and community partners who enter into service-learning relationships move between these worlds enough to dissolve firm distinctions that traditional learning can reinforce. In 2008, Program X at an R1 institution launched the Writing Initiative for Service and Engagement (WISE), a comprehensive initiative to become what Campus Compact defines as an “engaged program.” Being “engaged” requires a sustainable, substantive programmatic commitment to service-learning and civic engagement. Program X integrated service-learning throughout its lower- and upper-division writing courses and now offers over 30 sections of service-learning each year, involving 30% of its faculty. Program X places 700 students into community organizations each year through its courses and provides over 10,000 hours in service-based learning in the community.

This workshop, led by six Program X faculty members, will showcase five courses from across the writing curriculum as models of innovative ways in which service-learning theory and practice can be used in conjunction with some of the most pressing issues in composition studies: first-year experience, literacy, ecocomposition, digital literacy, and multimodal composition. In the first part of the workshop, the panel presentations, we will address the following questions through our research-grounded discussion of specific courses and assignments:

How does service-learning theory intersect with and extend developments in composition studies?

How can student writing create real social change?

How does an instructor meld traditional assignments with writing in and for the community?

How can service-learning be supported and encouraged on a programmatic level through incentives and rewards?

How does a program ensure that instructors are properly trained in service-learning theory?

How does a program publicize its work to the community and the university?

How can the community use a writing program to help achieve non-academic goals while faculty maintain a focus on academic outcomes?

The purpose of the panel presentation is two-fold. First, we will offer a full picture of how the Writing Initiative for Service and Engagement works in the context of Program X, the university, and the community. Registrants will take away a bibliography of readings on service-learning program design. Next, we will present the individual courses to offer registrants a wide range of models of innovative service-learning courses that will cover strategic areas of interest and expertise. Our models are easily adaptable to registrants’ programs and departments. Each panelist will provide a suggested readings list, a sample syllabus, and assignment examples for registrants to take away.

The second half of the workshop involves breakout sessions geared toward three areas of service-learning theory: course and assignment design, critical reflection, and partnerships. We will have one discussion leader per table, and registrants will be able to choose the leader whose work they find of most interest. The breakout session leader will guide registrants through group discussion of their specific questions on each of the three topic areas as it relates to the leader’s course theme. We ask that all registrants bring a syllabus or course idea and specific assignments with which they would like to work. Overall discussion may include, for example, what kind of relationship a participant wants with a community partner and how to establish and maintain partnerships; using theorists like Robert Bringle and Julie Hatcher, we could discuss the difference between transactional and transformational community partnerships. During the discussion on critical reflection, the conversation might center on how to construct assignments that encourage critical reflection that is analytical and data-driven versus reflection that is touchy-feely and difficult to grade; using scholar Patti Clayton’s model for creating substantive reflection assignments, participants might share ideas on questions that would work well to enhance student knowledge. While breakout session leaders will be ready to guide the discussion with questions and ideas, the discussion will be driven by participant need and interest. We invite all levels of service-learning providers into the conversation, from novices to seasoned practitioners. After 45 minutes, we will offer participants the opportunity to change tables and engage in discussion on the same three topic areas with a new leader. Participants will leave the workshop with detailed ideas for how to design a vertical service-learning writing curriculum, how to develop a course based on their particular interest, how to create assignments that are reflective in nature and that meet the criteria for “critical reflection,” and how to establish and maintain partnerships with community organizations in their hometown.

If service-learning is a gateway, then this workshop provides a path by which participants can explore new territories of pedagogical innovation.

***Chair:*** Veronica House, University of Colorado Boulder

***Speakers:*** Veronica House, University of Colorado Boulder, “Food and Civic Engagement: A First-Year Writing and Rhetoric Curriculum”

John Ackerman, University of Colorado Boulder, “The Public Work of Rhetoric: Institutional and Economic Relevance”

Peter Schaberg, University of Colorado Boulder, “Video Partnerships: Digital Gateways to Civic Engagement in First-Year Writing”

Ginger Knowlton, University of Colorado Boulder, “Poetics of Place: Ecocomposition and Experiential Learning”

Sally Green, University of Colorado Boulder, “Learning Teacher Ethos: Science and Engineering Students Open the Gate to At-Risk High Schools”

Christine Macdonald, University of Colorado Boulder, “Grant Writing: Navigating Professional and Academic Genres”

**MW.9 Unsustainable: Owning Our Best, Short-Lived Efforts at Community Writing Work**

This session takes its title from a book project, currently in progress, of the same name. *Unsustainable: Owning Our Best, Short-Lived Efforts at Community Writing Work* is a collection of essays that explores the issue of “failure” in university/community writing partnerships in order to rethink long-term sustainability, the often university-defined and widely accepted hallmark of success for such partnerships. All session speakers are contributors to the collection, and will share the narratives that inspired their chapters in the book, which describe and analyze a short-lived community-based writing project in hopes of re-theorizing the markers for success in this work. Workshop participants are asked to bring along a story about their own well-intentioned, short-lived community writing projects that fell outside the expectations of long-term sustainability. Ultimately, the workshop will function as a kind of think tank for close examination of specific projects in hopes of re-drawing the boundary lines of success, and re-imagining the terms of “sustainability,” in community writing work.

Sustainability has been one of the most salient themes within current community-based writing scholarship; Ellen Cushman puts it best when she argues that thoughtless practitioners have a “hit it or quit it” attitude, mining community resources for their own purposes and then leaving community partners with little in exchange (40). In an effort to resist such exploitative practices, committed teachers and community members work hard to establish strong ties between the university and the community; some scholars have even developed long standing, community-based writing centers that serve as models for the country (Utah, Pittsburgh, 826 Valencia). However, the very legitimate roadblocks of time, resources, and, as Tom Deans has argued, the inherent contradictions between university and community writing genres and motives, always stand to intervene even when all involved have the best of intentions (12). Accordingly, many well-meaning practitioners are left with short-lived programs, those big projects that did not go as planned and fell short of “best practice” ideals, such as long-term sustainability, in community-based writing work.

In *Tactics of Hope: The Public Turn in English Composition* (2005), Paula Mathieu argues that these moments can be generative precisely because they are not strategic, or part of university-defined standards for sustainability. Instead, Mathieu calls for tactical approaches to community partnerships, strategies that “foreground the temporal and spatial challenges that street-based projects always face” (17). Such partnerships allow for moments of surprise, serendipity, and unforeseen joy: what was planned may not happen at all, but something new and more invigorating might grow in its place. Mathieu’s call is echoed by others in the field—like Eli Goldblatt and Elenore Long—who argue against “longevity as the gold standard,” and in exchange insist on “measuring viability of a local public in terms of the quality of the engagement and alternative discourse that it sustains” (Long 29).

The goal of both the ongoing essay collection and the workshop, then, is to take seriously what has become an increasingly unified call for praxis, where scholar-practitioners explore a specific project that fell short of theorized “best practice” sustainability in order to determine not only the nature of what remains—how and why we might find value in a community-based writing project that lacks long-term sustainability, for example—but also how or why we might rethink, redefine, and reevaluate best practice ideals in the first place. In this workshop, we will discuss what thoughtful, engaged scholars and practitioners of service-learning and community-based writing programs can—and should—do with their best, “failed” efforts. In so doing, we are at once responding to what has been an increasing acknowledgment in the field that, for a variety of reasons, many community-based writing projects do not go as initially planned, and also applying—in praxis—a framework for thinking about and studying such projects. This workshop seeks to bring the book to life in the real time, face-to-face contexts that we all value, but also invite others—those whose work is not featured in our collection—to connect with each other and with the contributors to *Unsustainable*, to share stories, theories, and ideas, and to get and give feedback.

***Chair:*** Jessica Restaino, Montclair State University, Upper Montclair, NJ

***Speakers:*** Eli Goldblatt, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

Paula Mathieu, Boston College, MA

Elenore Long, Arizona State University, Tempe

Paul Feigenbaum, Florida International University, Miami

Michael Donnelly, Ball State University, Muncie, IN

Jennifer Clifton, Arizona State University, Tempe

Karen Johnson, Shippensburg University, PA

Sharayna Rolle, Florida International University, Miami

**Half-Day Wednesday Afternoon**:

**AW.1 Climbing over the Gate, Digging under the Gate, Busting through the Gate: How to Address Plagiarism as an Educational Opportunity**

This interactive workshop will benefit writing instructors at any level, instructors at any level from across the curriculum who include writing as a teaching tool, writing program administrators (including first-year program administrators, WAC directors and Writing Center directors), and college and university administrators at any level. It will introduce participants to the complexities of plagiarism and help us all better address the problem of student plagiarism. Research over the last 30 years has revealed that plagiarism is not the monolithic act of theft as typically defined but is a collection of separate behaviors that manifest themselves in similar forms. Scholarship identifies three large categories of these behaviors: intentional, unintentional, and developmental plagiarism, represented in writing as “patchwriting.” This workshop is intended to facilitate participants’ understanding of all three.

Participants will begin the workshop by answering researcher Miguel Roig’s Plagiarism Knowledge (PK) Survey questionnaire. They will read a source passage and determine which of ten different paraphrased versions of that passage are and are not adequately paraphrased. Participants will discuss why they identified certain versions the way they did. The survey is intended to reveal the potential in everyone for unintentional plagiarism. Participants will, then, discuss causes of unintentional plagiarism and how to help students avoid unintentionally plagiarizing.

Toward the end of the first hour and throughout the second hour, participants will analyze and discuss for about 15 minutes each, both in small groups and in plenary sessions, plagiarism scenarios of increasing complexity, moving from scenarios tending to evoke easy consensus to gray area scenarios that defy consensus, including scenarios involving student collaboration and what Brian Martin calls “institutionalized plagiarism” (plagiarism that occurs in contexts such as business settings, where plagiarism is not only acceptable but even encouraged). Participants also will address what Rebecca Moore Howard calls “patchwriting,” the most common form of developmental plagiarism—a form of plagiaristic behavior that occurs when an outsider seeks to sound like an insider in order to transition into a particular discourse community.

After a short break at the end of the second hour, participants will be assigned for the third hour to write a short essay on a topic of which they have little knowledge. They will be interrupted early on in this effort in order for them to reflect on the feelings of low self-efficacy that they experienced from this assignment. Some researchers have identified low self-efficacy as a factor in intentional plagiarism. After their discussion of low self-efficacy as a cause of plagiarism, participants in small groups will role-play several scenarios involving what might be seen as mitigating circumstances (inadequate time management, un-motivating assignment prompts, perceptions of peer plagiarism, and so on) and then, in plenary session, report on their discussions of each.

We will begin the final hour with a short discussion of change management—that is, the rhetoric of changing attitudes and persuading others. Then, small groups of participants will be asked to work on developing a plagiarism policy.

Participants will leave this workshop with a better understanding of plagiarism as educational opportunity and with strategies for better addressing the problem of student plagiarism.

***Speakers:*** Gerald Nelms, The Ohio State University, Columbus

Scott Leonard, Youngstown State University, OH

Carole Clark Papper, Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY

**AW.2 Understanding Students’ Use of Sources through Collaborative Research “The Citation Project and Beyond”**

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

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

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

***Speakers:*** Sandra Jamieson, Drew University, Madison, NJ

Elizabeth Kleinfeld, Metropolitan State College of Denver, CO

Rebecca Moore Howard, Syracuse University, NY

Kelly Kinney, Binghamton University, State University of New York, Binghamton

TJ Geiger II, Syracuse University, NY

Crystal Benedicks, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, IN

Kristi Murray Costello, Binghamton University, State University of New York

Tricia Serviss, Auburn University, AL

Maya Sanyal, Drew University, Madison, NJ

Sara Biggs Chaney, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH

Santosh Khadka, Syracuse University, NY

Nicole Wallack, Columbia University, New York, NY

Missy Watson, Syracuse University, NY

Kate Navickas, Syracuse University, NY

**AW.3 Transitioning to Informed Classroom Practices for all Students: Engaging the Politics and Pedagogy of Language Varieties in Writing Instruction**

The 2012 CCCC in St. Louis is a unique opportunity for the Language Policy Committee (LPC) to draw on the theme of the Gateway experience to invite teachers to participate in a workshop devoted to the pedagogy of linguistic diversity in writing instruction. Given on-going demographic changes on one hand and the pervasive ideology of monolingualism on the other, the LPC, with this proposal, continues its tradition of offering conferees theory-based, practical strategies for teaching writing in diverse classrooms, which are increasingly becoming the norm. The LPC is charged with “promoting effective pedagogies for advancing language diversity.”

Through the work of the LPC, both the CCCC and the NCTE passed two language policies, “Students’ Right to Their Own Language” (CCCC, l974, Reaffirmed, 2003; NCTE, 2003) and the “National Language Policy” (CCCC, l988; NCTE, l998), that were designed to set the tone for policy and pedagogy development to support language diversity in the classroom. Despite these policy pronouncements, experienced professionals in both organizations have expressed concern about current teaching practices and lack of academic preparation in language diversity of college composition instructors. This preconference half-day session offers composition professionals an interactive workshop that engages them in critical discussion of language rights issues and their implications for classroom pedagogy, with emphasis on the practical strategies that enable diverse writers to succeed as academic writers.

Such discussions remain relevant because many students use/“mesh” their home languages in classrooms (both when speaking and writing). Some of these students have already learned to ignore their home language abilities in the classroom, limiting their expressive qualities, despite research that shows the importance of integrating students’ language competence. Indeed, many language educators continue—knowingly and unknowingly—to encourage erasure of these home languages because they lack an understanding of language theory, research findings, and sound pedagogical practices that advocate home language preservation. Even those educators who are aware of important language policy statements such as “Students’ Right to Their Own Language” face an uphill battle because their use of sound educational practices moves against the grain of English Only policies and fall prey to threats from politicians who often advocate for such policies despite language diversity in use by their constituencies.

To address these issues and more, the LPC proposes a half-day workshop organized in three major parts as follows:

1:30–1:40 pm—Introduction of participants and workshop facilitators; overview of the workshop session.

1:40–2:50 pm—Part I: Scholarship on African American Language (AAL) and composition instruction often focuses primarily on AAL grammar, syntax, and vocabulary. However, AAL speaking students also produce writing that contains African American discourse style (Smitherman; Gilyard and Richardson). Part I reports on a research study that examines how the African American Verbal Tradition (AVT) manifests in written form, as evidenced in student samples from three first-year writing courses at a Midwestern university. Part I demonstrates the rhetorical effectiveness of AVT and the ability it has to enhance academic writing.

Following this twenty-minute presentation, participants will analyze a student paper, identify AVT features, and discuss their rhetorical effectiveness and the ways instructors can facilitate positive experiences for AAL speaking students to develop the rich and complex writing skills they possess in ways that are not harmful to their identity and culture.

2:50–3:30 pm—Part II will involve participants in an exercise that asks them to mark on a U.S. map where they consider “correct English” to be spoken. They will then mark where they believe “pleasant English” is spoken. Discussion will focus on the reasons for their choices. This activity opens individuals’ eyes to how we should respect each other’s languages, dialects, or language varieties. The activity leads to a healthy discussion on diversity and on how language indicates power relationships and dominance. Participants will be asked to “freewrite” on the same subject, but they will focus on their personal linguistic experiences. The goal is to show how important it is to recognize, respect, and promote students’ right to their own language.

3:30–3:40 pm—Break

3:40–4:30 pm—Part III: In the inclusive, process-oriented classroom, when teachers and students respond to pieces of writing, teachers need to consider new response models that help readers focus their comments in ways that are helpful to the writer for purposeful revision. This session presents new models for evaluating the effectiveness of a piece of writing at different stages of the writing process. These models focus on the quality of thinking and the presentation of information, as well as the consistency of the writing style. Emphasis is given to the importance of context, purpose, audience, and identity. Participants will read and respond to samples of diverse student writing, using and critiquing the response models.

4:30–5:00 pm—Wrap-up. The workshop will conclude with a wrap-up session and participants will be provided with teaching resources and encouraged to continue an on-going dialogue about how language diversity issues inform their classroom practices.

***Chair:*** Elaine Richardson, Ohio State University, Columbus

***Speakers:*** Isabel Baca, University of Texas El Paso

Bonnie Williams, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Rashidah Muhammad, Governors State University, University Park, IL

Kim Brian Lovejoy, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Denise Troutman, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Terry Carter, Southern Polytechnic University, Marietta, GA

Qwo-Li Driskill, Texas A&M University, College Station

**AW.4 Embracing the Richness of Multilingualism through WAC/WID: Re-envisioning Institutional Leadership, Advocacy, and Faculty Support**

Earlier today, the morning workshop on linguistic diversity highlighted translingual pedagogical practices that respond to our increasingly diverse student bodies; this afternoon’s workshop examines this diversity as it applies to Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID).

In “WAC/WID in the Next America” (2009), Jonathan Hall describes the psychological and pedagogical transitions necessary in the new reality of cultural and linguistic diversity on U.S. campuses. A central problem, he suggests, is that curricula and administrative structures assume a monolingual majority and consider students’ use of non-English languages as “a problem to be solved, a disease to be cured, a difficult transition [to English only] to be nourished” (37), a mentality now widely described as “difference as deficit” rather than “difference as resource” (Canagarajah 2002). Yet the demographic shift to a multilingual population is well documented and should be embraced for the richness it brings to the academic environment. For many writing professionals, the transition is well underway, leading them to make multilingualism a central consideration in curriculum design. Finding themselves at the forefront, these writing professionals are in a position to facilitate the transition of their WAC/WID and administrative colleagues’ perspectives and practices. In this workshop, we support these efforts by sharing and generating strategies for reaching colleagues across the institution.

The workshop will open with a presentation by Speaker 1 on the demographic trend toward a multilingual majority, of the transitions this trend necessitates, and of the interdisciplinary scholarly resources available to writing specialists. Discussion will follow as participants will be asked to consider ways to (re)position their roles and practices from a WAC/WID perspective. This discussion will be followed by three 20-minute sessions where presenters (Speakers 2–7) will explore:

 \* Researching local demographics and the institutional landscape. A pair of presenters will describe key lines of research on multilingual students’ needs and strengths, WAC/WID faculty attitudes and practices, methodologies, and critical data sources for informed, evidence-based advocacy.

 \* Driving change through institutional leadership and advocacy. A pair of presenters will set out the considerations and challenges that must be addressed in order to shape the vision and direction in order to shift the organizational perspective on working with multilingual writers.

 \* WAC/WID faculty development and support. A pair of presenters will describe concrete ways to help faculty across the curriculum modify courses with the needs and strengths of multilingual writers in mind. These strategies include faculty learning communities, and workshops. The presenters will also discuss successful strategies and goals of faculty development activities that increase understanding of L2 writing pedagogy.

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

Following these sessions, participants will choose to attend one of four concurrent roundtable discussions according to their needs and interests, which will be led by pairs of speakers. Each roundtable will focus on strategic planning related to the topics covered in the preceding discussions. These plans will be posted to a group discussion site for continued reflection and discussion in the professional community formed by the participants.

The workshop will end with co-chairs 2 and 3 who will synthesize themes of the workshop.

***Co-Chairs:*** Angela Dadak, American University, Washington, DC

Kathryn Nielsen-Dube, Merrimack College, NH

Gigi Taylor, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

***Speakers:*** Jonathan Hall, York College-City University of New York

Michelle Cox, Bridgewater State College, MA

Gigi Taylor, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Shanti Bruce, Nova Southeastern University, Ft. Lauderdale, FL

Kathryn Nielsen-Dube, Merrimack College, NH

Terry Zawacki, George Mason University, Falls Church, VA

Gail Shuck, Boise State University, ID

**AW.5 Recorded Spoken Feedback: A Compelling Alternative to Written Response**

The workshop will be conducted by 6 co-leaders from a range of institutions (including R1, liberal arts undergraduate, and community colleges) who have substantial experience using spoken recorded response with a wide range of a/v technologies and in training other instructors in this approach.

PARTICIPANT REQUIREMENTS: Participants should bring (1) a laptop, (2) headset with microphone compatible with their laptop and tested using any audio application prior to the workshop, (3) a sample of student writing from one of their own classes with their written comments already included—in both hard copy and electronic forms.

SESSION 1: OVERVIEW/INTRODUCTIONS (30 MINUTES)

Workshop agenda/Historical overview:

Although writing teachers have been using forms of recorded spoken response for half a century, the use of audio (and now also video) response to student writing has been slow to catch on in the field of composition. Several sessions at CCCC 2011 indicated a renewed interest in such alternative methods of responding to student writing. Technological obstacles to using recorded feedback have diminished to the point that such feedback can become more widespread among writing teachers. This workshop will provide practical, hands-on training for those who want to learn how to use current media technologies to speak to their students about their writing. Writing instructors spend considerable time responding to student work; this workshop will show how a/v technologies can productively reduce the time and effort teachers spend on response while perhaps providing even more effective—and potentially different kinds of—feedback for students.

The workshop will begin with listening to short examples of spoken response followed by a five-minute Jing video that previews the day’s agenda while illustrating one of the recording technologies to be discussed. Speakers will emphasize that responding to student writing is a key component of the work of writing instructors and that many technologies now enable alternatives to written feedback that make the practice of response much less psychologically and physically onerous for teachers. Then we will provide a historical overview of spoken recorded response in writing instruction and a summary of the scholarly literature on spoken feedback, including research examining advantages and some possible disadvantages of this approach.

SESSION 2: SPOKEN RECORDED COMMENTARY AT WORK (60 MINUTES)

PART A: Comparing spoken and written response

The workshop continues with an interactive examination of written vs. spoken recorded response, facilitated by all workshop speakers. In small groups, participants will respond to a sample student paper first in writing and then with an audio recording tool. Participants will discuss differences, advantages, and disadvantages of the change in media. This part will also discuss ways that spoken recorded response can help address disability issues in the writing classroom.

PART B: Modes of audio response

Participants will learn about different types of comments that fit particularly well with spoken recorded commentary: those that emphasize links to past classroom activities or previous student writing, those that suggest future directions for the revising process, and those that share the experience of reading the text. Recent research on these different modes of audio commentary will be shared. Participants will then record a second round of spoken comments on their student papers, trying out some of these different kinds of response.

10–MINUTE BREAK

SESSION 3: IMPLEMENTING RECORDED SPOKEN COMMENTARY: THE TECHNOLOGICAL POSSIBILITIES (60 MINUTES)

PART A: Available Technologies

Workshop Speakers will present an overview of current recording technologies useful for recording spoken response and discuss relative merits including simplicity of use, need to download software, access for students, maximum recording length, video markup, and independent media files vs. comments imbedded in student texts. The workshop team will then guide participants in hands-on practice with different recording technologies including Camtasia (screen capture software), Wimba and/or other LMS compatible / integrated audio tools, Audacity (a freeware audio recording application), Jing (an audio and video capture application), and the new audio comment tool in Word 2011.

PART B: Reflections

Workshop speakers will lead a discussion of two to three recordings made by attendees who volunteer.

10–MINUTE BREAK

SESSION 4: IMPLEMENTING RECORDED SPOKEN RESPONSE (40 MINUTES)

For those new to giving spoken feedback, the approach presents some challenges in record-keeping and preparing students to receive and make use of such feedback. Workshop leaders will present examples of strategies for keeping records of spoken comments and for introducing students to the use of spoken comments. Speakers and participants will share their own prior experiences with spoken feedback, including both successes and obstacles/frustrations, other technological options or approaches, limitations of the approach, and so on.

The workshop will conclude with final reflections on the part of the workshop group and the creation of an electronic resource designed to serve as a continuation of the workshop, a support for participants after the session, and, more broadly, a discipline-wide resource for teachers interested in employing this teaching technology.

Attendees will be provided with materials containing (1) description and tips for different modes of recorded spoken response, (2) a guide to using the recording technologies included, (3) Web addresses to online examples of recorded spoken response, and (4) a scholarly reference list.

***Chair:*** Cary Moskovitz, Duke University, Durham, NC

***Speakers:*** Scott Warnock, Drexel University, Riverton, NJ

Jeff Sommers, West Chester University, PA

Brittany Stephenson, Salt Lake Community College, UT

John Drake, Madison Area Technical College, WI

Susan Sipple, Raymond Walter College of the University of Cincinnati, OH

**AW.6 Multimedia Building Blocks: Design Plans and Storyboards**

A continually growing number of teachers would like to design assignments that offer students the challenge and excitement of composing with multimedia (Atwan, 2009; Faigley, George, Palchik & Selfe, 2004; Machin, 2007; Selfe & Selfe, 2008; Odell & Katz, 2006) . Yet, many of these same teachers are anxious that the students may know more about the technology than they do and are therefore reluctant to actually assign multimedia projects (Frost, 2009; Neal, 2010; Sorapure, 2006). Coupled with the anxiety of development and assessment, many compositionists also struggle with worrying about potential loss of the English identity and rhetorical connection (Neal, 2010; Sorapure, 2005; Zoetewey and Staggers, 2003) when new media assignments or activities are integrated into writing classroom curricula.

This workshop is designed for instructors who want to explore assignments that invite (or require) students to compose multmedia projects without requiring technical expertise with any technological hardware or software. By focusing on the essentially rhetorical nature of multimedia composing, participants will develop assignments and design a series of scaffolded classroom activities to guide students through analysis, design, composing, reviewing, and revising cycles. All attendees will be introduced to the concept of a design plan by participating in the development of sample plans for a variety of projects. Building on this, attendees will explore one dimension of the design plan in greater detail by participating in a reverse storyboard activity. The workshop facilitators will highlight the similarities between reverse storyboarding a multimedia composition and reverse outlining an alphabetic essay. The aim of this activity is to develop a practical activity that can be adapted and used in a variety of writing courses and to illustrate how working with multimedia assignments can directly draw from the instructor’s expertise in rhetorical strategies.

By the end of the workshop, attendees will create a comprehensive set of materials to support a four-to-six week multimedia unit. This will include a complete assignment sequence, a sample design plan, in-class activities, homework assignments, and assessment materials.

Attendees are encouraged to bring laptops, or be able to share with another participant.

***Speakers:*** E. Ashley Hall, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

Jennifer Ware, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

Kathie Gossett, Iowa State University, Ames

**AW.7 Obtaining External Grant Funding for Your Research**

This workshop is sponsored by the CCCC Research Committee with the goal of encouraging more CCC members to apply for external research funds. Workshop leaders have received grants from major funding agencies, including the Spencer Research Foundation, National Science Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, and the CCCC Research Initiative. Leaders will represent a range of institutions, including community colleges. These leaders will be matched with workshop participants proposing similar project and/or seeking funding from similar institutions.

The workshop will involve the following steps:

1. Two weeks prior to the workshop, participants will submit a copy of their proposal (in whatever shape or form it may be in) and any grant solicitations or agencies they have identified as potential funding sources.

2. Participants will be assigned to groups of approximately 4–5 in advance of the workshop. Each group will be matched with leaders/mentors with relevant experience and interests. We will ask the group leaders and members to read the submissions of all group members in advance of the workshop.

3. The workshop itself will begin with a brief (less than 20 minutes) presentation by the CCCC Research Committee on its survey of where composition and rhetoric researchers are finding funding and what factors seem to contribute to a successful proposal.

4. The next 90 minutes will be spent in small groups focused on providing feedback on the proposals submitted and brainstorming ideas for additional funding opportunities.

5. After a short break, we will have a 45-minute “speed dating for grants” in which workshop leaders and others sit at tables while participants pitch a soundbite of their grant ideas and receive feedback.

6. The workshop will end with a brief wrap-up of the session and participants will be asked to complete anonymous surveys evaluating the session.

***Co-Chairs:*** Paul Rogers, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA

Carol Rutz, Carleton College, Northfield, MN

Neal Lerner, Northeastern University, Brookline, MA

Howard Tinberg, Bristol Community College, Fall River, MA

Paul Anderson, Miami University, Oxford, OH

**AW.8 Effective Practices for Online Writing Instruction: A Workshop in OWI Practice, Instructor Training, Program Evaluation, and Assisting Special Needs Populations**

CCCC members—in public feedback to previous CCCC Committee on Best Practices for Online Writing Instruction (OWI) panels and SIGs, as well as in open-ended comment responses to the Committee’s 2010 National Survey regarding OWI—have requested workshops that present OWI training and professional development. To this end, the Committee proposes this half-day workshop to meet with interested CCCC members with the goal of promoting dialogue on online and hybrid writing pedagogies.

As a note on our Committee’s history, the CCCC Executive Committee first constituted this OWI Committee in 2007 for a period of three years for studying the best practices in OWI. During its first term, this Committee prepared an annotated bibliography on OWI, conducted a set of qualitative and quantitative pilot studies on OWI, and completed a nation-wide survey on OWI in 2010. Considering the relevance and scope of the Committee’s charges to the overall membership of CCCC and NCTE, the Committee was reconstituted for another three years to extend its existing work and to prepare a Best Practices Document for the use of the writing instruction community. The OWI Committee has met CCCC members over each of the past four years in a panel and a SIG setting. In 2012, the Committee will have completed the fifth year of our exploration of phenomena relevant to determining best practices regarding digital modalities, environments, and pedagogies.

Emerging from our work to date is instructors’ articulated need for professional development in the area of OWI. To that end, this proposed half-day workshop is designed to provide participants hands-on professional development in the areas of OWI-based practice, instructor training, programmatic evaluation, and assistance for special needs students. The areas of focus will surround state-of-the-art and best practices for OWI based on the work of the Committee for the past five years as well as the expertise of the facilitators running the workshop. This proposed workshop also will be integral to the Committee’s work as we will engage workshop participants in an open discussion in order to compare the key findings about the state-of-the-art in OWI from the survey against the workshop participants’ own practices and experiences in the online and hybrid writing classrooms.

The workshop will run for four hours total and will be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the highest standards of qualitative research and workshop development. In a thirty-minute introduction of the workshop, the Chair will offer a briefing of the Committee’s charges and the goals for the session. This introduction will also provide workshop participants with current scholarship on OWI as well as initial findings and emergent themes from the work of the previous year. The next three and a half hours of the workshop will be divided into four interactive segments described below. Completing each of these four segments, participants will leave the workshop with an “action plan” for immediate steps regarding their OWI endeavors:

• The Phenomenon of OWI (60 minutes): This section will address effective practices for conducting OWI in both synchronous and asynchronous modalities. The facilitator will introduce key pedagogical principles of OWI and engage participants in a series of hands-on exercises that will allow participants to put stated pedagogical principles into practice. Three practical exercises will include strategies for OWI in synchronous situations and simulate a real-time, text-based instructor and student conference. Three additional exercises will focus on asynchronous conferencing, including strategies for responding to essays in asynchronous environments. Participants will complete this section having had practice “teaching in text” and concrete examples that can be used in their on-going in-class experiences.

• Screening and Training (50 minutes): This section will address effective practices for the screening and training of OWI instructors. The section will introduce principles for screening and training organization and strategy. Using these principles, the facilitator will then lead the workshop participants through a series of questions that participants will need to answer in light of their specific institutional context. Workshop participants will be encouraged to discuss and share responses. The result of this work will be a blueprint that participants can use in future planning sessions that will address: timeline, content, sequence, and modality for screening and training. It will also highlight for participants areas that likely require further planning and support from their institution.

• On-Going Evaluation (50 minutes): This section will address best practices for on-going evaluation of OWI from instructor and student perspectives. This section will introduce principles for evaluation of actual sessions and instructor technique and performance. It also will address ways in which to communicate that feedback to instructors in a supportive and high-standard manner. Workshop participants will develop instructor-focused evaluation instruments for their institutional context. Participants will also develop student-focused evaluation instruments. The objective is for both instruments to be used in practice in future situations.

• Planning for Meaningful Choices for All (50 minutes): This section will help OWI instructors become proactive about preparing their courses for disabled students rather than to cater to these students on an ad hoc basis. It also aims at weaning instructors away from an overdependence on campus disability services. Beginning with a quick overview of what we know about catering to the needs of disabled students, the facilitator will offer a synopsis of how institutions of higher education in other countries are responding to the needs of the disabled, and then provide a set of guidelines to plan OWI courses that are inclusive of disabled students and tailor-made for all. The interactivity of this session will stem from a brief pre-workshop survey with the registered participants via email about how they handle, or would handle, a particular disabled student situation. Using their responses, the planning guidelines unit will build on and extend participants’ existing repertoire of pedagogical approaches to instruct their students with special needs.

During the workshop breaks, the facilitator for this segment will be available to demonstrate to interested participants how blind students use Web technology, problems with opening and reading PDF files, screen reader considerations, and to answer participant questions about access technology for the disabled.

The workshop will conclude with a summary of the one-half day session activities and an assessment intended to allow participants to provide feedback regarding future potential workshops in OWI best practices.

***Chair:*** Beth Hewett, University of Maryland University College, Adelphi

***Speakers:*** Beth Hewett, University of Maryland University College, Adelphi, “The Phenomenon of OWI”

Christa Ehmann Powers, Smarthinking, Inc., Washington, DC, “Screening and Training”

Webster Newbold, Ball State University, Muncie, IN, “On-Going Evaluation”

Sushil Oswal, University of Washington, Tacoma, “Planning for Meaningful Choices for All”

**AW.9 Diversity and Writing Assessment: Gateways to Assessing and Reporting Student Performance**

In the 2010 Census, just over one-third of the U.S. population reported their race and ethnicity as something other than non-Hispanic White alone. (U.S. Census, 2010). Such demographics mark a significant change in traditional writing classrooms. College students are diverse, international, multilingual, and many are not 18-22 years old. Thus our assessments must consider who our students are, what competencies they come with, and how we might best design and report our assessments. This workshop asks: What do the changing demographics of college students mean for the ways that we assess writing? What strategies are we using in designing assessment and reporting our data? How might we improve those processes, decisions, experiences, and reporting structures?

More than 15 years ago, Asa Hilliard challenged test designers to “account for cultural realities” of students (1995, p. 11). Rather than trying to make tests that were “culture-free,” Hilliard argued, test designers needed to consider culture throughout the test design process. In other words, our assessment technologies work with and against the diverse students who come to our institutions. The educational measurement community has responded to this call to make tests more “fair” by locating sources of bias in tests, considering the consequences of testing, and designing tests with enhanced cultural sensitivity (Camilli, 2006). Likewise, the writing assessment community has called for assessment to be linked to a social action agenda that “allows us to guard against over-privileging the values, gestures and customs of certain groups, and provides assessment with the potential to become an agent for progressive social change that highlights the improvement of educational environments and opportunities for all students” (Huot, 2002, p. 9).

This workshop has three phases: (1) framing concepts—90 minutes; (2) exploring local questions—60 minutes; and (3) discussion and next steps—60 minutes.

PHASE ONE: FRAMING

The first phase is a presentation of writing assessment concepts, framing ideas, and issues related to race that will help participants engage in the activities of the workshop. These three collaborative presentations are approximately 15 minutes each, and offer writing assessment examples. The final 45 minutes of this phase is reserved for participants to question and dialogue about the ideas, concepts, and issues.

Speakers 3 and 6 present a framework for assessment designed to capture and report the writing performance of diverse student populations, centering on the validation process, with special attention to construct and consequential validity (Kane, 2006). Participants consider how to design assessments that yield information that reaches far beyond a mere ranking of student performances. After a literature review of contemporary measurement practices tailored for writing assessment, reporting structures, specifically written report design and social media applications, are discussed so that all shareholders may better understand the design and impact of assessments (Middaugh, 2010). Special attention is given to survey design (NSSE SIG-Writing, 2011) and performance assessment (Baldwin, Fowles, & Livingston, 2005).

Speakers 1, 4, and 7 present some framing ideas and issues that identify some race-based assessment inquiries and ways to consider linguistically diverse students, providing some large-scale and classroom examples of writing assessments: How do students’ expectations of assessments, many of which are constructed by racial arrangements in society or their linguistic dispositions, shape students’ written products and results? How do students’ senses of the ways that test scores are reported affect their results and student performances? How do grading technologies affect various groups, and how might a teacher inquire in her own classes? How might writing assessments create unequal racial arrangements, or accommodate linguistically diverse populations?

Speakers 2 and 5 present the discourses of women of color in a FYW classroom who counter and re-script program learning objectives in a predominantly white-taught FYW program. In this example, the majority of faculty embraced the objectives and have argued that the female students of color were agreeably rewording the mostly white western tropes of discourse that the program objectives exemplified. Participants are asked how race is coded into their own program’s (or course) objectives and how those objectives might reproduce racialized outcomes, namely what Solano-Flores (Solano-Flores, 2001; Solano-Flores, et al., 2008; Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003) has shown: that assessment discourse is white and as teachers, we are not always “hearing” our students’ counter-positions and are often unable to argue strongly for the racial or cultural validity of our writing assessments’ decisions.

PHASE TWO: QUESTIONS

With design concepts in mind, the second phase asks participants to design generative research questions that may help them consider what they want to accomplish at their institutions. The following areas are considered:

Program Design

- Discourse forms that encourage / discourage students

- Process, post-process, and student diversity

- Stakeholders involved

- What do we want to learn from what evidence

- What kinds of decisions

Program Implementation as Shared Governance

- Instructor workshops

- Students as shareholders

- Designing programs for assessment

- Use of national assessment models, such as the NSSE SIG on Writing

- Stakeholder racial representation

Assessment Process

- Evidence gathering and methods

- Judges of writing performance

Reporting Processes

- Report designs

- Social / New media options

- Representing racial formations

Using Assessment Results to Inform Instruction

- Feedback loops vs. testing washback

- Mentoring, teacher orientations, and norming sessions

Participants engage in small groups to construct, or begin planning, their own writing assessments that address the unique, diverse student formations at their own sites. The workshop organizers participate in the discussions of each group. This phase culminates in participants producing lists of ideas, concerns, and questions, or planning documents. These lists and documents are offered to the entire group and the workshop organizers for discussion.

PHASE THREE: DISCUSSION

The third phase engages everyone in a discussion about the concepts and questions they produced in their groups, then considers ways to disseminate information generated from the workshop and their future projects. It also offers the organizers a way to connect the participants’ concerns with the opening presentations’ framing ideas, assessment concepts, and race issues.

***Speakers:*** Asao B. Inoue, California State University, Fresno

Mya Poe, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Elliot Norbert, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark

Carmen Kynard, St. John’s University, Queens, NY

William Condon, Washington State University, Pullman

Susan Miller-Cochran, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

Frankie Condon, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

**AW.10 Writing Democracy 2012: Envisioning a Federal Writers’ Project for the 21st Century**

Seventy-five years ago during the Great Depression, a division of the Works Progress Administration called the Federal Writers’ Project employed writers and researchers to create “a new roadmap for the cultural rediscovery of America” via local guidebooks, oral histories, and folklore. Today, college writing programs, service-learning programs, and scholars across the disciplines are engaging in university-community partnerships that might together create a similar roadmap for rediscovering 21st century America.

After the 2008 crash, numerous commentators suggested the idea of a new FWP. Although it became clear by late 2009 that Obama’s stimulus package would not fund such a project, the idea inspired an informal meeting at CCCC 2010 and a conference Writing Democracy: A Rhetoric of (T)here in March 2011 at Texas A&M-Commerce, and further developed during a follow-up meeting at CCCC 2011. Another venue for dialogue about the idea is a forthcoming special issue of the *Community Literacy Journal*.

Over 150 scholars, students, and community members convened in Commerce in March 2011 looked at place, history, local publics, and popular movements in an attempt to understand and promote democracy through research, writing, and action. It is precisely this existing infrastructure of university-community projects that suggests the direction Writing Democracy might take to enact what Ernest Boyer calls the “scholarship of engagement” in local communities: local histories of a neighborhood school in Brooklyn (Mutnick), publications co-authored by undergraduate researchers and local community centers and museums (Grobman), video and audio “remixes” of archival materials featuring local histories of traditionally underrepresented groups (Carter).

The primary goal of the proposed CCCC Workshop is to extend the conversation that began in 2010 at CCCC and continued in Commerce, and thus to further examine the possibilities for creating a national network that could link existing local projects and give rise to new ones. Participants will be invited to submit textual, video, and/or audio representations of local projects two weeks before the conference at writingdemocracy.org. Through this portal, workshop leaders will facilitate an online discussion regarding a wide range of projects nationwide, analyzing commonalities and differences, and drawing conclusions about how they might form the basis of FWP 2.0.

Part I of the proposed workshop will feature a brief presentation by Jerrold Hirsch (Truman University), a historian who will set the current initiative in the historical context of the FWP’s achievements and impediments. Hirsch’s emphasis on what we can learn from the FWP in the 1930s will set the stage for contemporary examples of how we can contribute to a people’s history of the U.S. in the 21st century. Contemporary local projects will be featured in a short video montage drawn from depictions provided by participants before the conference via the Writing Democracy portal.

For Part II of the workshop, invited Respondents will offer 5–10 minute prepared remarks in response to local projects featured on the video and at writingdemocracy.org within a broader context, setting the stage for a plenary for the development of a productive plan for FWP 2.0, utilizing the interactive, collaborative, user-generated capacities of the Web to collect, curate, disseminate, and archive multimodal writing about communities, places, and people that might be to future generations what FWP narratives are to contemporary scholars. Respondents will help guide the discussion of potential “linkages” and overarching goals from different angles, including community publishing, digital humanities, and writing across communities.

The Workshop concludes with a plenary on the mission, structure, and goals of Writing Democracy and FWP 2.0. Small groups will explore and debate methods, theories, goals, and outcomes of university-community projects, extrapolating best pedagogical, rhetorical, and research practices and identifying key themes. Discussion leaders will help facilitate small group discussion. Reports to the full group will be used to draft a mission statement which will then form the basis for a final discussion about building the Writing Democracy network, envisioning FWP 2.0, and generating new questions about the potential for linking existing and future projects across disciplinary, geographical, and social gateways.

Framing Questions:

1) Using the FWP as a model, can we develop a typology for what these projects look like now?

2) What pedagogical methods best support university-community projects? Are the goals of such projects compatible with the goals of college writing instruction?

3) What outreach and collaborative methods best support partnerships with communities? How can academic partners best meet the needs of community partners?

4) How can Writing Democracy/FWP 2.0 create a national—or even international—network of local projects (guides, ethnographic studies, oral histories, and multimodal essays)? What resources and support will be needed to sustain such an effort?

Through these framing questions, we hope to formulate an overarching set of methods, goals, and practices, while generating new questions about existing and possible projects. During the CCCC Workshop, we will use this knowledge from the field to envision a network that might replicate and go beyond the FWP’s achievements seventy-five years ago.

Names of additional presenters and descriptions of local projects will be available online (writingdemocracy.org) and at the workshop. Workshop organizers commit to continued communication and requests for involvement, posting mission statement, goals, and forum for next steps, which will likely include the organization of Writing Democracy 2013 in Brooklyn, NY (Long Island University).

***Co-Chairs:*** Deborah Mutnick, Long Island University, Brooklyn, NY

Shannon Carter, Texas A&M-Commerce,

***Speakers:*** Jerrold Hirsch, Truman State University, Kirksville, MO, “Historical Context of the Federal Writers’ Project”

Stephen Parks, Syracuse University, NY, “Resisting Democracy: Grassroots Activism Meets University/ Community Partnerships”

Laurie Grobman, Penn State Berks, Reading, “Community-Based Undergraduate Research and the Writing of Local Histories”

Brian Hendrickson, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, “As Taproot, As Heart: Writing Across Communities and the Democratizing Function of the Community Writing Center”

David Jolliffe, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, “Writing Democracy: Literacy and Civic Revitalization in an Arkansas Delta Community”

Catherine Hobbs, University of Oklahoma, Norman, “History in the Red: Radical History and the FWP”

***Respondents:*** Jeffrey Grabill, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Kathleen Blake Yancey, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Harvey J. Graff, The Ohio State University, Columbus

**AW.11 Writing Studies Curriculum: A Gateway to Writing Transfer**

Gateway composition courses are those that equip students for “far transfer” (Nelms & Dively, 2007) and “deep learning” (Tagg, 2003). Scholars have noted that teaching for far transfer or deep learning in writing requires more than merely teaching processes or “skills” (Detterman, 1993; Haskell, 2001; Nelms & Dively, 2007). A relatively new development in composition studies, using content in writing studies as the course content (what is known as a “writing about writing” or WAW approach) seems to be effectively engaging students at this deeper level, enabling an internal transformation, which, according to Bereiter (1995), is “a learner’s state of being, not just a set of situational learning strategies or instructional implants” (17). This workshop is designed to draw participants into discussions about innovative uses of the WAW approach in a variety of contexts. Participants will be expected to bring their own course materials to share (or their ideas about potential courses), actively engage in the pedagogical discussions, and draft concrete plans for pedagogical changes they plan to make.

The workshop will begin with a brief history and philosophy of WAW. Following this introduction, workshop leaders will set up “booths” at different tables, and participants will choose four booths to visit, having 30 minutes at each booth. The final portion of the workshop will engage participants in individually creating plans for implementing pedagogical changes, ending with a sharing of plans around tables.

***Chair:*** Barb Bird, Taylor University, Upland, IN

***Speakers:*** Elizabeth Wardle, University of Central Florida, Orlando, “History and Philosophy of WAW”

Rebecca Babcock, University of Texas Permian Basin, Odessa, “Writing about Writing Online”

Laurie McMillan, Marywood University, Scranton, PA, “ Increasing Student Engagement and Agency through Publication”

Marianna Hendricks, University of Texas at El Paso, “Attending to Multilingualism within WAW”

Zach Warzecka, University of Texas at El Paso, “Attending to Multilingualism within WAW”

Mackenzie Frazier, University of Texas at El Paso, “ Attending to Multilingualism within WAW”

Brennon Thomas, Saint Francis University, Loretto, PA, “Problem-Based Learning Projects
for Linked First-Year Composition Courses”

Cornelia Paraskevas, Western Oregon University, Monmouth, “ Exploring the Language of College Writing: Multiple Options, Minimal Constraints”

Jennifer Well, Florida State University, Tallahassee, “Transfer from a High School WAW
Course to College Writing”

Heather Camp, Minnesota State University-Mankato, “WAW a la Beaufort: A ‘Writing Expertise’ Curriculum Stretch Course”

M. Elizabeth Sargent, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, “Assessing WAW: Classroom Research and Program Assessment”

**AW.12 Pedagogical Transitions with Latino/a Students in the Midwest: A Workshop Sponsored by the NCTE/CCCC Latino/a Caucus**

The purpose of this workshop is to provide research opportunities for local and national teachers at all levels and to exchange knowledge and experience on teaching, research, mentorship, professional development, and community literacy related to Latino/a student populations, especially those in the Midwest.

Description: Each Facilitator will present their scholarly and pedagogical experiences on teaching Latino/a students both locally and nationally. Facilitators will respond to the efficacy of research on writing instruction with attention to teacher expertise and curriculum design. Interactive workshop themes will consist of: comparative place-based pedagogies for Latino/a populations in different regions including Hispanic Serving Institutions and specifically Missouri community colleges and schools; culturally-relevant teaching strategies and correlating educational needs of English Language Learners, migration, and literacy acquisition; emerging research strategies for building coalitions and alliances across disciplinary, cultural, ethnic, political, and linguistic borders; links between academic life, collaborative work, and community literacy. Some of our Latina facilitators teach in the Midwest and will provide research and pedagogical insights that address this region. Finally, significant time will be designated for local and national participants to share their research, teaching projects, and challenges unique in their region.

Proposed Activities: Participants will be actively involved through: a) focused writing and mentoring exercises, b) contributing to group discussion on Latino/a issues in writing and learning, and c) meeting in clusters organized according to specific themes. For the second half of the workshop, facilitators will organize groups according to participant research and teaching interests. Some interests may include pedagogies at Hispanic Serving Institutions, local Missouri community colleges, knowledge and practices that support English Language Learners, teaching Latino/a rhetorics and rhetorical theories, and Latino/a histories of rhetoric, literacy, and migration.

Expected Outcomes: Facilitators will network with colleagues and Missouri teachers to exchange knowledge and experience on teaching, research, mentorship, professional development, and community literacy related to Latino/a student populations. Participants will receive personal, constructive feedback from facilitators and other Workshop participants with the intention of future dialogues.

***Chairs:*** Damián Baca, University of Arizona, Tucson

Cristina Kirklighter, Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi

***Speakers:*** Isabel Baca, University of Texas at El Paso

Juan Gallegos, University of Arizona, Tucson

Romeo Garcia, Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi

Alexandra Hidalgo, Purdue University, Lafayette, IN

Kendall Leon, Purdue University, Lafayette, IN

Aja Martinez, University of Arizona, Tucson

Octavio Pimentel, Texas State University-San Marcos

**AW.13 We Are Not Gatekeepers: Complicating Our Relationships to Student Texts**

In 1983’s *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing*, C.H. Knoblauch and Lil Brannon wrote that “the artificial progression of stages, which many teachers recommend, from selecting a subject to finding a thesis to building an outline to ‘fleshing it out’ with prose […] surely suggests that writing is a perfunctory, ceremonial exercise, not designed to discover new learning” (24). It is still, however, not unusual to come across advice like the following in writing handbooks published as late as 2010: “Now it is time to create a working outline. Always include your thesis at the top of your outline as a guiding light.”

This may explain why it remains commonplace for first-year college students (and sometimes their teachers) to have an oddly linear understanding of not only their writing processes, but their progression as writers. In all too many popular contemporary handbooks, we encounter a linear path that begins with “personal” writing and “evolves” to more “academic” prose. This myth remains the dominant narrative in quite a large number of freshman composition courses.

We have a problem with this.

There are few spaces in academia more openly contested than the first-year writing course—we are still struggling, as a discipline, to define exactly what it is we do. And with continued institutional pressure to “legitimate” ourselves, it may be tempting to fall back on these tidy notions of “personal” and “academic” writing—they are, after all, relatively decipherable to an “outside” audience.

But we want to argue that they are also restrictive, limiting, and fundamentally untenable. We want to look at the selves our students construct through writing in a way that acknowledges the complex strategies and moves they perform—moves and strategies we may often miss if we read their texts in the circumscribed ways demanded by the still predominant “personal”/“academic” binary.

A group of established and emerging scholars, what we hope to offer our participants are questions and reading models, assignments, approaches, and strategies intended to open up the prescribed field of meaning facilitated by the “linear path” metaphors we encounter far too often. We want to debunk the myth of the solipsistic, uncritical first-year writer by looking at the way that our students configure the selves they write through and about—selves that are rhetorically crafted and constructed in dialogue with socio-political contexts, institutional demands, and multiple audiences. We will argue that these are meaningful practices that we can attune ourselves to become more aware of through critical reading habits.

Among the questions we want to explore through dialogue are:

What intellectual work occurs in the personal essays of first-year students? How do successful personal essays allow writers to challenge commonplaces and speak back to given identities and conventions?

How can the concept of “fictionalized truth” allow students viable options for constructing selves and voices that veer away from the journalistic and to the nuanced and complex?

How can genres like the lyric essay complicate our understanding of “personal” and “academic” writing?

What might Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s notion of “reparative reading” (as opposed to a hermeneutics of suspicion) offer us as readers of student texts?

How can multiple genres open up a dialogue among home and academic identities?

How can code meshing help us to escape the binary created by notions of code switching?

How do we engage with the multi-layered selves students construct in trauma narratives?

How do personal and academic writing foster the construction of students’ voices?

What role(s) might writing centers play in formulating and addressing these pivotal questions?

Overall, we want to ask: What expectations/assumptions are we bringing to the table in the construction of our assignments and our encounter with our students’ writing, and how can we form habits that might be better attuned to what our students may actually be saying? We will ask participants to come with their own assignments and syllabi, and engage with us in a rich dialogue about our expectations and habits. We will be looking at student texts together, writing and speaking about our own politics and reading practices, and ultimately attempting to enrich the discourse around textual self-construction and teacher response.

***Speakers:*** Matthew Bird, LaGuardia Community College, Long Island, NY

Tara Roeder, St. John’s University, Queens, NY

Roseanne Gatto, St. John’s University, Queens, NY

Thomas Newkirk, University of New Hampshire, Durham

Tom Philipose, St. John’s University, Queens, NY

Lizbeth Bryant, Purdue Calumet, Crown Point, IN

Nancy Mack, Wright State University, Urbana, OH

Daniel Collins, Manhattan College, Bronx, NY

Adam Koehler, Manhattan College, Bronx, NY

**AW.14 Contemplative Teaching and Learning in the Composition and Communication Classrooms**

Higher education has historically done well in training students with respect to critical reasoning and quantitative analysis, to what might be described as the higher order thinking skills. It has not always done as well in fostering the teaching and learning that develops contemplative methods and practice, the kind of learning that teaches students to be reflective, to be mindful, and to pay attention.

 In describing this kind of education, Professor Arthur Zajonc, Director of the Academic Program, Contemplative Mind in Society, writes, “Contemplative pedagogy makes conscious use of a wide range of practices for two essential ends:

- the cultivation of attention and emotional balance

- the development of faculties required for insight and creativity.

This half-day workshop will offer participants both the theory and practice of contemplative teaching and learning for the composition and communications classroom.

Speaker 1: “The Classroom Is a Sangha: Contemplative Education in the Composition and Communications Classroom.” Contemplative education, including meditation, mindfulness, lectio divina, free writing, regularly practiced in a classroom where a climate of ahimsa and non-judgment are defining attitudes, can restore wholeness and enhance engagement, imagination, and compassion in instructors and in students. During the workshop I will talk about the benefits of sitting meditation, engage participants in guided meditation, and end with freewriting.

Speaker 2: “Mindful Movement and Patterns of Argument.” In this part of the workshop, participants will engage in some activities that foster awareness of the body in motion, both as a contemplative practice and also as a bodily expression of patterns of argument. We will explore how certain physical movements (adapted from tai chi and aikido) provide a novel way to learn rhetorical structures—patterns that students can use when writing papers on controversial issues. The session will conclude with examples of

student papers that illustrate the connections between mindful movement and argumentative writing.

Speaker 3: “Eastern Understandings of Embodiment and Mindfulness as Articulated by Iyengar Yoga.” This part of the workshop investigates how Eastern understandings of embodiment and mindfulness as articulated by Iyengar yoga can be a generative heuristic for inquiry, pedagogy and practice in the writing classroom. My mixed session will combine a brief, practical overview and an interactive yoga practice. I will quickly explore the congruencies of writing bodies and yoga bodies and will explain how I have successfully integrated a “yoga for writers” sequence in my writing classes, a sequence that teaches students to use yoga of the breath (pranayama) and of the physical body (asanas) to navigate and to embody the writing process. I will then encourage attendees to try some of these same “yoga for writers” practices. By looking, finally, to samples of students’ reflective writings, my goal will be to show how contemplative writing curricula that teach students to use yoga as a means of navigating the composing process can help authors to imagine themselves as writing bodies; reflect on the writing process as physically demanding; and see the writing product as materially saturated.

Speaker 4: “Waking up to Ourselves”: The Use of Mindfulness Meditation and Emotional Intelligence in the Teaching of Communications.” This part of the workshop will continue the discussion of mindfulness and how it can be applied to improving one’s ability to communicate effectively. Participants will be lead through some basic mindfulness meditation to begin to experience the connection between mindfulness and communication. Participants will then use Paul Ekman’s “Refractory Period” model to discuss emotional reactivity and ways mindfulness can help us reappraise situations to avoid becoming emotionally hijacked–emphasizing recent findings in contemplative neuroscience that identify which parts of the brain may be activated during these processes. Participants will also identify some of their own communication challenges and discuss ways of meeting those challenges mindfully—without judgment. Finally, participants will explore how mindful communication can be used in writing workshops to help writers avoid becoming defensive and to assist peer responders to speak honestly and accurately about how they experienced reading their peers’ drafts.

***Chair:*** Keith Kroll, Kalamazoo Valley Community College, MI

***Speakers:*** Robert Haight, Kalamazoo Valley Community College, MI, “The Classroom is a Sangha: Contemplative Education in the Composition or Communications Classroom”

Barry Kroll, Leighigh University, Bethlehem, PA, “Mindful Movement and Patterns of Argument”

Christy Wenger, Shepherd University, Shepherdstown, WV, “Eastern Understandings of Embodiment and Mindfulness as Articulated by Iyengar Yoga”

Dan Huston, NHTI, Concord’s Community College, NH, “Waking up to Ourselves: The Use of Mindfulness Meditation and Emotional Intelligence in the Teaching of Communications”

**All-Day Wednesday:**

**W.1 Writing Teachers Writing: Deepening Our Passion for Our Own Writing**

While the CCCC convention allows for useful and often inspiring talk about writing and teaching writing, it rarely allows time for the activity of writing itself. The workshop leaders, experienced writers and teachers of Creative Nonfiction, will focus this day on writing. Leaders and participants will experience what we invite students in our classes to do: to write on demand and to share our writing. Leaders and participants will also get to do the kinds of writing that we may normally not make time to do—creative nonfiction, poetry, family or personal stories, for example. Participants will also take away tested writing prompts to use in or adapt to various kinds of writing classes.

In this full-day pre-convention workshop, three one-hour sessions will be devoted to writing, with participants invited to respond to prompts presented by workshop leaders. The day includes opportunities for small group sharing and discussion of ways to develop writings. In the final workshop hour, all participants will be invited to share writing and to reflect on the value of writing teachers’ writing for ourselves and for our students.

Where I Write

 Several famous essayists, George Orwell and Joan Didion among them, have contemplated “Why I Write.” As writers and teachers of writing, we often reflect on motivations for writing and mental processes, but we sometimes forget that writing is also an intensely physical act. Where do you write? Consider your present surroundings, your usual writing space, or an ideal writing space drawn from your experience or your imagination. Describe the space. In what ways does the physical context affect your writing? How do you interact with or inhabit the space? How does your body respond to the act of writing? Does making or experiencing physical changes alter the act of writing?

Family History

James Baldwin once wrote, “We are all trapped in history, and history is trapped in us.” That may be especially true of family history. Sometimes we are glad to accommodate the images of ourselves that we acquired in our childhood or adolescence or adulthood; sometimes we wince in real emotional pain in recalling ways we were teased, described, warned, threatened, punished for being who we were or wanted to be. As you remember what it was like to live with and in your family of origin, recreate a scene or a feeling, letting the details convey what happened and how or why it has stayed with you for all these years.

Writing about an Emotion

Choose a strong emotion you’d like to embrace with what Thich Nhat Hanh terms “the energy of mindfulness”: anger, fear, shame, guilt,joy, etc. Bring yourself into a moment of your experience of the emotion: How did it feel? Where were you? What happened? Write to embrace your experience of the emotion, to explore its complexities. Partway through this writing, you might stop and reflect on any inner resistances you might have to writing about your emotion—what do you tell yourself about it? Then continue writing about the emotion. How does your thinking evolve as you describe and reflect on your experience?

The Zebra Finch’s Song for Life

The zebra finch apparently has a gene allowing it to learn language, much like a limited number of species—bats, whales, elephants, and people. The baby zebra finch babbles, and then listening to an older zebra finch, learns to produce a sophisticated song that becomes its song for life. Has your life been guided by a song for life? It might be an actual song but it might be more useful to think of it as a way of being or seeing that has worked for you. Who helped you learn this? Can you describe a specific scene when this learning happened? How has your song for life changed? What does this mean to you now?

Snapshots

We will examine and write about photographs, soaking ourselves in the luxury of “reflective time” that French photographer Henri Cartier-Bresson describes as a key difference between the work of photographers and writers. After reviewing several poems about photographs, we will turn our attention to our own photographs (brought with us, taken that day, or provided by leader). Describe in full detail everything that you see in your chosen photograph. Then consider the life that is/was lived outside the frame of the photograph, the moments before and after the snap. Write about memories not contained in the precise moment of the photograph, then return to your photograph with both the eye of a photographer and the reflection of a writer to fill in the gaps.

Rant

Now and then a good rant, like a good cry, does wonders. Among my favorite ranters are Mark Twain and Edward Abbey, both willing and able to let fly at what they perceive as hypocrisy or stupidity, sometimes with humor, sometimes with gall. Here’s your invitation to blast away at something that pisses you off, without apology. But not without introspection. You see, after you’ve let your words run a good bit, I’d like you to step back. What’s the source of your ire? In particular, what experiences, people, ideas, or perspectives may have led to this? Write about that, too.

On the Streets

“The writing life has a continuing rhythm of listen and tell, listen and tell,” notes Kim Stafford in “The Muses Among Us”. In this segment, writers are invited to hit the nearby streets of St. Louis (or just roam the halls in the Convention Center) with their notebooks, opening their ears and eyes to the richness of the language around us. Overheard phrases and “found” texts—graffiti, ads, signs, etc.—should spark writing that draws strength from and plays with language rhythms, in the form of dialogue, speech, persona, or monologue.

***Chair:*** Libby Falk Jones, Berea College, KY

***Speakers:*** Sandee McGlaun, Roanoke College, Salem, VA, “Where I Write”

Rebecca Blevins Faery, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, “Family History” Irene Papoulis, Trinity College, Hartford, CT, “Writing about an Emotion”

Mike Heller, Roanoke College, Salem, VA, “The Zebra Finch’s Song for Life”

Jenny Spinner, St. Joseph’s University, Philadelphia, PA, “Snapshots”

Doug Hesse, University of Denver, CO, “Rant”

Libby Falk Jones, Berea College, KY, “On the Streets”

**W.2 Rhetoric and Composition Pedagogy and Scholarship in the Context of Globalization: Emerging Globally Networked Learning Environments as New Gateways for Theory, Research, and Pedagogy**

I. Workshop Description

Recent work in composition and rhetoric as well as in its various areas of specialization, such as WAC/WID or technical and professional communication, has seen a surge in efforts to situate and re-imagine the study and teaching of writing in the sociopolitical context of globalization. Characterized by dominant narratives of global Western expansion, “free” trade, and the sale of higher education in global markets as well as by the exclusion of the public from global decision making, globalization has presented new complexities for rhetoric and composition as a field that has a rich history of commitment to citizen participation in democratic deliberation as well as to the creation of learning environments that reflect this commitment.

Working from this commitment, rhetoric and composition scholars have begun to develop globally networked learning environments (GNLEs), that is, partnered learning environments that extend across national, institutional, linguistic, and other boundaries for mutual learning and knowledge making across diverse ways of knowing situated in diverse geopolitical locations (e.g., Alfano, 2009; Anderson, Bergman, Bradley, Gustafsson, & Matzke, 2010; Blum Malley, Ruiters, and Gulyaeva, 2011; Crabtree, Sapp, Malespie, & Norori, 2008; Dubinsky, 2008; Herrington, 2010; Maylath, Vandepitte, & Mouston, 2008; McNair & Paretti, 2010; O’Brien, 2009; Rainey, Smith, & Barnum, 2008; Starke-Meyerring, 2010). Their grounding in partnerships, collaboration, and networks of new pedagogical and scholarly relationships marks these emerging learning environments not only as important alternatives to dominant expansionist approaches, but also as new “gateways” for re-seeing rhetoric and composition scholarship. We invite workshop participants to join us in exploring these new learning environments as gateways for re-seeing and situating our work in the context of globalization. For this purpose, the workshop is guided by these questions:

1. What new possibilities do emerging partnered learning environments and pedagogies offer for examining and acting on the situatedness of rhetoric and composition theory, pedagogy, and scholarship in contexts of globalization?

2. How do we re-think our understanding of language and identity in these environments? How do we, as rhetoric and composition scholars have increasingly argued, move beyond a traditional notion of monolingual policies and standards (e.g., Horner, Lu, & Matsuda, 2010; Jordan, 2010)?

3. Since many of these learning environments are digitally mediated or have important digital components, how do the politics of language interact with the politics of technology in facilitating, enabling, or constraining cross-boundary knowledge making (e.g., Rife, 2010; Hawisher & Selfe, 2000; Grabill, 2007)?

4. What are the implications for emerging networked and partnered pedagogies for writing programs?

5. What opportunities can be created to develop a community or commons for continued inquiry?

Guided by these questions, the main purpose of this workshop is to bring together for sharing, mutual learning, and community building scholars, who have developed and studied globally networked learning environments as well as those who are interested in beginning to explore them.

II. Workshop Design

The workshop will consist of two sets of activities:

1. Pre-workshop activities

One month before the workshop, discussion facilitators (those who have developed and studied GNLEs) and registrants will exchange through an online forum to generate an initial understanding of and materials for:

- approaches to GNLEs

- possibilities or plans for GNLEs

- questions arising from GNLE work for the study and teaching of writing in globalizing higher education

- a bibliography of emerging scholarship

2. Workshop activities

The workshop itself is divided into two phases: morning and afternoon sessions, each with a set of small-group and plenary discussions exploring important aspects of emerging GNLEs. The workshop will begin with a brief introduction that will build on pre-workshop activities, followed by a large-group discussion in which those who have studied and facilitated GNLEs provide a brief introduction to their work to facilitate beginning questions and discussion for the workshop.

The small-group discussions will be facilitated by those who have developed and studied GNLEs, and the plenary discussions will benefit from the perspectives of leading scholars working in areas vital to advancing scholarship on these emerging partnered learning environments, such as work in WPA work, WAC/WID, politics of language, and politics of technology. The insights generated throughout these sessions will be captured and distributed to participants after the workshop.

***Chair:*** Doreen Starke-Meyerring, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

***Speakers:*** Christine Alfano, Stanford University, CA, “The Cross-Cultural Rhetoric Project”

Alyssa O’Brien, Stanford University, CA, “The Cross-Cultural Rhetoric Project”

Suzanne Blum Malley, Columbia College, Chicago, IL, “The Sharing Cultures Project”

TyAnna Herrington, Georgia Tech, Atlanta, “The Global Classroom Project”

Bruce Maylath, North Dakota State University, Fargo, “The Transatlantic Project”

Lisa McNair, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, “Across Cultures, Across Disciplines”

Marie Paretti, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, “Across Cultures, Across Disciplines”

David Allan Sapp, Fairfield University, Fairfield, CT, “Global partnerships for Social Justice”

Jennifer Craig, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, “A WAC partnership as a part of the Singapore-MIT Alliance”

Mya Poe, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, “A WAC-EFL Collaboration between MIT and Two Mexican Universities”

Herb Smith, Southern Polytechnic State University, Marietta, GA, “An International 2+2 Degree Program”

Paul Anderson, University of Miami, OH, “Peer Review across Cultures”

***Respondents:*** Cynthia Selfe, The Ohio State University, Columbus, “The Politics of Technology”

Jeff Grabill, Michigan State University, East Lansing, “The Politics of Technology”

Paul Matsuda, Arizona State University, Tempe, “The Politics of Language”

Jay Jordan, Utah State University, Salt Lake City, “The Politics of Language”

Min Zhan Lu, University of Louisville, KY, “The Politics of Language”

David Martins, Rochester Institute of Technology, NY, “Implications of GNLEs for Writing Programs”

Chris Thaiss, University of California, Davis, “Implications of GNLEs for Writing Programs”

**W.3 Assessing Multimodal Assignments**

Continual innovation in computer and classroom technology is creating a plethora of new media and new genres that are changing what it means to teach “writing.” Many instructors now routinely include assignments that include visual information (photographs, charts, graphs, maps), but even more than that, students can now create texts that include sound, movement, interaction, and even imagined or replicated worlds. While our students often find these assignments engaging and even exciting, they do present instructors—often trained in more traditional composition studies—with a major problem: How do we assess the work that our students produce in these new media using these new tools? In a recent Computers and Composition Online article, Murray, Sheets, and Williams report that many composition faculty feel that they have inadequate training to assess multimodal products. While composition and rhetoric studies provide some guidance, we need to go beyond our comfort zone and stretch our assessment muscles by incorporating ideas from fields such as cognitive psychology, semiotics, visual communication, and art. This workshop will provide an overview of guidelines that can aid assessment regardless of mode, medium, or genre, demonstrate how the guidelines work with different assignments, and allow participants to assess a variety of samples of student work. By the end of the workshop, attendees will understand how to apply a set of particular guidelines to help them assess a range of multimodal, new media products. Attendees will also be able to help other instructors at their institution develop an understanding of these guidelines.

Session leaders will bring their own laptop computers. Session participants are encouraged to bring their own laptop computers or iPads.

***Chair:*** Lee Odell, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, NY

***Speakers:*** Susan Katz, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

Matt Barton, St. Cloud State University, MN

Jared Johnson, Georgia Gwinnett College, Lawrenceville

Dirk Remley, Kent State University, OH

Matt Paproth, Georgia Gwinnett College, Lawrenceville

Jason Swarts, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

**W.4 Teaching, Research, and Service at the Two-Year College**

Scholarship on teaching and working in two-year college settings is growing. Tinberg and Nadeau’s *The Community College Writer* studies the experiences of students adjusting to the new expectations of academic discourse in an open-access campus; the journal *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* continues to flourish; two-year college faculty have led the discipline in exploring the question *What Is College-Level Writing*? in two edited volumes; and 2010 saw the release of a new public statement on Research and Scholarship in the Two-Year College. With 43% of our first-year students starting out at two-year campuses—nearly 7.4 million students, according to the American Association of Community Colleges—it’s more critical than ever that CCCC becomes a space for the professional development of instructors from these institutions.

We propose a full-day, interactive pre-conference workshop (part of the conference’s TYCA strand) to support the professional development of teachers and scholars who work at two-year institutions; the workshop would also be appropriate for graduate students who are interested in learning more about professional life at two-year and open-access campuses.

The morning session will be divided into three segments:

Segment 1—The Future of the Profession at Two-Year Colleges: A keynote panel of influential teacher-scholars will discuss important directions and pressing issues for the future of writing studies at two-year colleges.

Segment 2—Creative Solutions for Teaching English at Two-Year Institutions: All participants will be invited to bring challenges they face at their campuses related to program development, administration, professional development, or teaching and learning. They will learn from colleagues about what works at other institutions through interactive, small group discussions that focus on innovative solutions. This session will lay the foundation for the afternoon breakout sessions that will explore these issues in greater depth based on participant interest.

Segment 3— Research Gaps in Scholarship on English in the Two-Year College. This session will engage participants in discussion of gaps in research and inquiry on student learning in two-year settings, invite brainstorming about possible projects, and connect teacher-scholars with others who have similar research agendas. Experienced researchers will provide support for participants who are new to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

After lunch, the group will reconvene to focus primarily on breakout sessions facilitated by discussion leaders, each of whom is a national leader in the theme of the breakout session. The discussion facilitators will prepare brief (10–15 minute) statements assessing the current state of their theme and lead participants in a discussion of the problems, questions, strengths, and future of their respective topics. The three breakout themes are as follows:

• Professional Development at the Two-Year Campus: Scholarship originating from two-year campuses is underrepresented in the national scholarly dialogue on teaching and learning in writing studies. How can faculty at two-year campuses find (and fund!) time for research in their workloads?

• Teaching and Learning in the Two-Year College: This breakout session will focus on the challenges of meeting a wide range of student learning needs at open-access campuses and discuss resources for improving the work we do in the classroom.

• Program Development in the Two-Year College: Klausman, Taylor, Holmsten, Charlton, and Raines have all explored the difficulty of developing a cohesive and sequenced writing program across sections, departments, and campuses. This breakout session will focus on strategies for creating basic skills and first-year writing programs that serve the local needs of campuses and align program development with national best practices.

A closing plenary discussion session will highlight important issues and questions from the day’s activities and invite participants to reflect on a) future goals for their own professional work and b) future goals for the national agenda of two-year college English.

***Chair:*** Holly Hassel, University of Wisconsin-Marathon County, Wausau,

***Speakers:*** Joanne Giordano, University of Wisconsin-Marathon County, Wausau

Greg Shafer, Mott Community College, Flint, MI

Patrick Sullivan, Manchester Community College, CT

Howard Tinberg, Bristol Community College, Fall River, MA

Jeff Klausman, Whatcom Community College, Bellingham, WA, “Program Development at the Two-Year Campus”

Jean-Paul Nadeau, Bristol Community College, Fall River, MA, “Professional Development at the Two-Year College”

Leslie Roberts, Oakland Community College, Bloomfield, MI, “Teaching and Learning at the Two-Year College”

Holly Hassel, University of Wisconsin-Marathon County, Wausau

David Lydic, Austin Community College, TX, “Creative Solutions for Teaching English at Two-Year Institutions”

**W.5 Gateways, Thresholds, and Portals: Dialogues about International Higher Education Writing Research**

In the U.S., composition as a field pioneered the multiple strands of teaching, research, activism, and development that constitute CCCC work today. The field’s sense of international work, however, has often been framed in Western expansionist narratives and “export” modes. Now in its fifth year, this workshop serves to counter these forms of movement by creating new portals, new pathways for multiple and equal exchanges—for gates that open in both directions. Rather than assuming export models of U.S. writing studies research, this workshop highlights multicultural and multilingual perspectives and dialogue, as participants discover, share and participate in innovative, powerful research outside the U.S..

In the workshop, both facilitators and attendees work together on specific higher education writing research projects from physical and disciplinary sites often missing in U.S. discussions. This dialogic exchange is essential to the evolution of all of our disciplinary communities. At last year’s CCCC, Paul Prior noted that national boundaries are not the best intellectual boundaries. The same might be said of the U.S. disciplinary boundaries attached to “composition” as a relatively closed and defined domain. International researchers from many institutional, cultural, disciplinary, and methodological contexts bring to the table transformative questions, projects, approaches, and bodies of knowledge about which we are often unaware, to our detriment. Their work broadens and reshapes our horizons, while the linguistic and discursive challenges the workshop introduces help to move us from a monolingual space to an open embrace of translingual modes of work.

The workshop’s focus on international research also addresses current calls (Haswell, Russell) to rekindle U.S. writing studies research, by creating a space for full, substantial discussion of evolving and developed research projects. The texts from 24 research projects by 35 scholars from 14 countries will provide topics from diverse national, cross-national, and multilingual contexts, including writing instruction, writing center effectiveness, graduate student writing, the Common European Framework of Reference for Language, archival research, English for Specific Purposes competencies, sociocultural perspectives on literacy and education, and writing in anthropology, the sciences, visual and performing arts, and engineering.

Format:

When researchers from different geopolitical, theoretical, national, and institutional contexts get together to do real work, a critical element is time—time to understand each other and to encounter and negotiate multiple discursive orientations, from the simplest terminology to the deepest theoretical grounding. Translating practices, institutional research purposes, and projects across national, cultural, and linguistic borders requires both exchanging materials well in advance of the conference meeting, and extended time together during the workshop, to avoid the misunderstandings and superficial understandings that can occur without this extended kind of work.

The workshop thus unfolds in three activities, two should be done before the CCCC gathering to enable ongoing exchanges well in advance:

1) Workshop facilitators will post draft research texts on a wiki by January. All workshop participants (facilitators and registrants) will read the texts from January to March, freeing up all actual workshop time for discussion and exchange about these drafts.

The texts, several co-authored, will be grouped into clusters on the wiki. Each participant will choose a text relevant to his or her interests from each cluster. At the workshop, all participants thus work in small groups several times, once with the author(s) of each of six texts. In this unique format, workshop facilitators become learner-participants alongside registrants when not leading a group discussing their own draft, thus encountering the writing research from other countries represented and the different emergent or well-established methods and research questions.

2) With their texts, workshop facilitators will also post:

- A brief institutional description as it factors into their research about writing.

- A glossary of any potentially context/culture-specific terms, both practical and profound; the glossary collectively produced will be further discussed during the workshop itself.

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

3) The workshop chairs will maintain focus on broad questions that frame both the pre-workshop exchanges and the actual workshop discussions:

• What is meant by “research”? What are the research methodologies in use in different contexts? Why? Do we need new methods to collaborate internationally?

• What are the objects of research? The research questions, populations, courses, programs, assessments, practices? How do questions of identity, access, discursive mobility and power, and positionality affect the nature, culture, and practice of writing research across institutional and geopolitical contexts?

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

• Does English act as portal or gatekeeper for some international writing research exchange?

• What do we take as the evolving meanings of “international” and “global” for our collective concerns?

Through these framing questions, each project will receive attentive discussion, as we undo assumptions, negotiate tensions and differences, model practices that resist simple dichotomies, and broaden perspectives. We will thus construct a group sense of possible responses: a gateway of its own, enabling flows of relationships and foregrounding what all the participants learn, gain, and give.

At the end of the day, all participants will leave the workshop itself with a broader knowledge of international writing research, a sense of the very real complications and satisfactions of undertaking international collaborations, and contacts for future work that will move international exchange and understanding forward.

***Co-Chairs:*** Cinthia Gannett, Fairfield University, CT

Christiane Donahue, Dartmouth/Théodile, Hanover, NH

Yuehai (Mike) Xiao, New York University, NY

***Speakers:*** Erdem Akbas, University of York, England, “A Cross-Cultural and Cross-Linguistic Study: Metadiscourse in MA Dissertation Abstracts”

Lisa Arnold, American University of Beirut, Lebanon, “Internationalizing Composition History”

Amy Zenger, American University of Beirut, Lebanon, “Internationalizing Composition History”

Neval Avci, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, “Nationalism 101: Writing Instruction in the Turkish Higher Educational System”

Melanie Brinkschulte, University of Goettingen International Writing Center, Goettingen, Germany, “Looking inside and outside: Bicultural Academic Writing Partnerships”

Hatice Gulru Yuksel, Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey, “Metadiscoursal Features in Learner Corpora”

Yasemin Bayyurt, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey, “Metadiscoursal Features in Learner Corpora”

Suzan Hatipoglu Kavanoz, Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey, “Metadiscoursal Features in Learner Corpora”

Duygu Candarli, Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey, “Metadiscoursal Features in Learner Corpora”

Isabelle Delcambre, Université de Lille-Nord de France, Lille, “University Literacies: A Research Field for Describing Students and Faculty Perceptions about Writing”

Dominique Lahanier-Reuter, Université de Lille-Nord de France, Lille, “University Literacies: A Research Field for Describing Students and Faculty Perceptions about Writing”

Heather Graves, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, “‘Inorganic Chemists won’t remember the Physics!’: Claims, Evidence, and Argument in Nanotechnology and Its Contributing Disciplines”

Kathy Harrington, London Metropolitan University, England, “Investigating the Value of Collaborative Peer Writing Tutorials: Learning From Experiences in the UK”

Nancy Karabeyoglu, Sabanci University, Istanbul, Turkey, “‘Image of Science’: Creating Research with Text and Image in an X-Disciplinary Collaboration of Researchers, Designers, and Writers”

Kathrin Kaufhold, Lancaster University, England, “Researching European Students’Thesis Writing at a British University as Historically Situated Social Practices: An Ethnographic Perspective”

Julia Kiernan, University of Louisville, KY, “Allophone Canadians: Negotiating Multiculturalist Policy within Pedagogical Development”

Noreen Lape, Dickinson College, Carlisle, PA, “Going Global: The Development of a Multilingual Writing Center”

Anne McCabe, St. Louis University Madrid, Spain, “European ‘Can Do’Statements: Reflection and Self-Assessment in the First-Year Writing Classroom”

Ligia Mihut, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, “Making time for (Hi)story in Global Spaces”

Brian Paltridge, University of Sydney, Australia, “Researching Doctoral Writing in the Visual and Performing Arts: What Textography Affords”

Sue Starfield, University of New South Wales, Australia, “Re”

Danica Pirsl, University of Nish, Serbia, “Development of Generic Competencies in English for Specific Purposes”

Solzica Popovska, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, Macedonia, “Development of Generic Competencies by English for Specific Purposes”

Birgitta Ramsey, Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond, “Extending the Dialogue: New Approaches in Swedish Academic Writing Research”

Rich Rice, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, “Research Reading, Writing, and Teaching in India Using ‘Glocalized’New Media Approaches”

Boba Samuels, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, “Writing and Reading Texts in a Canadian Anthropology Department: Students’Tentative Movement between the Boundaries”

John Scenters-Zapico, University of Texas-El Paso, “Stories of Disruption: Border Crossing Lives, Educational Experiences”

Tatiana Teslenko, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, “Sustainable Integration: Writing Pedagogy for Engineers”

Connie Kendall Theado, University of Cincinnati, OH, “Sociocultural Perspectives on Literacy and English Education: A Cross-Cultural Study with U.S. and Kurdish Teacher Educators”

Margaret Willard-Traub, University of Michigan-Dearborn, “The Uses of Reflective Writing in Trans-National Educational Contexts”

Sheena Wilson, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, “Student Writing, Language Acquisition, and Metacognitive Reflection in a Bilingual Context: The Unique Case Campus Saint Jean”

Eva Lemaire, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, “Student Writing, Language Acquisition, and Metacognitive Reflection in a Bilingual Context: The Unique Case Campus Saint Jean”

Lisa Wolff, Dickinson College, Carlisle, PA, “Going Global: The Development of a Multilingual Writing Center”

Lucile Duperron, Dickinson College, Carlisle, PA, “Going Global: The Development of a Multilingual Writing Center”

Yuehai (Mike) Xiao, New York University, “Applying Schema Theory to EFL Writing Instruction with College Students in China”

**W.6 Gateways, Gates, and Gatekeeping: Mentoring and Diversity as a Feminist Future.**

**This workshop is sponsored by the Committee of Women Scholars in the History of Rhetoric and Composition.**

• What scholarly and methodological gateways has the field constructed, and do they limit or open up possibilities for inquiry?

• What else can we learn about the discipline from studying its past transitions and the consequences of those who moved into new territories of inquiry and teaching?

• How does the discipline welcome new teachers, scholars, and students? Who among all our publics—scholars in other disciplines, policy- and lawmakers, business leaders, and the general public—are turned away, and why?

The above questions from the 2011 CCCC CFP echo the concerns and questions expressed by participants at the 20th Anniversary Feminist Workshop, where we took stock of our collective history and imagined the future of the space. The group noted that the Workshop has been an important place in opening up possibilities for feminist friendships, collaboration, and mentoring and that, as a site of informal participation among scholars at many different levels and embodying many different identities, the Workshop introduces members to a small and supportive community that is itself a gateway to richer participation in the CCCC. For future workshops, participants expressed a strong interest in emphasizing mentoring relationships (especially for graduate students, contingent faculty, and scholars transitioning in academic status), encouraging visible participation and participant investment in the Workshop both during the Wednesday session and through the convention, and affording opportunities for in-depth sharing of work, ideas, challenges, issues, and material resources. The group also recognized the importance of drawing interest, camaraderie, and connection across identity categories, theoretical frameworks, and diverse participants. The group was wholly invested in finding ways to prevent the false separation of feminism from related concerns of gender and sexuality, race, and disability. The hope for the future of the Feminist Workshop is that it will continue to be a site that warmly welcomes CCCC scholars into a working and productive public, inclusively and creatively.

In light of the retrospective and prospective work of the 2011 Feminist Workshop, this year’s Workshop is designed to provide time and space for mentoring conversations among experts, advanced scholars, assistant professors, adjunct faculty, and graduate students as they negotiate various gateways—to tenure, publication, collaboration, pedagogical innovation, interdisciplinarity, and degree completion, to name a few.

Keynote Speakers and Morning Discussions

Dr. Roxanne Mountford, co-author of *Women’s Ways of Making It*, will offer opening remarks for the Workshop by discussing how productive mentoring relationships can be established, sustained, and reconceived to embody feminist principles and needs. Following Mountford’s opening remarks, Keynote Speakers Julie Jung, Jennifer Seibel Trainor, Beverly Moss, and Karen Kopelson will lead roundtable discussions that examine the intersections among race and whiteness, disability, queer scholarship, feminism, and mentoring. They will focus on ways to open up feminist scholarship and mentoring models to better accommodate the multiplicity of identities and ways of knowing and being that inform mentoring relationships. Kopelson, Trainor, Moss, and Jung will begin the roundtables by complicating the mentor-mentee relationship as they see it before opening the conversation and will give participants and experts time to consider ways collaboration and support at the workshop can help young scholars and professionals more smoothly grow and transition throughout their careers.

Afternoon Working Groups

Following lunch, speakers, mentors, and participants will form work groups that will provide a host of mentoring opportunities. The afternoon working groups, led by mentor-mentee or co-collaborator pairs, will mentor participants through mini-project presentations or workshops. Groups will be organized to discuss various challenges, share research ideas, provide feedback on potential publications, and strategize ways of addressing professional and classroom problems. Participants will have the opportunity to focus on their own professional interests as well as to engage in discussions that will help to critique and diversify feminist scholarship and mentoring models. The makeup of the groups will depend on participant interests and goals; in the fall, we will call for participant proposals and build the focus around their needs and expectations.

***Co-Chairs:*** Patti Hanlon-Baker, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA

Tammie Kennedy, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Lindsay Russell, University of Washington, Seattle

Jason Barrett-Fox, University of Kansas, Lawrence

***Speakers:***

Roxanne Mountford, University of Kentucky, Lexington, “Feminist Models for Mentoring Relationships”

Julie Jung, Illinois State University, Normal, “Disability and Neuroscience Rhetorics”

Jennifer Seibel Trainor, San Francisco State University, CA, “Race and Whiteness in the Academy”

Karen Kopelson, University of Louisville, KY, “Feminisms and Queer Theory”

Beverly Moss, Ohio State University, Columbus, “African American Women Scholars”

**W.7 Gathered at the Gate: Basic Writing in Evidence**

A swift rhetorical analysis of the Call for Proposals for CCCC 2012 reveals this: it is replete with the language of basic writing but sidesteps direct reference to it. Neither the word “basic” nor “developmental” appears in the body CFP, yet the tropes emerging from the narratives of and theory on basic writing reverberate everywhere in it. For example, when we read “our field is fundamentally about the transitions that literacy brings to individual lives and collective destinies” (Anson 2011), we cannot help but think about Mike Rose’s *Lives on the Boundary*. And “a successful passage can also mean loss: leaving behind one’s culture or language, taking on questionable new roles, or joining exclusionary communities of practice” brings to mind immediately the dialogue between Rodriguez’s *The Hunger of Memory* and Villanueva’s *Bootstraps*, while “checkpoints—thresholds that promise a welcome transformation, new state of being, or a journey onward, and borders that can block, reject, and turn away” echoes Bartholomae’s “Inventing the University.” And of course, “How does our field monitor gateways created by others?” praises Shaughnessy’s *Errors and Expectations* to the foreground.

Yet the most recent of those texts was published in 1993—what of basic writing almost two decades later? Perhaps the questions raised by these seminal texts have been fully integrated into discipline writ large and no longer require the “pull-out” or “remediation” of separate, specialized attention? Yet basic skills continues to dominate the cultural and social landscape as a central concern. Public policies focused on everything from financial aid to credit accumulation have become part of a very public discussion about basic skills in general. And, increasingly, foundations like Lumina and Gates have begun to consider the issue of basic skills in higher education. Despite this, those who teach, research, and study basic skills continue to be pushed to the sidelines of discussions about higher education.

This workshop will follow up on the Sense of the House motion passed at CCCC 2011 which stated, “Be it resolved that Basic Writing is a vital field and its students and teacher scholars a productive force within composition; is under attack by exclusionary public policies; and therefore must be recognized publicly and supported by CCCC as a conference cluster and with featured sessions.” It will do so by highlighting both the exclusionary forces at work as well as productive responses on local campuses demonstrated through evidence-based practices. This workshop will also provide critical support for basic writing educators by creating networking opportunities to work with faculty from across the United States in a focused, sustained way.

For the final part of the day, we will consider the CBW mission statement and the newly written charter. We will also consider new business.

***Co-Chairs:*** J. Elizabeth Clark, LaGuardia Community College, Long Island City, NY

Hannah Ashley, West Chester University, PA

***Speakers:*** Bruce Horner, University of Louisville, KY

Susan Naomi Bernstein, Independent Scholar, Forest Hills, New York, “Gathered at the Gate” Peter Adams, Community College of Baltimore County, MD

William B. Lalicker, West Chester University, PA

Heidi Johnsen, LaGuardia Community College—CUNY, Long Island City, NY

Nejla Camponeschi, Community College of Baltimore County, MD

Jan Allen, Community College of Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD

Michelle Zollars, Patrick Henry Community College, Martinsville, VA

Gregory Glau, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff

Sarah Kirk, University of Alaska Anchorage

**W.8 Co-Imagining Cultural Rhetorics: Practice, Performance, and Pedagogy**

What are cultural rhetorics? What do cultural rhetorics theories and methodologies look like? What are cultural rhetorics pedagogies? And how/why would we practice cultural rhetorics in our teaching and scholarship? These questions serve as the crux of this full-day workshop that explores cultural rhetorics and its affordances in our disciplinary practices.

Over the last seven years, “cultural rhetorics” has appeared with increasing frequency in CCCC programs. Presentations in these panels reveal a range of topics treating links between rhetoric and race, making underrepresented voices heard, and attempting to build methodologies for understanding everyday composing practices from new media writers in coffee houses to website designers advocating for social change to performances of bodily experience. As Malea Powell suggested, these approaches “move our conversations and our practices toward a wider understanding of how all made things are rhetorical, and of how cultures make, and are made by, the rhetoricity of things” (2010).

In her 2011 CCCC Chair’s address Gwen Pough asked us to remember that our work in this discipline is important because there are felt implications that exist/take effect throughout the university, and outside of the academic walls. Recent scholarship in cultural rhetorics methodologies that have emerged from the areas of indigenous rhetorics, queer rhetorics, embodied rhetorics, rhetoric of science, and technical communication. Through a cultural rhetorics practice we cultivate responsible, relational, and complex methodologies that pay attention to specific cultural and social contexts. Cultural rhetorics theories and methodologies matter beyond the study of rhetoric and composition; we envision this workshop as a space to co-imagine and make potential inter/multi-disciplinary cultural rhetorics trajectories.

In this workshop what panelists will do: several established cultural rhetorics scholars and practitioners will model a wide variety of cultural rhetorics methods and methodologies while asking our facilitators to share, make, and discuss their own practices and experiences. The tensions and contradictions between individual panelists will, further, serve as a model for understanding the degree to which these tensions are productive and necessary for highlighting the generative potential of resisting a single idea of “what is” cultural rhetorics.

What workshop participants will do: workshop participants will be asked to bring a research project, a tentative bibliography, or teaching materials at any stage of completion that might serve as a inquiry into cultural rhetorics. Facilitators will send out 1-2 short readings (approx. 15 pages, but no more) prior to the workshop. For the first half of the day, participants will move through “stations” arranged according to method/methodology. The goal of this activity is to acquaint participants with as many different ways of understanding and imagining their work inside cultural rhetorics frames as possible. These small groups allow for more direct facilitation with scholars already working in this area, as well as for opportunities for building potential collaborative partnerships.

In the second half of the workshop, we’ll begin with a large group discussion about the affordances and challenges that emerged during the morning’s “stations” activities. One strategy for this discussion will be to return to the organizing frame of this proposal: What are cultural rhetorics? What do cultural rhetorics theories and methodologies look like? What are cultural rhetorics pedagogies? And how/why would we practice cultural rhetorics in our teaching and scholarship? How do we co-imagine futures for cultural rhetorics within and outside the field? Then we’ll ask participants to break into smaller, self-themed work groups to think about how specific practices around particular issues might add up into the larger “what are cultural rhetorics” answers. We’ll end the workshop with a final, large group discussion that draws on the smaller group activities and points toward future work.

This set of recursive activities, enacted in small, focused groups and in a larger synthesis will enable participants to think about cultural rhetorics in a variety of practices—pedagogies that link first-year writing to graduate seminars, curriculum and program-building, research and scholarship—shared across interest areas in the discipline. Additionally, we will invite participants to collaborate on future conference panels, research projects, articles, and pedagogical deliverables.

***Co-Chairs:*** Donnie Johnson Sackey, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Jennifer Sano-Franchini, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Andrea Riley Mukavetz, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Madhu Narayan, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Matt Novak, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Doug Schraufnagle, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Martine Courant Rife, Lansing Community College, MI

Timothy Dougherty, Syracuse University, NY

Casie Cobos, Texas A&M University, College Station

Angela Haas, Illinois State University, Normal

Daisy Levy, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Malea Powell, Michigan State University, East Lansing

**W.9 Play/Write 4.0: Alternate Reality Games and Composition**

One sentence description: Building on the success of last year’s workshop, leaders will present Alternate Reality Games (ARGs) as sites for learning writing through immersion, building overarching narratives into composition classrooms, and doing collaborative work within classrooms and even between universities; leaders will lead participants not only in the experience of immersive play, but also in learning to design their own ARGs and assignments using both low tech and new media tools.

Alternate Reality Games (ARGs) are games that make use of interactive narratives, often utilizing multiple media and game elements, that deliberately blur the line between “in-game and out-of-game experiences” (Gosney, 2005). ARGs take place in physical space and in real time, but may make extensive use of online sites and tools. ARGs present a unique opportunity for the composition instructor because a class-based ARG grants a narrative arc to the composition classroom, engages students with each other and those at other schools both in and outside the classroom, makes use of both digital and paper-based research technologies, creates a student-centered semiotic domain (Gee, 2003), and relies upon a unique style of rhetorical situation that provides students real-world experience while engaging with fictional narratives. Using the ARG in the writing class is thus a more appropriate pedagogical practice than the “gamification” of learning that has recently been critiqued (Bogost, 2011).

In this full-day workshop, composition/rhetoric instructors who are also game studies researchers (and gamers) will present participants with a variety of ways to use Alternate Reality Games in the classroom, research existing games, and design assignments using games. In short presentations and discussions, workshop leaders will share updates on the games they already use to teach writing and rhetoric, lead participants through methods of designing an ARG, and work with other participants in creating assignments that teach writing, argument, and gaming in a blended way. Participants will have the opportunity to play one of these games themselves and examine how they might integrate game-oriented pedagogies with their current teaching practices. Ultimately, this workshop aims to consolidate some of the best practices in teaching with Alternate Reality Games and to equip all participants with the tools to bring ARGs to their own classrooms.

In the first half of the workshop, leaders will introduce participants to ARGs and related games through the firsthand experience of actual gameplay. In addition, leaders and participants will discuss ways to integrate games in the composition curriculum, while highlighting theories and best practices.

In the second half of the workshop, leaders and participants will break into groups to focus on techniques for building ARGs including game mechanics, the development of narrative arcs, storyboarding, and using both low-tech and high-tech tools to enact the game, such as incorporating augmented reality using LAYAR, and using new media tools such as Google Voice, Twitter, Facebook, and other social media sites. The participants will also focus on building assignments using ARGs as appropriate to their local contexts and desired learning outcomes.

At the conclusion of the small-group sessions, leaders and participants will discuss ways to shape future directions in composition and rhetoric games, and specifically, Alternate Reality Games and research. We hope to discover together the potentially illuminating lens ARGs can bring to writing, and what the dynamic space of ARGs can tell us about our notions of audience, interactivity, and research methods.

(The workshop leaders have both participated and facilitated past play/write workshops and have noted that participants frequently wish they had had more time to experience and reflect upon the workshop activities; thus, for this year’s proposal we are switching from a half-day to full-day format.)

***Co-Chairs:*** Douglas Eyman, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA

Kelly Centrelli, CUNY Queens College, New York

Jill Anne Morris, Frostburg State University, MD

Mary Karcher, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI

Scott Reed, Georgia Gwinnett College, GA

Sheryl Ruszkiewicz, Northern Michigan University, Marquette

Wendi Sierra, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

**W.10 Opening Prison Gates: Creating, Sustaining, Researching and Extending Literacy Programs Behind Bars**

Entering a correctional facility, whether for the first time or the hundredth time, means passing through both literal gateways of razor wire and steel as well as metaphorical barriers of difference and separation into a territory that transforms everyone who makes that journey. Increasingly, teachers of writing are finding value in making that journey either by teaching in prison education and arts programs or creating community-based collaborations between universities and a variety of correctional settings. Faculty and students alike find that the passage into prison is one through which beliefs and assumptions about justice, human rights, literacy, and pedagogy are challenged, tested and transformed.

This workshop is intended to facilitate that passage by offering both novice and veteran practitioners of prison teaching a chance to examine opportunities and challenges for literacy programs in prison, share and extend best practices, and develop research agendas. The workshop will focus on five key issues:

• Developing effective programs

• Creating and sustaining meaningful connections between universities and correctional facilities

• Crafting priorities for, and addressing the unique ethical concerns associated with, research in correctional settings

• Navigating the relationships among teaching, inquiry, and advocacy

• Exploring the implications of prison teaching for the future of composition studies.

 The workshop is organized to 1) ) present critical perspectives and models, 2) engage participants in active discussion of key issues, and 3) provide opportunities, materials, and collaborative formats through which to develop action plans and for prison literacy program development, enhancement, and/or research.

 The day is divided into several key components: an initial keynote address by the director and founder of the nationally acclaimed Prison Creative Arts Project; several breakout groups in which presenters will frame a critical issue to be taken up by the group; a choice of roundtable discussions addressing the more pragmatic elements of prison teaching and institutional relationships; a lunch hour interactive “gallery” of materials and resources; a second set of breakout sessions; and a final plenary session at which participants can synthesize the different ideas introduced throughout the day and make plans for ongoing programs, research, and collaborations. To ensure ample time for discussion, facilitators will supplement brief presentations with more extensive materials (elaborations of major arguments, sample pedagogical activities, and bibliographies) that will be compiled and made available electronically following the workshop.

***Co-Chairs:*** Laura Rogers, Albany College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, NY

Phyllis Hastings, Saginaw Valley State University, MI

***Speakers:*** William (Buzz) Alexander, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, “Prisons Are Limits, Blocks, Barriers; Workshops Are Openings, Doors, Dances”

Stacy Bell McQuaide, Oxford College of Emory University, GA, “Corpses in My Yard: The Challenge and Necessity of Writing Instruction in Prison”

Tobi Jacobi, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, “From the Pacific to the Atlantic and Everywhere In-Between: The Challenge of Publishing Prison Writing”

Wendy Hinshaw, Florida Atlantic University, Boynton Beach, “‘Read and Watch’: Building a Book Club with Incarcerated Juveniles”

Tom Kerr, Ithaca College, Syracuse, NY, “Prison Writing and Critical Literacy”

Patrick Berry, Syracuse University, NY, “Ethnography of the Prison”

Scott Whiddon, Transylvania University, Lexington, KY, “Prisons and Pedagogies: Reflections on Designing a Short-term Course on Prison Rhetoric”

Cory Holding, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, “Rhetoric and Performance in Prison”

Kimberly Drake, Scripps College, Claremont, CA, “Developing College-Prison Connections” Barbara Roswell, Goucher College, Baltimore, MD, “Go Where the Way Is Open: Creating Sustainable Institutional Partnerships”

**W.11 Convergence in the Classroom: Exploring New Media in Composition**

Twenty-first-century environments for reading and writing are continually expanding. With this expansion comes a growing variety of texts, few of which resemble what many students and teachers think of as a “traditional” essay. A critical understanding of the concepts of purpose, audience, context, and choice is vital for writers who take increasingly versatile approaches to composing. Rather than taking time away from the concerns of the composition classroom, critical engagement with digital technologies and multiple modes of communication enables students to access the concepts traditionally at the core of writing education.

The Writing Program at the University of Massachusetts Amherst sponsors a group of teachers who explore the convergence of new media and traditional writing pedagogy. These Technology Fellows encourage their students to develop an awareness of the conventions, material contexts, and possibilities of new media technologies and texts. In this workshop, Technology Fellows who have incorporated digital, multimedia, and new media components in their teaching will share insights from their work, lead discussions on classroom practices, and facilitate hands-on sessions in new media composition. Specifically, participants will work collaboratively to explore these questions:

- What is new media and what can it offer to the teaching of writing?

- How can critical engagement with new media promote effective classroom practices?

- How can we teach students to analyze and produce new media texts, especially if we are not completely sure how to do this ourselves? How can we navigate various levels of expertise and access to technology?

- How can we assess new media texts produced in the writing classroom?

- How does bringing new media into the classroom help us re-imagine the act of writing and our own goals as teachers?

Throughout the workshop, we will model how new media enhances classroom activities such as discussion, analysis, and composition. Attendees will participate in a range of exercises designed for in-class use, culminating in the creation and assessment of their own new media texts. This workshop will provide us and our participants the opportunity to examine new media’s relationship to traditional classrooms; however, participants do not need prior expertise in digital technologies and multimedia composition.

***Co-Chairs:*** Christina Jones, University of Massachusetts Amherst

Travis Grandy, University of Massachusetts Amherst

Hari Stephen Kumar, University of Massachusetts Amherst

John Gallagher, University of Massachusetts Amherst

***Speakers:*** Anne Bello, University of Massachusetts Amherst

Sarah Dwyer, Ivy Tech, Elkhart, IN

Neelofer Qadir, University of Massachusetts Amherst

**W.12 Cutting/Moving/Singing/Drawing through the Hype: Writing Actions and Activities in Multimodal Composing**

As new technologies complicate the writing situations our students will encounter in academic, professional, personal, and public contexts, we as writing teachers are presented with both new challenges and opportunities. One of the greatest challenges and opportunities lies in the relationship we adopt to multimodal composing in the classroom. Although multimodality carries with it diverse definitions and connotations associated with different communities of practice, the most basic definition is a composition combining word and image (and often sound and/or movement); this definition is one that challenges many of our fundamental assumptions about our work as writing teachers in the classroom and as writing researchers in the field. Therefore, multmimodal composition also offers the opportunity to make visible to our students some perplexing issues, such as: What is writing? What is authorship? What is rhetorical sensitivity in visual and auditory systems? What do purpose, audience, and constraints look like in these new composing situations?

The specific goals of this workshop are:

\*\*To introduce and discuss issues relevant to the integration of multimodal composing into the writing classroom

\*\*To provide participants with resources for designing new multimodal assignments and courses

\*\*To offer time for participants to practice with new, perhaps unfamiliar, platforms for multimodal composing and to engage in discussion about the rhetorical concerns they resurrect, re-frame, or reinvent.

\*\*To provide participants the opportunity to think together about how to assess multimodal composing in their particular contexts.

This workshop will serve as a space to examine “big questions” while providing concrete strategies for integrating multimodality into the writing classroom. Workshop participants will have the chance to consider the challenges that arise when designing and adapting to teaching and learning for/in these new situations and contexts, and they will discuss principles and guidelines for design and implementation of curricula, activities, lessons, assignments, and objectives related to them.

In this full-day workshop, we propose a two-part approach. We will begin with an examination of the theoretical implications of new media for the writing classroom. The questions addressed by the first portion of the workshop will include:

\*\*What is multimodality anyway?

\*\*What counts as writing in multimodal composing?

\*\*How do we teach, design, and assess aspects of interaction across modes?

\*\*How do we teach and assess unfamiliar genres of compositions?

\*\*How can we account for uneven experience with, and access to, technology?

\*\*How much expertise can we be expected to possess about the technologies we use for class purposes?

\*\*How do new digital tools and platforms raise new rhetorical considerations that might need to be taken into account in the process of composing, specifically issues surrounding the animation of text and the formulation of text as image?

\*\*What relationship should there be between mutlimodal composing goals and student engagement?

\*\*When we introduce additional modes into the writing classroom how do we mitigate “what we give up” in a 15-week semester?

\*\*How do we align multimodal composing with existing course, programmatic (e.g., First Year Writing, WAC/WID), and general education requirements?

The session will begin with presentations addressing the central questions raised above and then move into examples of assignments and assignment sequences, lessons and lectures, professional development activities, and free software applications for use in writing courses. In addition, participants will receive a bibliography of resources and sample assignment materials. Here participants will have a chance to bring their own questions to the table as well and discuss what has worked or not worked in the past in relation to these theoretical questions made practical.

The second half of the session will be a design workshop in which participants will work in stations--creating multimodal compositions themselves in order to play with new software, engaging in activity and assignment design, testing out possible assignment sequencing and assessment practices, and even collaborating on full course designs--based on participants’ goals and interests.

While there will be several demonstrations of relevant implementations of digital technology for multimodal composing, participants will need to provide their own technology for in-workshop use of the same. This workshop would benefit greatly from the availability of a projector and wireless internet access.

***Speakers:*** Kevin Brock, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

Matt Davis, Florida State University, Tallahassee

David Gruber, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

Kati Fargo, North Carolina State University, Raleigh

Robin Oswald, University of North Carolina at Pembroke

**W.13 Space, Portal, Passage: Invention and the Near Invisible**

The workshop frames “invention” as a family of emergent, generative practices that bubble up in incompletely known spaces—a hidden room behind the bank of bookcases, the cavern hinted at only by a breeze from the ground. These are places in which apparently disconnected bits of knowledge and experience may—over time—drift in and settle out, dissolve, combine, and roil. They may be closed off, or become portals, connections that can lead to alchemical transformation of knowledge, experience, and cultural practice.

Workshop leaders—who come from different disciplinary practices (ethnography, visual arts, documentary, composition, poetics, performance studies)—all have abiding interests in invention as a way of expanding theory, deepening creative practice and research, and improving our institutions and the experiences they create for human beings. We represent, however, very different practices—means, media, procedures, ways of making. We find that these different practices and modalities work with and against one another in ways that afford us new access to the “near-invisible.”

Workshop participants have opportunities to explore the invisible spaces of their own disciplines, daily practices, institutions, theories, and positions via multiple modalities—visual art, poetics, ethnography, video documentation, music, and moment. We posit the CCCCs is a particularly rich opportunity to see what potentials are brewing, is a place where those things that are hinted at or partly hidden in our daily professional lives—and consequently a productive locale for study and documentation of forms of invention that “open secret doors.”

In the morning, the workshop leaders will provide theoretical context and experiments with different media, procedures and modalities, and participants will make physical, documentary, digital, and art objects alone in groups to test the methods. In the afternoon, they will move around the conferences, choosing a preferred modality to find and capture the contents of a hidden or secret “space.” (Literal or metaphoric.) They will return to share what they have made. Workshop leaders will document and guide theorizing across everyone’s experience. What portals are opened by what inventive approach or medium? What does this give us to take away?

***Chair:*** Eric Staib, Okemos Public Schools, Okemos, MI

***Speakers:*** Julie Lindquist, Michigan State University, Lansing,

Bump Halbritter, Michigan State University, Lansing

Sarah Arroyo, California State University Long Beach,

Jason Wirtz, Hunter College, New York, NY

Steve Lessner, Michigan State University, Lansing

Nancy Dejoy, Michigan State University, Lansing

**W.14 Veterans in Writing-Intensive Courses: Higher Education as a Gateway or Gatekeeper? A Workshop for Composition Teachers, Scholars, and WPAs**

According to the Department of Defense, and in part as a result of the new Post-911 GI Bill, the number of veterans enrolled in colleges and universities increased 40% between 2009 and 2011. Each year, between 300,000-400,000 veterans discharge from the military, 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, and it is important to recognize that these men and women, a diverse group of often first generation college students, understand military service as not only an opportunity to serve their country, but as a gateway to expanded life experiences, educational opportunities, and improved employability.

Yet the transition from active duty to student status can be daunting for veterans. According to a 2010 NASPA report, student-veterans often report a sense of isolation on campus and frustration with traditional students: they express concern about entering into a potentially liberal college culture that may conflate anti-war sentiment with anti-military sentiment, and they can face difficulty finding mentors amongst faculty whose values may differ significantly from their own. Not only are many student-veterans struggling with financial pressures and dealing with physical and mental health disabilities (including the “signature wounds” of TBI and PTSD), they also share the challenges many nontraditional students face, “relearning” study skills and (often unspoken) academic expectations.

Writing-intensive courses are vital spaces to work with student-veterans, to address their vastly different needs and interests, and to encourage their success. Yet, much of the scholarship on veterans as writers has come from community literacy and literary studies, while most of the scholarship on veterans as students has come from Student Services researchers. Despite some notable exceptions (such as the 2009 special issue of TETYC) compositionists currently face a significant paucity of research on how to best work with student-veterans in writing-intensive courses.

This full-day workshop addresses that paucity of information and prepares writing teachers and WPAs to work with student-veterans. Teacher-scholars and WPAs from a variety of institutions (two-year colleges, military institutes and prep schools, liberal arts colleges and research universities) will share their research, pedagogical strategies, and experiences with workshop participants to address the following questions:

• What kind of stereotypes of student-veterans circulate, even on “Veteran Friendly” campuses, and how can we challenge those stereotypes in order to acknowledge the maturity and leadership skills veterans bring to our classes?

• How can specific pedagogical approaches—for developmental writing, service-learning, working with adult learners, etc.—be tailored for student-veterans?

• Given that many veterans have significant experience with computer-mediated communication, what can veterans teach us about the acquisition of multimodal literacies?

• What are the risks and benefits of life writing/autoethnography for student-veterans? What can community writing groups, such as Warrior Writers, teach us about working with student-veterans in writing-intensive courses?

• How does the presence of veterans in our classrooms (re)shape our understanding of disability studies, and vice-versa? Which pedagogical approaches best address the needs of students experiencing TBI or PTSD?

• How does race, gender, sexuality, and/or class intersect with veteran’s identities, educational experiences, or literacy practices?

• How can writing teachers/researchers advocate with and for veterans on campus? What kinds of collaborations with veterans services (on and off campus) can be beneficial?

***Co-Chairs:*** Lisa Langstraat, Colorado State University, Fort Collins

Carla Maroudas, Mt. San Jacinto Community College, San Diego, CA

***Speakers:*** SueDoe, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, “Demographics and Pragmatics: Who Are Student-Veterans, and Why Are So Many Enrolling in Colleges and Universities Now”

Alexis Hart, Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, “What Do Faculty and Administrators Need to Know about the Post-911 GI Bill, the VA, and Mid-semester Deployments?”

Lydia Wilkes, Bloomington, IN, “Warrior Ethos, Warrior Ethics: What Can Military Culture Teach Us about Veterans in the Writing Classroom?”

Sandra Jang, United States Military Academy Preparatory School, Eatontown, NJ, “Multimodal Composition and the Traditional Essay: What We Can Learn from Veterans”

Catherine Sacchi, Ohio State University, Columbus, “The Veterans Learning Community and Vets 4 Vets: Gateways to Community and Success in the University”

Tara Wood, University of Oklahoma, Norman, “Signature Wounds: Marking, Mainstreaming, and Medicalizing Post 9/11 Veterans”

Tifarah Hadassah O’Neill, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, “Bridging the Civilian/Student-Veteran Divide”

Erin Hadlock, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, “From Rucksack to Backpack: The Rhetorical and Genre Knowledge that Veterans Bring to Writing Classes”

Katt Blackwell-Starnes, Texas Woman’s University, Lewisville, “Veterans in Writing-Intensive Courses”

Karen Springsteen, SUNY Potsdam, “‘Veterans’Community Writing Groups”

Kathryn Broyles, American Public University System, Bartlett, TN, “On-line Learning at Home and on the Front Line: Digital Classrooms for Deployed and Returning Military and Their Families”

Bob Hazard, College of DuPage, Glen Ellyn, IL, “From Combat to Classroom: Assisting Veterans in Transition”

**W.15 Writing Transitions and Rhetorical Partnerships across Elementary, Secondary, and Post-Secondary Levels**

Throughout the world partnerships are taking place among scholars and teachers of all academic levels to improve the writing, reading, and critical thinking of students. That is, communication can enable students to make leaps—not just steps—from one academic level to another as educators communicate, share knowledge, and use pedagogical and andragogical practices together. In addition to sharing knowledge of research and practice, educators across levels are working together toward change in the institutions, communities, and political climates in which they teach. Whether the programs involve writing across the curriculum, writing centers, National Writing Project sites, dual-enrollment, or individual partnerships, teachers and students benefit from such programs. This all-day pre-conference workshop will be focused on training and preparing participants to go back to their own institutions with plans for partnerships or with ideas of ways to revise existing partnerships.

 Teachers working at both secondary and university levels will facilitate the workshop based on their research, experience, collaborations, and publications.

***Co-Chairs:*** Pamela Childers, Lesley University, Cambridge, MA

Maja Wilson, University of Maine, Orono

***Speakers:*** Maja Wilson, University of Maine, Orono

Pamela Childers, Lesley University, Cambridge, MA

Nancy Patterson, Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI

Leigh Ryan, University of Maryland, College Park

Amber Jensen, Edison High School, Alexandria, VA

James UhlenKamp, Graceland University, Lamoni, IA

Alice Myatt, University of Mississippi, University

Cynthia Miecznikowski, University of North Carolina-Pembroke

Melody Wise, Glenville State College, Pittsburgh, PA

Carrie Wastal, University of California-San Diego

Daniel Gutierrez, Windward School, Los Angeles, CA

Gerd Brauer, Freiburg University of Education, Germany